

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Private offerings (cont.)

In light of the fact that it was determined that the exposition of the Beraisa was unnecessary the Gemara explains what halachos are derived from the multiple appearances of the word קרבנו.

2) Heirs

R' Chananya cited a Beraisa that taught that an heir does not lean on the korban and does not effect temurah.

Rava challenges these rulings from a Mishnah.

Rather than delete the Beraisa Rava explains that it follows the opinion of R' Yehudah.

The rationales behind R' Yehudah and Rabanan's respective opinions are explained.

The exchange between R' Yehudah and Rabanan is recorded.

3) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah begins with a discussion of who must lean on the head of the korban and concludes with some details related to a proper semicha.

4) Those exempt from leaning on a korban

The Gemara explains why those mentioned in the Mishnah are exempt from leaning on the head of a korban and then asks why a blind person does not lean on his korban.

R' Chisda and R' Yitzchok bar Avdimi have different gezeiros shavos that teach that one who is blind does not lean on the head of his korban.

The exchange between R' Chisda and R' Yitzchok bar Avdimi regarding their respective expositions is recorded.

A Beraisa presents the sources that exclude one's slave, his agent and his wife from leaning on his korban on his behalf.

The reason different expositions are necessary is explained.

(Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

- Does an heir lean on his father's korban?

- What is meant when the Mishnah states that leaning is considered the remnant of a mitzvah?

- Why is it necessary to preclude one's slave, agent and wife from leaning on one's korban?

- How many hands are included in the word ידו?

Distinctive INSIGHT

The law of leaning on an animal owned by partners

לרבות כל בעלי חוברין לסמיכה

The Tosefta (Menachos 10:4) describes how a group of partners performed the rite of leaning on their animal before it was slaughtered for an offering. If, for example, five people jointly owned an animal, they each would lean on the animal, but not together at the same time. One would lean on the animal, followed by the next one. This is also how Rambam rules (Hilchos Ma'asei HaKorbanos 3:9).

Gri"z explains that the reason that they do not all lean on the animal at the same time is that there would be a problem of the hands of the one touching the head of the animal being an interposition between the animal and the hands of his fellow partners. According to this, all partners should lean on the animal together if there were only two or three partners, and it would be possible for all of them to place their hands directly.

Radba"z, however, writes that the reason only one of the partners should lean on the animal is based upon the verse which expresses the act of leaning in the singular "his hand - ידו," and not the plural "their hands - ידם." This would allow only one person to lean, even if there was no issue of other people's hands being an interposition.

Aruch HaShulchan HoAsid (Ma'asei Korbanos 68:15) gives still a different reason that partners do not each lean on the animal they bring for an offering. He says that when many people lean on a consecrated animal it gives the appearance that the animal is being used for their private usage.

Gri"z (Temura 2a) explains that when Rambam writes that the partners should not lean simultaneously it means that they do not have to lean together, but they may do so if they wish. This is true, provided that they each lean directly on the animal itself, and not on each other's hands. Ra'aved, however, holds that many partners may lean together, and even if they lean on each other's hands this does not constitute an interposition. He apparently holds that the issue of an interposition is when a cloth or other material interrupts between one's hands and the animal, but a hand, even of another person, is not an interposition between one's own hand and the animal's head.

The Gemara later (94a) notes that waving the mincha may not be done by multiple owners, based upon the issue of the hands of others being an interposition. Sfas Emes, however, explains the issue there being unique to waving. ■

HALACHAH Highlight

May a married woman use an agent to nullify her chometz or separate challah?

אבל אשתו דכגופיה דמיא אימא תיסמך

But when it comes to one's wife who is like one's body I would think that she could lean [for him]

It was suggested to Teshuvos Yehudah Ya'aleh¹ that a woman should not be capable of appointing someone to act as her agent to nullify chometz or separate challah. The reason is that the chometz and dough belong to her husband and her ability to nullify the chometz or separate the challah is that she acts as an agent of her husband. Accordingly, she cannot appoint another person to act as her agent since one agent cannot appoint another agent for something that does not involve an action – מילי לא מימסרן לשליח. Since this principle is codified in Shulchan Aruch² it follows that a woman should not be able to appoint someone as her agent for these activities.

Yehudah Ya'aleh rejected this approach for two reasons. First of all he does not consider these to be agencies that do not involve an action. Since the nullification of chometz removes the chometz from one's possession and saves one from violating the prohibition against owning chometz and the separation of challah allows one to eat the dough it is considered agency for an action and as such an agent may appoint another agent in his place. Secondly, when a woman nullifies chometz or separates challah she is not acting as her husband's agent. Rather she is acting as if she were her husband since husband and wife are considered a single individual (אשתו כגופו). This distinction is evident from our Gemara. The Gemara relates that had the Torah taught that leaning could not be done by proxy one would not know that a woman could not lean for

(Overview...continued from page 1)

5) The importance of leaning on the korban

A Beraisa teaches that if one does not lean on the head of a korban he misses out on some of the atonement.

Another Beraisa expresses a similar thought with regards to waving a korban.

6) Leaning

A Beraisa teaches that one must lean on the head of the animal and not on another part of the animal.

The Gemara explains why all these cases had to be excluded.

The Gemara inquires whether it is acceptable to put one's hands on the side of the animal's head.

A Beraisa is cited the states that one may not place his hands on the side of the animal's head.

R' Yirmiyah inquires whether a cloth would constitute an interposition and a Beraisa confirms that it would be an interposition.

Reish Lakish cites the source that two hands are required. A related incident is recounted.

The Gemara clarifies the last line of the Mishnah.

7) MISHNAH: The Mishnah contrasts the obligation to lean on the head of the korban with the obligation to wave the korban. ■

her husband. The reason a wife would not be excluded by the teaching that excludes agents is that husband and wife are considered to be single unit in contrast to a principal and his agent. Since she is considered to be a single unit with her husband she has the authority to appoint an agent to act in her place. ■

1. שו"ת יהודה יעלה או"ח סי' קכ"א.

2. שו"ע חו"מ סי' רמ"ד. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

The Power of Community

"אין כפרה אלא בדם..."

The Avnei Nezer, zt"l, gives a very deep explanation of the most important prerequisite for atonement. "On Menachos 93 our sages teach that atonement can only be attained through the blood of the sacrifices. Yet the verse explicitly says about the mitzvah of shekalim, 'לתת את תרומת ה' — לכפר על נפשותיכם' To give the terumah of Hashem to atone for your souls.' This clearly implies that shekalim also atone for

sins."

The Avnei Nezer went on to explain, "The atonement of shekalim is not for sins per se. Shekalim atone for a person's tendency to separate himself from his fellow Jews. Through giving shekalim he unifies himself with the community of the Jewish people. In this manner the blood of the sacrifices—which is what atones—are from the entire community, and so they also atone for him."¹

The Otzar HaYir'ah, zt"l, explains why shekalim serve to unify every Jew with the community. "We give specifically half-shekels to teach an important lesson: that

without the community we are nothing. Since every individual has a mission to fulfill which no one else can achieve, it is easy to feel uniquely different. We must never feel separated from our friends since, at the root, all Jews are one.

"To teach that we all need each other, each person gives half a shekel—which is only completed through another Jew's half shekel. This shows that we are only complete when we are unified with our friend. This brings to great feelings of brotherhood and nullifies our natural tendency towards feeling uniquely alone."² ■

1. שקלים תר"ע שם משמואל,

2. אוצר היראה, תשובת השנה, פורים. ■