

## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) Those precluded from a portion of korbanos

Reish Lakish cites an exposition that serves as the source for the Mishnah's ruling regarding those who are precluded from a portion of korbanos.

This exposition is unsuccessfully challenged.

R' Yosef offers a second response to the challenge to Reish Lakish's exposition.

### 2) One who is blemished and tamei

Reish Lakish asks whether one who is blemished and tamei is given a portion of korbanos.

Rabbah cites a Beraisa that proves that he does not receive a portion of korbanos.

### 3) One who is tamei when offering communal korbanos

R' Oshaya asks whether a kohen who is tamei when communal korbanos are offered is given a portion of the korbanos.

Ravina cites a Beraisa that proves that he does not receive a portion.

### 4) Onein

A contradiction between our Mishnah and a Mishnah in Chagiga is noted regarding whether an onein may touch a korban.

R' Ami in the name of R' Yochanan resolves the contradiction.

This resolution is rejected and another resolution is offered.

The Gemara's current understanding of the Mishnah in Chagiga is challenged and after some analysis the Gemara comes to a conclusion regarding the meaning of that Mishnah.

Another resolution of the contradiction between the two Mishnayos is presented.

A contradiction between our Mishnah and a Mishnah in Pesachim is noted regarding whether an onein may eat korbanos the night following his aninus.

R' Yirmiyah of Difti offers one resolution to the contradiction.

(Continued on page 2)

## Distinctive INSIGHT

### *The kohen shall eat from the offering*

הכהן המחטא יאכלנה, כהן המחטא יאכל שאינו מחטא אינו אוכל, וככלא הוא? והרי משמרה כולה דאין מחטאין ואוכלין

The Mishnah (98b) taught that only a kohen who is fit to do the service of the offering is eligible to receive a portion of the meat of that offering. This is determined from the verse (Vayikra 7:33), which says that the kohen who officiates over a shelamim offering, or a kohen who was at least tahor at the moment the blood of the offering was sprinkled, is the one who would receive the right leg.

The Gemara explains that although the verse tells us that only the kohen who does the service may eat from the offering, we learn that this means that any kohen who is fit for the service may eat, but a kohen who is not eligible to serve may not eat. Furthermore, the Gemara understands that the verse is not teaching the rules regarding eating from an offering, but rather which kohen may receive a portion. It is those who are eligible to serve that receive portions. This would exclude kohanim who are minors. A kohen who has a blemish would also be excluded from this halacha, but there is a special verse which includes blemished kohanim and allows them to receive portions of the offerings.

Chasam Sofer (O.C. 1, #49) writes that there is a preference for the kohen's portion from an offering to be given to the very kohen who performed the service, and the portion which he personally cannot eat may be distributed to the other kohanim. In his HaEmek Davar, the Netzi"v (to Vayikra 6:19) explains that this halacha is learned from the aforementioned verse. Although our sages in the Gemara interpret it in terms of the eligibility requirements of which kohen may receive the portions of the offering, the verse does not depart from its literal application in terms of who shall eat from the offering. And although the verse allows for all male kohanim to partake of the offering, there is a special advantage for the kohen who officiates to eat from it. The kohen's eating from the offering leads to atonement, so if the meat is destroyed, and only one k'zayis remains, the officiating kohen should be the one who eats it.

Beis HaLevi (Responsa, Vol. 1, #7) disagrees and says that there is no special mitzvah for an officiating kohen to eat from that offering. He proves his contention from the halacha of a Kohen Gadol who is allowed to officiate over an offering while he is an onein—during the time between the death of his close relative until the burial. Although he is allowed to serve, he may not eat from the offering during this period. If there were a mitzvah for the kohen who officiates to eat from the offering, based upon the verse "the kohen who makes it into a sin-offering shall eat it," we would expect the Kohen Gadol to be disqualified from officiating as an onein, in order not to have him forsake the positive command to eat from it. ■

## REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the source that a blemished kohen receives a portion of korbanos?
2. Is contact with a corpse necessary to require being sprinkled on day three and seven?
3. Is an onein permitted to eat korbanos on the night that follows his aninus?
4. What is a "wood korban"?

## HALACHAH Highlight

### A mourner participating in Hoshanos

"שלמים" כשהוא שלם מביא ואינו מביא כשהוא און

"Shelamim" teaches that the korban is brought when he is whole and is not brought when he is an onein.

**S**hulchan Aruch<sup>1</sup> writes that on Sukkos we take a Sefer Torah to the bimah and make a circuit around the bimah each day and on Hoshana Rabba we make seven circuits. This practice is to commemorate the similar practice that was done in the Beis HaMikdash. Rema<sup>2</sup> relates that the custom is that a mourner within twelve months of the burial of his parent does not make these circuits. Beis Yosef<sup>3</sup> expresses astonishment at this custom. Why should a mourner be restricted from performing the mitzvah? Vilna Gaon<sup>4</sup> explains that the obligation to fulfill the verse **ושמחתם לפני ה' אלקיכם שבעת ימים** – And you should rejoice before Hashem your God for seven days – takes place while performing the circuits and it is inappropriate for a mourner to rejoice.

Teshuvos Divrei Malkiel<sup>5</sup> challenges Vilna Gaon's rationale. There is no source that indicates that a mourner may not participate in mitzvos that involve joy. For example, would anyone say that a mourner should not eat meat and drink wine on Yom Tov because of the joy that it generates? He further proves from our Gemara that a mourner is not exempt from mitzvos that involve rejoicing. The Gemara teaches that a mourner does not bring a Shalmei Simcha since a prerequisite is that the person must be whole and a mourner is not whole. Shalmei Simcha are brought

tion.

R' Assi offers a second resolution to this contradiction.

The Gemara identifies the Tanna who maintains that aninus on the night following the death is Rabbinic.

Another contradictory ruling of R' Shimon is noted and resolved.

Another contradictory ruling of R' Shimon is raised related to whether an onein brings a Korban Pesach.

Two resolutions to this contradiction are presented. ■

in order to fulfill the mitzvah of rejoicing on Yom Tov. If a mourner was exempt from mitzvos that involve rejoicing the Gemara would not have to search for a reason that the mourner should be exempt from bringing a Shalmei Simcha since they should be exempt based on the general principle that mourners are exempt from mitzvos that involve rejoicing. The fact that this point was not raised indicates that there is no general principle that a mourner may not participate in mitzvos that involve joy.

Aruch HaShulchan offers the following explanation for the custom. During the time that we make the circuit around the bimah we beseech Hashem for mercy. Since during the year of mourning the mourner is in a state of judgment it is not appropriate for him to be involved in an activity that is designed to generate mercy. ■

1. שו"ע או"ח סי' תר"ס סעי' א'.

2. רמ"א שם.

3. בית יוסף שם ד"ה כתב.

4. ביאור הגר"א שם.

5. שו"ת דברי מלכיהל ח"ב סי' צ"א.

6. ערוה"ש שם סעי' ד' ■

## STORIES Off the Daf

### Focusing One's Heart

"לבי על הסל..."

**O**n today's daf we find that hesech hadaas leaves a vacuum that attracts defilement. A person's ability to maintain the sanctity of that for which he is responsible depends on his ability to focus his heart.

The Alter of Kelm convinced Reb Shmuel Strauss, z"l, to purchase a huge structure in Yerushalayim so that it could be developed into a place for Torah scholars to live rent-free. It would serve as a yeshiva and a beis hatalmud following the path of the Alter of Kelm.

The moment the Alter realized that the person put in charge—at his behest—had too many responsibilities, he sent a

letter indicated his change of heart. The Alter wrote to his proxy, "It seems clear that you are overly put upon by your many charges. Being overworked generates mental confusion which the midrash calls 'a slumber of foolishness.'<sup>1</sup>

"It seems clear that you must be relieved of some of your responsibilities since continuing this way defeats the entire purpose of Reb Shmuel Strauss's generosity. His purpose was only to sanctify the name of heaven by bringing together Torah and yir'ah—both for children and adults—in one special place in Yerushalayim.

"Do not think that being overworked is a light matter. It is clear that even if you were very smart and wise, you would be completely unable to accept the yoke of heaven on yourself in such a state. We can only accept the yoke of heaven properly if we have clarity of mind and an abundance

of yishuv hadaas. In your present state it is clearly impossible to impart mussar to others in an effective manner, so what is the point of the entire venture?

"If you want the edifice to last you must stop dealing with the technical details of the physical needs of its occupants. Give this over to someone else so that you will have more breathing space and can get back the tranquility you used to have. That way you will have time to work effectively with your group there and your efforts will bear lasting fruit."

The Alter concluded, "I thought you would be able to bear the burden of responsibility of the material concerns and also spiritual guidance of the members of the community, but I see now that you are not capable of both!"<sup>2</sup> ■

1. בראשית רבה, י"ז: ו'.

2. בית קלם, מידות, ע' תקמ"א-תקמ"ב ■