

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah discusses when a bird chattas becomes subject to me'ilah and when it is susceptible to disqualification.

2) Identifying the author

The fact that the Mishnah indicates that the bird chattas can be rendered disqualified rather than tamei from contact with a tevul yom indicates that the Mishnah follows Rabanan.

Rava demonstrates how the Mishnah could follow all of the opinions in the cited Baraisa.

3) After the blood was applied

The Mishnah implies that after the blood is applied to the Altar the bird is no longer subject to me'ilah but remains prohibited. This implication is challenged.

R' Chanina explains that the Mishnah refers to when the korban was taken out of the azarah.

4) Clarifying the Mishnah

R' Huna and R' Ada bar Ahava disagree whether Rav taught the Mishnah using the term **מייצה הזזה** or **מייצה הזזה**.

R' Huna's position that the Mishnah says **הזזה** is unsuccessfully challenged from a Baraisa.

R' Yishmael's exposition in the Baraisa is challenged. ■

REVIEW and Remember

- When is a bird chattas no longer subject to the prohibition of me'ilah?
- In matters of tum'ah, what is the difference between פסול and טמא?
- Why does the Gemara object to the fact that a bird chattas should be prohibited for benefit after the blood was applied to the Altar?
- What is the point of dispute between R' Huna and R' Adda?

Distinctive INSIGHT

When me'ilah is released for a bird chattas

א"ר חנינה ליווצה ור' עקיבא היא דאמר זריקה מועלת ליווצא
 דלאו בת אכילה היא

T

he procedure for a bird chattas (Vayikra 5:9) is that the kohen kills the bird with melikah. The kohen then holds the body of the bird and squirts its blood on the Altar (זריקה). He then presses the cut neck of the bird against the Altar and squeezes its blood against its wall (מייצוי).

The Mishnah taught that me'ilah no longer applies to a bird chattas after its blood has been squirted upon the Altar. The Gemara infers from this statement that although me'ilah no longer applies, nevertheless its flesh remains prohibited for the kohanim to eat. The Gemara questions this, because normal procedure is that after the sprinkling of the blood the flesh of the bird becomes the property of the kohen, and there is even a mitzvah for him to eat it (Vayikra 7:6). In response to this query, R' Chanina explains that in general, it is true that the flesh of the bird is to be eaten by the kohanim at this point. However, the Mishnah is teaching the view of R' Akiva who says that if the bird chattas was taken out of the Mikdash (יוצא), the bird has become disqualified. Although the sprinkling of its blood still functions to release the me'ilah, its flesh does not become permitted for consumption. This is the same situation we found regarding the blood of an offering of a mammal whose blood was removed from the Mikdash (7b).

The Gemara continues and presents the view of R' Ada b. Ahava in the name of Rav who says that the squeezing of the blood of a bird chattas is essential, and without it the one who brings that offering has not fulfilled his obligation. The Gemara notes that according to this opinion, the text of the Mishnah should read, "Me'ilah no longer applies once its blood has been squeezed (rather than squirted) against the Altar."

Rambam (Hilchos Ma'ase HaKorbanos 7:7) rules that the squeezing of the blood of a bird chattas is essential. This would lead us to conclude that it is after the squeezing of the blood that me'ilah is released. Yet, in Hilchos Me'ilah 2:6, Rambam rules that me'ilah is released after the squirting of the blood of a bird chattas.

HALACHAH Highlight

Squeezing out the blood of a bird Chatas

תנין רב הוזה דמה

As Rav taught “once its blood is sprinkled.”

Rambam¹ rules that squeezing out the blood of a bird chatta is essential to the validity of the korban. In another ruling Rambam² rules that it is the sprinkling of the blood that removes the me'ilah prohibition from a bird chatta. Lechem Mishnah³ finds difficulty with these two rulings. Our Gemara teaches that according to the opinion that maintains that squeezing out the blood is essential the correct wording of the Mishnah should be **מיצח דמה**—squeezing out the blood — since the squeezing out of the blood is what removes the me'ilah prohibition. How then could the Rambam rule on the one hand that squeezing out the blood is essential and on the other hand rule that sprinkling the blood is what removes the me'ilah prohibition?

Even HaAzel⁴ answers this contradiction in accordance with his assertion that squeezing out the blood of a bird Chatas is not an independent part of the service; rather it is the completion of the sprinkling of the blood and it happens on its own. Accordingly, when R' Huna asserts that the Mishnah should read **הוזה** — sprinkled — the intent was that the entire sprinkling process was completed including the squeezing which is a part of the sprinkling. When R' Ada bar Ahava asserts that the Mishnah should read **מיצח** —squeezed — he did not mean that the wording of the

(*Insight...continued from page 1*)
The commentators on Rambam raise this question, and Lechem Mishneh explains that Rambam understands that when R' Ada b. Ahava says that squeezing is critical, this refers to when the halachos of piggul and nosar become activated. However, me'ilah is released by the squirting of the blood.

HaGra"ch on Shas explains that there are two aspects to the squirting of the blood of a bird chatta. One is its ability to atone, and this is why the me'ilah is released at that moment. The second aspect is its ability to permit the flesh for consumption. This is completed only in concert with the squeezing of the blood. This is when piggul and nossar are also formalized. ■

Mishnah should be changed. Rather his intent was to say that since there is a dispute whether squeezing out the blood is essential Rav taught his students that the intent of the Mishnah was on the squeezing of the blood to teach that it is essential. He then references Sefer Yad Malachai⁵ who writes that when the Gemara uses the term, as R' Hunan and R' Ada bar Ahava use in our Gemara, the intent is not to change the wording of the Mishnah; rather the intent is that this is the meaning of the words that are in the Mishnah. ■

.1 פ"ז מהל' מעשה קרבנות ה"ז.
.2 פ"ב מהל' מעילה ה"ז.

.3 לחם משנה שם.

.4 בן האזל מעשה קרבנות פ"ז ה"ז.
.5 יד מלאכי סי' טר"ה. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

The Errors of the Poor

מיצוי חטא העוף אינו מעצב

It is intriguing that, according to some, squeezing out the blood of a bird chatta is not essential; and if one did not do so, he discharged his obligation in any case. This is how the Ra'avad rules. However if one brings an animal for his sin offering, everyone admits that the blood must be placed on the Altar at least once or the sacrifice does not atone.¹

We can understand, in light of the

explanation given by Rav Zalman Sorkin, zt"l, why the blood of a bird chatta is sprinkled on the lower part of the Altar while the blood of an animal brought for a chatta is placed on

the corners on top of the Altar. “It is the way of a wealthy man to cover up his sins and avoid admitting any wrongdoings at all. Since such admissions are abhorrent to the wealthy—who can afford to bring an animal chatta — it is worthy to publicize the great self-sacrifice involved in admitting that they did wrong.

“But those who bring a bird for their chatta offering are poor. Such people are very downtrodden and gen-

erally have no trouble whatsoever admitting when they erred. Since it is not noteworthy for them, there is no reason for the blood to go on top of the Altar.”²

Now we understand why it is possible that the entire squeezing out of the blood is not essential. Since the poor person is naturally in such a state of broken-heartedness, discovering and admitting his errors are natural to him. Placing the blood may well not be necessary, if this was not performed. ■

.1 זבחים, נ"ב, רמב"ם, פסולי המוקדשין,
פ"ב, ה"א

.2 אזנים לתורה, ויקרא, ח': ט'

