

## פרק שביעי – חטאת העוף

Our פרק completes and concludes the description of העוף and קרבנות העוף and which mis-procedures invalidate the קרבן

28.7.1

66a (משנה א) → 66b (רישא וסיפא במליקה ומציעתא במיצוי)

Note: these two משניות refer to מעשה חטאת and מעשה עולה as being distinct procedures. The גמרא inquires whether the focus is on מליקה or מצוי. The מליקה of an עולה involves הבלדה – fully separating the head from the body; חטאת doesn't allow for separation (except according to ראב"ש, whom we've already rejected as an author here). מצוי of an עולה involves just that – מצוי (squeezing דם against wall of מזבח) and no הזאה, הזאה חטאת involves הזאה (followed by מצוי if there is דם left).

I חטאת העוף: consequences of mis-performances with חטאת העוף

a חטאת העוף done below (properly) according to חטאת-procedure and לשם חטאת – valid

- i However: if done w/ עולה-process חטאת – לשם, or w/ עולה-process חטאת – לשם – or w/ עולה-process חטאת – לשם – פסולה
- ii In any case: if done above – פסולה

1 Question: what was done differently (“עולה-process”)?

(a) If: he did מליקה wrong (i.e. was מבדיל) – that means that our משנה does not accord with ראב"ש

(i) Background: he had a tradition that we (may) perform הבלדה on העוף חטאת

(b) Response: indeed, we've already established (previous chapter) that our משניות do not follow ראב"ש

(c) Nonetheless: our משנה could be agreeable to him as well –

(d) Answer: he did מצוי (instead of הזאה)

(i) Support (that all “changes” in משנה are about מצוי/הזאה): from סיפא –

1. If: he performed it all properly but above – invalid;

a. Cannot mean: that he did מליקה in the wrong place – it is valid anywhere (as per above)

b. Must be: he did הזאה in the wrong place (above) → our “change” is re: הזאה

2. Rejection: each section of the משנה is directed to its own area of עבודה

II עולת העוף: consequences of mis-performances with עולת העוף

a עולת העוף done above (properly) according to עולה-procedure and לשם עולה – valid

i However: if done עולה כמעשה but לשם חטאת – valid, but doesn't count for בעלים for their obligation

ii Furthermore: if done עולה כמעשה חטאת even לשם עולה – and certainly if done חטאת חטאת and לשם חטאת – פסולה

iii In any case: if done below – פסולה

1 Question: what was done differently (“חטאת-process”)?

(a) If: he did מליקה wrong (i.e. didn't separate head from body)

(b) Then: our משנה doesn't accord with יהושע ר' (see משנה ג-ד)

(i) Background: 'ג משנה rules that in all these cases (listed in א-ב) there is no טומאת בית הבליעה (i.e. not considered a עוף נבלת) and מעילה does attach – except for a חטאת done properly

1. yet: in 'ד משנה, ר"י holds (contra ר"א) that an עולה done like a חטאת חטאת and below – no מעילה

(c) Therefore: the “change” must be מצוי (he did הזאה instead of מצוי)

(i) Challenge: 'ד משנה, where ר"י claims that if done חטאת חטאת – no מעילה; must be מלקה (i.e. הבלדה)

(ii) Must be: במליקה, because if he does מצוי wrong (i.e. הזאה instead) no מעילה

(iii) Therefore: our משנה must be מליקה

iv Conclusion: רישא (our משנה) and סיפא ('ד משנה) are referring to מליקה and “middle משנה” ('ג) is referring to מצוי