



## OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) **The meaning of the phrase וטומאתו עליו (cont.)**  
After failing to understand the meaning of a Baraisa the Gemara cites Zeiri's explanation of that Baraisa.

2) **The laws of piggul**  
A Baraisa is cited and explained that teaches how we know the laws of piggul apply to other korbanos and a dispute why the Torah introduced the topic in the context of the Shelamim.

The Gemara identifies which korban would have been thought to be similar to the Shelamim.

It is noted that one part of the Baraisa follows R' Meir while another part of the Baraisa follows Rabanan.

R' Yosef suggests that the Baraisa reflects the view of Rebbi and cites a Baraisa that records Rebbi's view.

When this explanation was repeated before R' Yirmiyah he rejected it and offered an alternative resolution.

Abaye suggests an additional resolution.

3) **Bird Chattas**  
A Baraisa, amongst other things, identifies the source that kohanim may eat from a bird Chattas.

A statement in the Baraisa is clarified.

4) **Inner offerings**  
A Baraisa elaborates on the question of whether inner offerings are subject to the laws of piggul.

R' Yehoshua ben Levi cites the source for the guidelines recorded in the Baraisa.

R' Nachman in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha in the name of Rav rules in favor of the position of R' Elazar in the name of R' Yosi HaGalili recorded in this Baraisa. ■

## REVIEW and Remember

1. Why does the Torah introduce the laws of piggul in the context of the Shelamim?  
-----
2. What is the point of dispute between Tanna Kamma and Rebbi?  
-----
3. What is the source that kohanim are permitted to eat a bird Chatas?  
-----
4. What principle was taught by R' Elazar in the name of R' Yosi HaGalili?  
-----

## Distinctive INSIGHT

*Until what point is the log of oil of the metzora restricted?*

לוג שמן של מצורע מועלין בו עד שיזרוק הדם. נזרק הדם לא נהנין ולא מועלין. רבי אומר מועלין עד שיתן מתנותיו.

**T**he Gemara identifies the author of the Baraisa to be Rebbe. His opinion is that piggul intent during the applications in the heichal of the oil of the metzora is effective. Tanna Kamma holds that one might commit me'ilah by benefitting from the oil of the metzora only until the sprinkling of the blood of the asham of the metzora. Rebbe contends that me'ilah continues until the kohen performs the seven applications of the oil in the heichal.

Rashi explains that Tanna Kamma holds that with the sprinkling of the blood of the asham, the log of oil of the metzora is permitted. There is no me'ilah, and the Torah even permits it to be eaten by the kohanim. The Baraisa rules that the oil may not be used for benefit, but this is only a rabbinic restriction, until the seven applications of the oil in the heichal. The Baraisa continues and says that all opinions agree that the oil may not be eaten until after the seven applications of the oil in the heichal and the placement of the oil on the body of the metzora. Rebbe holds that the law of me'ilah continues until the application of the oil in the heichal.

The Gri"z explains that according to Rashi, Tanna Kamma holds that the me'ilah that is rabbinic extends beyond the sprinkling of the blood of the asham, but only until the application of the oil, at which point the me'ilah ends, because the oil was applied for the purpose of the holy process. At this point, the service of the oil has ended. The remaining application upon the body of the metzora is not for the procedure itself, but rather for the metzora to achieve purification. This application is not called "זריקה," and me'ilah no longer applies.

Rambam (Hilchos Me'ilah 2:10) explains that according to Tanna Kamma once the blood of the asham has been sprinkled there is no me'ilah, but the prohibition to eat the oil is still a Torah restriction (unlike Rashi who said that this is only rabbinic). The oil remains prohibited until after the application of the oil in the heichal, until the placement of the oil upon the body of the metzora. Accordingly, Keren Orah explains that Rebbe, who holds that the me'ilah continues until the application of the oil, would hold that this refers to the placement of the oil up-

## HALACHAH Highlight

### Can permitted foods corrupt one's heart?

סלקא דעתך אמינא נבילה היא

*I may have thought to say that it (the bird Chatas) is a neveilah*

The Gemara explains that it was necessary for the Torah to permit eating a bird Chatas since one would have assumed that it is prohibited for consumption as a neveilah since it was killed by melikah rather than by slaughtering. Sefer <sup>1</sup> אתוון דאורייתא comments that from this discussion it appears that melikah is not considered to be a form of slaughtering for if that was considered a form of slaughtering there would be no reason to think that a bird Chatas is prohibited. The fact that it was necessary to teach that it is permitted must be due to the fact that it is a neveilah and nonetheless the Torah permits kohanim to consume it. He then suggests that perhaps it is this exact point that the Torah is teaching. Without the pasuk one would have assumed that melikah is not considered to be a form of slaughtering and it is the verse that teaches that in the context of bird korbanos melikah is considered to be a form of slaughtering. He then rejects this approach based on the halacha that if a non-kohen eats a bird Chatas he is also liable for eating neveilah. This clearly indicates that melikah is not considered to be a variation of slaughtering. This is also evident from the Gemara Menachos (45a) that one may have thought that kohanim are permitted to eat all forms of neveilah since they are permitted to eat birds killed by melikah, therefore, an exposition is cited to dispel this notion.

(Insight...continued from page 1)

on the body of the metzora (again, unlike Rashi, who explained that the me'ilah only applies after the oil is applied in the heichal). The reason the me'ilah according to Rebbe is understood to apply until this point is that there is no reason to distinguish between the Tanna Kamma and Rebbe in this regard. Just as Tanna Kamma holds that the Torah's restriction not to eat continues until the placement of the oil upon the body of the metzora, so too according to Rebbe, the restriction of me'ilah applies until this point. ■

Sefer <sup>2</sup> שי למורא questions the Gemara's thought that kohanim should be permitted to eat neveilah. The Torah (Devarim 14:21) instructs us to give our neveilah to resident aliens or to sell it to gentiles. If it would be permitted for kohanim why would the Torah instruct us to give it away to others? Mishnas Chaim<sup>3</sup> suggests that the Gemara's thought is that neveilah would be permitted but would still have the potential to corrupt one's heart (טמטום הלב) similar to what the Gemara reports about what was permitted to the generation of those who entered Eretz Yisroel (See HaEmek Davar Devarim 6:10). Similarly, the Gemara entertains the possibility that neveilah would be permitted for kohanim but it is still preferable to give it to resident aliens so that the hearts of the kohanim would not be corrupted. ■

1. ספר אתוון דאורייתא כלל א'.
2. ספר שי למורא בכורות ו: אות ה'.
3. משנת חיים ויקרא סי' צ"ז. ■

## STORIES Off the Daf

### The Atonement of the Offerings

"העולה דמה מתיר את בשרה למזבח..."

The Rama, zt"l, explains why an olah is completely burned up, while a sin-offering is eaten partially by the kohanim. "The chatas is eaten by the kohanim since a chatas is brought to atone for a sin. It is only through enduring this embarrassment that the sinner will do a true teshuvah. It is obvious why the sinner himself may not partake of the korban: how can he

have any benefit from his sin? Surely this would show that he does not take his failing seriously.

"Another reason why kohanim would eat the korban was to supply those who serve Hashem with food, since this too atones for sin. Although it comes to atone for a sin, a korban chatas is still kodshei kodashim. This is to show that in the place which ba'alei teshuvah stand, even a complete tzaddik cannot stand. If this man's teshuvah was complete, no man can stand where he stands. A korban olah is kodshei kodashim for the same reason.

"But when an olah comes to atone, it is completely consumed. An olah is not eaten by the kohanim since it comes to atone merely for thoughts in one's heart. Because the sin was not revealed, it does not require the embarrassment of the kohanim publicly partaking of the flesh of the korban. Korbanos which do not atone yet are kodshei kodashim are brought by those who are on a high level of wholeness and are themselves kodesh kodashim."

■ תורת העולה, ח"ב, פי"ד ■