



## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

### Maseches Zevachim, Daf כו – Daf נז

Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas R' Avrohom Abba ben R' Dov HaKohen, A"H  
v'l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

#### -----Daf כו---62-----

- **Q:** It makes sense how the Anshei Kneses Hagedola knew the location of the Beis Hamikdash (when they came up to EY after Galus Bavel), because the outline of the First Beis Hamikdash was still noticeable. However, how did they know the exact location of the Mizbe'ach? **A:** **R' Elazar** said, they saw a Mizbe'ach with Michael HaMalach standing on it and offering korbanos. **R' Yitzchak Nafcha** said, they saw the ashes of Yitzchak (from the Akeida) lying in that place. **R' Shmuel bar Nachmeini** said, in the entire area of the Beis Hamikdash they smelled ketores, but in the area of the Mizbe'ach they smelled limbs of animals. **Rabbah bar bar Chana in the name of R' Yochanan** said, there were 3 nevi'im who went up to EY with them – Chagai, Zechaya, and Malachi – one of which testified regarding the size of the Mizbe'ach, one who testified about its exact location, and one who testified that korbanos may be offered even though the Beis Hamikdash was not yet built. A Braisa says, **R' Eliezer ben Yaakov** said, one of which testified regarding the size and location of the Mizbe'ach, one who testified that korbanos may be offered even though the Beis Hamikdash was not yet built, and one testified that the Torah should be written in Ashuris.
- A Braisa says, the requirement for the Mizbe'ach to have a horn, a ramp, a base, and that it be square are all essential. The measurement of its length, width, and height are not essential.
  - **Q:** How do we know that these are essential? **A:** **R' Huna** said, the pesukim regarding these say "HaMizbe'ach", and whenever that word is used it signifies that it is essential.
    - **Q:** A pasuk says, "v'nasata osah tachas karkov HaMizbe'ach milmata". A Braisa says, there is a machlokes – **Rebbi** says the "karkov" is the kiyor and **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda** says it is the ledge. Now according to each view, whatever they hold is referred to in the pasuk should be essential, because the pasuk uses the word "HaMizbe'ach"! **A:** The karkov actually *is* essential according to **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda**, as he clearly says so in a Braisa.
- A Braisa says, what is the karkov? It is the area between the horns, which is the amah-wide space where the Kohanim would walk on the Mizbe'ach.
  - **Q:** How could the Kohanim walk between the horns (the horns would block them from passing the corner)!? **A:** The Braisa means that the karkov is the area between the horns *and* an additional amah of space around, where the Kohanim would walk.
  - **Q:** A pasuk says that the copper lattice work on the side of the Mizbe'ach was "below the karkov". This means that the karkov was something on the side of the Mizbe'ach, not the top!? **A:** **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, there were two karkovs – one on the side for decoration, and one on top to prevent the Kohanim from slipping on top of the Mizbe'ach.
- The Braisa quoted earlier said that the length, width, and height of the Mizbe'ach are not essential. **R' Mani** said, this is true as long as it is not smaller than the Mizbe'ach of Moshe.
  - **Q:** How big was that? **A:** **R' Yosef** said it was an amah.
    - **Q:** They laughed at him, because the pasuk says it was 5x5 amos!? **A:** **Abaye** said to **R' Yosef**, you must be referring to the area of the fire itself. **R' Yosef** said to him, you are a great man and therefore knew what I meant. The others who laughed are "bnei Keturah".
  - **Abaye bar Huna in the name of R' Chama bar Gurya** said, the pieces of wood made by Moshe for the Mizbe'ach were 1x1 amah, and their thickness was the same as the level used to measure. **R' Yirmiya** said, this is an amah measured using 5 tefachim instead of the usual 6 tefachim. **R' Yosef** disagreed based on a pasuk.
- A Mishna says that the ramp was on the south of the Mizbe'ach, and it was 32 amos long and 16 amos wide.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Huna** said, we learn this from the pasuk that refers to the north of the Mizbe'ach as its "thigh" ("ahl yerech haMizbe'ach"), which would mean that the face of the Mizbe'ach was the south.
  - **Q:** Maybe we should say that the face and the thigh were both in the north? **A: Rava** said, the pasuk suggests that the Mizbe'ach is like a person lying on his face, where the thighs are in one direction and the face is in the opposite direction.
    - **Q: Abaye** asked, maybe it refers to a person sitting up, whose thighs and face are in the same direction? **A: Rava** said, the pasuk says "ravu'ah", which means lying down.
    - **Q:** This word is needed to teach that the Mizbe'ach has to be square!? **A:** Since it says "ravu'ah" instead of "merubah" it teaches both.
- A Tanna of a Braisa learns that the ramp was on the south side. The Braisa says, **R' Yehuda** learns from a pasuk that the ramp had to be put in a place that when the Kohen went up and then turned, he would be facing east.
  - **Q:** Maybe it means he would turn left and then be facing the east? **A:** That can't be, because **Rami bar Yechezkel** learned from a pasuk that the Kohen should always turn to the right when doing the Avodah.
- **R' Shimon ben Yose ben Lekunya** asked **R' Yose**, did **R' Shimon ben Yochai** really say that there was a small gap between the ramp and the Mizbe'ach? **R' Yose** said, do you not hold that way? The pasuk compares the blood to the meat of the korban, which teaches that just as the blood is offered on the Mizbe'ach by throwing it, so too the meat must be offered by throwing it from the ramp, which means there must be a space! He answered, I would agree that it must be thrown, but it can be thrown onto the fire by standing next to the fire. **R' Yose** said, since he throws it onto the biggest part of the fire, it would be obvious that he must throw it when standing nearby (he could not reach that part without throwing). The hekesh is only necessary if it is teaching that it is thrown from the ramp and that there is a space between the ramp and the Mizbe'ach.
  - **R' Pappa** said, the hekesh teaches that just as the blood is thrown through airspace that is directly over the ground, the same is with the meat. Therefore, it must be that there was a space between the ramp and the Mizbe'ach.
- **R' Yehuda** said, there were two small ramps that branched off of the main ramp. The Kohen would use these to get to the ledge and to the base. Each of them were a hairsbreadth away from the Mizbe'ach, based on the pasuk "saviv", which teaches that the Mizbe'ach must have space all around it. **R' Avahu** said, it is based on the pasuk of "ravu'ah", and if they were attached the Mizbe'ach would not be square.
  - If we only had "saviv" we would think it should be round. If we only had "ravu'ah" we would think that a rectangle is permitted as well.
- A Mishna says that the ramp and the Mizbe'ach together were 62 amos long.
  - **Q:** Each was 32 amos long, so the total should be 64 amos!? **A:** The ramp extended over the amah of the base and the amah of the ledge.
- **Rami bar Chama** said, all ramps of the Beis Hamikdash went out 3 amos horizontally for each amah that it rose vertically. This is all except for that of the Mizbe'ach, which extended horizontally 3.5 amos and one and 1/3 etzba'os for each amah that it rose vertically.

-----Daf 10---63-----

### MISHNA

- The kemitza of a mincha can be done anywhere in the Azarah. The leftover mincha can be eaten anywhere within the curtains of the Azarah, by male Kohanim, prepared in any manner, for that day and the following night until chatzos.

### GEMARA

- **R' Elazar** said, if the kemitza was done in the Heichal it is valid, for that is what is done when the two spoons of levonah are taken from the Shulchan.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q: R' Yirmiya** asked, a Braisa says that the pasuk of “v'kamatz misham” teaches that the kemitza must be done in a place where a non-Kohen is allowed to be (which would not include the Heichal)!? **A: R' Yirmiya or R' Akiva** answered, the Braisa means that the pasuk teaches that the entire Azarah is fit to have the kemitza done in it. We would have thought that it must be done in the north, just like the shechita of an olah, since the mincha is also kodshei kodashim.
  - **Q:** It cannot be compared to an olah, because an olah is totally burned on the Mizbe'ach!? **A:** We would learn it from chatas.
  - **Q:** It cannot be compared to a chatas, because a chatas provides kappara for sins that carry the kares penalty!? **A:** We would learn it from asham.
  - **Q:** It cannot be compared to an asham, because an asham is a blood offering!? **A:** We would learn it from all these 3 together.
  - **Q:** It cannot be learned from the 3 together, because they are all blood offerings!? **A:** Rather, we would say that the pasuk creates a hekesh between the requirement to bring the mincha to the Mizbe'ach, and the kemitza. We would think that this teaches that just as bringing it to the Mizbe'ach is done at the southwest corner, maybe the kemitza must be done there as well. The pasuk of “misham” therefore teaches that the kemitza may be done anywhere in the Azarah.
- **R' Yochanan** said, a shelamim that was shechted in the Heichal is valid, based on the pasuk “ush'chato pesach Ohel Moed”. This suggests that shechting it in the Azarah is only valid because of the entrance of the Ohel Moed. If so, the secondary place (the Azarah) cannot be better than the primary place (the Heichal).
  - **Q:** A Braisa says, **R' Yehuda ben Beseira** said, we learn from a pasuk that if goyim have besieged the Azarah, the Kohanim may go and eat kodshei kodashim in the Heichal. Now, according to **R' Yochanan** we should not need a special pasuk for this! The pasuk says “bachatzar Ohel Moed yochluha”, which suggests that eating it in the Azarah is only valid because of the entrance of the Ohel Moed. If so, the secondary place (the Azarah) cannot be better than the primary place (the Heichal)!? **A:** These two cases cannot be compared. **R' Yochanan** was talking about doing an Avodah, which is something one should certainly be able to do in a more holier place. The Braisa is referring to eating, which may be something that should not be done in a more holy place. That is why the pasuk is needed.

### MISHNA

- The Avodah of a bird chatas was done at the southwest corner of the Mizbe'ach. It was valid to be done at any place in the Azarah, but this is where it was done.
  - This corner was used for 3 things below the red line and for 3 things above the red line. The 3 things below the red line are: the avodah of the bird chatas, the bringing of the mincha to the Mizbe'ach, and the pouring of the leftover blood of a korbon. The 3 things above the red line are: the nisuch hayayin, the nisuch hamayim, and the avodah of the olah bird when there were too many Kohanim on the east side of the Mizbe'ach.
  - Whoever goes up onto the Mizbe'ach does so toward the right, goes around, and then goes down on the left side, except for the Kohen going up to do these 3 avodos (the yayin, mayim, and bird olah), who would go up the ramp and go back down the same way he went up.

### GEMARA

- **Q:** How do we know that the bird chatas is offered at the southwest corner? **A: R' Elazar** said, we see from the pesukim that a chatas is referred to as a mincha and that a mincha is referred to as a chatas. This teaches that just as a chatas requires the north, a mincha does as well, and just as a mincha is brought to the southwest corner, a bird chatas is as well.
  - **Q:** How do we know that a mincha is brought to the southwest corner? **A:** A Braisa says, the pasuk says that the mincha should be brought “lifnei Hashem” (which means the west side of the Mizbe'ach) and also says “ehl pnei hamizbe'ach” (which means the south side). Therefore, we learn that it should be brought on the southwest corner. **R' Eliezer** says that it was brought on the south side of that corner (not on the corner itself), because he says that the entire Mizbe'ach was in the northern half of the

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Azarah, and therefore even the south side of the southwest corner is considered to be “lifnei Hashem” since it was opposite the opening to the Heichal. In this way, by bringing it to the south side of the corner he has fulfilled both pesukim.

B'CHOL MAKOM HUYSA KISHEIRA...

- **R' Ashi** explained, the Mishna means that the melika of the bird could be done in any place in the Azarah, but the offering of the blood could only be done at the southwest corner.
  - The Mishna supports a Braisa which seems to say this as well.

-----Daf 70---64-----

SHLOSHA DEVARIM...

- We have already explained how we know that a bird chatas is done at the southwest corner.
- We learn that a mincha is brought to the Mizbe'ach at this corner from the pasuk which says it should be done “ehi pnei haMizbe'ach”.
- We learn that the leftover blood is poured on that corner from the pasuk that says it should be poured on the base “asher pesach Ohel Moed”.

MILMALAH NISUCH HAMAYIM...

- The Mishna suggests that the ideal place for the avodah of a bird olah is the southeast corner. **R' Yochanan** explained, this is because it is the closest corner to the Beis Hadashen, which is where the Kohen must throw a number of parts of the bird.
  - **R' Yochanan** said, come and see how strong the Kohanim were. The crop and feathers of a bird are extremely lightweight, and there were times when the Kohen had to throw it more than 30 amos. This can be seen in a Mishna which describes where the Beis Hadashen was. It tells us it was 10 amos north of the bottom of the ramp, 3 tefachim to the east of the ramp. When one does the calculation, when the Kohen stood at the southwest corner of the Mizbe'ach, he would have to throw the pieces of the bird over 30 amos to reach the Beis Hadashen.

KOL HA'OLIM LAMIZBE'ACH

- **Q:** Why is it that for these 3 avodos he did not walk all the way around the Mizbe'ach to get to the southwest, but instead walked up the ramp and walked to the left, directly there? **A: R' Yochanan** said, with the nesachim we were concerned that walking all the way around would cause the nesachim to absorb smoke, which would make them passul, and with regard to the bird olah the reason is that the smoke may cause the bird to die.
  - **Q:** A Mishna says that the Kohen Gadol would go up the ramp, turn to the right and go around the entire Mizbe'ach to reach the southwest corner and they would give him the wine to pour onto the Mizbe'ach. Presumably, they gave him the wine before he went up the ramp, and this therefore shows that we are not concerned for the wine absorbing smoke!? **A: R' Yochanan** said, they would not give him the wine until he arrived at the southwest corner. **Rava** said, the words of the Mishna suggest this as well (“they give him the wine” instead “he pours the wine”). SHEMAH MINAH.
- A Braisa says, all those who go up onto the Mizbe'ach do so to the right and come down to the left – they go up to the east and come down to the west. Except for those who go up to do the nisuch hamayim, nisuch hayayin, and a bird olah – these people would go up on the west and come down on the west – they would go up to the right and come down to the right.
  - **Q:** The end of the Braisa should say the *left* side, not the right!? **A: Ravina** said to change the word to “left”. **Rava** said, when the Braisa says “right” it refers to the right of the Mizbe'ach, and when it says “left” it refers to the left of the person (so essentially they are saying the same thing).
    - **Q:** Why not be consistent? KASHYEH.

MISHNA

- How was the avodah of the chatas bird done? The Kohen would do melikah from the back of its neck, and would not separate the head from the body. He would then sprinkle some of the blood onto the wall of the Mizbe'ach.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

The leftover blood would be squeezed onto the base. The Mizbe'ach only gets the bird's blood (not the meat, etc.), and the rest of the bird goes to the Kohen.

### GEMARA

- A Braisa says, when the pasuk regarding a bird chatas says “v'hizah midam hachatas” it means that the blood should be sprinkled directly from the bird's body. The Kohen does this by holding the head and the body and sprinkling from the cut on the neck. The pasuk says “ahl kir haMizbe'ach”, which teaches that it should not be sprinkled on the wall of the ramp, or of the Heichal, or of the Ulam. Rather, it is sprinkled onto the lower part of the wall of the Mizbe'ach. Maybe it should be sprinkled onto the upper part of the wall – which can be shown via a kal v'chomer, that if an animal olah is sprinkled on the lower half and yet an animal chatas is sprinkled on the upper half, then a bird, which when an olah is sprinkled on the upper half, should certainly be sprinkled on the upper half when it is a chatas! The pasuk therefore continues and says that the leftover blood should be squeezed onto the base of the Mizbe'ach. The pasuk thereby teaches that the blood should be sprinkled onto the wall where the leftover blood is squeezed – which is the lower part of the wall.
  - **Q:** Maybe the pasuk is saying that the sprinkling of blood should be done on the upper half and the squeezing of the leftover blood should be done on the lower half? **A: Rava** said, since the pasuk says “yimatzei” instead of “yimahtzeh”, it is referring to the blood that is allowed to drip down after it is sprinkled, and teaches that it should be on the lower half of the wall.
- **R' Zutra the son of Tuvia in the name of Rav** said, how was melika done? The Kohen would hold the wings with two fingers and its two legs with two fingers. He then stretched its neck over the width of his thumb and does the melikah. A Braisa says the neck is stretched over the width of the Kohen's two fingers, and the melika is then done, and this is the difficult avodah done in the Beis Hamikdash.
  - **Q:** There are other difficult avodos as well – such as kemitza and chafinah!? **A:** Rather, say melika is the most difficult of the difficult avodos done in the Beis Hamikdash.

### MISHNA

- How was the avodah of the olah bird done? The Kohen would go up the ramp and turn off to the ledge to go to the southeast corner. He would do melika on the back of its neck and separate the head from the body. He would then squeeze out the blood on the wall of the Mizbe'ach. He would then take the head and put the severed end against the Mizbe'ach. He would then put it into salt and throw it onto the Mizbe'ach's fire. He then went back to the bird's body and removed the crop and the feathers and the insides that come out along with them, and would throw all these pieces onto the Beis Hadashen. He would then rip open the body without separating it into two parts, but if it did separate it would still be valid. He then put the body into salt and threw it onto the fire. If he did not remove the crop, the feathers, or the insides, or if he did not put it into salt – any changes that he made to the process after the blood was already squeezed out, the korbon remains valid.
  - If he separated the head from the body of a chatas, or if he did not separate the head from the body of an olah, the korbon is passul. If he squeezed out the blood of the head of the olah bird, but not the blood of the body, or visa-versa, it remains valid.
- If the Kohen did melikah on a chatas bird not for its sake, or if he squeezed out the blood not for its sake, or if he did so for its sake and not for its sake, or not for its sake and for its sake, the korbon is passul. If this was done for an olah bird the korbon would remain valid, but it would not fulfil the obligation of the owner.
  - With regard to a chatas bird and an olah bird, if the melika or squeezing of the blood was done with intent to eat something that is normally eaten or to burn something on the Mizbe'ach that is normally burned there, beyond its allowable place, it is passul but there is no kares. If the intent was to do so beyond its proper time, it is piggul and there is kares as long as the “matir” is offered as it is supposed to be.
    - What does it mean that the matir is offered properly? If he did the melika in silence (without any improper intent) and then squeezed the blood with piggul intent, or visa-versa, or did both with piggul intent, that is called that the matir was offered (in the sense that it creates true piggul).

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- What would be a case of where the matir is not offered properly? If he does the melika for beyond its place and squeezes the blood for beyond its time, or visa-versa, or the melika and squeezing were both done with intent for beyond its place, or if a chatas bird had the meilka done shelo lishma and the squeezing done with intent for beyond its time, or visa-versa, or if both were done shelo lishma, in all these cases it is considered to be a matir that was not done properly and there would be no kares. If he intended to eat a kezayis of the bird chatas outside its place and a kezayis beyond its time, or if he intended for a kezayis beyond its time and a kezayis beyond its place, or he intended to eat a half zayis beyond its place and a half zayis beyond its time, or a half zayis beyond its time and a half zayis beyond its place, the korbon is passul but there is no kares.
  - **R' Yehuda** said, the general rule is, if the intent for beyond its time comes before the intent for beyond its place, it is piggul and one who eats it would be chayuv kares. If the intent for beyond its place came first, the korbon would be passul, but there would not be kares. The **Chachomim** said, that in both these cases it is passul and there is no kares.
  - If he had the bad intent regarding the eating of half a zayis and the burning of half a zayis, the korbon would remain valid, because eating and burning do not combine to create the minimum required amount.

-----Daf 70--65-----

### GEMARA

- A Braisa says, the pasuk regarding a bird olah says “v’hikrivo”, which teaches that a person may even bring one bird as a korbon. We would think that since many of the other pesukim discuss the bird korbanos in the plural, that one must always bring a pair. The pasuk then says “haKohen ehl haMizbe’ach” – the word “haKohen” teaches that only a Kohen may do the melika. We would think to say that if an animal olah, which has a specific place for its shechita (i.e. the north), still does not need the shechita to be done by a Kohen, then a bird olah, whose melika is not limited to be done in a certain place should certainly not need to be done by a Kohen! We would use this same logic to say that melika can be done with a kli (a knife). The pasuk therefore says “HaKohen...umalak”, which **R' Akiva** explains to teach that it must be done with the Kohen himself (i.e. his nail). We would think that the melika can be done either above the red line or below it. The pasuk therefore says “umalak...v’hiktir”, which teaches that just as the korbon is burned on top of the Mizbe’ach, the melika must be done there as well. The word “umalak” teaches that the melika is done from the back of the neck. It cannot be thought that it is to be done at the front of the neck, because we have a gezeira shava to a bird chatas – just as there it is done from the back of the neck, the same is true for the bird olah. Maybe say that just as by a chatas bird he does not separate the head from the body, the same should be done for an olah bird? The pasuk says “umalak v’hiktir”, which teaches that just as the head is burned separately from the rest of the body, so too the melika must serve to separate the head from the body. How do we know they are burned separately? The pasuk says “v’hiktir oso” and also says “v’hiktir haMizbeicha”, which teaches that they are to be offered separately. The pasuk then says “v’nimtza damo”, which teaches that *all* the blood must be squeezed out. The pasuk says “ahl kir haMizbe’ach”, which teaches that it may not be done on the wall of the ramp or the Heichal, but must rather be done on the upper wall of the Mizbe’ach. We would think to make an argument that it should be done on the lower wall – if for an animal korbon, where the chatas blood is offered above and the olah blood is offered below, then for a bird korbon whose chatas blood is offered below, its olah blood should certainly be offered below! The pasuk therefore says “umalak...v’hiktir...v’nimtza damo”. Now, the squeezing of the blood certainly comes before the burning on the Mizbe’ach, so why is the pasuk ordered in this way? It is to teach that just as the burning takes place on the top of the Mizbeach, the squeezing of the blood is done on the upper part of the Mizbe’ach as well, anywhere above the line. **R' Nechemya** and **R' Eliezer ben Yaakov** say, that the pasuk teaches that the melika must actually be done on top of the Mizbe’ach, like the burning.
  - **Abaye** and **Rava** explained that the machlokes is whether one can burn on a fire on the ledge.

BAH LO LAGUF...

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- A Braisa says, “v’heisir es muraso b’notzasa” refers to the bird’s crop. “B’notzasa” teaches that the crop should not be cut out with a knife leaving the feathers still attached to the bird, rather he is to take the feathers along with the crop. **Abba Yose ben Chanan** says, he takes the gizzard (not the feathers) along with the crop. The yeshiva of **R’ Yishmael** taught a Braisa that says, the word “b’notzasa” (“its” feathers) teaches that only the feathers around the crop are to be taken. He does this by cutting a “window” into the bird and removing the crop with the skin of that “window”.

### SHISA V’LO HIVDIL

- A Braisa says, “v’shisa” means it should be torn by hand, as we see this word is used in another pasuk.

### LO HEISIR ES HAMUR’AH...

- Our Mishna does not follow **R Elazar the son of R’ Shimon**, who says in a Braisa that if the head of the bird chatas was separated from the body it is still valid.
  - **R’ Chisda** explained that the machlokes is based on whether the squeezing out of the blood of a bird chatas is essential. The Tanna of our Mishna holds that it is, and since it is, if it is done like the avodah of an olah it becomes passul. **R’ Elazar** holds that it is not essential, and therefore it is as if he cut the meat of the bird, which does not make it passul.
  - **Rava** said, the machlokes is based on whether a delay in the cutting of the second siman of a bird olah makes the olah passul. The Tanna of our Mishna holds that it does not make it passul. Therefore, when he does so to a chatas bird, where there is meant to be a delay between the cutting of the simanim, he is said to be doing it like an olah, and therefore it becomes passul. **R’ Elazar** holds that the delay would make the olah passul, so when it is done by a chatas it can’t be viewed as having done the avodah of an olah.
  - **Abaye** said, the machlokes is based on whether the requirement to cut through the majority of the flesh around the neck is essential for a bird chatas.
    - The machlokes between **Rava and Abaye** is actually also a machlokes between **R’ Zeira and R’ Shmuel the son of R’ Yitzchak**.
    - This suggests that at least l’chatchila there is a requirement to cut through the majority of the flesh around the neck. We see this in a Braisa as well.
    - When this machlokes was repeated in front of **R’ Yirmiya**, he said that they must have not heard what was said in the name of **R’ Elazar the son of R’ Shimon**, that a chatas bird’s head may be separated from its body, and when the pasuk says “lo yavdil” it means that it does not *have* to be separated.
      - **Q: R’ Acha the son of Rava** said to **R’ Ashi**, based on this, when the pasuk regarding a bor says “v’lo yichasenu”, does that also mean that he does not *need* to cover it? Of course not! Similarly, “lo yavdil” does *not* mean that it does not need to be separated!

### MITZAH DAM HAGUF

- A Braisa says, the extra word “olah” in the pasuk teaches that it is valid even if he only squeezed out the blood from the body and not from the head. The word “hu” teaches that if he only squeezed the blood from the head and not from the body, it is passul.
  - **Q: How do we know what to include and what to exclude? A: Ravina** said, since the body has most of the blood, it makes sense that squeezing of the body is most important.

**HADRAN ALACH PEREK KODSHEI KODASHIM!!!**

# Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

-----Daf 10-----66-----

## PEREK CHATAS HA'OF -- PEREK SHEVI'I

### MISHNA

- A bird chatas which was offered below the red line, with the procedure of a chatas, for the sake of a chatas, is valid.
  - If it was offered with the procedure of a chatas but for the sake of an olah, or with the procedure of an olah but for the sake of a chatas, or with the procedure of an olah for the sake of an olah, the korbon is passul.
  - If it was offered above the red line with any of the above procedures (even that of a chatas), it is passul.
- A bird olah that was offered above the red line, with the procedure of an olah, for the sake of an olah, is valid.
  - If it was offered with the procedure of an olah for the sake of a chatas, it is valid but does not fulfil the obligation of the owner.
  - If it was offered with the procedure of a chatas but for the sake of an olah, or with the procedure of a chatas for the sake of a chatas, the korbon is passul.
  - If it was offered below the red line with any of the above procedures (even that of an olah), it is passul.

### GEMARA

- **Q:** When the Mishna refers to the bird chatas that was offered using the procedure of a bird olah but for the sake of a chatas, which procedure is it referring to? If it is referring to the Kohen having done the melika like an olah (he separated the head from the body), then we would have to say that our Mishna (that says it would be passul) does not follow the view of **R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon**, who says that a bird chatas may be separated!? **A:** We have already said that the last Mishna does not follow his view, so it would not be difficult to say that this Mishna also does not follow his view.
  - The Gemara said, we can say that the Mishna does follow his view, and rather, when it refers to the procedure of an olah, it is referring to the sprinkling of the blood (he only squeezed out the blood, like an olah, and didn't first sprinkle the blood as is supposed to be done for a chatas). It makes sense to say that this is what is referred to, based on the end of the Mishna. The Mishna says, if it was offered above the red line with any of the above procedures (even that of a chatas), it is passul. Now, what procedure was done above the red line? It can't be referring to the melika, because we have learned that the melika can be done anywhere. Rather, it is referring to where the sprinkling was done above the line. So too, in the earlier case it is referring to the procedure of sprinkling.
    - The Gemara says, this is no proof. It may be that the earlier case is referring to melika and the later case is referring to the sprinkling.

### OLAS HA'OF...

- **Q:** When the Mishna refers to the bird olah that was offered using the procedure of a bird chatas, which procedure is it referring to? It can't be referring to the Kohen having done the melika like an olah (he didn't separate the head from the body), because the next Mishna says that in all the cases of our Mishna, even though the korbon may be passul, the melika accomplishes to prevent tumah of neveila from coming upon the person who swallows it, but there is still the issur of me'ilah. **R' Yehoshua** later in the Mishna says that a bird olah offered as a chatas with the melika of a chatas, becomes a chatas and would therefore not have the issur of me'ilah on its meat. Now, if our Mishna means that the melika of a chatas was done to the olah, and it is on that case that the anonymous beginning of the next Mishna says that there is me'ilah, we would be forced to say that the anonymous Mishna does not follow the view of **R' Yehoshua**!? We also can't say that it refers to where the sprinkling of a chatas was done to the olah (the blood was sprinkled and was not squeezed out as is required for an olah). The next part of the next Mishna says, if a bird olah was offered below the line with the procedure of a chatas for the sake of a chatas, **R' Eliezer** says it is still subject to me'ilah and **R' Yehoshua** says it is not. Now, that can't be talking about where only the sprinkling procedure of a chatas was done, because **R' Yehoshua** only says there is no me'ila when the *melika* of a chatas was done to the olah! If only the blood procedure was changed he would not say that there is no me'ila!? If you will say that this last section is referring to a change to



## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

the melika, then we would be forced to say that the first part of our Mishna refers to melika, the second part of our Mishna (regarding the olah bird) refers to the blood procedure, and the next part (the next Mishna) again refers to melika!? **A:** Yes, we must say that the first and last sections refer to melika, and the middle section (the last section of our Mishna) refers to the blood procedure.

### MISHNA

- All the bird korbanos listed in the Mishna above do not create tumas neveila when swallowed, but they are subject to me'ilah. The exception is the case of the bird chatas that was offered below the line, with the procedure of a chatas, for the sake of a chatas (that is a valid chatas and would therefore not be subject to me'ilah).
- If an olah bird was offered below the line with the procedure of a chatas for the sake of a chatas, **R' Eliezer** says it would be subject to me'ilah and **R' Yehoshua** says it is not.
  - **R' Eliezer** said, if a chatas which has been offered for its own sake is not subject to me'ilah, and yet, when he offers it for the sake of another korbon it is subject to me'ilah, then an olah which is subject to me'ilah when offered for its own sake, should surely be subject to me'ilah when it is offered for the sake of another korbon!? **R' Yehoshua** responded, this is not a proof. When a chatas is brought for the sake of an olah it is subject to me'ilah because it is being offered for the sake of something (an olah) that is subject to me'ilah! However, when an olah is brought for the sake of a chatas it is being offered for the sake of something (a chatas) that is not subject to me'ilah (when offered properly)!
    - **R' Eliezer** said, we can bring a proof from the case of kodshei kodashim that were shechted in the south of the Azarah for the sake of kodshei kalim, which is a case in which it was offered for the sake of something that is not subject to me'ilah, and yet the korbon continues to be subject to me'ilah! So too, when an olah is offered for the sake of a chatas, the olah too can remain subject to me'ilah (even though a chatas is not subject to me'ilah). **R' Yehoshua** responded, the case of kodshei kodashim being shechted for the sake of kodshei kalim is very different, because kodshei kalim are partly subject to me'ilah and partly not (when they are offered properly). Therefore, this cannot be compared to the case of an olah offered for the sake of a chatas, which (the chatas) is something that is entirely not subject to me'ilah (when offered properly).

-----Daf 70---67-----

### GEMARA

- A Braisa says, **R' Eliezer** said to **R' Yehoshua**, we can prove this from the case of an asham that was shechted in the north (its proper place) for the sake of a shelamim, which although is offered not for its sake, is still subject to me'ilah. The same would be for an olah bird offered not for its sake – it too will remain subject to me'ilah! **R' Yehoshua** responded, the case of the asham is different, for although it was offered not for its sake, it was offered in its proper place. This is different than the case of the olah bird, which was offered not for its sake and was offered not in its proper location. **R' Eliezer** said, we can prove this from the case of an asham that was shechted in the south (not its proper place) for the sake of a shelamim, which although is offered not for its sake and not in its proper place, is still subject to me'ilah. The same would be for an olah bird offered not for its sake and not in its proper place – it too will remain subject to me'ilah! **R' Yehoshua** responded, the case of the asham is different, for although it was offered not for its sake and not in its proper place, it was offered with its proper procedure. This is different than the case of the olah bird, which was offered not for its sake and was offered not in its proper location and was offered not with its proper procedure. **R' Eliezer** then remained silent.
  - **Rava** asked, why did he remain silent? He should have responded with the case of an asham that was shechted in the south for the sake of a shelamim and for the sake of a different owner. Although it is offered not for its sake, not in the proper place, and not with the proper procedure, it is still subject to me'ilah. From the fact that he did not respond with this it must be that he realized the reason of **R' Yehoshua**, and realized that it could not be refuted with this case. It is as **R' Ada bar Ahava** said, that **R'**

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

**Yehoshua** would say that a bird olah that was offered below the line, with the procedure of a chatas, for the sake of a chatas, as soon as he does melika to one siman, it becomes a bird chatas.

- **Q:** If so, we should also say that a bird chatas that was offered above the line, with the olah procedure and for the sake of an olah, as soon as melika is done on one siman it should become a bird olah!? You can't say that it will in fact become an olah, because **R' Yochanan in the name of R' Bina'ah** said that the version of the Mishna as we have it is proper, which presumably means to say that **R' Yehoshua** wouldn't argue in the case of the chatas offered above the line! **A:** **R' Bina'ah** may have meant that this is the version that should be applied to the *entire* Mishna, meaning that although he only argues regarding the olah offered below, it should be understood as if he is also arguing regarding a chatas offered above. **A2:** **R' Ashi** said, **R' Yehoshua** only holds that way regarding an olah bird that was offered below the line as a chatas for the sake of a chatas. The reason is that the melika of a chatas is on one siman whereas the melika of an olah is on two simanim. Now, since an olah is not brought below the line, as soon as the melika cuts through the first siman it becomes a chatas. However, with regard to a bird chatas that is done above and offered as an olah for the sake of an olah, since we have learned that melika can be done in any place, as soon as he cuts through the first siman it becomes a chatas, and since he is doing it not for the sake of the chatas, it becomes passul. By then cutting through the second siman it would not transform it to an olah since it already has the status of a passul chatas.
- **Q:** A Mishna says, if the olah bird of one woman and the chatas bird of another woman were given to a Kohen and he mistakenly offered them both above the line as olos, one is valid and one is not. If he offered them both below the line as chata'os, one is valid and one is not. If one was offered above as an olah and one was offered below as a chatas they are both passul, because we say that the chatas may have been offered above and the olah below. Now, according to **R' Ada bar Ahava's** explanation of **R' Yehoshua**, in this last case, even if the olah was offered below we should say that it becomes a valid chatas!? **A:** **R' Yehoshua** only said this when one person was involved, not when we are dealing with the korbanos of two different people.
- **Q:** A Mishna continues on the above case and says, if in addition, these two women gave the Kohen a pair of unspecified birds to be offered for them and another pair designating one as a chatas and one as an olah, without specifying which is for which woman, and the Kohen then went and offered all the birds as olos above the line, half are valid. If he offered all below the line as chata'os, half are valid. If he offered half above the line and half below, only the unspecified pair is valid, and it is divided between the two women. Now, why wouldn't at least one of the specified pair be valid? Even if it was the olah that was offered below the line, it should become a valid chatas!? You can't answer that this Mishna does not follow **R' Yehoshua**, because the Mishna continues giving variations of cases which would require a woman who brought bird korbanos, which were then mixed up, to have to bring a number of additional birds in order to fulfil her obligation – with the climax of the Mishna requiring her to bring 7, and according to **Ben Azzai** 8, additional birds. The Mishna then ends with a statement of **R' Yehoshua** saying that "this is what people mean when they say that a live ram has one sound and a dead one has 7 sounds". This shows that the Mishna is following the view of **R' Yehoshua**. If so, the Mishna contradicts **R' Yehoshua** as explained by **R' Ada bar Ahava**!? **A:** **R' Yehoshua** (as explained by **R' Ada bar Ahava**) only meant that the olah becomes a chatas with regard to it not being subject to me'ilah. He never meant that it becomes a chatas to the extent of it fulfilling the person's chatas obligation.

-----Daf ןו-----68-----

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- Any pasul person who did the melika of a bird korbon, the melika is passul, but it prevents the bird from giving off tumas neveila if it is swallowed.
- If a Kohen does melika with his left hand, or at night, or if he shechted chullin birds in the Azarah, or kodashim birds outside the Azarah, the birds will not give off tumas neveila if they are swallowed.
- If a melika is done with a knife, or if he did melika on a chullin bird in the Azarah or on a kodashim bird outside of the Azarah, or if melika was done on “torim” birds that are still too young or on “bnei yonah” that are too old, or to a bird whose wing has withered, or whose eye has become blind, or whose foot was cut off, the bird will give off tumas neveila if it is swallowed.
- The general rule is, any bird whose psul is in kodesh will not give off tumas neveila if it is swallowed. If the psul is not in kodesh, the bird will give off tumas neveila if it is swallowed.

### GEMARA

- **Rav** said, a melika done with the left hand or at night prevents the bird from giving off tumas neveila if it is swallowed. If the melika is done by a non-Kohen or with a knife, it does not prevent the bird from giving off tumas neveila if it is swallowed.
  - **Q:** Why is it that a melika done with the left hand accomplishes something (to prevent the tumah) since there is an avodah done with the left hand that is valid on Yom Kippur, and a melika done at night accomplishes something (to prevent the tumah) since burning of limbs and fats may be done at night, but yet the melika done by a non-Kohen doesn't accomplish this even though a non-Kohen is valid to do the shechita of a korbon? **A:** They answered, that shechita is not an avodah.
    - **Q:** We find that **R' Zeira** learns from a pasuk that the shechita of a para adumah by a non-Kohen is passul, which means that it is an avodah!? **A:** A para adumah only has monetary kedusha and therefore the shechita is not an avodah at all. The reason it needs a Kohen is based on the pasuk.
      - **Q:** We should say that if the Kohen is needed for something which only has monetary kedusha and therefore shows that its shechita is an avodah, it should surely be needed for something that has full kedusha and its shechita should certainly be considered an avodah!? **A: R' Shisha the son of R' Idi** said, we find that tzaraas must be seen by a Kohen, and that has nothing to do with it being an avodah. The same is true for shechita.
    - **Q:** We see that the avodah of a non-Kohen was valid on a bamah!? **A:** We don't learn things from the case of a bamah.
      - **Q:** A Braisa learns from bamah that something of kodashim that was taken outside of the Azarah and is then brought up onto the Mizbe'ach is not taken down!? **A:** The Tannah actually learns this halacha from the pasuk of “zos Toras ha'olah”.
- **R' Yochanan** said, if the melika was done by a non-Kohen it does prevent the bird from giving off tumas neveila if it is swallowed, but if was done with a knife it does not prevent the bird from giving off tumas neveila if it is swallowed.
- **Q:** The Mishna said, any pasul person who did the melika of a bird korbon, the melika is passul, but it prevents the bird from giving off tumas neveila if it is swallowed. Now according to **R' Yochanan** we can say that “kol” (“any”) stated in the Mishna comes to include a non-Kohen who does the melika. However, according to **Rav** what does it come to include? **A:** It comes to include a melika done with the left hand or at night.
  - **Q:** Those are listed explicitly in the Mishna!? **A:** The Mishna first states it in a general way and then explains what it is referring to.
- **Q:** The Mishna said, the general rule is, “any” bird whose psul is in kodesh will not give off tumas neveila if it is swallowed. Now according to **R' Yochanan** we can say that “kol” (“any”) stated in the Mishna comes to include a non-Kohen who does the melika. However, according to **Rav** what does it come to include? **A:** Even according to **R' Yochanan** how would you explain the next phrase of the “general rule” that says – if the psul is not in kodesh, the bird will give off tumas neveila if it is swallowed? Rather, we can say that the first phrase comes to include

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

one who shechts kodashim birds in the Azarah and the second phrase comes to include the melika of a chullin bird outside of the Azarah (which would give off tumas neveila).

- There is a Braisa that clearly says like **R' Yochanan**.