



Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h

Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

May not or Need not?

Rav Acha the son of Rava challenged to Rav Ashi the suggestion that a verse that says *he will not do* something can mean that he *need* not do it, from the verse discussing one who digs a pit in the public domain, which describes that *lo yechasenu – he did not cover it*, indicating that he is liable because he did not cover it. Why do we not read it to mean he *need* not cover it, removing his liability if he did not cover it?

Rav Ashi answered that the continuation of the verse states that the owner of the pit must pay, making him liable for not covering it. In the case of a bird *olah*, the verse states that *v’hikrivo – and he will sacrifice it*, singling it out to be different than the bird *chatas*, in that the head must be severed. If the verse that says about a bird *chatas lo yavdil – he will not sever* means that he *may* not sever it, the verse about a bird *olah* would only be permitting the *Kohen* to sever its head. Since the verse about the *olah* mandates that it be severed, the verse about the *chatas* must be stating that he *need not* sever the head. (66a)

Body and/or Head?

The *Mishna* stated that if the *Kohen* squeezed only the blood of the body of the *olah* bird, but not of its head, it

is valid, but if he squeezed only the blood of the head, it is not valid.

The *braisa* says that the verse states *olah hu – it is an olah*. The inclusive word *olah* includes the case of squeezing only the body, while the exclusive word *hu – [only]* it excludes the case of squeezing only the head.

Ravina explains that it is logical to assign them this way, since most of the blood is in the body.

WE SHALL RETURN TO YOU,
KODSHEI KODASHIM

Birds

The *Mishna* discusses different cases of the service of a bird *chatas* and *olah*, in terms of where it was offered, for what purpose, and how the service was done. A bird *chatas* is supposed to be offered at the bottom of the altar, for a *chatas*, severing only one of the (*wind and food*) pipes, and spraying the blood on the wall of the altar. A bird *olah* is supposed to be offered at the top of the top of the altar, severing both pipes, and squeezing the blood on the wall of the altar.

The chart below lists the different cases:

Sacrifice	Where?	For what?	How?	Status
Chatas	Bottom	Chatas	Chatas	Valid
		Olah	Chatas	Invalid
		Chatas	Olah	
	Olah	Olah		
	Upper	Any	Any	
Olah	Upper	Olah	Olah	Valid
		Chatas	Olah	Valid, but doesn't fulfill obligation
		Olah	Chatas	Invalid
	Chatas	Chatas		
	Bottom	Any	Any	

(66a)

As an Olah?

The *Gemora* asks in what way the *chatas* was performed as an *olah* (in the third case). If it was by performing *melikah* as an *olah*, by severing both pipes, this would make the *Mishna* inconsistent with Rabbi Eliezer the son of Rabbi Shimon, who says that one may sever both pipes on a *chatas*. [The *Gemora* notes that we already established that the earlier anonymous *Mishna* was inconsistent with his opinion.]

The *Gemora* responds that this *Mishna* may be consistent with his opinion, as this case can be that the *Kohen* applied the blood as an *olah*, i.e., squeezing instead of spraying.

The *Gemora* says that this is more likely, as the last case of the *chatas* must be referring to the application of the blood. In the last case, the *Mishna* says that if the *chatas* was offered on the top half, even for a *chatas*, and as a *chatas*, it is invalid. The service on the top half that is invalid cannot be only the *melikah*, since that can be done anywhere. Rather, it must refer to doing the *chatas* application of spraying, but in the wrong place.

The *Gemora* deflects this, saying that different cases may refer to different aspects of the service. (66b)

As a Chatas?

The *Gemora* asks in what way the *olah* was performed as a *chatas* (in the third *olah* case). If it was by performing *melikah* like a *chatas*, severing only one pipe, the continuation of the *Mishna*, which says that this case has the prohibition of *me'ila* – misuse, is inconsistent with Rabbi Yehoshua, who says that if one performed *chatas* type *melikah* on an *olah*, it gets the status of a *chatas*, removing the prohibition of *me'ila*. Rather, the *olah* was performed as a *chatas* in the application of the blood, as the blood was sprayed and not squeezed.

The *Gemora* challenges this from the continuation of the *Mishna*, which discusses the case of an *olah* bird performed like a *chatas*, for a *chatas*, on the bottom half. Rabbi Eliezer says that the bird has the prohibition of *me'ilah*, while Rabbi Yehoshua says it does not. Rabbi Yehoshua only says this when the *olah* was performed with the *melikah* of *chatas*, as it then receives the status of a *chatas*. However, if *melikah* was done as an *olah*, and only the application was like a *chatas*, it already

retained the prohibition of *me'ilah*, and does not lose it due to the different application. Therefore, this case must be a case where the service differed in the *melikah* format.

The *Gemora* questions whether it is tenable to say that the first section of the *Mishna* (the third case) and the last section (the dispute of Rabbi Yehoshua and Rabbi Eliezer) refer to a change in service in the form of *melikah*, while the middle section (the third case of the *olah*) refers to a change in the application of the blood. The *Gemora* responds that it is. (66b)

Me'ilah

The *Mishna* says that in all of the cases above, the birds do not make one impure by ingesting, nor does the prohibition of *me'ilah* apply, except for the case of a bird *chatas* sacrificed correctly. *Me'ilah* does not apply to something that has become permitted, and *Kohanim* are permitted to eat the bird *chatas* sacrificed correctly. The *Mishna* cites a dispute of Rabbi Yehoshua and Rabbi Eliezer in the case of an *olah* done as a *chatas* – on the bottom, as a *chatas*, for a *chatas*. Rabbi Eliezer says that *me'ilah* still applies, as it still is an *olah*, while Rabbi Yehoshua says that it doesn't apply, since it gets the status of a *chatas*. Rabbi Eliezer offers a logical argument for his position. If a *chatas*, which has no *me'ilah* prohibition when done for its sake, gets a *me'ilah* prohibition when done for another sacrifices' sake, certainly an *olah*, which has a *me'ilah* prohibition when done for its sake, keeps its *me'ilah* prohibition when done for another sacrifices' sake. Rabbi Yehoshua answers that in the case of the *chatas*, it has *me'ilah*, as it is done for an *olah*, which itself has *me'ilah*. However, in the case of the *olah*, it is offered for the sake of a

chatas, which itself has no *me'ilah*, so it does not have *me'ilah*. Rabbi Eliezer offers another argument from the case of the more severe *kodshei kodashim* sacrifices, which were slaughtered in the south part of the courtyard, for the sake of the less severe *kodashim kalim*. Although they were changed to a sacrifice that has no *me'ilah*, as most of it is permitted, they still have *me'ilah*. Rabbi Yehoshua answers that even in that case, they were changed to a sacrifice which has *me'ilah* on part of it, i.e., the parts offered on the altar, as opposed to a bird *olah* offered as a *chatas*, since a bird *chatas* is totally permitted, with nothing of it subject to *me'ilah*. (66b – 67a)