



Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Zevachim, Daf תצ – Daf תק

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

-----Daf תצ---97-----

MISHNA

- **R' Tarfon** says, if a korbon was cooked in a keili at the beginning of Yom Tov, it can be used to cook korbanos for the entire Yom Tov (without the need to purge and rinse after each cooking). The **Chachomim** say, until the time of eating there is a requirement of purging and rinsing. Purging is like the purging of a cup, and rinsing is like the rinsing of a cup (like the cup used for birchas hamazon which is washed from inside and outside). The purging and rinsing are both done with cold water. In the case of a spit or grill used for korbanos, they must be purged with hot water.

GEMARA

- **Q:** What is the reason for **R' Tarfon's** view? **A:** The pasuk says that after Yom Tov “ufanisa baboker v'halachta l'ohalecha”, which teaches that the pasuk treats the entire Yom Tov as one long day (and purging and rinsing are never needed until the end of the day).
 - **Q: R' Achdevoy bar Ami** asked, based on that we should say that there is no piggul on Yom Tov (if he had in mind to eat it on another day of Yom Tov) and no nossar on Yom Tov! Yet, **R' Nosson** says in a Braisa that **R' Tarfon** only applies his ruling to purging and rinsing, not to these other halachos!? **A:** Rather, his reason is like **R' Nachman in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha** said, that the cooking of each day (since there are so many korbanos brought over Yom Tov) acts to purge the flavors of the earlier korbanos before they can become nossar.

VACHACHOMIM OMRIM AHD ZMAN ACHILAH...

- **R' Nachman in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha** explains that the **Chachomim** say that he waits until the time for eating this korbon has passed, and then he does the purging and rinsing.
 - **Q:** Where do we learn this from? **A: R' Yochanan** said, we learn this from the fact that the pasuk immediately following the purging and rinsing requirement says “kol zachar baKohanim yochal”.

MERIKA KIMRIKAS HAKOS...

- A Braisa says, **Rebbi** says the purging and rinsing are done with cold water. The **Chachomim** say that the purging is done with hot water and the rinsing is done with cold water.
 - The **Rabanan** hold that this is no different than the purging that needs to be done for the keilim used by goyim for their cooking. **Rebbi** says, I agree that to purge the flavor of the nossar he must use hot water. I am saying that *after* that purging there is another purging and rinsing that must be done with cold water. The **Rabanan** say, if the purging and rinsing both refer to cold water the pasuk should say “morak, morak” or “shutaf, shutaf”. The fact that it changes words shows that one is with hot water and one is with cold. **Rebbi** says, if the same word was used we would think that both washings of cold water are done on the inside or on the outside. The pasuk uses different words to teach that one is done on the inside and one is done on the outside.

MISHNA

- If a person cooked kodashim and chulin together in a keili, or if he cooked kodshei kodashim and kodshei kalim together in a keili, if the more stringent meat is present in enough size to impart flavor to the other meat, the lenient one is eaten with the chumros of the more stringent one, the pots don't need purging and rinsing (until the time for eating the lenient one has passed), and if after the time for eating the stringent one has passed the lenient one is then cooked with other meat, it does not pass the psul along to that other meat.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- If a passul rakik mincha touched a valid rakik mincha, or if a passul piece of korbon meat touched a valid piece of meat, it doesn't make the entire mincha or piece of meat passul, rather only the place where it touched becomes assur.

GEMARA

- **Q:** Why is it that the purging and rinsing doesn't need to be done as soon as the time for eating the stringent meat has passed!? **A:** The Mishna must be amended to be saying – if the stringent meat imparts flavor into the more lenient meat, then the lenient meat must be eaten with the chumros of the more stringent meat, it requires purging and rinsing when the time for eating the stringent one has passed, and it will make passul other meats that it is then cooked with. However, if it didn't impart flavor, then the lenient meat need not be eaten with the chumros of the more stringent meat, it does not require purging and rinsing when the time for eating the stringent one has passed, and it will not make passul other meats that it is then cooked with.
 - **Q:** We can understand that purging and rinsing are not needed in the second case of the Mishna for the kodshei kodashim, but it should be needed for the kodshei kalim!? **A: Abaye** said, it means that purging and rinsing need not be done until the time for eating the kodshei kalim has passed. **Rava** said the Mishna follows the view of **R' Shimon**, who says that kodashim kalim do not carry the purging and rinsing requirement.
 - **Q:** According to **Rava** we understand why the Mishna gave this second case. However, according to **Abaye**, why is this second case needed? **A:** If we only had the first case we would say that only chullin could be mevatel kodashim because they are considered to be of a different kind, but kodshei kalim can't be mevatel kodshei kodashim. If we only had the second case we would say that only kodashim are strong enough to be mevatel other kodashim, but chullin could not be mevatel kodashim.

RAKIK SHEHIGIYA B'RAKIK...

- A Braisa says, the pasuk says "kol asher yigah". We would think that even if the other meat did not absorb anything from the chatas meat it must be treated with the status of the chatas meat. The pasuk therefore says "**biv'sara**" ("in"), which teaches that there must be absorption into the meat. We would think that if the chatas was absorbed into only part of the meat, the entire piece should become passul. The pasuk therefore says "yigah", which teaches that only the part that touches becomes passul. What do we do? We cut off the place that absorbed and the remaining is mutar. The pasuk says "**biv'sarah**", which teaches that absorption from the meat makes it passul, but not absorption from the "**gidin**", bones, horns, or hooves. The pasuk says "**yikdash**", which teaches that it becomes like the chatas. This means, if the chatas is passul, the other meat becomes passul. If the chatas was valid, the other meat must be eaten with the stringencies of a chatas.
 - **Q:** Why would a valid korbon that absorbed from a passul korbon become passul to eat? We should say that the assei of eating a valid korbon should come and override the lav of not eating a passul korbon!? **A: Rava** said, an assei does not override a lav of the Mikdash. **R' Ashi** said, the word "yikdash" creates an assei that this meat becomes passul as well. Therefore, there is an assei on the one hand, and an assei and a lav on the other, and an assei does not override an assei with a lav.
 - **Q:** The pasuk teaches the rule when another piece of meat absorbs from a chatas. How do we know that other korbanos would do the same? **A: Shmuel in the name of R' Eliezer** said, it is learned from the pasuk that creates a hekesh between olah, mincha, chatas, asham, milu'im, and shelamim.
 - The comparison to olah teaches that all korbanos must be shechted using a metal knife – a kli shareis – like an olah. We learn this for olah from Avrohom's shechting of the ram by the Akeidah.
 - The comparison to mincha teaches that just as a mincha may only be eaten by male Kohanim, so too there are other korbanos that may only be eaten by male Kohanim. Although the fact that a chatas and asham may be so eaten is written explicitly in a pasuk, and a shelamim of a tzibbur is learned from a drasha in another pasuk, it is actually a machlokes Tanna'im whether we learn this from the hekesh or from these other pesukim.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- The comparison to chatas teaches that just as chatas meat that touches other meat makes the other meat like it when there is absorbed flavor, the same is for the meat of the other korbanos that touch other meat.
- The comparison to asham teaches that just as the fetus and amniotic sac of an asham have no kedusha, the same is for those of other korbanos.
- The comparison to milu'im teaches that just as for a milu'im the leftovers are burned and living animals are not considered to be leftover of a milu'im, the same is for the other korbanos.
- The comparison to shelamim teaches that just as a shelamim can become piggul themselves and make the other things brought along with them into piggul, the same is true for other korbanos as well.

-----Daf פ"ט-----98-----

- The Gemara said that **Shmuel** said the pasuk makes a hekesh among the korbanos, and the Gemara listed what is taught by each of the korbanos. The Gemara now brings a Braisa which says that **R' Akiva** says that different things are learned from each of the korbanos:
 - From a mincha we learn that just as something that absorbs from a mincha becomes kadosh like the mincha from that absorption, the same is true for all korbanos.
 - We said earlier that this is learned from chatas as well. The Gemara explains, that we need to learn this from mincha and from chatas. If we would only learn it from mincha we would say that is so for a mincha, because it is soft and more strongly absorbs. If we would only say this regarding chatas we would say that the fats of a chatas make it become more deeply absorbed. That is why both are needed.
 - From a chatas we learn that just as a chatas may only be brought from chullin, and may only be brought during the day, and its Avodah must be done with the Kohen's right hand, so too all other obligatory korbanos must be brought from chullin, during the day, and with the Kohen's right hand.
 - **Q:** The halacha that korbanos must be offered during the day is learned from the pasuk of "b'yom tzavoso", not from the hekesh!? **A:** It is in fact not learned from the hekesh, but the Braisa mentions it along with the other things learned from the hekesh, since theoretically it could have been learned from the hekesh.
 - **Q:** The halacha that korbanos must be offered with the Kohen's right hand is learned from **Rabbah bar bar Chana in the name of R' Yochanan**, who says that whenever the pasuk says "etzbah" or "kehunah" it refers to the right hand!? **A:** It is in fact not learned from the hekesh, but the Braisa mentions it along with the other things learned from the hekesh, since theoretically it could have been learned from the hekesh. We can also say that the Braisa holds like **R' Shimon**, who says that from "kahuna" alone this could not be learned, and therefore we would not know this for the other korbanos.
 - From an asham we learn that just as the bones of an asham are mutar, so too the bones of all other korbanos are mutar.
- **Rava** said, it is obvious to me that if the blood of a chatas splattered onto a garment and the blood of an olah then splattered on top of it, there would be a required washing (the chatas blood is touching the garment and is absorbed into it). The question is if the blood of an olah splattered onto a garment and the blood of a chatas then splattered on top of it, would there be a requirement to wash that garment? Is the washing requirement based on the blood touching the garment, and since the chatas blood is touching the garment it would have to be washed, or is it based on absorption into the garment, and here the chatas blood is not absorbed into the garment and would therefore not need to be washed? **Rava** then answered, that the garment would not have to be washed.
- **Rava** said, it is obvious to me that blood on a garment would act as a chatzitza for purposes of mikvah, but if it is the garment of a butcher it would not act as a chatzitza (it doesn't bother him). It is also obvious that melted fats and wax on a garment would act as a chatzitza for purposes of mikvah, but if it is the garment of a seller of these items it would not act as a chatzitza (it doesn't bother him). The question is if there is blood *and* melted fats or

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

wax on a garment which belongs to someone who is a butcher and a seller of these items, would it act as a chatzitza? Do we say that people are not particular about one substance on them, but are particular about two, or not? **TEIKU**.

HADRAN ALACH PEREK DAM CHATAS

PEREK TVUL YOM -- PEREK SHNEYM ASSAR

MISHNA

- A Kohen who is a tvul yom or who is a mechusar kippurim does not get a share of the kodashim even though he will be fit to eat them that night.
- A Kohen who is an onein may touch a korbon, but may not do the Avodah for a korbon. He also does not get a share of the kodashim even if he will be fit to eat them that night.
- A Kohen who has a mum, whether it is a temporary or permanent mum, gets a share of the kodashim and may eat them, but may not do the Avodah.
- The general rule is: whoever is not fit to do the Avodah does not get a share of the meat of the korbanos, and whoever does not get a share in the meat does not get a share in the skins of the korbon. Even if a Kohen is tamei during the zrika of a korbon but is tahor at the time that the fats were burned, he does not get a share of the meat of the korbon. This is based on the pasuk of “hamakriv es dam hashelamim v’es hacheilev mibnei Aharon lo sihiyeh shok hayamin l’manah”.

-----Daf ט"ז-----99-----

GEMARA

- **Reish Lakish** said, that the Mishna’s first halacha is learned from the pasuk of “haKohen hamichatei osah yochlena”. Now, this can’t mean that only the Kohen who does the zrika can eat the korbon, because we know that the entire mishmar eats from the korbon. Therefore, it must mean that a Kohen who is *fit* to do the zrika may eat from its meat.
 - **Q:** A minor is not fit to do the zrika and yet he may eat the meat!? **A:** When the pasuk says “yochlena” it means he is entitled to a share of the meat. A minor is not entitled to a share although he may eat it. This pasuk teaches that a tvul yom, who is not fit to do the zrika, is not entitled to a share of the meat.
 - **Q:** A Kohen with a mum is not fit to do the zrika, and yet he is entitled to a share of the meat!? **A:** The pasuk of “kol zachar baKohanim” comes to include a baal mum as being entitled to a share of the meat.
 - **Q:** Maybe say that “kol zachar” comes to include a tvul yom? **A:** It makes more sense to include a baal mum, since he is allowed to eat the meat.
 - **Q:** Maybe it makes more sense to include a tvul yom, because he will be fit to do Avodah that coming night!? **A:** Still, right now he is not fit.
 - **R’ Yosef** said, from the fact that the Torah writes “yochlena” (literally referring to eating) when it means to refer to taking a portion, it teaches that one who is fit to eat is entitled to a portion.
 - **Q: Reish Lakish** asked, what if a baal mum is tamei? Do we say that since he anyway can’t do the Avodah as a baal mum and yet the Torah specifically includes him to be entitled to a portion, he continues to be entitled even when he is tamei, or do we say that since he is not fit to eat the meat while he is tamei, he is also not entitled to a portion while he is tamei? **A: Rabbah** said, a Braisa says that a Kohen Gadol who is an onein may do the Avodah but may not eat from the korbon and is not entitled to a share of the korbon. We see that entitlement to a share is reserved for someone who is fit to eat the meat. SHEMAH MINAH.
 - **Q: R’ Oshaya** asked, if a Kohen who is tamei for a korbon tzibbur, is he entitled to a portion? On the one hand he is fit to do the Avodah, but on the other hand he may not eat the meat!? **A: Ravina** said, a Braisa says that a Kohen Gadol who is an onein may do the Avodah but may not

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

eat from the korbon and is not entitled to a share of the korbon. We see that entitlement to a share is reserved for someone who is fit to eat the meat.

ONEIN NOGEYA V'EINO MAKRIV...

- **Q:** Is it true that an onein may touch a korbon? A Mishna says that an onein and a mechusar kippurim need to go to the mikvah before touching kodashim!? **A: R' Ami in the name of R' Yochanan** said, our Mishna is talking about where the Kohen already went to the mikvah.
 - **Q:** If he went to the mikvah while he was still an onein, **Rabbah bar R' Huna** said that his aninus returns to him (so the tevila would not help)!? **A:** That Mishna that requires tevila is discussing a Kohen who was “meysi'ach daas” from making sure he doesn't become tamei, and our Mishna is discussing where the onein was not meysi'ach daas (and therefore no mikvah is required).
 - **Q: R' Yustai the son of R' Masun in the name of R' Yochanan** said, that if one is maysi'ach daas from tumah he is required to be sprinkled by the parah adumah ashes, so how could the Mishna say that going to the mikvah alone suffices? **A: R' Yustai** is referring to where he was maysi'ach daas from tumas meis, and the Mishna is talking about where he was maysi'ach daas from tumas sheretz.
 - **Q:** If the Mishna refers to tumas sheretz, going to the mikvah would not be sufficient, because he would need sunset before he is tahor. Also, if he was tamei sheretz, he would not be allowed to eat even terumah, not only kodashim!? **A: R' Yirmiya** said, the case is that the person said he was careful not to become tamei from something that would make him fully tamei, but was not careful from something that would make him only passul (referring to tumah D'Rabanan, for which mikvah alone would suffice). In fact, we find that we believe a person to say that he was careful regarding some things but not others.
 - **R' Abba bar Mamal** said (in answer to the contradiction between our Mishna and the other Mishna), the ones who asked obviously did not hear the statement of **R' Yochanan in the name of Rebbi**, which said that we find that the **Rabanan** said that one who ate terumah that was a shlishi of tumah is assur to eat other terumah, but is mutar to touch terumah. Similarly, it may be that the **Rabanan** said that an onein may not eat a korbon, but may touch it.

V'EINO CHOLEIK LECHOL...

- **Q:** The Mishna says that an onein won't get a portion of a korbon, which suggests that if a different Kohen wanted to give him some of the korbon meat that night, the onein would be allowed to eat from it. However, a Mishna says that an onein may only eat from a Korbon Pesach the night after his aninus, but not from other korbanos!? **A: R' Yirmiya MiDifti** said, our Mishna is discussing the night of Pesach, and since he may eat from the Korbon Pesach, he may also eat from other korbanos. On other nights of the year he would not be allowed to eat from korbanos. When the Mishna that is quoted here says he may not eat from other korbanos, that is referring to all other nights of the year. **A2: R' Assi** said, the Mishna quoted here is referring to where he became an onein on the 14th of Nisson and his relative was buried that same day, and the reason he may eat is because aninus of the night after the day of death is only D'Rabanan. Our Mishna is referring to where the relative died and was not buried until the following day, and the night following the day of burial is therefore not even aninus D'Rabanan. It is the night after the burial that our Mishna says is when the onein may eat from the korbanos.
 - The shitah that holds that aninus at night is only D'Rabanan is the view of **R' Shimon** in a Braisa, where he says this must be so, since an onein may eat his Korbon Pesach that evening.
 - **Q: R' Shimon** says elsewhere that an onein may not even send his korbon to be offered. Presumably, this includes a Korbon Pesach and shows that he holds that an onein may not eat his Pesach that evening!? **A:** It is referring to korbanos other than his Korbon Pesach.
 - **R' Shimon** says in another Braisa that an onein may not bring any korbanos, and he lists Pesach among the korbanos that an onein may not bring!? **A: R' Chisda** said, he lists Pesach, but in fact it does not belong in that list. **A2: R' Sheishes** said, when he lists Pesach he is referring to the shelamim of Pesach, not to the Korbon Pesach itself.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** He lists shelamim separately, so how can **R' Sheishes** say that he was referring to the shelamim of Pesach? **A:** He lists the shelamim of Pesach separately. If he had not done so, we would have said that since it is brought for Pesach, it is like the Pesach which may be brought by an onein. Therefore, he lists it separately to teach that it too may not be brought by an onein.

-----Daf 7-----100-----

- The Gemara had asked a contradiction – in one place **R' Shimon** says that an onein may bring a Korbon Pesach, and in another place he includes Korbon Pesach in the list of korbanos which may not be brought by an onein. The Gemara has to this point given two answers.
 - **R' Mari** said, when **R' Shimon** says the onein may not bring the Pesach he is talking about a case where the onein's relative died on the 14th of Nisson and was buried that very day. That following night he still has the status of an onein even D'Oraisa and would not be allowed to eat it that night. When **R' Shimon** says that he may bring the Pesach, he was referring to a case where the relative died on the 13th of Nisson and was buried on the 14th. On the night following the 14th he is only an onein D'Rabanan. Therefore he may eat the Korbon Pesach that night.
 - **Q: R' Ashi** asked **R' Mari**, in the Braisa itself **R' Shimon** said to **R' Yehuda**, I can show you that aninus at night is only D'Rabanan, because we know that an onein may go to the mikvah and eat his Korbon Pesach that night. Now, according to **R' Mari**, who says that **R' Shimon** is referring to the night after the burial, not the night after the death, **R' Yehuda** should have responded, "I was discussing aninus D'Oraisa and you are bringing me a proof from a case of aninus D'Rabanan!". **A:** This remains a KASHYEH.
 - **Abaye** said, when **R' Shimon** says the onein may not bring the Pesach he is talking about a case where the onein's relative died on the 14th of Nisson before chatzos (which is when the Pesach obligation sets in). Since at the time of chatzos he was already an onein he does not bring the Pesach. When **R' Shimon** says that he may bring the Pesach, he was referring to a case where the relative died after chatzos. Since at chatzos he was not yet an onein, he became obligated to bring the Pesach and the aninus therefore can't push away that obligation.
 - **Q:** How does **Abaye** know to differentiate between where the relative dies before chatzos or after chatzos? **A:** There are two Braisos that seem to contradict each other. One Braisa says that the pasuk of "lah yitamah" teaches that there is an obligation for a Kohen to become tamei to a close relative (it is not simply an allowance and optional), and it once happened that the wife of Yosef HaKohen died on Erev Pesach and he didn't want to make himself tamei, so the other Kohanim made him tamei. There is another Braisa that says that if a person is on his way to bring his Pesach or to give his son a bris milah and hears that his relative has died, the pasuk of "lo yitamah" teaches he should not become tamei to them. However, the pasuk of "uli'achoso" teaches that even such a person would still be required to make himself tamei for the sake of burying a meis mitzvah. Now, the first Braisa implies that an onein would not bring a Pesach and the second Braisa suggests that he would!? It must be that the first Braisa is discussing where he became an onein before chatzos and the second Braisa is discussing where he became an onein after chatzos. From here we see the differentiation that **Abaye** uses in his answer.
 - **Q:** Maybe both Braisos are discussing where the relative died after chatzos. The second Braisa is following the view of **R' Yishmael**, who says that there is no obligation to become tamei to a relative, and the first Braisa is following the view of **R' Akiva**, who says that there is an obligation!? **A:** We can't say this, because the beginning of the second Braisa explicitly says that it is the view of **R' Akiva**.
 - **Rava** said, both statements of **R' Shimon** were regarding cases where the relative died after chatzos. When **R' Shimon** says that the onein does not bring the Pesach he is referring to where the relative died before the korbon was shechted and the zrika was done, and when **R' Shimon** says that the onein does

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

bring the korbon it is referring to where the relative died after the korbon was shechted and the zrika was done.

- **Q: R' Ada bar Masna** asked **Rava**, once it was already shechted and the zrika was done, and the relative then died, why would we then allow the onein to eat the korbon? He was yotzeh his mitzvah (which carries kares) to bring the Pesach, and the eating is then a separate mitzvah which should not be allowed for the onein!? **A: Ravina** said, as can be seen from the statement of **Rabbah bar R' Huna**, the eating of the Korbon Pesach is essential to the fulfilment of the obligation of Korbon Pesach. **Rava** told **R' Ada bar Masna**, listen to what your rebbi is telling you!
 - This statement of **Rabbah bar R' Huna** was made to answer a contradiction within a Braisa. The Braisa first says, if someone hears of a relative's death (within 30 days of the actual death) it is like the day of the burial with regard to the halachos of shiva and shloshim, but with regard to eating a Korbon Pesach the day of hearing is treated like the day of gathering the bones of a relative (to be reinterred) and the Pesach may be eaten (this suggests that the night after the burial the Pesach could not be eaten). The Braisa then says, in both this case and that case (the day of burial and the day of gathering the bones) the person (the mourner) may go to the mikvah and eat korbanos at night. This contradicts the first part of the Braisa!? **R' Chisda** said, that the two parts of the Braisos are the views of different Tanna'im, who argue. **Rabbah bar R' Huna** said, the second part of the Braisa is talking about a person who heard about his relative's death before shkiya, or where his relative's bones were gathered before shkiya, or where the relative died and was buried before shkiya. In these cases, shkiya brings the new day and there is no longer aninus. In the earlier part of the Braisa the case is where these things happened after shkiya, and that night is therefore part of the day of aninus and that is why it is assur to eat the Korbon Pesach when the burial happens after shkiya. Now, we can ask that when he hears of the death after shkiya we should not allow him to eat the Pesach since he was yotzeh with his bringing of the korbon!? Rather, we see that he holds that the eating of the Pesach is essential to fulfilment of the mitzvah. **R' Ashi** said, that when the Braisa says "in both this case and this case", it means whether it was the day of hearing of the relative's passing or the day of the gathering of his bones, the mourner may go to the mikvah and eat korbanos that evening.
 - The Gemara says that the answer of **R' Ashi** is incorrect, because if it referred to those two cases, since the Braisa just mentioned these two cases it should have said "this and this" instead of "both this and this".
 - **Q: R' Chisda** answered, by saying there is a machlokes among Tanna'im. Where do we find such a machlokes among Tanna'im? **A:** A Braisa says, until when is one an onein (and is therefore assur to eat korbanos)? The entire day. **Rebbi** says, as long as the meis has not been buried. Now, this cannot refer to the actual day of death, because everyone holds that the night after the day of death has aninus at least D'Rabanan, and therefore the **T"K** would not say that he could eat a korbon that night!? Also, this would mean that **Rebbi** says that after the burial he would be mutar to eat a korbon even during that same day. This cannot be because all hold that aninus continues for the entire day!? **R' Sheishes** answered, that the Braisa is referring to the day of burial, and the machlokes is that the **T"K** holds that aninus lasts for that entire day whereas **Rebbi** holds that it ends at the time of burial. **R' Yosef** doesn't like this answer, because of a problem from a different Braisa, and therefore says that the machlokes in the Braisa is regarding the day of burial, and the **T"K** holds that aninus lasts throughout the day of the burial and the following night, whereas

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Rebbi says it ends at nightfall after the burial. **R' Yirmiya** doesn't like **R' Yosef's** answer, because he says that another Braisa shows that **Rebbi** is the one who is more machmir, and according to this answer he is more meikel. Rather, **R' Yirmiya** says the machloes is that the **T"K** holds that aninus continues for the day of the burial but only until nightfall, and **Rebbi** says that even on the day of the burial the aninus continues throughout the following night. When **R' Chisda** said that there is a machlokes among Tanna'im whether aninus continues through the night after the burial, he was referring to this machlokes between the **T"K and Rebbi** as explained according to **R' Yirmiya**.

- **Q: Rava** asked, according to **R' Yirmiya's** explanation, if **Rebbi** says that the night following the day of burial has aninus D'Rabanan, it must be that he holds that the night following the day of death has aninus D'Oraisa. However, **Rebbi** explicitly says in a Braisa that the aninus of the night following the day of death is only D'Rabanan!? **A:** It is only D'Rabanan, and the D'Oraisa aninus does not go into the following night. Still, the D'Rabanan aninus of the day of burial does go into the night, because the **Rabanan** were more machmir with their gezeira than the Torah was with its halacha D'Oraisa.

-----Daf X"7--101-----

- A Braisa says, the pesukim tell us that on the 8th day of the Milu'im, although Aharon was an "onein" (his sons had died that day), Moshe commanded Aharon to eat from the Korbon Mincha ("ki chein tzuveisi"). After offering the Chatas, Aharon did not eat from it, and Moshe asked, "Why did you not eat it as I had commanded regarding the Mincha" ("kasher tziveisi")? When it came time to eat the Shelamim, Moshe told Aharon, the Shelamim should be eaten (even though Aharon was correct for not eating the Chatas), because Hashem had so commanded ("kasher tziva Hashem").
 - **Q:** This Braisa says that Moshe told them to eat the korbon even though they were in a period of aninus. However, another Braisa says that the pasuk of "ka'eileh" teaches that Moshe ultimately agreed to the korban being burned, because they were in a period of aninus!? **A: Shmuel** said, the first Braisa follows the view of **R' Yehuda**, who says in a Braisa along with **R' Shimon** that the korbon was burned because it became tamei, and the second Braisa follows **R' Nechemya**, who says in a Braisa that it was burned because they were in aninus. **A2: Rava** said that both Braisos can follow **R' Nechemya**. The first Braisa refers to the korbanos that were unique to that one time in history (those were allowed to be eaten despite the aninus), and the second Braisa refers to the korbanos that were of the type that were brought in future generations as well.
 - **R' Nechemya** explained the conversation between Moshe and Aharon as follows. Moshe asked Aharon, "Why did you not eat the Rosh Chodesh chatas? Was its blood within the Heichal making it passul?" Aharon said, "hein lo huva es damah" – the blood was not brought into the Heichal. Moshe asked, "Was it taken out of the Azarah?" Aharon answered, "bakodesh" – it never left the Azarah. Moshe asked, "Is it because you offered it as an onein and therefore feel it was passul?" Aharon replied, "It is I who offered the korbon, and as a Kohen Gadol my Avodah is not passul due to aninus." Moshe asked, "If so, why did you not eat it? I told you to eat it even though you are in aninus!?" Aharon responded, "Maybe Hashem meant that I should eat the korbanos that were special for that particular day, never to be brought again, but not the korbanos that would continue to be brought throughout the generations?" The pasuk says that Moshe heard this reply and was pleased with it. He said, "What you told me is in fact what Hashem told me, but I forgot."
 - **R' Yehuda and R' Shimon** explained the conversation as follows. Moshe asked Aharon, "Why did you not eat the Rosh Chodesh chatas? Was its blood within the Heichal making it passul?" Aharon said, "hein lo huva es damah" – the blood was not brought into the Heichal. Moshe

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

asked, “Was it taken out of the Azarah?” Aharon answered, “bakodesh” – it never left the Azarah. Moshe asked, “Is it because you offered it as an onein and therefore feel it was passul?” Aharon replied, “It is I who offered the korbon, and as a Kohen Gadol my Avodah is not passul due to aninus.” Moshe asked, “Is it because in your pain you were not careful and it became tamei?” Aharon said, “I would never allow that to happen to a korbon due to such pain!” Moshe asked, “If so, why did you not eat it? I told you to eat it even though you are in aninus!?” Aharon responded, “Maybe Hashem meant that I, as an onein, can eat korbanos at night, but not during the day of the death?” The pasuk says that Moshe heard this reply and was pleased with it. He said, “What you told me is in fact what Hashem told me, but I forgot.”

- **Q:** If so, why didn't he save the korbon to be eaten that night? **A:** It accidentally became tamei before nightfall.
- The Braisa that brings the machlokes between **R' Nechemya**, and **R' Yehuda and R' Shimon** says that **R' Yehuda and R' Shimon** said, if the chatas was burned due to aninus, then all 3 korbanos should have burned! A Braisa darshens the words “v'eis se'ir hachatas darosh darash Moshe” to teach that there were 3 korbanos there – “se'ir” refers to the se'ir of Nachshon, “chatas” refers to the chatas of the 8th day, and “darosh” refers to the goat of Rosh Chodesh. The pasuk then says “v'hinei soraf”, which teaches that only one was burned, but the others were not.
 - “Darosh darash” refers to two questions. Moshe asked, why is it that the chatas was burned, and why is it that the others were not. We learn from another pasuk that it was the goat for Rosh Chodesh that was burned.
 - The Braisa said that **R' Yehuda and R' Shimon** asked that if the chatas was burned due to aninus, then all 3 korbanos should have burned. **R' Nechemya** would say that the korbanos that were unique to that day (chatas of Nachshon and of the 8th day) could be eaten even in aninus, and therefore it was only the goat of Rosh Chodesh that was burned.
 - The Braisa said that **R' Yehuda and R' Shimon** asked that if the chatas was burned due to aninus, why did Aharon not just wait and eat it at night, after the aninus day was over!? **R' Nechemya** would say that aninus of the night following the day of death is D'Oraisa.
 - The Braisa said that **R' Yehuda and R' Shimon** asked that if the chatas was burned due to aninus, why couldn't it instead have been given to Pinchas to eat, since he was a Kohen and was not an onein!? **R' Nechemya** holds like **R' Illai**, who darshens a pasuk to teach that Pinchas did not get the status of a Kohen until after he killed Zimri.
 - **R' Ashi** said that Pinchas did not get the status of a Kohen until he made peace among the Shevatim in the times of Yehoshua.
 - **Rav** darshened a pasuk to teach that Moshe had the status of Kohen Gadol and got a share of the korbanos.
 - **Q:** If this is true, why did the Braisa ask that Pinchas was with them and should have eaten the korbon? Why didn't it ask that Moshe was there and should have eaten the korbon!? **A:** Moshe was completely involved talking to the Shechina and did not have time to eat the korbanos.
 - **Q:** A Braisa learns from a pasuk that a Kohen who has a mum may eat from kodshei kodashim and kodshei kalim. The Braisa says, if the pasuk had only said that he may eat kodshei kodashim we would think that he may do that because we find that a non-Kohen ate kodshei kodashim, but maybe he would not be allowed to eat kodshei kalim. Now, who is this non-Kohen who ate kodshei kodashim? Presumably it refers to Moshe, and we see that he is referred to as a non-Kohen!? **A: R' Sheishes** said, it refers to a mincha brought on a bamah, which was allowed to be eaten by a non-Kohen.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** A Braisa discusses who acted as the Kohen to deal with Miriam's tzaraas. The Braisa says it could not have been Moshe, because he was not a Kohen and therefore could not pasken on tzaraas!? **A: R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, it may be that Moshe had the status of a Kohen, but since the pasuk regarding paskening on tzaraas says "Aharon" and "banav", it is limited to the descendants of Aharon.
- **Q:** A Braisa says that Elisheva was in a unique position that her brother in law (Moshe) was the king, her husband (Aharon) was the Kohen Gadol, her son (Elazar) was the s'gan, her grandson (Pinchas) was the mashu'ach milchamah, and her brother (Nachshon) was a Nasi. We see that Moshe was the king, but did not have the status of the Kohen Gadol!? **A:** The Braisa means that Moshe was *also* the king, in addition to having the status of a Kohen Gadol.

-----Daf כק--102-----

- The Gemara has been discussing whether Moshe had the status of a Kohen. The Gemara now says that this matter is actually the subject of a machlokes among Tanna'im. A Braisa says, the pasuk says "vayichar ahf Hashem b'Moshe". **R' Yehoshua ben Korcha** said, whenever the Torah states verbiage of "Charon ahf" there is always a manifestation of this anger that follows (e.g. in the form of a curse, or rebuke, etc.). However, in this pasuk there is no such manifestation. **R' Shimon ben Yochai** said, there is a manifestation here as well. He says we see this from the pasuk where Hashem said "halo Aharon achicha haLeivi". Now, Aharon was a Kohen so why is he being called a Leivi? The pasuk is teaching that Hashem told Moshe, you were supposed to be the Kohen and Aharon was supposed to remain a Leivi, but now I have given the Kehuna to Aharon. The **Chachomim** say that Moshe only had the status of a Kohen for the 7 days of the Milu'im. **Others** darshen pesukim to teach that Moshe remained a Kohen for his entire life, but the status did not pass to his children.
 - **Q:** Is it true that every "Charon ahf" has a manifestation of this anger? The pasuk says that Moshe left Paroh "bachari ahf", and we don't find a manifestation of that anger!? **A: Reish Lakish** said that Moshe slapped Paroh on the face before he left.
 - **Q:** There is a machlokes, where **Reish Lakish** learns from a pasuk that Hashem told Moshe that Paroh is a king and must therefore be respected, and **R' Yochanan** says that Hashem told Moshe that Paroh is a rasha and therefore need not be respected. How can we say that **Reish Lakish** said that Moshe slapped Paroh on the face!? **A:** We must reverse the views in this machlokes, so that it is **Reish Lakish** who holds that Hashem told Moshe that Paroh is a rasha and therefore need not be respected.
 - **R' Yannai** said, from the pasuk that says that Moshe told Paroh that Paroh's servants would come to look for Moshe and bow to him (after makas bechoros), although it was in fact Paroh who would do so, we learn that one must always fear and respect royalty. **R' Yochanan** said, we learn this concept from the pasuk that says that Eliyahu ran in front of the rasha Achav.
- **Ulla** darshens a pasuk to teach that Moshe wanted to be king but Hashem didn't give it to him.
 - **Q: Rava** asked, we have learned in a previous Braisa that he was the king!? **A: Rava** said, Moshe was the king, but he also wanted it to remain with his descendants. That is what was not given to him.

BAALEI MUMIN BEIN BAALEI MUMIN...

- This is learned from a Braisa. The Braisa says, the pasuk of "kol zachar" written regarding a mincha comes to include a Kohen with a mum. Now, this can't come to include him in the eating of the korbon, because that is learned from another pasuk. Rather, it comes to teach that a Kohen with a mum gets a share of the korbanos as well.
 - Another Braisa says that the pasuk of "kol zachar" written regarding a chatas comes to include a Kohen with a mum. Now, this can't come to include him in the eating of the korbon, because that is learned from another pasuk. It can't come to include that he gets a share of the korbanos, because that was

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

learned from the pasuk regarding mincha. Rather, we would think that only a Kohen who used to not have a mum and then got a mum gets a share of korbanos. This pasuk teaches that even a Kohen who always had a mum gets a share as well.

- Another Braisa says that the pasuk of “kol zachar” written regarding an asham comes to include a Kohen with a mum. Now, this can’t come to include him in the eating of the korbon, because that is learned from another pasuk. It can’t come to include that he gets a share of the korbanos, because that was learned from the pasuk regarding mincha. It can’t come to include a Kohen who always had a mum, because that is learned from the pasuk regarding chatas. Rather, we would think to only include a Kohen with a permanent mum. This pasuk comes to include even a Kohen with a temporary mum.
 - **Q:** It would seem that it makes more sense to initially include a Kohen with a temporary mum rather than one with a permanent mum!? **A: R’ Sheishes** said, we should reverse the words of the Braisa to say that. **R’ Ashi** said, we would think that a Kohen with a temporary mum should not be allowed to eat, just like a Kohen who is tamei (which is also a temporary condition), and should only eat when the temporary condition has passed. The pasuk therefore teaches that he may eat and he gets a share of the korbanos.

KOL SHE’EINO RA’UY...

- **Q:** A baal mum is not fit to do the Avodah and yet he gets a share!? Also, does this mean that one who is fit to do the Avodah gets a share? A tamei Kohen is fit to do the Avodah of a korbon tzibbur and yet he doesn’t get a share!? **A:** The Mishna means that a Kohen who is not fit to *eat* the korbon does not get a share of the korbanos.
 - **Q:** A minor Kohen is fit to eat and yet he does not get a share!? **A:** The Mishna teaches that one who is *not* fit to eat does *not* get a share. It should not be taken to teach that one who *is* fit to eat *does* get a share.
 - With this answer we can even say like we said originally, that one who is not fit to do the Avodah does not get a share. The fact that a tamei is fit and doesn’t get a share is not problematic, because the Mishna is not teaching that someone who *is* fit would get a share. The fact that a baal mum gets a share is not problematic, because that is based on a pasuk that comes to include a baal mum.

AFILU TAMEI BISHAS ZRIKAS DAMIM...

- The Mishna suggests that if a Kohen was tahor by the zrika and tamei when the fats were burned he would get a share. Based on this, our Mishna does not follow **Abba Shaul**, who darshens a pasuk in a Braisa to teach that a Kohen only gets a share of the korbon if he was tahor from the zrika until the burning of the fats.
 - **Q: R’ Ashi** asked, what if the Kohen was tahor at the time of the zrika and the time of the burning, but was tamei in between, would he get a share? **TEIKU.**
- **Rav** said, I learned the following halacha from **R’ Elazar the son of R’ Shimon** who said the following to himself in a bathroom. If a Kohen who is a tvul yom says to a tahor Kohen – “Give me a share of a Yisrael’s mincha and I will eat it tonight when I am fully tahor”, the tahor Kohen can say to him, “If regarding a chatas, where if a Kohen who is not doing the Avodah that week brings his own chatas he may still do the Avodah and eat the meat, yet even if he is supposed to do the Avodah that week, if he is a tvul yom he would not be able to demand a share of someone else’s chatas that is brought that week, then regarding a mincha, where a Kohen who brings his own mincha gets to eat none of it (it is fully burned), then certainly the tvul yom should get no share of a mincha!” The tvul yom could then respond, “You can push me away from a Yisrael’s chatas, because you and I both have a stronger claim to our own chatas, but you can’t use that to push me away from a mincha, since even you cannot eat your own mincha and are therefore no better than me!” The tahor Kohen could then say, “The pasuk regarding a mincha says “lakohen hamakriv osah lo sihiyeh” – if you come and do the Avodah you can come and eat the mincha” (and since he can’t do the Avodah he can’t eat the mincha). The Braisa then says, if the tvul yom asked for a share of a Yisrael’s chatas the tahor Kohen can say, “If regarding a mincha, where I don’t have a strong position, because I can’t eat my own mincha, yet I can push you away from getting a share of a Yisrael’s mincha, then regarding a chatas, where I have a strong position (I can do the Avodah and get my entire chatas even if it is not my week to do the Avodah) I can surely push you away from getting a share of a Yisrael’s chatas.” The tvul yom can answer, “The reason you can push me away from a mincha is because, just

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

like you, my position regarding my own mincha is weak. However, regarding a chatas, where like you, my position is strong, maybe you can't push me away!?" The tahor Kohen can say, "The pasuk regarding a chatas says "HaKohen hamichatei osah yochlena" – if you come and do the Avodah you can come and eat." The Braisa then says, if the tvul yom asks for a share of the chazeh v'shok of a shelamim, the tahor Kohen can say, "If regarding a chatas, where you have a strong position, I can push you away, then regarding a shelamim, where you have a weak position, because you can only get the chazek v'shok, I can surely push you away!" The tvul yom can answer, "You can push me away from a chatas, because my position is weak in that I cannot give it to my wife or slaves to eat, but maybe you can't push me away from the shelamim, since I can give it to my wife and slaves to eat!" The tahor Kohen can reply, "The pasuk says "laKohen hazoreik es dam hashelamim lo yihiyeh" – if you come and do the zrika you can get a portion and eat it." Based on all these arguments the tvul yom leaves with his arguments (they are all unsuccessful) and he has the mechusar kippurim on his right side and the onein on his left side (they would not be eligible to a share based on the same arguments that excluded the tvul yom).

- **Q: R' Achai** asked, the Braisa should have continued with one more case – where the tvul yom asks for a share of a bechor and the tahor Kohen eventually excludes him based on the pasuk that also talks of the zrika and the keeping of the meat, which teaches that only one who could do the zrika can get the meat!? **A: R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon** would say that this is not included, because the pasuk regarding bechor doesn't say "ubisaram laKohen hazoreik", rather it says "ubisaram yihiyeh lach" – which suggests that it can go to any Kohen, even one who didn't do the zrika.
- **Q: Rababh bar bar Chana in the name of R' Yochanan** said that one may not think of Torah in a bathroom, so how could **R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon** have done so!? **A:** He was considered an oneis, because he couldn't get his mind off of Torah.

-----Daf לך-----103-----

MISHNA

- In any case where the Mizbe'ach doesn't end up getting the meat of the olah (e.g. it became passul before the zrika so that it was never fit to be put onto the Mizbe'ach) the Kohanim do not get the skins of the animal. This is based on the pasuk of "olas ish" which teaches that the Kohen only gets the skins when it is an olah that is counted for the person who it is brought for.
 - If an olah was shechted not lishma, even though it does not count for the person who brought it, its skins are still given to the Kohanim.
 - The skins of a man's olah and of a woman's olah are given to the Kohanim.
- The skins of kodashim kalim belong to the owners. The skins of kodshei kodashim are given to the Kohanim. This is learned via a kal v'chomer – if a Kohen does not get the meat of an olah and yet he gets its skins, then other kodshei kodashim, where he does get the meat, he surely gets the skins. The Mizbe'ach cannot refute this kal v'chomer (by saying that it gets the meat of an olah but not its skins) because the Mizbe'ach never gets the skins of a korbon.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, the pasuk regarding the Kohanim getting the skins of the olah says "olas ish". **R' Yehuda** says, this comes to exclude the olah of hekdesch, and **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda** says, this comes to exclude the olah of a ger.
 - **Q:** What is an "olah of hekdesch"? **A: R' Chiya bar Yosef** said, it is an olah that is brought from the leftover of an asham (an asham whose owner died or got a kapparah through another animal, where we pasken that it grazes until it gets a mum, is sold, and an olah is brought with the proceeds).
 - **Q:** This only makes sense according to the view that this money is used for a korbon tzibbur. What will we say according to the view that this money is used to buy an individual's korbon? **A:** It is like **Rava** said, that the "hey" of "ha'olah" refers to the first olah. Here too, the pasuk says

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

“ha’olah” and therefore refers to an animal that was made kadosh initially as an olah, not one that came from a leftover asham.

- **R’ Aivo in the name of R’ Yannai** said that “olah of hekdeshe” refers to an olah given for bedek habayis and therefore the Kohen would not get the skins of such an olah. This is not only according to the view that kedushas bedek habayis takes hold onto an olah D’Oraisa. Rather, even according to the view that it only does so D’Rabanan, it is only D’Rabanan with regard to the meat, but with regard to the skins it would take hold D’Oraisa.
 - **R’ Nachman in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha** also said that “olah of hekdeshe” comes to exclude an olah brought from the leftover of another korban. **R’ Hamnuna** asked **R’ Nachman**, you are basing your answer on the view of **R’ Yehuda** in a Braisa who says that the skins of such animals are not given to Kohanim. However, **R’ Yehuda** seems to retract his view in the Braisa to instead hold that they do go to the Kohanim!? **R’ Nachman** asked, so how do you explain “olah of hekdeshe”? **R’ Hamnuna** said, it refers to someone who gave all his possessions to hekdeshe, and follows the view of **R’ Yehoshua**, who says in a Mishna that any male animals that this person had become olos. It is those olos whose skins are not given to the Kohanim.
 - **Q: R’ Yose the son of R’ Yehuda** said in the Braisa that “olas ish” comes to exclude the olah of a ger. **R’ Simai** asked **Ravina**, is a ger not a person? Why would he be excluded from “olas ish”? **A: Ravina** said, **R’ Yose the son of R’ Yehuda** means that it excludes the olah of a ger who died without leaving over any heirs.
- A Braisa says, the pasuk says that the Kohanim get the skins of “olas ish”. How do we know they also get the skins of the olah of a woman or of a slave? The pasuk says “ohr ha’olah”, which comes to include them as well. If so, why does the pasuk say “olas ish”? This teaches that it must be an olah that counts for the person who brings it. This excludes an olah that was shechted with intent for beyond its time or place. We would think that it also excludes an olah that was shechted not lishma, since it does not count for its owners. The pasuk of “ohr ha’olah” teaches that in this case the Kohanim would get the skins. The pasuk of “ohr ha’olah” only teaches that the skins of an olah are given to the Kohen. How do we know that the skins of other kodshei kodashim are also given to the Kohanim? The extra words in the pasuk “asher hikriv” teach to include other korbanos as well. We would think that the same should be done with the skins of kodashim kalim. The pasuk therefore says “olah”, which teaches that this only applies to korbanos that are like an olah – korbanos of kodshei kodashim. **R’ Yishmael** says, we know that the skins of other kodshei kodashim are given to the Kohanim based on a kal v’chomer – they don’t get the meat of an olah, yet they get the skins, then surely they get the skins of other kodshei kodashim where they even get the meat! The Braisa asks, we can refute this with the Mizbe’ach, which gets the meat but does not get the skins! The Braisa answers, the Mizbe’ach is different, because we never find that it gets skins of a korban. However, the pasuk clearly says that Kohanim get the skins of an olah. Since they get by an olah we can say that they get from all kodshei kodashim. **Rebbi** says, the pasuk that the Kohanim get the skins is only needed for a korban olah, because typically, the skins follow the meat. For example, the korbanos that are burned must have their meat and skins burned. A chatas, asham and shelamim of the tzibbur are given to the Kohanim to eat along with their skins. Kodshei kalim are kept by their owners along with their skins. However, when it comes to an olah, the meat is given to the Mizbe’ach and the pasuk teaches that the skins are given to the Kohanim. The pasuk then says “lo yihyeh”, which teaches that a Kohen who is a tvul yom, a mechusar kippurim, or an onein does not get the skins. We would think that they don’t get a share of the meat of a korban since they can’t eat it, but they should get a share of the skins. The pasuk therefore teaches that they do not.
 - **Q: Why doesn’t the T”K learn other kodshei kodashim from the kal v’chomer and instead learns it from a pasuk? A:** It could have been learned from a kal v’chomer, but sometimes the pasuk explicitly teaches things that could have been learned from a kal v’chomer.
 - **Q: What does R’ Yishmael do with the pasuk of “asher hikriv”? A:** He uses it to exclude a Kohen who is a tvul yom, a mechusar kippurim, or an onein.
 - **Q: Why doesn’t he learn that from “lo yihyeh”? A: R’ Yishmael** uses “lo yihyeh” for a gezeira shava to teach that the bones of an olah are mutar for the Kohanim to use.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

MISHNA

- All korbanos that became passul before they were skinned do not have their skins given to the Kohanim. If they became passul after they were skinned, the skins are given to the Kohanim.
- **R' Chanina the S'gan** said, in all my days I never saw skins being taken out to be burned. **R' Akiva** said, we can learn from him that if one skins a bechor and it is then found to be a treifa, the skins are given to the Kohanim. The **Chachomim** said "I never saw" is not a proof that something never happened, and therefore if the korbon was found to be a treifa, the skins would be burned along with the korbon.

GEMARA

- **Q:** The earlier Mishna said, that if the Mizbe'ach doesn't get the meat of a korbon the Kohanim don't get the skins. This implies that this is the case even if the animal was skinned before the zrika and before the korbon became passul. The Mishna follows the view of **R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon**, who says that even after the skin is removed, it only goes to the Kohanim if the meat eventually becomes valid for the Mizbe'ach. Now, our Mishna (which is a continuation of the last Mishna) says that korbanos that became passul before they were skinned do not have their skins given to the Kohanim. This implies that if it became passul after it was skinned the skins would go to the Kohanim. This follows the view of **Rebbi** who says that the zrika can accomplish to permit the skins for the Kohanim even if it will not make the meat valid for the Mizbe'ach. How can it be that the earlier part of the Mishna follows **R' Elazar** and the later part follows **Rebbi**? **A: Abaye** said, if the later part follows the view of **Rebbi** the earlier part must follow him as well. The reason the earlier Mishna says that if the korbon became passul before zrika the skins are not given to the Kohanim is because **Rebbi** says that a korbon is not skinned before the zrika takes place. **Rava** said, if the earlier part of the Mishna follows the view of **R' Elazar** then the later part must follow him as well. When our Mishna says "before they were skinned" and "after they were skinned" it means before they became *fit* for skinning, and after they became *fit* for skinning.