



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

### Zevachim Daf Pey Hey

- **Ulla** said, if eimurim of kodshei kalim were brought up onto the Mizbe'ach before their blood was offered, they are not taken down, because they have become the "bread" of the Mizbe'ach.
  - **R' Zeira** said, we have learned this as well in the Braisa quoted above, which said that a korbon whose blood spilled or whose blood was taken outside of the curtains are not taken down from the Mizbe'ach. Now, if in the those cases where the Kohen cannot offer the blood even if he wanted to, yet we have said that if the korbanos were brought up they are not taken down, then in **Ulla's** case, where if he wants to offer the blood he can, surely we should say that the eimurim do not have to be taken down.
    - The Gemara says this is no proof, because the Braisa may only be talking about kodshei kodashim, which have more kedusha, and it may be that that is why they are not taken down.
      - **Q:** The Braisa lists the Korbon Pesach, which is kodshei kalim!? **A:** That is referring only to a case where it was done not lishma
  - **Q:** Maybe we can bring a proof from our Mishna. The Mishna said, that if any korbon went up onto the Mizbe'ach alive, it is brought down. This implies that if they were brought up after their shechita, even if it was before their zrika, they would not be brought down!? **A:** The Mishna means, that if they were brought up after their shechita, some of them would be brought down and some would not be brought down.
    - **Q:** The Mishna says "if any korbon..."? **A:** That is referring to korbanos that went up while alive. That is when it applies to *all* korbanos. Although this seems obvious, we would say that it refers to live animals that have the mum of "dukin sheba'ayin", and follows the view of **R' Akiva** who says that if an animal with such a mum was brought up, it is not taken down.
      - **Q:** The Mishna later says that if an olah was brought up alive it should be taken down to be shechted. If it was shechted up there, it should be skinned, cut into pieces, and offered up there. Now, if the Mishna is referring to korbanos with a mum, this olah would not have to be cut up!? A pasuk teaches that only a valid olah is required to be cut up!? **A:** That part of the Mishna is referring to a valid korbon. Although the Mishna would then seem to be obvious, we can say that the Mishna is teaching that we would skin and cut up a valid olah that was shechted on top of the Mizbe'ach, right there on top of the Mizbe'ach.
        - **Q:** According to the view that we may never skin and cut up a valid olah on top of the Mizbe'ach, we must say that the Mishna is not discussing a valid olah!? **A:** The Mishna is dealing with a passul korbon that had a period of validity, and follows the view of **R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon**, who says that if the blood of a korbon was offered and its meat was valid for even a short time, it should be skinned and the skins are given to the Kohanim.
        - **Q:** A Braisa on our Mishna says that after skinning and cutting up the olah he takes down the intestines and washes them. Now, if we are dealing with a passul korbon why would we take the intestines down to wash them, since by taking them down they will no longer be allowed back up!? **A:** We wash them in case another Kohen sees them, and without realizing that they are from a passul korbon decides to bring them back up.

- **R' Chiya bar Abba** said that **R' Yochanan** asked whether eimurim of kodshei kalim that were brought up onto the Mizbe'ach before their blood was offered are taken down or not. **R' Ami** asked him, why don't you ask whether they are subject to me'ilah? **R' Yochanan** said, I don't ask about me'ilah, because I know that it is the zrika that makes them subject to me'ilah. **R' Yochanan** then answered that they would not be taken down from the Mizbe'ach and they are not subject to me'ilah.
  - **Another** version of the above was that **R' Chiya bar Abba** said that **R' Yochanan** asked whether eimurim of kodshei kalim are subject to me'ilah. **R' Ami** asked why he didn't ask whether they would be taken off the Mizbe'ach. **R' Yochanan** said he didn't ask about that, because since the eimurim became the "bread" of the Mizbe'ach they would not be taken down. **R' Yochanan** then answered that they would not be taken down from the Mizbe'ach and they are not subject to me'ilah.

#### V'EILU LO HAYA PESULAN...

- **R' Yochanan** said, **R' Akiva** only allowed this for the type of mum like cataracts in the eye. Since such a mum does not make a bird passul it also does not require that the animal be removed from the Mizbe'ach on account of it. Also, this is only if the mum came about after the animal was made kadosh. **R' Akiva** would also agree regarding a female olah, that it is considered to be as if the mum came before it made kadosh (an olah may only be brought from the male gender).
- **Q: R' Yirmiya** asked, is a bird that was sodomized by a person passul? Do we say that "min habeheima" teaches to exclude an animal that sodomized and that was sodomized, and since they are taught from the same place, we would say that a bird that cannot sodomize a person does not become passul if it was sodomized by a person? Or do we say that a sin was committed with it and therefore it becomes passul? **A: Rabbah** said, in our Mishna **R' Akiva** allows animals with certain mumim to remain on the Mizbe'ach since they are not considered a mum for a bird. If a bird that was sodomized is still valid, he should likewise say that an animal that was sodomized can remain on top of the Mizbe'ach, and he does not say so. We see from here that a bird that was sodomized is passul.
  - **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** brings a Braisa to prove that **Rabbah** is correct.

#### R' CHANINA SGAN HAKOHANIM...

- **Q:** He is simply repeating the view of the **T"K**, so what is he teaching us? **A:** Either he wanted to tell us that this was carried out in practice, or he was telling us that his father didn't directly take them down, but rather did so indirectly.

#### KISHEIM SHE'IHM ALU...

- **Ulla** said, this (that although they are not taken down, if they are taken down they are not brought back up) is only if the fire had not taken hold of them. However, if the fire had taken hold of them, then even if they were taken down, they are brought back up.
  - **R' Mari** learned the ruling of **Ulla** on the earlier part of the Mishna (as stated above). **R' Chanina of Sura** taught it on the next Mishna which says, with regard to the bones, sinews, horns, and hooves, as long as they are attached to the korbon they are brought up along with it, but if they were separated they are not brought up. A Braisa then says that even if they were brought up they must be taken down. Regarding that, he says that **Ulla** said, that is only if the fire had not yet taken hold of them. If it had, it is brought back up.
    - **R' Mari** may not agree with **R' Chanina**, because he may say that these are not fit for burning, and as such there is no difference whether the fire has taken hold of them.