



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

Zevachim Daf Kuf Gimmel

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 hekdeshe, and **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda** says, this comes to exclude the olah of a ger.
 - **Q:** What is an "olah of hekdeshe"? **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 "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 korbon. **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 korbon. 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 korbon 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 yihiyeh”, 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 korbon 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 yihiyeh”? **A:** **R’ Yishmael** uses “lo yihiyeh” for a gezeira shava to teach that the bones of an olah are mutar for the Kohanim to use.

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 korbos became passul before zrika the skins are not given to the Kohanim is because **Rebbi** says that a korbos 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.