



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

Zevachim Daf Kuf Daled

- The Gemara mentioned a machlokes between **Rebbi and R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon**. The machlokes was in a Braisa. The Braisa says, **Rebbi** said, the zrika accomplishes for the skin of the korbbon on its own. When it is still attached to the meat, if the meat became passul even before or after the zrika, the skin gets the same status as the meat. **R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon** said, the zrika does not accomplish for the skin of the korbbon on its own. When the skin is still attached to the meat, if the meat becomes passul before the zrika the skins also become passul. If the meat becomes passul after the zrika, then as long as the meat was valid for at least a moment, the animal can be skinned and the skins go to the Kohanim.
 - **Q:** Maybe we can say that they argue in the same machlokes as exists between **R' Eliezer and R' Yehoshua** in a Braisa. **R' Yehoshua** says that the pasuk of "v'sasisa olosecha habasar v'hadam" teaches that if the blood of an olah becomes passul its meat is not brought on the Mizbe'ach, and if the meat becomes passul its blood is not offered on the Mizbe'ach. **R' Eliezer** says, even if the meat becomes passul the blood is still offered, based on the pasuk of "v'dam zivachecha yishafeich". He says that the pasuk of "v'sasisa olosecha habasar v'hadam" teaches that just as the blood is thrown onto the Mizbe'ach, the meat is also thrown on – which teaches that there was a space between the ramp and the Mizbe'ach. Maybe we can say that **Rebbi** will hold like **R' Eliezer**, and that **R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon** holds like **R' Yehoshua**? **A:** All would agree that according to **R' Eliezer** the zrika would accomplish for the skins alone even if the meat is passul. The machlokes would be according to **R' Yehoshua**. **R' Elazar** would say that **R' Yehoshua** holds like him, but **Rebbi** would say that **R' Yehoshua** only holds that way regarding the meat, since it involves no loss to the Kohanim. However, regarding the skins, which would be a loss for the Kohanim, he would agree that the zrika would permit the skins. It would be no different than the case of where one did zrika where the meat was passul, in which case **R' Yehoshua** says that b'dieved it is a valid zrika.

AMAR R' CHANINA S'GAN HAKOHANIM...

- **Q:** Can it be that he never saw skins being burned? What about the korbanos that are brought inside the Heichal (the parim hanisrafim and se'irim hanisrafim) where are burned along with their skins!? **A:** He was referring to korbanos whose proper process is not to have the skins burned.
 - **Q:** What about a korbbon that became passul before the skinning and before the zrika, where the skins would certainly be burned? **A:** He was referring to skins that were no longer attached to the meat.
 - **Q:** What about a korbbon that became passul after the skinning but before the zrika, which according to **R' Elazar** would have to be burned? **A:** **R' Chanina** holds like **Rebbi** who says that the zrika would make those skins mutar. Or, even if he holds like **R' Elazar**, he would hold that the skinning was not done before the zrika.
 - **Q:** What about the case where the animal was found to be a treifa in its internal organs? **A:** He holds that the skins of such a korbbon would be mutar. In fact, the words of **R' Akiva** in the Mishna suggest this, because he says that from **R' Chanina** we can learn that if a bechor was skinned and then found to be a treifa, the Kohanim may benefit from the skins.
 - **Q:** If this is what **R' Chanina** meant, what is **R' Akiva** coming to add? **A:** He is teaching that the skins of a bechor don't become assur for the Kohen even if a bechor outside of the Beis Hamikdash – i.e. a bechor with a mum – is later found to be a treifa.

- **R' Chiya bar Abba in the name of R' Yochanan** said that the halacha follows the view of **R' Akiva**, but even **R' Akiva** would agree that this is only so when an expert ruled that the bechor had a mum, but if it was not paskened on by an expert, it would not be mutar.
- The Gemara paskens like the **Chachomim** who argue on **R' Chanina**, who say that if the animal is found to have been a treifah that was in existence before the skinning, the skins must be burned.

MISHNA

- With regard to the “parim hanisrafim” and the “se’irim hanisrafim”, when they are being burned as they are supposed to be (not due to them having become passul), they are burned in the Beis Hadashen and they make tamei the clothing of the people who burn them. If they were burned not based on it being done as a valid process, they are burned at the “birah” and do not make the person’s clothing tamei.
- With regard to these korbanos when they are properly burned, they would carry them out on poles. When the people carrying in front have left the wall of the Azarah, but those in the back have not yet left, the clothing of the ones in the front become tamei, but not of those in the back until they leave the wall as well. Once they leave, the clothing of all the people are tamei. **R' Shimon** says the clothing only becomes tamei once the fire has caught onto most of the animal (and only for those people who are involved at that point in time). Once the meat has decomposed, the one who burns it then will not have his clothing become tamei.

GEMARA

- **Q:** What is the “birah”? **A: Rabbah bar bar Chana in the name of R' Yochanan** said, there was a place on the Har Habayis called the “Birah”. **Reish Lakish** said, the Beis Hamikdash is referred to as “Birah”.
- **R' Nachman in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha** said, there were three places of ashes that were used: 1) there was a large place of ashes in the Azarah where they burned kodshei kodashim that became passul, the eimurim of kodshei kalim that became passul, and the “parim hanisrafim” and the “se’irim hanisrafim” that became passul before their zrika; 2) another place of ashes on the Har Habayis where they burned “parim hanisrafim” and the “se’irim hanisrafim” that became passul after their zrika; and 3) a place of ashes where they burned “parim hanisrafim” and the “se’irim hanisrafim” that were offered properly.
 - **Levi** taught a Braisa that said, there were three places of ashes that were used: 1) there was a large place of ashes in the Azarah where they burned kodshei kodashim that became passul, the eimurim of kodshei kalim that became passul, and the “parim hanisrafim” and the “se’irim hanisrafim” that became passul before or after their zrika; 2) another place of ashes on the Har Habayis where they burned “parim hanisrafim” and the “se’irim hanisrafim” that became passul after they left the Azarah; and 3) a place of ashes located outside of all 3 machanos (outside Yerushalayim) where they burned “parim hanisrafim” and the “se’irim hanisrafim” that were offered properly.
- **Q: R' Elazar** asked, is there a psul of linah for the “parim hanisrafim” and the “se’irim hanisrafim”? Do we say that linah is only a psul for korbanos that can be eaten, or do we say that it is a psul for these as well? **A: Rava** said, **Abaye** had this question and answered it from a Braisa that says that **R' Shimon and the Rabanan** agree that piggul intent will not effect these korbanos. Presumably, the same would be true for linah.
 - The Gemara says this is not a valid proof, because it may be that although piggul doesn’t make them passul, linah would.
 - **Q:** Maybe we can answer from a Mishna. The Mishna says that after shechita of the “parim hanisrafim” they become susceptible to becoming passul with “linah”. Presumably, this refers to the meat being left overnight, and we can learn from this that they are subject to the psul of linah! **A:** It may be that the Mishna is referring to where the pieces that are offered on the Mizbe’ach (the eimurim) were left overnight, not the meat.
 - **Q:** The end of the Mishna clearly is discussing the meat, which would suggest that the earlier part is as well!? **A:** That is not necessarily true. It may very well

be that the first part discusses the pieces to be offered on the Mizbe'ach and the later part discusses the meat.

- **Q:** The Braisa taught by **Levi** referred to a psul after these korbanos left the Azarah. Presumably it is referring to the psul of linah! **A:** It can be referring to the psul of tumah or the psul of leaving the Azarah.
- **Q: R' Elazar** asked, is there a psul of yotzei (leaving the Azarah) for the "parim hanisrafim" and the "se'irim hanisrafim"? **R' Yirmiya bar Abba** explained, the question is according to the view that kodshei kodashim that leave the Azarah before the zrika become passul. Maybe it is only there, since there is never an *obligation* to take them out of the Azarah. However, with regard to the korbanos that are burned, since they will be *obligated* to be removed from the Azarah, maybe they don't become passul if they are taken out early before the zrika. Or, maybe they would also become passul. **A:** The Braisa taught by **Levi** referred to a psul after these korbanos left the Azarah. Presumably it is referring to the psul of leaving the Azarah before the zrika.
 - This is not a valid proof. It can be referring to the psul of tumah or the psul of linah.
- **Q: R' Elazar** asked, what is the halacha if most of the animal of the "parim hanisrafim" and the "se'irim hanisrafim" has left the Azarah, but there is only a majority of the animal when we take into account the part of a limb that has left the Azarah, but with regard to that limb in particular, most of the limb is still inside the Azarah? Do we say that since most of that limb is inside we view the entire limb as being inside and therefore there is less than a majority of the animal that is outside, or do we say that since there is a majority of the animal as a whole that is outside, it is considered to be outside?
 - **Q:** It is certainly not a question, and we would certainly follow the majority of the animal, not the majority of the limb! Rather, the question is where exactly half of the animal is outside, but in the half that is outside there is a majority of one of the limbs. Do we say that we view that entire limb as being outside and therefore a majority of the animal is outside, or not? **TEIKU.**
 - **Rabbah bar R' Huna** said the question is where there were 5 people carrying the animal out, and 3 have left the Azarah and two remain inside. Do we follow the majority of the people carrying it, and therefore the animal is considered to have left, or do we follow the majority of the animal itself? **TEIKU.**