

24 Tammuz 5778
July 7, 2018



Zevachim Daf 85

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

Rabbi Yochanan’s Logic

Offered before the Sprinkling

Rabbi Yochanan said: If one slaughters a sacrifice at night inside the Courtyard, and then he offered its parts outside of the Courtyard, he is liable for *kares* (even according to Rabbi Yehudah, who maintains that the altar does not sanctify an animal slaughtered at night, and the halachah is that one is not liable for *kares* except on an animal that is fit to be offered inside, or that the altar sanctifies it). This is so, for it cannot be less severe than one who slaughtered a sacrifice outside the Courtyard and offered it there (and since there he is liable for *kares* – even though it is not fit to be offered inside, so too in this case).

Rav Chiya bar Avin asked a question from a *Mishna*. The *Mishna* states: If someone slaughtered (instead of doing *melikah* to) a bird offering inside the Courtyard and then offered it as a sacrifice outside the Courtyard, he is exempt (for offering a sacrifice outside the Courtyard). If he slaughtered it and offered it outside the Courtyard, he would be liable. According to Rabbi Yochanan, why should the first case be better than a case where one slaughtered and offered outside the Courtyard? This refutes Rabbi Yochanan’s logic.

Alternatively, the *Gemora* answers the question on Rabbi Yochanan. The slaughtering of a bird inside the Courtyard is never valid, as opposed to the slaughtering of an animal at night (Rabbi Yochanan’s case) which would be valid if the animal was a non-consecrated one. (84b – 85a)

Ulla says: Sacrificial parts of *kodashim kalim* that were offered before the sprinkling of the blood should not be taken off the altar, as they have become the “bread of the altar.”

Rabbi Zeira says: We learned this in a *Mishna*. The *Mishna* states: If its blood was spilled or its blood went outside the *kalim* (the parts should not be taken off the altar). If in this case where the blood is totally invalid or nonexistent, and the *Mishna* still states the parts should remain on the altar, certainly this will be the law in a case where the blood exists and is valid.

The *Gemora* answers: This is not a proof, as the *Mishna* is discussing *kodshei kodashim* (which have integral holiness even before the blood is sprinkled).

The *Gemora* asks: This same *Mishna* continues to discuss the *pesach* offering, which is *kodshei kalim*!?

The *Gemora* answers: The *pesach* offering is only mentioned in that *Mishna* regarding it not being brought with proper intent (not regarding the law of the sacrificial parts).

The *Mishna* states: All of them that went up to the altar while alive should be brought back down. This implies that anything that had been slaughtered should not be brought back down! “All” indicates whether it is *kodshei kodashim* or *kodashim kalim*! (Ulla’s law is therefore redundant!)



The *Gemora* answers: This is not the indication of the *Mishna*. The *Mishna* indicates that while all live animals should be brought back down, only some slaughtered limbs should be brought back down.

The *Gemora* asks: Doesn't "all" indicate "all?"

The *Gemora* answers: It only refers to all live animals.

The *Gemora* asks: Isn't this obvious? [They are anyway going to go back up on the altar, and it is therefore obvious that this should wait until they are properly slaughtered!]

The *Gemora* answers: It is referring to a live animal with a cataract in its eye (which cannot be offered as a sacrifice), and is according to Rabbi Akiva who says that animals with such blemishes that went on the altar do not go down. The *Mishna* teaches us that this is only regarding slaughtered animals, not live animals (even though the live *kodashim* animal will not be slaughtered as it has a blemish, it should be taken down).

The *Gemora* asks: How do we establish this case? It is regarding invalid *kodashim*. The end of this *Mishna* states: A live *olah* that went on the altar should go back down. If it was slaughtered by the head of the altar, it should be skinned and cut up in its place. If the *Mishna* is discussing invalid *kodashim*, should it be skinned and cut up by the altar? The verse states: *And he will cut it up* indicating he (the *Kohen* in the Courtyard) should only cut up a valid animal, not an invalid animal!

The *Gemora* answers: It must be that the second part of the *Mishna* is referring to a valid animal. What is it teaching us? It is teaching that one can skin and cut up an animal by the head of the altar.

The *Gemora* asks: According to the opinion that one cannot cut up and skin an animal at the head of the altar, what is this teaching us?

The *Gemora* answers: The case must be where it was valid, and then became invalid. This is the opinion of Rabbi Elozar the son of Rabbi Shimon who says that one the blood atones and the meat was permitted (*to the altar*) for even an instant, it should be skinned and its skin goes to the *Kohanim* (like a regular *olah*).

The *Gemora* asks: The *braisa* states: How does one deal with this sacrifice (that was skinned and cut up by the altar)? He brings down the intestines and washes them.

The *Gemora* replies: What should be done? Should they be put on the altar when they still have their excrement? The verse states: *Bring this (a disgusting or low grade animal) to your governor! Will he show you favor or will he turn his countenance towards you?!*

Rather, the *Gemora* asks: If the animal is invalid, the intestines obviously do not go on the altar! (Why should they be washed?)

The *Gemora* answers: They are washed in order that if a *Kohen* who does not realize they are invalid puts it on the altar, it will not be disgusting.

The *Gemora* asks: Do we institute a law in order to cause a *Kohen* to stumble?!

The *Gemora* answers: Even so, this is preferable, so that *kodashim* should not be lying around like carrion.

Rabbi Chiya bar Abba says that Rabbi Yochanan inquired the following: Should the sacrificial parts of *kodashim kalim* that were offered before the sprinkling of the blood be taken off the altar?

Rabbi Ami asked: Why don't you ask whether or not it is subject to *me'ilah* now that they were put on the altar?



Rabbi Yochanan said: I don't have a question regarding *me'ilah*, as this change is only effected by the sprinkling of the blood. My question is regarding taking it off the altar. He answered: They should not be taken off, and there is no *me'ilah*.

Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak taught that this conversation was held in the following manner: Rabbi Chiya bar Abba says that Rabbi Yochanan inquired the following: Should the sacrificial parts of *kodashim kalim* that were offered before the sprinkling of the blood be subject to *me'ilah*?

Rabbi Ami asked: Why don't you ask whether or not they should remain on the altar?

Rabbi Yochanan said: I don't have a question regarding taking them off the altar, as they have already become the "bread of the altar." My question is only about *me'ilah*. He answered: They should not be taken off, and there is no *me'ilah*.

The *Mishna* says that the following did not become invalid in the Holy (*but rather before they arrived at the Holy*).

Rabbi Yochanan says: Rabbi Akiva only permitted the cataract in the eye (*that if it was put on the altar it should not be taken down*) being that such a blemish is not even considered a blemish for bird sacrifices. This is also only if the animal became *kodashim* before it received the blemish. However, Rabbi Akiva admits that a female animal dedicated to be an *olah* is considered like it had a blemish before it was dedicated (*being that a female animal cannot become an olah*). (85a – 85b)

Sodomized Bird

Rabbi Yirmiyah asked: Is there a law that a bird which has been sodomized by a person cannot be offered as a sacrifice? Do we say that being that the verse *from the animal* excludes an animal that sodomized a person and an animal that had

been sodomized by a person, that a bird which cannot sodomize a person is also not ruled invalid if it had been sodomized by a person (*being that both categories do not apply*)? Or do we just look at the fact that a sin was committed with it and therefore rule that it is invalid?

Rabbah says: We can prove this from Rabbi Akiva's statement in the *Mishna* that animals with a blemish are permitted (*to stay on the altar once placed there*). If a bird would not be invalid if it had been sodomized by a person, Rabbi Akiva should also say that he permits animals that had been sodomized! [*Being that Rabbi Akiva's logic to permit animals with a blemish is because birds with a blemish are valid, he should similarly permit animals that had been sodomized to stay on the altar being that birds that had been sodomized are valid!*] The fact that he did not say this proves that birds that had been sodomized by a person are invalid.

Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak says: We already learned this in a *braisa*. The *braisa* says: A bird that had been sodomized by a person, or that it was set aside for idolatry or worshipped as an idol, or it was used as a harlot's payment, or if it was exchanged for a dog, or if it had no signs of gender or both signs of gender, its carcass render one's clothes impure if he swallowed it (*as is the law of any kosher bird which becomes neveilah*). (85b)

Explaining the Mishna

The *Mishna* states that Rabbi Chanina the administrator of the *Kohanim* relates that his father used to push the sacrificial parts of animals that had blemishes off of the altar.

The *Gemora* asks: What is this teaching us? [*The Tanna Kamma already ruled that this is the law!*]

The *Gemora* answers: It is possible he is teaching us that this was the practice of the *Kohanim* during the time of the Temple. Alternatively, it is possible that he is teaching that the limbs should be "pushed," meaning they should be

removed in an abnormal and indirect fashion (*as opposed to denigrating them by directly "kicking them off" of the altar*).

The *Mishna* states: Just as we rule regarding sacrificial parts that if they were placed on the altar they should not be removed, so too if they were removed they are not placed back on the altar.

Ulla says: This is only if they did not start to get consumed by the fire on the altar. However, if they already started to be consumed, they should be put back on the altar.

Rav Mari understands Ulla's statement was regarding the first part of the *Mishna*, while Rav Chanina from Sura understands it was referring to the second part of the *Mishna*. The second part of the *Mishna* states: Bones, sinews, horns, and hooves that are connected to the limbs should be placed on the altar, but if they were separated from the limbs they should not be placed on the altar (*and if they were, they should be taken off*). Ulla says: This is only if they did not start to get consumed by the fire on the altar. However, if they already started to be consumed, they should be put back on the altar.

The one who understands this is referring to the second part of the *Mishna* understands that it certainly applies to the first part of the *Mishna*. The one who understands it applies to the first *Mishna* understands that it does not apply to the second part of the *Mishna*, as bones and sinews are not meant to be burned on the altar (*as opposed to limbs of animals that are invalid, which were meant to be burned there before they became invalid*). (85b)

Mishna

The following are things that should be removed from the altar, despite the fact that they were already placed there. Meat of *kodshei kodashim* or *kodashim kalim* (*that is meant to be eaten by people*), the leftovers of the *omer* sacrifice (*offered on Pesach*), the *shtei halechem* (*two breads offered*

on Shavuot), the *lechem hapanim* (*showbreads*), the leftovers of flour offerings, the *ketores* (*incense*), the wool on the heads of the sheep, beards of the goats, bones, sinews, horns, and hooves. When they are connected to the limbs they should be placed on the altar. This is as the verse states: *And the Kohen will offer all (of the animal, with all meaning even these parts if they are connected)*. However, if they were separated from the limbs, they should not be placed on the altar (*and if they were, they should be taken off*). This is as the verse states: *And you will make your olos, the meat and the blood.* (85b)

DAILY MASHAL

Respect of Kodashim

The *Gemora* indicates that we rinse the excrement off the disqualified *korban* to preserve the sanctity of the *korban*, even though by doing so we can mislead a *Kohen* to bring it back up to the altar. From here we see that the obligation to treat *kodashim* respectfully is an active *mitzvah* - meaning, that it is not merely a prohibition to treat *kodashim* disrespectfully, but there is an active *mitzvah* to make sure that it is being treated respectfully.