

- 1 *defense*: כולם refers only to חיים (that they all come down)
 - 2 *challenge*: that is obvious
 - (a) *defense*: it is in reference to a "light מום" according to ר"ע
 - (i) *explanation*: since this one is נפסל מחיים, we might think that if put up alive, remains there – קמ"ל
 - (b) *challenge*: setting the חיים-clause as referring to פסולים is difficult in light of the end of ד' משנה ד'
 - (i) *explanation*: v. 2 rejects עולה פסולה from נתוח
 - (c) *answer*: that case is indeed referring to a כשרה, teaching that הפשט ונתוח may be performed atop מזבח
 - (i) *challenge*: according to מ"ד that it may not be performed there, how can our משנה be explained?
 - (ii) *answer*: case is where it was once fit but then נפסל (after שחיטה בראש המזבח and זרה"ד)
 1. *according to*: ר"אב"ש – once the דם was נזרק and there was even a moment of רצוי – it should be flayed and the pelt goes to the כהנים
 2. *challenge*: תוספתא ט:ט – in such a case, he brings the innards down and washes them
 - a. *explanation*: if it is פסול, what is the purpose behind washing them?
 - i. *question*: why ask – after all, they cannot be offered like that (per v. 3)
 - b. *answer*: our question cuts to the concern that if a כהן sees them and doesn't know their status, he may mistakenly bring them up
 - c. *therefore*: it teaches that in spite of that concern (which may "trip up" the כהנים) we are more concerned with keeping קדשי שמים from lying around in a degraded state
- d *versions (of discussion involving ר' יוחנן)*:
 - i *version*: ר' יוחנן asked whether קדשים קלים that were put up before זרה"ד come down
 - 1 *מעילה* ד' אמי (לר' יוחנן) why not ask about מעילה
 - (a) *answer*: מעילה is obviously not yet in play, as זרה"ד generates חיוב מעילה for קלים
 - 2 *conclusion* (ר' יוחנן) – אע"פ לא ירדו – nonetheless, מעילה does not obtain
 - ii *version2* (ר' יוחנן) asked whether מעילה applies to קלים put up before זרה"ד
 - 1 *מעילה* ד' אמי (לר' יוחנן) why not ask about bringing them down?
 - (a) *answer*: that is obvious – they are the "food of the מזבח" and remain
 - 2 *conclusion* (ר' יוחנן) – אע"פ לא ירדו – nonetheless, מעילה does not obtain
- VI *spinoff from ר"ע's position on בעלי מומין*: he permits (per ר' יוחנן, above) "light מום" בעלי מום which are not מומים for birds
- a *עופות* ד' ירמיה is נרבע an "invalidating act"
 - i *lemma1*: מן הבהמה (which is the source – ולא כל בהמה, excluding רובע ונרבע) – perhaps only a type which could be נרבע (impossible with birds) could be נרבע → כשר
 - ii *lemma2*: it was used for illicit purposes → פסול
 - iii *answer* (רבה): according to ר' יוחנן's explanation of ר"ע, he should then permit רובע ונרבע (to be left up), since that "מום" doesn't apply to birds → it does apply to birds
 - 1 *support* (ר' נחמן בר יצחק) – תוספתא זבחים ז:כב – list of those which are הבליעה אבית הבליעה (i.e. עוף טהור) and רובע ונרבע are listed there
- VII analysis of ד' משנה – if any of these fall off, they are not put back
- a *exception* (עולא): if they were not enflamed by אש המערכה; but if they were, they are restored (belong to מזבח)
 - i *note*: ר' מרי saw this comment as being about the רישא (our משנה)
 - ii *but*: ר' חנינא מסורא saw this comment as being about the סיפא (משנה ה' –page 68) – bones, sinews, horns and talons – if they are connected to the meat, they go up; if they separated from the meat – are not brought up
 - 1 *עולא*: only remain below if never enflamed – but if האור בהן האור, put back up.
 - iii *note*: the one who reads his caveat about ה' סיפא, will certainly apply it to רישא, as those are 'burnables'
 - 1 *but*: ר' מרי would not apply it to סיפא, as those parts are not בני הקטרה and don't belong on מזבח (without בשר)