## 28.9.2; 84a (משנה בני הקטרה נינהו) → 85b (משנה בני הקטרה בני הקט

- ז. צַוֹ אֶת אַהַרֹן וְאֶת בָּנָיו לֵאמר **זאת** תּוֹרַת הָעֹלָה **הָוֹא הָעֹלָה** עַל מוֹקְדָה עַל הַמִּזְבֵּחַ כָּל הַלִּיְלָה עַד הַבַּקֶר וְאֵשׁ הַמִּזְבֵּחַ תּוּקֵד בּוֹ:י*יקרא וּ, ב* 2. וְהַפְּשִׁיט אֶת הָעלָה וְנִתַּח **אֹתָה** לְנְתָּחָיה:י*יקרא א,ו* 
  - בּ. וְכִי תַּגִּשׁוּן עַוָּר לְזָבֹּחַ אֵין רַע וְכִי תַגִּישׁוּ פַּסֵח וְחֹלֶה אֵין רָע **הַקּריבָהוּ נָא לְפָּחָתָדּ הַיִּרְצְּדְ אוֹ הַיִּשְׂא בְּנֶידְ** אָמַר ה' צְּבָאוֹת: *מלאכי א, ח*
- משנה ב': list of those offerings which do not come down and the exceptions
  - a פסולן בקודש: (consensus) אם עלו לא ירדו:
    - i 15: if it lapsed overnight
    - ii טמא if the meat became טמא
    - iii יוצא. if it went out of its precinct
    - iv מחשבת חוץ למקומו or הוץ למקומו invalidated it
    - v בסולים if פסולים (viz. ב:א did קבלת הדם or זרה"ד or
  - b disputed cases (ר' יהודה go down די stay up)
    - i נשחט after sunset
    - ii נשפק: if the blood spilled out
    - iii יוצא. if the דם went out of the עזרה
      - rule if the פסול was in the קודש, the (מזבח, the מזבח) accepts it
    - iv background of their dispute:
      - 1 את, היא, העולה sees three exclusionary words in v. 1- זאת, היא, העולה excluding these three
      - 2 תורת העולה sees תורת העולה as all-encompassing, including these (plus other בסולים if דם is put in wrong locus [in/out, up/down] מים that were נשחט שלא לשמן)
        - (a) however: he agrees that מעוט excludes the agreed-upon exclusions (above)
        - (b) reason for distinction: פסולן בקודש or before
      - 3 מיגו" infers אם עלו לא ירדו infers אם אם from series of "מיגו" arguments e.g. since לן is acceptable for מיגו it is valid for אירד  $\rightarrow$  for דער ירד עבודת צבור is valid for טמא ירד  $\rightarrow$  to יעצא אימורץ אימורץ לא ירד עבודת צבור אימורץ.
        - (a) challenge: can we infer from a proper case to an improper one?
        - (b) answer: the תנא is really relying on זאת תורת העולה (as a רבוי )
- II משנה: list of those פסולי all agree the פסולי: all agree they go down if put up
  - a the "9": רובע, נרבע, מוקצה, נעבד, אתנן, מחיר, כלאים, טריפה, יוצא דופן
  - b disputed "10th": בעל מום
    - i ד"*ע*: remains up
      - 1 הי יוחנן which are not considered מום for birds דוקין שבעין which are not considered מום
      - 2 and: only where the מום came after the הקדש
        - (a) and: מום" agrees that an עולת נקבה comes down the "מום" (נקבות) came before הקדש in any case
    - ii מכמים goes down (supported by הנונא סגן הכהנים's report from his father)
      - 1 comment: ר' חנינא' r's report may just be support, or may teach that it was put down "discreetly"
- III משנה ד' two extended rules of אם עלו לא ירדו
  - a limitation: though if they go up, they remain up, if they fall off, they aren't re-elevated
  - b *exception*: any of these that goes up alive, is taken down
    - i however: if an מולה (which should be taken down) is נשחט atop the מזבח are performed there
- IV spinoff (ב"י יוחנק): even to י"ז if one slaughters בלילה בפנים, if he then offers it outside ק"י (as "proper" קרבן
  - a argument: shouldn't be less liable than שוחט בחוץ (which, if he is then מעלה בחוץ generates (חיוב
    - i challenge (ד' חייא בר אבין): if someone performs שחיטה on a bird inside and is מטור מעלה בחוץ
    - ii and: should be no worse than חיובתא) שוחט בחוץ
      - 1 possible defense: שחיטת העוף inside isn't proper "slaughter", unlike שחיטת בהמה בלילה
- V spinoff (עולא): קדשים קלים קלים אימורים which were put off before זרה"ד are not brought down
  - a support (ר"ש our משנה if the משנה was spilled or went out אם עלה לא ירד (according to ר"ש)
  - b קרבן, which can no longer have זרה"ד, stays up, certainly here it stays up
    - i block: perhaps that ruling in our מעילה is only re: קדק"ד (which have מעילה immediately)
      - 1 challenge: פסח is also mentioned in our קדשים קלים it is קדשים
      - 2 answer: that passage is only re: שלא לשמן (not שנשפך דמה etc.)
  - c support: ruling in our (ד משנה that any of them that went up alive are brought down → if משנה, left up (קדק"ל or קדק"ל)
    - i block: perhaps in ference is just that some שחוטין remain up, others (e.g. זרה"ד.) come down
    - ii *challenge*: text stays פולם, implying that all שחוטין remain up

- 1 defense: כולם refers only to חיין (that they all come down)
- 2 *challenge*: that is obvious
  - (a) defense: it is in reference to a "light מום" according to ד"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 יחיין r-clause as referring to משנה ד' is difficult in light of the end of משנה ד'
    - (i) explanation: v. 2 rejects עולה פסולה from נתוח
  - (c) answer: that case is indeed referring to a מזבח may be performed atop מזבח may be performed atop מזבח
    - (i) challenge: according to משנה 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 מחיטה בראש המזבח and זירה"ד (זרה"ד) ונפסל
      - 1. according to: ראב"ש once the נזרק and there was even a moment of ברניי it should be flayed and the pelt goes to the כהנים
      - 2. challenge: תוספתא טיט 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 מהנים) we are more concerned with keeping קדשי שמים from lying around in a degraded state
- d versions (of discussion involving ר' יוחנן):
  - i *version:* זרה"ד asked whether אימורי קדשים קלים that were put up before זרה"ד come down
    - 1 (לר' יוחנן). why not ask about מעילה
      - (a) answer: מעילה is obviously not yet in play, as זרה"ד generates חיוב מעילה for קדשים קלים
    - 2 conclusion (אם עלו לא ירדו nonetheless, מעילה does not obtain
  - ii version2(מעילה בר ינחמן בר ינחמן בר יצחק); ווחנן מעילה asked whether מעילה applies to דר יוחנן
    - 1 (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 (מעילה does not obtain אם עלו לא ירדו does not obtain
- VI spinoff from בעלי מום ''s position on בעלי מום he permits (per "light" ה''ע, above) "light" מומים which are not בעלי מום ''h
  - a נרבע is עופות an "invalidating act" for עופות?
    - lemma1: מן הבהמה (which is the source ולא כל בהמה, excluding רובע ונרבע) perhaps only a type which could be (impossible with birds) could be כשר ← נרבע
    - ii lemma2: it was used for illicit purposes → פסול
    - iii answer (רבת): according to יוחנן 'ז's explanation of 'ז', 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 (נבלת עוף טהור ז:כב :כב 'ר' נחמן בר יצחק list of those which are מטמא בגדים אבית מטמא (i.e. מטמא בורים and ונרבע are listed there

VII analysis of 'ם 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: רב מרי saw this comment as being about the משנה (our משנה)
  - ii but: מטורא א a saw this comment as being about the משנה ה') סיפא –page 68) bones, sinews, horsn 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 משלה בהן האור, put back up.
  - iii note: the one who reads his caveat about he סיפא, will certainly apply it to רישא, as those are 'burnables'
    - 1 שנו: רב מרי would not apply it to סיפא, as those parts are not בני הקטרה and don't belong on מזבח (without בשר)