

28.8.2; 73a (ולמשך ונקרב חד מיניהו) → 74b (לא אמרין איסורא ברובא איתיה) →

I Suggested solution to תערוכות in our משנה –

- a *solution1*: pull one out and, employing רוב, claim that it is מרובא פריש (valid קרבן)
  - i *block*: by pulling it out, we make it קבוע → like 50/50 (כל הקבוע כמחצה על מחצה דמי)
- b *solution2*: direct the animals to scatter, in which case it is not definitionally קבוע
  - i *answer* (רבא): it is a precaution against a case of many כהנים coming at one time, each taking one of the animals
    - 1 *explanation*: in that case, we can't employ דפריש כל and define by רוב, as one of them certainly has איסור
    - 2 *challenge* (one of the students to רבא): if so, why is the pot (in which the אימורין are kept before הקטרה) אסור?
      - (a) *Explanation*: after they were בטל by פריש, do they now become אסור again when mixed?
    - 3 *Answer*: the concern is that many כהנים may come at the same time and take אימורין – certainly some are אסור
      - (a) *Challenge*: that many כהנים cannot possibly take אימורין at the same time (logistics)
    - 4 *Rather*: the reason for the prohibition is a משום קבוע – to avoid a קבוע circumstance, where it'd be אסור

II Discussion: ריצוי of a קרבן which has been rejected מדרבנן (building off of רבא's assessment that our משנה is קבוע משום קבוע (גזירה משום קבוע))

- a רצוי דבא
  - i *Challenge*: ruling if עולות העוף and חטאות העוף got mixed, all should (לכתחילה) die
    - 1 *But if*: the כהן went ahead and offered them, e.g. "up" – ½ are accepted (½ were עולות)
    - 2 *Explanation*: even though there is an איסור דרבנן to offer them, they are accepted בדיעבד
  - ii *Answer*: our משנה follows approach that נדחין חיים בעלי חיים; that ruling follow approach that they are not (until שחיטה)
    - 1 *Challenge*: even שחוטין, which all agree have דחוי; yet ר"א rules that if a בעל מ"מ got mixed with כשרים and one head was put on the מזבח, all heads may be brought – we assume the first was the מום בעל מום
      - (a) *Answer*: ר"א accepts המצרי חסן's ruling that there is no דחוי at all – even during עבודת הדם ("אפי' דם בכוס...")

III Discussion: assigning lost member of a תערוכות to be the pollutant

- a (ל"ג בשם רב) if a ring of ע"ז got mixed with many similar rings, all אסור; but if one fell out (לים המלח) – אומר
  - i *Reason*: we assume that the one that fell out is the ע"ז-ring
  - ii *Challenge* (רבא): our משנה – if this is the case, why not assume that the first animal to die was the מתה חטאת?
  - iii *Defense* (ר"ג): רב was following ר"א (above) – if a בעל מום got mixed with other קרבנות and (inadvertently), one of the heads was put on מזבח, all others may come up
    - 1 *Challenge*: ר' אלעזר (בן פדת) reported that ר"א's ruling was only valid if they brought the heads up 2 at a time
    - 2 *Answer* (ר"ג): indeed, the permission to take/sell the rings is only if 2 are taken at a time
      - (a) *Reason*: in that way, there is certainly a permissible ring (at least one) in the pair
- b דב if a טבעת של ע"ז got mixed in with 100 rings – אסור
  - i *If*: the group was then split into 60 and 40 – if one fell from the 60, it prohibits new mix, but not from 40
    - 1 *Challenge*: reason for 40 is that we assign איסור to majority (60); but then it should belong to 59, not 1
    - 2 *Rather*: רב's ruling was that the 40, as a group, do not prohibit another group; the 60 do prohibit בתערוכות
- c אפילו ספק ספיקא: this should not apply to ע"ז, as we are very stringent (אפילו ספק ספיקא)
  - i *challenge*: ruling that ספק ספיקא is permitted – even if the איסור is ע"ז
  - ii *defense*: it's a dispute – ר' יהודה/ר"ש – re: כלאים etc. –
    - 1 *ביטול* no ד' יהודה, even if one unit from תערוכות falls into 2<sup>nd</sup> group etc.; ר"ש permits ספיקא ר"ש
    - 2 *Challenge*: שמואל's position is like neither (neither distinguishes between other איסורים and ע"ז)
    - 3 *Answer*: שמואל accepts יהודה's ruling – but only re: ע"ז
  - iii *Revisiting ר"ש's lenient ruling*: he ruled that if it fell into a lot, then 1 fell into 3 – then fell out, מותר
    - 1 *Question*: why does the second תערוכות have to have 3? Should need 2 (ביטול ברוב)
    - 2 *Answer1*: "3" refers to the 2 plus the "fallen" one
    - 3 *Answer2*: he holds like ר"א (בע"ז) who allows "throwing the הנאה away" to permit a תערוכות (need 3+1)
- d ל"ל if 1 barrel of תרומה fell into 100 – and one fell out (לים המלח) – all are permitted; we assume תרומה fell out
  - i *Justification*: if we only had ר"ג's ruling, א"א since ע"ז has no מתירין, we allow – but not תרומה
    - 1 *And if*: we only had ר"ל, א"א it applies to a barrel, where its space is visible; not true about one ring
      - (a) *Explanation*: we would have reason to think that we should not permit as precaution against non-falling
  - ii *דבה* ר"ל only permitted a barrel (visible), but not if a single figs (of תרומה) fell into 100 (then one fell out)
  - iii *דב יוסף* even permitted if it was 1 fig into 100 – just like it prohibits by falling
- e ל"א if 1 barrel of תרומה fell into 100 – he may open 1 and separate 1/100 and drink the rest
  - i *Challenge* (ר"ג): this isn't permissible לכתחילה (challenges ר"ג's report of ר"א's ruling)
  - ii *Rather*: if one of them was opened, he may separate per ratio and drink the rest
- f ל"א אושעיא if 1 barrel fell into 150 and 100 got opened, we don't permit the 50 (i.e. we don't employ נפל ברובא נפל)