28.11.5 96b (משנה ז2) 98b (סיום הפרק)

- I משנה זב: time frame and method of (משנה מריקה ושטיפה ושטיפה)
  - a Time frame:
    - i איז. if he used it during the די". if he used it during the רגל, he may continue throughout the גרים, then process it afterwards
      - 1 Suggested source: v. 1- entire דגל is considered to have one "morning after"
        - (a) Challenge: פיגול ונותר ברגל only applied principle to this הלכה there is !פיגול ונותר ברגל!
      - 2 Source: (since there is constant cooking) each day generates גיעול for the day before
    - i מכמים. he continues using it until after הכמים of whichever קודש he cooked in it
      - 1 Source: vv. 2-3; wait until אכילה (v. 3) is over, then wash (v. 2)
  - b Method:
    - i מריקת הכוס (cleaning inside) cold water
    - ii שטיפת הכוס (cleaning outside) cold water
      - 1 ברייתא these opinions follow שטיפה, maintain that מריקה is with hot water, מריקה with cold
        - (a) Argument: follows method of גיעולי נכרים
          - (i) Counter (רבי): this process is besides גיעול
        - (b) Argument: text could've used מדק (or שטף) twice; use of both indicates that one is hot, other cold
          - (i) Counter (סד"א): if it had stated סד"א twice, סד"א only do inside (or out)→need both in and out (cold)
    - iii Spits and grills: must undergo הגעלה in hot water
- II משנה ח': processing pots that had mixture cooked in them
  - $\mathit{If}$ : he cooked קדשים with חולין or קדשי קדשי with קדשים אוth קדשים
    - If there is נ״ט. they are eaten like the more stringent one (קדשים or קדשים)
      - 1 But: no requirement of מריקה ושטיפה nor do they invalidate through contact
      - 2 Question: if קדש"ם שere cooked with קדשים קלים, they require מו"ש for the קדשים קלים
        - (a) Answer1 (אביי): they do require, just not for the נ"ט (if no נ"ט)
        - (b) *Answer2 (משנה follows ביש* follows מו"ש for קדשים קלים for קדשים קלים
          - (i) Analysis: according to ר"ש, we understand the 2 clauses 2nd teaches according to ר"ש
          - (ii) But: according to אביי, why require both clauses?
            - 1. Justification: if only had  $1^{\mathrm{st}}$  clause, א"ס that only חולין can "trump" (מבטל, not other קדשים, not other
            - 2. And: if we only had  $2^{nd}$  clause, שד"ל that only other קדשים can nullify קמ"ל... חולין, not קדשים
  - ס If: a loaf touched another loaf or a piece (of meat) touched another only the spot of contact (בליעה) is אסור
    - Source: v. 4 יגע → any contact, but בבשרה → must have יגע; בליעה → only point of contact; בבשרה → not sinews etc.
      - Continued: יקדש → if it is פסול, to invalidate (point of contact); if כשר, to require all be eaten as
        - (a) Question: why invalidate? Why doesn't אכילת קדשים אכילת trump ל"ת of eating חטאת פסולה?
          - (i) Answer1 (רבא): rule of עשה דוחה ל"ת doesn't apply in מקדש
            - 1. *Proof*: may not break bone of ססח (v. 5) even if there is meat inside (marrow)
          - (ii) Answer2 (ישה יקדש is an עשה of אכילת קדשים doesn't trump עשה ול"ת doesn't trump אכילת קדשים

- ii Extension: from v. 6; each קרבן listed there informs rest of list about one rule
  - 1 מולה requirement of כלי (doesn't mean מזרק that is written re: שלמים v. 7) knife (for שוחיטה that is written re
    - (a) Source: v. 8 and עקידה was an עולה (v. 9)
  - 2 מנחה only eaten by זכרי כהונה
    - (a) Can't be: in re: חטאת ואשם, which are written explicitly (v. 10)
    - (b) Nor: שלמי צבור, inferred from extra phrase in v. 11
    - (c) Answer: some infer from v. 11, some from v. 6
  - 3 מקדש is מקדש (our rule)
  - 4 ששם just as placenta of אשם is not קדוש; neither is placenta of any קדשים sanctified
    - (a) Note: he must hold that וולדות קדשים are only sanctified at birth
      - (i) And: we can infer from impossible cases (e.g. אשם only male)
  - 5 מילואים. just as any leftovers were burnt but no live animals included
    - (a) So too: all קדשים any living "leftovers" (e.g. אשם שנתכפרו בעליו) aren't burned, but graze etc.
  - קרבנות so too with all פיגול, so too with all שלמים, so too with all קרבנות
- iii Alternate version of אשם (only replacing מנחה, מנחה and אשם)
  - 1 מנחה just as מנחה sanctifies others via קרבנות, so too all קרבנות
    - (a) Justification: if only written in re: סד"א because it is soft, it is חטאת not חטאת
      - (i) And if: only written in re: מנחה because it is "bubbly" with fat it is מנחה, not so with מנחה, not so with מנחה
  - 2 קרבנות just as חטאת must be brought from חולץ, during the day and with his right hand, so too all קרבנות
    - (a) Sources:
      - (i) מעשר v. 12 must be his, not from communal funds, nor from מעשר
      - (ii) ביים is inferred from general phrase in v. 13 (a: it was mentioned inadvertently)
      - (iii) כהונה inferred from כהונה (a: mentioned inadvertently, or in response to אבע who maintains that אצבע alone is enough, but אצבע doesn't imply right hand)
  - 3 אשם just as bones of אשם are permitted, so too with all קרבנות
- c לבא's questions:
  - i Above/below: if דם עולה is atop אבגד חס דם חטאת, obviously requires כיבוס; what about inverse?
    - 1 Lemma1: issue is contact − there is contact → טעון כיבוס
    - 2 Lemma2: issue is absorption no absorption → אינו טעון כיבוס
      - (a) Conclusion: no requirement (issue is בליעה)
  - ii שוחט or fat on the garment of a שוחט or fat on the garment of a חוצץ מוכר רבב
    - 1 Question: what about both on one of these artisan's garments?
      - (a) Lemma1: he only ignores that which is part of his livelhood → חוצץ
      - (b) Lemma2: he doesn't care about dirt on his garment at all → אינו חוצץ
        - (i) Conclusion: תיקו