29.2.2

14b (משנה ב2) → 15b (משנה ב2)

ז. אָם על תּוֹדָה יָקָרִיבָנוּ **וָהָקָרִיב על זֶבֶר הָתּוֹדָה** חֵלוֹת מַצוֹת בְּלוּלֹת בַּשְּׁמֵן וִרְקִיקִי מָצוֹת מָשׁחִים בַּשְּׁמֵן וִסְלָת מַרְבָּכָת חַלֹּת בְּשְׁמֵן:ייקר*א זְ,יב*

- סדרי לחם הפנים 2 or 2 שתי הלחם symbiosis of שתי הלחם
 - a יהודה: if one becomes טמא, both are burned because אין קרבן צבור חלוק
 - b ממא one is burned ממא one is burned
- II Analysis of the dispute
 - a איי, dispute is only לפני זריקה whether the ציץ effects רצוי for things that are eaten
 - i But: if one became אמא after זריקה, they agree that the טהור loaf is eaten
 - ii Challenge1: dispute (in ברייתא) is also re: ממא (if one became ממא, if the other is burnt)
 - iii *Challenge2*: די יהודה holds that even if only 1 שבט is שבט (ט"מ) הודה is performed בטומאה בטומאה
 - 1 Reason: ציץ אין ק"צ חלוק (no ציץ issue here)
 - iv Challenge3: in our אין הציץ מרצה על האכילות should state that אין הציץ מרצה על האכילות, instead of אין קרבן צבור חלוק
 - b איז (i.e. has nothing to do with the function of the צביר חלוק: we have the explicit reason צ' יחתן (i.e. has nothing to do with the function of the ציץ)
- שתי הלחם and כבשים: relationship between תודה and its loaves; between משנה ג'
 - a Rule: the מפגל is מפגל the loaves, not vice-versa
 - b Example: if he slaughtered the חודה to eat from it the next day, both חודה and loaves are מפוגלים;
 - נשר is still חודה But if: he slaughtered the תודה to eat from the loaves the next day only loaves are קרבן, מפוגלים
 - c Proposal: the reason for the one-sided relationship (in re: תודה is called "תודה" (v. 1) not vice-versa
 - i Block: שתי הלחם aren't called "כבשים"
 - d Rather: the loaves (in each case) are sanctified by שחיטת, not vice-versa
 - i Justfication: if we only had סד"א ,תודה since לחמי תודה aren't "lifted" with קרבן, they don't affect it
 - 1 But: שמ"ל, which must be lifted with שתי הלחם, may have symbiotic relationship קמ"ל
- IV אייא's question of ניתודה שחט intending to eat מפגל the bread (certainly not מפגל the bread (certainly not מפגל the מפגל the bread).
 - a Ansswer: here too, the bread is מפגול, but not the animal
 - b Challenge: shouldn't the bread be ק"ו via יק"ו,
 - i If: a successful פיגול (animal still שחט ע"מ לאכול מלחמה למחר) doesn't generate serlf פיגול (animal still כשר
 - ii Then: certainly in a case where he was unsuccessful (here –included זבת, but it's still כשר (כשר) bread is not מתפגל
 - 1 Challenge (דב): we don't use ק"ו that way
 - 2 Support: case where someone planted grains in other's "young (סמדר)" vineyard
 - (a) Ruling: only the grains are אסור; not the vineyard but ק"י the grains should be מותר
 - 3 Block: in that case, it's all דרבנן (only grains that are "rooted"), they "fine" perpetrator
- V איי's question of כבשים and מתי הלחם (version2): same back-and-forth, but question was asked about שתי הלחם and בנשים instead
 - a Note: those who read this שקלא וטריא about תודה would certainly apply the ruling to כבשים/שתי
 - b But: those who read it about בנשים/שתי wouldn't apply it to in case of שתי הלחם, both needed for תונפה, both needed for
- VI Alternate version of question: if שחט with intent to eat מחברו the next day –does "חברו" mean other (כשר) or bread (פגול)
 - a Answer: from הברו" ב:ה means the other כבש
 - b Block: perhaps in that case he explicated "חברו כבש"
- VII משנה ד' relationship between נסכים (only according to ה"מ, who allows for נסכים to affect נסכים)
 - a Rule: the מפגל is מפגל the wine (after קידוש בכלי שרת); not vice-versa
 - b Example: if he slaughtered the מפגולים with intent to eat from it חוץ לזמנו, both it and the מפגולים are מפגולים
 - But if: he slaughtered the קרבן with intent to pour the נסכים the next day, only נסכים are נסכים is still כשר
 - c Background: מתיר is מתיר to affect נסכים, since מתיר is מתיר them
 - i Counter (נסכים may be brought days later
 - ii Response (פ"מ): only applies possibility of נסכים that come with זבח that come with זבח
 - 1 Counter: they could be applied to another קרבן
 - d Explanation (כבא): מרים holds that נסכים are defined at moment of שחיטה, akin to לחמי
 - i Note: parallel dispute ר"מ/חכמים re: לוג שמן לוג שמן לוג שמן מצורע) לוג שמן (נסכים::לוג שמן
 - 1 And: parallel give-and-take
 - 2 And: same explanation by שחיטת האשם is defined at moment of לוג שמן is defined at moment of שחיטת