29.2.2

(כלחמי תודה) → 15b (משנה ב2)

אם על תודה יקריבנו והקריב על זבח התודה חלות מצות בלולת בשמן ורקיקי מצות משחים בשמן וסלת מרבכת חלת בלולת בשמן: $\sigma_{r,r}$ $\sigma_{r,r}$

- I משנה ב2: symbiosis of שתי הלחם or 2 משנה ב2
 - 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 איץ dispute is only לפני זריקה whether the ציץ effects רצוי for things that are eaten
 - i But: if one became טהור וויקה, they agree that the טהור loaf is eaten
 - ii Challenge1: dispute (in בזיכי לבונה) is also re: בזיכי (if one became טמא, if the other is burnt)
 - iii Challenge2: די יהודה holds that even if only טמא is שבט (מ"מ) ק"פ ני יהודה is performed בטומאה
 - 1 Reason: אין ק"צ חלוק (no ציץ issue here)
 - iv Challenge3: in our משנה, הווא האכילות should state that אין הציץ מרצה אין הציץ הציץ מרצה, instead of אין קרבן צבור חלוק
 - b שאין קרבן צבור חלוק (i.e. has nothing to do with the function of the ציץ)
- שתי הלחם and כבשים: relationship between תודה and its loaves; between שתי הלחם
 - 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;
 - i But if: he slaughtered the תודה to eat from the loaves the next day only loaves are כשר is still כשר
 - c Proposal: the reason for the one-sided relationship (in re: תודה is called לחם ר' כהנא 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 הזבח, not vice-versa
 - i Justfication: if we only had סד"א, תודה since מד"א aren't "lifted" with קרבן, they don't affect it
 - שתי הלחם But: כבשי עצרת, which must be lifted with שתי הלחם, may have symbiotic relationship קמ"ל
- - a Ansswer: here too, the bread is מפגול, but not the animal
 - b Challenge: shouldn't the bread be יק"ו via יק"ו,
 - i If: a successful פיגול (מחר) מפגל doesn't generate serlf (שחט ע"מ לאכול מלחמה למחר)
 - ii Then: certainly in a case where he was unsuccessful (here –included זבת, but it's still מתפגל) 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"ו 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 מתי הלחם (version2): same back-and-forth, but question was asked about שתי הלחם and מתי הלחם instead
 - a Note: those who read this שקלא וטריא about תודה would certainly apply the ruling to כבשים/שתי הלחם
 - b But: those who read it about בבשים/שתי הלחם wouldn't apply it to תודה in case of שתי הלחם, both needed for תנופה
- VI Alternate version of question: if שחט with intent to eat מחברו the next day –does "חברו" mean other פגול) or bread (כשר)
 - a Answer: from הברו" ב:ה means the other כבש
 - b Block: perhaps in that case he explicated "חברו כבש"
- VII משנה : relationship between נסכים (only according to "ר"מ, who allows for פיגול to affect משנה די"מ, who allows for נסכים
 - a Rule: the מפגל is מפגל the wine (after קידוש בכלי שרת); not vice-versa
 - b Example: if he slaughtered the יסבים with intent to eat from it חוץ לזמנו, both it and the מפגולים are מפגולים
 - i But if: he slaughtered the קרבן with intent to pour the next day, only נסכים are קרבן is still כשר
 - c Background: מתיר allows for מסכים to affect נסכים, since מתיר is מתיר them
 - i Counter (נסכים: may be brought days later
 - ii Response (מ"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 (מ"מ:) ה"מ holds that נשכים are defined at moment of אחיטה, akin to לחמי תודה
 - ... Note: parallel dispute נסכים::לוג שמן ;זבח::אשם מצורע) לוג שמן של מצורע re: נסכים:
 - 1 *And*: parallel give-and-take
 - 2 And: same explanation by יר"מ os position לוג שמן is defined at moment of שחיטת האשם