29.4.8

45b (משנה ג) → 46b (משנה ג)

- 1. וְהָקַרְבְתֶּם עַל הַלֶּחֶם שָׁבָעַת כְּבָשִׁים תְּמִימִם בְּנֵי שָׁנָה וּפַּר בֶּן בָּקָר אֶחָד וְאֵילִם שְׁנָיִם יְ**הִיּוּ** עֹלָה לַה׳ וּמְנְחָם עַל הַלֶּחֶם שִׁבְעַת כְּבָשִׁים תְּמִימִם בְּנֵי שָׁנָה וּפַּר בֶּן בָּקָר אֶחָד וְאֵילִם שְׁנָיִם יִ**הְיוּ** עֹלֶה לָה׳ וּמְר*ֹא כֹּג, יח* 
  - 2. **וְשֶׁבֹ תָּכֹּהֶן** בַּיִּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי ... **וּבָא תָכֹּח**ָן וְרָאָה וְהָנָּה פְּשָּׁה הַנְּגַע בַּבְּיִת מָמְאֶרֶת הַוֹא בַּבַּיִת טָמֵא הוּא: *ויקרא יד, לט, מד* 
    - ב. וְהֵנִיף הַכֹּהֵן אֹתָם עַל לֶחֶם הַבִּכּוּרִים תְּנוּפָה לְפָנֵי ה' עַל שְׁנֵי כְּבָשִׁים לְדֶשׁ יְ**הִיוּ** לה' לַכֹּהֵן: ויקרא כג, כ
      - 4. וְאֶת הָאַיִל יַצְשֶה זֶבַח שָׁלָמִים לַה' עַל סַל הַמַּצוֹת וְעָשָה הַכֹּהֵן אֶת מִנְחָתוֹ וְאֶת נְסְכּוֹ: במדבר וֹ, יז
- ו משנה ג': interdependence of קרבנות of שבועות and the שתי הלחם
  - a Independent: the 7 lambs, 2 rams and bull (v. 1) are independent of the לחם and vice-versa
  - b Disputed dependence: the two lambs (v. 3) and the שתי הלחם
    - i y''7. bread needed for lambs, lambs not needed for bread
    - ii שמעון בן ננס. lambs needed for bread; but they may be brought independently
      - 1 Argument: בנ"י brought lambs in desert without bread
    - iii בן ננס follows בן ננס for a different reason:
      - 1 refutation of צבן ננס 's reason: anything mentioned in במדבר כח-כט was brought in desert, not ייקרא כג
      - 2 *nonetheless*: the bread requires the lambs to מתיר them; the lambs need no מתיר
- II ברייתא: analyzing v. 1
  - a על הלחם יחיש indicates that until they became obligated to bring על הלחם these offerings weren't brought
  - b שר"א .ד"ע these are the same lambs as those in פרים; but the numbers of פרים and אילים aren't the same (1/2 vs. 2/1)
    - i Suggerstion: perhaps the lambs (7 in both) are the same
    - ii Rejection: since the bulls and rams are different, the lambs must be a different set
      - Note: we don't consider that the bulls/rams are a choice (1/2 or 2/1) since the sequence changes ויקרא/במדבר
    - iii Therefore: only those in במדבר were brought before entering Land
- III Analysis of disptue ר"ע/בן ננס
  - a ר"ע: infers from יהיו (v. 3) and תהיינה (re: שתי הלחם) both לחם
  - b ב"נ: infers from יהיו and יהיו (v. 1) both כבשים
    - i Clarification: יהיו and יהיו is a preferable inference; 'tho we accept ובא ושב (v. 2); only when nothing is closer
    - ii עולות prefers inferring that which goes to כבשי שלמים) from another (שתי הלחם); v. 1 are עולות
    - iii *Alternatively*: they disagree about what is "holy to the "כהן in v. 3; the lambs or the bread
      - 1 בן נגס: the lambs are partially given to 'ה and part to the בן נגס; unlike the bread;
      - 2 בהן all bread given to ה' and then given to כהן
  - c שחיטה agree that if the lambs and bread were brought together (at שחיטה)- both needed
    - i א"י, they asked if תנופה (raising bread and lambs) "ties" them together
      - 1 Suggestion: infer from שחיטה that it doesn't only שחיטה does, as that is what he mentioned
      - 2 Defense: that is what they are asking whether we can extend "י"'s ruling back to תיקו תנופה
    - ii Challenge: v. 3 is after בן ננס and בן ננס disagree about implementation
      - 1 Answer: it's also after שחיטה; yet the verse must read "that which will eventually go to "כהן" and foreshadows
    - iii Challenge: תוספתא מנחות couldn't generate "binding" with לחם, per תוספתא מנחות ח:כו-נז re the relationship between תודה and its loaves; after שחיטה, the loaves may be invalid without invalidating the
      - l Answer: שלמים is different; it's considered שלמים; just as שלמים don't require loaves, so תודה can be valid as such
    - iv Analysis (אי ירמיה): if we accept the notion that תנופה generates לחם is lost (afterwards), the lambs are "lost" and vice-versa
      - But: if we don't accept that notion, if he did תנופה, lost the לחם and brought a replacement, does the replacement bread require תנופה
        - (a) Note: question only asked about bread, and only according to עיקר that sees the עיקר as עיקר
          - (i) Lemma1: since the bread is the עיקר, requires תנופה OR
          - (ii) Lemma2: since its מתירין are the lambs, no need תיקו
- IV Question (אביי לרבא): why are כבשי שלמים tied to bread, but not עולות in v. 1?
  - a Answer1: since they are raised together (תנופה)
    - Challenge: תודה isn't raised with the 40 loaves, yet they are interdependent
  - b Answer2: like שלמי שלמים, which is a שלמי also the שלמי are tied to loaves
    - i Challenge: in the case of תודה, there are no other קרבנות
  - c Answer3: like שלמים, where there are other offerings, yet מצות are tied to שלמים, per v. 4