

29.8.2

78a → 79b (משנה ב) → (דאית להו תקנתא ברעייה)

1. ומסל המצות אשר לפני ה' לקח חלת מצה אחת וחלת לחם שמן אחת ורקיק אחד וישם על החלבים ועל שוק הלחם: ויקרא ח, כו
 2. זה קרבן אהרן ובניו אשר יקריבו לה' ביום המשח אתו עשירת האפה סלת מנחה תמיד מחציתה בבקר ומחציתה בערב: ויקרא ז, יג
 3. על חלת לחם חמץ יקריב קרבנו על זבח תודת שלמינו: ויקרא ז, יג
 4. וסל מצות סלת חלת בלולת בשמן ורקיקי מצות משחים בשמן ומנחתם ונספיהם: במדבר ו, טו
 5. אלה מועדי ה' אשר תקראו אתם מקראי קדש להקריב אשה לה' עלה ומנחה זבח ונסכים דבר יום ביומו: ויקרא כג, לו

- I לחמי נזיר and מילואים amounts of loaves and flour for bread brought during משנה ב
- a brought like מצה of תודה (10 עשרונות, divided among 30 loaves) **מילואים**
- i Source: v. 1 – חלה::חלה – רבוכה::לחם שמן and ריקיק::רקיק, חלה::חלה – 1
- Challenge: perhaps לחם שמן is a loaf-shaped ball of oil
 - Rather: source – v. 2; כ"ג חביתי compared to מילואים (day of anointment of אהרן and his sons); both have רבוכה
 - Tangent (ר' חסדא): a כ"ג coming to do his first עבודה as כ"ג brings 2 – מנחת חינוך and חביתי כ"ג – 1, כהן as כ"ג and חביתים
 - Addition (מר בר ר' אשי): if he never did any עבודה – brings 3; מנחת חינוך as כהן, 1 as כ"ג and חביתים
- b 2 of the מצה-types (no רבוכה) same ratio (→ 6.6 עשרונות divided among 20 loaves) **מזירות**
- i Source: v. 3 alludes to מזירות, but not to רבוכה which is never called מצות (viz. v. 4)
- Alternatively (תדברי): v. 4 constitutes כלל (מצות) and פרט (חלה ורקיק) – only can include פרט → רבוכה no
- II relationship between שחיטת התודה and the loaves משנה ג
- a If: when he slaughters, the loaves are “outside of the wall”, they aren’t sanctified
- i Meaning of “outside the wall”:
- ד' יוחנן: outside פאגי בית (i.e. outside of the city wall - where it may not be eaten)
 - ד"ל: outside the wall of the עזרה – where the קרבן is being processed
 - Challenge: this replicates another dispute:
 - If: someone slaughters קרבן פסח (ע"פ תמיד של בה"ע – ר' יהודה) while owning חמץ – violates ל"ת
 - ד"ל: only if he has חמץ in the עזרה
 - ד"י: if he owns חמץ anywhere
 - Justification: if we only heard their dispute re: חמץ, we wouldn't know that ר' יוחנן holds this position re: ל"ת... (ר"ל that ס"א, חמץ applies everywhere (and if we only heard our dispute, חמץ איסור, לחמי תודה)
- b If: when he slaughters, even one of the loaves isn't yet browned in the oven – none are קדוש
- i source: ברייתא (on v. 3)
- ד' יוחנן: teaches that the bread must be browned when תודה is slaughtered for לחם to be קדוש
 - ד"ל: teaches that it becomes קדוש at שחיטת התודה
 - ד"ל: teaches that if it is not slaughtered, the loaves aren't sanctified
- ii Related re ברייתא מצה בפסח: one may use “raw” מצה or מצה baked in a kettle
- Meaning of נא (“raw”): as long as it doesn't get stringy when pulled apart
 - ד"ל: same applies to לחמי תודה
 - Challenge: this is obvious, as both are defined as לחם
 - Defense: we might have thought that לחמי תודה require more baking, as the תרומה may not be פרוס
 - And: we might consider an easily tearable piece to be already sliced – קמ"ל
- iii Related dispute among אמוראים: if he slaughtered the תודה for 80 loaves
- חזקיה: 40 of them are sanctified
 - ד' יוחנן: none are sanctified
 - Analysis (ר' זירא): all agree that if he stated “40/80 are sanctified” it is valid
 - And: all agree that if he said “40 are only holy if 80 are sanctified” – none are sanctified
 - Disagreement: if he said nothing
 - חזקיה: believes that he intends the other 40 as “backup” (אחריות)
 - ד' יוחנן: believes that he intends all 80 as a surplus קרבן (→invalid)
 - Analysis (אביי): they agree that he intends a surplus קרבן
 - חזקיה: כלי שרת can sanctify in spite (and against) his intent (→they only sanctify 40)
 - ד' יוחנן: כלי שרת can only sanctify in accord with his stated intent (attempt to sanctify all; but fails)
 - Analysis (ר"פ version1): all agree that כלי שרת can shape his intent
 - חזקיה: the שחיטה knife, tho it has no commodium, is כלי שרת and can shape his intent to 40/80
 - ד' יוחנן: since knife has no תוך, it doesn't have the power of כלי שרת to “fix” his errant intent

- (d) *Analysis* (ר"פ version2): all agree that כלי שרת can only sanctify per his intent
- (i) *חזקיה*: the slaughtering knife ('tho it has no commodium) is more "powerful" than a regular שרת and can shape his intent properly – 40/80
- (ii) כלי שרת is no stronger than regular שרת *ד' יוחנן*
- III ג2 *משנה*: invalidating features of the תורה and their respective effects on the לחם
- a *If*: he slaughtered the תורה with intent of חוץ לזמנו or חוץ למקומו – loaves are sanctified
- b *If*: he slaughtered and then found the animal to be a טריפה – loaves are not sanctified
- c *If*: he slaughtered and found the animal to be a בעל מום
- i *ד' א*: loaves are sanctified
- ii *חכמים*: loaves are not sanctified
- d *If*: he slaughtered the תורה שלא לשמה – loaves aren't sanctified
- i *Parallel*: same applies to איל המילואים (loaves brought with ram during 7-days of preparation for משכן-inauguration) and שתי הלחם, if the lambs offered with it were slaughtered לשמן
- 1 *Note* (ר"פ): the תנא chose איל המילואים – a one-time offering – and omitted איל נזיר
- (a) *Explanation*: this was the first time loaves were sanctified
- IV *Analysis*: authorship of our משנה follows ר"מ (*contra* יהודה ר"י) in *ברייתא*:
- a *ר"מ* rule is – if the invalidity happened before שחיטה (e.g a טריפה), the loaves aren't sanctified
- i *But if*: it happened in the מקדש (e.g. מחשבת פסול), loaves sanctified
- ii *Therefore*: if he slaughtered with intent for חוץ לזמנו or חוץ למקומו – קדש הלחם; if it proved to be a טריפה – לא קדש
- iii *If*: he slaughtered it and it proved to be a בעל מום:
- 1 *ד' א*: loaves sanctified
- 2 *ד' יהושע*: not sanctified
- (a) *Note*: ר"מ distinguishes between טריפה and בעל מום – ר"ע and "fine" מום → אם עלו לא ירדו (ר' יהושע) אם עלו לא ירדו – answer – that's sufficient to allow it to remain atop מזבח, not to sanctify loaves)
- b *יהודה* ר"י and ר"א *ד' יהושע* didn't disagree about:
- i *If it proved to be a טריפה*: not sanctified (in harmony with ר"מ)
- ii *If he slaughtered with intent to eat חוץ לזמנו*: sanctified (in harmony with ר"מ)
- iii *If he slaughtered and it proved to be a בעל מום*: not sanctified (*contra* ר"מ)
- iv *Disagreement*: in case he slaughtered with intent of חוץ למקומו
- 1 *ד' א*: sanctified – just like חוץ לזמנו
- 2 *ד' י*: not sanctified – just like בעל מום
- (a) *ד' א*: more similar to חוץ לזמנו – both are intents and not physical obstacles
- (b) *ד' י*: more similar to בעל מום – כרת; furthermore – infer from שלא לשמו – (ר"א שתק) פסול מחשבה – שלא לשמו
- v *Tangential discussion*: if a חטאת was slaughtered חוץ לזמנו – חוץ לא תרד – אם עלה לא תרד; but חוץ למקומו
- 1 *ד' א*: goes down; *ד' ב*: doesn't go down (ר"א conceded to ר"א, as ר"א conceded to ר"י)
- 2 *Alternate version*: they held positions; in ר"י's case, he argued from שלא לשמו, which won't help re: חטאת
- V ד2 *משנה*: if נסכים were sanctified in the כלי and the זבח was invalidated
- a *If*: there is another זבח – use them for it; if not – let it lapse and become פסול
- b *זעירי* only become sanctified at שחיטת הזבח (per v. 5)
- i *Challenge*: our משנה (implies that it was already sanctified at שחיטה)
- ii *Answer*: it was invalidated at זריקה (already קדוש at שחיטה)
- 1 *Note*: this seems to follow ר"י, who maintains that if there are several מתירין, each is sufficient (for קידוש)
- 2 *Defense*: could follow ר"א (his disputant) – following ר"ש – כל העומד לזרוק כזרוק דמי – if דם was spilt from כלי
- c *Analysis of ruling*: if there is another קרבן, bring נסכים with it
- i *Challenge* (ר"ח): if oil was set aside for a מנחה, may not be used with another
- ii *Answer* (ר' ינאי): בית דין has enforced intent (לב ב"ד מתנה עליהן) – if נסכים unneeded, may be used for another
- 1 *Challenge*: why not make same תנאי for oil?
- 2 *Defense*: oil is absorbed into מנחה (it is part and parcel), unlike נסכים
- (a) *Challenge*: why not make condition that they become חולין?
- (b) *Answer*: people will think that you may take נסכים and move them to חולין at will
- (i) *Challenge*: per our ruling, people may think that you may move נסכים from one קרבן to another at will
- (ii) *Defense*: our משנה is only referring to a case where the other offering was already נשחט
1. *Challenge*: our משנה should stipulate to that (*answer*: that's how it should be read per יהודה בן יהודה)
- iii *Challenge*: ר"א (included per [b ii 2]) doesn't accept לב ב"ד per father's disagreement with חכמים re: surplus תמידין
- 1 *Answer*: in that case, there is a solution – they can graze and get blemished and be redeemed