(כי קאמרינן דרבנן) → 102b (מיתיבי) + 29.12.2; 101b

Note: this session picks up in the middle of the discussion of "ר"ש approach to מנחה מפוגלת and whether שומאת אוכלין would obtain, or, as ר'ש alaims, that it is invulnerable to טו"א, to that end, this seminal ד' אושעיא is cited again.

... כן היה ר' שמעון אומר יש נותר שהוא מטמא טומאת אוכלין ויש נותר שאין מטמא טומאת אוכלין כיצד לפני זריקת דמים אין מטמא טומאת אוכלין לאחר זריקת דמים מטמא טומאת אוכלין מוספתא מסכת עוקצין (צוקרמאנדל) פרק ג מטמאין טומאת אוכלין פגול בין לפני זריקת דמין ובין לאחר זריקת אין מטמא טומאת אוכלין הפגול במנחה מטמא טומאת אוכלין מוספתא מסכת עוקצין (צוקרמאנדל) פרק ג

- I Challenge to טו"א end of מוחה מפוגלת: end of מותר s opinion re נותר and נותר, explicitly states that טו"א has מו"א
 - a Resolution/defense: that is a case where it had שעת הכושר would be applied to case with no שעת הכושר
 - i *Circumstance*: where he was מקדיש while grain was still in ground (had no point where מ"ע could have applied when it would be edible) *note*: at that point, it would have only had קדוה"ג not קדושת, not קדושת דמים
 - 1 Challenge: he could have redeemed it and generated שעת הכושר
 - 2 Answer: if we accept version of ר"א (p. 86) contra שמואל, that we may not redeem סהורים if סהורים fine
 - (a) But: if we accept other version he could have redeemed it
 - (b) And: should we answer that since in fact he didn't redeem it, that is irrelevant but
 - (i) "7". holds that anything which could be redeemed is considered released, per:
 - (ii) ר"ש :*ברייתא* has טו"א rules that טו"א
 - 1. Explanation (ב"ש '' maintains that פרה may be redeemed right at שחיטה
 - 2. Block: in that case, it is proper to redeem it if a better מנחות is found, unlike מנחות
 - (c) challenge: חוטפתא (above), מ"א excludes לן לפני זריקה from ל, even though they should have performed זריקה before evening → to "ע"א, "should have" does not equate to "did"
 - (i) defense: circumstance of תוספתא was where it was slaughtered too late for זריקה
 - (ii) challenge: then the תוספתא should add that if there was time for טו"א, זרה"ד obtains
 1. answer: indeed, that's what it means if it was jb before זריקה was possible, then טו"א applies
 - (iii) challenge: סנ"ל whether קדק"ל where it is a מצוה to perform טו"א yet no טו"א yet no מצוה
 - 1. answer: case is where שעת הכושר (no שעת הכושר and זרה"ד wouldn't have prevented פיגול
 - 2. challenge: then the תוספתא should have made that distinction explicit
 - a. *answer*: had to use פיגול as שחיטה-point, to contrast with מנחה where מנחה where מרטה::) קמיצה where מנחה, is להקדש oint, is מטמא טו"א, since it had a permitted moment (before הקדש)
 - ii שחיטה no need to theorize that the שחיטה was done late etc. could even have had time
 - reason: while ר"ש applies "could have redeemed"::redemption, doesn't apply "could have done זריקה::"זרה"ד
 - (a) challenge: שעת היתר לכהנים is already unbound from שעת is already unbound from מעילה; if it never had שעת היתר לכהנים, still bound by מעילה
 - (i) examples of יצאה or נטמאה or נטמאה or יצאה or יצאה
 - (ii) examples of ... לא היתה לה... was received/דור מווי was received דור סי חוץ לזמנה או מקומה של נודק
 - 1. note: mention of לנה etc. proves that "should have" = "performed"
 - 2. block: case is where it was "fit" for לינה, טומאה etc. (i.e. had been properly processed)
 - a. challenge: wording should have been שעת היתר, not שעת היתר, not
 - (b) answer (מעילה cannot use rule of מעילה to challenge טומאה to challenge טומאה
 - (i) קדושה is gone (fit for קדושה) can't restore it
 - (ii) יטומאה defined as "edible" (for א") if he could have performed זריקה → becomes "food"
 - (c) Challenge: if someone brings an אשם תלוי and then finds out that he didn't sin
 - (i) If: he finds out before שחיטה:
 - 1. ה"מ: the animal is חולין
 - 2. חכמים it grazes (until it gets a מום, is redeemed and money used for נדבת עולה
 - 3. אשם תלוי offer it as אם תלוי to cover "sins") אם may be brought as נדבה to cover "sins")
 - (ii) If: he finds out after שחיטה, the דם is spilled out and the meat burned (outside on דשן)
 - (iii) If: he finds out after זרה"ד, meat is eaten (considered as valid)
 - 1. יוסי: even if the דם was in the chalice, considered as if נזרק (→ meat eaten)
 - a. ר"י אas utilizing ר"ש was utilizing ר"י אבא was utilizing כל העומד ליזרק כזרוק דמי
 - (iv) Defense: that's not the reason; in א"י, explain that ר"י holds כלי שרת מקדשין את הפסולין ליקרב
 - iii ב' אשי לר"כ. since ר"ש ruled העומד ליזרק... he should hold כל העומד לישרף כשרוף דמי;
 - If so: why are פרה אדומה or נותר vulnerable to א"יש they should be considered "burnt up"
 - 2 Answer: מקדש (their value for use for מקדש) makes them considered "food"
 - (a) *Question (רבינא לר"א*): does that also set them within the system of א"א etc.)?
 - (doesn't he was asking מחה"ת (doesn't he was asking מחה"ת (doesn't he was asking מה"ת)