

## 29.2.1

13a (משנה א) → 14b (דדמי ליה)

1. וְאִם הָאֵלֶּל יֵאָכֵל מִבֶּשֶׂר זָבַח שְׁלָמֵיו בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁלִישִׁי לֹא יִרְצָה הַמִּקְרִיב אֹתוֹ לֹא יִחָשֵׁב לוֹ פְּגוּל יְהִיָּה וְהַנֶּפֶשׁ הַאֲכָלָת מִקְנֵי עֹנָה תִּשָּׂא: וּקְרָא ז, יח

- I פיגול re: role of the dispute as a focal point of **לבונה**
- a *agreed*: if he intended to eat **שיריים** or burn **קומץ** the next day → פיגול – כרת
- i *note*: need to mention that ר"י agrees – so that we don't infer (from סיפא) that he holds מתיר בחצי מתיר אין מפגלין בחצי מתיר
- b *but if*: he intended to burn **לבונה** the next day
- i פסול ד' יוסי
- ii פיגול חכמים
- 1 *Argument*: no different than זבח (i.e. זרה with intent to burn אימורים after the time)
  - 2 *Response*: the blood and אימורים are all from one animal; the לבונה comes from a separate source
- II Analyzing ר"י's opinion
- a בזיכי לבונה 2 מתיר מפגל another מתיר; same applies to 2
- i *Justification*: that in re: לבונה, reason is that it is a different substance than קומץ (untrue in re: בזיכים) – קמ"ל – (בזיכים) –
- ii *Challenge*: ר"י's retort in the משנה – due to לבונה being a different substance
- 1 *Defense*: אינה מן המנחה means the sequence isn't set – can bring לבונה or קומץ first
  - iii agree that המתיר את מפגל את המתיר – unless they were set in one כלי (as in קומץ ולבונה) which "unites" them
- III ר"י's ruling – if a זר collects the לבונה – פסול
- a it is akin to הולכה ד' ידמיה
- i *Proof*: our משנה counts קמיצה (שחיטה); מוליק (הולכה); and הקטרה (זרה"ד); but מתן בכלי isn't similar to קבלת הדם
- 1 *Reason*: קבלת הדם happens of its own (the blood flows in); unlike מתן בכלי
  - 2 *Rather*: since it is necessary for the process, we equate them
- (a) *Similarly*: since ליקוט לבונה is necessary for the process, we count it as הולכה
- ii *Rejection*: מתן בכלי is similar to קבלת הדם – regardless of ממילא vs. בידיים; both are קדוש בכלי, therefore equivalent
- IV dispute re: פיגול of 1 of 2 attached focal points of eating
- a *If*: he slaughtered both כבשי עצרת intending to eat 1 of **שתי הלחם** the next day
- b *Or*: burned both בזיכי לבונה intending to eat 1 of the **סדרים** לחם הפנים the next day
- i ד' יוסי the one he intended to be eaten late is פיגול, the other פסול (→ כרת נח)
- ii חכמים both are פיגול → כרת
- V Analysis of ר"י's opinion:
- a ר"י would say that if he was מפגל regarding one body part, the rest is כשר (e.g. R/L)
- i טומאה just as טומאה (afterwards, when separated), the טומאה of one limb doesn't affect the other
- ii קרא v. 1 – ממנו but not the other part
- iii *Challenge* (ר"י): ruling that לעולם there is no כרת (for שתי הלחם of פיגול) unless he intends a כזית of both of them
- 1 *Note*: this can't be רבנן, as they would allow for פיגול even if only one was the object of פיגול
  - 2 *Must be*: ר"י יוסי – and he regards the two as "one unit" → certainly he'll consider limbs to be one
  - 3 *Answer*: author is רבי who rules that in case of שתי הלחם:
    - (a) *If*: he slaughters 1 to eat ½ כזית from one לחם, then slaughters the other to eat ½ כזית from the other – valid
      - (i) *Implication*: if he declared 1 כזית from both – would be פיגול
      - (ii) *Must be*: according to ר"י יוסי (to רבנן, don't need both); but then we are back to "square one"
    - (b) *Answer*: follows רבנן; don't read "בשתייהן" (both loaves); rather "בשניהן" (flashpoint must be כבשים ב כבשים)
      - (i) *But*: focal point may be just one loaf; this is taught *contra* ר"מ מתיר – מפגלים בחצי מתיר – ר"מ
      - (ii) *Challenge*: why use verbiage of לעולם
        1. *If*: it is representing ר"י יוסי and is requiring both בשניהן and בשתייהן
          - a. *Then*: we understand לעולם –opposed ר"מ בח"מ) and רבנן (must focus on both loaves)
        2. *But if*: it is representing רבנן, only requiring בשניהן (*contra* ר"מ) –
          - a. *Then*: "לעולם" seems unnecessary
- iv *Challenge*: רבי quoted ר"י (re: פיגול) if he was בעזרה and did שחיטה (of פנימית) with intent to spill שיריים the next day – פיגול
- 1 *Yet*: what are שיריים being מפגל? Can't be דם – per זבחים ד:ג
  - (a) *Must be*: בשר – so even פיגול about דם invalidates בשר; certainly פיגול about R "infects" L
- v *Challenge*: our משנה ר"י יוסי – ר"י admits that קומץ is a focal point of פיגול – must be for שיריים → ק"ו that (R → L)
- 1 *Conclusion*: ר"ה is rejected

- b ר' יוחנן: the תורה relates to שתי הלחם as one unit and as separate units
- i *support*: the תורה made each dependent on the other ( $\rightarrow 1$ ); yet instructed they be processed separately ( $\rightarrow 2$ )
  - ii *therefore*: if he "mixes" them, they are treated as one; if not, treated independently
  - iii *follow-up questions* (ר' יוחנן): if he was מפגל about one of the types of תודה לחמי תנור or מאפה תנור, do ר"י/חכמים maintain?
    - 1 *Answer*: report from א"י – the dispute is maintained in both of those cases
- VI Backdoor to רבי/רבנן:
- a *Ruling re: פיגול בזבח*: if he had intent for  $\frac{1}{2}$  כזית at שחיטה and  $\frac{1}{2}$  at זרה"ד – they are merged to generate פיגול
    - i *Some*: limit to שחיטה וזריקה, which are מתירין, but not קבלה והולכה
    - ii *Others*: reason that if שחיטה וזריקה, which are at polar ends of the process, can merge, ק"ו that קבלה והולכה merge
  - b *challenge*: לוי taught that each of the 4 עבודות stands alone and can't be merged
    - i *resolution* (רבא): רבי's rule follows רבי (above) who permits loaves if he did שחיטה on each כבש with intent to eat  $\frac{1}{2}$  כזית of one loaf לזמנו
      - 1 *challenge* (אבוי): רבי only allowed where there is  $\frac{1}{2}$  מתיר (כבש 1) and  $\frac{1}{2}$  eating ( $\frac{1}{2}$  כזית of one loaf)
        - (a) *but*: where there is a full מתיר (e.g. שחיטה) – would he validate?
      - 2 *Block* (רבא בר רב חנא): if רבי holds that full מתיר to  $\frac{1}{2}$  אכילה is פיגול, he should extend פסול (as גזרה דרבנן) to  $\frac{1}{2}$  מתיר and  $\frac{1}{2}$  אכילה
        - (a) *Support*: ר' יוסי extends such a גזירה (e.g. in our משנה re: לבונה, which he holds is not פיגול, yet – פסול)
        - (b) *And*: רבנן (ahead ב:ב), *contra* ר"מ, if he is only מפגל with קומץ or לבונה – not כרת ( $\rightarrow$  פסול)
      - 3 *Defense* (אבוי): in those cases, there is a similar case that may happen (e.g. קומץ לבונה should be invalidated as a precaution against דמנחת חוטא; קומץ דמנחה; קומץ alone should be פסול as a precaution against חוטא)
        - (a) *But*: here, there is no other  $\frac{1}{2}$  מתיר +  $\frac{1}{2}$  אכילה that we would need to be גוזר
      - 4 *Note*: support that רבנן employ this reasoning to invalidate, as they add (in ב:ב) that they assent to ר"מ in case of מנחות without לבונה – which is obvious
        - (a) *Rather*: the reason it is stated is to explain why they are פוסל in case of פיגול בקומץ (alone) – as a גזרה