

29.2.3

16a (משנה ה) → 17a (סיום הפרק)

- I מפגלים בחצי מתיר ר"מ/חכמים dispute משנה ה'
- a If: he had לבונה (or vice-versa) intent to eat it but not פיגול (intention to eat it)
- i מפוגל is מנחה ד"מ
- ii (לבונה+קומץ) מתיר full until he has that intent with the full (לבונה) that קומץ alone suffices
1 Therefore: they agree with ר"מ in case of מנחת חוטא (no) that קומץ alone suffices
- b If: he had פיגול-intent regarding eating שתי הלחם at שחיטה of one of the lambs
- c Or if: he had פיגול-intent regarding eating לחם הפנים at burning one of the לבונה
- i מפוגל is ד"מ the bread
- ii חכמים: no פיגול until he has that intent with the full (slaughtering both lambs, burning both בזיכים)
- d If: he slaughtered one of the lambs with intent to eat it לזמנו, only it is מפוגל
- i And if: he slaughtered it with פיגול-intent for the other lamb, both are כשר
- II Dispute רב/שמואל about the parameters of the dispute
- a דב: dispute only if שתיקה came first; but if פיגול was done on 1st half-מתיר and 2nd was בשתיקה all agree to פיגול
- i Reason: כל העושה על דעת ראשונה הוא עושה
- b שמואל: dispute maintained in both cases
- i Challenge (to רב) where ברייתא חכמים hold their position regardless of the order
- 1 Proposed defense: reversal means "he had already done Y בפגול and then was silent for X"
- 2 Block: then the two cases are alike, and the wording "afterwards" (X then Y) is meaningless
(a) Answer: could be 2 separate כהנים (→ silence of 2nd doesn't follow פיגול of 1st מתנה)
- ii Challenge (to רב) in re: חטאת מתנוה, where (כב"ה) only one is מעכב → מחשבת פיגול at 1st is מפגל
- 1 Qualification: only applies to בחוץ מתנוה, but בפנים – e.g. 43 (or 47/48) of יוה"כ 11, פרים הנשרפים of פרים הנשרפים
- (a) ד"מ: if he is מפגל any of them – פיגול (even though the subsequent הזאות are meaningless, could be a case of 4 פרים and 4 שעירים, where none has a פסול-history; or it is meaningful as accepted for פיגול)
- (b) חכמים: must be מפגל all (and even if his פיגול is followed by שתיקה – פיגול)
- 2 Cannot argue: 2 כהנים, per מ"ד if כה"ג becomes פסול in mid-עבודה, new כה"ג must start over with new פ
- 3 Defense (רבא): 1st was פיגול, 2nd silent, 3rd פיגול – his "פיגול-re" in 3rd indicates that שתיקה was not פיגול
- (a) Challenge (רבי אשי): doesn't state "שתק" in the description
- 4 Rather (רבי אשי): 1-2-3 were all פיגול, but no need to repeat if עושה הוא ראשונה
- (a) Challenge: the description reads בין...בין (whether the 1st or 2nd etc.) – not multiple occurrences – קשיא
- III Question posed re: role of הולכה - is it like קמיצה (doesn't apply to לבונה → if he only had פיגול-intent at הולכה it would be a full מתיר) or is it like הקטרה (applies to לבונה – this is then a חצי מתיר and subject to dispute ר"מ/חכמים)
- a ד' יוחנן: it is like קמיצה (→ all would agree that it is מפגל alone)
- b ד"ל: it is like הקטרה (→ would be considered מתיר בחצי מתיר)
- i Explanation (of ר"י's reasoning): רבא – ר"י holds that any עבודה which isn't a מתיר is significant enough to be מפגל
- 1 Challenge (אב"י) שחיטה of 1 of the עצרת, כבשי, which isn't מתיר – yet ר"מ/חכמים still dispute its פיגול-ability
- (a) Defense (רבא): loaf is קדוש at שחיטה → it is a מתיר
- 2 Challenge (רבי אשי): dispute about counting ערלים before מולים for שחיטת פסח is about חצי מתיר
- (a) Answer: the שחיטה is the מתיר
- ii Challenge (to ר"י) משנה lists 4 flashpoints of פיגול, including הולכה, we assume meaning הקטרה
- 1 Defense: it refers to כלי of הילוך מתן כלי
- 2 Challenge: if so, the order should be הקטרה, מתן בכלי, הולכה, קמיצה (a: we have such a version of the משנה)
- (a) Challenge: if הולכה is כלי, it should have stated לו להולכה, instead of בא לו להקטרה
- (i) Answer: since the הולכה is for purposes of הקטרה, the תנא refers to it as הקטרה
- (b) Challenge: the phrase בשתיקה should be הולך בשתיקה – קשיא

- IV Question posed re: gradual פיגול – dispute among ר' חסדא, ר' המנונא and ר' ששת
- a If he was מפגל one grain at a time, intending to eat one grain at a time – is it פיגול?
- i Range: כשר, פסול, כשר
- 1 Proposal: פיגול holds like ר"מ (מפגלים בח"מ); פסול holds like רבנן (אין מפגלים בח"מ) and כשר holds like רבי (re: כבשים)
 - 2 Break: the positions do not necessarily align:
 - (a) ר"מ: only disagrees when he thought about eating כשיעור when he was מפגל
 - (b) רבנן: only disagree when he never completed the מתיר with פיגול-intent
 - (c) דבי: only disagrees when he never added to that עבודה with פיגול
 - 3 Rather: each position will hold that it represents a consensus:
 - (a) פיגול: this is a normal way of eating and of burning
 - (b) פסול: this is a usual way of eating, but an abnormal way of burning → like הוקטרה
 - (c) כשר: this is an unusual way of eating, but a normal method of הקטרה
- V Discussion re: הקטרה מפגלת הקטרה (e.g. if he burned one ע"מ to burn the other למחר)
- a הקטרה מפגל is another הקטרה (עיפא ואבימי): חריפי דפומבדיתא
- i Even: רבנן will assent that מתיר מפגל מתיר; in this case, the entire מתיר is affected (as flash-point or focal-point)
- ii Support (רבא): משנה equates all 4 עבודות for פיגול
- 1 Implication: just as other עבודות are מפגל whether intending to eat or burn after time
 - (a) Similarly: הקטרה is מפגל even if intending to burn (other מוקטר) after time
 - 2 Rejection: perhaps הקטרה is only מפגל eating, unlike first three עבודות
- b מפגל הקטרה is not הקטרה (תלמיד ר"ח (לפני אביי))
- i Even: ר"מ will agree – a מפגל must be the מתיר of the focal point
- ii Note: אביי confirmed that this was a report of ר' חסדא going back to רב
- iii Support: our משנה – שחט 1 lamb intending to eat other לזמנו – fully כשר
- 1 Reason: since one lamb is not מתיר the other, no effect
 - 2 Rejection: in that case, they were never joined in one כלי (unlike ולבונה)
- VI "Precious" report from ר' המנונא which he learned at חנינא
- a If he burnt קומץ intending to burn לבונה to eat שיריים after time – פיגול-
- i Assumption: these are two independent statements
- ii Therefore: unclear – if he wants to support position that מפגלים בח"מ, let him state ע"מ לאכול שיריים
- 1 And: if he wants to support הקטרה מפגלת הקטרה, let him state ע"מ להקטיר לבונה after time
 - 2 And: if he wants to support both, let him make it one compound statement
- iii Answer: the case is where he burned קומץ, intending to burn לבונה and that when he burns לבונה, that will be with intent to eat שיריים after time
- iv Teaching: that the thought "stretches" from one עבודה to the next
- VII Final report: תנא taught before ר' יצחק בר אבא if he burnt קומץ intending to eat שיריים after time, all agree it is פגול
- a Challenge (ריב"א): can't be הכל דברי רבנן – מפגלים בחצי מתיר
- b Correction: read הכל פסול
- i Question: why didn't he correct him to read פגול and that it was only ר"מ's opinion
- ii Answer: תנא had memorized הכל דברי רבנן, but wasn't sure about פגול/פסול