

29.2.1

13a (משנה א) → 14b (דדמי ליה)

1. ואם האכל אכל מבשר זבח שלמיו ביום השלישי לא ירצה המקריב אתו לא יחשב לו פגול והנהפך האכלת מן פגול תשא: ויקרא ז, יח

- I פיגול re: role of **לבונה** as a focal point of **dispute**: משנה א'
- a *agreed*: if he intended to eat **שיריים** or burn **קומץ** the next day – **כרת** → **פיגול**
- 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 **זבה** (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 בזכי **לבונה** 2 **מתיר** another **מפגל** **מתיר** cannot be **פיגול** ר"י's reason is that a **מתיר** cannot be **פיגול**
- i *Justification*: **סד"א** that in re: **לבונה**, reason is that it is a different substance than **קומץ** (untrue in re: **בזיכים** – **קמ"ל**)
- ii *Challenge*: ר"י's retort in the **משנה** – due to **לבונה** being a different substance
- 1 *Defense*: **קומץ** or **לבונה** means the sequence isn't set – can bring **לבונה** first
- iii **דבנן** agree that **ר"י** ruling – if a **זר** is in one **כלי** (as in **קומץ ולבונה**) which "unites" them
- III **פסול** – **לבונה** if a **זר** collects the **ר"י**'s ruling ינאי
- a **הולכה** ד' **ירמיה** it is akin to
- i *Proof*: our **משנה** counts **קמיצה** (**שחיטה**); **מולך** (**הולכה**); and **הקטרה** (**זרה**); 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. **בידים**; both are **קדוש בכלי**, therefore equivalent
- IV **משנה ב'** dispute re: **פיגול** of 1 of 2 attached focal points of eating
- a *If*: he slaughtered both **עצרת** **כבשי** intending to eat 1 of **שתי הלחם** the next day
- b *Or*: burned both **בזיכי לבונה** intending to eat 1 of the **סדרים** of **לחם הפנים** the next day
- i **פסול** ד' **יוסי** the one he intended to be eaten late is **פיגול**, the other **כרת** (→ no **כרת**)
- ii **חכמים** both are **פיגול** → **כרת**
- V *Analysis of ר"י's opinion*:
- a **הונא** 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"נ**): 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*: **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 **יוסי** (to **רבנן**, don't need both); but then we are back to "square one"
- (b) *Answer*: follows **רבנן**; don't read "בשתיהן" (both loaves); rather "בשניהן" (flashpoint must be **בכשבים**)
- (i) *But*: focal point may be just one loaf; this is taught *contra* ר"מ – **מתיר בחצי מתיר**
- (ii) *Challenge*: why use verbiage of **לעולם**
1. *If*: it is representing **יוסי** and is requiring both **בשניהן** and **בשתיהן**
- a. *Then*: we understand **לעולם** – opposed – **ר"מ** (מפגלים **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 **יוסי** (re: **פיגול** in same locus as focal point) 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** – **יוסי** 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 (→1); yet instructed they be processed separately (→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 תורה 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 ½ כזית at שחיטה and ½ at זרה"ד – they are merged to generate פיגול
    - i *Some*: limit to שחיטה זריקה, which are מתירין, but not קבלה והולכה
    - ii *Others*: reason that if שחיטה זריקה, 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 ½ חוץ לזמנו of one loaf כזית
      - 1 *challenge* (אב"י): רבי only allowed where there is ½ מתיר (כבש 1) and ½ eating (½ 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 ½ אכילה is פיגול, he should extend פסול (as גזרה דרבנן) to ½ מתיר and ½ 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 *os* לבונה – not כרת (→ פסול)
      - 3 *Defense* (אב"י): 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 alone should be פסול as a precaution against דמנחת חוטא)
        - (a) *But*: here, there is no other ½ מתיר + ½ אכילה that we would need to be גזר
      - 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 בקומץ (alone) - as a גזרה