

29.2.3

16a (משנה ה) → 17a (סיום הפרק)

- I מפגלים בחצי מתיר ר"מ/חכמים dispute משנה ה'
- a If: he had **פיגול**-intent at קומץ but not לבונה (or vice-versa)
- i **ל"מ**: the מנחה is מפוגל
- ii **חכמים**: no פיגול until he has that intent with the full מתיר (לבונה+קומץ)
- 1 Therefore: they agree with ר"מ in case of מנחת חוטא (no לבונה) that קומץ alone suffices
- b If: he had **פיגול**-intent regarding eating הלחם שתי at שחיטה of one of the lambs
- c Or if: he had **פיגול**-intent regarding eating הפנים לחם at burning one of the לבונה בזיכי
- i **ל"מ**: the bread is מפוגל
- ii **חכמים**: no פיגול until he has that intent with the full מתיר (slaughtering both lambs, burning both בזיכים)
- d If: he slaughtered one of the lambs with intent to eat it חוץ לזמנו, only it is מפוגל
- i And if: he slaughtered it with **פיגול**-intent for the other lamb, both are כשר
- II Dispute 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 **דב**): 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 **דב**): in re: חטאת מתנות, where (כ"ה) only one is מעכב → מחשבת פיגול at 1st is מפגל
- 1 Qualification: only applies to בחוץ מתנות, but בפנים – e.g. 43 (or 47/48) of יוה"כ, 11 of הנשרפים, פרים הנשרפים
- (a) **ל"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 – no 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 פר
- 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 ראשונה הוא עושה
- (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 **ל"מ**: it is like קמיצה (→ all would agree that it is מפגל alone)
- b **ל"ל**: it is like הקטרה (→ would be considered חצי 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 (**אבוי**): 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 פסח is about חצי מתיר שחיטת פסח
- (a) Answer: the שחיטה is the מתיר
- ii Challenge (to ר"י): משנה lists 4 flashpoints of פיגול, including הולכה, we assume meaning דהקטרה
- 1 Defense: it refers to הילוך of כלי מתן כלי
- 2 Challenge: if so, the order should be הקטרה, מתן בכלי, הולכה, קמיצה, הולכה (a: we have such a version of the משנה)
- (a) Challenge: if הולכה is מתן כלי, it should have stated להולכה, בא לו להקטרה, instead of 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 הוליק בשתיקה – קשיא

- IV Question posed re: gradual פיגול – dispute among ר' המנונא, ר' חסדא, ר' ששת and ר' ששת re: *If*: he was מפגל one grain at a time, intending to eat one grain at a time לזמנו – is it פיגול?
- a *If*: he was מפגל one grain at a time, intending to eat one grain at a time לזמנו – is it פיגול?
- i *Range*: כשר, פסול, כשר
- 1 *Proposal*: פיגול holds like ר"מ (מפגלים בח"מ); רבנן holds like ר"מ (מפגלים בח"מ) and רבי 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) רבי only disagrees when he never added to that עבודה with פיגול with מחשבת 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 מנחה שלא 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 is מפגל another הקטרה (ענינא ואבימי refers to 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 (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 בי ר' 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
 - 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 ר' יצחק בר אבא: if he burnt קומץ intending to eat שיריים after time, all agree it is פיגול
- a *Challenge* (ריב"א): can't be הכל דברי רבנן – דברי הכל
- b *Correction*: read הכל פסול דברי
- 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, but wasn't sure about פגול/פסול