35.1.2

3b (אמר רב גידל אמר רב זריקת פיגול אינו מוציא מידי אמר רב גידל אמר רב גידל אמר $\Rightarrow 4b$

- I זריקת about זריקת פיגול and the pursuant discussion
 - a אוריקת פיגול מעילה does not alter status of קדק"ד) מעילה קדק"ד) מעילה קדק"ל maintain מעילה attachment; קדק"ל ador't get it)
 - i challenge (מנחם it): מנחם if he slaughters תודה inside, but the מנחם is outside the city walls
 - 1 or: if he slaughtered before even one of the breads was minimally baked loaves are not קדוש
 - 2 but: if he slaughtered with intent for חוץ לזמנה/מקומה loaves are קדוש
 - (a) evidently: פיגול act is significant enough to lead to פיגול (no answer)
 - ii אבא 'r: ב' s rule was about מעילה at time of זריקה, which an end-step מעילה can never begin
 - 1 however: that משנה is referring to מחשבה at time of שחיטה, and he continued and did זריקה with proper מחשבה
 - iii challenge (קמיצה :(ד' אשי לרבא) should be considered parallel to שחיטה;
 - 1 and: עולא ruled that קמיצה ethat was put on מזבח loses its פיגול status (סיגול can make something עולא).
 - 2 *defense*: doesn't meant that קומץ becomes full פיגול, but that it can be defined as such בשעת קמיצה, but not considered פיגול, until מיגול (זריקת הדם::)
 - (a) challenge (עולא:(ד' אשי), in defending his position, used ק"ו if it can make others פיגול, certainly itself
 - (b) answer: same meaning not to classify it as פיגול (yet); but that it is an איסור which leads to פיגול
 - iv challenge: in re: dispute ר' יהודה/חכמים about sequence of מחשבת חוץ לזמנו+חוץ למקומו...
 - 1 (background: זבחים ב:ה if he had חממים, first, מחשבת חוץ לזמנו הדה and פוסל and פוסל (background: מחשבת חוץ לזמנו
 - 2 שבודות dispute is only if different עבודות (e.g. שוחט $1^{\rm st}$ שימן $1^{\rm st}$ שממן $1^{\rm st}$ שממן $1^{\rm st}$ שוחט $1^{\rm st}$
 - (a) but: in a single act, all agree that it is מחשבה מעורבת (even מחשבה to 'יהודה, regardless of order)
 - (b) implication: עבודה is an עבודה which, in and of itself, generates פיגול
 - (i) defense: same as above; at point of זריקה, retroactively becomes עבודה (1 פיגול) or 2 עבודות (2 עבודות)
 - (ii) challenge: if so, in re: מנחות ז:ג) תודה), should become פיגול retroactively
 1. answer: indeed "קדש" means it must be burnt, but cannot proceed properly
 - b suggestion: support found in פיגול ברייתא always carries מעילה
 - i doesn't this mean: even if there was זרה"ד?
 - ii rejection: must mean without זרה"ד
 - 1 challenge: if so, it should be obvious that מעילה still applies
 - 2 rather: it means even if there was דרה"ד but the reference is to an עולה (where מעילה applies even after זרה"ד
 - (a) challenge: if it is an עולה, again it is obvious that מעילה still applies
 - (b) challenge: סיפא (if מעילה apsed overnight (w/o זריקה), even w/ז the next day, מעילה still attaches) must be מעילה still attaches) at the next day, מעילה אנון מיפא
 - (i) answer: indeed, סיפא supports אבי but does רישא as well?
 - (ii) rejection: סיפא doesn't necessarily support ברב
 - 1. explanation: מעילה is done actively; perhaps the זריקה that follows cannot lift מעילה; but משבה may not be strong enough to harm later מעילה and prevent it from lifting מעילה
 - c suggestion: support found in פיגול תוספתא מעילה in פיגול in מעילה carries מעילה
 - i doesn't this mean: even if there was זרה"ד?
 - ii rejection: only if there was no זרה"ד; if there was מעילה זרה"ד is lifted
 - 1 challenge: if so, why does סיפא state that קדשים קלים ni פיגול (msut be with מעילה (state that מעילה that קדשים קלים (msut be with מדי"ד, else it's obvious)
 - 2 and: if that's the case, the מעילה should've distinguished: before זרה"ד, there is מעילה; afterwards no מעילה
 - 3 answer: indeed, that תוספתא certainly support רב 's ruling
 - (a) suggestion: since רישא supports בימא, shall we say that רישא supports him as well?
 - (b) rejection: רישא could be case where there was no זריקה yet;
 - (i) but: מנא presented it as he did because קדשים קלים is one consistent rule no מעילה attaches;
 - (ii) however: in קדשי קדשים, ruling varies; for מעילה is never lifted