

## 4.6.7

71b (משנה ה-ו) → 72b (מטריד טריד)

- I. שבת on קרבן of שחיטה liability for משנה ה'.
- a. **פסח**: liable
  - b. *Other זבחים offered פסח לשם פסח* if they aren't fit for ק"פ (e.g. ox) – חייב
    - i. *If*: they are fit (e.g. male yearling) – ר"א holds that he is liable; ר' יהושע exempts
      1. ר"א: if פסח, which is מותר, when changed to something else is חייב, חייב קרבן which is already אסור
      2. ר' יהושע: פסח is חייב b/c he changed to אסור דבר מותר; unlike our case, where he changed to מותר דבר מותר
      - a) ר"א: תמיד (e.g.) disproves it; it is permissible but if someone offers something else חייב לשם תמיד
      - b) ר"י: תמיד (e.g.) is dissimilar, it has a set amount (1), unlike פסח (where a mistake could happen)
    - c. ר"מ: even offering any other offering צבור (תמיד) on שבת is exempt
- II. שבת on שחיטה further implications of משנה ו'
- a. *Group*: if slaughtered exclusively for invalid group (e.g. טמאים) – חייב; for mixed group, exempt
  - b. *פסול הגוף*: if it has a מום – חייב; if it is found to be a טריפה (in secluded place) – פטור
  - c. *פסול בעלים*: if, after שחיטה, we learn that the owners were no longer fit (or associated) – פטור
- III. Analysis of משנה ה' טועה or עוקר
- a. *1<sup>st</sup> clause (invalid פסח)*: must be עוקר
  - b. *2<sup>nd</sup> clause (other קרבנות)*: must be טועה (otherwise, distinction of ראוי/אינו ראוי meaningless)
    - i. *Challenge*: from משנה ו' – ר"א builds his argument from 1<sup>st</sup> clause; should be challenged based on עוקר/טועה
    - ii. *Answer*: ר"א doesn't distinguish between עוקר/טועה
      1. *Challenge*: ר"י should defend based on distinction
      2. *Answer*: ר"י answers to ר"א's approach (no distinction) – (“changed to מותר...”)
- IV. Analysis of משנה ה' the arguments
- a. *ד' יהושע* distinguishes between קצבה (set amount) and no קצבה
    - i. *Therefore*: ר"י must agree that when there's a קצבה the errant violator is חייב
    - ii. *Challenge*: ר' יהושע in the case of 2 babies to circumcise, 1 on שבת the other on Friday (שבת יט:ד)
      1. *Note*: this is a case of קצבה – only 1 baby to properly circumcise – ר"י exempts if ע"ש baby circumcised on שבת
    - iii. *Answer*: in the case of babies, 1<sup>st</sup> circumcised Friday baby, he was properly involved with שבת baby
      1. *But*: in the case of קרבנות, תמיד was brought first – no more “proper engagement”
      2. *Challenge*: (final clause of משנה ה') – ר' מאיר exempts (→ even if תמיד was already brought)
        - a) *Answer*: ר' מאיר maintained that ר"י only exempts if 1 baby for Sunday and 1 for שבת
        - b) *Challenge*: if Friday/שבת, where in any case he fulfilled a מצוה – חייב; certainly here חייב
          - i. *Answer*: in the case of מילה,
            1. *In*: the ע"ש/שבת case, first he circumcised שבת baby on ע"ש, שבת was already “closed off”
            2. *But*: the שבת/א' בשבת case, he had done neither, שבת was “permitted” for other baby
          - ii. *But*: in our case, שבת had been “permitted” for the קרבן צבור
- V. Analysis of משנה ה' distinction between “fit” and “unfit”
- a. *Follows ד' ש* ר"מ holds that in any case – he is exempt
    - i. ר"מ: would exempt even a calf (unlike בעל מום which never has a “fit” moment)
    - ii. ר"מ: would even exempt חולין (unlike בעל מום; this could be confused with a proper קרבן)
    - iii. *Conclusion*: ר"מ exempts if:
      1. *Confusion*: if it could be confused with a proper קרבן (חולין – must be a lamb or goat etc.) OR
      2. *Engagement*: he is engaged in bringing this offering at some point (even calf)
      3. *Excluded*: בעלי מומין