



- IV ח"ר רב and רב"ח slaughtered with understanding that they are rams, not lambs
- a *ח"ר*: valid, but don't count
- b *רב*: valid and count
- i *ח"ר*: we should validate *רב*'s position if he thought them to be אילים but intended כבשים (which is what they are)
- 1 *but not*: if he thought them to be rams and intended rams – this is עקירה בטעות which is עקירה (errant thought)
  - 2 *רב*: unintentional עקירה is not an עקירה (still valid)
- ii *רב*: we challenge from ruling that כהנים who are מפגל are only liable if they did so במזיד
- 1 *and*: we infer that if they did so בשוגג, they are exempt (for torts) but it is a valid פיגול
    - (a) *cannot mean*: that he knew it to be a חטאת and stated שלמים – that is מזיד
    - (b) *rather*: must be a case where he thought it to be שלמים and stated so → עקירה בטעות is an עקירה (*contra* רב)
  - 2 *אב"י*: (rejects the "cannot mean" assumption) - he knew it was a חטאת and intended שלמים
    - (a) *שונג*: is that he didn't know it was אסור to be מחשב בקדשים
- iii *challenge (to רב)*: from ר"ש's distinction between מנחות/זבחים, allowing מנחות that were לשמן שלא לשמן
- 1 *reasoning*: the process of each is different and that helps determine the intent, unlike זבחים which are the same
  - 2 *cannot be a case where*: he intended מחבת but it was מרחשת and he knew that – his intent should invalidate
    - (a) *reason*: it is intentional עקירה and should be invalid
    - (b) *must be*: a case where he thought it was מרחשת and he was מקמץ with that intent
      - (i) *and*: were it not for ר"ש's distinction, it would be invalid → עקירה בטעות is an עקירה
  - 3 *defense*: original assumption is wrong; he knew it was מחבת and intended מרחשת
    - (a) *and*: to challenge that this should certainly invalidate as it is intentional עקירה
    - (b) *answer*: per רבא – only "unrecognizable" מחשבות are invalid; here, the process defines the purpose