31.5.3; 34a (משנה גו) -> 35a (משנה בי פעי מיחזי)

- I משנה consequences of deliberately making a בכור תם on a בכור תם
 - a If: someone makes a hole in a בכור's ear
 - i "7". he may never slaughter the animal
 - ii מום nappens, he may slaughter מום nappens, he may slaughter
 - b Challenge: א"ז doesn't fine "forever" in such cases
 - i Support: בהרת if a בהרת got cut off by accident, he may be declared טהור
 - 1 But if: he cut it off on purpose
 - (and is טהור when he has another טהור (and is יה"א from it) (he is יה"א from it)
 - (b) פשיון) נגע which is a סימן טהרה which is a פשיון) נגע which is a סימן טהרה. he isn't פשיון
 - ii Answer1 (בנור), not against his body (נגעים), not against his body (נגעים), not against his body (נגעים)
 - מום Reason: regarding the בכור, he has nothing to lose by making a מום (if this one doesn't "work", he'll have to wait for another מום in any case); regarding נגעים, he has much to lose and wouldn't do so intentionally
 - 2 Challenge (צבי): that solves the apparent contradiction within א"ז; what of the contradiction within ?"; what of the contradiction within ?"?
 - iii Answer2 (בא): in each case, they only fine within that which he violated
 - 1 בכול we regard the מום (that he made) as if it isn't there; prohibited until another מום happens
 - 2 שהיר we regard the cut-off בהרת as if it were there can't be declared מהור as it can't be seen
 - iv Tangential question (ד"מ): is ר"א's formulation in נגעים
 - 1 מסקל meaning when he develops the new געג, he is immediately cleansed of the first (cut-off) אוגע OR
 - 2 איטהד meaning when he develops the new נהנע and is declared pure from it he is טהור
 - (a) Split the difference: if a חתן (during 7 days of שמחה or anyone during רגל has an appearance of בהרת
 - (i) הלכה we allow to complete period of rejoicing before declaring טומאה
 - (ii) If: the phrasing is יטהר once the new one appears, he is cleansed from earlier one
 - (iii) But if: the phrasing is ייטהר he is still טמא until the new one is declared and he is then תיקו
- II Question posed to יר ירמיה על ד' זירא 'ז: if someone pierces בכור ear and dies, is his son fined to have to wait for new?
 - a On the one hand: if he sells his ע"כ to non-Jew and dies, son is also "fined" to spend up to 10x his value to redeem him
 - i But: in that case, the מבו is uprooted from מצוות every day; unlike here, where the act happened once
 - b On the other hand: if someone orchestrates his work so that a דבר האבד "falls" on חוה"מ and then dies, his son is allowed to do that work (not fined, as we would fine the father were he to have lived)
 - i But: in that case, no איסור happened (yet) but in our case, the בכור's ear was already pierced
 - c In our case: did they fine the man (who is now dead) or his possessions (i.e. the בכור)?
 - d Answer: if he dethorns field on שמיטה, it may be planted after שמיטה;
 - i But: if he fertilizes field (by leaving animals in field), may not work the field (as a fine)
 - ii ד' יוסי בר חנינא. but if he did so and died, his son may work the field
 - iii In other words: only he is fined, not his possessions so too, here, the מכנר may be slaughtered
 - e Further support (אביי): if he made another's מהרות impure (we fine him) and he died son isn't fined (to pay)
 - i Reason: it is "intangible" damage (-not מוק) and the payment is a fine son isn't fined
- III משנה גים: inadvertent and willful מומים made by "others"
 - a Story #1: Roman clerk saw old-looking goat, found out that it was a מום that never had a מום; made a מום
 - i חכמים. permitted it to be slaughtered based on that מום
 - ii But then: he went ahead and pierced a bunch of animals and חכמים forbade slaughtering them
 - b Story #2: kids were playing with animals, inadvertenly caused a מום
 - מום permitted it to be slaughtered based on that מום
 - ii But then: learning what they had "accomplished", they played with more and חכמים forbade slaughter
 - c General rule: if it is done by consent/awareness of owners forbidden (even מסיח לפ"ת); if not permitted (even מסיח לפ"ת)
 - I Justification: if we only had 1st story, א"א in that case he is a non-Jew and won't continue doing so, we can permit 1st
- i And: if only had 2nd story, סד"א since we wouldn't confuse him with an adult, מותר, unlike adult non-Jew צריכא
- IV משנה דו: if a מבנו was chasing a person and he kicked the animal and made a בכוד it may be slaughtered
 - a 2" (version 1): only permitted if he kicked him while chasing but if afterwards, it isn't caused by his anger/pain
 - b מום (version 2): permitted even if he kicked him afterwards it is his anger, not desire to make a מום, that drove him
 - בכור a permitted to make מום before it comes out of the birth canal
 - i אבא. a kid on its ears; a lamb on its lambs (or a lamb, also on its ears, if it came out sideways)
 - ii מום in mouth isn't seen when it eats, but is seen when it yawns this is מום שבגלוי and may be נשחט
 - 1 Question: what is he teaching we already learned this (ד:ו) (a: בא is teaching reason for that משנה)