34.6.1; 23b (משנה א) → 25a (משנה א)

ו. וְהַבִּיא אָיַל תַּמִים מָן הַצֹּאן בָּעֵרְכָּךְּ לָאָשֶׁם אֶל הַכֹּהֶן וְכָבֶּר עַלִיו הַכֹּהֶן עַל שׁגְנָתוֹ אַשִּׁר שַׁנָג וְהוּא לֹא יָדַע וְנָסְלָח לוֹ: *ייִקרא ה*,יי*ח*

- I משנה א: status of אשם תלוי if, at a particular stage, the doubt was cleared up
 - If: he brought an שחיטה and found out, before שחיטה, that he hadn't sinned
 - i חולין (goes back to graze) חולין. animal is fully חולין
 - ii חכמים. requires מום and redemption (like אשם שנתכפרו בעליה)
 - 1 *Dispute*: impact of intent:
 - (a) ד"מ since he didn't require it, his הקדש is moot
 - (b) מקדיש due to pangs of conscience
 - (i) ברייתא. their positions are the same whether he found out he didn't sin or if he learned that he did sin
 1. If he did sin: to teach the extent of "ר"מ position since he didn't need הקדש אשם תלוי is null
 - 2. If he didn't sin: to teach extent of 'חכמים's approach since his conscience bothered him יחדש valid
 - (c) אשמת (as backup) that both need מום agrees in case he sets aside 2 אשמות
 - (i) Reason: by designating backup, he made it clear that he has pangs of conscience → is valid
 - iii "7". bring it in any case if not for this sin, for another
 - b If: he found out after שחיטה the blood is spilled out and the meat goes out to בית השריפה
 - c If: he found out after דרה"ד continue properly (בהנים eat meat)
 - כוס is in כוס (before זרה"ד) continue properly
- II משנה ב: Differences between אשם תלוי and other קרבנות/animals that are used in ceremony
 - a אשם וודאי: if before שחיטה he found out that he wasn't liable, must graze and get מום etc.
 - i If: after שחיטה, animal is buried
 - ii And if: after זרה"ד, meat is burned at בית השריפה
 - b שור הנסקל if discovered to not require סקילה; if yet alive, goes back to herd; if already killed, מותר בהנאה
 - c עריפה if murderer found before עריפה, goes back to herd; if after, processed normally (אסור בהנאה)
 - i Reason: it came to absolve a ספק which it did (if only for a short time)
- III Series of discussions about impact of הזמת עדים
 - a חכמים agree with עדים in case the עדים (of his alleged violation) were הקדש no הקדש
 - i Reason: in this case, no doubts on his part and he didn't designate אַקדש with full intent
 - i Challenge שנה our משנה (below) distinguishes א"ת from שור הנסקל which could only be בהוזמו עדיו
 - 1 Defense (שור הנסקל needn't be הזמה the "victim" could walk into court
 - 2 Parallel: in case of א"ת if the piece of meat was identified as שמן may still be בהזמה but not בהזמה but not בהזמה
 - (a) Note: this issue is subject to dispute between ר' יוחנן/ר"א in case of א"ת where א"ת where הוזמו עדיו
 - (b) א"ז. it's like מנחת סוטה becomes חולין חולין
 - (c) מום must graze and get מום
 - (i) Reason: מנחת סוטה isn't coming for כפרה, but to clarify עוון does that)
 - b מוזם rif מוזם were מוזם and anyone who grabs it owns it
 - i אבד. this only stands to reason if they testified that his שור was נרבע (he might not know about it)
 - 1 But: if they testified that he was רובע his own animal he knows it isn't true and isn't מפקיר it
 - 2 Challenge: ruling that if עדי עיר הנדחת are מוזמים, all the property is הפקר?
 - (a) Answer: there, each citizen who knows he didn't sin will assume that someone else did and is מפקיר נכסים
 - c רשב"ל :מתנה if B rejects A's gift, it is now הפקר
 - i *Challenge:* ר' ששת ruled that if a donee says אי אפשי (etc.) his words are valid (unlike אינה מתנה etc.)
 - 1 Answer: דבריו קיימין doesn't mean that it goes back to donor; means that the gift is null and is now הפקר
 - ii Challenge: if a partner avers that he has no דין ודברים on a field or is removed from it it is meaningless
 - 1 Answer: in that case, he didn't give up ownership, just interest (דין ודברים)
 - iii Challenge: if someone gifted his property (posthumously) to another, including slaves, and the beneficiary refused it
 - 1 Then: if the intended donee was a כהן, the slaves eat תרומה (!)
 - 2 *רשב"ג*: the heirs retake ownership (no תרומה)
 - (a) *Understood:* רשב"ג the donor gave the gift on condition that it would be accepted → reverts
 - (b) But: ת"ח if not owned by כהן, how can they eat תרומה?
 - (c) Answer: he holds that if someone is מפקיר his slave, he needs a גע and, w/o א, still eats תרומה slave, he needs a גע

- IV Analysis of יר"א's opinion offer the אשם תלוי nonetheless
 - a Question: why does he need to invoke the possibility that there was a sin? He rules that א"ת may be brought as נדבה
 - b Answer: this is per "אמרו לו" (see next משנה) must at least have some doubt that he sinned to justify אשם תלוי
- V Examining consequences of post-שחיטה awareness
 - a אשם חלוי if found out after שחיטה, is burned \rightarrow חולין שנשחטו בעזרה are burned, per ר' שמעון
 - b אשם וודאי: is buried \rightarrow חולין שנשחטו בעזרה are buried, per תמורה ז:ד (see תמורה ז:ד
 - i משנה .*ר"ש* is split part representing ר"י and part ר' יהודה
 - ii אשם ודאי no contradiction from א"ת to אשם ודאי
 - 1 אשם ודאי: is really a mistake, must be buried
 - 2 אשם חלוי: was sanctified properly, as he had doubt about his actions
 - 3 However: there is a contradiction within אשם ודאי buried or burned
 - (a) דבה this one is certainly "split"
 - (b) שריפה is for אשם תלוי as it looks to be דבת (which is burnt unlike שריפה) וחלין שנשחטו בעזרה

VI Analysis of rest of א משנה:

- If: נזרק הדם complete the קרבן
 - i Challenge: he already knows why complete it?
 - ii Answer (זרה"ד.) per v. 1 as long as he didn't know at moment of סליחה (i.e. זרה"ד) considered done properly
- b כוס when he found out continue properly אינסי. even if כוס when he found out continue properly
 - i Challenge: he knows before זריקה (i.e. has ידיעה at point of סליחה)
 - ii Answer: כל העומד ליזקר כזרוק דמי ר"ש holdsl like כל העומד ליזקר
 - 1 Challenge: ד"ש only applied that to דם that was properly done and ought to be
 - 2 Answer: מקדש is מקדש -even a בסול to be offered

VII Analysis of end ב משנה – the עגלה ערופה

- a עגלה. when does it become אסור בהנאה?
 - i המנונא. even before being killed (י ינאי) quoting his colleagues when it's brought down to ravine)
 - 1 Support: dispute ר"ש/חכמים about "unfit" שחיטה for liability of אותו ואת בנו
 - (a) If: slaughtered שור הנסקל, פרת חטאת (on same day) "exempts (שריטה שאינה ראויה)
 - (i) Proof: must already be אסור before death, else אותו is אותו (and should be liable for אותו ואת בנו
 - (ii) Counter: perhaps שויטה allows for שחיטה as proper killing of עגלה
 - 1. Rejection: עריפה חולין א:יד and עגלה have opposite עריפה (→only עריפה valid for ענגלה valid for ענגלה
 - 2. And: if תנא disagreed, תנא would've mentioned it

ii עריפה at *רבא*

- 1 Support: from our משנה if murderer found before עריפה she goes back to herd
 - (a) But: if she is אסורה beforehand, how can she go back to herd?
 - (i) Answer (צריפה means "if before she is fit for עריפה (i.e. in נחל איתן):
 - (b) Challenge: then why does משנה rule that if she was already גערפה, she should be buried?
 - (i) Answer (מ"ק): means "if he was found after she was fit for עריפה, she is buried"
 - (c) Challenge: end of משנה if found then, buried, since she did her job of כפרה
 - (i) But if: that means being found before כפרה, there was no כפרה
- iii comment: this dispute is a מחלוקת תנאים (as our משנה seems to support רבא
 - 1 ברייתא: there is a עזרה מכשיר) and מכפר (all מכפר) inside עזרה (עזרה) inside אינור,
 - שעיר המשתלח) מכפר and (עגלה ערופה and שעיר המשתלח) מכפר and עגלה ערופה) outside
 - (a) Just as: inside מכשיר is treated like inside מכפר, so with outside
 - (i) And: birds of אסורים מחיים are אסורים אסורים עגלה and עגלה ard אסורים מחיים are אסורים