But now let the slain victim save the murderer – אלא מעתה הרוג יציל

OVERVIEW

According to ר' יוסי, who maintains that even if the פסול or קרום did not warn the (alleged) murderer, nevertheless עדותן בטלה; therefore אביי asked אביי, according to ד' יוסי the murderer can never be convicted, for the victim will save the murderer from the death penalty. תוספות explains how the הרוג

פירוש שהוא בעל דין אי נמי מפני שהוא שונא ושונא פסול לעדות:

The explanation why הרוג יציל is because he is a litigant; or you may also say, because the הרוג is an enemy to the הורג and an enemy is unfit to testify.

[ועיין תוס' יבמות כה. ד"ה הוא וכו'³ באריכות

SUMMARY

The בסול להעיד is פסול להעיד either because he is a בע"ד, or because he is a שונא.

THINKING IT OVER

What are the relative advantages of both explanations of תוספות?

_

¹ We can view the הרוג and the הרוג as a claimant (the הרוג) and defendant (the הורג) in this case. The הרוג demands that the הורג be killed. Since the הרוג saw the killing he can be considered as a witness; however he is an invalid witness since he is a litigant (a litigant cannot testify [since he is considered as a relative to himself (see רש"י ד"ה who saw the murder, invalidates the entire אינ מון מון אינ פול and should invalidate the entire שד פסול saving the murderer from the death penalty.

² There is a dispute (between the הכמים and הורג whether an enemy (one who did not talk to him for three days, ע"י"ש) can testify. However in this case where the הרג is a mortal enemy of the הכמים, even the הרג agree that such a שונא cannot testify (see "ל סי' לג הרב"ל סי' לג [See following תוס' ד"ה נרבע].

There תוספות explains that the הרוג cannot testify since he is a טריפה (and a טריפה is שאי אתה יכול להזימה because it is an שאי אתה יכול להזימה).