



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

Bechoros Daf Gimmel

VACHACHOMIM OMRIM KOL ZMAN SHEYAD HA'OVEID KOCHAVIM...

- **R' Yochanan** said, they both darshen the same pasuk. The pasuk says "kol bechor". The **Rabanan** hold that the word "bechor" means even a bechor owned only in part by a Yid is chayuv in the halachos of bechor. The pasuk therefore says "kol" to teach that it is not chayuv until the entire bechor is owned by a Yid. **R' Yehuda** says that "bechor" means the entire bechor, and the addition of the word "kol" teaches that even if only a small part is owned by a Yid it is chayuv as a bechor.
 - We can also say that all agree that "bechor" means the majority of the animal. The machlokes is whether "kol" comes to complete that to the entire animal or to diminish that to any minimal amount.
 - **Q:** According to the **Rabanan**, how much must a goy own in order to make the animal patur from bechor? **A:** **R' Huna** said, even if he owns as much as the animal's ear it is patur. **R' Nachman** asked, if that is true, why can't the Kohen tell the goy to take the ear and then claim the rest of the animal?
 - **R' Chisda** said, the goy has to own something that if removed would make the animal a neveila. **Rava** said, it must be something that if removed would make the animal a treifa.
 - The machlokes between them is whether a treifa can live – **Rava** says a treifa can't live and **R' Chisda** says it can, which is why he says it must be something that will make it die and become a neveila.
 - The **Rabanan** said to **R' Pappa**, **R' Huna** on the one hand, and **Rava** and **R' Chisda** on the other, don't argue. **R' Huna** is talking about a case where the goy became a partner in the bechor itself, and **Rava** and **R' Chisda** are talking about where he became a partner in the mother animal. **R' Pappa** disagreed and said, just like regarding the bechor itself we learn from "kol bechor" that it must be the entire animal owned by a Yid, regarding the mother the pasuk says "kol miknicha tizachar", which teaches that the entire mother must be owned by a Yid! Rather, there is no difference whether the partnership is in the bechor or the mother.
 - **Q: Mar bar R' Ashi** asked, why should this be treated differently than a "neifel", which does get kedushas bechor? The same should be true even if the goy owns a vital organ of the animal – the rest should similarly get kedushas bechor even though it isn't viable without that organ!? **A:** The difference is that a neifel may not be viable, but there is no chullin mixed in with it and it therefore is considered to be "kol bechor". When the goy owns a piece it is no longer called "kol bechor".
 - **R' Elazar** missed a day in the Beis Medrash and asked **R' Assi** what he missed. **R' Assi** told him that **R' Yochanan** said that an animal owned in partnership with a goy is patur from bechor even if only a light mum would be created by removing the part that is owned by the goy. He then said, when a Mishna says that if a sheep has a firstborn that looks like a goat, or visa-versa, it is patur from bechor, but if it has some features of its mother it is chayuv, although it is chayuv, it is considered to be a permanent mum upon which the bechor can be sheched.
 - **Q:** Now, his ruling regarding a light mum was said to teach that the halacha follows **R' Huna** and not **R' Chisda** and **Rava**. However, the fact that a mutation is considered to be a mum is something that is taught in a Mishna which said that if one eye of the animal is large and the other

is small it is a mum, so what chiddush was he teaching? **A:** It may be that that Mishna considers it a mum of “saru’ah” (an animal with limbs of unequal size), and not because it is a mutation. In fact, there is a Mishna that says that a Kohen who has 2 eyes that are large or small is considered to have a mum. Now, this is clearly a mutation and suggests that an animal is only considered to have a mum with different sized eyes, not a mutation where both eyes are of the same size. We see that the reason the earlier Mishna held that the animal has a mum is because of “saru’ah”, not because of a mutation. That is why **R’ Yochanan** had to teach that a mutation is a mum.

- The Gemara says this is not a valid proof. It may be that even one large eye in an animal would be a mum because of mutation. However, when both eyes are either large or small we can attribute that to being tied to the overall health of the animal, not to a mutation.
- There was a geiyores whose brothers would give her animals to fatten in exchange for her receiving a share of the offspring. She asked **Rava** whether the offspring would be chayuv in bechora. **Rava** said, there is no one who is concerned for the view of **R’ Yehuda** who says that an animal owned in partnership with a goy is subject to bechor.
- **R’ Mari bar Rachel** had animals and he would give ownership of the ears of the firstborns to goyim to make them patur from bechor. However, he would still say they are assur to be worked with or sheared and would give them to the Kohanim (just like a bechor). At the end, his animals died.
 - **Q:** If he was not working with them or shearing them and giving them to the Kohanim why did he give ownership to a goy at all? **A:** He was afraid that he would be over on the halachos of bechor and he therefore prevented them from even getting the status of bechor.
 - **Q:** If so, why did all his animals die? **A:** He was punished, because he removed them from becoming kadosh as a bechor.
 - **Q: R’ Yehuda** said that a person may make a mum in a bechor before it is born!? **A:** Doing that removes it from becoming kadosh as a korban but it remains kadosh as a bechor for a Kohen. **R’ Mari** removed all kedusha of bechor from the animals. **A2: R’ Mari** was careful to make a full kinyan and remove all kedusha. However, there was a concern that others would see him and copy him without making a proper kinyan, in which case the kedusha is not removed and would lead to the transgression of kedushas bechor. That is why he was punished.