



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

Bechoros Daf Daled

MISHNA

- Kohanim and Levi'im are patur from the halachos of bechor (presumably meaning the laws of peter chamor) based on a kal v'chomer – if they were able to make the firstborns of the Yisraelim patur in the Midbar, they should surely be able to make themselves patur.

GEMARA

- **Q:** The Levi'im themselves did not make the animals of the Yisraelim patur! The pasuk says that the Levi'im themselves made the Yisraelim themselves patur, and it was the animals of the Levi'im that made the animals of the Yisraelim patur!? **A: Abaye** said, the Mishna means that the firstborn donkeys are patur from the halachos of bechor based on a kal v'chomer – if their animals were able to make the animals of Yisraelim patur in the Midbar, they should certainly be able to make their own animals patur!
 - **Q: Rava** asked, the Mishna says that the Levi'im themselves were what made the firstborns of the Yisraelim patur, not their animals!? Also, based on your explanation, the Levi'im should even be patur from the halachos of bechor of a kosher animal, and yet a Mishna says they are only patur from pidyon haben for the bechor of people and from the halachos of peter chamor!? **A:** Rather, **Rava** said, the Mishna means that the Kohanim and Leviim are themselves patur from bechor (from pidyon haben) based on a kal v'chomer – if they were able to remove the kedushas bechor of the Yisraelim, they should certainly be able to make themselves patur!
 - **Q:** We now have a source for them being patur from their firstborn humans being subject to pidyon haben. How do we know that their firstborn donkeys are also patur from bechor (peter chamor)? **A:** The pasuk says “ach padoh sifdeh eis bechor ha'adam v'eis bechor habeheima hatmei'ah tifdeh”. This teaches that whoever is subject to the rules of human bechor is also subject to the laws of peter chamor, and whoever is not subject to the laws of human bechor is not subject to the laws of peter chamor.
 - **Q: R' Safra** asked **Abaye**, in the Midbar not every Levi had an animal that removed the kedusha from an animal of a Yisrael. If so, only a Levi that had an animal that took off kedusha from an animal of a Yisrael should be patur based on the kal v'chomer, but a Levi who did not should not be patur based on this kal v'chomer!? Also, according to you (**Abaye**) and **Rava**, since only a Levi who was at least one month old took the kedusha off a Yisrael, only such a Levi should be patur based on the kal v'chomer!? Also, the firstborn son of a Levi's daughter should not be patur based on this kal v'chomer, and yet **R' Ada bar Ahava** said that he is!? The Gemara says, this last question is not problematic according to **Mar the son of R' Yosef in the name of Rava**, who says that that pasuk refers to a bechor as a “peter rechem” (one that opens the womb). Since it is all about the opening of the womb, and the womb belongs to the daughter of a Levi, that firstborn is patur. However, **R' Safra** continues and asks, Aharon was not part of the count of Levi'im that took the kedushas bechor from the Yisraelim, so his kedushas bechor should not have been removed based on the kal v'chomer!? **A: Abaye** answered, the pasuk says “haLevi'im” which compares all Levi'im to each other and includes them all.
 - **Q:** How do we know that Kohanim are included as well? **A:** It is like **R' Yehoshua ben Levi** said, that we find 24 pesukim where Kohanim are referred to as Levi'im.
 - **Q:** How do we know that this applies to later generations as well? **A:** The pasuk says “v'hayu li haLevi'im”, which teaches that they always retain that status.

- **Q:** How do we know that in the Midbar it was a “seh” of a Levi that was used to remove the kedusha from a firstborn donkey of a Yisrael? The pasuk simply says it was an animal!? **A: R’ Chisda** said, we know that in generations after the Midbar money is used to redeem human bechors and that a seh is used to redeem peter chamors. Just as in the case of money it was also used in the Midbar, so too in the case of seh it was also used in the Midbar.
 - **Q:** Maybe money was used even in the Midbar since money is also used to redeem hekdesch and maaser sheini? **A:** Rather, the pasuk says “ach padoh sifdeh eis bechor ha’adam v’eis bechor habeheima hatmei’ah tifdeh”, which teaches that just as regarding human bechors there is no difference in their method of redemption between the Midbar and later generations, the same is true regarding the redemption of firstborn donkeys – it was done with a seh in the Midbar as well.
- **R’ Chanina** said, a single seh of a Levi was able to redeem many peter chamors of Yisraelim. **Abaye** said we can prove this from the fact that the pasuk tells us that regarding the human redemption there were more bechors than Levi’im and tells us exactly how many extra there were. The pasuk does not do this for the peter chamors.
 - **Q:** Maybe the pasuk doesn’t say that there were more because there were not more peter chamors than the number of sehs that the Levi’im had? **A:** That can’t be, because the pasuk says that the people of Reuven and Gad had a lot of animals. It must be that the Yisraelim had many more animals than the Levi’im.
 - **Q:** Maybe the number of peter chamors was still less than the number of sehs of the Levi’im? **A:** The pasuk says “v’es beheimas haLevi’im tachas behemtam” – one beheima of the Levi’im took care of multiple animals.
 - **Q:** We find that the word beheima in the singular is sometimes used to refer to many animals!? **A:** If so, the pasuk should have used the singular to refer to the animals of the Levi’im and of the Yisraelim. The fact that it changes shows that it means for it to be singular. **Rava** said, we find that **R’ Chanina** explained a Mishna by saying that one seh of a Levi was able to redeem many peter chamors of the Yisraelim.
- We have learned, **R’ Yochanan** says that bechoros were made kadosh in the Midbar as the pasuk says “Kadesh li kol bechor” from that point forward, and **Reish Lakish** says they were not, as the pasuk says “v’haya ki yivi’acha” and then says “v’ha’avarta”, which teaches that bechoros were only made kadosh after entering EY.
 - **Q: R’ Yochanan** asked **Reish Lakish**, a Mishna says that before the Mishkan was put up it was mutar to use bamos and the Avodah was done by the bechoros. We see they did have kedusha then!? **A: Reish Lakish** said, that refers to the ones born in Mitzrayim, not the ones born in the Midbar.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that on the day that the Mishkan was put up the Yidden brought their bechoros korbanos. We see it had kedusha in the Midbar!? **A:** Here too, it refers to the ones that were born in Mitzrayim. In fact, the Braisa says they brought them “that day”, which suggests they did not bring bechoros in the Midbar again after that day.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that there were 3 times that bechoros were made kadosh – in Mitzrayim, in the Midbar, and in EY. The Braisa brings a pasuk for each. We see they were made kadosh in the Midbar!? **A: R’ Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, this means they were commanded regarding bechoros in three places, but they were not actually made kadosh until they entered EY.
 - **Q:** We already said that they were also made kadosh in Mitzrayim!? **A:** The Braisa means that in some of these 3 places they were made kadosh and in some they were not.
 - **Q: R’ Pappa** asked, how can one say that the bechoros were not made kadosh in the Midbar? The pasuk regarding the time in the Midbar says, “pekod kol zachar livnei Yisrael”, which shows that they were made kadosh!? **A:** Rather, the machlokes must be that **R’ Yochanan** says that the bechoros were made kadosh at the beginning of the time in the Midbar and continued to be made kodesh throughout the years in the Midbar,

and **Reish Lakish** said they were made kadosh early on when they were counted but never again after that in the Midbar.

- **Q: Reish Lakish** gave a reason for his view – the pasuk says “v’haya ki yivi’acha...”. What is the reason for **R’ Yochanan’s** view? **A: R’ Elazar** said, I saw **R’ Yochanan** in a dream last night so I know I will say something proper – the pasuk says “li yihyu”, which teaches that they will always remain in the kadosh state.
 - **Q:** What does **R’ Yochanan** do with the pasuk of “v’haya ki yivi’acha”? **A:** He uses it like the **Tanna Divei R’ Yishmael**, who says it means that by doing this mitzvah we will merit to enter EY.
- **R’ Mordechai** said to **R’ Ashi** that he had a version of the machlokes where **R’ Yochanan** said the bechoros were not made kadosh in the Midbar and **Reish Lakish** says they were. He then explained that this means that **R’ Yochanan** held there was no reason to make them kadosh, because they were already kadosh on their own.
 - **Q:** Based on this, he is saying the same version that we had!? **A:** He is teaching that you must teach things using the same language as your rebbi.