



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

Bechoros Daf Hey

- Kuntrukas the Roman official asked **R' Yochanan ben Zakai**, in the detailed count of the Levi'im in the Midbar there are 22,300 Levi'im, but in the total there is only 22,000. Where did the other 300 go!? **R' Yochanan** answered, those 300 were themselves bechorim and could therefore not take on the kedusha from a bechor of the Yisraelim. **Abaye** explained, the reason is that it is enough that he could remove his own kedusha.
 - He also asked him, based on the amount of machtzis hashekel for 603,550 people there should have been 201 kikars and 11 maneh. However, we find that the amount of silver given for the Mishkan was only 100 kikar. Was Moshe a ganav or a kidnapper or not an expert in math? **R' Yochanan** said, he was honest and an expert. The reason why the numbers are different is because the maneh used for the Mishkan was double the size of a regular maneh.
 - **Q: R' Achai** asked, why couldn't he have answered that the pasuk says 100 kikar were used to pour the "adanim", and the other 100 were put in the treasury of hekdeshe!? **A:** There is another pasuk that seems to say that the entire amount collected was 100 kikar, not 200 kikar.
 - **Q:** How does he know that the maneh used for hekdeshe is double the value of the regular maneh? It can't be from the fact that when the pasuk regarding the silver mentions the kikar it says there was another 1,775 shekalim. Now, in a regular kikar there is 60 maneh, which is 1,500 shekalim, which should therefore have brought the count to 101 kikar. Rather, it must be that the reason it was counted in shekalim is because the kikar of hekdeshe had 3,000 shekalim and there therefore was not 101 kikar. This can't be the source, because it may be that the pasuk only counts in 100s of kikars and wouldn't count one more! You also can't say it is from the pasuk's tally of the amount of copper, where similarly the pasuk counts in terms of shekalim instead of maneh and kikar and may be because the amount per maneh of hekdeshe is double. Again, this can't be the source, because it may be that the pasuk only counts in 10s of kikars and wouldn't count one more! **A:** Rather, **R' Chisda** said, it is based on a pasuk that says that the maneh is made of 60 shekalim. Now we know the maneh is made of 25 shekalim!? Rather, this teaches that the maneh of kodesh was doubled, that we may add to sizes but not more than a sixth, and that the sixth is calculated from the outside.
- **R' Chanina** said, I asked **R' Elazar** why is the firstborn donkey treated different than that of a horse or camel? He told me it is a gezeiras hakasuv. Also, it is because the donkeys helped the Yidden leave Mitzrayim, because each Yid had 90 donkeys carrying the silver and gold of Mitzrayim. I then asked him, what does the word "Redifim" mean (the pasuk says that the Yidden traveled there)? He told me, that is the name of the place. This is actually a machlokes Tanna'im where **R' Eliezer** says it was the name of the place, and **R' Yehoshua** said it means that the Yidden slacked off from Torah. I then asked him, what does the word "Shitim" mean? He told me, that is the name of the place. This is actually a machlokes Tanna'im where **R' Eliezer** says it was the name of the place, and **R' Yehoshua** said it means that the Yidden became involved with foolishness (znus with the women of Moav). The pasuk regarding that says "vatikrena" – **R' Eliezer** says it means the women came to the Yidden without clothing, and **R' Yehoshua** said it means that all the men who went to party with Moav became baalei keri.

MISHNA

- If a cow gives birth to a firstborn that looks like a donkey, or if a donkey's firstborn looks like a horse, it is patur from bechor, because the pasuk says "peter chamor" twice, which teaches that the mother and the offspring each have to be a donkey.
 - What is the halacha with regard to eating an offspring that looks like a species other than its mother? If a kosher animal has an offspring that looks like a non-kosher animal it is mutar to be eaten, but the reverse is assur to be eaten. The reason is, that something that comes from a non-kosher animal is non-kosher and something that comes from a kosher animal is kosher.

GEMARA

- A Mishna says, if a sheep has a firstborn that looks like a goat, or visa-versa, it is patur from bechor. If the offspring looks like the mother a little bit, it is chayuv.
 - **Q:** Where do we know this from? **A: R' Yehuda** says, the pasuk says "ach bechor shor", which teaches that mother must be a cow and the firstborn must be a cow in order for it to be chayuv as a bechor. The pasuk then says "bechor kesev", which teaches that the mother must be a sheep and the firstborn must be a sheep. The pasuk then says "bechor eiz", which teaches that the mother must be a goat and the firstborn must be a goat. We would think that even with a partial resemblance it would be patur. The pasuk therefore says "ach", which limits the exemption to where the offspring does not look like the mother at all.
 - **Q:** Our Mishna says the source is the double use of "peter"! **A: R' Yehuda** holds like **R' Yose Haglili** who gives his source in a Braisa. The machlokes is that our Mishna holds that the Torah taught us this halacha regarding something of monetary kedusha and we learn from there for physical kedusha, and **R' Yose Haglili** says the reverse.
 - **Q:** What does the Tanna of our Mishna do with the pasuk used by **R' Yose Haglili**? **A:** He uses it for the drasha of **R' Yose the son of R' Chanina**, who says that the requirement to offer the eimurin was said regarding a cow bechor, regarding a sheep bechor, and regarding a goat bechor, because we could not learn out one from the other, or even one from the other two. **R' Yose Haglili** says, from the fact that the pasuk says the word "bechor" 3 times, instead of just saying "ach bechor shor, kesev, v'eiz", we can also learn out the other drasha, that an animal is only chayuv as a bechor if it looks like its mother.
 - **Q:** What does **R' Yose Haglili** learn from the double use of "peter chamor"? **A:** He uses it as in a Braisa, and says that a pasuk says that the bechor of a non-kosher animal must be redeemed. We would think that this includes all non-kosher animals. The pasuk therefore says "peter chamor" – only a donkey. We would still think to say that a donkey bechor must be redeemed with a seh, but other non-kosher animals can be redeemed with anything. The pasuk therefore says "peter chamor" again, to teach that only firstborn donkeys must be redeemed, not any other non-kosher animals.
 - **Q: R' Achai** asked, if the pasuk only said peter chamor once we would say that it is something that was in the general category of non-kosher animals and was singled out to teach regarding the whole category, and would therefore teach that all non-kosher animals must be redeemed with a seh. The second peter chamor teaches that the redemption obligation only applies to donkeys, and no other non-kosher animals. Maybe say that the other non-kosher animals are excluded from being redeemed with a seh, but they must be redeemed with something else? **A:** The pasuk could have said "peter chamor tifdeh biseh" and then "chamor tifdeh beseh". The second mention of "peter" teaches that redemption is only needed for donkeys, not other non-kosher animals.
 - **Q:** How does the Tanna of our Mishna learn to exclude other non-kosher animals? **A: R' Pappa** said, "kol miknicha tizachar" is a klal, "shor v'seh" and "chamor" is a prat, which is a klal uprat and therefore only

includes what is listed in the prat – only shor, seh, and chamor are subject to bechor, but other animals are not.

- **R' Yose Haglili** will say that “peter” makes a separation and chamor is therefore not part of the prat. The **Rabanan** say that the “vuv” of “upeter” connects it to the previous pasuk. **R' Yose Haglili** says, if the Torah meant for it to be connected it would not have written “peter” or the “vuv”. The **Rabanan** say, since shor and seh are kedushas haguf and chamor is only kedushas mammon the pasuk made a separation between them with peter. However, the pasuk then connected them with the “vuv” to include chamor in the prat.