



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

Bechoros Daf Yud Daled

MISHNA

- All kodashim animals that had a permanent mum before they were made kodesh and were then redeemed are subject to the laws of bechor and of "the gifts", they return to their chullin status as being permitted to be shorn and to be put to work, their offspring and their milk become mutar – all this is true after it was redeemed – one who shechts them outside the Azarah is patur, they can no longer be subject to temurah, and they may even be redeemed after they die. This applies to all kodashim animals except a bechor and maaser.
- All kodashim animals that got a permanent mum after they were made kadosh or got a temporary mum even before they were made kadosh and were then redeemed, are not subject to the laws of bechor and of "the gifts", they do not return to their chullin status as being permitted to be shorn and to be put to work, their offspring and their milk do not become mutar, one who shechts them outside the Azarah is chayuv, they can still be subject to temurah, and if they die they must be buried.

GEMARA

- The Mishna says they become subject to bechor and the gifts only because they were redeemed. It implies that if they were not redeemed they would be patur from bechor and the gifts. The Mishna must hold that monetary kedusha is enough to prevent an animal from being subject to bechor and to the gifts.

V'YOTZIN LACHULLIN...

- The reason that they may be shorn and worked is that they were redeemed. This implies that if they were not redeemed they would be assur to be shorn and worked. This supports **R' Elazar**, who says that even kadshei bedek habayis are assur to be shorn or worked.
 - The Gemara says this is no proof. It may be that the Mishna is discussing animals with monetary kedusha whose value will be used for the Mizbe'ach. It is such animals that we are concerned will lead to confusion with animals with physical kedusha for the Mizbe'ach, and that is why the **Rabanan** are goizer in this case. However, it may be that animals of bedek habayis are not be assur to be shorn or worked at all.

VLADAN VACHALAVAN MUTAR...

- What is the case? If the offspring were conceived and born after the redemption it is obvious that they are mutar, because at that point the animals were fully chullin!? Rather, it must be that they were conceived before the redemption and were born after the redemption. This would suggest that if they were born before the redemption they would be assur until the offspring themselves are redeemed as well.
 - **Q:** Can these offspring be redeemed even if they don't have a mum or only once they have a mum? **A:** A Braisa clearly says that since the mother did not have physical kedusha the offspring can be redeemed without having a mum of its own, so that the "tafel" (the offspring) not be treated more stringently than the "ikar" (the mother).
 - This suggests that if not for this reason it would get full kedusha. This supports **Rava** who says that if one gives an unblemished male ram for its monetary value it would get physical kedusha.

V'HASHOCHTAN BACHUTZ PATUR

- **R' Elazar** had a version of the Mishna that said that one is chayuv for offering this animal with the mum outside the Azarah and said it refers to one who offered it on a private bamah. For we find that **R' Elazar** said, how do we know that one who shechts an animal with a mum on a private bamah at a time when private bamos may be used, that he is oiver a lo saasei? It is based on the pasuk of "lo sizbach laHashem Elokecha shor vaseh". This is not needed to teach

regarding a public bamah, because we have another pasuk that says “averes oy shavur...”. Therefore, this pasuk must be teaching regarding a private bamah.

- **Q:** Maybe instead say that if the pasuk of “lo sizbach” is not needed for a regular korbon it comes to teach regarding a bechor that it may not be offered on a public bamah if it has a mum? We would have thought that since a bechor is kadosh even when it has a mum it can be offered even when it has a mum and the pasuk is therefore needed to teach that it may not be offered!? **A:** There is a pasuk that specifically already says this regarding a bechor – “pise’ach oy iveir...lo sizbachenu”.
- **Q:** Maybe instead say that if the pasuk of “lo sizbach” is not needed for a regular korbon it comes to teach regarding animal maser, that it may not be offered on a public bamah if it has a mum? We would have thought that since maaser is kadosh even when it has a mum it can be offered even when it has a mum and the pasuk is therefore needed to teach that it may not be offered!? **A:** We learn maaser from bechor that it may not be offered with a mum, so the pasuk is not needed for that.
- **Q:** Maybe instead say that if the pasuk of “lo sizbach” is not needed for a regular korbon it comes to teach regarding a temurah that it may not be offered on a public bamah if it has a mum? We would have thought that since a temurah is kadosh even when it has a mum it can be offered even when it has a mum and the pasuk is therefore needed to teach that it may not be offered!? **A:** The pasuk regarding temurah says “v’haya hu usmuraso”, which creates a hekesh between the initial korbon and the temurah, which teaches that just as the initial korbon may not be offered when it has a mum, the same is true for the temurah. Therefore, the pasuk is not needed for that.
- **Q:** **R’ Zeira** asked, maybe instead say that if the pasuk of “lo sizbach” is not needed for a regular korbon it comes to teach regarding the offspring of a korbon that it may not be offered on a public bamah if it has a mum? We would have thought that since it becomes kadosh even when it has a mum based on the kedusha of its mother, it can be offered even when it has a mum and the pasuk is therefore needed to teach that it may not be offered!? **A:** **Rava** said, the **Tana Divei R’ Yishmael** already set the rule from a pasuk – “rak kadashecha” refers to the temurah, “asher yihiyu lecha” refers to the offspring, “undarecha” creates a hekesh to a neder and teaches that just as a neder may not be offered with a mum, so too these may not be offered when they have a mum.

V’EIN OSIN TEMURAH

- This is based on the pasuk of “lo yachlifenu v’lo yamir oso tov b’rah oy rah b’tov”. Now, if a bad animal may not be replaced with a good one, it is obvious that a good one may not be replaced with a bad one! Rather, the pasuk means to say that if the animal is “good” in the beginning (i.e. it doesn’t have a mum) it can create a temurah, but if it is “bad” (it has a mum) in the beginning it cannot create a temurah.

IHM MEISU YIPADU

- **R’ Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, this is the view of **R’ Shimon**, who says only kadshei Mizbe’ach must stand and be assessed before being redeemed, but kodshei bedek habayis don’t have that requirement. He says this in a Mishna where he argues with the **Chachomim**, but the Mishna says that he agrees that even kodshei Mizbe’ach that had a mum when it was made kadosh does not have this requirement, because the pasuk says “osah”, which excludes an animal with a mum from the very beginning from having this requirement.
 - The **Chachomim** say that such an animal would have to be buried (it cannot be redeemed because it cannot stand and be assessed). The view of these **Chachomim** is the view of the **Tanna Divei Levi**, who teach a Braisa that even an animal with a mum from the very beginning is subject to this requirement.
 - **Q:** This suggests that the **Chachomim** that argue with **R’ Shimon** in the Mishna would hold that if an animal had a mum before it was made kadosh and then died it may still be redeemed. If so, instead of **R’ Yehuda in the name of Rav** saying that the Mishna follows the view of **R’ Shimon**, he should say that it follows the view of **R’ Shimon** and the **Chachomim** who argue with him!? **A:** **Rav** holds like **Reish Lakish** who said that the requirement that the animal be able to stand and be assessed in order to be redeemed

only applies to bedek habayis and not to kodshei Mizbe'ach. Therefore, our Mishna can't follow this **Rabanan**, because it says that kodshei Mizbe'ach that died must be buried.

- **Q:** Maybe the reason the Mishna says it must be buried is because it holds that it may be redeemed, but that we may not redeem kodashim for the purpose of feeding it to the dogs!? **A:** If that is the reason the Mishna should have said, if they became a treifa they must be buried (even though it is still alive and can stand and be assessed it could not be redeemed because it may not be redeemed to be fed to the dogs). Since the Mishna gives the example of the animal that died, it must be that the issue is that it cannot stand and be assessed.
- We can also say that **Rav** really holds like **R' Yochanan** (that kodshei Mizbe'ach are subject to the requirement that the animal be able to stand and be assessed in order to be redeemed). And, in fact we should change **Rav's** statement to say that the Mishna follows the view of **R' Shimon** and the **Chachomim** who argue with him.