



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

Bechoros Daf Tes Vuv

AVAL KADAM HEKDEISHAN...

- **Q:** How do we know this? **A:** A Braisa says, the pasuk regarding a korbán that got a mum and was redeemed says it is like a "tzvi" (a deer). This teaches that just as a deer is patur from bechor, a passul korbán that was redeemed is also patur from bechor. We would think to exclude them from bechor but not from the gifts. The pasuk then says this animal is like an "ayul" which teaches that just as an "ayul" is patur from bechor and from the gifts, a passul korbán that was redeemed is also patur from bechor and from the gifts. Maybe we should say that just as the cheilev of a deer and an ayul are mutar the same should be true for a passul korbán that was redeemed? The pasuk therefore says "ach", which limits the comparison.
 - **Q:** Why would we think it is more likely to exclude them from bechor than from the gifts? **A:** Bechor doesn't apply to all animals (it only applies to firstborns) whereas the gifts do. Therefore it would be logical to exclude them from bechor before excluding them from the gifts.
 - **R' Pappa** asked **Abaye**, if we are taught to compare the redeemed animals to a deer and an ayul, we should say that just as oso v'es beno doesn't apply to a deer and ayul, it should also not apply to the redeemed animals!? **Abaye** said, whether you want to consider the redeemed animals to be like kodashim or like chullin the halacha of oso v'es beno will apply, therefore we will not say that it doesn't apply (we only compare to these chayos in regard to a characteristic that they share with kodashim). **R' Pappa** asked, if so, we should say the same thing regarding the cheilev, and yet the Tanna said that we need the pasuk of "ach" to teach that this comparison should not be made! Rather, we can say that "ach" also teaches that the comparison should also not be made for purposes of oso v'es beno either.
 - **Rava** said, that "ach" teaches that we don't compare the redeemed animals to the deer and ayul for purposes of oso v'es beno. We learn not to make the comparison for purposes of cheilev from the pasuk that says that we may not eat the blood of the redeemed animals. Now, even if it is like a deer its blood is assur! Rather, it must be referring to cheilev, and teaches that the cheilev of the redeemed animals may not be eaten. The reason the pasuk refers to cheilev as blood instead of simply as cheilev is so that we not think that the comparison to a deer removes the kares penalty from eating the cheilev of the redeemed animals.
 - **Q:** The Braisa said that "ach" teaches that the cheilev of the redeemed animals remains assur, so how can **Rava** say that "ach" teaches regarding oso v'es beno? **A:** The Braisa means to say, if the pasuk would not have said "blood" we would say that "ach" teaches that the cheilev is still assur. Now that the pasuk says that the "blood" (which we understand to refer to the cheilev) is assur, we can say that "ach" teaches that oso v'es beno is assur as well.

V'EINAN YOTZIN L'CHULLIN

- **Q:** How do we know this? **A:** A Braisa says that the pasuk that permits the redeemed animal to be eaten is darshened as follows: "tizbach" – it may be shechted but not shorn, "basar" – you may eat its meat but not its milk, "v'achalta" – you may eat it yourself but may not feed it to your dogs. From here we learn that one may not redeem kodashim to be fed to dogs. **Others** say that "tizbach v'achalta" teaches that it is only mutar for consumption after the shechita (but shearing and milking would be assur), however it is mutar to be redeemed to be fed to dogs.

- **Q:** What is the case? If they became pregnant and gave birth after the redemption why would they be assur? They should be no different than the offspring of a deer!? **A:** Rather, the case is that they became pregnant before the redemption and gave birth after the redemption.
- **Q:** The Mishna implies that if the offspring was born before the mother's redemption they would actually be kadosh. How do we know this? **A:** A Braisa says, the pasuk regarding a shelamim says "zachar" which teaches that the offspring of a shelamim is kadosh like a shelamim, and the word "nikeiva" teaches that the temurah of a shelamim is kadosh like a shelamim. The words "ihm" written before zachar and before nikeiva teach that this is even true for the offspring and temurah of a blemished shelamim.
- **Q:** What is to be done with the offspring that is born after the redemption (they can't be brought as a korbon and can't be sold)? With regard to offspring born before the redemption there is a machlokes – one view is that they may be brought as a korbon and one view is that they are left to graze until they get a mum and are then redeemed themselves. What is the done with the ones born after the mother's redemption? **A:** **R' Huna** said, they are brought into a room and left to die. This is because they can't be offered as a korbon, because they come from a kedusha that has been rejected, and for this reason their kedusha is not even strong enough to allow for their own redemption.
 - In EY they said in the name of **R' Chanina** that right before we redeem the mother the owner should make the fetus kadosh for the same type of korbon that the mother was made kadosh for. When this is done, the mother's redemption doesn't help for it and when it is born it may be redeemed for itself.
- **Q:** Why does the Mishna hold that such offspring are assur? Why don't they become mutar to be eaten with the mother's redemption? **A:** **R' Levi** said, it is a gezeira that if this was allowed people would allow these passul korbanos to linger around so that they can produce offspring, and this lingering would increase the chance that someone would work with or shear the passul korbanos.
- **Ravina** asked **R' Sheishes**, when the fetus is made kadosh before the redemption of the mother (as suggested by **R' Chanina**, above), must it only be made kadosh for the same korbon as was the mother or can it be made kadosh for a different korbon? **R' Sheishes** said, it must be done only for the same type of korbon as the mother. He said this is learned from a gezeira shava on the word "bisharecha" from bechor, which teaches that just as a bechor cannot be designated as any korbon that the owner wants, the same is true for these animals.
 - There is a Braisa that says like **R' Sheishes**. The Braisa says, with regard to kodashim that got a mum before they were made kadosh and were then redeemed, they are chayuv in bechor and the gifts, before and after the redemption one who shears or works with them will not get malkus, before and after their redemption they cannot create a temurah, they are subject to me'ilah before their redemption but not after it, their offspring born after the redemption are chullin and the ones born before their redemption can be redeemed even without a mum and can be designated as any type of korbon. The general rule is, that these animals are considered to be completely chullin, with the only mitzvah being to redeem them and use the proceeds for korbanos. With regard to kodashim that got a mum after they were made kadosh or that had a temporary mum before they were made kadosh and then got a permanent mum and were then redeemed, they are patur from bechor and the gifts, before and after the redemption one who shears or works with them will get malkus, before and after their redemption they can create a temurah, they are subject to me'ilah before their redemption but not after it, their offspring are kodesh and cannot be redeemed without a mum and cannot be designated as any type of korbon (other than that of the mother). The general rule is, that these animals are considered to be completely kodesh, with the only thing being mutar is the allowance to eat them.
 - The "general rule" given in the first part of the Braisa comes to include that one who shechts them outside the Azarah would be patur, and the "general rule" of the second part of the Braisa comes to include its milk and to teach that it is assur.
 - **Q:** The Braisa implies in the second half that the offspring can be redeemed when they have a mum and can be designated for the same type of korbon as

the mother. This seems to refute **R' Huna** who said that such offspring must be left to die!? **A: R' Huna** would say that the second part of the Braisa says "they cannot be redeemed without a mum" and "cannot be designated for any korbbon that the owner chooses" only because the first part of the Braisa said that they can. It is not meant to imply that they can be redeemed with a mum and can be designated for the korbbon of the mother.