



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

Bechoros Daf Chuf Gimmel

- The Gemara has stated that tumah can reawaken other tumah.
 - **Q:** A Mishna regarding parah adumah says, if the parah adumah ashes (which give off tumah when touched or carried) become mixed with regular ashes, we follow the majority of the ashes to decide on tumah – if the majority is of regular ash the mixture does not give off tumah. Now, if tumah has the ability to be “reawakened” that means that the tumah is there the entire time and never really disappears. It makes sense why one does not become tamei by touching it, because we say that he only touched the ashes of the majority. However, why wouldn't he become tamei if he carries the mixture? The parah adumah ashes are still there and have their tumah!? **A:** We have actually learned that **R' Yose the son of R' Chanina** said that the mixture doesn't give off tumah via touching but *does* give off tumah via carrying the mixture.
 - **Q:** We find that **R' Chisda** says that neveila becomes batul in shechted meat since neveila cannot become shechted meat. Now, we can understand why it would become batul and wouldn't give off tumah from touching the mixture, but why would it not give off tumah from carrying the mixture!? **A:** We have actually learned that it does not give off tumah through touching, but would give off tumah through carrying.
 - **Q:** We learned previously that **R' Chiya** taught a Braisa on our Mishna that taught that the “cookie of blood” that contained the disintegrated fetus does not give off tumah by touching it or by carrying it (because it becomes batul in the other contents of that blood). Now, it makes sense that it would not give off tumah though touching it, but why wouldn't it give off tumah through carrying it!? **R' Yirmiya** remained silent in the face of this question. **A:** The Gemara says, maybe the reason it does not give off tumah is because this fetus is a form of putrid and decomposed tumah, which therefore doesn't give off tumah.
 - **Q:** This may be true according to **Bar Padda** who says that stringent tumah (like neveila) only gives off tumah as long as it would still be eaten by a ger, and lenient tumah only gives off tumah for as long as it would still be eaten by a dog – since this is not fit to be eaten by a ger it does not give off tumah. However, according to **R' Yochanan** who says both types of tumah give off tumah for as long as they are fit to be eaten by a dog, this cookie of blood should give off tumah!? This remains a KASHYEH.
 - **Bar Pada** bases his view on the pasuk of “lo sochlu kol neveila lager”, which teaches that only something that is fit for a ger is considered to be neveila. **R' Yochanan** says the pasuk comes to teach regarding meat that was decomposed and not fit for human consumption before the animal even died. **Bar Pada** says, such meat doesn't need a pasuk to teach that it is not neveila, because it is mere dust.
 - **Q:** Our Mishna gave the case of the animal that discharged a “cookie of blood” and a Braisa then said that this blood does not give off any tumah. **R' Yochanan** explained, the reason it gives off no tumah is because the majority of the blood is made of things other than the decomposed fetus. Now, according to what was just said, **R' Yochanan** should say that the reason it doesn't give off tumah is because it was never fit for human consumption!? **A:** If the mother would have been shechted before discharging this cookie of blood, this could have been eaten based on the mother's shechita, and would have in fact been eaten and would therefore have given off tumah. The only reason it

does not give off tumah is because it becomes batul to the other items in the blood.

- A Mishna says, **R' Eliezer ben Yaakov** says, if there is tahor tzir into which fell a small amount of water, it becomes tamei. **R' Nachman in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha** said, we learn from here that an ahm haaretz is suspected of making tzir using 50% water and 50% fish juice (therefore, adding a little more water makes it the majority).
 - **Q:** Why do we need to say that they use 50% water, which along with the added water makes the water the majority? Why not say that they use almost 50% water, which along with the added water will make the mixture to have 50% water, and since it is no longer the minority it cannot become batul!? **A:** That is actually what the Braisa should be understood as saying. **A2:** Tumah of an ahm haaretz is only D'Rabanan, and tumah of liquids is only D'Rabanan. Therefore, the **Rabanan** were only goizer when there is a majority of water in the mixture, but were not goizer when there was only 50% water in the mixture.

MISHNA

- **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** said, if one buys an animal that is nursing a baby animal from a goy, we are not concerned to say that maybe it is not its baby, but it instead is nursing the baby of another animal. Rather, we say it is its own baby and therefore the baby that it has next will be patur from bechor.
- If a person enters his flock and sees that animals that had never yet given birth are now nursing a baby (their babies are certainly bechors) and there are also animals that had already previously given birth which are now nursing new babies (their babies are not bechors), we don't have to be concerned that maybe the babies of one animal went to nurse from another mother. Rather, we say that the baby nursing from each mother is the baby that was just born to that mother (and therefore the baby animals that were nursing from the animals that had never given birth before are bechors, and the ones nursing from animals that had already given birth are not bechors).

GEMARA

- **R' Nachman in the name of Rav** said, the halacha follows all the rulings stated in the Mishnayos of this perek, except when there is a machlokes in the Mishna.
 - **Q:** **R' Sheishes** said, **Rav's** ruling doesn't make sense. He couldn't have said it to teach the halacha in the first Mishna, because that Mishna has a machlokes between **R' Yishmael** and **R' Akiva**! It can't be referring to the ruling of **R' Eliezer ben Yaakov** in the second Mishna, because we have a general rule that the halacha always follows **R' Eliezer ben Yaakov** in the Mishna! It can't be referring to **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** in our Mishna, because there is a Braisa that argues on him! You also can't say that he refers to the ruling of **R' Yose ben Hameshulem** in the later Mishna, because **Rav** already clearly said that the halacha follows **R' Yose ben Hameshulem**! The only other choice is to say that he was referring to the status of the hair of a bechor that has a mum, which is discussed in the last Mishna of the perek. However, that also can't be, because that matter is a matter of machlokes in the Mishna between **Akavya ben Mahalaleil** and the **Rabanan**! **A:** **Rav** made the statement to refer to **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** in our Mishna, and he is teaching that a Braisa is not considered to be a machlokes with what is stated in a Mishna.
 - **Q:** Since **Rav** says that the halacha follows all the rulings of the Mishna except where there is a machlokes, why did he separately have to state that the halacha follows **R' Yose ben Hameshulem**? **A:** If he wouldn't have said that the halacha follows **R' Yose** we would have thought that that is what he meant when he said that the halacha follows all the rulings of the Mishnayos since **R' Yose** states two rulings, and we would have said that he did not refer to the ruling of **R' Shimon** because he is argued on by the Braisa, and an argument from a Braisa is considered to be a full machlokes. Therefore, he separately stated that the halacha follows **R' Yose** and then said the halacha follows the rulings of the Mishnayos, which can't be referring to **R' Yose** (since he already paskened like him) and must instead be referring to **R' Shimon**, which teaches that the machlokes from the Braisa is not considered to be a machlokes for these purposes.

- The Gemara then quotes the Braisa which brings the view of the **Rabanan** who argue on **R' Shimon ben Gamliel**.