



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

Bechoros Daf Chuf Vuv

- The Gemara brought the view of **Reish Lakish** that said that the machlokes in our Mishna is where the wool came from a bechor that was already declared to have a mum by an expert. In that case the **Rabanan** say that the wool is assur as a gezeira so that people not delay the shechting of the bechor to allow for more wool to grow and **Akavya** says it is mutar, because he does not think this gezeira is needed. However, if the wool fell off a bechor that had not been confirmed by an expert as having a mum, all would agree that the wool would remain assur.
 - **Q:** Maybe we can say that **Reish Lakish's** view is actually the subject of a machlokes among Tanna'im. A Braisa says, if one pulls out wool from a bechor without a mum and then shechts it, the wool is assur. If wool was pulled from a bechor that had a mum and the bechor then died, **Akavya ben Mahalaleil** says it is mutar and the **Chachomim** say it is assur. **R' Yehuda** said, that is not the case where **Akavya** said it is mutar. Rather, he was talking about a case where the wool of a bechor with a mum fell out and one put it aside until after the bechor was shechted. It was that case in which **Akavya** said it is mutar and the **Chachomim** said it is assur. **R' Yose** said, my father **Chalafta** (who was from the **Chachomim** that argued on **Akavya**) agreed that in this case the wool would be mutar. Rather, in the case where the bechor was shechted all would agree it is mutar, and it is when the bechor died that **Akavya** said it is mutar and the **Chachomim** said it is assur. Now, **R' Yose** seems to be saying the same thing as the **T"K**! We must say that the difference is whether the mum must have been verified by an expert before the hair was detached from the animal – the **T"K** says it only becomes mutar if this happened after the mum was verified by an expert (which is the view of **Reish Lakish**) and **R' Yose** says it is mutar even if it was not verified by an expert! **A: Rava** said, it may be that all agree that it would only be mutar if the mum was verified by an expert, and there are actually 3 opinions as to the machlokes between **Akavya and the Chachomim** – the **T"K** holds that they argue where the bechor died and where it was shechted, **R' Yehuda** holds that if the bechor died all agree that it is assur and they only argue where the bechor was shechted, and **R' Yose** holds that all agree that where the bechor was shechted it is mutar, and the machlokes is only where the bechor died. However, it may be that all agree with **Reish Lakish**.
 - **R' Nachman** said, the halacha follows **R' Yehuda** (that the machlokes is only where the bechor was shechted) since a Mishna in Mesechta Idiyos follows his view.
 - **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said that our Mishna suggests this as well. The Mishna says, if there is wool that is detached and hanging from a bechor, if it looks like it is part of the rest of the wool it is mutar, but if it does not it is assur. Now, this can't be following **R' Yose**, because according to him if the Braisa is referring to a case where the bechor was shechted then all would agree that in both cases it should be mutar, and if it is referring to where the bechor died, then according to the **Rabanan** it should be assur in both cases and according to **Akavya** the halacha should be that if it looks like part of the rest of the wool it should be assur since the death makes it assur, and if it doesn't look like part of the wool it should be mutar since it was detached before the animal died!? Rather, it must be that the Mishna follows **R' Yehuda**, but it can't be referring to where the animal died, because in that case **Akavya and the Rabanan** would both say that whether it looks like part of the wool or not it is assur! Rather, it must refer to where the bechor

was shechted. Now, if he is stating the view of **Akavya** it should be mutar in both cases. Rather, he must be stating the view of the **Rabanan**, and this proves that **Akavya and the Rabanan** argue in the case of where the bechor was shechted, like **R' Yehuda** said. **SHEMA MINAH.**

- **Q:** What is the halacha if one pulled out wool from an olah that did not have a mum? [Noone says that wool that was purposely pulled out is mutar!? Rather, the question is, what if wool became detached from an olah that didn't have a mum]. With regard to a chatas and an asham, since they are brought for a kappara, there is no concern that people will delay bringing them to allow them to grow more wool, and therefore if they get a mum, are redeemed, and shechted the wool would be mutar. With regard to bechor and maaser also there is no question, since they are not brought for a kapparah we do need to be concerned that people will delay bringing them. The question is regarding an olah, which is primarily brought as a nedavah, but also brings a kapparah for an assei – do we say there is a concern that he would delay in bringing the korbon or not? **A:** The Braisa quoted above said, if one pulls out wool from a bechor that doesn't have a mum, even though it then gets a mum and is shechted, the wool is assur. This implies that the reason it is assur is because it was purposely pulled out, but had it fallen out it would be mutar. If this is true for a bechor, it is certainly true for an olah, for which there is less concern that one would delay its bringing!
 - The Gemara says this is not a valid proof. The Braisa may mean that even if the wool fell out it would be assur. The reason the Braisa gives the case of where it was pulled out is to teach that **Akavya** even allows where it was pulled out if the bechor has a mum.
 - **Q:** The Mishna said that **Akavya** holds it is mutar when it falls out!? **A:** That case was given only to show that the **Rabanan** say it is assur even when it fell out.

TZEMER HAMEDULDAL

- **Q:** What is the case of wool that does not look like it is part of the rest of the wool? **A: R' Elazar in the name of Reish Lakish** said, it is where the roots are turned over, facing the other way. **R' Nosson bar Oshaya** said, it is where the wool is not on the same level as the rest of the wool, but rather sticks out from it.
 - **R' Ila'ah** explained that **Reish Lakish** doesn't hold like **R' Nosson bar Oshaya** because he says that it is not possible to find an animal whose wool is completely level.

HADRAN ALACH PEREK HALOKE'ACH BEHEIMAH!!!

PEREK AHD KAMAH -- PEREK REVI'I

MISHNA

- For how long must a Yisrael care for a bechor before it may be given to the Kohen? With a small animal it is 30 days and with a large animal it is 50 days. **R' Yose** says, for a small animal it is 3 months.
 - If during this time the Kohen told the Yisrael to give him the bechor, he may not give it to him. If the bechor had a mum and the Kohen said "give it to me so that I may eat it", it is mutar to give it to him. If when the Beis Hamikdash was standing there was a bechor without a mum and during the time period (that the Yisrael is obligated to keep it) the Kohen told him "give it to me so that I can bring it as a korbon", it is mutar to give it to him.
 - A bechor must be eaten "year by year", whether it has a mum or not (it must be eaten within the year if it was born with a mum or must be brought as a korbon within a year that it may be brought as a korbon). This is based on the pasuk of "lifnei Hashem Elokecha sochlenu shana b'shana".
 - If it got a mum during its first year it may be kept for the full 12 months. If it got a mum after its first year he is only allowed to keep it for 30 days.

GEMARA

- **Q:** How do we know these different time periods? **A: R' Kahana** said, the pasuk says “milei’ascha v’dimacha lo si’acher bechor banecha titen li, kein taaseh l’shorcha litzonecha”. We darshen it as saying “bechor banecha titen li, kein taaseh...litzonecha”, which teaches that just as one must wait 30 days before redeeming a human bechor he must similarly wait 30 days before giving a small animal to the Kohen. We also darshen it as saying “milei’ascha v’dimacha lo si’acher...kein taaseh l’shorcha”, which teaches that just as bikkurim must wait 50 days the same is true for a large animal bechor.
 - **Q:** Why not say that we learn large animals from a human bechor and a small animal from bikkurim? **A:** It makes sense that the first part of the first pasuk (bikkurim) teaches regarding the first part of the second pasuk (large animals) and that the second part of the first pasuk (human bechor) teaches regarding the second part of the second pasuk (small animals).
 - **Q:** Maybe it makes more sense to darshen the parts of the pesukim that are near each other (and learn large animals from human bechor)!? **A: Rava** said, the pasuk says “taaseh” regarding the large animal (the ox) which teaches that there is an additional amount of waiting for the large animal.
 - **Q:** Maybe say the waiting period should be 60 days!? **A:** The Torah didn’t give a time period and left it to the **Rabanan** to tell us how long it is.
 - A Braisa says like **Rava** and also gives this reason as to why it is not 60 days. **R’ Yose** in the Braisa then says that a small animal must be kept for 3 months, because it is difficult to care for it. A Braisa explains, this is because it has very small teeth and cannot survive without its mother.

IHM AMAR LO HAKOHEN B’TOCH HAZMAN...

- **R’ Sheishes** explains, the reason it may not be given to the Kohen who wants to take it early is because it looks like he is getting it for helping out the owner in return for the bechor (which is why it is assur to give terumah to a Kohen who “helps work the threshing floor”).
 - A Braisa says, it is assur to give Kohanim, Levi’im, or poor people the terumah and maaser in return for their helping with the work, and if one does so he has profaned the terumah and maaser and is even chayuv misah. The **Chachomim** wanted to penalize the person who did this to have to give terumah or maaser a second time [but didn’t end up doing so out of fear that one would separate from something that is patur for something that is chayuv]. However, the Yisrael may have “tovas hana’ah” from the terumah or maaser, for example, he may accept money from another Yisrael in return for giving it to a Kohen of his choosing, although a Kohen could not offer money even to have the terumah given to another Kohen.
 - **Q:** Why wasn’t this “tovas hana’ah” also mentioned as being allowed for the other gifts (a bechor with a mum, the zero’ah, lechayayim, and keiva) that are given to a Kohen? **A:** Terumah cannot be redeemed, and the receiving Kohen will therefore never think it was redeemed and will continue to treat it with the kedusha that it needs to be treated with. However, these other gifts may be redeemed, and the Kohen who saw the Yisrael get money will therefore think they were redeemed and will treat them as such. That is why we don’t allow this to take place.