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

Bechoros Daf Lamed Gimmel

MISHNA

- **B"S** say that a Yisrael may not be invited to eat the bechor with a mum together with the Kohen. **B"H** say that even a goy may eat from the bechor.

GEMARA

- Our Mishna follows the view of **R' Akiva** of a Braisa. The Braisa says, **B"S** say that only Kohanim may eat from a bechor that had a mum, but **B"H** say that even non-Kohanim may do so. **R' Akiva** said that **B"H** say that even a goy may eat from such a bechor.
    - The view of **B"S** is based on the pasuk that compares a bechor to the chazeh v'shok of a shelamim – just as the chazek v'shok may only be eaten by Kohanim, the same is true for the bechor. **B"H** say that the comparison is regarding a bechor that does not have a mum. Once the bechor has a mum the pasuk says "hatamei v'hatahor yachdav yochlenu". Now, if a tamei Kohen, who may not eat kodashim kalim, may eat the bechor, then certainly a non-Kohen, who may eat kodashim kalim, may eat from a bechor!
        - We can ask that a tamei Kohen is different, because he may do the Avodah for the tzibbur? **B"H** would say that although he may at times do the Avodah, we never find that he may eat kodashim. A non-Kohen may eat things that a tamei Kohen may not and therefore it makes sense that the non-Kohen may eat the bechor.
    - **R' Akiva** says that a goy may eat from it, because the pasuk says the bechor is "katzvi v'cha'ayal" and it therefore is mutar for a goy just like a deer. The **T"K** uses the three times the pasuk says "katzvi v'cha'ayal" for different drashos, and therefore they are not available for this drahsa of **R' Akiva**.
- A Braisa says, **B"S** said that a bechor may not be eaten by niddos, but **B"H** said that it may.
    - **B"S**'s view is based on the fact that the Torah compares the bechor to the shelamim – just as a niddah may not eat a shelamim she may not eat a bechor. **B"H** say, that comparison is regarding an animal that doesn't have a mum – once it has a mum the pasuk says "hatamei v'hatahor yochlenu". **B"S** say, that pasuk allows one who is tamei to eat the bechor only when it is a tumah that did not emanate from their body. We find this difference in types of tumah regarding the bringing of a Korbon Pesach when tamei – which even then may not be done by one who is tamei with a tumah that emanates from their body. **B"H** say that is true for the Korbon Pesach, because the pasuk specifically says only a "tmei nefesh" may bring the Pesach.
    - A Braisa says, we may not skin an animal from the feet on Yom Tov. Similarly, we may not skin a bechor from the feet (even if it has a mum) and we may not skin a passul korbon (that was redeemed) from the feet.
        - **Q:** It makes sense that this may not be done on Yom Tov, because it involves doing work that is not needed for Yom Tov. Why is it assur to be done to a bechor? **A: R' Chisda** said, this is the view of **B"S** who say that a niddah may not eat a bechor (which shows that it has kedusha, and for that same reason may not be skinned from the feet).
        - **Q:** Who is the view that says that this also applies to a passul korbon? **A: R' Chisda** said it is the view of **R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon**, who says regarding a chatas that had a mum, that even if it was shechted before the owner brought another animal for his kapparah, it becomes assur when the blood of the actual chatas is applied (at that point the one with the mum is a chatas whose owner

has achieved a kapparah through other means). We see that he holds that even after the shechita it retains the kedusha of a chatas.
    - **Q:** Why couldn't **R' Chisda** say that the entire Braisa follows the view of **B"S**? **A:** We can say that **B"S** only says that regarding bechor which becomes kadosh from the womb, but not for other passul kodashim.
    - **Q:** Why couldn't **R' Chisda** say that the entire Braisa follows the view of **R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon**? **A:** We can say that **R' Elazar** only says that regarding passul korbanos, because their kedusha is strong enough to allow for a redemption, but the kedusha of a bechor which is not as strong maybe doesn't have kedusha after the shechita.
    - **Q:** Does **R' Elazar** not hold of our Mishna which allows a passul korbon to be sold even in the market since it benefits hekdesh, which would seem to similarly allow a passul korbon to be skinned from the feet!? **A: R' Mari the son of R' Kahana** said, skinning like that ruins the meat, therefore it is not considered to be a benefit for hekdesh.
    - In EY in the name of **Ravina** they said that the reason it may not be skinned from the feet is because it looks like one is doing work with the animal.
    - **R' Yose bar Avin** said, the reason it may not be skinned from the feet is because it would entice people to keep the animal alive, which would have them produce more animals and lead to issurim.

MISHNA

- If a bechor had "too much blood" (and it must have blood let from it), **R' Yehuda** says even if it will die if left untreated, we may not let blood from it. The **Chachomim** say we may let its blood as long as he does not make a mum. If he did make a mum, he may not shecht it based on that mum. **R' Shimon** says we may let its blood even if he will make a mum by doing so.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, if an animal bechor had a life-threatening blood condition which could be healed by letting blood from it, **R' Meir** says we may only let blood in a way that would not make a mum in it (even though it is currently in a life-threatening situation and is therefore already a baal mum). The **Chachomim** say that we may let blood even if it will cause a mum, as long as we don't remove it from kedusha and allow the Kohen to eat it based on the mum that we have created. **R' Shimon** says we may even allow the bechor to be eaten by the Kohen based on this mum caused by the blood letting. **R' Yehuda** says, even if the bechor will die if left untreated, we may not let blood from it to heal it.
    - **R' Elazar** (or **R' Chiya**) told his son, the machlokes in this Braisa is like the machlokes in a Mishna regarding terumah. The Mishna says, if terumah wine became safek tamei, **R' Eliezer** says, even though it may no longer be eaten one must take measures to prevent it from becoming definitely tamei. **R' Yehoshua** says it may be made definitely tamei (so that it can at least be used for sprinkling). **R' Gamliel** says it may not be made tamei but it need not be protected from becoming tamei. It would seem that **R' Meir** holds like **R' Eliezer**, that the **Rabanan** hold like **R' Yehoshua**, and that **R' Yehuda** holds like **R' Gamliel**.
        - The Gemara says this may not be a valid comparison. It may be that **R' Meir** holds that way regarding bechor, because he is causing the mum with his hands, but regarding the wine he may agree with **R' Yehoshua** that it is permitted since it is being done in an indirect way (he moves it to a place where it will likely become tamei). Also, maybe **R' Eliezer** holds that way regarding the terumah, because Eliyahu may come and tell us whether it is actually tamei, but in the case of the bechor which will die if left untreated he may agree with the **Rabanan**! The same can be said for the **Rabanan**, that they may agree with **R' Eliezer** in the case of terumah, because Eliyahu may come and tell us whether it is tamei! Also, it may be that **R' Yehuda** says it is assur by bechor, because it is being done by the person's hands, but in the case of terumah, where it is only indirect, maybe he agrees with **R' Yehoshua**! Also, maybe **R' Gamliel** only holds that way regarding terumah, because Eliyahu may come and tell us whether it is

tamei, but in the case of bechor, since it will die if left untreated, maybe he agrees with the **Rabanan**!

- Also, we find that the machlokes regarding bechor is based on how to darshen pesukim and that the machlokes regarding terumah is based on how to darshen other pesukim. We learned, **R' Chiya bar Abba in the name of R' Yochanan** said, all these Tanna'im would agree that in the case of one who processes a chametz mincha after another person has already processed the chametz mincha, the person would be chayuv, because the pasuk says "lo sei'aseh chametz" and also says "lo sei'afeh chametz". All these Tanna'im would also agree that if one castrates an already castrated animal more severely than it was already castrated, he would be chayuv, because the pasuk says "uma'uch, v'kasus, v'nasuk, v'karus", which teaches that one is chayuv for the latter even if the previous was already done. **R' Meir and the Chachomim** only argue in the case of the Braisa, because **R' Meir** holds that the pasuk of "kol mum lo yihiyeh bo" teaches that it is absolutely always assur to make a mum in the animal, even if there was already a mum there, whereas the **Rabanan** hold that the pasuk of "tamim yihiyeh l'ratzon" teaches that it is only assur to make a mum if the animal was a "tamim", but if it already had a mum anyway, the issur to make a mum would not apply.
    - **Q:** How does **R' Meir** darshen the pasuk of "tamim yihiyeh l'ratzon"? **A:** He uses it to teach that an animal that was *born* with a mum is not subject to the issur of making a mum in it.
    - **Q:** An animal born with a mum can never be made kodesh, so it is obvious that there would be no issur to make a mum in it!? **A:** Rather, he uses it to teach that the issur does not apply to a korbon that became passul and was then redeemed from kodesh. We would think that since it remains assur to be shorn or worked it is also assur to make a mum in it. The pasuk therefore teaches that the issur does not apply.
    - **Q:** How do the **Rabanan** darshen the pasuk of "kol mum lo yihiyeh bo"? **A:** They use it to teach that one may not even indirectly cause a mum – for example, by putting dough on the animal's ear, causing a dog to come and bite it, thereby making a mum in the ear.
- We also learned that **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said that the machlokes regarding terumah is based on how to darshen the pasuk of "es mishmeres terumosai".
- For all these reasons the Gemara remains that the comparison of the machlokes regarding bechor and terumah are not comparable.