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

Bechoros Daf Lamed Daled

- **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said that we pasken like **R' Shimon**.
    - **Q: R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** asked, which view of **R' Shimon** is he referring to? It can't be the view of **R' Shimon** in our Mishna where he says that it is mutar to let the blood and make the mum but doesn't say that it becomes mutar for shechita with that mum, because **Shmuel** has already said elsewhere that the halacha follows **R' Shimon** that an unintended act is mutar!? **A:** Rather, he is referring to **R' Shimon** of the Braisa, where he says that it even becomes mutar to shecht that bechor on account of that mum.
        - **R' Shisha the son of R' Idi** said explicitly that **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, the halacha follows **R' Shimon** of the Braisa.

MISHNA

- If a person makes a mum in the ear of a bechor, **R' Eliezer** says this bechor may never be shechted. The **Chachomim** say, if it later gets another mum it may be shechted based on that other mum.

GEMARA

- **Q:** Does **R' Eliezer** really make a penalty that it may never be shechted? A Mishna says, if someone cut off a tzaraas from his body (which is assur to do), if it was done unintentionally he becomes tahor. If it was done intentionally, **R' Eliezer** says that if he later gets another tzaraas and becomes tahor from that one, he will become tahor from the first one as well. The **Chachomim** say that he remains tamei until a new tzaraas spreads all over his body. At that time he becomes tahor from the first one. We see that **R' Eliezer** does not penalize forever!? **A: Rabbah and R' Yosef** both said, **R' Eliezer** only penalizes in monetary matters (since a person would inflict a mum on a bechor to try to allow him to shecht it), not in matters involving his body (he would not risk cutting off a tzaraas if the only way he can become tahor is by getting another tzaraas). **A2: Rava** said, the contradiction of **R' Eliezer** is answered. The contradiction of the **Rabanan** can be answered by saying that the **Rabanan** are consistent in penalizing regarding the thing that he tried to do. Therefore, regarding the bechor they penalize that the mum he inflicted cannot serve as the basis of allowing it to be shechted, and regarding the tzaraas they penalize that the cutting off of the tzaraas does not make it that that tzaraas is no longer tamei.
    - **Q: R' Pappa** asked, does **R' Eliezer** say he becomes tahor as soon as the second tzaraas appears, or is it only when he becomes tahor from the second tzaraas that he then becomes tahor from the first tzaraas as well? The practical difference between these two would be for a chosson who developed his second tzaraas during sheva brachos, or to a person who developed the second tzaraas on Yom Tov, in which case we don't examine tzaraas during sheva brachos or Yom Tov. If this person had earlier cut off another tzaraas, then if he becomes tahor with the appearance of the new tzaraas then he is tahor, but if he only becomes tahor when he becomes tahor from the new tzaraas, he is still tamei. What is the halacha? **TEIKU**.
- **Q: R' Yirmiya** asked **R' Zeira**, if someone made a mum in a bechor and the person then died, would we penalize his son (who inherits the bechor from him) as well and not allow him to shecht this bechor? Even if we say that if one sells his slave to a goy and then died we do penalize his son, that is because every day that slave is prevented from doing mitzvos. Even if we say that if someone planned to do work on chol hamoed and then died we allow his son to do the work to prevent a loss, that may be because the father didn't actually do an issur. The question is regarding bechor – did the **Rabanan** only penalize the person who made the mum and he is no longer alive, or did the **Rabanan** penalize the person's property and that still exists

and therefore it still applies? **A: R' Zeira** said, a Mishna regarding shmitta says that if one improved his field during shmitta it is assur to plant it after shmitta. **R' Yose the son of R' Chanina** said that we have a kabbalah that if he died his son may plant the field after shmitta. We see that the **Rabanan** penalize the person and not the property. The same should be true regarding the case of the bechor.

- **Abaye** said, we have a kabbalah that if one made tamei the taharos of another person and then died, the **Rabanan** did not penalize his son to have to pay for that damage. The reason is that an unrecognizable damage is not considered to be a damage at all, and it is only a penalty of the **Rabanan** that requires one to pay for such damage. The **Rabanan** only instituted this penalty for the person, not for his son.