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

Bechoros Daf Lamed Ches

- The Gemara quoted a Braisa where **Chizkiya the father of Ikesh** said in the name of **R' Gamliel Hazakein**, any earthenware keili that does not have a hollow inside does not have a separate outside, and therefore if the inside becomes tamei the outside becomes tamei as well, and if the outside becomes tamei the inside becomes tamei as well.
    - **Q:** An earthenware keili only becomes tamei from the inside – if it has a hollow inside it can become tamei and if it doesn't it can't!? **A: R' Yitzchak bar Avin** said, what **Chizkiya** meant to say was that any type of earthenware keili that does not have a hollow interior, a comparable type of wooden keili does not have a separate outside, and therefore if the inside becomes tamei the outside becomes tamei as well, and if the outside becomes tamei the inside becomes tamei as well.
        - **Q:** Why does he make the comparison to the earthenware keili altogether? Why not simply say – any wooden keili that does not have a hollow inside does not have a separate outside? **A:** This teaches that if a wooden keili does have a hollow interior it is like an earthenware keili – if the inside becomes tamei the outside becomes tamei as well, and if the inside does not become tamei the outside does not become tamei at all.
            - **Q:** This is true regarding an earthenware keili, based on the pasuk of "tocho", but why would this be true for a wooden keili!? **A:** He was referring to tumah of liquids, which only has the ability to make keilim tamei D'Rabanan. The **Rabanan** treated even a wooden keili like an earthenware keili so that people realize the tumah is only D'Rbanan and that people not burn terumah or kodashim on account of such tumah.
                - **Q:** If so, even if it has no hollow inside we should say that the outside can become tamei without making the inside tamei so as to make sure that people realize it is only tamei D'Rabanan!? **A:** Since they made it clear with the differentiation in the case where there is a hollow inside, it becomes obvious that even when there is no hollow inside it is only D'Rabanan.
        - **Q:** The above suggests that a wooden keili without a hollow inside can become tamei even D'Oraisa. However, we have learned that a keili must be like a sack in order to become tamei – just as a sack can be carried with items in it and can be carried empty, the same must be true of the keili!? **A: Chizkiya** was referring to wooden keilim that can become tamei with tumas medras. This would not be the same for an earthenware keili, because such a keili does not become tamei with tumas medras.
- The Gemara earlier asked regarding the Mishna that discusses the size of the hole that classifies a skull as being incomplete, that the views of **B"S** who say it is the size of a drill, and **B"H** who are explained to say it is the size of a selah , are one and the same. The Gemara answered one answer. **R' Pappa** now says that they are actually not the same size, because **B"S** is referring to a regular drill, and it is only the larger drill that is the size of a selah.
    - **Q:** That doesn't work according to the **Rabanan**, because they say that **B"S** was referring to a large drill!? Also, even according to **R' Meir** (who says he refers to a small drill) this cannot be right, because this would lead to a case of where **B"H** are more machmir than **B"S** and such cases are limited to a list we have, and this is not included on that list!? **A: R' Nachman** said, it is only the Nironis selah that is the same size as the hole of the drill. **B"H** was referring to a regular selah, which is smaller than the hole of a drill.

MISHNA

- If the "ris" of the bechor's eye was punctured, nicked, or split; if there is "dak" (cataracts) in its eye; if there is mixing in the eye; or if there is a "chilazon" growth, a snake growth, or a grape growth in its eye, the bechor becomes mutar for shechita.
    - What is a "mixing in the eye"? It is where the white breaks the barrier and enters the black of the eye. However, if the black breaks the barrier and goes into the white, it is not a mum.

GEMARA

- **R' Pappa** said, the "ris" is the eyelid.

DAK TIVALUL

- A Braisa says that a "dak" that looks sunken in is a mum, but one that looks raised is not.
    - **Q:** A Braisa says the reverse!? **A:** This Braisa is referring to a dak in the black of the eye and that Braisa is referring to a dak in the white of the eye.
        - **Q:** We have a rule that there are no mumin in the white of the eye!? **A:** Rather, one Braisa refers to a white dak and the other refers to a black dak. In fact, we find that **Rabbah bar bar Chana** said that **R' Yoshiya of Usha** told him that a black dak that looks sunken is a mum and one that looks raised is not, and a white dak that looks sunken is not a mum and one that looks raised is.

CHILAZON NACHASH V'EINAV

- **Q:** Does the Mishna mean to say that the "chilazon" mum is the same thing as the "nachash" mum, or does it mean that they are two different things and are both mumin? **A:** We have learned that **Rabbah bar bar Chana** said, **R' Yonason ben Elazar** told me that he heard from **R' Shimon ben Yose ben Likunya** that the chilazon is a mum that allows a bechor to be shechted, and it is the nachash mum that is spoken about by the **Chachomim**.

EIZEHU TIVALUL LAVAN HAPOSEIK ES HASIRAH

- Our Mishna follows **R' Yose** of a Braisa. The Braisa says, **R' Meir** says whether the white goes into the black or visa-versa it is a mum. **R' Yose** says, when the white goes into the black it is a mum, but the reverse is not, because there is no mum in the white of the eye.

MISHNA

- If there are white dots in the eye or if the eye waters excessively in a permanent fashion, it is a mum.
    - What are white dots that are considered to be permanent? Dots that have lasted for 80 days. **R' Chanina ben Antignas** says, we check it 3 times within the 80 days.
    - Excessive watering of the eye is considered permanent as follows: if the animal ate moist and dry food from a rain watered field, or if it ate moist and dry food from an irrigated field, or if it ate dry and then moist food, and was still not healed, it is not considered to be permanent. If it ate the moist food first and afterwards ate the dry food and this condition continues to exist, it is then considered to be permanent.

GEMARA

- Our Mishna follows the view of **R' Yehuda** in a Braisa, where he says that white dots are considered to be permanent when they have lasted for 80 days, and excessive watering of the eyes is considered to be permanent only when it eats moist food and then dry food from a rain-watered field for 3 months and the condition has still not healed.
    - **Q:** Our Mishna seems to say that produce of a rain-watered and of an irrigated field can serve as the basis for healing this condition, whereas **R' Yehuda** seems to say that only the produce of a rain-watered field can do so!? **A:** The Braisa is missing words, and it should say that **R' Yehuda** holds like the Mishna, that the produce of a rain-watered *and* of an irrigated field can serve as the basis for healing this condition.
    - **Q:** We find that **R' Idi bar Avin in the name of R' Yitzchak bar Ashyan** said that the animal is given moist food during Adar and Nissan and dry food during Elul and Tishrei, which is a total of 4 months, not 3 like the Braisa says!? **A:** We must say that he means Adar and half of Nissan, and Elul and half of Tishrei.
        - **Q:** Must it be given moist produce during the months when the produce is moist and dry during the months that the produce is dry or can it be given moist and

dry during the months that produce is moist? **A:** We see from **R' Idi bar Avin in the name of R' Yitzchak bar Ashyan** that it must be moist in the moist months and dry in the dry months.

- This is not a valid proof. He may mean that we must give the produce of Elul and Tishrei in Adar and Nisson.

- **Q:** How much must be fed to the animal? **A: R' Yochanan in the name of R' Pinchas ben Aruva** said, the amount of a dried fig.
  - **Rava** said, in EY they asked whether this amount must only be given at the animal's first meal each day or must it be given at every meal? If we say only before the first meal, is it to be eaten before the meal or even after? Before the meal it should definitely help – like medicine, but what about after the meal? Must it be eaten before it drinks anything or after drinking? Before drinking it should definitely help – like it eats barley before drinking, but what about after drinking? Must it eat it when it is tied down or when it is free to walk around? When it is free it is certainly good for it, but what about when it is tied down? Must it eat it when it is alone or when it is with other animals? With other animals it is certainly good for it, but what about when it is alone? Must it eat it when it is in the city or out in the field? It is certainly good for it when it is out in the field, but what about when it is in the city? **R' Ashi** asked, if we say it must be eaten when out in the field, what about if it is in a garden that is close to the city? **TEIKU**.

R' CHANANYA BEN ANTIGNUS OMER…

- **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, these 3 examinations must be made by dividing the 80 days into thirds.
- **R' Pinchas the brother of Shmuel** asked **Shmuel**, if the treatment was given and it didn't help (thereby proving that the mum is permanent), is it considered to be a mum retroactively or only from this point forward? The difference is whether one can be oiver for me'ilah for using the redemption money used to redeem a korbon with this condition before the 80 days have passed – if it is a mum retroactively then he is oiver me'ilah, but if it is only going forward then he is not oiver me'ilah. What is the halacha? **Shmuel** answered with a pasuk to show that he thought highly of his brother for asking such a sharp question, for which he had no answer.