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

Bechoros Daf Lamed Tes

MISHNA

- If the bechor's nose was punctured, nicked, or split, or if its lip was punctured, nicked, or split, the bechor becomes mutar for shechita.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, if the nostrils were punctured one into the other – if the hole is on the outside it is a mum, but if it is on the inside it is not a mum.

SIFASO SHENIKVA…

- **R' Pappa** said, this is only if it is on the outer edge of its lip.

MISHNA

- If the front gums were nicked or cut (it is a mum), and if the back gums were uprooted (it is a mum). **R' Chanina ben Antignas** says, we don't examine the gums from the point of the molars and within, and also not the gums underneath the molars themselves.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, what are the molars? It is from the molars and within, and the area of the molars themselves are like the area further in. **R' Yehoshua ben Kefutzai** says, we only shecht a bechor for a mum on its front gums. **R' Chanina ben Antignas** said, we do not bother with the molars at all.
    - **Q:** What is the Braisa saying? Also, **R' Yehoshua** seems to be saying the same thing as the **T"K**!? **A:** The Braisa is missing words and should say – what are the inner gums? It is the area from the molars and within, and the area of the molars is considered like that area within. Now, this area is not considered a mum only if it is nicked or cut, but if it is uprooted we would shecht the bechor based on that. **R' Yehoshua ben Kefutzai** says, we only shecht a bechor for a mum on its front gums. Although we can't shecht a bechor even if its back gums are uprooted, it does make it passul to be brought as a korbon. **R' Chanina ben Antignas** said, we do not bother with the molars at all, and they would not even make the animal passul as a korbon.
- **Q: R' Achdevai bar Ami** asked, is there significance if an animal is missing an internal organ?
    - **Q:** He can't be asking for purposes of bechor or a korbon, because we learn from the pesukim that only exposed mumin count for them!? **A:** It certainly is not a mum to allow a bechor to be shechted or to allow a korbon to be redeemed. The question is whether it makes an animal passul to be brought on the Mizbe'ach – does the pasuk of "tamim" teach that a missing organ makes it passul or does the comparison of "tamim" to "kol mum" teach that that is only for external mumin? **A2:** A Braisa says, the pasuk of "v'eis shtei haklayos" teaches that if it has only one kidney or 3 kidneys it is passul as a korbon. Another Braisa says that the pasuk of "yisirena" teaches to include an animal that has only one kidney. Maybe we can say that both Braisos hold there is no animal that when healthy has only one kidney and the machlokes is that one Braisa holds a missing internal organ makes it passul and the other holds that it does not!
        - **R' Chiya bar Yosef** said, it may be that all agree that there is such a thing as an animal that is only supposed to have one kidney, and all agree that a missing internal organ makes it passul. The Braisa that says it is valid is referring to an animal that only had one kidney all along and the Braisa that says it is passul is referring to an animal that had two kidneys and is now missing one.

- **Q:** The first Braisa can't be referring to where it had two kidneys and lost one, because it also says that it is passul if it had 3 kidneys. Now, just as the case of 3 kidneys is where it was like that from birth, the case of one kidney must likewise be where it was like that from birth!? **A:** Rather, the machlokes must be whether we say that there is such a thing as an animal that is born with one kidney. The second Braisa says there is such a thing and the first Braisa holds there is no such thing and that the fact that it now has only one must mean that it lost one at some point.

▪ **R' Yochanan** said, both Braisos hold that there is no animal that is supposed to have only one kidney, and they both hold that missing an internal organ is considered to be something that is missing. The first Braisa is discussing where it lost its kidney before the shechita and the second Braisa is discussing where it lost its kidney after the shechita.

- **Q:** If it lost a kidney after the shechita, but before the kabbalah, would it be mutar to be offered? **R' Zeira in the name of Rav** darshened a pasuk to teach that such an animal could not be offered!? **A:** Rather, we can say that the first Braisa is discussing where it lost its kidney before the kabbalah and the second Braisa is discussing where it lost its kidney after the kabbalah.
  - **Q:** A Braisa regarding Korbon Pesach darshens the pasuk of "seh samim zachar ben shanah yihiyeh lachem" to teach that it must be complete and within its first year during all the Avodos – even the zrika!? **A:** This requirement is only regarding the requirement that the animal be within its first year. This makes sense, because **R' Yehoshua** says in a Braisa that if after the shechita the animal parts are lost and only a kezayis of meat or cheilev remain, one may still do zrika based on that. We see that it need not be complete at the zrika!
  - **Q:** Is it possible that an animal can be within its first year at the shechita and in its second year at the other Avodos? **A: Rava** said, from here we see that we look at the hours (not just the days) when determining the age of korbanos.

- **Q:** Maybe we can say that this question is the subject of a machlokes among Tanna'im. A Braisa says, **R' Yehuda** says that the injuries of "ma'uch v'kasus v'nasuk v'karus" all refer even to injury of the beitzim. **R' Eliezer ben Yaakov** says it refers to injury of the eiver. **R' Yose** says "ma'uch v'kasus" refer even to the beitzim and "nasuk v'karus" refer to the eiver. It would seem that the machlokes is that **R' Yehuda** holds that something missing internally is considered to be significant, whereas **R' Eliezer ben Yaakov** holds that it is not! **A:** Based on this, what does **R' Yose** hold? Rather, the machlokes in the Braisa is regarding what is considered to be an exposed mum. **R' Yehuda** all these injuries to the beitzim are. **R' Eliezer ben Yaakov** says none of them are. **R' Yose** holds that "ma'uch v'kasus" are and "nasuk v'karus" are not.

MISHNA

- If the skin that covers the eiver of a male was nicked or the genitals of a female of a kodashim animal (it is a mum). If the tail is nicked in the bone (it is a mum) but not in the joint, or the tip of the tail is exposed to the bone, or there is an "etzbah" of flesh between the vertebrae of the tail (it is a mum).

GEMARA

- **R' Elazar** said, the Mishna refers only to where the skin covering the eiver was nicked, but not when it was removed. Also, it only refers to the skin covering the eiver, not to the eiver itself.
  - A Braisa says this as well.

NIFGIMA HAZANAV MIN HA'ETZEM…

- A Braisa says, the "etzbah" referred to by the **Chachomim** is ¼ of a tefach of an average man.

- **Q:** With regard to what halacha was this said? **A: Rabbah** said, it refers to tzitzis, as stated in a Braisa. **A2: R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua** said, it refers to the 2 amah measuring sticks that were kept in the Beis Hamikdash, regarding which a Mishna teaches that one was ½ etzbah larger than that of Moshe and the other was ½ etzbah larger than this first one. **A3: R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** (or **R' Huna bar Nosson**) said, it refers to our Mishna when it says that if there is an etzbah of flesh between the vertebrae of the tail it is a mum.