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

Bechoros Daf Mem Aleph

MISHNA

- On the basis of all of these mumin (listed previously in the perek) we may shecht a bechor, and passul kodashim may be redeemed based on them.

GEMARA

- **Q:** The earlier Mishna already stated "we may shecht a bechor on the basis of the following mumin", so what is this Mishna adding!? **A:** It is the latter part of the Mishna, regarding redemption of kodashim, that is needed.
    - **Q:** This is also obvious – if we may shecht a bechor on the basis of these we may surely redeem based on them!? **A:** Rather, since the earlier Mishna said that **Ayalah** added more to the list, but the **Rabanan** didn't agree with him, and the Mishna then quotes others who added to the list, the Mishna here teaches that we follow all these individuals' views and additions.

MISHNA

- The following mumin cause a bechor to become passul to be offered on the Mizbe'ach, but do not allow the bechor to be shechted for ordinary eating by the Kohen: white spots in the eye or severely watering eyes when the condition is only temporary; back gums that are nicked but not uprooted; an animal that has "garav"; an animal that has "yabeles"; an animal that has "chazazis"; an old animal; a sick animal; a smelly animal; an animal that was mezaneh with a person; an animal that killed a person, based on the testimony of a single witness or of the owner; a tumtum; or an androginas. Such an animal may not be shechted on the Mizbe'ach or outside the Azarah. **R' Yishmael** says, being an androginas (it has male and female organs) is the greatest mum (and it therefore can be shechted, but not worked or shorn). The **Chachomim** say, a bechor that is an androginas is not a bechor at all and may even be worked and shorn.

GEMARA

- **Q:** "Garav" (a type of boil) is written in the pasuk as being a mum, so how can the Mishna say it is not a full mum!? Also, a Braisa says that "yalefes" written in the pasuk is the "Egyptian chazazis" (a type of boil) so how can the Mishna say that chazazis is not a full mum!? Now, we can answer that the "Egyptian chazazis" is different than a regular chazazis, and in that way answer for the Mishna. However, how do we answer for garav? **A:** Our Mishna is referring to a moist garav (which heals) and the one listed as a full mum in the pasuk refers to a dry one (which does not heal).
    - **Q:** A pasuk lists "the boils of Mitzrayim" and lists "cheres", which is a dry boil, and "garav", which we are saying is a moist boil, and the pasuk says that neither can be healed!? **A:** Rather, there are 3 types – the one mentioned in the pasuk as a full mum is dry inside and outside. The one in our Mishna is moist on the inside and outside. The pasuk that talks of the boils of Mitzrayim refers to where it is dry on the inside and moist on the outside.

V'HAZAKEIN V'HACHOLEH V'HAMEZUHAM

- A Braisa teaches, the pasuk says "*min* hatzon *min* hakvasim oy *min* ha'izim". The three words "min" are darshened to exclude an animal that is old, that is sick, and that is smelly.
    - All three must be taught. If we only were taught regarding an old animal we would say that is so because that condition can never be changed. If we were only taught regarding a sick animal we would say that is so because it is not a part of the animal's normal development. If we had taught regarding these two we would not know to

exclude a smelly animal, since a smelly animal is otherwise perfectly healthy. Also, if we only were taught regarding a smelly animal we would say that is so because it is disgusting.

V'SHENEVDA BO AVEIRA…

- A Braisa says, the pasuk regarding korbanos says "*min* habeheima" to exclude an animal that was mezaneh with a person, "*min* habakar" to exclude an animal that was worshipped as avoda zara, "*min* hatzon" to exclude an animal that was designated for purpose of avoda zara, and "***u***min hatzon" to exclude an animal that gored and killed a person.
    - **Q:** These animals are chayuv misah, so why do we need the pasuk to teach that they are passul as a korbon? **A:** It is needed for when there is only a single witness or only the testimony of the owner that says they did one of these things.
- **Q:** It makes sense that a tumtum can't be offered as a bechor, because maybe it is a female, and can't be shechted outside the Azarah, because maybe it is a male. However, with regard to an androginas, it makes sense that it can't be offered on the Mizbe'ach, because it may be a female, but it should be allowed to be shechted outside the Azarah, because even if it is a male, the female organs should act as a "charutz" (cut) mum!? **A: Abaye** said, the pasuk says "oy charutz oy shavur" which compares the two and teaches that just as "shavur" is in the place of a bone so too charutz is only a mum if it is in the place of a bone.
    - **Rava** said, you can learn this from the fact that the Torah separately writes "garav" even though it too cuts through the skin. Therefore, it must be that "charutz" refers to a place of a bone.
    - **R' Yishmael** argues. He doesn't say like **Abaye**, because he says this comparison should not be made. He doesn't say like **Rava**, because he says that a cut in the flesh is only not a mum when it is not noticeable.

R' YISHMAEL OMER EIN LECHA MUM GADOL MIZEH

- **Q: Rava** asked, does **R' Yishmael** hold that an androginas is a definite bechor but is has a mum, or is he unsure whether it is a bechor and is saying that even if it is a bechor it already has a mum? The practical difference would be whether he would get malkus for working or shearing it, and whether it must be given to a Kohen. **A:** We are taught that **R' Illai in the name of R' Yishmael** said that an androginas is a bechor with a mum. We see that he holds it is a definite bechor!
    - The Gemara says this is not a valid proof. It may be that he means to say that if you say it is a bechor it already has a mum.
    - **Q:** Maybe we can answer from a Braisa. The Braisa says, the pasuk regarding olah says "zachar" which teaches that a female may not be brought. The pasuk later again says "zachar", which teaches to exclude a tumtum and androginas. Now, the Tanna of this Braisa can't be the **T"K** of our Mishna, because he holds that an androginas is a safek and as such cannot be excluded by the pasuk! It can't be the **Rabanan** who are certain that an androginas is considered to be its own gender, because then it can be excluded from the first "zachar" and doesn't require another word, in the same way that they exclude it by bechor from only one pasuk!? Rather, it must be **R' Yishmael**, and it must be that he holds that an androginas is a male and the second "zachar" teaches that such a male may not be brought as a korbon! **A:** The Tanna may be the **Rabanan**, and they in fact require two pesukim to exclude regarding bechor, and they therefore likewise require two here as well.