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

Bechoros Daf Nun Aleph

MISHNA

- One may not redeem a bechor with slaves, with documents, with real property, or with hekdesh. If a father wrote a promissory note of 5 sela'im to a Kohen for the redemption of his son, he must give him 5 sela'im, but his son is still not redeemed (even after he pays the 5 sela'im, and he must give a second 5 sela'im). Therefore, if the Kohen wants he may gift back 5 sela'im to the father.
- If one designated 5 sela'im to be used to redeem his son and it was then lost (before giving it to the Kohen), he is responsible for it. We learn this from the hekesh of "yihiyeh lach" to "padoh sifdeh" which teaches that the bechor is only redeemed once the money has been received by the Kohen.

GEMARA

- Our Mishna does not follow **Rebbi**, who says in a Braisa that anything of value may be used to redeem a bechor, except for documents.
    - The machlokes between **Rebbi** and the **Rabanan** of our Mishna is as follows. **Rebbi** darshens the pesukim using the "ribuy umi'at" approach. He says "upeduyav miben chodesh tifdeh" is a ribuy, "b'erkicha kesef chameishes shekalim" is a mi'ut, and "tifdeh" is another ribuy. The rule is that when we have a ribuy, mi'at, and ribuy it includes everything except one thing – therefore everything may be used for redemption except for documents. The **Rabanan** darshan the pesukim with a "klal, uprat, uklal" approach. They say that "upeduyav miben chodesh" is a klal, "b'erkicha kesef chameishes shekalim" is a prat, and "tifdeh" is another klal. The rule is that when we have a klal uprat uklal we include things that are similar to the prat. Just as the prat (5 silver shekels) is something that is moveable and has intrinsic value, so too all things that are moveable and that have intrinsic value may be used – this comes to exclude real estate which is not moveable, it excludes slaves which are compared to real estate, and excludes documents, because they don't have intrinsic value.
        - **Q: Ravina** asked **Mareimar**, we see from a Braisa regarding the piercing of the ear of an eved ivri that **Rebbi** darshens using the klal uprat approach, so how can we say that here he uses the ribuy umi'at!? **A:** Normally he darshens with klal uprat. However, since over here the two general terms are together and the specific term is after (there is a klal, then a klal, and then a prat) he darshens it with ribuy umi'at. The **Rabanan** say that even in this case we view the prat as having been written in between the two klals and we still darshan as a klal uprat uklal.

V'LO B'HEKDEISHOS

- **Q:** This seems obvious! Since the hekdesh doesn't belong to the father it is obvious that he can't give it to the Kohen!? **A:** The Mishna means to say that just as a bechor cannot be redeemed with slaves, documents, and real property, so too hekdesh cannot be redeemed with these things.

KASAV LAKOHEN SHEHU CHAYUV LO CHAMISHA SELA'IM CHAYUV LITEIN LO…

- **Ulla** said, D'Oraisa the bechor is redeemed when the money is given to the Kohen, however the **Rabanan** made a gezeira out of concern that people will think the bechor is redeemed with the document. Therefore they said that he is not even redeemed with the money paid for the obligation in the document.
- A Braisa was taught in front of **R' Nachman** that said that the bechor *is* redeemed when the father gives the money pursuant to the document. **R' Nachman** said, this is the view of **R' Yose**

the son of R' Yehuda Sitimta'a (or **R' Elazar the son of R' Shimon Sitimta'a**), but the **Chachomim** say the bechor would not be redeemed.
    - The Gemara paskens that the bechor is not redeemed.

LEFIKACH IHM RATZA HAKOHEN LITEIN LO B'MATANA RASHAI

- The Mishna teaches what is taught in a Braisa which says that **R' Tarfon** would take the 5 sela'im as the Kohen and would then return it to the father.
- **R' Chanina** would take the money and then give it back to the father. He once saw a father that was waiting around to get the money back. **R' Chanina** understood that this man must have not given the money wholeheartedly. He told the man – you have done a bad thing and your son is not redeemed.

HAMAFRISH PIDYON BENO V'AVAD CHAYUV B'ACHRAYUSO

- **Q:** How do we know that the father is responsible for the money until it is given to the Kohen? **A: Reish Lakish** said, we learn this from a gezeira shava from eirachin. **R' Dimi in the name of R' Yonason** said, we learn a gezeira shava of "reikam" from the Korbon Re'iya.
    - **Q: R' Pappa** asked, the Mishna already gave a pasuk as the source, why are we looking for another source!? **A:** Rather, **R' Pappa** said, the sources of **Reish Lakish** and **R' Dimi** were given for the previous Mishna, which said that if the bechor died after the 30 days, even though the father had not yet given the money, he should still give it. These sources teach that these obligations carry to the heirs. We learn from them that the same is true regarding the redemption of a bechor.