

Daf Notes

2 Kislev 5772

Insights into the Daily Daf

Bechoros Daf 14

November 28, 2011

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamah of

Yonina bas Menachem Mendel o"n.

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for her neshamah and may her soul find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of Life.

Visit us on the web at <http://www.daf-yomi.org/>,
where we are constantly updating the archives from the entire Shas.

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler

To subscribe, please send email to: aneinu@gmail.com

Daily Daf

Mishna

All consecrated animals which had contracted a permanent physical blemish before they were consecrated and have been redeemed are subject to the law of the *bechor* and to the *Kohanic* gifts; and they revert to *chullin* that they may be shorn and may be put to work; and after they have been redeemed, their offspring and their milk are permitted; and he who slaughtered them outside the Sanctuary is not liable; and they cannot effect *temurah* (*the owner illegally attempts to exchange a different animal with the original korban; the halachah is that the temurah animal gets the same sanctity as the original one, and both animals must be brought as a korban*); and if they died, they may be redeemed, except for the *bechor* and the *ma'aser*.

All consecrated animals which had contracted a permanent blemish after they were consecrated, or if they had contracted a temporary blemish before they were consecrated and subsequently (*after consecration*) contracted a permanent blemish, and have been redeemed, are exempt from the law of the *bechor*, and from the *Kohanic* gifts, and they do not revert to *chullin* that they may be shorn and be put to work; and even after they have been redeemed, their offspring and their milk are forbidden; and he who slaughtered them

outside the Sanctuary is liable, and they do effect *temurah*; and if they died, they must be buried. (14a)

Explaining the Mishna

The *Gemora* notes: The reason (*that they are liable to the law of the firstborn and Kohanic gifts*) is because they were redeemed, but if they were not redeemed, they would have been exempt from the law of the firstborn and from the *Kohanic* gifts, for the *Tanna* of the *Mishna* holds that an object consecrated for its value pushes aside the law of the firstborn and the obligation of the *Kohanic* gifts.

The *Mishna* had stated: and they revert to *chullin* (*that they may be shorn and may be put to work*).

The *Gemora* notes: The reason (*that they may be shorn and that they may be put to work*) is because they were redeemed, but if they were not redeemed, they would have been forbidden for shearing and working. This would support the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer, who said: Animals dedicated for the maintenance of the Temple are forbidden for shearing and working!

The *Gemora* rejects the proof: They said: No! An animal consecrated for its value, eventually to be used for the altar, might be confused with an animal which is itself

consecrated for the altar, therefore the Rabbis enacted a decree (*against shearing and working them*); but in the case of an animal dedicated for the maintenance of the Temple, the Rabbis did not issue a decree.

The *Mishna* had stated: their offspring and their milk are permitted.

The *Gemora* asks: What are the circumstances of the case? If you will say that they were conceived and born after their mother's redemption, surely this is obvious, for they are unconsecrated animals!?! Rather, what is meant is that they were conceived before their mother's redemption and born afterwards. [*Once they were conceived, they (the fetuses) receive the same sanctity as their mother, for the fetus is regarded as the thigh of the mother; and when the mother is redeemed, so are they.*]

The *Gemora* notes: This implies that if they were born before their mother's redemption, they are forbidden (*for benefit before their own redemption; they cannot be offered on the altar, for they come from a rejected source, since their mother could not have been offered*).

The *Gemora* inquires: Can they be redeemed even without developing a blemish, or, can they not be redeemed - so long as they do not develop a blemish? [*In general, animals that have monetary sanctity only, do not need a blemish in order to be redeemed; however, these animals were unblemished and potentially fit to be offered on the altar – perhaps, then, they can only be redeemed after developing a blemish?*]

The *Gemora* attempts to resolve this from the following *braisa*: If one consecrated animals having a permanent blemish for the altar and they gave birth, the offspring are to be sold and they do not need a blemish, because they receive no physical sanctity. This is because we cannot be more stringent with the subsidiary (*the offspring*) than with the primary object (*the mother*). [*Seeing that the offspring is holy only in virtue of its mother, and as the mother can be redeemed immediately, the same rule should apply to its offspring. This resolves the question.*]

The *Gemora* notes: Now the reason (*why the offspring do not require a blemish before redemption*), is because we cannot be more stringent with the subsidiary than with the primary object, but if one consecrated a male ram for its value (*and the law is that it should be sold and the proceeds will be used to purchase an olah offering*), it receives a physical sanctity of an animal consecrated as such (*for this animal was consecrated directly; accordingly, this animal would require a blemish before being redeemed*). This would support Rava's ruling, for Rava said: If one consecrated a male ram for its value, it receives a physical sanctity of an animal consecrated as such. (14a – 14b)

Blemished Sacrifice

The *Mishna* had stated: and he who slaughtered them outside the Sanctuary is not liable.

Rabbi Elozar taught the *Mishna* as follows: He is liable; and he explains the *Mishna* to be referring to a case where he slaughtered them (*a blemished animal*) on a private altar (*during the time that bamos were permitted; R' Elozar maintains that by offering a blemished animal on a private altar, one violates a Biblical transgression, and he is punished with lashes*). For Rabbi Elozar said: From where do we derive that he who slaughters a blemished animal on a private altar at a period when *bamos* are used legitimately, is guilty of transgressing a negative prohibition? It is written: *You shall not sacrifice to Hashem, your God, an ox or a sheep that has a blemish*. If this verse has no bearing on a major *bamah* (*such as those at Nov and Gibeon*), since the Torah has already stated (*regarding a major bamah*): *Blind or broken* etc. (*you shall not offer these to Hashem*), apply it to a private altar.

The *Gemora* asks: Why not say that if the verse has no bearing on ordinary sacrifices, apply it to a firstborn (*that a blemished bechor is disqualified, and consequently, it is forbidden from offering it on a major bamah*)? For I might have thought that since it is holy, even when blemished (*the shearing and working being*

forbidden), it should therefore be offered - even if blemished. The Torah therefore teaches us that it is not so!

The *Gemora* answers that in connection with a firstborn, the Torah expressly states elsewhere that it cannot be offered up.

The *Gemora* asks: Why not say that if the verse has no bearing on ordinary sacrifices, apply it to *ma'aser* (*that a blemished ma'aser animal is disqualified, and consequently, it is forbidden from offering it on a major bamah*)? For I might have thought that since it is holy, even when blemished (*if the tenth animal exiting the pen happened to have a blemish*), it should therefore be offered - even if blemished. The Torah therefore teaches us that it is not so!

The *Gemora* answers that an extra verse would not be necessary, for it can be derived by means of a *gezeirah shavah* from *bechor*.

The *Gemora* asks: But let us apply the verse to a *temurah* (*an animal exchanged for a regular sacrifice*)? For I might have thought that since it is sacred, even if blemished, as the Torah writes: *Neither shall he exchange it or replace it (good – unblemished for bad – blemished)* etc. Therefore, it should be offered even blemished; and consequently, the Torah teaches us that it is not so!

The *Gemora* answers: The Torah says: *Then it and that for which it is changed, shall be holy*. The Torah is comparing the exchanged animal with the animal itself; just as the animal itself cannot be offered for the altar if it is blemished, so too the exchanged animal with a blemish cannot be offered for the altar if it is blemished.

Rabbi Zeira asked: Why don't we apply the verse to the (*blemished*) offspring, born of (*unblemished*) sacrifices? For I might have thought that since they are holy even when blemished on account of their mother, therefore they may be offered up even blemished, and the Torah therefore informs us that it is not so?

Rava answers: The following was taught in the academy of Rabbi Yishmael: It is written: *Only your holy animals, which you will have, and your vows*. The Torah is discussing the offspring of *korbanos* and their *temurah* exchanges. The Torah is comparing these things with an animal vowed for a sacrifice: just as an animal vowed for a sacrifice cannot be brought for the altar with a blemish, so too these too cannot be brought for the altar with a blemish. (14b)