

דף יומי • בכורות • דף י"ג

Daf Yomi • The Full Daf • Elucidated Talmud • Navy & Gold Edition • with Rashi

THE SUGYA

We begin this segment of the limud by wrapping up the first perek, focusing on the exact timing and halachic priorities of redeeming a firstborn donkey. The Gemara works through a kasha regarding whether the mitzvah of redemption begins immediately or only after thirty days, bringing a teretz that links this to a machlokes between Rabbi Eliezer and the Rabbis. We then learn a beautiful Mishnah that establishes a fundamental rule of priorities in mitzvos: redeeming the donkey comes before breaking its neck, just as yibum originally took precedence over chalitzah, and a master designating a Hebrew maidservant takes precedence over her redemption.

Moving into the second perek, the Mishnah shifts our focus to the firstborn of a clean animal, such as a cow. We learn that any partnership or transaction with a gentile that gives the gentile a share in the animal or its fetus exempts the offspring from the din of bechor, since the Torah davka says "in Israel." The Gemara immediately asks a strong kasha on the structure of the Mishnayos, questioning why the Tanna chose to teach the donkey first before the cow, and brings down a beautiful yesod from Eretz Yisrael about the special status of donkeys in helping Klal Yisrael carry the spoils of Mitzrayim. We then dive into a major sugya regarding the kinyanim between a Jew and a gentile, analyzing how property is acquired according to the Torah's laws.

All introductions, summaries, and contextual notes are the editor's commentary and are not part of the original text.

עמוד א' DAF 13A

ANSWER

רב ששית אמר: לומר שאינו עובר עליו.

Rav Sheshet said: The second baraita means **to say that** until thirty days have passed, **he does not transgress** a prohibition **on it** if he has not yet redeemed the donkey, but after thirty days he does transgress.

OBJECTION

מתיב רמי בר חמא: מצותו כל שלשים יום, מכאן ואילך — או פודהו או עורפו.

Rami bar Hama challenged Rav Sheshet from a baraita: Its mitzvah applies **throughout thirty days; from this point forward, either he redeems it or he breaks its neck.**

QUESTION

מאי לאו מצנה לשהותו כל שלשים יום?

What, is it not that there is a mitzvah **to delay it throughout thirty days** and only redeem it afterwards?

ANSWER

לא, מצנה לפדותו כל שלשים יום.

The Gemara answers: **No**, it means there is a **mitzvah to redeem it throughout thirty days**, and if he delays past that, he has transgressed.

QUESTION

אי הכי, "מפאן ואילף או פודהו או עובר עליו" מיבעי ליה!

The Gemara asks: **If so**, instead of saying he must break its neck, **it should have** stated: **From this point forward**, either he redeems it or he transgresses on it!

RESOLUTION

אָלָא אָמַר רַבָּא: לָא קִשְׁיָא, הָא רַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר דְּמִקְשִׁי, הָא רַבְנֵן דְּלָא מִקְשִׁי.

Rather, Rava said: **It is not difficult**. This baraita, which says the mitzvah is after thirty days, is like **Rabbi Eliezer**, who **compares** the firstborn donkey to a firstborn son; and **that** baraita, which says the mitzvah is immediate, is like **the Rabbis**, who **do not compare** them.

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מִתְנִי' לֹא רָצָה לְפָדוּתוֹ — עוֹרְפוֹ מֵאַחֲרָיו וְקוֹבְרוֹ.

MISHNAH: If the owner **did not want to redeem it**, he breaks its neck from behind with a cleaver and buries it.

MISHNAH

מִצְוַת הַפְּדִיָּה קוֹדֶמֶת לְמִצְוַת עֲרִיפָה, שֶׁנֶּאֱמַר: "אִם לֹא תִפְדֶּה וְעֲרַפְתָּ."

The mitzvah of redemption takes precedence over the mitzvah of breaking the neck, as it is stated: "And if you will not redeem it, then you shall break its neck."

MISHNAH

מִצְוַת יַעֲדָה קוֹדֶמֶת לְמִצְוַת הַפְּדִיָּה, שֶׁנֶּאֱמַר: "אֲשֶׁר לֹא יַעֲדָה וְהִפְדָּה."

Similarly, the mitzvah of designation of a Hebrew maidservant takes precedence over the mitzvah of redemption, as it is stated: "Who has not designated her, then he shall let her be redeemed."

MISHNAH

מִצְוַת הַיִּבּוּם קוֹדֶמֶת לְמִצְוַת חֲלִיצָה, כְּרֵאשׁוֹנָה שֶׁהֵיוּ מִתְכוּוֹנִין לְשֵׁם מִצְוָה,

The mitzvah of levirate marriage takes precedence over the mitzvah of chalitzah. This was initially, when they would **intend** to perform the yibum for the sake of the mitzvah;

MISHNAH

וְעַכְשָׁיו שֶׁאֵין מִתְכוּוֹנִין לְשֵׁם מִצְוָה, אָמְרוּ: מִצְוַת חֲלִיצָה קוֹדֶמֶת לְמִצְוַת יִבּוּם.

but now that they do not intend to perform it for the sake of the mitzvah, but for beauty or money, the Sages said: The mitzvah of chalitzah takes precedence over the mitzvah of levirate marriage.

MISHNAH

מצות הגאולה באדון, הוא קודם לכל אדם, שנאמר: "ואם לא יגאל ונמכר בערפך".

The mitzvah of redemption of a consecrated non-kosher animal is on the owner; he takes precedence over any other person, as it is stated: "And if it is not redeemed, then it shall be sold according to your valuation."

גמרא GEMARA

STATEMENT

הדרן עליה הלוקח עובר חמורו.

May we return to you, "One who purchases the fetus of his donkey."

משנה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מתני' הלוקח עובר פרתו של נכרי, והמוכר לו, אף על פי שאינו רשאי,

MISHNAH: One who purchases the fetus of the cow of a gentile, or one who sells the fetus of his cow to him, even though he is not permitted to sell a large animal to a gentile,

MISHNAH

והמשתתף לו, והמקבל ממנו, והנותן לו בקבלה — פטור מן הבכורה,

or one who enters a partnership with him, or one who receives a cow from him to tend, or one who gives a cow to him in receivership—in all these cases, the offspring is exempt from the law of the firstborn,

MISHNAH

שנאמר "בישראל", אבל לא באחרים.

as it is stated: "In Israel," but not among others. If a gentile has any share in it, it is exempt.

MISHNAH

הכהנים והלויים חייבים, שלא נפטרו מבכור בהמה טהורה, אלא מפדיון הבן ומפטר חמור.

Priests and Levites are obligated in the firstborn of a clean animal, as they were not exempted from the firstborn of a clean animal, but only from the redemption of the son and from the firstborn of a donkey.

גמרא GEMARA

QUESTION

גמ' מאי אידיא דתני עובר חמורו ברישא, והדר תני עובר פרתו?

GEMARA: Why did the Tanna specifically teach "the fetus of his donkey" in the first chapter, and then return and teach "the fetus of his cow" in our Mishnah?

QUESTION

לִיתְנִי בְּרִישָׁא עוּבֵר פֶּרֶתוֹ, דְּקְדוּשַׁת הַגּוֹף הוּא, וְהִדֵּר לִיתְנִי עוּבֵר חֲמוּרוֹ, דְּקְדוּשַׁת דְּמִים הוּא.

Let him teach first "the fetus of his cow," which has inherent sanctity, and then let him teach "the fetus of his donkey," which only has monetary sanctity!

ANSWER

אָמְרִי בְּמַעְרְבָא: אֵיפֻעִית אִימָא, אִיִּדֵּי דְחִבִּיבָא לִיהּ, כְּדִרְבֵּי חֲנִינָא,

They said in the West, Eretz Yisrael: If you want, say that he taught the donkey first since it is dear to him, in accordance with the statement of Rabbi Ḥanina that donkeys helped the Jews carry the wealth of Egypt.

ANSWER

וְאִי בְּעִית אִימָא, אִיִּדֵּי דְזוּטָרָן מִיִּלְיָה דְּבִהֶמָּה טְמֵאָה, פְּסִיק וְשִׁדֵּי לָהּ.

And if you want, say instead: Since the matters of an unclean animal are few, he finishes them and sets them aside.

STATEMENT

אָמַר רַבִּי יִצְחָק בַּר נַחֲמָנִי אָמַר רִישׁ לָקִישׁ מִשּׁוֹם רַבִּי אוֹשְׁעִיא:

Rabbi Yitzḥak bar Naḥmani said that Reish Lakish said in the name of Rabbi Oshaya:

STATEMENT

יִשְׂרָאֵל שֶׁנָּתַן מָעוֹת לְגוֹי בְּבִהֶמָּתוֹ בְּדִינֵיהֶם, אַף עַל פִּי שֶׁלֹּא מָשַׁךְ — קָנָה, וְחֵיִיבָת בְּבִכּוּרָה.

If a Jew gave money to a gentile for his animal according to their laws, even though he did not pull the animal, he has acquired it, and it is obligated in the law of the firstborn.

STATEMENT

וְגוֹי שֶׁנָּתַן מָעוֹת לְיִשְׂרָאֵל בְּבִהֶמָּתוֹ בְּדִינֵיהֶם, אַף עַל פִּי שֶׁלֹּא מָשַׁךְ — קָנָה, וּפְטוּר מִן הַבְּכּוּרָה.

And conversely, if a gentile gave money to a Jew for his animal according to their laws, even though he did not pull it, he has acquired it, and it is exempt from the law of the firstborn.

STATEMENT

אָמַר מָר: יִשְׂרָאֵל שֶׁנָּתַן מָעוֹת לְגוֹי בְּדִינֵיהֶם, אַף עַל פִּי שֶׁלֹּא מָשַׁךְ — קָנָה וְחֵיִיבָת בְּבִכּוּרָה.

The Master said above: If a Jew gave money to a gentile according to their laws, even though he did not pull it, he has acquired it and it is obligated in the law of the firstborn.

QUESTION

מַאי "בְּדִינֵיהֶם"?

The Gemara asks: What is meant by "according to their laws"?

QUESTION

אִי נִימָא בְּדִינֵיהֶם דְּגוּפֵיהּ, דָּאֲתִי בְּקַל וְחוּמָר:

If we say it means according to the laws of his own body, i.e., the laws of acquiring a gentile slave, which comes by a kal vachomer:

EXPLANATION

אם גופיה קני ליה ישראל בכסף, דכתיב "לרשת אחוזה", הקישו הכתוב לאחוזתו, מה אחוזת נקנית בכסף ובשטר ובחזקה, אף עבד כנעני נקנה בכסף.

If his body, a Jew acquires with money, as it is written: "To inherit as a possession," whereby the verse compares him to a possession—just as a possession is acquired with money, document, and chazakah, so too a Canaanite slave is acquired with money.

INFERENCE

ממונו — לא כל שפן הוא?

If so, his property, i.e., his animal, is it not all the more so acquired with money?

OBJECTION

אם כן, אפילו בשטר ובחזקה נמי!

The Gemara objects: If so, that we learn it from a slave, then even with a document and chazakah also a Jew should acquire a gentile's animal! But we know that is not the case.

REFUTATION

ועוד, ישראל מישראל יוכיחו, דגופיה קני ליה בכסף, ממונו במשיכה!

And furthermore, the case of a Jew from a Jew will prove otherwise: for his body, a Hebrew slave, is acquired with money, yet his property is acquired only with pulling! So the kal vachomer is refuted.

RESOLUTION

אֵלָא אָמַר אַבַּיִי: בְּדִינֵיהֶם שֶׁפְּסָקָה לָהֶם תּוֹרָה, "אוֹ קָנָה מִיַּד עַמִּיתָךְ" — מִיַּד עַמִּיתָךְ הוּא דְּבַמְשִׁיכָה, הָא מִיַּד גּוֹי בְּכֶסֶף.

Rather, Abaye said: "According to their laws" means according to the laws that the Torah decreed for them, as it is written: "Or buy from the hand of your fellow"—from the hand of your fellow is acquired with pulling, but from the hand of a gentile is acquired with money.

QUESTION

ואימא: מיד גוי — כלל כלל לא!

The Gemara asks: But say that from the hand of a gentile, money does not acquire at all!

ANSWER

אמרי: לא סלקא דעתך, קל וחומר הוא — אם גופו קונה, ממונו לא כל שפן?

They say in response: Do not let this enter your mind, for it is a kal vachomer: if his body is acquired with money, is his property not all the more so?

QUESTION

ואימא: מיד גוי — עד דאיכא תרתוי!

The Gemara asks: **But say that from the hand of a gentile**, he does not acquire **until there are both** money and pulling!

ANSWER

אמרי: ולאו קל וחומר הוא? גופו באחת, ממונו בשתיים!?

They say: And is it not a kal vachomer? His body is acquired **with one** kinyan, and his property would require **two**?! That makes no sense.

ANSWER

ואימא: או בקא או בקא, דומיא ד"עמיתה". מה "עמיתה" בקדא, אף גוי נמי בקדא.

The Gemara asks: **But say** he can acquire **either with this or with this**, i.e., either money or pulling? The Gemara answers: It must be **similar to "your fellow."** Just as "your fellow" is acquired **with one** specific kinyan, so too a gentile is also acquired **with one** specific kinyan, which is money.

STATEMENT

אמר מר: וגוי שנתן מעות לישראל בבקמתו בדיניהן, אף על פי שלא משה — קנה, ופטור מן הכבורה.

The Master said above: And a gentile who gave money to a Jew for his animal according to their laws, even though he did not pull it, has acquired it, and it is exempt from the law of the firstborn.

QUESTION

מאי בדיניהן?

The Gemara asks: **What is meant by "according to their laws"?**

QUESTION

אלימא בדיניהן דגופיה, משום דאתי בקל וחומר: אם גופו ישראל קני ליה בכסף, דכתיב "מכסף מקנתו", ממונו לא כל שכן?

If we say it means according to the laws of his own body, because it comes by a kal vachomer: if his body, a Jewish slave, a gentile acquires with money, as it is written: "From the money of his purchase," is his property not all the more so?

REFUTATION

ישראל מישראל יוכיחו, דגופו קני בכסף, ממונו במשיכה!

The Gemara objects: **A Jew from a Jew will prove** otherwise, for his body is acquired with money, yet his property is acquired only **with pulling**!

RESOLUTION

אלא אמר אביי: בדיניהם שפסקה להם תורה, "וכי תמכרו ממכר לעמיתה" — לעמיתה במשיכה, הא לגוי בכסף.

Rather, Abaye said: It means according to the laws that the Torah decreed for them, as it is written: "And if you sell a sale to your fellow"—to your fellow is acquired with pulling, but to a gentile is acquired with money.

QUESTION

ואימא: לגוי כלל כלל לא!

The Gemara asks: **But say** that **to a gentile**, money does **not** acquire **at all**!

ANSWER

אמרי: לאו קל וחומר הוא? אם גופו קנה, ממונו לא כל שפון?

They say: Is it not a kal vachomer? If his body is acquired with money, is his property not all the more so?

QUESTION

אימא: לגוי עד דאיפא תרתי!

The Gemara asks: **But say** that **to a gentile**, he does not acquire **until there are both** money and pulling!

ANSWER

לאו קל וחומר הוא? גופו באחד, ממונו בשנים?!

Is it not a kal vachomer? His body is acquired with one, and his property would require two?!

ANSWER

ואימא: או בקא או בקא, דומיא ד"עמיתה";

The Gemara asks: **But say** he can acquire **either with this or with this**, similar to "your fellow"? The Gemara answers: Just as "your fellow" is acquired with one specific kinyan, so too a gentile is acquired with one specific kinyan, which is money.

עמוד ב' DAF 13B

STATEMENT

מה "עמיתה" באחת, אף גוי נמי באחת.

Just as transactions with "**your counterpart**" are effected by **one** single act of acquisition, i.e., pulling, **so too**, transactions with **a gentile** are **also** effected by **one** single act of acquisition, i.e., payment of money.

OBJECTION

אמרי: ולאמימר דאמר משיכה בגוי קונה, הניחא אי סבר לה פרבי יוחנן דאמר: דבר תורה מעות קונות, משיכה לא, אהני "לעמיתה" — לעמיתה בכסף, לגוי במשיכה.

The Sages said in the bais medrash: **And according to Ameimar**, who says that **pulling** effects **acquisition** in the case of a **gentile**, **this works out well** if he holds in accordance with the opinion of **Rabbi Yoḥanan**, who says: By Torah law, **money** effects **acquisition**, but **pulling** does **not**. If so, the word "**of your counterpart**" is **effective** to teach us: Transactions with **your counterpart** are effected by **money**, whereas transactions **with a gentile** are effected by **pulling**.

QUESTION

אלא אי סבר לה כריש לקיש, דאמר: משיכה מפורשת מן התורה, לעמיתה במשיכה, ולגוי במשיכה, "לעמיתה" למה לי?

But if he holds in accordance with the opinion of Reish Lakish, who says: The act of acquisition of **pulling** is explicit in the Torah, then the halakha is that transactions with **your counterpart** are effected by **pulling**, and transactions with a **gentile** are also effected by **pulling**. If so, **why do I need** the phrase "of your counterpart"?

ANSWER

אָמַרְי: לְעִמִּיתְךָ אַתָּה מַחְזִיר אוֹנָאָה, וְאִי אַתָּה מַחְזִיר אוֹנָאָה לְגוֹי.

The Sages said in explanation: The phrase "of your counterpart" is needed for the law of ona'ah (exploitation): **To your counterpart you must return** the sum of **exploitation**, but you do not need to return the sum of **exploitation** to a **gentile**.

QUESTION

לְגוֹי — מִ"אַל תּוֹנוּ אִישׁ אֶת אָחִיו" נִפְקָא!

The Gemara asks: The exemption from returning the sum of exploitation **to a gentile is derived from** the latter part of the verse: "**A man shall not exploit his brother**"! A gentile is excluded because he is not "his brother."

ANSWER

חַד בְּגוֹי, וְחַד בְּהֶקְדָּשׁ, וְצָרִיכִי, דְּאִי כָּתֹב רַחֲמָנָא חַד — הָוָה אֱמִינָא: לְגוֹי הוּא דְאִין לוֹ אוֹנָאָה, אֲבָל הֶקְדָּשׁ — יֵשׁ לוֹ אוֹנָאָה, קָא מְשַׁמַּע לֵן.

The Gemara answers: **One** exclusion is needed for a **gentile**, and **one** is needed for **consecrated property**. And both are necessary, as, had the Merciful One written only one exclusionary phrase, I would have said: It is specifically with regard to a **gentile** that there is no prohibition of **exploitation**, but with regard to **consecrated property**, there is a prohibition of **exploitation**. Therefore, the other derivation teaches us that **consecrated property** is also excluded.

QUESTION

הֲנִיחָא לְמֵאן דְּאָמַר גְּזִילוֹ אָסוּר — הֵיִינוּ דְּאֶצְטְרִיךְ קָרָא לְמִישְׁרֵי אוֹנָאָה, אָלָא אִי סָבַר לָהּ כְּמֵאן דְּאָמַר גְּזִילוֹ שְׁל גוֹי מוּתָר, אוֹנָאָה מִיפְעָא?

The Gemara remarks: **This works out well according to the one who says** that **robbing a gentile is prohibited**; that is why a verse was necessary to permit keeping the sum of **exploitation** obtained from him. But if he holds in accordance with the one who says that **robbing a gentile is permitted**, is a verse to permit **exploitation** necessary? Surely if you can steal from him, you can exploit him!

ANSWER

אָמַרְי: אִי סָבַר לָהּ כְּמֵאן דְּאָמַר גְּזִילוֹ מוּתָר — עַל כּוּרְחֵיהּ כְּרַבִּי יוֹחָנָן סְבִירָא לֵיהּ.

The Sages said in response: If he holds in accordance with the one who says that **robbing a gentile is permitted**, then perforce he holds in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yoḥanan that money effects acquisition by Torah law, and therefore the difficulty of Reish Lakish does not arise.

OBJECTION

מִיתִיבִי: הֲלוֹקָה גְּרוּסָאוֹת מִן הַגּוֹיִם, וּמִצָּא בִּהּ עֲבוּדָה זָרָה — אִם עַד שְׁלֹא נָתַן מַעוֹת מִשְׁךְ — יִחְזִיר, וְאִם מִשְׁנָתָן מַעוֹת מִשְׁךְ — יוֹלִיף הִנָּאָה לָיִם הַמָּלַח.

The Gemara raises an objection from a braisa: **One who buys broken vessels** of gold or silver from **gentiles**, and finds among them an object of idol worship—if before he gave the money he pulled the vessels, he may return the idol to the

gentile. **But if after he gave the money he pulled them, he must cast the benefit of the idol into the Dead Sea** because he has already acquired it and a Jew may not benefit from or return an idol.

QUESTION

ואי אמרת מעות קונות, משיכה למה לי?

And if you say that **payment of money acquires** items from gentiles, **why do I need pulling** in the latter clause to effect the acquisition? The money alone should have acquired it!

ANSWER

הכא במאי עסקינן — שקיבל עליו לדון בדיני ישראל.

The Gemara answers: **With what are we dealing here?** A case **where** the gentile **accepted upon himself to have** this transaction **adjudicated by Jewish law**, which requires pulling.

QUESTION

אי הכי, מעות למה לי?

The Gemara asks: **If so, why do I need** the mention of **money** in the braisa at all? Pulling alone should be the only factor!

ANSWER

הכי קאמר: אף על פי שנתן מעות, אי משיך — אין, ואי לא — לא.

The Gemara explains: **This is what the braisa is saying:** Even though he gave money, the halakha still depends on pulling: **if he pulled** the vessels, **yes**, he has acquired them, **and if not**, he has **not** acquired them.

QUESTION

אי הכי, קשיא רישא!

The Gemara asks: **If so, the first clause is difficult!** It says that if he pulled before giving money, he may return it, which implies that pulling alone did not effect acquisition!

ANSWER

אמר אביי: רישא משום דאיכא מקח טעות.

Abaye said: The first clause is ruled as it is **because there is a mistaken transaction**, as the Jew never intended to buy an idol.

OBJECTION

אמר ליה רבא: רישא משום דאיכא מקח טעות, סיפא ליכא מקח טעות?

Rava said to Abaye: You say the first clause is because there is a mistaken transaction; is there no mistaken transaction in the latter clause? In both cases, he did not want to buy an idol!

RESOLUTION

אלא אמר רבא: רישא וסיפא מקח טעות, רישא דלא יהיב זוזי — לא מיחזי כעבודה זרה ביד ישראל, סיפא דיהיב זוזי — מיחזי כעבודה זרה ביד ישראל.

Rather, Rava said: Both the first clause and the latter clause are a mistaken transaction. However, in the first clause, where he did not pay the money, it does not look like an idol in the possession of a Jew, so he may return it. But in the latter clause, where he paid the money, it looks like an idol in the possession of a Jew, so he must cast it away.

EXPLANATION

ואביי אמר לך Bird: רישא מקח טעות, דלא ידע, דהא לא יחייב ליה זוזי. סיפא לאו מקח טעות הוא, דכיון דיהיב זוזי, כי קא משיך — איבעי לעיוני והדר מימשה.

And Abaye could have said to you: The first clause is a mistaken transaction because he did not know about the idol, as he had not yet paid him the money and therefore had no reason to inspect the purchase. But the latter clause is not a mistaken transaction, because since he already paid the money, when he came to pull it, he should have inspected it and then pulled it. Since he did not inspect it, he waived his right to void the sale.

EXPLANATION

רב אשי אמר: מדרישא משיכה אינה קונה, סיפא נמי משיכה אינה קונה, ואידי דתנא רישא "משה", תנא סיפא נמי "משה".

Rav Ashi said: Since in the first clause pulling does not effect acquisition, in the latter clause also pulling does not effect acquisition. And since the Tanna taught "pulled" in the first clause, he also taught "pulled" in the latter clause even though pulling is not actually required there.

EXPLANATION

רביןא אמר: מדסיפא משיכה קונה, רישא נמי משיכה קונה, ורישא הכי קאמר: אם לא נתן ולא משה — יחזור. מאי יחזור? יחזור בדברים. קסבר: דברים יש בהם משום מחוסרי אמנה, והני מילי — ישראל מישאל, דקיימי בדבוריהו, אכל ישראל מגוים, דאינהו לא קיימי בדבוריהו — לא.

Ravina said: Since in the latter clause pulling effects acquisition, in the first clause also pulling effects acquisition. And this is what the first clause is saying: If he did not pay and did not pull, he may retract. What is the meaning of "he may retract"? He may retract his verbal agreement. For the Tanna holds: Retracting verbal agreements involves a lack of trustworthiness. But that applies only to a Jew from a Jew, who stand by their word; but a Jew from a gentile, who do not stand by their word, does not.

SUMMARY

The sugya clarifies that while the primary mitzvah is to redeem a firstborn donkey, if the owner refuses, he must perform the mitzvah of breaking its neck from behind and burying it. We then transition to the second perek, establishing that any ownership stake held by a gentile in a clean animal's fetus completely removes the kedushas bechor. Finally, the Gemara engages in a deep shakla v'tarya based on the shittah of Rabbi Oshaya, exploring the mechanism of acquisition between Jews and gentiles, ultimately deriving from the pesukim that a transaction with a gentile is finalized through the exchange of money rather than meshichah.

In our Mishnah, the Sages teach us a profound principle of priorities in avodas Hashem. The Mishnah lists several mitzvos where one option is clearly preferred over another: redeeming a firstborn donkey is better than breaking its neck, and originally, performing yibum was preferred over chalitzah. But then the Mishnah points out a critical shift: once the inner motivation changed, and people no longer did yibum purely for the sake of the mitzvah, the priority flipped, and chalitzah became the preferred path.

This is a powerful chiddush for our daily lives. The Gemara is teaching us that the value of an action is not just about the external act itself, but about the purity of our ratzon, our inner desire. We can be doing something that looks like the highest level of a mitzvah, but if our heart is not in the right place, the entire priority changes. Hashem wants our hearts. When we do a mitzvah, we must ask ourselves: am I doing this l'shem shamayim, or is there a touch of personal honor, comfort, or ulterior motive mixed in?

Today, before you perform a mitzvah or sit down to learn, take ten seconds to pause and align your thoughts. Explicitly say to yourself, "I am doing this purely to bring nachas ruach to Hashem," and watch how that small shift in motivation elevates your entire day.