

דף יומי • בכורות • דף י"ד

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

THE SUGYA

We are starting a new perek, and the Mishnah begins by laying down a major yesod in the halachos of kodshim. The Tanna is coming to be mechadesh a fundamental distinction between two types of consecrated animals: those where a permanent blemish preceded their consecration (where they only have kedushas damim, sanctity of value), and those whose consecration preceded their blemish (which have kedushas haguf, physical sanctity). The Mishnah outlines how these two categories differ across a whole list of halachos, including the obligation of the firstborn, the priestly gifts, shearing and working with them, and whether they can be redeemed after death.

In the Gemara, the shakla v'tarya gets straight to work analyzing the precise wording of our Mishnah. The Gemara is bothered by what we can infer from the Mishnah's cases, looking to see if these halachos support Rabbi Eliezer's shitta regarding animals consecrated for Temple maintenance, or Rava's chiddush that consecrating a male animal for its value automatically confers physical sanctity. We also delve into a fascinating discussion regarding the status of offspring born to these animals, and whether they require a blemish before they can be redeemed.

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

עמוד א' DAF 14A

MISHNAH משנה

MISHNAH

מִתְנִי כָּל הַקֹּדְשִׁים שֶׁקָּדַם מוֹם קְבוּעַ לְהַקְדִּישׁ וְנִפְדּוּ — חַיִּיבִין בְּכֹרָה וּבְמִתְנֹת,

Mishnah: All sacrificial animals in which a permanent blemish preceded their consecration, and then they were redeemed, are obligated in the mitzvah of a firstborn (meaning, their offspring are subject to the laws of a firstborn), and in the priestly gifts of the foreleg, the jaw, and the maw,

MISHNAH

וְיוֹצְאִין לְחֹלִין לִיגֹז וְלִיעֲבֹד,

and they emerge to non-sacred status to be shorn and to be worked with,

MISHNAH

וְלָדוֹ וְחֵלְבוֹ מִיתֵּר לְאַחַר פְּדִיוָנוֹ.

and their offspring and their milk are permitted after their redemption.

MISHNAH

והשוֹחֵטֵן בַּחוּץ פֶּטוּר,

And one who slaughters them outside the Temple courtyard is **exempt** from the punishment of kares,

MISHNAH

וְאֵין עוֹשִׂין תְּמוּרָה,

and they do not make a substitute (meaning, if one attempts to exchange them for another animal, the second animal does not become holy),

MISHNAH

וְאִם מָתוּ — יִפְדּוּ,

and if they died before being redeemed, they may be redeemed even after death to be fed to dogs,

MISHNAH

חוּץ מִן הַבְּכוֹר וּמִן הַמַּעֲשֵׂר.

except for the firstborn and the animal tithe, which, even if they were blemished before they became consecrated, assume inherent sanctity.

MISHNAH

וְכָל שֶׁקֶדֶם הִקְדָּשׁוֹ אֶת מוֹמָן, אוֹ מוֹם עוֹבֵר לְהִקְדָּשׁוֹ, וְלֵאחֶר מָפֵאן נוֹלַד לָהֶן מוֹם קָבוע לְהִקְדָּשׁוֹ
וְנִפְדּוּ — פֶּטוּרִין מִן הַבְּכוֹרָה וּמִן הַמִּתְּנּוֹת,

And all sacrificial animals whose consecration preceded their blemish, or who had a temporary blemish prior to their consecration, and afterward a permanent blemish developed on them which allowed them to be consecrated for redemption, and they were redeemed — they are exempt from the mitzvah of a firstborn and from the priestly gifts,

MISHNAH

וְאֵינָן יוֹצְאִין לְחוּלִין לִיגְזוֹ וְלִיעֲבֹד.

and they do not emerge to non-sacred status to be shorn and to be worked with.

MISHNAH

וְלָדָו וְחֵלְבֵן אָסוּר לְאַחֶר פְּדִיוָןָן,

And their offspring (conceived before redemption) and their milk are prohibited after their redemption,

MISHNAH

והשוֹחֵטֵן בַּחוּץ חַיִּיב, וְעוֹשִׂין תְּמוּרָה, וְאִם מָתוּ — יִקָּבְרוּ.

and one who slaughters them outside the Temple courtyard is liable to kares, and they make a substitute, and if they died before redemption, they must be buried and cannot be redeemed to be fed to dogs.

INFERENCE

גמ' טעמא דנפדו, הא לא נפדו — פטורין מן הפכורה ומן המתנות.

Gemara: The Gemara infers from the first clause of our Mishnah: **The reason** they are obligated in these mitzvot is **that they were redeemed**; but if they were **not redeemed**, they are **exempt** from the mitzvah of a firstborn and from the priestly gifts.

STATEMENT

קסבר: קדושת דמים מדחה מן הפכורה ומן המתנות.

The Gemara notes: This indicates that the Tanna **holds: Sanctity of value** (which is the only sanctity these pre-blemished animals have) **defers** and exempts the animal **from** the mitzvah of a firstborn and from the priestly gifts as long as the sanctity remains on it.

INFERENCE

ויוצאין לחולין וכו'. טעמא דנפדו, הא לא נפדו — אסירי בגיזה ועבודה.

We learnt in the Mishnah: **And they emerge to non-sacred status** to be shorn and to be worked with. The Gemara infers: **The reason** they are permitted is **that they were redeemed**; but if they were **not redeemed**, they are **prohibited in shearing and labor**.

QUESTION

מסייע ליה לרבי אליעזר, דאמר: קדשי בֶּדֶק הבית אסורין בגיזה ועבודה?

The Gemara asks: Does this **support Rabbi Eliezer, who said: Animals consecrated for Temple maintenance** (which only have sanctity of value) **are prohibited in shearing and labor**? Since our Mishnah's unredeemed animals also have only sanctity of value, this seems to support his view.

ANSWER

אמרי: לא, קדושת דמים למזבח הוא דמיחלףא בקדושת הגוף למזבח, גזרו בהו רבנן, אכל קדשי בֶּדֶק הבית — לא.

The Sages **say** in response: **No**, there is no proof from here. It is only **sanctity of value for the Altar that is easily confused with physical sanctity for the Altar**, and therefore **the Rabbis decreed on them** that they are prohibited in shearing and labor so people wouldn't treat physically holy animals lightly. **But** as for **animals consecrated for Temple maintenance**, which are never offered on the Altar, there is no such confusion, and the Rabbis did **not** make a decree.

QUESTION

ולדן וחלבן מותר כו'. היכי דמי?

We learnt in the Mishnah: **Their offspring and their milk are permitted** after their redemption. The Gemara asks: **What are the circumstances** of this case?

OBJECTION

אילימא דאיעבר ואתיליד לאחר פדיונן — פשיטא, חולין נינהו!

If we say that the animal became pregnant and gave birth after their redemption, then it is obvious that they are permitted, as they are completely non-sacred from the moment of conception!

RESOLUTION

אָלס דאָסער פֿרונד, וואָס זיין פֿרונד, וואָס זיין פֿרונד.

Rather, it must be that the animal became pregnant before their redemption, and gave birth after their redemption, and the Mishnah teaches that the offspring is permitted.

INFERENCE

האָ פֿרונד — אָסיר.

The Gemara infers: But if they gave birth before their redemption, the offspring are prohibited until they themselves are redeemed.

עמוד ב' DAF 14B

QUESTION

נפדין תמימים או אין נפדין תמימין?

Are the offspring of animals consecrated for their value redeemed while they are still unblemished, or are they not redeemed while they are unblemished, meaning we must wait for them to develop a blemish?

PROOF

תא שמע: המתפס בעלי מומין קבועין לגבי מזבח, וילדו — ימכרו, ואין צריכין מום, שאין קדושה חלה עליהן, שלא יהא טפל חמור מן העיקר.

Come and hear a proof from a baraita: One who consecrates permanently blemished animals for the altar, and they gave birth, the offspring may be sold to be redeemed, and they do not require a blemish to permit their sale, because altar sanctity does not take effect on them, for we say that the secondary offspring should not be more stringent than the primary mother. Since the mother can be redeemed unblemished, so can the offspring.

INFERENCE

טעמא, שלא יהא טפל חמור מן העיקר, אבל הקדיש זכר לדמיו — קדוש קדושת הגוף.

The Gemara infers: The reason the offspring is not sanctified with physical sanctity is that the secondary should not be more stringent than the primary. But if one consecrated a male animal for its value, where there is no secondary consecration, it is indeed sanctified with physical sanctity.

STATEMENT

מסייע ליה לרבא, דאמר רבא: הקדיש זכר לדמיו — קדוש קדושת הגוף.

This supports Rava, as Rava said: One who consecrates a male animal for its value, it becomes sanctified with physical sanctity.

MISHNAH

והשוֹחֵטֵן בַּחוּץ פָּטוּר.

The Mishnah taught: **And one who slaughters them**, animals whose blemish preceded their consecration, **outside** the Beis HaMikdash, is **exempt** from the punishment of kares.

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

EXPLANATION

רבי אֶלְעָזָר מְתִיב "חַיִּיב", ומוֹקִי לָהּ בְּכֶמֶת יָחִיד.

Rabbi Elazar teaches the Mishnah with the version "liable", and he establishes it as referring to a private altar of an individual, where offering a blemished animal is forbidden.

STATEMENT

דָּאָמַר רַבִּי אֶלְעָזָר: מִנֵּיין לְזוּבַח בְּהֶמָּה בְּעֵלְתָּ מוֹם בְּכֶמֶת יָחִיד בְּשַׁעַת הַיֵּיתֵר הַבְּמוֹת, שֶׁהוּא בִּלְאִי תַעֲשֶׂה?

As Rabbi Elazar said: From where is it derived for one who slaughters a blemished animal on a private altar at a time when high places were permitted, that he violates a negative commandment?

PROOF

שֶׁנֶּאֱמַר: "לֹא תִזְבַּח לַה' אֱלֹהֶיךָ שׁוֹר וְשֶׂה", אִם אֵינוֹ עֹנֵין לְכֶמֶת גְּדוּלָּה, דְּכֵתיב: "עֹרֹת אוֹ שָׂבוֹר וגו'", תִּנְהוּ עֹנֵין לְכֶמֶת יָחִיד.

As it is stated: "You shall not sacrifice to Hashem your Elokim an ox or a sheep in which there is a blemish." If this verse is not needed for the matter of the great altar in the Mishkan, as it is written there: "Blind or broken etc. you shall not offer these to Hashem," then apply it to the matter of a private altar.

QUESTION

אִמָּא: אִם אֵינוֹ עֹנֵין לְקַדְשִׁים — תִּנְהוּ עֹנֵין לְבָכוֹר, סֵלְקָא דַּעְתָּךְ אֲמִינָא: הוּאִיל וְקִדּוּשׁ בְּשָׂהוּא בְּעַל מוֹם — לִיקָרֵב נָמִי בְּשָׂהוּא בְּעַל מוֹם, קָא מְשַׁמַּע לֵן דְּלֹא!

The Gemara asks: But say instead: If it is not needed for the matter of regular sacrificial animals, apply it to the matter of a firstborn. For it might enter your mind to say: Since a firstborn is holy even when it is blemished from birth, let it also be sacrificed when it is blemished. Therefore, the verse comes to teach us that it is not so!

ANSWER

אָמְרִי: בָּכוֹר בְּהֶדְיָא כְּתִיב בֵּיהּ "פֶּסֶחַ אוֹ עוֹר לֹא תִזְבְּחוּ".

The Sages say in response: Regarding a firstborn, it is explicitly written about it: "Lame or blind... you shall not sacrifice it." So we do not need another verse for this.

QUESTION

ואימא: אם אינו ענין לקדשים — תניהו ענין למעשר, דסלקא דעתך אמינא: הואיל וקדוש במומו, דכתיב: "לא יבקר בין טוב לרע", נקרב נמי במומיה, קא משמע לן דלא!

The Gemara asks: But say: If it is not needed for sacrificial animals, apply it to the matter of animal tithe. For it might enter your mind to say: Since it is holy with its blemish, as it is written: "He shall not distinguish between good and bad," let it also be sacrificed with its blemish. Therefore, the verse comes to teach us that it is not so!

ANSWER

אמרי: מעשר נמי גמר "העברה" "העברה" מכאן.

The Sages say: Animal tithe is also derived by a gezerah shavah of the word "passing" and "passing" from a firstborn. Just as a blemished firstborn is not offered, neither is a blemished tithe.

QUESTION

אימא: תניהו ענין לתמורת קדשים, דסלקא דעתך אמינא: הואיל וקדושה כשהיא בעלת מום, דכתיב: "לא יחליפנו ולא ימיר אותו וגו'", קריבה נמי כשהיא בעלת מום, קא משמע לן דלא!

The Gemara asks: But say: Apply it to the matter of a substitute of sacrificial animals. For it might enter your mind to say: Since it becomes holy even when it is blemished, as it is written: "He shall not exchange it nor substitute it etc.," let it also be sacrificed when it is blemished. Therefore, the verse comes to teach us that it is not so!

ANSWER

אמר קרא: "והיה הוא ותמורתו", מקיש תמורתו לו — מה הוא בעל מום לא, אף תמורתו בעל מום לא.

The Gemara answers: The verse states: "Then it and its substitute shall be holy." This compares its substitute to it, the original animal: Just as it, the original animal, if it is blemished, is not sacrificed, so too its substitute, if it is blemished, is not sacrificed.

OBJECTION

מתקיף לה רבי זירא: אימא, תניהו ענין לולדות קדשים, דסלקא דעתך אמינא: הואיל וקדושיין כשהן בעלי מומין אנב אמן, כשהן בעלי מומין נמי קרבי, קא משמע לן דלא!

Rabbi Zeira objects to this: Say instead, apply it to the matter of the offspring of sacrificial animals. For it might enter your mind to say: Since they are holy when they are blemished on account of their mother, let them also be sacrificed when they are blemished. Therefore, the verse comes to teach us that it is not so!

RESOLUTION

אמר רבא: כבר פסקה תנא דבי רבי ישמעאל, דתנא דבי רבי ישמעאל: "רק קדשיה אשר יהיו לה ונדריה" — "רק קדשיה" אלו התמורות, "אשר יהיו לה" אלו הולדות, "ונדריה" — הקישין הכתוב לנדר, מה נדר בעל מום לא, אף הני נמי בעל מום לא.

Rava said: The Tanna of the school of Rabbi Yishmael already decided this, as the Tanna of the school of Rabbi Yishmael taught: "Only your holy things which you have, and your vows, you shall take and go to the place which Hashem shall choose." "Only your holy things" — these are the substitutes; "which you have" — these are the offspring; "and

your vows" — the verse compares them to a vow. Just as a vow, if it is blemished, is not sacrificed, so too these, if they are blemished, are not sacrificed.

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

וְאֵין עוֹשִׂין תְּמוּרָה, מֵאִי טַעְמָא? דְּאָמַר קָרָא: "לֹא יַחֲלִיפֶנּוּ וְלֹא יִמִּיר וְגו'".

The Mishnah taught: And they do not effect a substitution. What is the reason? As the verse states: "He shall not exchange it nor substitute it etc."

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

EXPLANATION

הַשְׁתָּא רַע בְּטוֹב אִמְרַתְּ לֹא, טוֹב בְּרַע מִיבְעִיָּא? אֵלֹא טוֹב מְעִיקְרוֹ עוֹשֶׂה תְּמוּרָה, רַע מְעִיקְרוֹ אֵין עוֹשֶׂה תְּמוּרָה.

The Gemara asks: Now, if substituting a bad animal for a good one you said is not allowed, is it necessary to say that substituting a good for a bad is forbidden? Rather, the verse must mean: An animal that was good from its inception, meaning unblemished when consecrated, effects a substitution, but one that was bad from its inception, meaning blemished when consecrated, does not effect a substitution.

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

אִם מָתוּ יִפְדּוּ.

The Mishnah taught: If they died, they may be redeemed.

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

STATEMENT

אָמַר רַב יְהוּדָה אָמַר רַב: זֶה דְּבַרֵּי רַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן, דְּאָמַר: קֳדָשֵׁי מִזְבֵּחַ הֵיוּ בְּכָלֵל הַעֲמָדָה וְהַעֲרָכָה, קֳדָשֵׁי בֶּדֶק הַבַּיִת לֹא הֵיוּ בְּכָלֵל הַעֲמָדָה וְהַעֲרָכָה.

Rav Yehudah said in the name of Rav: This is the opinion of Rabbi Shimon, who said: Altar-consecrated animals were included in the law of standing and valuation, meaning they cannot be redeemed after they die, but Temple-treasury-consecrated animals were not included in the law of standing and valuation.

PROOF

דִּתְנֹנוּ, רַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן אוֹמֵר: קֳדָשֵׁי בֶּדֶק הַבַּיִת, אִם מָתוּ — יִפְדּוּ.

As we learned in a Mishnah, Rabbi Shimon says: Temple-treasury-consecrated animals, if they died, they may be redeemed.

STATEMENT

ומוֹדָה רַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן בְּבָעַל מוֹם מֵעִיקָרוֹ שְׁנִפְדָּה.

And Rabbi Shimon agrees regarding an animal that was blemished from its inception and consecrated for the altar, that it may be redeemed even if it died.

EXPLANATION

מַאי טַעְמָא? דָּאֲמַר קָרָא: "אוֹתָהּ" "אוֹתָהּ" — לְמַעוּטֵי בְּעַל מוֹם מֵעִיקָרָא.

What is the reason? As the verse states: "it" and "it", which comes to exclude an animal that was blemished from its inception from the requirement of standing and valuation.

STATEMENT

אָבֵל חֲכָמִים אוֹמְרִים: אִם מָתוּ — יִקָּבְרוּ.

But the Sages say: If they died, they must be buried, because they hold even these require standing and valuation.

EXPLANATION

מֵאֵן חֲכָמִים? תָּנָא דְּבִי לִוי הוּא, דְּתָנָא דְּבִי לִוי: הֲפֹל הָיוּ בְּכָלֵל הָעֲמֻדָּה וְהַעֲרָכָה, וְאִפִּילוּ בְּעַל מוֹם מֵעִיקָרוֹ.

Who are the Sages mentioned here? It is the Tanna of the school of Levi, as the Tanna of the school of Levi taught: Everything was included in the law of standing and valuation, and even an animal blemished from its inception.

STATEMENT

וְכֹן תָּנָא דְּבִי לִוי בְּמִתְנִיתִיהּ: אִפִּילוּ חִיָּה, אִפִּילוּ עוֹף,

And so the Tanna of the school of Levi taught in his Mishnah: Even a wild beast, and even a bird, require standing and valuation.

QUESTION

וְהִכְתִּיב "אוֹתָהּ"!

The Gemara asks: **But isn't it written "it"**, which implies an exclusion?

ANSWER

"אוֹתָהּ" לְתָנָא דְּבִי לִוי קָשְׁיָא.

The Gemara answers: The word "it" is indeed a difficulty for the Tanna of the school of Levi.

QUESTION

אָבֵל רַבָּנָן דְּפָלִיגִי עָלֶיהָ דְּרַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן, מַאי? הֲכִי נָמִי דָּאֵם מָתוּ יִפְדּוּ? אִי הָכִי,

But the Rabbis who argue with Rabbi Shimon, what do they say? Do they also hold that if they died they may be redeemed? If so,

SUMMARY

The daf focuses on analyzing the Mishnah's rulings regarding blemished consecrated animals. We learn that an animal with a pre-existing blemish only has kedushas damim, meaning that once it is redeemed, it is completely chullin; its offspring and milk are muttar, and one who slaughters it outside the Azarah is exempt from kares. Conversely, an animal that had kedushas haguf before it was blemished retains a higher level of sanctity even after redemption, meaning its offspring and milk remain assur, and shearing or working it is forbidden. The Gemara uses these distinctions to clarify the status of offspring born before redemption, proving that they do not require a blemish to be redeemed. Finally, the Gemara discusses Rabbi Elazar's unique version of the Mishnah, which leads into a deep halachic analysis of whether one is allowed to offer a blemished animal on a private bamah.

למעשה WHAT TO TAKE HOME

The yesod of our Mishnah lies in the deep distinction between an animal whose blemish preceded its consecration, and one whose consecration came first. When a blemish is already there, the animal only receives a "kedushas damim", a sanctity of monetary value. It never becomes physically holy on the Mizbeach. But if it was holy first and then became blemished, that "kedushas haguf", the physical, intrinsic holiness, remains locked inside it forever, even after it is redeemed.

Lichoira, we have to ask ourselves: what is the avodah here for us? Every single Yid is a chelek Eloka mima'al, possessing a pure neshama that is inherently kadosh. But life happens, and we face nisyonos. Sometimes a person looks at themselves and sees "blemishes", mistakes they made, bad middos, or spiritual setbacks. The yetzer hara tries to convince us that these blemishes define us, that we have lost our intrinsic holiness and are now just "damaged goods."

But the Torah is teaching us a tremendous chiddush here. Your kedushah preceded any blemish! You were born with a neshama tehorah; your essential self is pure kedushas haguf. A blemish might affect your external actions or require a process of teshuvah and redemption, but it can never erase the intrinsic holiness of who you really are. Just like the animal that was consecrated first, your inner holiness remains intact, waiting to be uncovered.

Today, when you make a mistake or feel discouraged by your spiritual shortcomings, stop and remind yourself: "My neshama is kedushas haguf. This blemish is only on the outside, and it can never change my essential connection to Hashem."