

דף יומי • בכורות • דף ה'

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

THE SUGYA

We begin the daf with a deep dive into the machlokes between Rabbi Yoḥanan and Reish Lakish regarding whether the firstborn of Bnei Yisrael were sanctified in the wilderness. The Gemara seeks the source for Rabbi Yoḥanan's shitta that they indeed remained holy, bringing a beautiful chiddush from Rabbi Elazar who saw Rabbi Yoḥanan in a dream, confirming the limud from the pasuk "Mine they shall be." We also explore a second version of this machlokes brought by Rav Mordekhai, which leads to an important yesod about the chiyuv to teach a dabar in the precise lashon of one's rebbe.

Next, the Gemara brings a fascinating shakla v'tarya involving the Roman officer Kontrokos and Rabban Yoḥanan ben Zakkai. The officer asks several tough kashas on the numbers in the Torah, including why the individual count of the Levi'im doesn't match the total sum, and a serious challenge on the accounting of the silver collected for the Mishkan. Rabban Yoḥanan ben Zakkai defends the integrity of Moshe Rabbeinu, showing how the math works out perfectly once we understand the unique weight of the Sanctuary's currency.

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

עמוד א' DAF 5A

STATEMENT

ופסקו.

And then their sanctity **ceased** following the census in the wilderness.

QUESTION

בשלא ייש לקיש, כדאמר טעם,

The Gemara asks: **Granted, according to Reish Lakish**, it is **as he said** the **reason** for his view, that they were not sanctified in the wilderness, based on the pesukim,

QUESTION

אלא לרבי יוחנן — מאי טעמא?

but according to Rabbi Yoḥanan, who holds that they did continue to be sanctified, **what is the reason** and source for his opinion?

ANSWER

אמר רבי אלעזר: רבי יוחנן חזאי בחילמא דמילתא מעליה אמנא,

Rabbi Elazar said: I saw Rabbi Yoḥanan in a dream, which is a sign that I am saying a proper matter in explaining his opinion.

ANSWER

אָמַר קָרָא "לִי יְהִיו" — בְּהִיטֵן יְהוּ.

The verse states: "Mine they shall be" (Bamidbar 3:13), which teaches that **in their current state of sanctity they shall remain** for all generations.

QUESTION

וְרַבִּי יוֹחָנָן, "וְהָיָה כִּי יְבִיאֲהֶ... וְהִעֲבַרְתָּ" מֵאִי עֲבִיד לִיָּה?

The Gemara asks: **And** as for Rabbi Yoḥanan, the verse "And it shall be when He shall bring you... and you shall set apart" (Shemos 13:11-12), which Reish Lakish used to prove that the mitzvah only started in Eretz Yisrael, **what does he do with it?**

ANSWER

הָהוּא מִיבְּעִי לִיָּה לְכַדְתָּנָא דְּבִי רַבִּי יִשְׁמַעֵאל: עֲשֵׂה מִצְוָה זוֹ שְׁפָשְׁבִי לָהּ תִּיפְנִס לְאַרְצָא.

The Gemara answers: **That** verse is **necessary** for him for that which the Tanna of the school of Rabbi Yishmael taught: **Perform this mitzvah** of firstborns now, **because on account of it you will merit** to enter the Land of Eretz Yisrael.

STATEMENT

אָמַר לִיָּה רַב מְרִידְכִי לְרַב אָשִׁי: אַתּוֹן הָכִי מִתְנִיתוֹ לָהּ, אֲנִן אֵיפְכָא מִתְנִינִן לָהּ,

Rav Mordekhai said to Rav Ashi: You teach it this way, but we teach it the opposite way:

STATEMENT

רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן אָמַר: לֹא קִדְּשׁוּ בְּכוֹרוֹת בְּמִדְבָּר, וְרִישׁ לְקִישׁ אָמַר: קִדְּשׁוּ בְּכוֹרוֹת בְּמִדְבָּר.

Rabbi Yoḥanan says: The firstborn were not sanctified in the wilderness; and Reish Lakish says: The firstborn were sanctified in the wilderness.

QUESTION

אָמַר לִיָּה: וְאַפְכִית נָמִי תִּיּוֹבָתָא, וְאַפְכִיתוֹ לָהּ לְהָא דְּרַבִּי אֶלְעָזָר?

Rav Ashi said to him: **And do you also reverse the objections** raised between them, **and do you also reverse that which Rabbi Elazar** said about his dream, applying it to Reish Lakish instead?

ANSWER

אָמַר לִיָּה: לֹא קִדְּשׁוּ לָהּ — לֹא הוּצָרְכוּ לִיקְדָּשׁ.

Rav Mordekhai said to him: No, when Rabbi Yoḥanan said "they were not sanctified," he meant they did not need to be **consecrated** by mouth, because they were already holy from the womb. But they certainly had sanctity.

QUESTION

אִי הָכִי, הֵיִינוּ דִּידָן!

The Gemara asks: **If so**, that **is the same as our** version of the dispute, that according to Rabbi Yoḥanan they were indeed holy! Why did you present it as a different version?

ANSWER

קָא מִשְׁמַע לָן: חֵיִיב אָדָם לומר בְּלִשׁוֹן רַבּוֹ.

The Gemara answers: This comes to teach us that a person is obligated to say a teaching in the precise language of his teacher, even if the ultimate meaning is the same.

STATEMENT

שאל קונטריוקוס השר את רבן יוחנן בן זכאי: בפרטן של לויים אתה מוצא עשרים ושנים אלה ושלוש מאות.

The Gemara relates: Kontrokos the officer asked Rabban Yohanan ben Zakkai: In the individual count of the families of the Levites, you find twenty-two thousand and three hundred,

QUESTION

בכללן אתה מוצא עשרים ושנים אלה, ושלוש מאות להיכן הלקו?

yet in their collective count, you find only twenty-two thousand. Where did the other three hundred go?

ANSWER

אמר לו: אותן שלש מאות בכורות הן, ואין בכור מפקיע בכור.

Rabban Yohanan ben Zakkai said to him: Those three hundred extra Levites were firstborns themselves, and a firstborn Levite cannot abrogate the sanctity of an Israelite firstborn because he himself needs redemption.

EXPLANATION

מאי טעמא? אמר אביי: דיו לבכור שיפקיע קדושת עצמו.

The Gemara asks: What is the reason? Abaye said: It is sufficient for the Levite firstborn that he should abrogate his own firstborn sanctity and exempt himself from redemption.

QUESTION

ועוד שאלו: בגיבוי כסף אתה מוצא מאתיים ואחת כפר ואחת עשרה מנה,

And he further asked him: In the collection of the silver, you find two hundred and one talents and eleven maneh,

PROOF

דכתיב: "פקע לגלגלת מחצית השקל בשקל הקדש וגו'",

as it is written: "A beka a head, half a shekel, by the shekel of the Sanctuary, etc." for 603,550 men, which totals 301,775 shekels,

PROOF

ובנתינת הכסף אתה מוצא מאת כפר, דכתיב: "ויהי מאת כפר הכסף לצקת וגו'".

but in the giving of the silver for the sockets, you find only one hundred talents, as it is written: "And the hundred talents of silver were for casting, etc."

QUESTION

משה רבכם גנב היתה, או קוביוסטוס היתה, או אינו פקי בחשבונות?

Was Moshe your teacher a thief, or was he a gambler, or was he not expert in accounting?

QUESTION

נתן מחצה ונטל מחצה, ומחצה שלם לא החזיר.

For he gave half of the money and took half for himself, and he did not even return a complete half to the Tabernacle!

ANSWER

אמר לו: משה רבינו גיזבר נאמן היה, ובקי בחשבונות היה, ומנה של קודש כפול היה.

Rabban Yohanan ben Zakkai said to him: Moshe our teacher was a trustworthy treasurer, and he was expert in accounting, but the maneh of the Sanctuary was double the value of a standard maneh.

QUESTION

הוי ביה רב אחאי: מאי קא קשיא ליה, "ויהי מאת כפר הכסף לצקת וגו'?"

Rav Achai discussed it: What was difficult for him that forced him to give this answer? Was it the verse "And the hundred talents of silver were for casting, etc."?

QUESTION

הנה לצקת, ואינה בי גזא!

But **these** one hundred talents were designated **for casting** the sockets, and the **other** hundred talents were placed in the **treasury**! Why did he assume they were missing?

ANSWER

כתב קרא אחרינא: "וכסף פקודי העדה מאת כפר וגו'".

The Gemara answers: **Another verse is written** regarding the total sum collected: "And the silver of those that were numbered of the congregation was a hundred talents, etc." which shows that only one hundred talents were collected in total.

QUESTION

ודקאמר ליה: מנה של קודש כפול היה, מנא ליה?

The Gemara asks: **And that** which he said to him, that the maneh of the Sanctuary was double, from where does he derive **this**?

ANSWER

אלימא מיניה, שהרי כאן שבועים ואחד מנה — "וְאֵת הָאֶלֶף וּשְׁבַע מֵאוֹת וַחֲמִשָּׁה וּשְׁבַעִים עָשָׂה וַיַּמְדֵּם",

If we say it is derived from the verse itself, for there are seventy-one maneh here in the remaining silver: "And of the thousand seven hundred and seventy-five shekels he made hooks for the pillars,"

ANSWER

ולא מנאן הכתוב אלא בפרוטרוט, ואם איתא — מאה ואחד כפר ואחת עשרה מנה מיבעי ליה!

and the verse only counted them in detail as shekels, and not as talents. And if it were so that a Sanctuary maneh was standard, it should have written one hundred and one talents and eleven maneh!

ANSWER

אֵלָא, מִדְּלֵא מְנָאן הַכְּתוּב אֵלָא בְּפִרְטוּט, שְׁמַע מִינָּה: מָנָה שֶׁל קוּדֶשׁ כְּפוּל הִיָּה.

Rather, since the verse only counted them in detail, learn from this that the maneh of the Sanctuary was double, making 1,775 shekels less than a full talent.

OBJECTION

וְדִילְמָא כְּלָלִי קִחְשִׁיב בְּכַכְרִי, פְּרָטִי לָא קָא חֲשִׁיב בְּכַכְרִי!

The Gemara objects: **But perhaps** the Torah counts whole talents in talents, but fractions of a talent it does not count in talents, even if they add up to more than a talent!

ANSWER

אֵלָא מִהֲכָא: "וַיִּנְחֹשֶׁת הַתְּנוּפָה שְׁבַעַיִם כֶּכֶר וְאַלְפִים וְאַרְבַּע מֵאוֹת שֶׁקֶל",

Rather, the proof is from here: "And the copper of the wave-offering was seventy talents and two thousand and four hundred shekels" (Shemos 38:29).

ANSWER

שְׁהָרִי כָּאן תִּשְׁעִים וְשֵׁשָׁה מָנָה, וְלֹא מְנָאן הַכְּתוּב אֵלָא בְּפִרְטוּט, שְׁמַע מִינָּה: מָנָה שֶׁל קוּדֶשׁ כְּפוּל הִיָּה.

For there are ninety-six maneh here in the remaining copper, and the verse only counted them in detail as shekels, and not as a talent. Learn from this that the maneh of the Sanctuary was double, so ninety-six maneh is less than a double-value talent.

OBJECTION

וְדִילְמָא פְּרָטָא רַבָּה קָא חֲשִׁיב בְּכַכְרִי, פְּרָטָא זוּטָא לָא קִחְשִׁיב בְּכַכְרִי!

The Gemara objects: **But perhaps** a large fraction like ninety-six maneh it would count in talents, but a small fraction like seventy-one maneh it does not count in talents!

ANSWER

אֵלָא אָמַר רַב חֲסִידָא: מִהֲכָא, "וְהַשֶּׁקֶל עֶשְׂרִים גֵּרָה עֶשְׂרִים שֶׁקֶלִים חֲמִשָּׁה וְעֶשְׂרִים שֶׁקֶלִים עֶשְׂרֶה וַחֲמִשָּׁה שֶׁקֶל הַמָּנָה יִהְיֶה לָכֶם".

Rather, Rav Chisda said: The proof is from here: "And the shekel shall be twenty gerah; twenty shekels, twenty-five shekels, fifteen shekels, shall be your maneh" (Yechezkel 45:12), which totals sixty shekels, showing the Sanctuary maneh was indeed double.

עמוד ב' DAF 5B

OBJECTION

וְהָא מֵאֲתוּ וְאַרְבַּעִין הִוְיִין!

The Gemara objects: **But** sixty shekels of four dinars each are two hundred and forty dinars, which is still not a maneh of one hundred dinars! So how does Yechezkel's verse equate sixty shekels to a maneh?

ANSWER

אֵלָא שְׁמַע מִינָּה: מָנָה שֶׁל קוֹדֶשׁ מָנָה כָּפוּל הָיָה.

Rather, learn from this verse a number of things: First, learn that the **maneh** of the Sanctuary was a **double maneh**, meaning it was worth fifty holy shekels, which equal two hundred dinars.

INFERENCE

וּשְׁמַע מִינָּה, מוֹסִיפִין עַל הַמִּדּוֹת, וְאֵין מוֹסִיפִין יֵתֵר עַל שְׁתּוֹת,

And learn from this as well that the court **may increase the measures** and weights, **but they may not increase** them by **more than one-sixth** of the final total.

INFERENCE

וּשְׁמַע מִינָּה שְׁתּוֹתָא מְלָכָר.

And learn from this that the **one-sixth** increase is calculated **from the outside**, meaning it is one-sixth of the new total, which is equivalent to adding one-fifth to the original fifty shekels, bringing it to sixty.

STATEMENT

אָמַר רַבִּי חֲנִינָא: שָׁאֲלָתִי אֶת רַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר בְּבֵית מוֹתְכָא רַבָּא, מָה נִשְׁתַּנוּ פְּטוּרֵי חֲמוֹרִים מִפְּטוּרֵי סוּסִים וְגַמְלִים?

The Gemara returns to the topic of firstborn donkeys: **Rabbi Chanina said: I asked Rabbi Eliezer in the great study hall: In what way are the firstborn of donkeys different from the firstborn of horses and camels**, which do not require redemption?

ANSWER

אָמַר לִי: גְזֵירַת הַכָּתוּב הִיא,

He said to me: It is a decree of the Scripture, a chok that we cannot fully understand.

EXPLANATION

וְעוֹד שְׁפִייעוּ יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּשַׁעַת יְצִיאָתָם מִמִּצְרַיִם, שָׁאִין לָהּ כָּל אֶחָד וְאֶחָד מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל שֶׁלֹּא הָיוּ עִמּוֹ תִּשְׁעִים חֲמוֹרִים לִוְבִים טְעוּנִים מִכֶּסֶּפֶה וְזָהָבָה שֶׁל מִצְרַיִם.

And furthermore, there is a historical reason: **because they assisted Bnei Yisrael at the time of their exodus from Mitzrayim**, as there was not a single one of Israel who did not have ninety Libyan donkeys with him, laden with the silver and gold of Mitzrayim.

STATEMENT

וְעוֹד שָׁאֲלָתִיו: מָאי לְשׁוֹן "רִפְּדִים"?

Rabbi Chanina continues: **And furthermore, I asked him: What is the meaning of the name 'Rephidim' in the verse where Amalek attacked?**

ANSWER

וְאָמַר לִי: רִפְּדִים שְׁמָהּ.

And he said to me: Rephidim is simply its name, a literal place name.

EXPLANATION

בְּתַנָּאִי: רַבִּי אֶלְיעֶזֶר אוֹמֵר: רִפְדִּים שְׁמָה,

The Gemara notes: This is **like** a dispute between **Tannaim**, as it is taught in a beraisa: **Rabbi Eliezer** says: Rephidim is its **name**.

EXPLANATION

רַבִּי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ אוֹמֵר: שָׂרִיפוּ עֲצָמָן מִדְּבַר־י תּוֹרָה, וְכֵן הוּא אוֹמֵר: "לֹא הִפְנוּ אָבוֹת אֶל בָּנִים מִרְפִּיּוֹן יָדִים".

But **Rabbi Yehoshua** says: It is called Rephidim because **they weakened themselves from the words of Torah**, and so it says in Yirmiyahu: '**Fathers did not turn back to their children because of weakness of hands**'.

STATEMENT

וְעוֹד שָׁאֵלְתִּיו: מַאי לְשׁוֹן "שְׁטִים"?

Rabbi Chanina continues: **And furthermore**, I asked him: What is the meaning of the name 'Shittim'?

ANSWER

וְאָמַר לִי: שְׁטִים שְׁמָה.

And he said to me: Shittim is its name.

EXPLANATION

בְּתַנָּאִי: רַבִּי אֶלְיעֶזֶר אוֹמֵר: שְׁטִים שְׁמָה, רַבִּי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ אוֹמֵר: שְׁנַתְעִסְקוּ בְּדַבְרֵי שְׁטוּת.

The Gemara notes: This is **like** a dispute between **Tannaim**: **Rabbi Eliezer** says: Shittim is its name. **Rabbi Yehoshua** says: It was called Shittim because **they engaged in matters of nonsense** and immorality.

EXPLANATION

"וַתִּקְרָאֵן לָעָם לְזִבְחֵי אֱלֹהֵיהֶן" — רַבִּי אֶלְיעֶזֶר אוֹמֵר: עֲרוּמוֹת פָּגְעוּ בָהֶן, רַבִּי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ אוֹמֵר: שְׁנַעְשׂוּ כוֹלָן בְּעַלֵּי קְרִיּוֹן.

Regarding the verse, '**And they called the people to the sacrifices of their gods**,' **Rabbi Eliezer** says: **Naked women met them** and enticed them. **Rabbi Yehoshua** says: **They all became baalei keri** from the intense lust.

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מִתְנִי פָּרָה שֶׁיָּלְדָה מִיֵּן חֲמוֹר, וְחֲמוֹר שֶׁיָּלְדָה כְּמִין סוֹס — פְּטוּרָה מִן הַבְּכוּרָה,

MISHNAH: A cow that gave birth to a donkey-like offspring, and a donkey that gave birth to a horse-like offspring, are both **exempt** from the law of the firstborn.

MISHNAH

שנאמר: "פטר חמור" "פטר חמור" שני פעמים, עד שיהא היולד חמור והנולד חמור.

As it is said: 'The firstborn of a donkey' in one verse, and 'the firstborn of a donkey' in another verse, written two times, to teach that there is no obligation until the mother giving birth is a donkey and the offspring born is a donkey.

MISHNAH

ומה הם באכילה?

And what is their status regarding eating them?

MISHNAH

בהמה טהורה שילדה כמין בהמה טמאה — מותר באכילה,

A kosher animal that gave birth to a non-kosher-like offspring—the offspring is permitted for eating.

MISHNAH

וטמאה שילדה כמין בהמה טהורה — אסור באכילה,

And a non-kosher animal that gave birth to a kosher-like offspring—the offspring is forbidden for eating.

MISHNAH

שהיוצא מן הטמא — טמא, והיוצא מן הטהור — טהור.

Because that which emerges from the non-kosher is non-kosher, and that which emerges from the kosher is kosher.

גמרא GEMARA

GEMARA

גמ' תנן התם: רחל שילדה מין עז, ועז שילדה מין רחל — פטור מן הפכורה, ואם יש בו מקצת סימנין — חייב.

GEMARA: We learned in a Mishnah over there in Chullin: A ewe that gave birth to a goat-like offspring, and a goat that gave birth to a ewe-like offspring, are exempt from the law of the firstborn. But if the offspring has some of the characteristics of its mother, it is obligated.

QUESTION

מנא הני מילי?

The Gemara asks: From where are these words derived?

ANSWER

אמר רב יהודה, דאמר קרא: "אך בכור שור" — שיהא הוא שור ובכורו שור,

Rav Yehuda said: As the verse states: 'But the firstborn of an ox'—teaching that it must be an ox and its firstborn must be an ox.

ANSWER

”בְּכוֹר כֶּשֶׁב” — שִׁיָּהּ הוּא כֶּשֶׁב וּבְכוֹרוֹ כֶּשֶׁב, ”בְּכוֹר עֹז” — שִׁיָּהּ הוּא עֹז וּבְכוֹרוֹ עֹז.

‘The firstborn of a sheep’—that it must be a sheep and its firstborn must be a sheep. ‘The firstborn of a goat’—that it must be a goat and its firstborn must be a goat.

ANSWER

יָכוֹל אֶפְיָלוּ יֵשׁ בּוֹ מְקַצֵּת סִמָּנִין? תִּלְמוּד לֹאֵמַר: ”אֲךָ” — חֵלֶק.

I might have thought that even if it has some of the characteristics of the mother, it is still exempt? Therefore, the verse states: ‘But’—which divides and excludes this case, teaching that if it has some characteristics, it is obligated.

QUESTION

וְהָא תַּנָּא ”פֶּטֶר” פֶּטֶר קְנָסִיב לָהּ, לְפָרָה!

The Gemara asks: But doesn’t the Tanna of our Mishnah bring the verses of ‘firstborn’ and ‘firstborn’ for the cow that gave birth to a donkey-like offspring? Why does Rav Yehuda use a different verse?

ANSWER

הוּא דֹאֵמַר כְּרַבִּי יוֹסִי הַגְּלִילִי, דְּתַנָּא: רַבִּי יוֹסִי הַגְּלִילִי אָמַר: ”אֲךָ בְּכוֹר שׁוֹר” — עַד שִׁיָּהּ הוּא שׁוֹר וּבְכוֹרוֹ שׁוֹר,

The Gemara answers: Rav Yehuda spoke in accordance with Rabbi Yosei HaGelili, as it is taught in a beraita: Rabbi Yosei HaGelili says: ‘But the firstborn of an ox’ teaches that it is not holy until it is an ox and its firstborn is an ox.

ANSWER

”בְּכוֹר כֶּשֶׁב” — עַד שִׁיָּהּ הוּא כֶּשֶׁב וּבְכוֹרוֹ כֶּשֶׁב, ”אוֹ בְּכוֹר עֹז” — עַד שִׁיָּהּ הוּא עֹז וּבְכוֹרוֹ עֹז.

‘The firstborn of a sheep’—until it is a sheep and its firstborn is a sheep. ‘Or the firstborn of a goat’—until it is a goat and its firstborn is a goat.

ANSWER

יָכוֹל אֶפְיָלוּ יֵשׁ בּוֹ מְקַצֵּת סִמָּנִין? תִּלְמוּד לֹאֵמַר: ”אֲךָ” — חֵלֶק.

I might have thought that even if it has some of the characteristics of the mother, it is exempt? Therefore, the verse states: ‘But’—which divides and includes it.

QUESTION

בְּמַאי קָמִיפְלָגִי?

The Gemara asks: In what principle do they dispute—our Mishnah’s Tanna and Rabbi Yosei HaGelili?

EXPLANATION

תַּנָּא דִּידֵן סָבַר: גָּלִי רַחֲמָנָא בְּקַדוּשַׁת דְּמִים, וְהוּא הִדִּין בְּקַדוּשַׁת הַגּוֹף.

Our Tanna holds: The Torah revealed this rule of ‘until the mother and offspring are the same’ by non-kosher animals, which have sanctity of value, and the same law applies to animals with physical sanctity.

EXPLANATION

ורבי יוסי סבר: גלי רחמנא בקדושת הגוף, והוא הדין בקדושת דמים, וגמר קדושת דמים מקדושת הגוף.

And Rabbi Yosei holds: The Torah revealed this by physical sanctity, and the same law applies to sanctity of value, and he derives sanctity of value from physical sanctity.

QUESTION

ותנא דידן, האי "בכור" "בכור" מאי עביד ליה?

The Gemara asks: And our Tanna, what does he do with this repetition of 'firstborn' and 'firstborn' in the verse of the ox, sheep, and goat?

ANSWER

מיבעי ליה לכדרבי יוסי ברבי חנינא.

He requires it for that which Rabbi Yosei b'rabbi Chanina said.

EXPLANATION

דאמר רבי יוסי ברבי חנינא: למה נאמרו אימורין בבכור שור, אימורין בבכור כשב, אימורין בבכור עז?

For Rabbi Yosei b'rabbi Chanina said: Why were the sacrificial parts mentioned by the firstborn of an ox, the firstborn of a sheep, and the firstborn of a goat separately?

EXPLANATION

צריכא, דאי כתב רחמנא בבכור שור — שפן נתרפה בנסכים.

They are all necessary, because if the Torah had only written it by the firstborn of an ox, we would say it applies only there because it is accompanied by a large amount of libations.

EXPLANATION

כשב — שפן נתרפה בא ליה.

If it was only written by a sheep, we would say it applies only there because its fat tail is offered on the Altar.

EXPLANATION

עז — שפן נתרפה אצל עבודה זרה ביהיד.

And if it was only written by a goat, we would say it applies only there because a goat is brought as a sin offering for an individual's unintentional idol worship.

QUESTION

חדא מחדא לא אתיא, תיתי חדא מתרתי!

The Gemara asks: Granted one cannot be derived from another, but let one be derived from the other two!

QUESTION

בהי לא ליכתוב?

The Gemara analyzes: Which one should the Torah not write?

EXPLANATION

לא לִיְכָתוֹב רַחֲמָנָא בְּשׁוֹר, וְתִיתִי מִהֶנָּה — מָה לְהֵנָּה, שְׁפֵן נִתְּרָבוּ אֶצֶל פְּסָחִים!

Let the Torah not write it by an ox, and let it be derived from the others—sheep and goats! But we could refute this: What is unique about those two is that they are eligible for Pesach offerings, which an ox is not!

EXPLANATION

לא לִיְכָתוֹב בְּכֶשֶׁב, וְתִיתִי מִהֶנָּה — מָה לְהֵנָּה שְׁפֵן נִתְּרָבוּ אֶצֶל עֲבוֹדָה זָרָה בְּצִיבוּר!

Let the Torah not write it by a sheep, and let it be derived from the others—ox and goat! But we could refute this: What is unique about those two is that they are brought for communal idol worship offerings, which a sheep is not!

EXPLANATION

לא נִיְכָתוֹב רַחֲמָנָא בְּעִז, וְתִיתִי מִהֶנָּךְ — מָה לְהֵנָּה שְׁפֵן יֵשׁ בָּהֶן צֵד רַבּוּי אֶצֶל מִזְבֵּחַ!

Let the Torah not write it by a goat, and let it be derived from the others—ox and sheep! But we could refute this: What is unique about those two is that they have aspects of extra offerings on the Altar—the ox has more libations, and the sheep has the fat tail!

RESOLUTION

הֵילָכָה צָרִיכִי.

Therefore, they are all necessary.

OBJECTION

וְרַבִּי יוֹסִי הַגְּלִילִי, אִם כֵּן לִיְכָתוֹב קָרָא "אֶה בְּכוֹר שׁוֹר כֶּשֶׁב וְעִז", "בְּכוֹר" "בְּכוֹר" לָמָּה לִי?

And Rabbi Yosei HaGelili argues: If so, let the verse write: 'But the firstborn of an ox, sheep, and goat.' Why do I need the repetition of 'firstborn' and 'firstborn' for each one?

RESOLUTION

אָלָא לָאוּ שָׁמַע מִינָּה: עַד שְׁיֵהָא הוּא שׁוֹר וּבְכוֹרוֹ שׁוֹר.

Rather, is it not to be learned from this: that it is not holy until it is an ox and its firstborn is an ox?

QUESTION

וְרַבִּי יוֹסִי הַגְּלִילִי, הָאִי "פֶּטֶר חֲמוֹר" "פֶּטֶר חֲמוֹר" מָאִי עָבִיד לִיה?

The Gemara asks: And Rabbi Yosei HaGelili, what does he do with this repetition of 'the firstborn of a donkey' and 'the firstborn of a donkey' in the Torah?

ANSWER

מִיבְעֵי לִיה לְכַדְתֵּינָא: רַבִּי יוֹסִי הַגְּלִילִי אוֹמֵר, מִתּוֹךְ שְׁנַיִמָּר "אֶה פֶדָה תִּפְדֶּה אֶת בְּכוֹר הָאָדָם וְאֶת בְּכוֹר הַבְּהֵמָה הַטְּמֵאָה תִּפְדֶּה",

He requires it for that which is taught in a beraisa: Rabbi Yosei HaGelili says: Since it is said, 'But you shall surely redeem the firstborn of man, and the firstborn of the non-kosher animal you shall redeem,'

ANSWER

שומע אני אפילו פטרי סוסים וגמלים?

I might hear that this includes even the firstborn of horses and camels?

ANSWER

תלמוד לומר "פטור חמור" — פטור חמור אמרתי לה, ולא פטרי סוסים וגמלים.

Therefore, the verse states: 'The firstborn of a donkey'—meaning, I told you the firstborn of a donkey, and not the firstborn of horses and camels.

ANSWER

ועדיין אני אומר: פטרי חמור בשוה, פטרי סוסים וגמלים בכל דבר.

And yet I might still say: The firstborn of a donkey is redeemed with a lamb, while the firstborn of horses and camels are redeemed with anything else.

SUMMARY

In this daf, the Gemara clarifies the dispute over the sanctity of the firstborn in the midbar, establishing that according to Rabbi Yohanan, their holiness was permanent across generations, while Reish Lakish holds it was paused until they entered Eretz Yisrael. We then address the questions of the officer Kontrokos; Rabban Yohanan ben Zakkai explains that the missing three hundred Levi'im were firstborns themselves, who could not redeem other firstborns. Regarding the silver accounting, the Gemara proves through a series of calculations and pesukim—culminating in a raaya from Yechezkel brought by Rav Chisda—that the holy shekel and maneh used for the Sanctuary were double the value of standard currency, vindicating the precise accounting of Moshe Rabbeinu.

The Gemara is bothered by a kasha on the accounting of the Mishkan's silver. The Roman officer Kontrokos challenged Rabban Yoḥanan ben Zakkai, claiming that Moshe Rabbeinu must have been a thief or terrible at math, because the total silver collected from the census did not seem to match what was actually used for the sockets. Rabban Yoḥanan ben Zakkai answered him clearly: Moshe Rabbeinu was a completely trustworthy treasurer, and the holy maneh of the Sanctuary was actually double the value of a standard maneh.

Lichoira, look at what is happening here. Moshe Rabbeinu, the leader of Klal Yisrael who spoke to Hashem face-to-face, was subjected to suspicion and accounting audits by outsiders. Even the greatest, most selfless leader can have his integrity questioned. Yet, the Torah goes out of its way to show that everything was accounted for down to the very last half-shekel. Moshe Rabbeinu did not rely on his reputation alone; he made sure the math was absolutely clear and transparent.

This teaches us a massive yesod in our own avodah. Sometimes we think, "As long as my intentions are pure and Hashem knows the truth, it doesn't matter how things look to others." But the Torah is telling us the exact opposite. We must be incredibly careful to act in a way that is completely clean, not just in the eyes of Hashem, but also in the eyes of people. Whether you are managing tzedakah funds, running a business, or just dealing with family members, you must go the extra mile to ensure there is no room for suspicion.

Today, make a point to practice absolute transparency in your financial dealings or commitments. If you owe someone money, manage a public project, or promised to take care of something, lay out the details clearly so there is no room for misunderstanding or doubt.