

דף יומי • בכורות • דף נ"א

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

THE SUGYA

We start off on our daf finishing up the discussion about which Torah payments require Tyrian shekels, with the Gemara explaining why the Tanna had to list cases like the rapist and the defamer specifically. We then move into a fascinating discussion about what kinds of items can be used for payments and redemptions. The Mishnah teaches that while most monetary obligations can be paid with either coins or equivalent value, certain things like the half-shekels, second tithe, and appearance-offering money must be paid davka with actual minted coins.

This leads us directly into a new Mishnah regarding Pidyon Haben, the redemption of a firstborn son. The Tanna Kamma rules that a father cannot redeem his son with slaves, promissory notes, land, or consecrated items. We also learn that the redemption is not complete until the Kohen actually receives the money, though the Kohen is allowed to give the five sela'im back to the father as a gift afterward. The Gemara immediately jumps into a beautiful shakla v'tarya analyzing the source of this Mishnah, contrasting the Rabbis' view with that of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, who has a different approach to what can be used for redemption.

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

עמוד א' DAF 51A

GEMARA

זוֹנָא מֵאכָא בְּהֶרִיָּה דְּלֹא נָפִיק,

Chanan had **an impaired dinar with him, which was not in circulation** because of its poor condition,

GEMARA

תָּקַע לֵיהּ אַחֲרִינָא וְיַהֲבִיהּ נִיְהָלִיהּ.

so **he struck him another time** to incur a second fine of half a dinar, **and gave it**, the full dinar, **to him** as payment for both blows.

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

שְׁלֹשִׁים שָׁל עֶבֶד, חֲמִשִּׁים שָׁל אֹיִם וְשָׁל מִפְתָּה וְכו'.

We learned in the Mishnah: **The thirty** shekels paid to the owner **of a** Canaanite **slave** killed by an ox, **the fifty** shekels paid by **a rapist and by a seducer, etc.**, are all paid in the shekel of the Sanctuary.

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

QUESTION

הא תו למה לי? הא תנא ליה רישא!

The Gemara asks: **Why do I need this additional** mention of these cases? **The Tanna already taught this in the first clause** of the Mishnah, which stated that all Torah payments are in Tyrian shekels!

ANSWER

אונס ומוציא שם רע איצטריד,

The Gemara answers: It **was necessary** to explicitly list the cases of the **rapist and the defamer**,

EXPLANATION

סלקא דעתך אמינא: כיון דלא כתיב בהו "שקלים", אימא זוזי בעלמא,

since **it might enter your mind to say**: Since the term "shekels" is not written regarding them, but rather "money," say that they pay **merely** ordinary **dinars** and not shekels which are worth four dinars.

EXPLANATION

קא משמע לן דמילף קא ילפי מהדרי.

Therefore, the Tanna **comes to teach us that they derive from one another** through a gezerah shavah, and all require Tyrian shekels.

משנה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

חזין מן השקלים.

The Mishnah taught: All monetary obligations are redeemed with coins or equivalent value, **except for the half-shekels**.

גמרא GEMARA

BRAISA

תנא: חזין מן השקלים, ומעשר, ותרומה.

A Tanna **taught** in a Braisa: **Except for the half-shekels, and second tithe, and the appearance-offering money**, which must be paid specifically in coins.

EXPLANATION

שקלים — דתנו: מצרפין שקלים לדרבנות, מפני משאוי הדרך.

The rule regarding **shekels** is **as we learned in a Mishnah**: **We may combine** copper **shekels into darics**, which are gold coins, **because of the burden of the journey**, but they must remain in the form of coins.

EXPLANATION

מעשר — דכתיב: "וצרת הכסף בידך",

The rule regarding second **tithe** is **as it is written**: "**And you shall bind up the money in your hand**," which the Sages expound to mean money that has a form, i.e., a minted coin.

EXPLANATION

וְהִרְאִינוּ — תַּנִּי רַב יוֹסֵף: שְׁלֹא יָבִיא סִינָה לְעוֹזָרָה.

And the rule regarding the appearance-offering money is as Rav Yosef taught: So that one should not bring unrefined silver into the Temple Courtyard, but rather proper coins.

MISHNAH מִשְׁנָה

MISHNAH

מִתְנִי' אֵין פּוֹדִין לֹא בַּעֲבָדִים, וְלֹא בְּשִׁטְרוֹת, וְלֹא בְּקִרְקָעוֹת, וְלֹא בְּהֶקְדָּשׁוֹת.

MISHNAH: One may not redeem a firstborn son neither with Canaanite slaves, nor with promissory notes, nor with land, nor with consecrated items.

MISHNAH

כָּתַב לְכֹהֵן שֶׁהוּא חַיִּיב לִיתֵּן חֲמִשָּׁה סֵלָעִים — חַיִּיב לִיתֵּן לוֹ, וּבְנֹו אֵינוֹ פְּדוּי.

If the father wrote to a Kohen that he is obligated to give him five sela'im, the father is obligated to give them to him because of his written commitment, but his son is not redeemed until the Kohen actually receives the money.

MISHNAH

לְפִיכָךְ, אִם רָצָה הַכֹּהֵן לִיתֵּן לוֹ בְּמַתָּנָה — רִשְׁאִי.

Therefore, if the Kohen wished to give the five sela'im back to him as a gift, he is permitted to do so, and the redemption is valid.

MISHNAH

הַמַּפְרִישׁ פְּדִיּוֹן בְּנוֹ, וְאָבֵד — חַיִּיב בְּאַחֲרִיּוֹתוֹ, שֶׁנֶּאֱמַר: "יִהְיֶה לְךָ" ו"פָּדָה תִּפְדֶּה".

One who designates the redemption money for his son and it was lost before reaching the Kohen, is responsible for its replacement, as it is stated: "Shall be yours" to Aaron, and only then "you shall surely redeem," meaning the son is not redeemed until the money is in the Kohen's possession.

GEMARA גְּמָרָא

STATEMENT

גַּמְ' מִתְנִיתִין דְּלֹא כְּרַבִּי, דְּתַנִּיא: רַבִּי אֹמֵר: בִּכְהֵן פּוֹדִין בְּכוֹר אָדָם, חוּץ מִן הַשִּׁטְרוֹת.

GEMARA: Our Mishnah is not in accordance with Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, as it is taught in a Braisa: Rabbi says: With anything of value one may redeem a firstborn of man, except for promissory notes.

QUESTION

מַאי טַעְמָא דְּרַבִּי?

What is the reason of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi?

ANSWER

דְּרִישׁ רִיבּוּי וּמִיעוּטִי,

The Gemara answers: **He expounds** the verses using the method of **amplifications and restrictions**.

EXPLANATION

“וּפְדוּיוֹ מִבֶּן חֹדֶשׁ תִּפְדֶּה” — רִיבָה, “בְּעֶרְכְּךָ כֶּסֶף חֲמִשָּׁת שֶׁקֶלִים” — מִיַּעַט, “תִּפְדֶּה” — רִיבָה.

The phrase "And its redemption from a month old you shall redeem" is an **amplification**; "according to your valuation, silver of five shekels" is a **restriction**; "you shall redeem" is again an **amplification**.

EXPLANATION

רִיבָה וּמִיַּעַט וְרִיבָה, רִיבָה הַכֹּל.

And the rule is: When the Torah **amplified, and restricted, and amplified, it amplified everything**.

EXPLANATION

מֵאֵי רַבִּי? רַבִּי כָּל מִילֵי, וּמֵאֵי מִיַּעַט? מִיַּעַט שְׁטָרוֹת.

What did it amplify? It amplified all things, including land and slaves. **And what did it restrict? It restricted only promissory notes**, which have no intrinsic value.

STATEMENT

וְרַבֵּנּוּ דִּרְשִׁי כָּלֵל וּפְרָט:

And the Rabbis expound the verses using the method of **a generalization and a detail**:

EXPLANATION

“וּפְדוּיוֹ מִבֶּן חֹדֶשׁ” — כָּלֵל, “בְּעֶרְכְּךָ כֶּסֶף חֲמִשָּׁת שֶׁקֶלִים” — פְּרָט, (פְּדָה) “תִּפְדֶּה” — חִזּוּר וְכָלֵל.

"And its redemption from a month old" is a **generalization**; "according to your valuation, silver of five shekels" is a **detail**; "you shall redeem" is once again a **generalization**.

EXPLANATION

כָּלֵל וּפְרָט וְכָלֵל, אִי אֵתָּה דֵּן אֶלֶּא כְּעֵין הַפְּרָט.

And the rule is: When there is **a generalization, a detail, and a generalization**, you may judge only in accordance with the **nature of the detail**.

EXPLANATION

מָה הַפְּרָט מְפֹרָשׁ — דְּבַר הַמִּטְלָטֵל וְגוֹפוֹ מְמוּן, אֵף כָּל דְּבַר הַמִּטְלָטֵל וְגוֹפוֹ מְמוּן.

Just as the detail is explicitly defined as something that is movable and its body is intrinsic money, i.e., silver coins, so too, anything that is movable and its body is intrinsic money may be used.

EXPLANATION

יֵצְאוּ קִרְקָעוֹת — שְׂאִין מִטְלָטֵלִין, יֵצְאוּ עֲבָדִים — שֶׁהוֹקְשׁוּ לְקִרְקָעוֹת, יֵצְאוּ שְׁטָרוֹת — שְׂאֵף עַל פִּי שְׁמִטְלָטֵלִין, אֵין גּוֹפֵן מְמוּן.

This **excludes land**, which is not movable; it **excludes slaves**, which are compared to land; and it **excludes promissory notes**, because even though they are movable, their body is not intrinsic money.

QUESTION

אָמַר לִיה רַבִּינָא לְמַרְיָמָא: וְרַבִּי, רִיבּוּיֵי וּמִיַּעוּטֵי דִּרְיֵשׁ?

Ravina said to Mareimar: Does Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi really expound using amplifications and restrictions?

OBJECTION

וְהָא רַבִּי כָּלְלִי וּפְרָטִי דְרִישׁ בְּמַדְצֵעַ!

But doesn't Rabbi expound generalizations and details regarding the awl used for piercing a Hebrew slave's ear?

BRAISA

דְּתַנִּיא: "מַדְצֵעַ" — אֵין לִי אֶלָּא מַדְצֵעַ, מִנֵּין לְרַבּוֹת הַסּוּל וְהַסִּירָא וְהַמַּחֲט וְהַמְקַדָּח וְהַמַּכְתֵּב?

As it is taught in a Braisa: From the word "awl" I only know an awl; from where do we derive to include a thorn, a needle, a drill, or a stylus?

BRAISA

תִּלְמוּד לֹאמַר "וְלָקַחְתָּ" — לְרַבּוֹת כָּל דָּבָר שֶׁנִּלְקַח בְּיָד, דְּבָרֵי רַבִּי יוֹסִי בְּרַבִּי יְהוּדָה.

The verse teaches: "And you shall take," to include anything that is taken in the hand; these are the words of Rabbi Yosei bar Rabbi Yehuda who expounds amplifications.

BRAISA

רַבִּי אֹמֵר: "מַדְצֵעַ" — מָה מַדְצֵעַ מֵיִחוּד שֶׁל מִתְּכָת, אִף כָּל שֶׁל מִתְּכָת.

But Rabbi says: "Awl"—just as an awl is uniquely made of metal, so too, anything used must be of metal.

OBJECTION

וְאִמְרִינוּ: בְּמַאי קָא מִיפְלָגִי? רַבִּי דְרִישׁ כָּלְלִי וּפְרָטִי, וּרְבִי יוֹסִי בְּרַבִּי יְהוּדָה דְרִישׁ רִיבּוּי וּמִיעוּטִי.

And we said in explaining this dispute: In what do they differ? Rabbi expounds generalizations and details, and Rabbi Yosei bar Rabbi Yehuda expounds amplifications and restrictions! This contradicts our assumption about Rabbi's method.

RESOLUTION

אֵין בְּעֻלְמָא רַבִּי כָּלְלִי וּפְרָטִי דְרִישׁ,

The Gemara answers: Yes, generally Rabbi expounds generalizations and details,

EXPLANATION

וְהָאכָא כְּדִתְנָא דְבִי רַבִּי יִשְׁמַעְיָאֵל.

but here, regarding redemption, he expounds in accordance with that which the school of Rabbi Yishmael taught.

EXPLANATION

דְּתַנָּא דְבִי רַבִּי יִשְׁמַעְיָאֵל: "בְּמִים" "בְּמִים" שְׁתֵּי פְעָמִים, אֵין זֶה כָּלֵל וּפְרָט, אֶלָּא רִיבּוּ וּמִיעוּט.

For the school of Rabbi Yishmael taught: "In water," "in the water," written two times, this is not expounded as a generalization and a detail, but rather as an amplification and a restriction.

EXPLANATION

וְרַבֵּנּוּ אָמְרִי: כְּדִאֲמַרְיֵנּוּ בְּמַעְרְבָא, כָּל מְקוֹם שֶׁאֵתָּה מוֹצֵא שְׁתֵּי כְּלָלוֹת הַסְּמוּכִים זֶה לָזֶה — הֵטֵל פָּרֹט בֵּינֵיהֶם, וְדוּגִים בְּכָלֵל וּפְרָט.

And the Rabbis say: We expound as they say in the West, Eretz Yisrael: **Wherever you find two generalizations adjacent to each other, place the detail between them and judge them as a generalization, a detail, and a generalization.**

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

ולא בקדושות.

The Mishnah taught: **And not with consecrated items.**

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

QUESTION

פְּשִׁיטָא, לֹא דִידֵיהּ נִינְהוּ!

The Gemara asks: Isn't this **obvious? They are not his** to give, as they belong to the Temple!

ANSWER

אִמָּא:

The Gemara answers: You might **say** that we are dealing with a case of minor sanctity, so the Tanna had to teach us this.

עֲמוּד ב' DAF 51B

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

ולא הקדשות בכל אלו.

And nor may **consecrated** items be redeemed **with any of these** items mentioned above, namely Canaanite slaves, documents, and land.

MISHNAH

כָּתַב לְכֹהֵן שֶׁהוּא חַיִּיב לוֹ חֲמִשָּׁה סֵלָעִים חַיִּיב לִיתֵּן לוֹ כּו'.

The Mishnah teaches: If the father of a firstborn **wrote to a Kohen that he is obligated to him five sela coins, he is obligated to give them to him**, but his son is not redeemed, etc.

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

STATEMENT

אמר עולא: דבר תורה בנו פדוי, מאי טעמא אין בנו פדוי? גזירה נשמה יאמרו פודין בשטר.

Ulla said: By Torah law, his son is redeemed immediately when the father gives the note to the Kohen. If so, what is the reason the Sages said his son is not redeemed? It is a Rabbinic decree, lest people say that one may redeem a firstborn son with a third-party promissory note, which is invalid because the Torah requires actual money.

BRAISA

תני תנא קמיה דרב נחמן: בנו פדוי לכשיתן.

A Tanna taught a Braisa in the presence of Rav Nachman: His son is redeemed when the father actually gives the money.

STATEMENT

אמר ליה רב נחמן: זו דברי רבי יוסי ברבי יהודה (סתימתא) [סתימתא], ואמרי לה: זו דברי רבי אלעזר ברבי שמעון סתימתא, אבל חכמים אומרים: אין בנו פדוי.

Rav Nachman said to him: This Braisa is the statement of Rabbi Yosei son of Rabbi Yehuda, which was recorded as unattributed, and some say it: This is the statement of Rabbi Elazar son of Rabbi Shimon, recorded as unattributed; but the Sages say: His son is not redeemed at all with this note.

RULING

והלכתא: אין בנו פדוי.

And the halacha is: His son is not redeemed.

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

לפיכך אם רצה הכהן ליתן לו במתנה — רשאי.

The Mishnah continues: Therefore, if the Kohen wished to give the five sela coins back to him as a gift, he is permitted to do so.

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

STATEMENT

תנינא להא דתנו רבנן: נתנו לעשרה כהנים בבת אחת — יצא, בזה אחר זה — יצא, וטלו וקחזירו לו — יצא.

The Gemara comments: We have learned in our Mishnah that which the Rabbis taught explicitly in a Braisa: If he gave it to ten Kohanim at one time, he has fulfilled his obligation. If he gave it one after the other, he has fulfilled his obligation. If the Kohen took it and returned it to him, he has fulfilled his obligation.

STATEMENT

וכך היה מנהגו של רבי טרפון, שהיה נוטל ומחזיר.

And this was the practice of Rabbi Tarfon, who would take the redemption money and return it.

STATEMENT

ובשמיני חכמים בדבר אמרו: קיים זה הלכה זו.

And when the Sages heard of the matter, they said: This individual has fulfilled this halacha.

QUESTION

הלכה זו ותו לא? אלא, קיים זה אף הלכה זו.

The Gemara asks: Did he fulfill only **this halacha and nothing more**? Surely Rabbi Tarfon fulfilled all the mitzvos! **Rather**, they meant: **This individual fulfilled even this halacha**, which is a difficult one to perform properly.

STATEMENT

רבי חנינא הוה רגיל (משקיל) [דלשקיל] ומתדר, חזייה ליהוה גברא דהוה קא אגיל ואתי קמיה, אמר ליה: לא גמרת ויהיבת — מידעם ביש, הילכך אין בנו פדוי.

The Gemara relates: **Rabbi Chanina was accustomed to take** the redemption money **and return** it. One time, **he saw a certain man who was walking back and forth before him**, hinting that he wanted the money back. Rabbi Chanina **said to him: You did not conclusively resolve and give** the money with a whole heart, but rather you gave it only on condition that I return it. This is **a bad thing, and therefore his son is not redeemed**.

משנה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

המפריש פדיון בנו ואבד — חייב באחריותו.

The Mishnah teaches: **One who designates the redemption money for his son and it was lost, is responsible for its replacement**.

גמרא GEMARA

QUESTION

מנלן?

The Gemara asks: **From where do we derive this?**

ANSWER

אמר רבי שמעון בן לקיש: אתיא "עֶרֶךְ" "עֶרֶךְ" מעֶרְכִּין.

Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish said: It is derived by a gezeirah shavah of "**valuation**" and "**valuation**" from the passage of **valuations**. Just as one is responsible for valuations until they reach the Kohen, so too here.

ANSWER

רב דימי אמר רבי יונתן: "וכל בכור בן־תפדה ולא יראו פני־ריקם", ויליף "ריקם" "ריקם" מעולת ראיה, מה עולת ראיה חייב באחריותו, אף פדיון הבן חייב באחריותו.

Rav Dimi said that Rabbi Yonatan said: The pasuk says, "**And all the firstborn of your sons you shall redeem, and none shall appear before Me empty,**" and he learns a gezeirah shavah of "**empty**" and "**empty**" from the burnt-offering of appearance. Just as with the burnt-offering of appearance, one is responsible for its replacement if it is lost, so too with the redemption of the son, one is responsible for its replacement.

OBJECTION

מתקין לה רב פפא: קרא לקרא?

Rav Pappa objects to this: Do we need to compare **verse to verse** to find a source?

RESOLUTION

אָלאַ אַמר רב פפא: הא כדקתני טעמא — "יהיה לך... אך פדה תפדה".

Rather, Rav Pappa said: This halacha is as the Mishnah itself teaches the reason, from the pasuk: "They shall be yours... nevertheless you shall surely redeem."

EXPLANATION

וכי איתמר דריש לקיש — ארישא איתמר: מת לאחר שלשים יום, אף על פי שלא נתן — יתן.
מנא לן? אמר רבי שמעון בן לקיש: אתיא "ערוך" "ערוך" מערכין.

And when the statement of Reish Lakish was stated, it was stated on the first clause of the Mishnah: If the son died after thirty days, even though the father did not yet give the money, he must give it. From where do we derive this? Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish said: It is derived by a gezeirah shavah of "valuation" and "valuation" from valuations.

STATEMENT

רב דימי אמר רבי יונתן: "וכל בכור בןך תפדה ולא יראו פני ריקם", מה להלן יורשין חייבין, אף כאן יורשין חייבין.

Rav Dimi said that Rabbi Yonatan said: The pasuk says, "And all the firstborn of your sons you shall redeem, and none shall appear before Me empty." Just as there, by the burnt-offering of appearance, if the father died, the heirs are obligated to bring it, so too here, the heirs are obligated to pay the five sela coins.

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מתני' הבכור נוטל פי שנים בנכסי האב, ואינו נוטל פי שנים בנכסי האם, ואינו נוטל בשבב, ולא בראוי כבמותקן.

MISHNAH: The firstborn takes a double portion in the property of the father, but he does not take a double portion in the property of the mother. And he does not take a double portion in the enhancement of the property after the father's death, nor in property that was merely due to the father as he does in property that was actually possessed by the father.

SUMMARY

The Gemara explains that the Tanna listed the rapist and defamer to teach that they require Tyrian shekels through a gezerah shavah, even though the Torah uses the word "money" instead of "shekels" by them. We learn that second tithe, half-shekels, and appearance-offering money must be paid in minted coins, with the Gemara bringing the source for each. In the Mishnah of Pidyon Haben, we see that a father cannot redeem his son with slaves, land, promissory notes, or consecrated items, and he remains responsible for the money if it is lost before reaching the Kohen. The Gemara explains that our Mishnah follows the Rabbis, who expound the verses using the method of "generalization, detail, and generalization" (klal u'prat u'klal), which limits the redemption to movable property with intrinsic value, thereby excluding land, slaves, and notes. Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, however, uses the method of "amplification and restriction" (ribuy u'mi'ut), which is much more inclusive and only excludes promissory notes because they have no intrinsic value.

Finally, the Gemara addresses a kasha on Rabbi's consistency in using these hermeneutical rules, resolving it by explaining that here he is following a specific rule of the school of Rabbi Yishmael.

למנצח WHAT TO TAKE HOME

In our sugya, the Gemara discusses the halachah of a father who designates five sela'im to redeem his firstborn son, but the money gets lost before it reaches the Kohen. The halachah is clear: he is still fully responsible to replace it. Why? Because the Torah says "yihyeh lach", it must actually belong to the Kohen, and "padoh tifdeh", the redemption is only complete when the payment is fully delivered. Until the Kohen actually holds that money in his hand, the father's obligation has not been fulfilled.

Think about what this means for our own avodas Hashem. How often do we "designate" a mitzvah in our minds, or even start the process, but never actually follow through to the finish line? We might decide to learn a specific shiur, resolve to call a lonely person, or set aside money for tzedakah. In our minds, we feel a sense of accomplishment just from making the decision. We think, "I already set it aside, I'm practically done."

But the Torah is teaching us a deep yesod here: "padoh tifdeh." A mitzvah requires completion. It is not enough to have good intentions or to start the process and let it get lost along the way. Hashem wants us to bring our holy thoughts down into the physical world and ensure they reach their destination. If we let our good resolutions get lost before they are actually executed, we haven't yet fulfilled our responsibility.

Today, take one good resolution or mitzvah that you have "designated" or started recently but haven't yet finished, and take the concrete step to complete it and bring it to its final destination.