

דף יומי • בכורות • דף י"א

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

THE SUGYA

We start off on our daf by looking into the shiur of the lamb used to redeem a firstborn donkey. The Gemara brings down a machlokes and a practical halachic distinction between what we tell a person l'chatchilah when he comes to ask Beis Din how to redeem his donkey, and what is acceptable b'di'avad if he already went ahead and redeemed it on his own with a very cheap lamb.

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

עמוד א' DAF 11A

EXPLANATION

בְּהֶשֶׁג יָד כְּתִיב.

The minimum of a shekel is **written with regard to affordability**, meaning a case where someone makes a vow of valuation to the Beis HaMikdash and cannot afford the standard amount, in which case the Torah sets a minimum of a shekel. It does not apply to other redemptions.

RULING

אָמַר רַב נַחֲמָן: הֵלָכָה כְּדִבְרֵי חֲכָמִים,

Rav Nachman said: The halacha is in accordance with the words of the Sages that you can redeem a firstborn donkey with a lamb of any value.

QUESTION

וְכַמָּה?

The Gemara asks: **And how much** must the value of this lamb be at a minimum?

ANSWER

אָמַר רַב יוֹסֵף: אֲפִילוּ פִטְרוּזָא בֶּר דִּנְקָא,

Rav Yosef said: Even a lean lamb that is only worth a danka, which is a sixth of a dinar, may be used.

PROOF

אָמַר רַבָּא: אִף אֲנָן נָמִי תַנִּינָא גְדוֹל וְקָטָן.

Rava said: We also learned in our Mishnah that the owner may give a lamb, whether it is **large or small**, which supports Rav Yosef's ruling.

QUESTION

פְּשִׁיטָא!

The Gemara asks: Isn't this **obvious**? The Mishnah explicitly says a small lamb is fine!

ANSWER

מהו דתימא כולי האי לא?

The Gemara answers: **Lest you say** that **this much** of a low value, such as a danka, is **not** acceptable because it is too cheap,

ANSWER

אי נמי, פטרוזא לא? קא משמע לן.

or alternatively, you might think that a **lean lamb** which is physically weak is **not** acceptable for a mitzvah; therefore Rav Yosef **comes to teach us** that it is valid.

STATEMENT

רבי יהודה נשיאה הוה ליה פטר חמור, שדריה לקמיה דרבי טרפון, אמר ליה: כמה בעינא למיתב לכהן?

The Gemara relates: **Rabbi Yehuda Nesia had a firstborn donkey. He sent it before Rabbi Tarfon and said to him: How much do I need to give to the Kohen for its redemption?**

STATEMENT

אמר ליה: הרי אמרו: עין זפה בסלע, עין רעה בשקל, בינונית ברגיא.

Rabbi Tarfon **said to him: Behold, they said:** One who has a **generous disposition** redeems it **with** a lamb worth a sela; one who has a **stingy disposition** redeems it **with** a lamb worth a shekel; and an **average** disposition redeems it **with** a ragya.

RULING

אמר רבא: הלכתא ברגיא.

Rava said: The halacha is that one must redeem it with a lamb worth a ragya.

EXPLANATION

וכמה? תלתא זוזי. רגיל הכא ורגיל הכא.

The Gemara asks: **And how much** is a ragya? The Gemara answers: It is worth **three zuz**, which are three dinars. It is called a ragya because it is **accustomed here and accustomed there**, meaning it is close to both a sela of four dinars and a shekel of two dinars.

QUESTION

קשיא הלכתא אהלכתא!

The Gemara asks: This is a **difficulty**, as we have a **halacha against a halacha**! Rav Nachman ruled that a lamb of any value is valid, while Rava rules that a ragya is required!

ANSWER

לא קשיא, כּאן — פּבא לימלּהּ, כּאן — בעושה מעצמו.

The Gemara answers: This is **not difficult. Here**, where we require a ragya, it is **when he comes to consult** the Beis Din beforehand, so we tell him to give a respectable amount. **There**, where any value is valid, it is **when he does it on his own** without consulting, in which case the redemption is valid post facto.

STATEMENT

אמר רבי יצחק אמר ריש לקיש: מי שיש לו פטר חמור ואין לו שה לפדותו — פודהו בשויו.

Rabbi Yitzchak said that Reish Lakish said: One who has a firstborn donkey and does not have a lamb to redeem it, may redeem it with its monetary value in money or vessels and give that to the Kohen.

QUESTION

למאן? אילימא לרבי יהודה — הא אמר: הקפידה עליו תורה בשוה!

The Gemara asks: In accordance with whose opinion is this statement? If we say it is in accordance with Rabbi Yehuda, but didn't he say that the Torah was particular about it being redeemed specifically with a lamb?

ANSWER

אלא לרבי שמעון.

Rather, it must be in accordance with Rabbi Shimon, who does not require a lamb exclusively.

OBJECTION

רב אחא מתני הכי, רבינא קשיא ליה: רבי יהודה ורבי שמעון — הלכה כרבי יהודה!

The Gemara notes: Rav Aha taught it this way, that Reish Lakish follows Rabbi Shimon. But Ravina found this difficult: In any dispute between Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Shimon, the halacha is established like Rabbi Yehuda!

OBJECTION

וסתם לן תנא כרבי יהודה, ואת אמרת הלכה כרבי שמעון!?

And furthermore, the Tanna taught us an unattributed Mishnah like Rabbi Yehuda that a firstborn donkey is forbidden before redemption. And yet you say that the halacha is like Rabbi Shimon?

RESOLUTION

אלא, אפילו תימא רבי יהודה, לא יהא חמור מן ההקדש, ולא אמרה תורה "בשוה" להחמיר עליו
אלא להקל עליו.

Rather, Ravina concludes: Even if you say the halacha is like Rabbi Yehuda, the firstborn donkey should not be more stringent than consecrated property which can be redeemed with its value. And the Torah did not say "with a lamb" to be stringent on him, but rather to be lenient on him, so that he does not have to give the full value of the donkey if he has a lamb.

STATEMENT

רב נחמן בריה דרב יוסף פריק ליה בשילקי בשויו.

The Gemara relates that Rav Nachman the son of Rav Yosef redeemed a firstborn donkey with boiled vegetables worth its value.

STATEMENT

אמר רב שיזבי אמר רב הונא: הפודה פטר חמור של חבירו, פדיונו פדוי.

Rav Sheizevi said that Rav Huna said: One who redeems the firstborn donkey of his fellow, its redemption is valid.

QUESTION

איבעיא להו: פדיונו לפודה, או דלמא פדיונו לבעלים?

A dilemma was raised before them: Does the redeemed donkey now belong to the redeemer, or perhaps the redeemed donkey belongs to the owner?

EXPLANATION

אליבא דרב רבי שמעון לא תיבעי לה, כיון דאמר מותר בהנאה — ממונא דבעלים הוא,

The Gemara clarifies: According to Rabbi Shimon, do not raise the dilemma, since he says that the donkey is permitted for benefit before redemption, so it is the monetary property of the owner, and the redeemer cannot take it.

EXPLANATION

כי תיבעי אליבא דרב רבי יהודה, דאמר אסור בהנאה.

When you should raise the dilemma, it is according to Rabbi Yehuda, who says that the donkey is forbidden for benefit before redemption.

QUESTION

להקדש מדמי ליה, ורחמנא אמר: "ונתן הכסף וקם לו", או דלמא, כיון דקני להו בכיני וכיני, לא דמי להקדש?

Do we compare it to consecrated property, and the Merciful One says regarding consecrated property: "And he shall give the money and it shall be established for him," meaning the redeemer acquires it? Or perhaps, since the owner gains the difference in value between the cheap lamb and the expensive donkey, it is not similar to consecrated property, and the owner retains ownership?

PROOF

אמר רב נחמן, תא שמע: הגויב פטר חמור של חבירו — משלם תשלומי כפל לבעלים, ואף על פי שאין לו עכשיו — יש לו לאחר מכאן.

Rav Nachman said: Come and hear a proof from a Baraisa: One who steals the firstborn donkey of his fellow pays double payment to the owner; and even though he has no monetary rights in it now, he will have rights in it after this, when it is redeemed.

EXPLANATION

מני? אלימא רבי שמעון, אמאי אין לו עכשיו? אלא פשיטא רבי יהודה.

The Gemara analyzes: Whose opinion is this? If we say it is Rabbi Shimon, why does it say he has no rights now? He is allowed to benefit from it! Rather, it is obvious that this is Rabbi Yehuda.

INFERENCE

ואי סלקא דעתך להקדש מדמינן ליה, "וגנב מבית האיש" אמר רחמנא, ולא מבית הקדש!

And if it enters your mind that we compare it to consecrated property, the Torah says regarding double payment: "And it be stolen from the house of the man," and not from the house of consecrated property! Since double payment is paid, it must not be like consecrated property.

RESOLUTION

ותו לא מידי.

The Gemara concludes: **And there is nothing more** to say; this is a decisive proof that it is not like consecrated property, and the owner retains ownership.

משנה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

אחת ביכרה ואחת שלא ביכרה [כוי].

The Gemara returns to the Mishnah: **Whether it had given birth first or whether it had not given birth first, etc.**

גמרא GEMARA

BARAISA

תנו רבנן: כיצד אמרו נכנס לדיר להתעשר?

The Rabbis taught in a Baraisa: **How did they say** that a lamb used for redemption enters the corral to be tithed under Maaser Behemah?

EXPLANATION

אי אתה יכול לומר בבא ליד כהן, שהרי שנינו: הלקוח ושנייתו לו במתנה פטור ממעשר בהמה,

You cannot say this refers to a lamb that came into the hand of a Kohen, for behold we learned: An animal that is purchased or given as a gift is exempt from animal tithe, and the Kohen received this lamb as a gift.

EXPLANATION

אלא בישראל שהיו לו עשרה ספק פטרי חמורים בתוך ביתו, שמפריש עליהן עשרה שזין, ומעשרן, והן שלו.

Rather, it must be in the case of an Israelite who had ten doubtful firstborn donkeys in his house, who separates ten lambs for them to redeem them, and since the lambs belong to him because of the doubt, he tithes them, and they are his.

PROOF

מסייע ליה לרב נחמן, דאמר רב נחמן אמר רבה בר אבוא: ישראל שהיו לו עשרה ספק פטרי חמורים — מפריש עליהן עשרה שזין, ומעשרן, והן שלו.

The Gemara notes: This Baraisa supports Rav Nachman, for Rav Nachman said in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha: An Israelite who had ten doubtful firstborn donkeys separates ten lambs for them, tithes them, and they are his.

STATEMENT

וְאָמַר רַב נַחֲמָן אָמַר רַבָּה בַּר אָבוּהָ: יִשְׂרָאֵל שֶׁהָיוּ לוֹ עֶשְׂרֵה פִטְרֵי חֲמוּרִים וְדָאִין בְּתוּךְ בֵּיתוֹ, שֶׁנִּפְּלוּ מִבֵּית אָבִי אָמוֹ כֹּהֵן, וְאוֹתוֹ אָבִי אָמוֹ כֹּהֵן נִפְּלוּ לוֹ מִבֵּית אָבִי אָמוֹ יִשְׂרָאֵל.

And Rav Nachman said in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha: An Israelite who had ten definite firstborn donkeys in his house, which fell to him as an inheritance from the house of his mother's father who was a Kohen, and those donkeys had come to that mother's father who was a Kohen from the house of his mother's father who was an Israelite,

STATEMENT

מִפְּרִישׁ עָלֵיהֶן עֶשְׂרֵה שִׁינִין, וּמַעֲשָׂרָן, וְהֵן שָׁלוּ.

he separates ten lambs for them, tithes them, and they are his, because as an heir to a Kohen he is exempt from giving the lambs to another Kohen.

STATEMENT

וְאָמַר רַב נַחֲמָן אָמַר רַבָּה בַּר אָבוּהָ: יִשְׂרָאֵל שֶׁהָיוּ לוֹ טְבָלִים מִמּוֹרְחִין בְּתוּךְ בֵּיתוֹ, שֶׁנִּפְּלוּ מִבֵּית אָבִי אָמוֹ כֹּהֵן, וְאוֹתוֹ אָבִי אָמוֹ כֹּהֵן נִפְּלוּ לוֹ מִבֵּית אָבִי אָמוֹ יִשְׂרָאֵל — מַעֲשָׂרָן וְהֵן שָׁלוּ.

And Rav Nachman said in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha: An Israelite who had untithed produce whose processing was completed in his house, which fell to him from the house of his mother's father who was a Kohen, and those had come to that mother's father who was a Kohen from the house of his mother's father who was an Israelite — he tithes them and they are his.

EXPLANATION

וְצָרִיכָא, דְּאִי אֲשַׁמְעִינן קַמִּיתָא — מְשׁוּם דְּקָא מִפְּרִישׁ וְקָאִי.

The Gemara notes: And it is necessary to state all of these cases. For if he had only let us hear the first case of the donkeys, we would say it is because he is separating a lamb and standing it aside, so it looks like a regular redemption.

EXPLANATION

אֲבָל הָכָא — מִתְּנֹת שֶׁלֹּא הוֹרְמוּ כָּמִי שֶׁלֹּא הוֹרְמוּ דְּמִיין, אִימָא לָא.

But here, in the case of the produce, gifts that have not been separated are considered as if they have not been separated at all, so say that he does not keep them. Therefore it is needed.

EXPLANATION

וְאִי אֲשַׁמְעִינן הָכָא — דְּאֶפְשָׁר לְעֲשׂוֹרֵי מִינִיָּה וּבִיָּה, דְּהָא מִנַּח, אֲבָל הָתָם — כִּיּוֹן דְּשָׁה מַעֲלָמָא כְּעִי אֹתוּי, וּמִפְּרִישׁ וְקָאִי, אִימָא לָא, צָרִיכָא.

And if he had only let us hear this case of the produce, we would say it is because it is possible to tithe from it and within it, as it is lying there. But there, in the case of the donkeys, since he needs to bring a lamb from the outside, say that he does not keep it. Therefore both are necessary.

STATEMENT

אָמַר רַבִּי שְׁמוּאֵל בַּר נָתַן אָמַר רַבִּי חֲנִינָא: הַלּוֹקֵחַ טְבָלִים

Rabbi Shmuel bar Natan said that Rabbi Chanina said: One who purchases untithed produce...

STATEMENT

ממורחין מן הגוי, מעשרן והן שלו.

If one purchases grain that is already **smoothed** into piles, which completes the processing, **from a non-Jew, he must tithe them, but they are his**, meaning he does not have to give the tithes to the Kohen or Levi.

QUESTION

דמרחינהו מאן?

The Gemara asks: **Who smoothed them?** Who completed the processing of this grain?

OBJECTION

אילימא דמרחינהו גוי — דגנה "אמר רחמנא, ולא דגן גוי!

If we say that a **non-Jew smoothed them**, then why is there any obligation to tithe at all? The Merciful One says in the Torah, "**Your grain**," which implies that only your own grain is obligated, **and not the grain of a non-Jew** whose processing was completed while in the non-Jew's possession!

RESOLUTION

אלא דמרחינהו ישראל מרשות גוי.

Rather, we must say that a **Jew smoothed them** while they were still in the domain of the non-Jew, before purchasing them.

EXPLANATION

מעשרו, דאין קנינו לגוי בארץ ישראל להפקיע מיד מעשר,

Therefore, **he must tithe them**, because a non-Jew has no power of acquisition in Eretz Yisrael to remove the land's sanctity and exempt its produce from the obligation of tithing.

EXPLANATION

והן שלו — דאמר ליה: קאתינא מכח גברא דלא מצית (אישתעית) [אישתעויי] דינא בהדיה.

But they are his, and he keeps the tithes, because he can say to the Kohen: "I am coming from the power of a man, the non-Jew, **with whom you cannot engage in litigation** to demand these gifts, since a non-Jew is exempt from giving them. Therefore, I too am exempt from giving them to you."

STATEMENT

תנו הָתָם: המפקיד פירותיו אצל הכותי ואצל עם הארץ, בחזקתו למעשר ולשביעית.

The Gemara introduces a related discussion: **We learned in a Mishnah there** in Demai: **One who deposits his produce with a Samaritan or with an am ha'aretz**, the produce remains in its presumptive status regarding tithes and regarding the Sabbatical year, and we do not suspect that they switched it for untithed or Shevi's produce.

STATEMENT

אצל הגוי — בפירותיו, רבי שמעון אומר: דמאי.

But if he deposited it **with a non-Jew**, the returned produce is treated **like his own produce**, because we assume the non-Jew switched it. **Rabbi Shimon says:** It is treated as **demai**, meaning it is a safek, a doubt, whether he switched it.

STATEMENT

אמר רבי אלעזר: להפריש — כולי עלמא לא פליגי, כי פליגי — ליתנו לכהן.

Rabbi Elazar said: Regarding separating the tithes, everyone agrees that he must separate them. Where they argue is regarding giving them to the Kohen.

EXPLANATION

תנא קמא סבר: ודאי חלפינהו, ובאי מיתננהו לכהן, ורבי שמעון סבר: דמאי.

The First Tanna holds: He certainly switched them, so this is now the non-Jew's produce which the Jew acquired, and he must give them to the Kohen. And Rabbi Shimon holds: It is demai, so the Kohen cannot demand them without bringing proof.

STATEMENT

יתיב רב דימי וקאמר להא שמעתא, אמר ליה אביי: טעמא דמספקא לן אי חלפינהו אי לא חלפינהו, הא ודאי חלפינהו — דכולי עלמא פליגי למיתבינהו לכהן,

Rav Dimi sat and was saying this halacha of Rabbi Elazar. Abaye said to him: The reason Rabbi Shimon exempts him from giving it over is only because we are in doubt whether he switched them or whether he did not switch them. But if he certainly switched them, everyone agrees that he must give them to the Kohen.

QUESTION

והאמר רבי שמואל אמר רבי חנינא: הלוקח טבליים מן הגוי ממורחין — מעשרן והן שלו!

But doesn't Rabbi Shmuel say in the name of Rabbi Chanina: One who purchases untithed produce from a non-Jew that is smoothed, he tithes them but they are his? Why would he have to give them to the Kohen here if he definitely switched them and they are considered purchased from a non-Jew?

ANSWER

דלמא פאן בתרומה גדולה, פאן בתרומת מעשר!

Rav Dimi answered: Perhaps here, where he must give it to the Kohen, it is referring to Terumah Gedolah, whereas there, where Rabbi Chanina says they are his, it is referring to Terumas Maaser.

STATEMENT

אזכרתן מילתא דאמר רבי יהושע בן לוי: מניין ללוקח טבליים ממורחין מן הגוי שהוא פטור מתרומת מעשר?

Abaye said to him: You have reminded me of a ruling that Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi said: From where do we know that one who purchases smoothed untithed produce from a non-Jew is exempt from giving Terumas Maaser to the Kohen?

PROOF

שנאמר: "ואל הלויים תדבר ואמרת אליהם כי תקחו מאת בני ישראל ה"ת

As it is stated: "And to the Levites you shall speak and say to them, when you take from the children of Israel the tithe... then you shall set apart from it a gift for Hashem, a tithe of the tithe."

INFERENCE

טָבָלִים שְׂאֵתָהּ לֹקַח מִבְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל — אֶתָּה מִפְּרִישׁ מֵהֶן תְּרוּמַת מַעֲשֵׂר וְנוֹתְנָהּ לַכֹּהֵן, טָבָלִים שְׂאֵתָהּ לֹקַח מִן הַגּוֹי — אִי אֶתָּה מִפְּרִישׁ מֵהֶן תְּרוּמַת מַעֲשֵׂר וְנוֹתְנָהּ לַכֹּהֵן.

This teaches: Untithed produce that you take from the children of Israel, you must separate Terumas Maaser from them and give it to the Kohen; but untithed produce that you take from a non-Jew, you do not have to separate Terumas Maaser from them and give it to the Kohen.

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

וְאִם מֵת נֶהְנִים בּוֹ.

We learned in the Mishnah: **And if** the lamb designated for the redemption of a firstborn donkey **dies**, **they may derive benefit from it**.

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

QUESTION

דְּמִית הֵיכָא?

The Gemara asks: **Where did it die?** In whose possession was it when it died?

OBJECTION

אִילֵּימָא דְּמִית בֵּי כֹהֵן, וְנִהְנֶה בּוֹ כֹהֵן — פְּשִׁטָּא, מִמוֹנָא דִּידֵיהּ הוּא!

If we say that it died in the house of the Kohen, and the Kohen may benefit from it, that is obvious! It is his own property, so why shouldn't he benefit from it?

OBJECTION

אָלָא, דְּמִית בֵּי כְּעָלִים וְנִהְנֶה בּוֹ כֹהֵן — הָא נָמִי פְּשִׁטָּא!

Rather, we must say that it died in the house of the owner, and the Kohen may benefit from it, meaning the owner must give the carcass to the Kohen. **But this is also obvious**, since the lamb was already designated for him!

EXPLANATION

סָלָקָא דַּעְתָּהּ אָמִינָא, כֹּל כַּמָּה דְּלֹא מָטָא לִידֵּיהּ לֹא זָכָה בִּיהּ,

The Gemara answers: **It might enter your mind** to say that as long as it has not reached his hand, the Kohen has not **acquired it**, and therefore if it dies, the owner would have to give him another lamb.

RESOLUTION

קָא מִשְׁמַע לֹ דְּמַעֲיָדָנָא דַּאֲפֻרְשִׁיהּ, בְּרִשׁוּתִּיהּ דְּכֹהֵן קָאִי.

Therefore, the Mishnah **comes to teach us that from the moment the owner separated it, it stands in the domain of the Kohen**, and the owner has fulfilled his obligation.

SUMMARY

The Gemara establishes that while a lamb of any value—even a very cheap or lean one—is valid b'di'avad for redeeming a firstborn donkey, l'chatchilah we instruct a person to use a respectable lamb worth a ragya (three zuz). We then learn that according to Rabbi Yehuda, if a person does not have a lamb, he can redeem the donkey with its monetary value in money or vessels, as the Torah's mention of a "lamb" was meant as a lula (leniency) rather than a chumra. Additionally, the Gemara clarifies that if someone redeems his friend's firstborn donkey, the redemption is valid, and the donkey remains the property of the original owner rather than the redeemer.

למעשה WHAT TO TAKE HOME

The Gemara is bothered by a contradiction between two halachos: Rav Nachman rules that you can redeem a peter chamor with a lamb of any value, even a cheap, lean one worth a danka, while Rava rules that you must use a ragya, a respectable lamb worth three dinars. The teretz is beautiful: if a person comes to ask the Beis Din beforehand, we tell him to give a respectable amount (a ragya). But if he went ahead and did it on his own, even the cheapest lamb is valid.

Lichoira, this teaches us a massive yesod in our own avodas Hashem. When we are planning our service of Hashem, when we are "coming to consult" and deciding how we want to live our lives, we should never look for the cheapest, easiest way out. We shouldn't ask, "What is the bare minimum I can get away with?" We strive for the ragya, something respectable, beautiful, and full. We want our mitzvos to look like we care about them.

But on the flip side, the Torah is telling us that Hashem still deeply values the small things. If a Yid was only able to muster a "danka", a tiny, weak, cheap effort because that was all he had in him at that moment, Hashem does not throw it back in his face. Post facto, it is still a valid redemption. Hashem cherishes every single drop of effort, even the smallest, poorest-looking mitzvah.

Today, when you do a mitzvah or sit down to learn, try to do it with a "ragya" mindset, give it your best, most respectable energy. But if you find yourself tired and only able to give a tiny, "danka" effort, do not despair. Do that small action anyway, knowing that in Shamayim, it is still precious and completely valid.