

דף יומי • בכורות • דף י"ב

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

THE SUGYA

We begin the daf with a Mishnah that outlines which animals are invalid for redeeming a firstborn donkey (peter chamor). The Mishnah rules that we cannot redeem it with a calf, a wild beast, a slaughtered lamb, a tereifah, a hybrid, or a koy. The Gemara immediately seeks the source for these exclusions, identifying our Mishnah as the view of ben Bag Bag, who learns a gezeirah shavah of "lamb" "lamb" from the Pesach offering to exclude these categories.

From there, the Gemara enters a classic lomdishe shakla v'tarya regarding the limits of this gezeirah shavah. We explore why certain invalidations of the Pesach offering—such as being female, blemished, or older—do not apply to the redemption of a donkey, which the Torah explicitly permits through the ribbuy (inclusion) of "you shall redeem." This leads the Gemara to analyze two fascinating dilemmas: whether we can redeem a peter chamor with a ben pekua (a live fetus found inside a slaughtered animal), and whether we can use a lamb that physically resembles a different species.

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

דף יומי DAF 12A

משנה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מִתְּנִי אֵין פּוֹדִין לֹא בְּעֶגְלָה וְלֹא בְּחֵזָה, לֹא בְּשִׁחוּטָהּ וְלֹא בְּטְרִיפָהּ, וְלֹא בְּכֶלְאִים וְלֹא בְּכוֹי.

We may not redeem a firstborn donkey neither with a calf, nor with a wild beast, nor with a slaughtered lamb, nor with a tereifah lamb, nor with a hybrid of a sheep and a goat, nor with a koy, which is a creature of doubtful status.

MISHNAH

וְרַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר מַתִּיר בְּכֶלְאִים מִפְּנֵי שֶׁהוּא שֶׁה, וְאוֹסֵר בְּכוֹי מִפְּנֵי שֶׁהוּא סֶפֶק.

And Rabbi Eliezer permits redeeming with a hybrid because he holds it is considered a lamb, but he prohibits redeeming with a koy because it is a doubt whether it is a domestic or wild animal.

MISHNAH

נָתַנוּ לְכֹהֵן — אֵין הַכֹּהֵן רֹשֵׁא לְקַיְמוֹ עַד שֶׁיַּפְרִישׁ שֶׁה תַּחֲתָיו.

If he gave it to a Kohen before redeeming it, the Kohen is not permitted to keep it as a donkey until he designates a lamb in its stead to redeem it.

GEMARA

גמ' מתניתין מני? בן בג בג היא,

Whose opinion is our Mishnah? It is the view of ben Bag Bag,

PROOF

דתנא: בן בג בג אומר: נאמר כאן "שה", ונאמר להלן "שה",

as it is taught in a braisa: ben Bag Bag says: It is stated here by the redemption of a donkey "lamb", and it is stated there by the Pesach offering "lamb".

PROOF

מה להלן פרט לכל השמות הללו, אף כאן פרט לכל השמות הללו.

Just as there, by the Pesach offering, the Torah excludes all of these names from being fit, so too here, by the firstborn donkey, the Torah excludes all of these names from being used for redemption.

QUESTION

אי מה להלן זכר תמים וכן שנה, אף כאן זכר תמים וכן שנה?

The Gemara asks: If so, just as there the Pesach offering must be a male, unblemished, and in its first year, so too here must the lamb be a male, unblemished, and in its first year?

ANSWER

תלמוד לומר: "תפדה" "תפדה" — ריבה.

Therefore, the Torah teaches: "you shall redeem" "you shall redeem", repeating the word to show that the Torah included even a female, a blemished lamb, or an older one.

QUESTION

אי "תפדה" "תפדה" ריבה, אפילו כל הני נמי?

The Gemara asks: If "you shall redeem" "you shall redeem" included everything, then even all of these excluded animals of our Mishnah should also be included?

ANSWER

אם כן, "שה" "שה" מאי אהני ליה?

The Gemara answers: If so, what did the gezeirah shavah of "lamb" "lamb" accomplish for it? It must be that the inclusion only goes so far, and the exclusions of the gezeirah shavah still stand.

QUESTION

איבעיא להו: מהו לפדות בכך פקועה?

A dilemma was raised before them: What is the halacha to redeem a firstborn donkey with a ben pekua, a live fetus found inside a slaughtered animal?

EXPLANATION

אליבא דרבבי מאיר לא תיבעי לה, דכיון דאמר רבי מאיר: בן פקועה טעון שחיטה, שזה מעליא הוא.

The Gemara clarifies: According to Rabbi Meir, do not raise the question, since Rabbi Meir says that a ben pekua requires ritual slaughter on its own, it is a full-fledged lamb in every way.

EXPLANATION

אלא כי תבעי לה אליבא דרבנן, דאמרי: שחיטת אמו מטהרתו.

Rather, when should you raise the question? According to the Rabbis, who say that the slaughter of its mother permits it to be eaten without its own slaughter.

QUESTION

כבישרא בדיקולא דמי, או דלמא: כיון דהשתא מיהא רהיט ואזיל, "שה" קרינא ביה?

Is it considered like meat in a basket, meaning it is already considered slaughtered and thus invalid for redemption, or perhaps, since now at any rate it runs and goes about, we call it a "lamb"?

STATEMENT

מר זוטרא אמר: אין פודין, ורב אשי אמר: פודין.

Mar Zutra said: We may not redeem with it, and Rav Ashi said: We may redeem with it.

QUESTION

אמר ליה רב אשי למר זוטרא: מאי דעתיה? דילפת מפסח.

Rav Ashi said to Mar Zutra: What is your reasoning? That you learn the laws of redemption from the Pesach offering, and a ben pekua is invalid for a Pesach offering?

OBJECTION

אי מה להלן זכר תמים וכן שנה, אף כאן זכר תמים וכן שנה!

But if so, just as there it must be a male, unblemished, and in its first year, so too here it must be a male, unblemished, and in its first year!

ANSWER

"תפדה" "תפדה" — ריבה.

Mar Zutra replied: The words "you shall redeem" "you shall redeem" included other lambs.

OBJECTION

אי "תפדה" "תפדה" ריבה, אפילו בן פקועה נמי!

Rav Ashi said to him: If "you shall redeem" "you shall redeem" included other lambs, then even a ben pekua should also be included!

ANSWER

אם כן, "שה" "שה" מאי אהני ליה?

Mar Zutra replied: **If so, what did "lamb" "lamb" accomplish for it?** It must be that a ben pekua is excluded because it is considered like a slaughtered animal.

QUESTION

איבעיא להו: מהו לפדות בנדמה?

A dilemma was raised before them: What is the halacha to redeem a firstborn donkey with a lamb that resembles another animal, such as a goat?

EXPLANATION

אליבא דרבי אליעזר לא תיבעי לה, השתא בכלאים פרקינן, בנדמה מיבעיא?

The Gemara clarifies: **According to Rabbi Eliezer, do not raise the question; now that we may redeem with a hybrid, is a lamb that resembles another animal needed to be asked?** It is certainly permitted.

QUESTION

כי תיבעי לה: אליבא דרבנן, בכלאים הוא דלא פרקינן, בנדמה פרקינן, או דלמא לא שנא?

When should you raise the question? According to the Rabbis: **Is it only with a hybrid that we may not redeem, but with a lamb that resembles another animal we may redeem, or perhaps there is no difference and both are invalid?**

PROOF

תא שמע: פרה שילדה מין עז — אין פודין, הא רחל שילדה מין עז — פודין.

Come and hear a proof from a braisa: **A cow that gave birth to a kind of goat — we may not redeem with it. But we can infer that a ewe that gave birth to a kind of goat — we may redeem with it.**

QUESTION

מני? אילימא רבי אליעזר — הא בכלאים נמי פרקינן!

The Gemara asks: **Whose opinion is this? If we say it is Rabbi Eliezer — but we may redeem even with a hybrid according to him, so why would he need to permit a lamb that resembles a goat?**

PROOF

אָלָא לָאוּ רַבָּנָן הִיא?

Rather, is it not the opinion of **the Rabbis?** This proves that the Rabbis permit redeeming with a lamb that resembles another animal.

REFUTATION

לא, לעולם רבי אליעזר היא, גופה קא משמע לן דפרה שילדה מין עז — אין פודין.

The Gemara rejects this: **No, actually it is** the opinion of **Rabbi Eliezer, and it comes to teach us the law itself, that a cow that gave birth to a kind of goat — we may not redeem with it.**

EXPLANATION

לא תימא: זיל אפתריה דידיה, והאי עז מעלָא הוא, אלא זיל פתר אימיה — והאי עגל הוא.

Do not say: go after the offspring itself, and this is a proper goat and should be valid; rather, go after its mother — and **this is a calf** and is therefore invalid.

PROOF

תָּא שְׁמַע, דְּתַנִּי רַבָּה בַּר שְׁמוּאֵל: אֵיזְהוּ כְּלָאִים? רַחֵל שְׂיָלְדָה מִיַּן עֵז, וְאָבִיו שֶׁה.

Come and hear another proof from that which Rabba bar Shmuel taught: What is a hybrid? A ewe that gave birth to a kind of goat, and its father was a lamb.

OBJECTION

אָבִיו שֶׁה, כְּלָאִים הוּא? נִדְמָה הוּא!

The Gemara asks: If its father was a lamb, is it a hybrid? It is a lamb that resembles another animal!

EXPLANATION

אָלָא, אֵיזְהוּ דְּמִי לְכְּלָאִים, דְּשִׁוּיוֹה רַבָּנָן כִּי כְּלָאִים? רַחֵל שְׂיָלְדָה מִיַּן עֵז, וְאָבִיו שֶׁה.

Rather, the braisa must mean: What is similar to a hybrid, which the Rabbis treated like a hybrid? A ewe that gave birth to a kind of goat, and its father was a lamb.

QUESTION

לְמַאי? אִי לְקַדְשִׁים — מַהִיכָא דְּמַמַּעַט כְּלָאִים, מִהֶתֶם מַמַּעַט נִדְמָה, דְּתַנָּיָא: "שׂוֹר אוֹ כֶּשֶׁב" — פֶּרֶט לְכְּלָאִים, "אוֹ עֵז" — פֶּרֶט לְנִדְמָה!

The Gemara asks: For what halacha did they equate them? If for Kodashim — from where we exclude a hybrid, from there we also exclude a lamb that resembles another animal, as it is taught in a braisa: "A bull or a sheep" — to exclude a hybrid, "or a goat" — to exclude a lamb that resembles another animal!

EXPLANATION

אִי לְכִכּוֹר, "אֵתָּה בְּכוֹר שׂוֹר" אָמַר רַחֲמָנָא, עַד שְׂיֵהָא הוּא שׂוֹר וּבְכוֹרוֹ שׂוֹר!

If for a firstborn animal, the Torah says: "But the firstborn of a bull", meaning until it is a bull and its firstborn is a bull, which already excludes a lamb that resembles another animal!

EXPLANATION

אָלָא לְמַעֲשֵׁר, "תַּחַת" "תַּחַת" מְקַדְשִׁים גָּמַר!

Rather, for animal tithe? But the gezeirah shavah of "under" "under" is learned from Kodashim, which already excludes it!

ANSWER

אָלָא לְפֻטֵּר חֲמוֹר.

Rather, it must be for the redemption of a firstborn donkey, proving that the Rabbis treat a lamb that resembles another animal like a hybrid and invalidate it.

REFUTATION

לָא, לְעוֹלָם לְמַעֲשֵׁר, וּכְגוֹן שִׁישׁ בּוֹ מְקַצֵּת סִימָנִין, מֵהוּ דְּתִימָא "הַעֲבָרָה" "הַעֲבָרָה" מְבָכוֹר גָּמַר, קָא מְשַׁמַּע לוֹ, "תַּחַת" "תַּחַת" מְקַדְשִׁים גָּמַר.

The Gemara rejects this: No, actually it is for animal tithe, and in a case where it has some of the physical signs of its mother, lest you say we learn the gezeirah shavah of "passing" "passing" from a firstborn animal, therefore it teaches us that we learn "under" "under" from Kodashim.

QUESTION

איבעיא להו: מהו לפדות בפסולי המוקדשין?

A dilemma was raised before them: What is the halacha to redeem a firstborn donkey with consecrated animals that became unfit due to a blemish and were redeemed?

EXPLANATION

אליבא דרבבי שמעון לא תיבעי לה, כיון דאמר מותר בהנאה — חולין הוא,

According to Rabbi Shimon, do not raise the question, since he says they are permitted for benefit, they are like regular chullin and valid.

QUESTION

כי תיבעי לה אליבא דרבבי יהודה דאמר אסור בהנאה. מאי?

When should you raise the question? According to Rabbi Yehuda, who says they are forbidden for benefit. What is the halacha?

QUESTION

כיון דאסור בהנאה, אין איסור חל על איסור? או דלמא, כיון דלא תפיס כדיונו, אפקועי איסורא בעלמא הוא?

Since it is forbidden for benefit, does a prohibition not fall upon a prohibition? Or perhaps, since its redemption does not transfer sanctity to the donkey, it is merely removing a prohibition and is permitted?

ANSWER

אמר רב מרי בריה דרב כהנא: מי זוטרי מאי דכתיב בהו, "כצבי וכאיל"? מה צבי ואיל אין פודין, אף פסולי המוקדשין אין פודין!

Rav Mari the son of Rav Kahana said: Is that which is written concerning them, "like the gazelle and like the deer", a minor thing? Just as a gazelle and a deer we may not redeem a firstborn donkey with them, so too with unfit consecrated animals we may not redeem.

GEMARA

השתא דאתית להכי,

The Gemara notes: Now that you have arrived at this derivation,

עמוד ב' DAF 12B

EXPLANATION

לרבבי שמעון נמי, "צבי ואיל" כתיב בהו.

The Gemara notes: **According to Rabbi Shimon as well**, the verse "like the gazelle and like the hart" is written regarding **them**, the disqualified consecrated animals. Therefore, since a gazelle and a hart cannot be used for redemption, disqualified consecrated animals are also invalid for this purpose.

QUESTION

איבעיא להו: מהו לפדות בכהמת שביעית?

A dilemma was raised before them in the bais medrash: **What is the halacha to redeem** a firstborn donkey **with an animal** purchased with the holy produce **of the Sabbatical Year**?

EXPLANATION

וידאי — לא תיבעי לה, לאכילה אמר רחמנא, ולא לסחורה.

The Gemara clarifies: Regarding a donkey of **definite** firstborn status, **do not raise the dilemma**, because **the Merciful One said** regarding Shevi'is produce, "it shall be **for consumption**," and **not for commerce**. Since the owner acquires his firstborn donkey in exchange for the lamb he gives to the kohen, this is considered forbidden commerce.

EXPLANATION

כי תיבעי לה — ספק.

When you should raise the dilemma, it is in a case of a donkey of **uncertain** firstborn status.

EXPLANATION

ואליבא דרבא שמעון לא תיבעי לה, דלית ליה ספק,

And according to the opinion of Rabbi Shimon, **do not raise the dilemma**, as he does **not hold** that there is any obligation of redemption in a case of **uncertain** firstborn status.

EXPLANATION

כי תיבעי לה אליבא דרבא יהודה.

Rather, **when you should raise the dilemma**, it is **according to the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda**, who holds that the owner must designate a lamb for an uncertain firstborn donkey to permit it, but he keeps the lamb for himself.

QUESTION

מאי כיון דמפריש טלה והוא לעצמו, "לֹא־כֹלֶה" קרינא ביה, או דילמא: כיון דכמה דלא מפקע איסוריה לא מישתרי, בסחורה דמי?

What is the halacha? Do we say that **since he designates a lamb and it is for himself**, as he does not give it to the kohen, **we read in it "for consumption"**, and it is not considered commerce? **Or perhaps**, since **as long as he does not abrogate its forbidden status** by designating the lamb, the donkey **is not permitted** for benefit, when he designates the lamb to permit the donkey, **it is like commerce**?

PROOF

תא שמע, דאמר רב חסדא: כהמת שביעית אין פודין בה את הודאי, אכל פודין בה את הספק.

Come and hear a resolution from that **which Rav Chisda said**: **With an animal of the Sabbatical Year**, we **may not redeem a definite** firstborn donkey, **but we may redeem an uncertain** firstborn donkey **with it**. This resolves our dilemma!

STATEMENT

וַאֲמַר רַב חֲסִידָא: בְּהֵמַת שְׁבִיעִית פְּטוּרָה מִן הַבְּכוֹרָה, וְחַיִּיבַת בְּמִתְּנוּת.

And Rav Chisda said another ruling: An animal of the Sabbatical Year is exempt from the law of firstborn, but is obligated in the gifts of the priesthood.

EXPLANATION

פְּטוּרָה מִן הַבְּכוֹרָה — "לֹאכְלָה" אָמַר רַחֲמָנָא, וְלֹא לְשְׂרִיפָה,

The Gemara explains: It is exempt from the firstborn status because the Merciful One said regarding Shevi'is produce, "it shall be for consumption," and not for burning, and parts of a kosher firstborn animal are burned on the Mizbe'ach.

EXPLANATION

וְחַיִּיבַת בְּמִתְּנוּת — דִּ"לֹאכְלָה" קָרִינָא בֵּהּ.

And it is obligated in the gifts of the priesthood, because we read in it "for consumption," as the kohen eats these gifts.

OBJECTION

מִיתִיבִי: הָאוֹכֵל מַעֲסִיט שְׁבִיעִית עַד שֶׁלֹא הוֹרְמָה חֻלָּתָהּ — חַיִּיב מִיתָה.

The Gemara raises an objection from a Mishnah: One who eats from dough of the Sabbatical Year before its challah has been separated is liable to death at the hand of Heaven, just like any other tevel.

QUESTION

וְאִמָּאִי? בֵּינָן דְּאִילוּ מְטַמְּיָא בֵּת שְׂרִיפָה הִיא, "לֹאכְלָה" אָמַר רַחֲמָנָא, וְלֹא לְשְׂרִיפָה!

But why is there an obligation of challah here? Since if it becomes tamei, it is subject to burning, and the Merciful One said "for consumption," and not for burning! Why is this different from Rav Chisda's ruling on the firstborn?

ANSWER

שְׁאֵנִי הָכָא, דְּכָתִיב "לְדוֹרוֹתֵיכֶם".

The Gemara answers: It is different here, as it is written regarding challah, "throughout your generations," which includes all dough, even in Shevi'is.

PROOF

תִּנְיָא נָמִי הָכִי: מִנֵּין לְאוֹכֵל מַעֲסִיט שְׁבִיעִית עַד שֶׁלֹא הוֹרְמָה חֻלָּתָהּ שְׁחַיִּיב מִיתָה — שְׁנַאֲמַר: "לְדוֹרֵתֵיכֶם".

This is also taught in a Braisa: From where is it derived that one who eats from dough of the Sabbatical Year before its challah has been separated is liable to death? As it is stated: "Throughout your generations."

QUESTION

וְלִגְמַר מִינֵהּ!

The Gemara asks: And let us learn from it, from challah, that a firstborn animal of Shevi'is should also be holy, and we should not apply the rule of "for consumption and not for burning"!

ANSWER

הָתָם עֵיקָר לְאַכִּילָהּ, הֲכָא עֵיקָר לְשַׂרִּיפָהּ.

The Gemara answers: **There**, regarding challah, **the primary purpose is for consumption**, and it is burned only if it becomes tamei. **Here**, regarding the sacrificial parts of a firstborn, **the primary purpose is for burning** on the Mizbe'ach.

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

נִתְּנוֹ לְכֹהֵן כּוֹי.

We learned in the Mishnah: **If he gave it to the kohen**, the kohen may not keep it unless he redeems it, etc.

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

STATEMENT

תֵּינִינָא לְהָא דִּתְּנֵנוּ רַבָּנִין: יִשְׂרָאֵל שֶׁהָיָה לוֹ פֶּטֶר חֲמוֹר בְּתוֹךְ בֵּיתוֹ, וְאָמַר לוֹ הַכֹּהֵן: "תִּנְהוּ לִי וְאֲנִי אֶפְדֶּהוּ" — הֲרִי זֶה לֹא יִתְּנוּ לוֹ, אֲלֵא אִם כֵּן פָּדְאוּ בְּפָנָיו.

The Gemara comments: **We have learned** in our Mishnah that which the Rabbis taught in a Braisa: **An Israelite who had a firstborn donkey in his house**, and the kohen said to him, "Give it to me and I will redeem it," behold, he may not give it to him, unless the kohen redeems it in his presence.

STATEMENT

אָמַר רַב נַחֲמָן אָמַר רַבָּה בַּר אֲבוּה: זֹאת אוֹמֶרֶת נַחֲשֵׁדוּ הַכֹּהֲנִים עַל פֶּטְרֵי חֲמוֹרִים.

Rav Nachman said that Rabba bar Avuh said: That is to say, kohanim are suspected regarding firstborn donkeys, that they might use them without redeeming them.

QUESTION

פְּשִׁיטָא!

The Gemara asks: **Isn't it obvious?** That is exactly what the Braisa says!

ANSWER

מִהוּ דְּתִימָא: הֲנִי מִלִּי הֵיכָא דְּמַחֲזִק לֹן דְּמִיקְרִי, אֲבָל בְּסִתְּמָא לָא — קָא מְשַׁמַּע לֹן דְּמוֹרָה בֵּה הִיתִירָא.

The Gemara answers: **Lest you say**, these words apply only where we have a presumption that it occasionally happens with this specific kohen, **but with an ordinary kohen no**, we do not suspect him. Therefore, Rav Nachman **comes to teach us that** we suspect every kohen, because a kohen **finds a way to permit it to himself**, thinking that since it belongs to him anyway, he does not need to hasten to redeem it.

משנה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מתני' המפריש פדיון פטר חמור ומת, רבי אליעזר אומר: חייבין באחריותו, כחמש סלעים של בן, וחכמים אומרים: אין חייבין באחריותו, בפדיון מעשר שני.

MISHNAH: One who designates a lamb as redemption for a firstborn donkey, and the lamb dies before being given to the kohen, Rabbi Eliezer says: He is responsible for its replacement, like the five sela'im of the redemption of the son. And the Sages say: He is not responsible for its replacement, like the redemption of Ma'aser Sheni.

MISHNAH

העיד רבי יהושע ורבי צדוק על פדיון פטר חמור שמת, שאין כאן לפהו כלום.

Rabbi Yehoshua and Rabbi Tzadok testified concerning the redemption lamb of a firstborn donkey that died, that there is nothing here for the kohen.

MISHNAH

מת פטר חמור, רבי אליעזר אומר: יקבר, ומותר בהנאתו של טלה.

If the firstborn donkey itself died after the lamb was designated, Rabbi Eliezer says: It must be buried, and the benefit of the lamb is permitted to the owner, as he does not have to give it to the kohen.

MISHNAH

וחכמים אומרים: אין צריף להקבר, וטלה לפהו.

And the Sages say: It does not need to be buried, and the lamb must still be given to the kohen.

גמרא GEMARA

QUESTION

גמ' אמר רב יוסף: מאי טעמא דרבי אליעזר?

GEMARA: Rav Yosef said: What is the reason of Rabbi Eliezer for holding the owner responsible for the lamb?

ANSWER

דכתיב: "אף פדה תפדה וגו'", מה בכור אדם חייב באחריותו, אף בכור בהמה טמאה חייב באחריותו.

As it is written: "But you shall surely redeem, etc." This equates the two; just as the firstborn of man, the father is responsible for its replacement if the money is lost before reaching the kohen, so too, the firstborn of an impure animal, the owner is responsible for its replacement.

OBJECTION

אמר ליה אבוי: אי מה בכור אדם מותר בהנאה, אף בכור בהמה טמאה מותר!

Abaye said to him: If so, just as the firstborn of man is permitted for benefit even before redemption, so too, the firstborn of an impure animal should be permitted for benefit before redemption!

OBJECTION

וכי תימא הָכִי נָמִי, וְהִתְנַן: מִת פֶּטֶר חֲמוֹר, רַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר אוֹמֵר: יִקָּבֵר.

And if you say that indeed it is so, but didn't we learn in our Mishnah: If the firstborn donkey died, Rabbi Eliezer says: It must be buried?

QUESTION

מֵאִי יִקָּבֵר? לֹא דְאִסּוּר בְּהִנָּאָה?

What is the meaning of "it must be buried"? Is it not because it is forbidden for benefit? This proves it is not like a firstborn of man!

ANSWER

לֹא, יִקָּבֵר כְּבָכוֹר אָדָם.

The Gemara answers: **No**, it means **it must be buried like a firstborn of man**, which is buried out of respect, but not because it is forbidden for benefit.

QUESTION

אָלָא, אָדָם בָּכוֹר הוּא דְבָעֵי קְבוּרָה, פְּשוּט לָא בָּעֵי קְבוּרָה?

The Gemara asks: **But is it only a firstborn man who requires burial, and a non-firstborn does not require burial?** Everyone requires burial!

OBJECTION

וְעוֹד תִּנָּא: מוֹדָה רַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל שֵׁישׁ לוֹ סֶפֶק פֶּטֶר חֲמוֹר בְּתוֹךְ בֵּיתוֹ — שְׁמִפְרִישׁ טָלָה עָלָיו, וְהוּא שָׁלוּ!

And furthermore, it is taught in a Braisa: Rabbi Eliezer agrees in the case of an Israelite who has an uncertain firstborn donkey in his house, that he designates a lamb for it, and the lamb is his. If the donkey itself were permitted for benefit, why would he need to designate a lamb at all?

ANSWER

אָלָא אָמַר רַבָּא: אָמַר קָרָא "אֲךָ פָּדָה תִּפְדֶּה", לְפָדְיָהּ הִקְשִׁיתִּיו, וְהוּא שָׁלוּ! וְלֹא לְדָבָר אֲחֵר.

Rather, Rava said: The verse states, "But you shall surely redeem." I have equated it to a firstborn of man only with regard to redemption, to teach that one is responsible for its replacement, but not with regard to any other matter, such as being permitted for benefit.

STATEMENT

תַּנּוּ הֵתָם: הָעֶרְכִּין — בְּשַׁעֲתָן, וּפְדִיּוֹן הֵבֵן — אַחֵר שְׁלָשִׁים יוֹם, פְּדִיּוֹן פֶּטֶר חֲמוֹר — לְאִלְתֵּר.

We learned in a Mishnah there: Valuations are paid at their designated time; and the redemption of the son is after thirty days; and the redemption of a firstborn donkey is immediately.

OBJECTION

וּפְדִיּוֹן פֶּטֶר חֲמֹר לְאֵתֶר? וְרַמִּינָהּ: אֵין בְּעֶרְכִּין, וּבְפִדְיוֹן הֶפֶן, וּבְנִזְירוֹת, וּבְפֶטֶר חֲמֹר — פְּחוֹת מִשְׁלָשִׁים. וּמוֹסִיפִין עַד עוֹלָם!

The Gemara asks: **And is the redemption of a firstborn donkey immediately?** But I will point out a contradiction: There is **not in valuations, and in the redemption of the son, and in Nazirite vows, and in a firstborn donkey, less than thirty days. And we may add** to this time **forever!** This contradicts the ruling that it is immediate.

ANSWER

אָמַר רַב נַחֲמָן: לוֹמַר שְׂאֵם פֶּדְאוֹ — פְּדוּי,

Rav Nachman said: When the first Mishnah says "immediately," it is **to say that if he redeemed it** before thirty days, **it is redeemed.**

QUESTION

מִכָּלָל דְּבָנָו אִם פֶּדְאוֹ אֵינוֹ פְּדוּי?

The Gemara asks: **By inference,** does this mean **that regarding his son, if he redeemed him** before thirty days, **he is not redeemed?**

OBJECTION

וְהָאִיתָמַר: הַפּוֹדֶה אֶת בְּנוֹ בְּתוֹךְ שְׁלָשִׁים יוֹם, רַב אָמַר: בְּנוֹ פְּדוּי!

But wasn't it stated: One who redeems his son within thirty days, Rav says: His son is redeemed!

ANSWER

לָאוֹ אִיתָמַר עֲלֶיהָ, אָמַר רַבָּא: דְּכוּלֵּי עַלְמָא "מַעֲכָשִׁיו" — אֵין בְּנוֹ פְּדוּי.

The Gemara answers: **Was it not stated concerning this** dispute, **Rava said: Everyone agrees** that if he said the redemption should take effect "**from now,**" **his son is not redeemed,** because the obligation has not yet arrived. The first Mishnah refers to such a case.

SUMMARY

The Gemara concludes that while the gezeirah shavah from Pesach excludes animals that are not halachically defined as a standard "lamb" (like a hybrid or a calf), the repeating words of "you shall redeem" come to include blemished or female lambs. Regarding a ben pekua, Mar Zutra and Rav Ashi argue whether it is considered a valid lamb or if it is treated like a pre-slaughtered animal in a basket, which is invalid. Finally, the Gemara analyzes whether a lamb that resembles another animal (such as a goat) is treated like a hybrid and disqualified by the Rabbis, bringing proofs from various braisos discussing Kodashim, firstborns, and animal tithes to determine if we go after the physical appearance of the offspring or the status of the mother.

The Gemara is bothered by a fascinating question: can you redeem a firstborn donkey with a "ben pekua", a live lamb found inside its mother after she was slaughtered? On the one hand, the animal is running around the field, so lichora it looks like a living lamb. On the other hand, the halacha says the slaughter of its mother already rendered it permitted to be eaten, so in a halachic sense, it is already considered "meat in a basket." Mar Zutra rules that we cannot use it for redemption. Since it is halachically considered slaughtered, its physical running around is a mere illusion; we must look at its true halachic status.

This contains a deep, beautiful yesod for our daily avodas Hashem. In life, we often look at things based on how they appear on the outside. We see a person running around, busy, making noise, and we think, "Ah, look how alive and successful he is!" Or we look at our own actions and think that because we are physically active and going through the motions, we are doing great. But the Torah teaches us to look deeper. What is the real, inner halachic status of our actions? Are they truly alive with kavanah and yiras Shamayim, or are they just "meat in a basket", lifeless habits that happen to be moving?

When you do a mitzvah today, don't just let it be a mechanical action that "runs and goes about" on its own. Stop for one second before you daven or make a berachah, and bring real life into it. Ask yourself: is this action truly alive, or am I just going through the motions?