

דף יומי • בכורות • דף ל"ב

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

THE SUGYA

We begin the daf by continuing our sugya regarding the sale of a blemished animal tithe (ma'aser behemah). The Gemara clarifies that the Rabbinic restriction against selling the meat in a normal marketplace does not apply to parts of the animal that are not appraised while it is alive, such as the hide and sinews. Furthermore, we learn that the Rabbis went back to the original Torah law for young orphans, allowing them to sell the meat normally to prevent financial loss. We also explore a practical shailah about whether one can include the value of the meat in the bones when selling it, which leads to a beautiful resolution based on local custom and the size of the animal.

From there, the Gemara returns to a fundamental Baraisa comparing a firstborn animal (bechor) and ma'aser behemah. While a bechor can be sold by a Kohen while alive, ma'aser behemah cannot be sold at all, whether alive or slaughtered, unblemished or blemished. The Gemara launches into a classic, rigorous shakla v'tarya to find the source for this prohibition against selling ma'aser, utilizing a gezerah shavah from the laws of dedications (charamim) and analyzing whether the pesukim are free (mufneh) to be used for this derivation.

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

עמוד א' DAF 32A

EXPLANATION

דבר שאינו נישום מחיים — לא גזור רבנן,

But regarding **an item that is not appraised** when the animal is **alive**, such as the hide and the sinews, **the Rabbis did not decree** a prohibition against selling them after slaughter.

EXPLANATION

וביתמי אוקמוה רבנן אדאורייתא.

And in the case of young **orphans**, **the Rabbis established** the halakha **according to Torah law**, allowing them to sell the meat of a blemished animal tithe in the normal manner to prevent financial loss.

STATEMENT

ואף רב שמואל בר רב יצחק סבר לה להא דרבא,

And even Rav Shmuel bar Rav Yitzchak **holds in accordance with this** ruling of Rava, that by Torah law, the meat of a blemished animal tithe may be sold in the normal manner.

QUESTION

דאמר רב שמואל בר רב יצחק: מניין למעשר בהמה של יתומים שמוכרים אותו כדרכו?

As Rav Shmuel bar Rav Yitzchak says: From where is it derived that the meat of an animal tithe of orphans may be sold in its usual manner, without having to resort to the method of inclusion?

ANSWER

שְׁנֵאמַר: "יֵרָק בְּכָל אוֹת נִפְשָׁךְ תִּזְבַּח וְאָכַלְתָּ בִּשְׂרָר",

It is derived from that **which is stated** in the verse regarding blemished consecrated animals: "Notwithstanding, after all the desire of your soul, you may slaughter and eat flesh according to the blessing of Hashem your Elokim."

EXPLANATION

אֵיזוֹהוּ דָּבָר שֶׁאֵין בוֹ בְּרָכָה מִחַיִּים אֲלָא לְאַחַר שְׁחִיטָה?

Now, **which is the item that has no blessing**, meaning it is forbidden to derive benefit from it, **while alive**, but only after slaughter, as indicated by the words "you may slaughter... according to the blessing"?

EXPLANATION

הָיִי אוֹמֵר: זֶה מֵעֶשֶׂר בְּהֵמָה.

You must say: This is the animal tithe, which may not be sheared or worked while alive, but whose meat may be eaten after slaughter.

QUESTION

אֵיבָעִיָּא לְהוֹ: מַהוּ לְהִבְלִיעוּ בַּעֲצָמוֹת?

A dilemma was raised before them: What is the halakha with regard to including the value of the meat **in the bones** of the animal?

STATEMENT

רַבִּי חִיָּיא וְרַבִּי שִׁמּוֹן בְּרַבִּי, חֵד אָמַר: מִבְּלִיעוּ, וְחֵד אָמַר: אֵין מִבְּלִיעוּ.

Rabbi Chiyya and Rabbi Shimon, the son of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, disputed this. **One says: One may include** the value in the bones, **and one says: One may not include** it.

RESOLUTION

וְלֹא פְּלִיגִי — הָא בְּדִקְהָ, הָא בְּגִסָּה.

The Gemara notes: **And they do not disagree.** This opinion, which says one may not include it, is referring to a small domesticated animal whose bones are not fit for making utensils and are not sold; **that** opinion, which says one may include it, is referring to a large domesticated animal whose bones are valuable and are sold.

RESOLUTION

וְאֵיבָעִית אֵימָא: אֵיזִידִי וְאֵיזִידִי בְּגִסָּה, וְלֹא פְּלִיגִי — מָר בִּי אֶתְרִיָּה, וּמָר בִּי אֶתְרִיָּה.

And if you wish, say instead: Both **this Sage and that Sage** are referring to a large animal, **and still they do not disagree.** **This Master** rules according to his place, where they do not sell bones, **and this Master** rules according to his place, where they do.

STATEMENT

גּוֹפָא: בְּבִכּוּר הוּא אוֹמֵר: "לֹא יִפְדָּה", וְנִמְכָּר;

Returning to **the text itself** cited in the Baraisa: **Regarding a firstborn animal**, the verse says: "You shall not redeem," and yet **it may be sold** by the Kohen while alive;

STATEMENT

בְּמַעֲשֵׂר נֶאֱמַר: "לֹא יִגָּאֵל", וְאֵינּוּ נִמְכָּר, לֹא חַי וְלֹא שְׁחוּט, וְלֹא תָם וְלֹא בָּעַל מוּם.

whereas **regarding** the animal tithe, it is stated: "It shall not be redeemed," and it cannot be sold, neither alive nor slaughtered, neither unblemished nor blemished.

QUESTION

מֵנָּה הֵי מִיָּלֵי?

The Gemara asks: **From where are these words** derived, that the prohibition of redemption in animal tithe includes a prohibition against selling?

ANSWER

אָמַר רַב חִינְנָא אָמַר רַב, וְכֵן אָמַר רַב דִּימִי אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: נֶאֱמַר "לֹא יִגָּאֵל" בְּמַעֲשֵׂר, וְנֶאֱמַר "וְלֹא יִגָּאֵל" בְּחֶרֶמִּים,

Rav Chinnana says that Rav says, and similarly, Rav Dimi says that Rabbi Yochanan says: It is stated "It shall not be redeemed" regarding the animal tithe, and it is stated "And it shall not be redeemed" regarding dedications (charamim).

EXPLANATION

מָה לְהֵלֶן מְכִירָה עִמּוֹ, אִף כָּאֵן מְכִירָה עִמּוֹ.

We learn by verbal analogy: **Just as there**, regarding dedications, the prohibition of **selling** is mentioned **with it**, so too **here**, regarding the animal tithe, the prohibition of **selling** is applied **with it**.

QUESTION

אָמַר לִיהִי רַב נַחֲמָן בַּר יִצְחָק לְרַב הוּנָא בְּרִיהַ דְּרַב יְהוֹשֻׁעַ: מִפְּנֵי, דְּאִי לָא מִפְּנֵי, אִיכָּא לְמַפְרָה:

Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak said to Rav Huna the son of Rav Yehoshua: Is the verse **free** for this verbal analogy? For if it is **not free**, there is room to **refute** the analogy by pointing out a difference:

OBJECTION

מָה לְחֶרֶמִּים, שְׁכֵּן חֲלִים עַל הַכֹּל!

What is notable about dedications? That they apply to **everything** a person wishes to dedicate, whereas animal tithe applies only to kosher animals.

ANSWER

לְאִי אֶפְנוּיִי מִפְּנֵי, לֹא יֵאמַר "וְלֹא יִגָּאֵל" בְּחֶרֶמִּים, וְיִגְמַר מִמַּעֲשֵׂר:

The Gemara answers: **No**, it is indeed **free**. Let "And it shall not be redeemed" not be stated regarding dedications, and let it be **derived from** the animal tithe:

EXPLANATION

מָה מַעֲשֵׂר קָדוּשׁ וְאֵינּוּ נִגְאָל, אִף חֶרֶמִּים קָדוּשִׁים וְאֵינָם נִגְאָלִין.

Just as the animal **tithe** is sacred and may not be redeemed, so too dedications are sacred and may not be redeemed.

EXPLANATION

”וְלֹא יִגָּאֵל” דְּכָתֵב רַחֲמָנָא לְמָה לִּי? לְאַפְנוּיִי.

If so, **why do I need** "And it shall not be redeemed" which the Merciful One writes in the case of dedications? It must be **to make it free** for the verbal analogy.

OBJECTION

אִיכָא לְמִיפְרָה: מָה לְמַעְשָׁר, שְׁפָן קָדוֹשׁ לְפָנָיו וְלֹא חֲרִיּוּ!

The Gemara objects: **There** is still room **to refute** this: **What is notable** about the animal **tithe**? That it is sacred before it **and after it**, meaning if one mistakenly calls the ninth or eleventh animal the tithe, it becomes holy. This is not true of dedications, so the verse is needed and is not free.

ANSWER

אָלֹא, לֹא יֵאמֵר "לֹא יִגָּאֵל" בְּחֲרָמִים, וְיִגְמַר מִבְּכוֹר:

Rather, let "It shall not be redeemed" not be stated regarding dedications, and let it be derived from a firstborn:

EXPLANATION

מָה בְּכוֹר קָדוֹשׁ וְאִינוּ נִגְאָל, אֶף חֲרָמִים קָדוֹשִׁין וְאִינוּ נִגְאָלִין.

Just as a firstborn is sacred and may not be redeemed, so too dedications are sacred and may not be redeemed.

EXPLANATION

”לֹא יִגָּאֵל” דְּכָתֵב רַחֲמָנָא לְמָה לִּי? לְאַפְנוּיִי.

If so, **why do I need** "It shall not be redeemed" which the Merciful One writes regarding dedications? It must be **to make it free**.

OBJECTION

אִיכָא לְמִיפְרָה: מָה לְבְּכוֹר, שְׁפָן קָדוֹשֶׁתוֹ מִרְחֶם!

The Gemara objects: **There** is still room **to refute** this: **What is notable** about a firstborn? That its sanctity is from the **womb**, which is not true of dedications. Thus, the verse is not free.

ANSWER

אָלֹא לֹא יֵאמֵר "לֹא יִגָּאֵל" בְּמַעְשָׁר, וְיִגְמַר הַעֲבָרָה הַעֲבָרָה מִבְּכוֹר,

Rather, let "It shall not be redeemed" not be stated regarding the animal **tithe**, and let it be **derived** through the verbal analogy of the word "**passing**" (ha'avarah) **from a firstborn**:

EXPLANATION

מָה בְּכוֹר קָדוֹשׁ וְאִינוּ נִגְאָל, אֶף מַעְשָׁר קָדוֹשׁ וְאִינוּ נִגְאָל.

Just as a firstborn is sacred and may not be redeemed, so too the animal **tithe** is sacred and may not be redeemed.

EXPLANATION

”לא יגאל” דכתב רחמנא במעשר למא לי? לאפנויי.

If so, why do I need "It shall not be redeemed" which the Merciful One writes regarding the animal tithe? It must be to **make it free** for the verbal analogy with dedications.

QUESTION

ואפתי, במעשר נמי לא, מפני דאיכא למיפרה כדפרכינן!

The Gemara asks: **And still, regarding the animal tithe also, it is not free, because there is room to refute** the derivation from firstborn **as we refuted** it before, since a firstborn's sanctity is from the womb!

ANSWER

”והעברת” קרא יתירא הוא.

The Gemara answers: The word "**And you shall pass**" is a **superfluous verse**, which makes the analogy free from refutation.

QUESTION

בכור נמי נילף "גאולה" "גאולה" מחרמים!

The Gemara asks: If so, **let a firstborn also learn** the prohibition of selling by a verbal analogy of "**redemption**" (geulah) **from dedications**, so that a firstborn also cannot be sold!

ANSWER

דמעשר מפני, דבכור לא מפני.

The Gemara answers: The verse of **animal tithe is free, but the verse of firstborn is not free.**

QUESTION

ומאי חזית דלא תפדה דבכור — לגופיה, ודמעשר — לאפנויי?

The Gemara asks: **And what did you see** to say that "**You shall not redeem**" of a firstborn is for its own sake, and the verse of **animal tithe is to make it free**?

QUESTION

ואימא: דמעשר — לגופיה, דבכור — לאפנויי!

Say instead: The verse of **animal tithe is for its own sake, and the verse of firstborn is to make it free!**

ANSWER

דנין גאולה מגאולה, ואין דנין פדייה מגאולה.

The Gemara answers: **We derive** the word "**redemption**" (geulah) **from "redemption"** (geulah), **but we do not derive "redemption"** (pidyon) **from "redemption"** (geulah). Since the animal tithe uses "yiga'el" like dedications, they are compared.

QUESTION

מאי נפקא מינה? הא תנא דבי רבי ישמעאל: "ושב הכהן" "ובא הכהן" — זו היא שיבה זו היא ביאה!

The Gemara asks: **What difference does it make** that the words are slightly different? Behold, the school of Rabbi Yishmael taught: "**And the Kohen shall return**" and "**And the Kohen shall come**" — this returning is the same as this coming! We

see that synonyms can be used for verbal analogies.

ANSWER

הַנִּי מִיָּלִי, הֵיכָא דְלִיכָא דְדָמִי לִיה, אֲבָל אֵיכָא דְדָמִי לִיה — מִדְּדָמִי לִיה יִלְפִינן.

The Gemara answers: **These words apply where there is no word that is identical to it, but where there is a word that is identical to it, we derive from the one that is identical to it.**

QUESTION

וְלִילָף בְּכוֹר "הַעֲבָרָה" מִמַּעֲשֵׂר, דְּהָא מַעֲשֵׂר נָמִי גָמַר "גְּאוּלָּה" "גְּאוּלָּה" מִחֲרָמִים!

The Gemara asks: **And let a firstborn derive** the prohibition of selling through the verbal analogy of "passing" (ha'avarah) **from animal tithe, since animal tithe also derived "redemption" from dedications!**

ANSWER

מֵיעֵט רַחֲמָנָא גְבִי תְרָמִים, "הוא" — "הוא" וְלֹא בְכוֹר.

The Gemara answers: **The Merciful One excluded this by dedications**, writing the word "it" (hu) — meaning "it" cannot be sold, **but not a firstborn.**

QUESTION

וְאֵימָא "הוא" וְלֹא מַעֲשֵׂר!

The Gemara asks: **But say instead: "It" is excluded, and not animal tithe!** Why exclude the firstborn?

ANSWER

מַעֲשֵׂר גְּאוּלָּה כְּמוֹתוֹ.

The Gemara answers: **Animal tithe** is more similar because it uses the word "redemption" (geulah) like it.

STATEMENT

רָבָא אָמַר, "לֹא יִגָּאֵל" דְּחֲרָמִים לָא צָרִיךְ, דְּאִיתְנָהוּ הֵיכָא?

Rava said: **"It shall not be redeemed" of dedications is not needed** for its own sake at all, **for where are they located** when they are holy?

EXPLANATION

אִי בִי בְּעָלִים — הֶקְדָּשׁ נִינְהוּ, אִי בִי כֹהֵן — חוּלִין נִינְהוּ.

If they are still **in the house of the owner**, they are like **consecrated property** and cannot be redeemed; if they were already **given to the Kohen**, they are like **non-sacred property** (chullin) and do not need redemption.

PROOF

דִּתְנִינָא: חֲרָמִים, כָּל זְמַן שֶׁהֵן בְּבֵית בְּעָלִים — תָּרִי הֵן כְּהֶקְדָּשׁ לְכָל דְּבָרֵיהֶם, שְׁנַאֲמַר: "כָּל חֶרֶם קֹדֶשׁ קֹדָשִׁים הוּא לֵה".

As it is taught in a Braisa: Dedications, as long as they are in the house of the owner, they are like consecrated property in all their matters, as it is stated: "Every dedicated item is holy of holies to Hashem."

PROOF

נִתְּנוּ לַכֹּהֵן — הֲרִי הֵן כְּחוּלִין לְכָל דְּבָרֵיהֶם, שֶׁנֶּאֱמַר: "כָּל חֵרֶם בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל לְךָ יִהְיֶה". לֹא

Once he gave them to the Kohen, they are like non-sacred property in all their matters, as it is stated: "Every dedicated item in Israel shall be yours." Therefore, the words "shall not be redeemed" are entirely free for the verbal analogy.

עמוד ב' DAF 32B

QUESTION

יִגָּאֵל" דְּכָתַב רַחֲמָנָא לְמָה לִּי?

The extra phrase "it may be redeemed" that the Merciful One writes in the Torah regarding dedications, why do I need it?

ANSWER

אם אינו ענין לַחֲרָמִים — תִּנְהוּ עֲנִין לְמַעֲשֵׁר.

If it is **not** needed for the **matter of dedications**, as we have already derived that they can be redeemed, **apply it** as a **matter for animal tithe**, to teach that it may not be sold.

QUESTION

אִמָּא תִנְהוּ עֲנִין לְבָכּוֹר?

But the Gemara asks: Why not **say** instead, **apply it** as a **matter for a firstborn** offering, to teach that a blemished firstborn may not be sold?

ANSWER

מַעֲשֵׁר גְאוּלָּה כְּמוֹתוֹ.

The Gemara answers: We apply it to animal **tithe** because an expression of **redemption** is written **like it**, just as redemption is written by dedications, **which is not so** concerning a firstborn.

STATEMENT

רַב אֲשִׁי אָמַר: "לֹא יִגָּאֵל" דְּמַעֲשֵׁר — לֹא יִמָּכַר הוּא.

Rav Ashi said: The phrase "it shall not be redeemed" of animal **tithe** actually means "it shall not be sold."

PROOF

אָמַר רַב אֲשִׁי: מִנָּא אָמִינָא לָהּ? דְּכִתְיִב: "וְהָיָה הוּא וְתַמּוּרְתּוֹ יִהְיֶה קֹדֶשׁ לֹא יִגָּאֵל".

Rav Ashi said: From where do I say this? As it is written: "Then both it and that for which it is substituted shall be holy; it shall not be redeemed."

EXPLANATION

אִמָּתִי עוֹשֶׂה תַּמּוּרָה — מַחֲיִים, אִמָּתִי אֵינוֹ נִגָּאֵל — מַחֲיִים, הָא לְאַחַר שְׁחִיטָה — נִגָּאֵל,

Now we analyze: **When does** the animal tithe **effect substitution**? Only while it is **alive**. So too, **when** is it **not redeemed**? Only while it is **alive**. This **implies** that after **slaughter**, it may be **redeemed**.

OBJECTION

הא בעי העמדה והערכה!

But how can that be? **Behold**, any redemption of a consecrated animal **requires standing and valuation** before a kohen, which cannot be done after it is slaughtered!

RESOLUTION

אָלא שמוע מינה, "לא יגאל" — לא ימכר הוא.

Rather, learn from this that the phrase "it shall not be redeemed" is not literal, but rather it means "it shall not be sold."

OBJECTION

הניחא למאן דאמר קדשי מזבח היו בכלל העמדה והערכה,

The Gemara asks: **This works out well** according to the one who says that animals consecrated for the altar that became blemished **were included** in the requirement of **standing and valuation**;

OBJECTION

אָלא למאן דאמר קדשי מזבח לא היו בכלל העמדה והערכה, מאי איכא למימר?

but according to the one who says that animals consecrated for the altar were not included in the requirement of **standing and valuation**, what is there to say? According to him, a slaughtered animal tithe could indeed be redeemed literally!

RESOLUTION

אנו הכי קאמרינן: מי איכא דמחיים לא מיפריק, ולאחר שחיטה מיפריק?

The Gemara answers: **This is what we are saying** to prove Rav Ashi's point: **Is there any** case of a consecrated animal **where** while alive it cannot be redeemed, and yet after slaughter it can be redeemed? Such a concept does not exist.

QUESTION

אָלמָה לֹא מחיים דאלימא קדושתיה — לא מיפריק, לאחר שחיטה דאקיל ליה קדושתיה — מיפריק!

The Gemara asks: **Why not?** Perhaps while alive, since its sanctity is strong, it cannot be redeemed; whereas after slaughter, since its sanctity is weakened, it can be redeemed!

REFUTATION

ולא כל דכן הוא?

The Gemara rejects this: **But is it not** an a fortiori argument to the contrary?

REFUTATION

ומה מחיים דאלימ ליתפס פדיונו — לא מיפריק, לאחר שחיטה דלא אלימ ליתפס פדיונו — מיפריק?

If while alive, when its sanctity is strong enough to transfer its holiness to its redemption money (just as it can transfer holiness to a substitute), it still cannot be redeemed; then after slaughter, when its sanctity is not strong enough to transfer its holiness to its redemption money, should it be able to be redeemed? Certainly not!

RESOLUTION

אָלס שְׁמַע מִינֶה: "לֹא יִגָּאֵל" — לֹא יִמָּכָר הוּא.

Rather, learn from this that the phrase "it shall not be redeemed" must mean "it shall not be sold."

QUESTION

וְלִכְתּוֹב רַחֲמָנָא "לֹא יִמָּכָר"!

The Gemara asks: But let the Merciful One write explicitly "it shall not be sold"!

ANSWER

אִי כָתַב רַחֲמָנָא "לֹא יִמָּכָר", הֲוָה אָמִינָא: אֵינְדְּבוּנִי הוּא דְלֹא מְזַדְּבֵן, דְּקָא עֶבֶד עוֹבְדֵין דְּחוּל, אֲבָל אִיפְרוּקִי — מִיפְרוּקִי, דְּקָא עֵינִי דְּמִיּוּ לְהַקְדֵּשׁ.

The Gemara answers: If the Merciful One had written "it shall not be sold," I would have said: It is only selling that is not permitted, because he is performing a mundane act with a consecrated animal; but redeeming it should be permitted, since its redemption money enters the Temple treasury.

ANSWER

לְהִכִּי כָתַב רַחֲמָנָא "לֹא יִגָּאֵל", דְּלֹא אֵינְדְּבוּנִי מִיִּזְדְּבֵן וְלֹא אִיפְרוּקִי מִיפְרוּקִי.

For this reason, the Merciful One writes "it shall not be redeemed," to teach that it may neither be sold nor may it be redeemed.

MISHNAH מִשְׁנָה

MISHNAH

מִתְנִי בֵּית שַׁמַּי אוֹמְרִים: לֹא יִמָּנָה יִשְׂרָאֵל עִם הַכֹּהֵן לְבָכּוֹר,

MISHNAH: Beit Shammai say: An Israelite may not be registered with a kohen to eat a blemished firstborn animal,

MISHNAH

וּבֵית הִלֵּל מַתִּירִין, וְאַפִּילוּ גוֹי.

and Beit Hillel permit an Israelite to eat it, and they permit even a non-Jew to eat it.

GEMARA גְּמָרָא

GEMARA

גְּמ' מִתְנִיתִין מְנִי? רַבִּי עֲקִיבָא הִיא, דְּתַנָּא:

GEMARA: Whose opinion is our Mishnah? It is the view of Rabbi Akiva, as it is taught in a braisa:

BRAISA

בְּכוֹר אֵין נִמְנֵין עָלָיו אֶלָּא חֲבוּרָה שְׂכוּלָה כֹהֲנִים, דְּבָרֵי בֵּית שְׁמַאי.

Regarding a blemished firstborn, none may be registered for it except a group that is entirely kohanim; these are the words of Beit Shammai.

BRAISA

ובֵּית הֵלֵל אוֹמְרִים: אֶפִּילוּ זָרִים.

And Beit Hillel say: Even non-kohanim may register for it.

BRAISA

רַבִּי עֲקִיבָא מְתִיר אֶפִּילוּ גּוֹי.

Rabbi Akiva goes further and permits even a non-Jew to register and eat it.

QUESTION

מָאי טַעְמָא דְּבֵית שְׁמַאי?

The Gemara asks: What is the reason of Beit Shammai?

ANSWER

דְּכָתִיב "וּבְשָׂרָם יִהְיֶה לָּהֶם וְגו'."

As it is written regarding the firstborn: "And their flesh shall be yours, like the wave-breast and like the right thigh, it shall be yours."

ANSWER

מָה הָתָם כֹהֲנִים — אֵין, יִשְׂרָאֵל — לָא, אִם הָתָא כֹהֲנִים — אֵין, יִשְׂרָאֵל — לָא.

Just as there, by the breast and thigh, kohanim may eat them—yes, but an Israelite may not; so too here, by a blemished firstborn, kohanim may eat it—yes, but an Israelite may not.

SUMMARY

In this daf, the Gemara establishes that the Rabbinic decree against selling ma'aser behemah meat in a regular butcher shop does not extend to the hide and sinews, nor does it apply to orphans, who may sell the meat normally to avoid financial loss. The Gemara then addresses whether the value of the meat can be included in the bones, resolving that it depends on whether the bones are valuable and commonly sold in that locality. Finally, the Gemara analyzes the source for the absolute prohibition against selling ma'aser behemah, deriving it via a gezerah shavah of "redemption" from charanim, and carefully tests the validity of this verbal analogy by checking if the relevant pesukim are free from potential refutations based on the unique stringencies of bechor and ma'aser.

The Gemara is bothered by a deep question: why does the Torah use the term "lo yiga'el" (it shall not be redeemed) when it actually means to forbid selling the animal tithe? The Gemara explains that if the Torah had simply written "it shall not be sold," we would have thought that only a regular commercial sale is forbidden because it looks like a weekday activity, but redeeming it for money would be permitted since the funds go to Hekdesh. The Torah is teaching us a major yesod: sometimes, even when our intentions are to bring "holy funds" into the treasury, if the action itself is a compromise on the intrinsic sanctity of the object, Hashem says, "I do not want it."

In our daily avodas Hashem, we often face this exact nisayon. We might think that we can compromise on a halakha, skip a proper tefillah b'tzibbur, or engage in a questionable business practice, telling ourselves, "It is all for a good cause! I will use the money for tzedakah, or I will learn more Torah later." We try to "redeem" a spiritual compromise with a future payoff.

But the Torah's ratzon is clear. You cannot trade away the holiness of the present moment for a calculated benefit down the road. The way we do a mitzvah must be holy in its own right, without shortcuts or compromises.

Today, when you are tempted to cut a corner or compromise on a halakha for the sake of a "good cause" or a future benefit, stop and remind yourself: Hashem wants the ratzon of the mitzvah done properly right now, not a compromise that we try to redeem later.