

דף יומי • בכורות • דף ל"ג

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

THE SUGYA

We start off on our daf with a beautiful shakla v'tarya between Beit Shammai and Beit Hillel regarding who is allowed to eat a blemished firstborn animal (bechor ba'al mum). Beit Hillel bring a powerful kal v'chomer to prove that even a non-priest (zar) may eat it, while the Gemara tests this logic and looks for the source of Rabbi Akiva's chiddush that even a non-Jew is permitted to eat from it. We also delve into the different drashos from the Hekesh of "gazelle and deer" to understand the exact status of these blemished kodashim.

From there, the Gemara brings a braisa discussing whether we can feed a blemished bechor to a niddah. Beit Shammai are machmir, comparing it to the breast and thigh of shelamim, while Beit Hillel are mekil based on the pasuk of "the impure and the pure alike shall eat it." This leads us into a fascinating discussion about different types of tumah—specifically, tumah that comes from the body versus tumah from an outside source—and how this affects the halachos of eating kodashim.

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

עמוד א' DAF 33A

ANSWER

ובית הלל: הני מילי תם, אבל בעל מום כתיב "הטמא והטהור יחדיו יאכלנו",

And Beit Hillel would respond to that claim: **These words**, that a non-priest may not eat of it, apply only to **an unblemished firstborn**, which is offered on the Mizbe'ach; **but** regarding **a blemished firstborn**, **it is written**: "The impure and the pure alike shall eat it."

PROOF

ומה טמא שאינו אוכל בקדשים קלים אוכל בבכור, ור שאוכל בקדשים קלים אינו דין שיאכל בבכור.

Beit Hillel now make a kal v'chomer: **And if an impure person, who does not eat of offerings of lesser sanctity**, nevertheless **eats of a blemished firstborn; a non-priest, who does eat of offerings of lesser sanctity** like shelamim, **is it not logical that he should eat of a blemished firstborn?**

OBJECTION

איכא למיפרך: מה לטמא, שכן הותר מכללו בעבודת צבור!

The Gemara asks: **There is a refutation** to this kal v'chomer: **What** is unique about an impure person? **For he was permitted from his general prohibition in** the case of **communal service**, where impure kohanim may perform the avodah if the tzibbur is tamei! This leniency does not apply to a non-priest, who is never allowed to perform the avodah.

RESOLUTION

ובית הלל, אטו בעבודה קאמר? באכילה קאמרינו, אכילת זר עדיף.

And Beit Hillel would answer: Is that to say that the kal v'chomer was stated regarding the avodah, which was the subject of your refutation? No, we are speaking regarding eating the meat, and regarding eating, the eating of a non-priest is superior to that of an impure person, so the refutation does not apply.

STATEMENT

ורבי עקיבא מתיר, ואפילו גוי.

The baraita stated: And Rabbi Akiva permits a blemished firstborn to be eaten, and even by a non-Jew.

EXPLANATION

מאי טעמא דרבי עקיבא? "פצבִי וְאַיִל" — מָה צָבִי וְאַיִל מוּתָר לְגוֹי, אִם פְּסוּלִין מוּתָר לְגוֹי.

What is the reason of Rabbi Akiva? The Torah compares blemished consecrated animals to "the gazelle and the deer"—just as a gazelle and a deer are permitted to a non-Jew to eat, so too, disqualified blemished consecrated animals, including a blemished firstborn, are permitted to a non-Jew.

QUESTION

ואידך?

And the other Tanna, who disagrees with Rabbi Akiva and forbids a non-Jew from eating it, how does he explain this comparison?

ANSWER

תֵּלְתָא "צָבִי וְאַיִל" כְּתִיבִי, חֵד לְכַדְרָבִי יִצְחָק, וְחֵד לְכַדְרָבִי אוֹשְׁעִיָּא, וְחֵד לְכַדְרָבִי אֶלְעָזָר הַקָּפָר.

The Gemara answers: Three times the comparison to "gazelle and deer" is written in the Torah. One is needed for that which Rabbi Yitzchak taught, and one is needed for that which Rabbi Oshaya taught, and one is needed for that which Rabbi Elazar HaKappar taught.

EXPLANATION

ואידך? מָה צָבִי וְאַיִל פְּטוּרִים מִן הַבְּכוֹרָה, אִם פְּסוּלֵי הַמוּקְדָּשִׁין פְּטוּרִין מִן הַבְּכוֹרָה.

And the other verse, how does he use it? He derives: Just as a gazelle and a deer are exempt from the law of the firstborn, since the law only applies to cattle, sheep, and goats, so too, disqualified consecrated animals that were redeemed are exempt from the law of the firstborn if they give birth after redemption.

BRAISA

תְּנִי רַבָּנִי: כְּכוֹר אֵין מֵאכִילִין אוֹתוֹ לְנִדּוֹת, דְּכָרִי בֵּית שְׁמַאי. וּבֵית הֵלֵל אוֹמְרִים: מֵאכִילִין אוֹתוֹ לְנִדּוֹת.

The Rabbis taught in a braisa: As for a blemished firstborn, we do not feed it to menstruating women; this is the statement of Beit Shammai. And Beit Hillel say: We may feed it to menstruating women.

EXPLANATION

מאי טעמא דבית שמאי? דכתיב: "וּבְשָׂרָם יִהְיֶה לָהֶם", מָה הֵתָם נִדּוֹת לָהֶם, אִם הֵכָא נִדּוֹת לָהֶם.

What is the reason of Beit Shammai? As it is written regarding the firstborn: "And their meat shall be yours, like the wave-breast and like the right thigh." Just as there, with the breast and thigh, menstruating women may not eat them because they are tamei, so too here, with the firstborn, menstruating women may not eat it.

ANSWER

ובית הלל: הני מילי תם, אבל בעל מום — "הטמא והטהור יאכלנו".

And Beit Hillel respond: **These words**, comparing it to the breast and thigh, apply only to **an unblemished** firstborn; but regarding **a blemished** firstborn, the Torah says: "**The impure and the pure alike shall eat it.**"

ANSWER

ובית שמאי, הני מילי היכא דאין טומאה יוצאה עליו מגופו, אבל היכא דטומאה יוצאה עליו מגופו — לא.

And Beit Shammai argue: **These words**, that an impure person may eat it, apply only **where the impurity does not issue upon him from his own body**, such as one who touched a corpse; **but where the impurity issues upon him from his own body**, such as a zav or a niddah, **no**, they may not eat it.

PROOF

דאשכחן דפליג רחמנא בין טומאה יוצאה עליו מגופו, לבין שאין טומאה יוצאה עליו מגופו,

For we find that the Merciful One distinguishes between impurity issuing upon him from his own body, and between impurity **that does not issue upon him from his own body**,

PROOF

דתנו: הפסח שפא בטומאה — לא יאכלו ממנו זבים ומצורעין ונדות ויו לדות.

as we learned in a Mishnah: **A Pesach offering that comes in a state of impurity** because the majority of the community is tamei, zavim, metzoraim, zavot, niddot, and women after childbirth may not eat from it, because only corpse-impurity is permitted, but not impurity issuing from the body.

RESOLUTION

ובית הלל: התם הוא דגלי רחמנא "טמא נפש", אבל הכא "טמא" סתמא כתיב, לא שנא.

And Beit Hillel respond: **It is only there**, by the Pesach, that the Merciful One revealed a distinction by writing "**impure by a corpse,**" **but here**, by the firstborn, "**impure**" is written unspecified, so it makes **no difference** what kind of impurity it is.

BRAISA

תנו רבנן: אין מרגילין ביום טוב, פיוצא בו אין מרגילין בבכור, ולא בפסולי המוקדשין.

The Rabbis taught in a braisa: **We do not skin** an animal from its feet to keep the hide whole as a container **on Yom Tov**; and similarly, we **do not skin** in this manner **a firstborn** animal, **nor** do we do so **with disqualified consecrated animals**.

STATEMENT

בשלמא יום טוב — דקא טרח טירחא דלא חזי ליה.

The Gemara analyzes this: **Granted, on Yom Tov** it is forbidden, because **he is exerting an exertion that is not needed for him** on Yom Tov itself.

QUESTION

א לא בכור — מאן תנא?

But regarding a blemished **firstborn** on a weekday, **who is the Tanna** who forbids skinning it this way?

ANSWER

אמר רב חסדא: בית שמאי היא, דאמר אין מאכילין אותו לנדות.

Rav Chisda said: It is the opinion of Beit Shammai, who say we do not feed it to menstruating women, because they treat a blemished firstborn with the sanctity of kodashim, and skinning it this way is a degradation.

QUESTION

ולא בפסולי המוקדשין. מאן תנא?

The Gemara asks: "Nor with disqualified consecrated animals"—who is the Tanna of this clause?

ANSWER

אמר רב חסדא: רבי אלעזר ברבי שמעון היא,

Rav Chisda said: It is Rabbi Elazar son of Rabbi Shimon,

PROOF

דתנו: היו לפניו שתי חטאות, אחת תמימה ואחת בעלת מום — תמימה תקרב, בעלת מום תיפדה.

as we learned in a Mishnah: If there were before him two sin-offerings, one unblemished and one blemished, the unblemished one shall be offered, and the blemished one shall be redeemed.

PROOF

נשחטה בעלת מום, אם עד שלא נזרק דמה של תמימה — מותרת, אם משנזרק דמה של תמימה — אסורה.

If the blemished one was slaughtered after redemption, if it was before the blood of the unblemished one was sprinkled, it is permitted to be eaten; if it was after the blood of the unblemished one was sprinkled, it is forbidden to be eaten, because the unblemished one has already atoned for the sin.

PROOF

רבי אלעזר ברבי שמעון אומר: אפילו בשר בקדירה, ונזרק דמה של תמימה — אסורה.

Rabbi Elazar son of Rabbi Shimon says: Even if the meat of the blemished one was already cooking in the pot, and then the blood of the unblemished one was sprinkled, it is forbidden. We see he holds that disqualified consecrated animals retain a high level of sanctity, so he would forbid skinning them from the feet.

QUESTION

ורב חסדא, לוקמה כולה בבית שמאי!

The Gemara asks: And Rav Chisda, let him establish the entire braisa according to Beit Shammai, including the clause about disqualified consecrated animals!

ANSWER

דלמא עד כאן לא קאמרי בית שמאי אלא בבכור, דקדושתו מרחם, אבל פסולי המוקדשין דאין קדושתו מרחם — לא.

The Gemara answers: Perhaps Beit Shammai only say their strict ruling regarding a firstborn, whose sanctity is from the womb; but regarding disqualified consecrated animals, whose sanctity is not from the womb, no, they would not apply

this restriction.

עמוד ב' DAF 33B

QUESTION

ולוקמה כולל ברבי אֶלְעָזָר בְּרַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן!

The Gemara asks: **But let him establish the entire** baraita in accordance with Rabbi Elazar son of Rabbi Shimon, and then we would not need to split the authorship of the baraita!

ANSWER

דִּילְמָא עַד כָּאן לָא קָאֻמַּר רַבִּי אֶלְעָזָר בְּרַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן הָתָם אֵלָּא פְּסוּלֵי הַמוֹקֵדֶשִׁין, דְּאֵלִימִי לְמִיתָפֶס פְּדִיוָנוּ, אֲבָל בְּכוֹר דְּלֹא אֵלִים לְמִיתָפֶס פְּדִיוָנוּ — לֹא.

The Gemara answers: **Perhaps Rabbi Elazar son of Rabbi Shimon only says** his lenient ruling **there with regard to disqualified consecrated animals, whose sanctity is strong enough to transfer** itself to **their redemption money**, so they retain some sanctity even after slaughtering; **but with regard to a firstborn, whose sanctity is not strong enough to transfer** itself to **its redemption money** since it cannot be redeemed, perhaps its sanctity is not retained after slaughtering, and therefore **no**, he would not permit skinning it from its feet.

QUESTION

ורבי אֶלְעָזָר בְּרַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן לִית לֵיהּ כָּל פְּסוּלֵי הַמוֹקֵדֶשִׁין נִמְכָּרִין בְּאִיטָלִיז וְנִשְׁקָלִין בְּלִיטְרָא?

The Gemara asks: **But does Rabbi Elazar son of Rabbi Shimon not hold** of the Mishnah's rule that **all disqualified consecrated animals are sold in the butcher's market and weighed by the litra** like non-sacred meat?

INFERENCE

אֵלְמָא דְכִיּוֹן דְּאִיכָּא רוּחָא לְהַקְדֵּשׁ שָׂרִי לֵהּ!

Consequently, since there is a financial gain for Hekdesh, because the owner will pay more to redeem it if he knows he can sell it easily, the Sages **permitted it**. If so, why not permit skinning from the feet for the same reason?

ANSWER

אָמַר רַב מַרִּי בְרִיהַ דְּרַב כַּהֲנָא: מַה שְּׁמִשְׁבִּיחַ בְּעוֹר — פּוֹגֵם בַּבָּשָׂר.

Rav Mari the son of Rav Kahana said: That which he improves in the **hide** by skinning it whole he ruins in the meat, because some meat gets torn off with the hide, so there is no net gain for Hekdesh.

ANSWER

בְּמַעֲרָבָא מְשַׁמִּיָּה דְּרַבִּינָא אָמַר: מִפְּנֵי שְׁנִרְאָה כְּעוֹבֵד עֲבוּדָה בְּקִדְשִׁים.

In the West, Eretz Yisrael, **they say in the name of Ravina:** It is forbidden because it looks like he is performing work with **consecrated animals**, which is a Torah prohibition.

ANSWER

רַבִּי יוֹסִי בַר אֲבִין אוֹמַר: גְּזִירָה שְׁמָא יִגְדֵּל מֵהֶן עֲדָרִים עֲדָרִים.

Rabbi Yosei bar Avin says: It is a Rabbinic decree, lest he raise herds upon herds from them by delaying their slaughter while waiting for buyers for the hides, and he might come to shear or work them.

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מִתְּנִי בְּכוֹר שְׂאֵחָזוֹ דָּם, אֶפִּילוֹ מֵת — אֵין מְקִיזִין לוֹ דָּם, דְּבָרֵי רַבִּי יְהוּדָה.

MISHNAH: A firstborn animal that was seized with a congestion of blood, even if it will die if left untreated, we may not let its blood; these are the words of Rabbi Yehuda, because he holds we are afraid he might make a blemish.

MISHNAH

וְחֻכָּמִים אוֹמְרִים: יִקְיָז, וּבִלְבָד שְׂלֹא יַעֲשֶׂה בּוֹ מוֹם, וְאִם עָשָׂה בּוֹ מוֹם — הֲרִי זֶה לֹא יִשְׁחַט עָלָיו.

And the Sages say: He may let its blood, provided that he does not make a blemish in it; and if he did make a blemish in it, behold, this animal may not be slaughtered on account of that blemish, as a penalty for causing it.

MISHNAH

רַבִּי שִׁמּוֹן אוֹמֵר: יִקְיָז, אֲף עַל פִּי שֶׁהוּא עוֹשֶׂה בּוֹ מוֹם.

Rabbi Shimon says: He may let its blood even though he makes a blemish in it, and he may even slaughter it on account of that blemish.

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

BRAISA

גְּמ' תִּנּוּ רַבָּנָן: בְּכוֹר שְׂאֵחָזוֹ דָּם — מְקִיזִין לוֹ אֶת הַדָּם בְּמָקוֹם שֶׁאֵין עוֹשִׂים בּוֹ מוֹם, וְאֵין מְקִיזִין לוֹ אֶת הַדָּם בְּמָקוֹם שֶׁעוֹשִׂין בּוֹ מוֹם, דְּבָרֵי רַבִּי מֵאִיר.

GEMARA: The Rabbis taught in a braisa: A firstborn animal that was seized with a congestion of blood, we may let its blood in a place where we do not make a blemish, but we may not let its blood in a place where we make a blemish; these are the words of Rabbi Meir.

BRAISA

וְחֻכָּמִים אוֹמְרִים: אֲף בְּמָקוֹם שֶׁעוֹשֶׂה בּוֹ מוֹם, וּבִלְבָד שְׂלֹא יִשְׁחַט עַל אוֹתוֹ הַמוֹם.

And the Sages say: Even in a place where he makes a blemish he may let blood, provided that he does not slaughter the animal on account of that blemish.

BRAISA

רַבִּי שִׁמּוֹן אוֹמֵר: אֲף נִשְׁחַט עַל אוֹתוֹ הַמוֹם.

Rabbi Shimon says: It may even be slaughtered on account of that blemish.

BRAISA

רבי יהודה אומר: אפילו מת — אין מקיזין לו את הדם.

Rabbi Yehuda says: Even if it will die, we may not let its blood at all.

STATEMENT

מתני ליה רבי אלעזר לבריה, ואמרי לה רבי חייה לבריה: כמחלוקת כאן, כך מחלוקת בבית של תרומה,

Rabbi Elazar taught his son, and some say it was Rabbi Chiyya who taught his son: Just as there is a dispute here regarding bloodletting, so there is a dispute regarding a barrel of terumah.

STATEMENT

דתנו: הבית של תרומה שנולד בה ספק טומאה — רבי אליעזר אומר: אם היתה במקום התורפה — נניחנה במקום המוצנע, אם היתה מגולה — יכסנה.

As we learned in a Mishnah: In the case of a barrel of terumah in which a doubt of impurity arose, Rabbi Eliezer says: If it was in an exposed place, he should place it in a hidden place; if it was uncovered, he should cover it, to protect it from further impurity.

STATEMENT

רבי יהושע אומר: אם היתה מונחת במקום המוצנע — נניחנה במקום התורפה, אם היתה מכוסה — גללה.

Rabbi Yehoshua says: If it was resting in a hidden place, he may place it in an exposed place; if it was covered, he may uncover it, because we do not need to protect doubtful terumah.

STATEMENT

רבן גמליאל אומר: לא יחדש בה דבר.

Rabban Gamliel says: He should not initiate any new action with it, but rather leave it exactly as it is.

EXPLANATION

רבי מאיר כרבי אליעזר, ורבנן כרבי יהושע, ורבי יהודה כרבן גמליאל.

The Gemara aligns the opinions: Rabbi Meir holds like Rabbi Eliezer, and the Rabbis hold like Rabbi Yehoshua, and Rabbi Yehuda holds like Rabban Gamliel.

OBJECTION

ממאי? דלמא עד כאן לא קאמר רבי מאיר התי, דקא עביד בידים, אבל הכא דגרימא — כרבי יהושע סבירא ליה!

The Gemara objects: **From where** do we know this? Perhaps Rabbi Meir only says his strict ruling **there** by the firstborn because he is doing the blemish actively with his hands; but here by the barrel, where it is only indirectly causing impurity, he holds like Rabbi Yehoshua that it is permitted!

OBJECTION

ועד פאן לא קאמער רבי אליעזר הָתָם, אָלָא שְׁמָא יָבֵא אֵלָיו ויטְהַרְנָה, אָבֵל הָכָא, דְּאִי שְׂבִיב לִיה
מִיֵּית — כְּרַבּוֹנָן סְבִירָא לִיה!

And perhaps Rabbi Eliezer only says his strict ruling there by the barrel because perhaps Eliyahu will come and declare it pure, so we must preserve it; but here by the firstborn, where if he leaves it, it will die and be completely lost, he holds like the Rabbis that we may let its blood!

OBJECTION

ועד פאן לא קאמרי רבנן הָכָא, דְּאִי שְׂבִיב לִיה מִיֵּית, אָבֵל הָתָם — שְׁמָא יָבֵא אֵלָיו ויטְהַרְנָה, כְּרַבִּי
אֵלִיעֶזֶר סְבִירָא לָהּ!

And perhaps the Rabbis only say their lenient ruling here by the firstborn because if he leaves it, it will die; but there by the barrel, where perhaps Eliyahu will come and declare it pure, they hold like Rabbi Eliezer that we must protect it!

OBJECTION

ועד פאן לא קאמער רבי יהודה הָכָא, דְּקָא עֲבִיד בְּיָדָם, אָבֵל הָתָם דְּגֵרְמָא — כְּרַבִּי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ סְבִירָא
לִיה!

And perhaps Rabbi Yehuda only says his strict ruling here by the firstborn because he is doing the blemish actively with his hands; but there by the barrel, where it is only indirectly causing impurity, he holds like Rabbi Yehoshua!

OBJECTION

ועד פאן לא קאמער רבן גמליאל הָתָם, דְּשְׁמָא יָבֵא אֵלָיו ויטְהַרְנָה, אָבֵל הָכָא, דְּאִי שְׂבִיב לִיה
מִיֵּית, כְּרַבְּנָן סְבִירָא לִיה!

And perhaps Rabban Gamliel only says his ruling there by the barrel because perhaps Eliyahu will come and declare it pure; but here by the firstborn, where if he leaves it, it will die, he holds like the Rabbis!

OBJECTION

ועוד, הָכָא בִּקְרָאִי פְּלִיגִי וְהָכָא בִּקְרָאִי פְּלִיגִי,

And furthermore, here in the case of the firstborn they argue about verses, and there in the case of the barrel they argue about verses, so the disputes are not based on the same principles.

STATEMENT

דָּאמַר רַבִּי חִיָּיא בַר אֲבָא אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: הַכֹּל מוֹדִים בְּמַחֲמִץ אַחֵר מְחַמֵּץ שֶׁהוּא חַיִּיב, דְּכֵתִיב "לֹא
תֵאָפֶה חֻמֶּץ" וְ"לֹא תַעֲשֶׂה".

For Rabbi Chiyya bar Abba said that Rabbi Yochanan said: Everyone agrees regarding one who leavens a meal offering after another has already leavened it that he is liable, as it is written: "It shall not be baked as chametz" and "It shall not be made as chametz."

STATEMENT

בְּמִסְרָס אַחֵר מִסְרָס שֶׁהוּא חַיִּיב, דְּכֵתִיב: "וּמַעוֹף וְכֹתוֹת וְנִתּוֹק וְכֹרוֹת", אִם עַל כּוֹרֵת חַיִּיב, עַל נוֹתֵק
לֹא כָּל שְׁפֹן? אֲלֵא לְהֵבִיא נוֹתֵק אַחֵר כּוֹרֵת, שֶׁהוּא חַיִּיב.

And everyone agrees regarding one who castrates an animal after another has already castrated it that he is liable, as it is written: "And that which is bruised, or crushed, or torn, or cut"; if one is liable for cutting off the organ, is he not all the more so liable for tearing it? Rather, the verse comes to include one who tears the organ after another has already cut it, that he is liable.

EXPLANATION

לא נחלקו אלא במטיל מום בבעל מום, דרבנן מאיר סבר: "כל מום לא יהיה בו", ורבנן סברי: "תמים יהיה לרצון".

They only disputed regarding one who places a blemish on a blemished animal; for Rabbi Meir holds that the verse "No blemish shall be in it" means even a blemished animal may not receive another blemish, and the Rabbis hold that the verse "It shall be unblemished to be accepted" implies that the prohibition only applies to an unblemished animal.

QUESTION

ורבנן מאיר, האי "תמים יהיה לרצון" מאי עביד ליה?

The Gemara asks: And Rabbi Meir, what does he do with this verse of "It shall be unblemished to be accepted"?

ANSWER

מביעי ליה למעוטי בעל מום מעיקרו.

The Gemara answers: He needs it to exclude an animal that was blemished from its inception from being consecrated.

OBJECTION

בעל מום מעיקרו — פשיטא, דיקלא בעלמא הוא!

The Gemara objects: An animal blemished from its inception is obvious that it cannot be consecrated, for it is merely like a palm tree, which only has monetary sanctity!

ANSWER

א לא למעוטי פסולי המוקדשין לאחר פדיונן, סלקא דעתך אמינא: הואיל ואסירי בגיזה ועבודה — במומין נמי ליתסרו, קא משמע לן.

Rather, it comes to exclude disqualified consecrated animals after their redemption from the prohibition of causing a blemish; for it might enter your mind to say: Since they are forbidden in shearing and working, they should also be forbidden in receiving blemishes; therefore, it teaches us that they are permitted.

QUESTION

ורבנן נמי, הכתיב "כל מום לא יהיה בו"!

The Gemara asks: And the Rabbis also, is it not written: "No blemish shall be in it", which Rabbi Meir used to forbid causing a blemish on a blemished animal?

ANSWER

לגרמא הוא דאתי, דתנא: "מום לא יהיה בו" — אין לי

The Gemara answers: It comes to forbid indirectly causing a blemish, as it was taught in a braisa: "No blemish shall be in it" — I only have a prohibition against actively making a blemish...

SUMMARY

In short, the daf establishes that according to Beit Hillel, a blemished bechor has a lighter status, allowing both zarim and tamei individuals (including a niddah) to eat from it, as the Torah does not distinguish between different types of tumah here. We then learn a braisa that forbids skinning a firstborn or disqualified consecrated animal from the feet to make a leather container. Rav Chisda explains that the Tanna who forbids this by a blemished bechor is Beit Shammai, who treat it with high sanctity, while the one who forbids it by disqualified kodashim is Rabbi Elazar son of Rabbi Shimon, who holds they retain their sacred status even after redemption.

למעשה WHAT TO TAKE HOME

The Gemara is bothered by how we treat a blemished firstborn, a bechor ba'al mum. Lichoira, once it has a mum, it cannot be offered on the Mizbe'ach. Yet, we see a major machlokes between Beit Shammai and Beit Hillel about how much of its original kedushah remains. Beit Shammai hold that even a blemished bechor retains such a high level of sanctity that we cannot feed it to a niddah, and we cannot skin it in a way that degrades the meat, because they hold its kedushah is still deeply intact. Beit Hillel are mekil, but even they agree it has a special status. We see from here a tremendous yesod: something that was once designated for the Mizbe'ach never completely loses its holiness, even when it becomes broken and blemished.

This is a powerful lesson for our own avodas Hashem. Sometimes a Yid looks at himself and feels like a ba'al mum. He feels broken, spiritually bruised, or far from the madreigah of being 'unblemished' and fit for the Mizbe'ach. The yetzer hara whispers to him, 'You are disqualified, your learning and davening have no value anymore.' But the Torah is telling us the exact opposite. Even when there is a mum, the kedushah is still there! Hashem still treasures you, and the holiness of your neshama remains intact.

We must treat ourselves, and every single fellow Yid, with the utmost respect and dignity, recognizing that a holy neshama can never be truly disqualified. Even when we feel broken, we are still kadosh.

Today, when you feel a lack of inspiration or feel 'blemished' by your mistakes, stop and remind yourself: 'My neshama is still kadosh to Hashem.' Do one small mitzvah with the pride of knowing your holiness is still fully there.