

דף יומי • בכורות • דף ל"ו

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

THE SUGYA

We begin the daf by continuing our discussion of the credibility of kohanim regarding blemishes on a firstborn animal. The Gemara asks whether we can accept hearsay testimony—where one witness testifies in the name of another—to permit a blemished bechor. We also look at a case where a kohen brings a blemished bechor and claims he didn't know it was a firstborn until now, analyzing this through the lens of "the mouth that prohibited is the mouth that permitted" and the power of a miggo.

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

עמוד א' DAF 36A

ANSWER

אימר דאמר רבי מאיר לחששא, לאחזוקינהו מי אמר?

The Gemara answers: You can say that Rabbi Meir says that kohanim are suspect for a concern that they might cause a blemish, but to establish them as definitely causing blemishes, did he say this? Certainly not.

QUESTION

איבעיא להו: עד מפי עד, מהו לעדות בכור?

A dilemma was raised before them: Regarding hearsay testimony, where one witness testifies in the name of another, what is the halacha for testimony of a firstborn animal's blemish?

STATEMENT

רב אסי אסר, ורב אשי שרי.

Rav Asi prohibits permitting the firstborn based on this, and Rav Ashi permits it.

OBJECTION

אמר ליה רב אסי לרב אשי: והא תנא דבי מנשה: אין עד מפי עד כּשר אלא לעדות האשה!

Rav Asi said to Rav Ashi: But didn't the Tanna of the school of Menashe teach: Hearsay testimony is not valid except for the testimony of a woman to permit her to remarry when her husband dies!

RESOLUTION

תני: אלא לעדות שהאשה כשרה לה בלבד.

Rav Ashi replied: Emend the baraisa and teach it this way: Except for testimony for which a woman is kosher herself, which includes testifying on a firstborn's blemish.

STATEMENT

רב יימר אכשר עד מפי עד בכור, קרי עליה מרימר: "יימר שרי בוכרא".

The Gemara relates: Rav Yeimar declared valid hearsay testimony regarding a firstborn. Mareimar called out about him mockingly: "Yeimar permits firstborns!"

RULING

והלכתא: עד מפי עד כשר לעדות בכור.

And the halacha is: Hearsay testimony is valid for the testimony of a firstborn.

STATEMENT

אמר רבי אילעא: לא היו מוחזקין בו שהוא בכור, ובא אחד ואמר שהוא בכור ומומו עמו — נאמן.

Rabbi Ile'a said: If they did not have an established presumption about it that it is a firstborn, and one came and said that it is a firstborn and its blemish is with it, meaning it was blemished inadvertently, he is believed.

QUESTION

מאי קא משמע לן, שהפה שאסר הוא הפה שהתיר? תנינא: האשה שאמרה "אשת איש הייתי וגרושה אני" נאמנת, שהפה שאסר הוא הפה שהתיר!

The Gemara asks: What is this coming to teach us? Is it that 'the mouth that prohibited is the mouth that permitted'? But we already learned this in a Mishnah: A woman who said, "I was a married woman and now I am divorced," is believed, because the mouth that prohibited is the mouth that permitted!

ANSWER

מהו דתימא: התיב הוא דאי בעי לא אמרה. אבל הכא, דלא סגי דלא אמרה, דקדשים בחוץ לא אכיל, אימא: לא הפה שאסר הוא,

The Gemara answers: Lest you say: There by the woman it is different, since if she wanted she did not have to say anything at all. But here, where it is not possible that he would not say it, since he cannot eat kodashim outside the Beis HaMikdash without an expert's permission, I might say: It is not a case of 'the mouth that prohibited' because he was forced to admit it was a firstborn,

EXPLANATION

קא משמע לן, דאי משום הכי — הוה שדי ביה מומא דניכר ואכיל ליה.

therefore it comes to teach us that he is believed, for if it were because of that, that he wanted to lie, he would have cast a blemish in it that is obvious to everyone and eaten it without needing an expert.

OBJECTION

מתקיף לה מר בר רב אשי: מאי שנא מההוא גברא דאוגר ליה חמרא לחבריה, ואמר ליה: לא תיזיל באורחא דנהר פקוד דאיפא מיא, זיל באורחא דנרש דליפא מיא.

Mar bar Rav Ashi challenged this: How is this different from that man who rented a donkey to his fellow, and said to him: Do not go on the path of Nehar Pekod where there is water, go on the path of Neresh where there is no water.

STATEMENT

אֵל בְּאֶרְחָא דְנֶהָר פֶּקוֹד וּמִית חֲמָרָא, וְאָתָא וְאָמַר לֵיהּ: בְּאֶרְחָא דְנֶהָר פֶּקוֹד אָזְלִי, וּמִיָּהּ מִיָּא לָא הוּוּ.

He went on the path of Nehar Pekod and the donkey died, and he came and said to him: I went on the path of Nehar Pekod, but there was no water there.

STATEMENT

וְאָמַר רַבָּא: מָה לוֹ לְשַׁקֵּר, אִי בְּעֵי אָמַר: בְּאֶרְחָא דְנֶרֶשׁ אָזְלִי.

And Rava said: He is believed because of a miggo of 'why would he lie?' If he wanted, he could have said: I went on the path of Neresh.

STATEMENT

וְאָמַר אַבַּיִי: "מָה לוֹ לְשַׁקֵּר" בְּמָקוֹם עֵדִים לָא אָמְרִינָן.

And Abaye said: We do not say 'why would he lie' in a place of witnesses, since witnesses can testify that there is water on that path. So too here, since kohanim are suspected of causing blemishes, it is like a place of witnesses!

REFUTATION

הֲכִי הִשְׁתָּא?! הֵתָם וְדָאִי אִיכָא מִיָּא, הָכָא וְדָאִי שְׂדֵי בֵיהּ מוּמָא — חֲשָׁשָׁא הוּא, וּבְמָקוֹם חֲשָׁשָׁא אָמְרִינָן "מָה לוֹ לְשַׁקֵּר".

The Gemara rejects this: How can you compare the two?! There, there is certainly water on that path; but here, is it certain that he cast a blemish in it? It is only a concern, and in a place of mere concern we do say 'why would he lie'.

STATEMENT

תְּיַב רַבִּינָא וְקָאָמַר לְהָאִי שְׁמַעְתָּא בְּלֹא גִבְרָא, אָמַר לֵיהּ רַבָּא זוּטִי לְרַבִּינָא: אֲנִן מְשַׁמְיָה דְרַבִּי אֵילָעָא מִתְנַיֵּן לֵהּ.

Ravina sat and was saying this halacha anonymously. Rava Zuti said to Ravina: We learn this in the name of Rabbi Ile'a.

STATEMENT

רַבִּי צְדוֹק הָוָה לֵיהּ בּוּכְרָא, רָמָא לֵיהּ שְׁעָרֵי בָסְלִי, בְּהָדִי דְקָאָכִיל אִיבָזַע שִׁיפְתִּיהּ.

The Gemara relates: Rabbi Tzadok had a firstborn animal. He put barley for it in wicker baskets, and while it was eating, its lip split on the basket, rendering it blemished.

STATEMENT

אָתָא לְקַמְיָה דְרַבִּי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ, אָמַר לוֹ: כָּלוּם חֵילָקְנּוּ בֵּין חֵבֵר לְעַם הָאֶרֶץ? אָמַר לוֹ רַבִּי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ: הֵן.

He came before Rabbi Yehoshua and said to him: Did we make any distinction between a chaver and an am ha'aretz regarding credibility about blemishes? Rabbi Yehoshua said to him: Yes, we did, and you are believed.

STATEMENT

אָתָא לְקַמְיָה דְרַבָּן גַּמְלִיֵּאל, אָמַר לוֹ: חֵילָקְנּוּ בֵּין חֵבֵר לְעַם הָאֶרֶץ? אָמַר לוֹ רַבָּן גַּמְלִיֵּאל: לֹא.

He came before Rabban Gamliel and said to him: Did we make any distinction between a chaver and an am ha'aretz? Rabban Gamliel said to him: No.

STATEMENT

אמר לו: (והא) [והלל] רבי יהושע אמר לי הן! אמר לו: המתן עד שיעלו בעלי תריסין לבית המדרש.

Rabbi Tzadok said to him: But Rabbi Yehoshua said to me, "Yes"! Rabban Gamliel said to him: Wait until the masters of the shields, the Torah scholars, go up to the Beis HaMedrash.

STATEMENT

כיון שנכנסו לבית המדרש, עמד השואל ושאל: כלום חילקנו בין חבר לעם הארץ? אמר לו רבי יהושע: לאו.

Once they entered the Beis HaMedrash, the questioner stood and asked: Did we make any distinction between a chaver and an am ha'aretz? Rabbi Yehoshua said to him: No.

STATEMENT

אמר לו רבן גמליאל: והלא משמך אמרו לי הן! יהושע, עמוד על רגליך, ויעידו בך.

Rabban Gamliel said to him: But they told me in your name, "Yes"! Yehoshua, stand on your feet, and they will testify against you that you said this.

STATEMENT

עמד רבי יהושע על רגליו ואמר: היאך אעשה? אילמלי אני חי והוא מת — יכול החי להכחיש את המת, עכשיו שאני חי והוא חי — היאך חי יכול להכחיש את החי?

Rabbi Yehoshua stood on his feet and said: How can I do this? If I were alive and he, the witness Rabbi Tzadok, were dead, the living could deny the dead. Now that I am alive and he is alive, how can a living person deny another living person?

STATEMENT

והיה רבן גמליאל עומד ודורש, ורבי יהושע עומד על רגליו, עד שריננו כל העם ואמרו לחוצפית המתורגמן: עמוד! ועמד.

And Rabban Gamliel was standing and expounding, and Rabbi Yehoshua was standing on his feet, until all the people murmured and said to Chutzpis the Meturgeman: Stop! And he stopped.

MISHNAH מִשְׁנָה

MISHNAH

מתני' נאמן הכהן לומר: הראיתי בכור זה ובעל מום הוא.

MISHNAH: A kohen is believed to say: I showed this firstborn to an expert in the past, and it is blemished with a permanent blemish, and thus I may slaughter it.

STATEMENT

גמ' אומר רב יהודה אומר רב: נאמן הכהן לומר "בכור זה נתן לי ישראל במומו".

GEMARA: Rav Yehuda said in the name of Rav: A kohen is believed to say, "An Yisrael gave me this firstborn with its blemish already on it."

EXPLANATION

מאי טעמא? כל מילתא דעבידא לאיגלויי לא משקרי בה אינשי.

What is the reason? Any matter that is likely to be revealed, people do not lie about it, since the Yisrael who gave it to him can easily be asked.

PROOF

אמר רב אשי: אף אנו נמי תנינא, נאמן הכהן לומר "הראיתי בכור זה ובעל מום הוא".

Rav Ashi said: We also learned this in our Mishnah: A kohen is believed to say, "I showed this firstborn and it is blemished."

EXPLANATION

מאי טעמא? לא משום דאמרין כל מילתא דעבידא לאיגלויי לא משקרי בה אינשי?

What is the reason? Is it not because we say: Any matter that is likely to be revealed, people do not lie about it, since we can ask the expert?

OBJECTION

התם הוא דקדשים בחוץ לא אכיל, אבל הכא, כיון דחשידי — חשידי.

The Gemara objects: Perhaps **there** in the Mishnah he is believed because **he would not eat kodashim outside** the Beis HaMikdash, **but here**, regarding whether he received it with a blemish, **since they are suspected** of causing blemishes, **they are suspected** and we should not believe him!

OBJECTION

מתיב רב שיזבי: האומר למי שאין נאמן על המעשר "קח לי ממי שהוא נאמן" או "ממי שהוא מעשר" — אינו נאמן.

Rav Sheizbi challenged this: One who says to someone who is not trusted regarding ma'aser, "Buy for me from someone who is trusted," or "from someone who tithes," he is not believed when he says he did so.

QUESTION

אמאי? נימא: כל מילתא דעבידא לאיגלויי לא משקרי בה אינשי!

Why? Let us say: Any matter that is likely to be revealed, people do not lie about it, since we can ask the seller!

ANSWER

שאני התם,

The Gemara answers: **It is different there,**

עמוד ב' DAF 36B

EXPLANATION

דאית ליה לאשתמוטי.

The Gemara explains why the agent is not afraid to lie in the first case of the Mishnah: **Since he has** an easy way **to excuse himself** by claiming that he truly believed the merchant was trustworthy.

STATEMENT

סיפא ודאי מסייעא ליה:

The Gemara suggests: **The latter clause** of that Mishnah **certainly supports him**, namely Rav, who ruled that a person will not lie about something that is bound to be revealed.

PROOF

מאיש פלוני — הרי זה נאמן.

For the Mishnah says that if the sender specified, "Buy **from person so-and-so**," who is known to be trustworthy, **behold, this agent is believed** when he says he bought from him. Since the sender can easily ask that person, the agent would not dare to lie.

REFUTATION

התם, פיון דאית ליה תובע, מירתת.

The Gemara rejects this proof: **There**, in the case of the Mishnah, **since he has a claimant** who specified a particular merchant and is likely to check up on him, the agent **is afraid** to lie. But in Rav's case, the priest does not expect anyone to go and track down the Israelite who gave him the animal, so he is not afraid.

OBJECTION

אמר רבי ירמיה בר אבא: מנא ליה ליהודה הא?

Rabbi Yirmeya bar Abba said upon hearing Rav Yehuda's ruling: **From where does Rav Yehuda know this** halacha in the name of Rav?

EXPLANATION

אנא בגידול קבעתיה, וגידול קבע בדידיה.

Actually, **I established it** by teaching this halacha **to Giddul** in Rav's name, and **Giddul established it in his own** transmission to Rav Yehuda, but Giddul must have gotten it confused.

STATEMENT

והכי אמרי ליה: נאמן ישראל לומר "בכור זה נתתי לכהן במומו".

And this is what I said to him: An Israelite is believed to say, "This bechor I gave to the kohen with its blemish already on it," and we do not suspect that they are conspiring to permit an unblemished bechor.

QUESTION

ישראל? פשיטא!

The Gemara asks: An **Israelite**? Is it not **obvious** that he is believed? He has no personal gain here, as the bechor belongs entirely to the kohen!

ANSWER

לא צריכא בקטן והגדיל,

The Gemara answers: **No**, it is **necessary** to state this in a case **where** the animal was **small** when he gave it to the kohen, and now it has **grown large**.

EXPLANATION

מהו דתימא: לא קים ליה? קא משמע לן.

Lest you say that the Israelite **does not recognize it** clearly anymore and might be mistaken, **He comes to teach us** that we trust his recognition.

STATEMENT

בסורא מתנו כלשנא בתרא, בפומבדיתא כלשנא קמא,

The Gemara notes: **In Sura they taught** this halacha according to the latter version of Rabbi Yirmeya bar Abba, that only the Israelite is believed; but **in Pumbedita they taught** it according to the first version of Rav Yehuda, that even the kohen is believed.

RULING

והלכתא אפילו כלשנא קמא.

And the halacha is even according to the first version, that the kohen is believed when he names the Israelite who gave it to him.

STATEMENT

רפרם בפומבדיתא הוה ליה בוכרא, ויהביה ליה לכהן בלא מומא.

The Gemara relates: **Rafram in Pumbedita had a bechor**, and he gave it to a kohen without a blemish.

STATEMENT

אזל שדא ביה מומא.

The kohen **went and cast a blemish in it** intentionally.

STATEMENT

יומא חד חלש בעיניה, אייתיה לקמיה.

One day, Rafram **suffered in his eyes** and could not see well, so the kohen **brought it before him** to examine the blemish, not realizing Rafram was the owner.

STATEMENT

אמר ליה: בכור זה נתן לי ישראל במומו.

The kohen **said to him**: "An Israelite gave me this bechor with its blemish already on it."

STATEMENT

אַרְפָּסִינְיָה לְעִינְיָהּ, חֲזִייהָ בְּשִׁקְרָיָהּ.

Rafram **forced open his eyes**, and **saw him in his lie**, recognizing the animal.

STATEMENT

אָמַר לִיה: לָאוּ אֲנִי דִּיהִיבְתִּיהָ לָּךְ?

Rafram **said to him**: "Was it not I who gave it to you without any blemish?"

EXPLANATION

וְאַפִּילוּ הֵכִי לֹא חָשׂ לַה לְמִיָּלְתָּא, הָאִי הוּא דְחֻצִּיתָּא, כּוּלֵּי עֲלָמָא לֹא חֻצִּיפִי.

And even so, Rafram **did not worry about this matter** to disqualify other kohanim; he said: **This** particular kohen is the one who is **impudent**, but the rest of the world of kohanim are not so **impudent** as to lie about this.

STATEMENT

הָהוּא שְׂרוּעַ דְּאֵתָא לְקַמִּיָּה דְּרַב אָשִׁי, אָמַר: לְמַאי נִיחוּשׁ לִיה?

There was a **certain** animal with an **oversized limb** that came before Rav Ashi. He said: For what should we suspect here?

STATEMENT

אִי כֹהֵן הוּא, אִי יִשְׂרָאֵל הוּא — הֲרִי בְּכוֹר וּמוּמוֹ עִמוֹ.

Whether it is a **kohen** who brought it, or whether it is an **Israelite** who brought it, behold, the **bechor** and its **blemish** are **with it** from birth, so there is no concern of an intentionally inflicted blemish.

QUESTION

אָמַר לִיה רַבִּינָא לְרַב אָשִׁי: וְדָלְמָא יִשְׂרָאֵל הוּא, וְאָמַר רַב יְהוּדָה: אֵין רוֹאִין בְּכוֹר יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶלָּא אִם כֵּן כֹּהֵן עִמוֹ!

Ravina said to Rav Ashi: But perhaps it is an **Israelite** who brought it, and Rav Yehuda said: We do not examine the **bechor** of an **Israelite** unless a **kohen** is with him, so that the **Israelite** does not keep it for himself!

ANSWER

אָמַר לִיה: הֵכִי הִשְׁתָּא?!

Rav Ashi said to him: How can you compare the two?!

EXPLANATION

הֵתָם, נְהִי דְקַדְשִׁים בְּחוּץ לָא אָכִיל, אֲמַמוּנִיָּה דְכֹהֵן חֲשִׁיד.

There, in a standard case, **granted** that the **Israelite** would not eat **sacrificial meat outside** the Beis Hamikdash because of the severe prohibition, yet **regarding the money** of the **kohen**, he is **suspected** of wanting to steal it.

EXPLANATION

הָכָא, מִכְּדִי יָדַע דִּהְיָא מוּם מוּבָהֶק הוּא, מַאי טַעְמָא אֶתִיּוּהָ קַמִּיָּה רַבָּנָן?

But here, since he knows that this is an obvious blemish, what is the reason he brought it before the Rabbis at all?

EXPLANATION

משום כבודו דחכם; על כבודו דחכם לא עבד, איסורא עבד!

It is only **out of respect for the Torah scholar**. Now, if he is so careful that **he would not bypass the respect of a Torah scholar, would he commit a transgression** of stealing from the kohen?! Surely not.

משנה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מתני' הכל נאמנין על מומי מעשר.

MISHNAH: Everyone is believed regarding the blemishes of animal **tithe**, even the owner himself.

גמרא GEMARA

QUESTION

גמ' מאי טעמא?

GEMARA: What is the **reason** the owner is believed here, unlike by a bechor?

ANSWER

דאי בעי שדי ביה מומא מעיקרא!

The Gemara answers: **Because if he wanted, he could have cast a blemish in it from the very beginning** before tithing it!

QUESTION

מי ידע הי נפיק?

The Gemara asks: But **did he know which one would come out** tenth during the counting to blemish it beforehand?

OBJECTION

וכי תימא מפיק ליה פריש עשרה, "לא יבקר בין טוב לרע" אמר רחמנא!

And if you say **he could force it to come out at the head of the ten**, the Torah says, "He shall not search between good and bad," meaning he must count them as they pass through the gate naturally!

RESOLUTION

א לא דאי בעי שדי ביה מומא (כולי) [בכוליה] עדריה.

Rather, the reason he is believed is **that if he wanted, he could have cast a blemish in his entire herd** before counting, which is permitted, and thereby ensure the tenth animal would be blemished. Since he had this option, he is believed now.

MISHNAH

מתני' בכור שנסימית עינו, ושנקטעה ידו, ושנשברה רגלו — הרי זה ישחט על פי שלשה בני הכנסת.

MISHNAH: A bechor whose eye was blinded, or whose foreleg was severed, or whose hind leg was broken, behold, this may be slaughtered based on the assessment of three members of the synagogue who are not ordained experts, as these are obvious blemishes.

MISHNAH

רבי יוסי אומר: אפילו יש שם עשרים ושלשה, אינו נשחט אלא על פי מומחה.

Rabbi Yose says: Even if there are twenty-three laymen there, it may not be slaughtered except based on the ruling of an ordained expert.

גמרא GEMARA

STATEMENT

גמ' רבי שמלאי ורבי יהודה נשיאה תרוניהו משמיה דרבי יהושע בן לוי אמרי,

GEMARA: Rabbi Simlai and Rabbi Yehuda Nesi'ah both said in the name of Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi,

STATEMENT

ואמרי לה: רבי שמלאי ורבי יהושע בן לוי תרוניהו משום רבי יהודה נשיאה אמרי:

and some say it this way: Rabbi Simlai and Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi both said in the name of Rabbi Yehuda Nesi'ah:

STATEMENT

התרת בכור בחוצה לארץ על פי שלשה בני הכנסת.

The permitting of a bechor in Chutz La'aretz may be done based on three members of the synagogue.

STATEMENT

אמר רבא: ובמומין מובהקין.

Rava said: And this is specifically with obvious blemishes.

QUESTION

מאי קא משמע לן? תנינא: בכור שנסימית עינו, ושנקטעה ידו, ושנשברה רגלו — הרי זה ישחט על פי שלשה בני הכנסת!

The Gemara asks: What is this coming to teach us? We already learned this in our Mishnah: A bechor whose eye was blinded, or whose foreleg was severed, or whose hind leg was broken, behold, this may be slaughtered based on three members of the synagogue!

ANSWER

אי ממתניתין הוה אמינא: בחוצה לארץ אפילו מומין שאין מובהקין,

The Gemara answers: If we only knew it from the Mishnah, I would have said: In Chutz La'aretz, even blemishes that are not obvious may be permitted by three laymen,

EXPLANATION

והאי דקתני מובהקין — להודיעהו כחו דרבי יוסי, קא משמע לן.

and that which the Mishnah teaches regarding obvious blemishes was only to let you know the strength of Rabbi Yose, who requires an expert even for these. Therefore, Rava comes to teach us that even in Chutz La'aretz, laymen may only permit obvious blemishes.

STATEMENT

אמר רב יהודה אמר רבי ירמיה בר אבא, ספק משמיה דרב, ספק משמיה דשמואל:

Rav Yehuda said that Rabbi Yirmeya bar Abba said, with doubt whether it was in the name of Rav, or doubt whether it was in the name of Shmuel:

STATEMENT

שלשה מתירין את הבכור במקום שאין מומחה.

Three laymen may permit a bechor in a place where there is no expert.

QUESTION

מאי קא משמע לן? תנינא: הרי זה ישחט על פי שלשה בני הכנסת!

The Gemara asks: What is this coming to teach us? We already learned in the Mishnah: Behold, this may be slaughtered based on three members of the synagogue!

ANSWER

אי ממתניתין הוה אמינא: במקום מומחה, קא משמע לן: במקום שאין מומחה — אין, במקום שיש מומחה — לא.

The Gemara answers: If we only knew it from the Mishnah, I would have said they may do so even in a place where there is an expert. Therefore, it comes to teach us: In a place where there is no expert, yes, they may permit it; but in a place where there is an expert, no, they may not.

STATEMENT

אמר רב חייא בר עמרם: שלשה מתירין את הבכור במקום שאין מומחה, שלשה מתירין את הנדר במקום שאין חכם.

Rav Chiyya bar Amram said: Three laymen may permit a bechor in a place where there is no expert, and three laymen may permit a vow in a place where there is no Torah scholar.

STATEMENT

שלשה מתירין את הבכור במקום שאין מומחה

The Gemara repeats: **Three may permit a bechor in a place where there is no expert.**

SUMMARY

The Gemara concludes that hearsay testimony is indeed kosher for permitting a blemished firstborn, as it falls under the category of testimony for which a woman is kosher. We then learn that if a kohen brings a blemished animal and says he didn't realize it was a bechor, he is believed because of a miggo, since he could have easily cast an obvious blemish and eaten it without an expert. The daf relates the famous, dramatic incident where Rabbi Tzadok's bechor was blemished, leading to a sharp dispute between Rabban Gamliel and Rabbi Yehoshua in the Beis HaMedrash. Finally, a new Mishnah teaches that a kohen is believed to say he already showed the bechor to an expert, which the Gemara explains is based on the principle that people do not lie about matters that are easily revealed and verified.

למעשה WHAT TO TAKE HOME

The Gemara on our daf brings down a powerful rule of human nature: "Kol miltha d'avida l'igaluya, la meshakri bah inashi", people do not lie about something that is bound to be revealed. When a person knows that the truth will eventually come to light, they naturally hold back from fabricating a story. This isn't just a rule of halachic credibility; it is a profound insight into how Hashem designed our psychological makeup to lean toward truth when we are held accountable.

In our daily avodah, we can use this concept to build our own spiritual guardrails. The yetzer hara often tries to convince us that we can slip up in private, whispering that "nobody will ever know." But the emunah of a Yid is to live with the constant awareness that everything we do is ultimately "avida l'igaluya", it is destined to be revealed before the Kisei HaKavod. When we realize that there are no secrets from Hashem, the temptation to cut corners or compromise on our integrity simply melts away.

Today, take one small action with the conscious thought that Hashem is watching and everything is open before Him. Whether it is being extra honest in a business transaction, speaking gently when no one else is around to hear, or davening with real kavana in private, remind yourself: "The truth is always revealed before Hashem, and that is my greatest motivation to do what is right."