

דף יומי • בכורות • דף מ'

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

THE SUGYA

We start off on Daf Mem with a fascinating discussion about the different cubit measures kept in the Beis HaMikdash, specifically the two larger cubits that were used to prevent the Temple artisans from accidentally committing me'ilah. The Gemara connects these measurements to our Mishnah's discussion of blemishes in a firstborn animal, specifically regarding the size of a fingerbreadth on the tail. This leads us directly into a new Mishnah dealing with testicle-related blemishes, where Rabbi Yishmael and Rabbi Akiva argue about how we determine if an animal has only one testicle, and we learn about a major dispute between Rabbi Akiva and Rabbi Yochanan ben Nuri regarding a testicle that was found attached to the loins after shechitah.

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

עמוד א' DAF 40A

EXPLANATION

בְּשׁוּשַׁן הַבְּיָרָה, אַחַת עַל קֶרֶן מְזֻרְחִית צְפוֹנִית וְאַחַת עַל קֶרֶן מְזֻרְחִית דְּרוֹמִית.

These cubit measures were kept in **Shushan the Capital** chamber, which was built above the eastern gate of the Temple Mount. **One** was placed **on the northeastern corner**, and **one** was placed **on the southeastern corner** of that chamber.

EXPLANATION

וְשֶׁעַל קֶרֶן מְזֻרְחִית צְפוֹנִית הָיְתָה יְתִירָה עַל שֵׁל מֹשֶׁה חֲצִי אֶצְבָּע.

The one **that** was **on the northeastern corner** was **longer than** the standard cubit of **Moshe**, which was six handbreadths, **by half a fingerbreadth**.

EXPLANATION

וְשֶׁעַל קֶרֶן מְזֻרְחִית דְּרוֹמִית הָיְתָה יְתִירָה עָלֶיהָ חֲצִי אֶצְבָּע, נִמְצְאָה יְתִירָה עַל שֵׁל מֹשֶׁה אֶצְבָּע.

And the one **that** was **on the southeastern corner** was **longer than** it, meaning longer than the northeastern one, **by another half a fingerbreadth**; thus, **it turned out to be longer than** the cubit of **Moshe** by a full **fingerbreadth**.

EXPLANATION

וְלָמָּה הָיוּ אַחַת גְּדוֹלָה וְאַחַת קְטַנָּה? (כשהיו) אוֹמְנֵיין נוֹטְלִין בְּקִטְנָה, וּמַחֲזִירִין בְּגְדוּלָה, שֶׁלֹּא יָבוֹאוּ לְיַדֵּי מַעֲלָה.

And **why did** the Sages say **there should be** two measures of a cubit, **one large and one small**? It was **so that** the Temple artisans **would take** their payment according to the work they did as measured **by the small** cubit, **and return** the value to the Temple **by** doing their work measured with **the large** cubit, **so that they would not come to** commit **me'ilah**, a misuse of consecrated property, by taking more payment than they deserved.

QUESTION

תִּרְתִּי לְמָה לִי?

The Gemara asks: **Why do I need two** large cubits, the one that was half a fingerbreadth larger than Moshe's cubit, and the other that was a full fingerbreadth larger?

ANSWER

חָדָא — דְּכִסְפָּא וְזָהָבָא, וְחָדָא — דְּבִנְיָנָא.

The Gemara answers: **One**, the shorter of the two, was **for** measuring **silver and gold** vessels, so the artisans would not lose too much on these precious metals. **And** the other **one**, the larger, was **for** the stone and wood **building** structures.

STATEMENT

רַב נַחֲמָן בַּר יִצְחָק, וְאִי תִימָא רַב הוּנָא בַּר נָתָן, לְאוֹתָהּ שְׁשָׁנִינוּ: שֵׁישׁ בָּשָׂר בֵּין חוֹלְיָא לְחוֹלְיָא מְלֵא אֲצִבְעָא.

Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak, and some say Rav Huna bar Natan, said: This baraita, which defines a fingerbreadth as one-fourth of a handbreadth, refers **to that which we learned** in our Mishnah regarding the blemishes of a firstborn animal: **Where there is flesh between one joint and another joint** of the tail to the extent of **a full fingerbreadth**. That measure of a fingerbreadth is one-fourth of an average handbreadth.

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מִתְנִי' אֵין לוֹ בִּיצִים, אוֹ אֵין לוֹ אֶלָּא בִּיצָה אַחַת.

MISHNAH: A firstborn animal is considered blemished and may be slaughtered if **it has no testicles**, or if **it has only one testicle**.

MISHNAH

רַבִּי יִשְׁמָעֵאל אוֹמֵר: אִם יֵשׁ לוֹ שְׁנֵי כִיסִּין — יֵשׁ לוֹ שְׁתֵּי בִיצִים, אֵין לוֹ שְׁנֵי כִיסִּין — אֵין לוֹ אֶלָּא בִּיצָה אַחַת.

Rabbi Yishmael says: If it has **two** scrotal sacs, we assume **it has two testicles**; but if it does **not have two sacs**, we assume **it has only one testicle** and is blemished.

MISHNAH

רַבִּי עֲקִיבָא אוֹמֵר: מוֹשִׁיבוֹ עַל עֲפוּזוֹ וּמִמַּעְהָ, אִם יֵשׁ בִּיצָה — סוֹפָהּ לִצְאָתָא.

Rabbi Akiva says: The matter can be clarified. **One seats** the animal **on its rump** and **mashes** the sac; if **there is a second testicle** hidden inside, **it is ultimately going to emerge**.

MISHNAH

מַעֲשֶׂה שְׁמִיעָה וְלֹא יָצָא, נִשְׁחָטָה וְנִמְצְאָת דְּבוּקָה בְּכֶסֶלִים, וְהִתִּיר רַבִּי עֲקִיבָא וְאָסֵר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן בֶּן נוּרִי.

There was **an incident where** a kohen **mashed** the sac **and** the testicle **did not emerge**, so they assumed it was blemished. But after **it was slaughtered**, the second testicle **was found attached to the loins**. **And Rabbi Akiva permitted** the meat to be eaten, because the testicle had not emerged normally, making it a blemish, **while Rabbi Yochanan ben Nuri prohibited** it, holding that since it had two testicles, it was unblemished and slaughtered outside the Beis HaMikdash.

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

QUESTION

גְּמִי הַשְׁתָּא אֵין לוֹ אֶלָּא בִּיצָה אַחַת אֲמַרְתָּ הוּי מוּמָא, אֵין לוֹ כָּלֵל מִיבְעָיָא?

GEMARA: The Gemara asks: **Now**, since **you said** that if it has **only one** testicle it is a blemish, is it **necessary** to state that if it has **none at all** it is a blemish? That is obvious!

ANSWER

חֲסוּרֵי מִיחְסָרָא וְהָכִי קִתְּנִי: אֵין לוֹ שְׁתֵּי בִיצִים בְּשְׁתֵּי כִיסִין אֶלָּא בְּכִיס אֶחָד, אִי נָמִי שְׁתֵּי כִיסִין וּבִיצָה אַחַת — הָרִי זֶה מוּם.

The Gemara answers: The Mishnah is **incomplete**, and **this is what it is teaching**: If it does not have two testicles in two sacs, **but** rather they are both **in one sac**, or **alternatively**, if it has **two sacs** and **only one testicle**, behold, **this is a blemish**.

EXPLANATION

רַבִּי יִשְׁמַעֵאל אוֹמֵר: יֵשׁ לוֹ שְׁתֵּי כִיסִים — בְּדוּעַ שְׂיֵשׁ לוֹ שְׁתֵּי בִיצִים, אֵין לוֹ אֶלָּא כִיס אֶחָד — כָּמִי שְׂאֵין לוֹ אֶלָּא בִיצָה אַחַת דָּמִי,

And this is how the rest of the Mishnah should be understood: **Rabbi Yishmael says**: If it has **two sacs**, it is **known** that it has **two testicles**, and it is unblemished. But if it has **only one sac**, it is **considered** like one that has **only one testicle**, and it is blemished.

EXPLANATION

וְאֵתָא רַבִּי עֲקִיבָא לְמִימַר: בְּדוּעַ לָא אֲמַרִּינוּ, אֶלָּא מוֹשִׁיבֵי עַל עַפְוִזָּא וּמִמַּעַר, אִם יֵשׁ בִּיצָה סוּפָא לְצֵאתָ.

And Rabbi Akiva comes to say: We do not say that it is **known** just from the sacs. Rather, one seats it on its rump and **mashes** the sac; if there is a testicle, it is ultimately going to emerge.

EXPLANATION

וּמַעֲשֶׂה שְׂמִיעָרָא וְלֹא יָצָא וְכוּ'.

And the Mishnah concluded: **There was an incident where he mashed** and it **did not emerge**, etc.

BRAISA

תִּנָּיָא, אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹסִי: מַעֲשֶׂה בְּפִירָן שֶׁל בֵּית מִנְחֵם, שְׂמִיעָרָא וְלֹא יָצָאתָ, וְנִשְׁחָטָה וְנִמְצְאתָ דְּבוּקָה בְּכֶסֶלִים, וְהִתִּיר רַבִּי עֲקִיבָא, וְאָסַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן בֶּן נוּרִי.

It is taught in a braisa: **Rabbi Yosei said**: **There was an incident in Piran of Beit Menahe**m, where a kohen **mashed** the sac and the testicle **did not emerge**, and the animal was **slaughtered** and the testicle was **found attached to the loins**. **And**

Rabbi Akiva permitted the meat, and Rabbi Yochanan ben Nuri prohibited it.

BRAISA

אָמַר לוֹ רַבִּי עֲקִיבָא לְרַבִּי יוֹחָנָן בֶּן נוּרִי: עַד מָתִי אַתָּה מְכַלָּה מְמוֹנָן שֶׁל יִשְׂרָאֵל!

Rabbi Akiva said to Rabbi Yochanan ben Nuri: Until when will you destroy the property of the Jewish people by declaring these animals forbidden to be eaten?

BRAISA

אָמַר לוֹ רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן בֶּן נוּרִי לְרַבִּי עֲקִיבָא: עַד מָתִי אַתָּה מְאָכִיל יִשְׂרָאֵל נְבִילוֹת!

Rabbi Yochanan ben Nuri said to Rabbi Akiva: Until when will you feed the Jewish people nevelos, unslaughtered carcasses!

QUESTION

לָאוּ מִישְׁחָט שְׁחִטָּיָה?

The Gemara asks: **Was it not properly slaughtered?** How could Rabbi Yochanan ben Nuri call it a nevelah?

ANSWER

אֵלֹא: טְרֵיפּוֹת.

The Gemara answers: **Rather**, he meant to say: Until when will you feed them **treifos**, animals with a fatal defect?

QUESTION

לֹא אִיסּוּר טְרֵיפּוֹת הוּא?!

The Gemara challenges: But **is it not a prohibition of treifos?** A missing testicle is not a treifah defect!

ANSWER

אֵלֹא: עַד מָתִי אַתָּה מְאָכִיל יִשְׂרָאֵל קֳדָשִׁים בַּחוּץ!

Rather, this is what he meant: **Until when will you feed the Jewish people kodashim**, sacrificial meat, slaughtered **outside** the Temple courtyard! Since he held it was unblemished, it remained a holy offering that could not be eaten as chullin.

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מִתְּנִי בַעַל חֲמִשָּׁ רַגְלִים, אוֹ שְׂאֵאִין לוֹ אֵלֹא שְׁלֹשׁ, וְשֶׁרָגְלָיו קְלוּטוֹת כְּשֶׁל חֲמוֹר, וְהַשְּׁחוּל וְהַכְּסוּל.

MISHNAH: An animal with five legs, or one that has only three, or one whose hooves are closed like those of a donkey, and the shachul, and the kasul are all blemished and may be slaughtered.

MISHNAH

אֵיזֶהוּ שְׁחוּל? שֶׁנֶּשְׁמָטָה יָרִיכוֹ. וְכְסוּל? שֶׁאֶחַת מִיָּרִיכוֹתָיו גְּבוּהוֹת.

What is a shachul? One whose thighbone was dislocated. And what is a kasul? One where one of its thighs is higher than the other.

STATEMENT

גְּמִי אָמַר רַב הוּנָא: לֹא שָׁנוּ אֶלָּא שְׁחִסְרָא וְיִתְרָא בִּיד, אֲבָל בְּרֶגֶל — טְרֵפָה נִמִּי הוּא, דְּכָל יִתְרָא בְּנִטּוּל דְּמִי.

GEMARA: Rav Huna said: They only taught that an extra or missing leg is merely a blemish where it is missing or extra on the foreleg. But on the hind leg, it is also a treifah, because any extra limb is considered like a removed limb, and an animal whose hind leg is removed is a treifah.

STATEMENT

אָמַר רַב פַּפָּא: לֹא תִימָא דְּעִגְלָא וְלֹא סְדִיקָא, אֶלָּא כִּיּוֹן דְּעִגְלָא, אִף עַל גַּב דְּסְדִיקָא.

Rav Pappa said: Do not say that it is a blemish only where they are round and not split at all. Rather, once they are round, even though they are split, it is still a blemish.

BRAISA

וְהַשְּׁחוּל וְהַכְּסוּל וְכוּ'. תַּנּוּ רַבֵּנָן: אֵיזָהוּ כְּסוּל וְאֵיזָהוּ שְׁחוּל?

The Mishnah taught: And the shachul and the kasul, etc. The Rabbis taught in a braisa: What is the kasul and what is the shachul?

BRAISA

שְׁחוּל — שֶׁנִּשְׁמְטָה יְרִיכוֹ, כְּסוּל — שֶׁרָגְלוֹ אֶחָד בְּתוֹךְ הַכְּסָל, וְרָגְלוֹ אֶחָד עַל גַּבֵּי הַכְּסָל.

The shachul is one whose thighbone was dislocated. The kasul is one where one of its legs is inside the loin, and its other leg is on top of the loin.

BRAISA

תַּנָּא: הַשְּׂרוּעָא וְהַקָּלוּט — שְׂרוּעָא שֶׁנִּשְׁתַּרְבֵּב לוֹ יְרִיכוֹ, קָלוּט — שֶׁרָגְלָיו קְלוּטוֹת כְּשֶׁל חֲמוֹר וּכְשֶׁל סוֹס.

A Tanna taught: The sarua and the kalut. A sarua is one whose thigh is elongated. A kalut is one whose hooves are closed like those of a donkey or a horse.

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מִתְּנִי' נִשְׁפָּר עֶצֶם יָדוֹ וְעֶצֶם רַגְלוֹ, אִף עַל פִּי שְׂאִינּוֹ נִכְרָ.

MISHNAH: If the bone of its foreleg or the bone of its hind leg was broken, even though it is not noticeable, it is a blemish.

MISHNAH

מוֹמִיין אֵלּוּ מִנֵּה אֵילָא בְּיָבֵנָה, וְהוּדוֹ לוֹ חֲכָמִים.

These blemishes were enumerated by Ilai in Yavneh, and the Sages agreed with him.

MISHNAH

וְעוֹד שְׁלֹשָׁה הוֹסִיף, אָמְרוּ לוֹ: לֹא שָׁמַעְנוּ אֶת אֵלּוּ.

And he added three more cases, but they said to him: We have not heard a tradition regarding these.

MISHNAH

שֶׁנִּלְגַּל עֵינּוֹ עָגוּל כְּשֶׁל אָדָם, וּפִיו דּוֹמֶה כְּשֶׁל חֲזִיר, וְשִׁנָּיִטָּל רֹב הַמְדַּבֵּר בְּלִשְׁוֹנוֹ.

The three cases are: An animal whose eyeball is round like that of a human, and its mouth resembles that of a pig, and one whose tongue has lost most of its speaking part.

MISHNAH

בֵּית דִּין שֶׁל אַחֲרֵיהֶן אָמְרוּ: הֲרִי זֶה מוּם.

However, the court that came after them said: Behold, this is a blemish.

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

QUESTION

גְּמ' אֵינּוּ נִיכָר, מִי קָא הָרִי מוּמָא?

GEMARA: The Gemara asks: If a break is not noticeable, does it indeed constitute a blemish? A blemish must be visible!

ANSWER

אָמַר רַב פָּפָא: אֵינּוּ נִיכָר מִחַמַּת עֲצָמוֹ, אֲבָל נִיכָר מִחַמַּת מְלָאכָה.

Rav Pappa said: It is not noticeable on its own when the animal is standing, but it is noticeable when it does work, as it limps.

QUESTION

מוּמִין אֵלּוּ מִנֵּה וְכוּ'. לְמִימָרָא דְלָאוּ הֵינּוּ אוֹרְחִיָּה?

The Mishnah taught: These blemishes were enumerated, etc., including an eyeball round like a human's. The Gemara asks: Is this to say that this is not its normal way for an animal to have a round eyeball?

OBJECTION

וּרְמִינָהּ: הַמְּפֻלֶּת מִיּוֹן בְּהֶמָּה וְחִתָּה וְעוֹף, בֵּין טְמֵאִין בֵּין טְהוֹרִין, אִם זָכָר תֵּשֵׁב לְזָכָר. אִם נִקְבָּה — תֵּשֵׁב לְנִקְבָּה, אֵינּוּ יָדוּעַ — תֵּשֵׁב לְזָכָר וְלִנְקָבָה, דְּבָרֵי רַבִּי מֵאִיר.

But they raised a contradiction from a Mishnah in Niddah: One who discharges the form of a beast, wild animal, or bird, whether impure or pure, if it is male she must observe the impurity and purity periods for a male, and if it is female she must observe them for a female, and if it is not known she must observe the stringencies of both a male and a female; these are the words of Rabbi Meir.

OBJECTION

ואמר רבה בר בר חנה אמר רבי יוחנן: מאי טעמיה דרבי מאיר? הואיל וגלגל עינו כגול כשל אדם!

And Rabba bar bar Chana said in the name of Rabbi Yochanan: What is the reason of Rabbi Meir? Since its eyeball is round like that of a human, it is considered a human fetus! This implies that all animals normally have round eyeballs like humans!

RESOLUTION

אמר רב יוסף: לא קשיא, הא באוקמא, הא בחיורא.

Rav Yosef said: This is not difficult. This case, where it is a blemish, refers to the black part of the eye, which is normally oval in animals but here is round like a human's. That case, where they are similar, refers to the white part of the eye, which is round in both.

STATEMENT

ופיו דומה כשל חזיר. אמר רב פפא: לא תימא דשפיד ופרוס, אלא כיון דפרוס אף על גב דלא שפיד.

The Mishnah taught: And its mouth resembles that of a pig. Rav Pappa said: Do not say that it is a blemish only where it is pointed and split like a pig's mouth. Rather, once it is split, even though it is not pointed, it is a blemish.

EXPLANATION

ושניטל רוב המדבר שבלשונו. מתניתין מני? רבי יהודה היא, דתנא: ואת שניטל רוב הלשון, רבי יהודה אומר: רוב המדבר של לשונו.

The Mishnah taught: And one whose tongue has lost most of its speaking part. Whose Mishnah is this? It is Rabbi Yehudah, as it is taught in a braisa: And one whose tongue has lost most of its tongue, Rabbi Yehudah says: Most of the speaking part of its tongue.

משנה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מתני' ומעשה שהלחי התחתון עודף על העליון, ושאל רבן גמליאל לחכמים, ואמרו: הרי זה מום.

MISHNAH: And there was an incident where the lower jaw projected beyond the upper jaw, and Rabban Gamliel asked the Sages, and they said: Behold, this is a blemish.

גמרא GEMARA

QUESTION

גמ' מאי תנא דקתני "ומעשה"?

GEMARA: What did the Tanna teach previously that he now teaches: "And there was an incident"? Usually, "and there was an incident" comes to support a previously stated rule, but this rule was not mentioned!

ANSWER

משום דתנן "פיו דומה לחזיר", ופליגי רבנן עליה דרב, וקאמרין: כי פליגי רבנן עליה דרב
בשפתו עליונה עודפת על התחתונה, אבל שהתחתונה עודפת על העליונה — הרי זה מום.

The Gemara answers: It is **because we learned** in a Mishnah elsewhere: "Its mouth resembles that of a pig," and the Rabbis disagree with Rabbi Yehudah there. And we say: When the Rabbis disagree with Rabbi Yehudah, it is where its upper lip projects over the lower one, but where the lower jaw projects over the upper one, all agree that behold, this is a blemish. The incident is brought to support this distinction.

עמוד ב' DAF 40B

STATEMENT

ומעשה נמי שלחי התחתון עודף על העליון, שאל רבן שמעון בן גמליאל לחכמים ואמרו: הרי זה מום.

And there was also an incident where the lower jaw of a firstborn animal protruded beyond the upper jaw, and Rabbab Shimon ben Gamliel asked the Sages for a ruling, and they said: This is a blemish that permits the animal to be slaughtered.

QUESTION

והא גבי אדם הוא דתנן: שפתו העליונה עודפת על התחתונה, או שתחתונה עודפת על העליונה — הרי זה מום.

But the Gemara asks: Is this really so? But it is with regard to a person that we learned in a Mishnah elsewhere: If his upper lip protrudes beyond the lower lip, or if his lower lip protrudes beyond the upper lip, this is a blemish that disqualifies a Kohen from serving in the Beis HaMikdash.

EXPLANATION

גבי אדם הוא דכתיב: "איש איש מזרע אהרן", איש ששורה בזרעו של אהרן, אבל בבהמה לא!

And we explain that it is only with regard to a person that it is written: "Any man of the seed of Aaron," which we darshen to mean he must be a man who is equal in appearance to the rest of the seed of Aaron; but with regard to an animal, this requirement of a normal appearance does not apply, so why should a protruding jaw be a blemish?

ANSWER

אמר רב פפא: לא קשיא, הא דאית בה עצם, הא דלית בה עצם.

Rav Pappa said: This is not difficult; this case in our Mishnah, where it is a blemish for an animal, is where there is a bone in the lower jaw that is longer than the upper jaw, whereas that case in the other Mishnah, which is only a blemish for a human, is where there is no bone protruding, but only the fleshy lip.

משנה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מתני' אוזן הגדי היתה כפולה, אמרו חכמים: בזמן שהוא עצם אחד — מום, בזמן שאין בו עצם — אינו מום.

MISHNAH: If the ear of a kid was doubled so that it looked like two ears, the Sages said: When it is one bone—meaning the extra ear has its own cartilage—it is a blemish; when there is no bone in it, it is not a blemish.

MISHNAH

רבי חנניא בן גמליאל אומר: זנב הגדי שהוא דומה לשל חזיר, ושאיין בה של חליות — הרי זה מום.

Rabbi Chananya ben Gamliel says: The tail of a kid that is similar to that of a pig, or a tail that does not have three joints, this is a blemish.

גמרא GEMARA

BRAISA

גמ' תנו רבנן: פיו בלום ורגליו מבוזמות, מחמת הרוח — אינו מום, מחמת העצם — הרי זה מום.

GEMARA: The Rabbis taught in a Braisa: If its mouth is swollen, or its legs are swollen, then if it is due to wind, meaning it is just bloated, it is not a blemish; but if it is due to the bone being enlarged, this is a blemish.

BRAISA

אזניו כפולות, בחסחסות אחת — הרי זה מום, בשתי חסחסיות — אינו מום.

If its ears are doubled, then if they are joined with one cartilage, this is a blemish; but if they are split with two cartilages, it is not a blemish.

STATEMENT

רבן גמליאל אומר: זנב הגדי שהוא דומה לשל חזיר.

The Mishnah taught that Rabban Gamliel says: The tail of a kid that is similar to that of a pig is a blemish.

EXPLANATION

אמר רב פפא: לא תימא דקטינא, אלא דכריכא, אף על גב דאלימא.

Rav Pappa said: Do not say that this means only where it is thin like a pig's tail; rather, even where it is curled like a pig's tail, even though it is thick like a normal goat's tail, it is still a blemish.

STATEMENT

או שאיין בה של חליות וכו'.

The Mishnah also taught: Or if the tail of a kid does not have three joints, etc.

STATEMENT

אמר רב הונא: בגדי — שתים הרי זה מום, שלש אינו מום. בטלה — שלש הרי זה מום, ארבע אינו מום.

Rav Huna said: In a kid, if the tail has only two joints, this is a blemish, but if it has three, it is not a blemish. In a lamb, if it has only three joints, this is a blemish, but if it has four, it is not a blemish.

OBJECTION

מִיתִיבִי בְּגָדִי — אַחַת הָרִי זֶה מוֹם, שְׁתֵּים הָרִי זֶה מוֹם, שְׁלֹשׁ אֵינּוּ מוֹם.

The Gemara raises an objection from a Braisa: In a kid, if it has only one joint, this is a blemish, but if it has two, it is not a blemish. In a lamb, if it has only two joints, this is a blemish, but if it has three, it is not a blemish!

REFUTATION

תְּיֻבָּקָא דְּרַב הוּנָא.

This is indeed a conclusive refutation of Rav Huna.

EXPLANATION

וְרַב הוּנָא, מִתְנִיתִין אֲטַעֲיֵיהּ; אִיהּוּ סֵבֵר: מִדְּרִישָׁא בְּגָדִי — סִיפָא נָמִי בְּגָדִי, וְלֹא הִיא — רִישָׁא בְּגָדִי, וְסִיפָא בְּטָלָה.

And the Gemara explains: Rav Huna, the wording of the Mishnah misled him; he thought that since the first clause of the Mishnah speaks of a kid, the latter clause mentioning three joints must also speak of a kid. But it is not so; the first clause indeed speaks of a kid, but the latter clause actually speaks of a lamb, as the Braisa clarified.

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מִתְנִי רַבִּי חֲנִינָא בֶּן אֲנְטִיגֹנוֹס אוֹמֵר: אֵת שִׁיבֹלֶת בְּעֵינָיו, וְשֹׁנְפָגִם עֶצֶם יָדוֹ וְרַגְלוֹ, וְשֹׁנְפָרֶק עֶצְמוֹ שֶׁל פִּיו, עֵינּוֹ אַחַת גְּדוֹלָה וְאַחַת קְטַנָּה, אֶזְנוֹ אַחַת גְּדוֹלָה וְאַחַת קְטַנָּה, בְּמִרְאָה אֶבֶל לֹא בִמְדָה.

MISHNAH: Rabbi Chanina ben Antigonus says: These are blemishes: One that has a wart in its eyes; and one whose bone of its foreleg or hind leg was damaged; and one whose bone of its mouth—its jaw—was dislocated; and one whose one eye is large and one is small, or one whose one ear is large and one is small, provided the difference is noticeable by sight, but not if it is only noticeable by measurement.

MISHNAH

רַבִּי יְהוּדָה אוֹמֵר: שְׁתֵּי בֵיצִיו, אַחַת גְּדוֹלָה כְּשֶׁחֶבְרֵתָהּ, וְלֹא הוֹדּוּ לוֹ חֲכָמִים.

Rabbi Yehuda says: If of its two testicles, one is as large as two of its fellow, it is a blemish; but the Sages did not agree with him.

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

QUESTION

גְּמָ' לְמִימָרָא דִּינִפְלֵת הוּי מוֹם?

GEMARA: Is this to say that a wart is a blemish?

OBJECTION

וּרְמִינָהוּ: וְאֵלּוּ שְׂאִין שׁוֹחֲטִין עָלֶיהֶן לֹא בַּמִּקְדָּשׁ וְלֹא בַּמִּדְיָנָה — בְּעַל גֶּרֶב וּבְעַל יָפֶלֶת!

But I will point out a contradiction from a later Mishnah: And these are those that we do not slaughter for as a blemish, neither in the Beis HaMikdash nor in the province—meaning they are not full-fledged blemishes—namely, an animal with scurvy or a wart!

QUESTION

וְתִסְבְּרָא? הָא כְּתִיבָא "יָפֶלֶת" בְּאוֹרֵייתָא!

The Gemara asks: And can you really think that a wart is not a blemish? But "a wart" is explicitly written in the Torah as a blemish!

ANSWER

אֵלָּא, לָא קִשְׁיָא: הָא — בְּגוּפוֹ, הָא — בְּעֵינֹו.

Rather, it is not difficult: This Mishnah here, which says it is a blemish, is referring to a wart in its eye; whereas that Mishnah, which says it is not a full blemish, is referring to a wart on its body.

QUESTION

מִכְדִּי קָרָא סִתְמָא, מָה לִּי בְּגוּפוֹ וּמָה לִּי בְּעֵינֹו?

The Gemara asks: Now, since the Pasuk is written without specification, what difference does it make to me if it is on its body, and what difference does it make to me if it is in its eye? Why should we distinguish?

ANSWER

אֵלָּא לָא קִשְׁיָא, הָא דְאִית בֵּה עֶצֶם, הָא דְלִית בֵּה עֶצֶם.

Rather, it is not difficult: This case where it is a blemish is where there is a bone inside the wart, and that case where it is not is where there is no bone inside it.

EXPLANATION

דִּקְרָא — דְאִית בֵּה עֶצֶם, מִתְנִיתִין — דְלִית בֵּה עֶצֶם; בְּעֵינֹו — הָוֵי מוּם, בְּגוּפָא — לָא הָוֵי מוּם.

So the Pasuk and our Mishnah refer to a wart that has a bone; whereas the other Mishnah refers to a wart that has no bone, in which case if it is in its eye, it is a blemish, but if it is on its body, it is not a blemish.

QUESTION

וְלִית לֵה עֶצֶם בְּגוּפָא פְּסוּלָה? הָרִי תִלְתּוּל בְּעֶלְמָא הוּא, דְתַנּוּ: רַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר אוֹמַר: בְּעַלִּי הַתִּילּוּלִין פְּסוּלִין בְּאָדָם וּכְשִׁירִין בְּבִהְמָה!

The Gemara asks: But does a wart that has no bone on the body disqualify the animal at all? It is merely hanging flesh, as we learned in a Mishnah: Rabbi Eliezer says: Those with hanging flesh are disqualified in a person, but fit in an animal! So why would the other Mishnah say it is even a minor blemish?

ANSWER

אֵלָּא, אִידִי וְאִידִי בְּעֵינֹו, וְלָא קִשְׁיָא: הָא — בְּשַׁחֲוֹר, הָא — בְּלָבָן.

Rather, both this Mishnah and that Mishnah are referring to a wart in its eye, and it is not difficult: This Mishnah here refers to a wart in the black of the eye, which is a blemish; whereas that Mishnah refers to a wart in the white of the eye.

QUESTION

וְהָא אֵין מוּמִין בְּלָבָן!

The Gemara asks: **But we have a rule that there are no blemishes in the white** of the eye at all, so it should not even be a minor blemish!

ANSWER

אָלָא: אֵינְדִי וְאֵינְדִי בְּלָבָן, וְאָמַר רִישׁ לָקִישׁ: לָא קוּשְׂיָא, הָא — דְּאִית בֵּה שְׁעָר, הָא — דְּלִית בֵּה שְׁעָר.

Rather, both this Mishnah and that Mishnah refer to a wart **in the white** of the eye, and Reish Lakish said: It is not difficult; this case where it is a blemish is **where there is hair** growing on the wart, and that case where it is not is **where there is no hair** growing on it.

STATEMENT

עֵינֹו אַחַת גְּדוֹלָה וְכוּ'. תָּנָא: גְּדוֹלָה כְּשֶׁל עֵגֶל, קְטַנָּה כְּשֶׁל אֲוִיו.

The Mishnah taught: **One eye large, etc.** A Tanna taught in a Braisa: **Large** means it is as large as that of a calf, and **small** means it is as small as that of a goose.

QUESTION

אֲזַנֹו אַחַת גְּדוֹלָה וְכוּ'. וְרַבֵּנָן עַד כַּמָּה?

The Mishnah taught: **One ear large, etc.** And the Gemara asks: According to the Rabbis, up to how much of a difference must there be to be a blemish?

BRAISA

תָּנִינָא, אַחֲרִים אוֹמְרִים: אִפִּילוּ אֵינָהּ לְשִׁנְיָה אֶלָּא כְּפוֹל — כְּשִׁירָה.

It is taught in a Braisa: **Others say: Even if one ear is only like a bean compared to the second ear, it is fit**, unless the difference is even more extreme.

MISHNAH מִשְׁנָה

MISHNAH

מִתְנִי' זָנֵב הָעֵגֶל — שְׂאִינָהּ מַגְעַת לְעֶרְקוֹב, אָמְרוּ חֲכָמִים: כָּל מְרֻבֵּית עֲגָלִים כֵּן, כָּל זְמַן שִׁיְהוּ מְגֻדֵּלִין — הֵן נִמְתַּחֲוֹת.

MISHNAH: If the tail of a calf does not reach the knee-joint, the Sages said: All growing calves are like this; as long as they grow, their tails stretch and grow longer, so this is not a permanent blemish.

MISHNAH

אִיזְהוּ עֶרְקוֹב שֶׁאָמְרוּ? רַבִּי חֲנִינָא בֶן אֲנְטִיגוֹנוֹס אוֹמֵר: בְּעֶרְקוֹב שֶׁבְּאֶמְצַע הֵירֶה.

Which is the knee-joint that they spoke of? Rabbi Chanina ben Antigonus says: The knee-joint that is in the middle of the thigh.

SUMMARY

The Gemara first clarifies the dimensions of the cubits in the Temple and how they relate to the definition of a fingerbreadth for blemishes. We then learn the Mishnah's halachos regarding a firstborn with missing or misplaced testicles, with the Gemara explaining the exact nature of the dispute between Rabbi Akiva and Rabbi Yochanan ben Nuri—specifically whether an internal testicle renders the animal unblemished, which would make its slaughter outside the Azarah a severe transgression of eating kodashim outside the Temple. Finally, the next Mishnah introduces other physical blemishes, such as an animal with five legs or three legs, or closed hooves like a donkey, as well as the cases of shachul (a dislocated thighbone) and kasul (uneven thighs), with Rav Huna clarifying that an extra or missing hind leg actually renders the animal a treifah, not just a ba'al mum.

לְמַעֲשֶׂה WHAT TO TAKE HOME

The Gemara brings down a powerful exchange between Rabbi Akiva and Rabbi Yochanan ben Nuri. When dealing with a doubtful blemish on a firstborn animal, Rabbi Akiva cries out: "Until when will you destroy the property of the Jewish people!" To which Rabbi Yochanan ben Nuri fires back: "Until when will you feed the Jewish people kodashim outside the Temple!" Lichoira, we see here two giants of the Mesorah, each standing guard over a different, sacred boundary. Rabbi Akiva is looking at the Yid who is about to lose his hard-earned money, while Rabbi Yochanan ben Nuri is looking at the absolute sanctity of the Beis HaMikdash.

This is not just a lomdishe machlokes in Hilchos Bechoros; it is a profound lesson in how we must carry our own avodas Hashem. When we look at another Yid, we must have the heart of Rabbi Akiva, a deep, burning sensitivity for their physical and financial well-being, feeling their pain and worrying about their hard work. At the very same time, when it comes to our own standards of halachah and yiras Shamayim, we must have the uncompromising vigilance of Rabbi Yochanan ben Nuri, ensuring we do not compromise on a single detail of Hashem's Torah.

True greatness means holding both of these truths at once. We cannot use "strictness" in halachah as an excuse to be insensitive to another person's pocket or feelings, nor can we use "compassion" as an excuse to bend the clear halachah. We must be incredibly soft and caring toward our fellow Yid, while remaining beautifully firm and holy in our commitment to Hashem.

Today, when someone asks you for help or when a business situation arises, make a conscious effort to protect the other person's money and dignity with the utmost care, treating their property with the same seriousness you would treat a holy offering in the Beis HaMikdash.