

דף יומי • פכורות • דף מ"א

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

THE SUGYA

We start off the daf by clarifying a detail from the previous Mishnah regarding the joints of an animal, specifically how to identify the upper joint in a camel versus a calf. The Gemara then asks a strong kasha on the next Mishnah: why does the Tanna need to repeat that we slaughter a firstborn outside the Beis HaMikdash for these blemishes, when we already learned this at the very beginning of the perek? The Gemara's teretz is beautiful, showing us that the repetition is a major chiddush to teach us that the halacha follows all the individual opinions mentioned previously, and that disqualified consecrated animals can also be redeemed on account of these blemishes.

Next, we move into a new Mishnah that lists temporary blemishes and other disqualifications for which we do not slaughter a firstborn, neither in the Beis HaMikdash nor in the province. This includes things like pale spots on the eye, damaged internal guns, warts, and certain boils. The Gemara immediately jumps in to analyze the nature of these boils, contrasting our Mishnah with the pesukim in the Torah that list "garav" and "yalefes" as permanent blemishes. Through a beautiful shakla v'tarya, the Gemara resolves the apparent contradictions by distinguishing between different types of moist and dry boils, and between standard boils and the incurable boils of Egypt.

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

עמוד א' DAF 41A

GEMARA

גמ' תנא: קפץ העליון ולא קפץ התחתון, וכנגדו בגמל ניכר.

GEMARA: It was taught in a Braisa: The joint mentioned in the Mishnah is the upper joint, and not the lower joint; and corresponding to it in a camel, this bone is noticeable from the outside, whereas in a calf it is not.

משנה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מתני' על אלו מומין שוחטין את הבכור, ופסולי המוקדשין נפדין עליהן.

MISHNAH: For these blemishes enumerated in the previous Mishnayos, one slaughters the firstborn outside the Beis HaMikdash, and disqualified consecrated animals may be redeemed on their account.

גמרא GEMARA

QUESTION

גַּמְ' הָא תוּ לְמָה לִי? הָא תָנָא לִיה רִישָׁא: עַל אֱלוּ מוּמִין שׁוּחֲטִין אֶת הַבְּכוֹר!

GEMARA: Why do I need this statement further? But didn't the Tanna already teach in the first clause at the beginning of the perek: For these blemishes one slaughters the firstborn outside the Beis HaMikdash?

ANSWER

סִיפָא אֵינְצִטְרִיכָא: פְּסוּלֵי הַמוֹקֵדְשִׁין נִפְדִּין עֲלֵיהֶן.

The Gemara answers: The latter clause was necessary to teach that disqualified consecrated animals may be redeemed on their account.

QUESTION

הָא נָמִי פְּשִׁיטָא — מִישְׁחָט שְׁחֲטִינוּ, מִפְּרָק מִיבְעִיָּא?

The Gemara asks: But this too is obvious! If we may slaughter a firstborn on account of these blemishes, is it necessary to state that we may redeem other consecrated animals on their account? Surely a blemish that permits a firstborn is severe enough to permit redemption!

ANSWER

אֵלָּא, אֵינְדִּי דִתְנָא שְׁלָשָׁה הִוְסִיף, וְאָמְרוּ לוֹ: לֹא שָׁמַעְנוּ אֶת אֱלוּ, וְקִתְנֵי וְאֶתִּי דִּיחִידָאָה, וְקָא סְתִים לָהּ בְּכוּלָּהּ: עַל אֱלוּ מוּמִין שׁוּחֲטִין אֶת הַבְּכוֹר וּפְסוּלֵי הַמוֹקֵדְשִׁין נִפְדִּין עֲלֵיהֶן.

Rather, since a previous Mishnah taught that Rabbi Ila added three blemishes, and the Sages said to him: "We did not hear of these," and then the Mishnah proceeded to teach individual opinions of Rabbi Chananya ben Gamliel and Rabbi Chanina ben Antigonus, we might have thought the halacha does not follow them. Therefore, the Tanna states an unattributed ruling regarding all of them: For these blemishes one slaughters the firstborn and disqualified consecrated animals may be redeemed on their account, to teach us that the halacha indeed follows all of these individual opinions.

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מִתְנִי' וְאֱלוּ שְׂאִין שׁוּחֲטִין עֲלֵיהֶן, לֹא בַּמִּקְדָּשׁ וְלֹא בַּמִּדְינָה:

MISHNAH: And these are the blemishes that one does not slaughter a firstborn on their account, neither in the Beis HaMikdash nor in the province (outside the Beis HaMikdash):

MISHNAH

חֲוֹרֹר, וְהַמִּים שְׂאִין קְבוּעִין, וְחֻטִּין הַפְּנִימִיּוֹת שֶׁנִּפְגְּמוּ — אֲבָל לֹא שֶׁנֶּעְקְרוּ,

pale spots on the eye, and water streaming from the eye that is not permanent; and internal gums that were damaged, but not those that were completely extracted;

MISHNAH

וּבַעַל גָּרֵב, וּבַעַל יִבְלָת, וּבַעַל חֲזָזִית, זָקֵן, וְחוֹלָה, וּמְזוּהָם,

and an animal with moist boils, and one with a wart, and one with boils, and an old, or sick, or foul-smelling animal;

MISHNAH

וְשֶׁנֶעְבְּדָה בּוֹ עֲבִירָה, וְשֶׁהָמִית אָדָם — עַל פִּי עֵד אֶחָד אוֹ עַל פִּי הַבַּעֲלִים.

and an animal with which a transgression was performed, such as bestiality, and one that killed a person, where the transgression or killing was established by the testimony of one witness or by the owner's own admission.

MISHNAH

וְטוּמְטוּם וְאַנְדְּרוֹגִינוֹס, לֹא בַּמִּקְדָּשׁ וְלֹא בַּמִּדְיָנָה.

And one does not slaughter a tumtum (an animal with hidden organs) or an androgynos (a hermaphrodite), neither in the Beis HaMikdash nor in the province.

MISHNAH

רַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן אוֹמֵר: אֵין לָהּ מוּם גָּדוֹל מִזֶּה, וְחֻכָּמִים אוֹמְרִים: אֵינוּ כְּכוּר, אֲלָא נִגְזָז וְנִעְבָּד.

Rabbi Shimon says: You have no greater blemish than this, and it may be slaughtered in the province. And the Sages say: It does not have the sanctity of a firstborn at all; rather, it is like a non-sacred animal and may be shorn and worked with.

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

QUESTION

גָּמ' וְגָרַב לָא? וְהִכְתִּיב "גָּרַב" בְּאוֹרֵייתָא!

GEMARA: And is a boil not considered a permanent blemish? But isn't it written "garav" in the Torah as one of the permanent blemishes?

QUESTION

וְחִזְזִית לָא? וְהִכְתִּיב "יַלְפֶּת" בְּאוֹרֵייתָא!

And is a boil of the chazazis type not a permanent blemish? But isn't it written "yalefes" in the Torah, which is a blemish?

PROOF

וְתַנְיָא: "גָּרַב" — זֶה הַחֶרֶס, "יַלְפֶּת" — זֶה חִזְזִית הַמְצָרִית,

And it was taught in a Braisa: "Garav" — this is a boil as hard as earthenware; "yalefes" — this is the Egyptian chazazis.

QUESTION

וְאָמַר רִישׁ לָקִישׁ: לָמָּה נִקְרָא שְׁמָהּ "יַלְפֶּת"? שֶׁמֶלְפָּפֶת וְהוֹלֶכֶת עַד יוֹם הַמִּיתָה.

And Reish Lakish said: Why is it called "yalefes"? Because it clings to the animal and continues until the day of death, meaning it is incurable. So why does our Mishnah say they are not permanent blemishes?

ANSWER

בְּשִׁלְמָא חִזְזִית אַחֲזִית לָא קָשְׁיָא: כָּאן בְּחִזְזִית הַמְצָרִית, כָּאן בְּחִזְזִית דְּעָלְמָא.

The Gemara answers: **Granted**, the contradiction of chazazis against chazazis is not difficult: Here, in the Torah, it refers to the Egyptian chazazis which is incurable; there, in our Mishnah, it refers to a standard chazazis which can heal.

QUESTION

אֵלָא גָרַב אֶגְרַב קָשִׁיָא!

But the contradiction of garav against garav is difficult!

ANSWER

גָרַב אֶגְרַב נִמִּי לָא קָשִׁיָא, הָא בְּלַח, הָא בְּיָבֵשׁ.

The Gemara answers: **Garav against garav is also not difficult:** This one in our Mishnah refers to a moist boil, while that one in the Torah refers to a dry boil.

EXPLANATION

לַח — אִיתֵּסִי, יָבֵשׁ — לָא מִיתֵּסִי.

A moist boil **heals**, so it is only a temporary blemish; a dry boil **does not heal**, so it is a permanent blemish.

QUESTION

וְלַח מִיתֵּסִי? וְהִכְתִּיב: "יִפְכֹּה ה' בְּשָׁחִין מִצָּרִים וְגוֹי",

The Gemara asks: **And does a moist** boil indeed **heal**? But isn't it written: "Hashem will smite you with the boil of Egypt, and with hemorrhoids, and with garav, and with chares, from which you cannot be healed"?

INFERENCE

וּמִדְּכָתִיב "וּבְחָרָס" הֲרִי גָרַב לַח אָמור, וְקָאָמר: "אֲשֶׁר לֹא תוּכַל לְהַרְפֵּא!"

And since it is written "and with chares" which is dry like earthenware, behold, "garav" in that verse must refer to a moist boil, and yet the verse says: "from which you cannot be healed"! This proves moist garav is also incurable!

ANSWER

אֵלָא, תִּלְתָּא הִוּוּ: דְּקָרָא — יָבֵשׁ בֵּין מַבְחוּץ וּבֵין מַבְחוּץ,

Rather, there are three types of garav: The garav of the verse of blemishes is dry both on the inside and on the outside, which is incurable and is called "charas" in Devarim.

EXPLANATION

דְּמִתְנִיתִין — לַח מַבְחוּץ וּמַבְחוּץ,

The garav of our Mishnah is moist on the outside and on the inside, which heals.

EXPLANATION

דְּמִצָּרִים — יָבֵשׁ מַבְחוּץ וְלַח מַבְחוּץ, דְּכָתִיב "וַיְהִי שָׁחִין פֹּרַח אֲבַעְבוּעוֹת בְּאָדָם".

And the garav of Egypt is dry on the inside but moist on the outside, which is also incurable, as it is written: "And it became a boil breaking out with blisters on man," and blisters are moist.

STATEMENT

וְהַזָּקֵן וְהַחֹלֶה וְהַמְזוּהָם.

The Mishnah taught: And the old, and the sick, and the foul-smelling animal may not be sacrificed.

QUESTION

מנהגי מילי?

The Gemara asks: **From where are these words derived?**

ANSWER

דְּתַנּוּ רַבֵּנּוּ: "מִן הַצֹּאן וּמִן הַכְּשָׁבִים וּמִן הָעִזִּים" — פֶּרֶט לְזָמֶן וּלְחֹלָה וּלְמִזְוָהּ.

For the Rabbis taught in a Braisa: The verse says, "from the flock, from the sheep, and from the goats" — the three instances of the word "from" come to **exclude the old, and the sick, and the foul-smelling animal.**

EXPLANATION

וְצָרִיכִי, דְּאִי כָּתַב רַחֲמָנָא לְמַעוּטֵי זָקֵן, דְּלֹא הָדַר בְּרִיא, אֲבָל חוֹלָה, דְּהָדַר בְּרִיא — אֵימָא לָא.

And all three exclusions are necessary: For if the Merciful One had written only one exclusion to exclude an old animal, we would say it is excluded because it will not become healthy and young again; but a sick animal, which can become healthy again, I would say is not excluded.

EXPLANATION

וְאִי כָּתַב לְמַעוּטֵי חוֹלָה, דְּלֹא אִוְרְחִיהּ, אֲבָל זָקֵן, דְּהֵינּוּ אִוְרְחִיהּ — אֵימָא לָא.

And if the Torah had written an exclusion only to exclude a sick animal, we would say it is excluded because this is not its normal way; but an old animal, which is its normal way of life, I would say is not excluded.

EXPLANATION

וְאִי כָּתַב רַחֲמָנָא תְּרֵי, לְמַעוּטֵי הֵנִי דְּכַחֲשִׁי, אֲבָל מִזְוָהּ דְּלֹא כַּחֲשִׁי — אֵימָא לָא.

And if the Merciful One had written only two exclusions, we would say they come to exclude these two which are weak; but a foul-smelling animal which is not weak, I would say is not excluded.

EXPLANATION

וְאִי נָמִי לְמַעוּטֵי מִזְוָהּ מְשׁוּם דְּמָאִיס, אֲבָל הֵנִי דְּלֹא מָאִיס — אֵימָא לָא, צָרִיכִי.

And alternatively, if it only excluded a foul-smelling animal, we would say it is excluded because it is repulsive; but these others which are not repulsive, I would say are not excluded. Therefore, all three are necessary.

QUESTION

וְשִׁנְעָבְדָּהּ בּוֹ עֲבִירָה וְכוּ'. מִנָּא הֵנִי מִלֵּי?

The Mishnah taught: **And an animal with which a transgression was performed, etc.** The Gemara asks: **From where are these words derived?**

ANSWER

דְּתַנּוּ רַבֵּנּוּ: "מִן הַבְּהֵמָה" — לְהוֹצִיא רוֹבֵעַ וְנִרְבָּע, "מִן הַבְּקָר" — לְהוֹצִיא אֶת הַנֶּעֱבָד,

For the Rabbis taught in a Braisa: The verse says, "from the animal" — to exclude an animal that mated with a human or was mated by a human; "from the cattle" — to exclude an animal that was worshipped as an idol;

EXPLANATION

"מִן הַצֹּאן" — לְהוֹצִיא אֶת הַמוֹקֵצָה, "וּמִן הַצֹּאן" — לְהוֹצִיא אֶת הַנוֹגֵחַ.

"from the flock" — to exclude an animal set aside for idolatry; "and from the flock" — to exclude an animal that gored and killed a person.

QUESTION

הַנִּי בְּנֵי קֶטֶל אֵל נִינְהוּ!

The Gemara asks: But **these** animals are subject to the death penalty by Beis Din! Why do we need a verse to disqualify them from the Mizbeach? They should be stoned!

ANSWER

עַל פִּי עֵד אֶחָד אוֹ עַל פִּי הַבַּעֲלִים.

The Gemara answers: This refers to where the act was established by the testimony of one witness or by the owner's own admission, where they cannot be executed but are still disqualified.

EXPLANATION

בְּשִׁלְמָא טוּמְטוּם, בְּמִקְדָּשׁ לָא — דִּילְמָא נִקְבָּה הִיא, בְּמִדִּינָה לָא — דִּילְמָא זָכָר הוּא וְלִית בֵּה מוּמָא.

The Gemara analyzes the Mishnah: **Granted**, a tumtum is not slaughtered; in the Beis HaMikdash no, because perhaps it is a female and not a firstborn at all; in the province no, because perhaps it is a male and has no blemish, so it is a perfect firstborn which may not be slaughtered outside.

QUESTION

אֵלָא אַנְדְּרוֹגִינוֹס, בְּשִׁלְמָא בְּמִקְדָּשׁ לָא, דִּילְמָא נִקְבָּה הִיא.

But an androgynos: **Granted**, in the Beis HaMikdash no, because perhaps it is a female and invalid for a firstborn offering.

QUESTION

אֵלָא בְּמִדִּינָה נָמִי, נָהִי דְזָכָר הוּא — תַּעֲשֶׂה נִקְבוֹת חֲרִיץ, וְיִשְׁחֹט עָלֶיהָ!

But in the province also let it not be slaughtered? **Granted** that it is a male, let its female organ be considered a cleft in the flesh, and let us slaughter it on account of this blemish!

ANSWER

אָמַר אַבְי: אָמַר קְרָא "אוֹ חֲרוּץ אוֹ שָׁבוֹר", חֲרוּץ דּוּמְיָא דְשָׁבוֹר, מָה שָׁבוֹר בְּמָקוֹם עֵצָם, אַף חֲרוּץ בְּמָקוֹם עֵצָם.

Abaye said: The verse says: "or cleft, or broken." We compare "cleft" to "broken": Just as "broken" is a blemish only in a place of bone, so too "cleft" is a blemish only in a place of bone, not in the soft flesh of the genitalia.

ANSWER

רַבָּא אָמַר: בְּלֹא שָׁבוֹר נָמִי לָא מַצִּית אֲמַרְתָּ חֲרוּץ בְּמָקוֹם בְּשַׁר הָוִי מוּמָא,

Rava said: Even without comparing it to "broken," you cannot say that a cleft in a place of flesh is a blemish.

EXPLANATION

דְּאִי סְלָקָא דַּעְתָּהּ הָוִי מוּמָא, כִּיּוֹן דְּאָמַר "גָּרֵב" זֶהוּ חֶרֶס, מִיחְרָץ חֲרִיץ, דְּכַתִּיב: "וּמִרְאֵהוּ עֲמוּק מִן הָעוֹר", כְּמִרְאֵה חֲמָה הָעֲמוּקָה מִן הַצֶּל.

For if it should enter your mind that it is a blemish, since the Gemara said "garav" is chares, which is a cleft in the skin — as it is written: "and its appearance is deeper than the skin," like the appearance of sunlight which appears deeper than the shadow —

EXPLANATION

וְלִיכְתֹּב רַחֲמָנָא "חַרוֹץ" וְלֹא בָּעֵי "גָּרַב", וְאִמְיָנָא: "חַרוֹץ" דְּלֹא מְאִיס — הָוֵי מוּמָא, "גָּרַב" דְּמְאִיס — לֹא כָּל שְׂכוּן?

let the Merciful One write "cleft" and we would not need "garav"! For I would say: If a "cleft" which is not repulsive is a blemish, is "garav" which is repulsive not all the more so a blemish?

EXPLANATION

כָּתַב רַחֲמָנָא "גָּרַב" לְמִימַר דְּחַרוֹץ בְּמָקוֹם בָּשָׂר — לֹא הָוֵי מוּמָא.

Rather, the Merciful One wrote "garav" to say that a cleft in a place of flesh is not a blemish, which is why a separate word was needed for garav.

STATEMENT

רַבִּי יִשְׁמַעְאֵל אוֹמֵר: אֵין לָהּ מוֹם גָּדוֹל מִזֶּה.

The Gemara notes: Rabbi Ishmael says: You have no greater blemish than this androgynos.

EXPLANATION

כְּאַבְיִי לֹא אָמַר, חַרוֹץ דּוּמִיָּא דְשִׁבּוּר לֹא אָמְרִינָן.

He did not say like Abaye, because we do not say "cleft" is compared to "broken."

EXPLANATION

כְּרַבָּא נָמִי לֹא אָמַר, דִּילָמָא הֵיכָא דְלֹא מֵינַכְרָא, אֲבָל הֵיכָא דְמֵינַכְרָא — "מוֹם רָע" קְרִינָא בֵּיהּ.

And he also did not say like Rava, because perhaps a cleft in flesh is not a blemish only where it is not noticeable, but where it is noticeable, we call it a "bad blemish" and it is indeed a blemish.

עמוד ב' DAF 41B

QUESTION

בָּעֵי רַבָּא: מַאי טַעְמָא דְרַבִּי יִשְׁמַעְאֵל?

Rava asks: What is the reason of Rabbi Yishmael for ruling that a hermaphrodite is slaughtered in the province as a blemished firstborn?

QUESTION

מִפְּשָׁט פְּשִׁיטָא לִיה אֲנִדְרוּגִינוֹס בְּכוֹר הוּא וּמוֹמוֹ עִמּוֹ,

Is it completely obvious to him that a hermaphrodite is definitely a male firstborn, and that its blemish—the female organ—is with it, so it is a blemished firstborn that may be slaughtered?

QUESTION

או די'למא ספוקי מספקא ליה, ו"אם תימצא לומר" קאמר — אם תימצא לומר בכור הוא, הרי מומו עמו!

Or perhaps he is in doubt whether it is a male or female, and he is speaking in the style of "if you will say"—meaning, if you will say that it is a firstborn because it is a male, then behold, its blemish is with it, and either way it can be slaughtered?

QUESTION

למאי נפקא מינה?

The Gemara asks: What is the practical difference between these two ways of understanding Rabbi Yishmael?

ANSWER

למילקא עליה משום גיזה ועבודה, אי נמי למיתבה לכהן.

The Gemara answers: The difference is regarding being flogged on its account because of the prohibition of shearing and working a firstborn; if it is a certain firstborn, one is flogged, but if it is a doubt, one is not. Or also, there is a difference regarding giving it to a Kohen; if it is a doubt, the owner can say to the Kohen, "bring proof that it is a male and you can have it."

PROOF

תא שמע: רבי אילעאי אומר משום רבי ישמעאל: אנדרוגינוס בכור הוא, ומומו עמו.

Come and hear a proof from a braisa: Rabbi Ilai says in the name of Rabbi Yishmael: A hermaphrodite is a firstborn, and its blemish is with it.

INFERENCE

שמע מינה מיפשט פשיטא ליה!

The Gemara suggests: Learn from this that it is completely obvious to him that it is a male firstborn, since he states clearly "it is a firstborn."

REFUTATION

ודילמא "אם תימצא לומר" קאמר!

The Gemara repels the proof: But perhaps he was still speaking in the style of "if you will say" and the braisa just shortened his words!

PROOF

תא שמע: זכר — ולא נקבה.

Come and hear another proof from a braisa: The Torah says regarding a cattle burnt-offering, "a male"—which teaches: and not a female.

PROOF

בשהוא אומר למטה "זכר", שאין תלמוד לומר, מה תלמוד לומר? להוציא טומטום ואנדרוגינוס.

When it says below regarding sheep "a male", where there is no need for the verse to say so since we already know it must be a male, what does the verse come to teach? It comes to exclude a tumtum and a hermaphrodite from being brought as a burnt-offering.

EXPLANATION

מִנִּי? אִי־לִימָא תְּנָא קָמָא — סְפִיקָא הוּא, וְאַתִּי קָרָא לְמַעוּטֵי סְפִיקָא?

The Gemara analyzes this: **Whose opinion is this** braisa? **If we say** it is the **first Tanna** of our Mishnah, who says a hermaphrodite is a doubt, **is it a doubt** to him, **and would a verse come to exclude a doubt** which is already excluded from the Mizbe'ach because of the uncertainty?

EXPLANATION

אֵלָּא רַבֵּנּוּ בְּתַרְאֵי מַחֲד קָרָא נִפְקִי, דְּהָא גַּבִּי בְּכוֹר חַד "זָכָר" הוּא דְּכַתִּיב, (קא) [וְקָא] מְמַעְטֵי כּוּלְהוּ מִיַּדֵּיהוּ!

Rather, is it the **latter Rabbis** of our Mishnah who hold a hermaphrodite is a creation of its own? But they **derive** all exclusions from one verse, as regarding a firstborn, only one "male" is written, and they exclude all of them—female, tumtum, and hermaphrodite—from it! Why would they need a second verse here?

EXPLANATION

אֵלָּא, פְּשִׁיטָא רַבִּי יִשְׁמָעֵאל, וְאִי אָמַרְתָּ בְּשִׁלְמָא רַבִּי יִשְׁמָעֵאל מִיפְשָׁט פְּשִׁיטָא לִיה — הֵיִינוּ דְּאִיצְטְרִיה קָרָא לְמַעוּטֵי,

Rather, it is obvious that this braisa is Rabbi Yishmael. And granted if you say that it is completely obvious to Rabbi Yishmael that a hermaphrodite is a male, that is why a verse was needed to exclude it from being brought as a burnt-offering.

EXPLANATION

אֵלָּא אִי אָמַרְתָּ מְסַפְקָא לִיה — אִיצְטְרִיה קָרָא לְמַעוּטֵי סְפִיקָא?

But if you say he is in doubt, was a verse needed to exclude a doubt? Surely not! Therefore, it must be obvious to him that it is a male.

REFUTATION

לְעוֹלָם רַבֵּנּוּ בְּתַרְאֵי, וְגַבִּי בְּכוֹר תַּרְתִּי קָרָאִי כְּתִיב: "הַזָּכָר" וְ"הַזָּכָרִים".

The Gemara rejects this: **Actually**, the braisa can be the **latter Rabbis**, and regarding a firstborn, two verses are written: "the male" and "the males," so they also use two verses to exclude them, just like by a burnt-offering.

MISHNAH מִשְׁנָה

MISHNAH

וְחֻכָּמִים אוֹמְרִים: אֵינוּ בְּכוֹר כּוֹי.

§ The Mishnah taught: **And the Sages say: It is not a firstborn**, but rather it is non-sacred and may be shorn and worked.

GEMARA גְּמָרָא

STATEMENT

אמר רב חסדא: מחלוקת באגדרוגינוס, אבל בטומטום — דברי הכל ספיקא הוא, וקדוש מספיקא.

Rav Chisda says: This dispute between Rabbi Yishmael and the Sages is regarding a hermaphrodite, but regarding a tumtum, everyone agrees it is a doubt, and it is holy out of doubt and cannot be shorn or worked.

OBJECTION

אמר ליה רבא: אלא מעתה, בערכין יערה?

Rava said to him: If that is so, that a tumtum is definitely a male or a female and only hidden, then regarding valuations, should he be valued as a doubt of either a male or female valuation?

SUMMARY

In this daf, the Gemara resolves a contradiction between our Mishnah and the pesukim regarding whether boils (garav and chazazis) are considered permanent or temporary blemishes, explaining that it depends on whether they are dry or moist, and whether they are the Egyptian variety. We also learn the source for excluding old, sick, or foul-smelling animals from being brought as korbanos. The Gemara derives these exclusions from the three-fold repetition of the word "from" in the pesukim, explaining lichaira why we need a separate exclusion for each case, as we could not have derived one from the other due to their different characteristics of weakness, repulsiveness, or potential to heal.

למעשה WHAT TO TAKE HOME

The Gemara is bothered by a contradiction regarding the blemish of "garav" (boils). The Torah lists garav as a permanent blemish that disqualifies an animal from the mizbeach, yet our Mishnah says it is a temporary blemish that does not allow us to slaughter a firstborn. The teretz is that there are different types of garav. A dry boil is permanent and incurable, but a moist boil is temporary because it eventually heals.

Lichaira, this teaches us a deep yesod in our own avodas Hashem. Sometimes a Yid looks at his own spiritual state, his middos, or his struggles with the yetzer hara, and he feels completely broken. He sees his flaws and thinks, "This is who I am, it is permanent, I am incurable." He falls into a heavy, dry despair, which is the real danger of the yetzer hara.

But the Tanna is telling us a different sevara. As long as there is still warmth, as long as there is a "moistness" and a desire to grow, the blemish is only temporary. It is not a permanent state. If you still feel the pain of where you are holding, and you still wet your siddur with tears or feel a warmth for a blatt Gemara, that means your neshama is alive and healing is on the way. The only permanent blemish is when a person becomes dry and cold, chas v'shalom.

Today, when you feel down about a spiritual slip or a bad middah, don't let yourself dry up in despair. Keep things "moist" by doing one small, warm act of avodah, say a single chapter of Tehillim with real heart, or learn one halacha with enthusiasm, to show Hashem that you are ready to heal.