Bechoros 34 – Good Morning Raboisai

1️⃣ Adding a Second Mum to a Bechor

We continue the Sugya of a sick Bechor that requires bloodletting.

The animal is already dangerously ill. Rashi explains that this itself can be considered a Mum. The question is:

👉 May you now create an additional Mum while treating it?

The Chachamim learn from:

תמים יהיה לרצון

The prohibition applies when the animal is Tam. Once it already has a Mum, creating another Mum is treated differently.

Rebbi Meir learns from:

כל מום לא יהיה בו

👉 "Kol Mum" includes even adding another Mum to an animal that is already a Baal Mum.

2️⃣ "Kol Mum" – Even Causing a Mum

According to the Chachamim, what does the word "Kol" teach?

It includes:

👉 Causing a Mum indirectly.

You may not arrange for something else to create the Mum.

For example, one may not place food on the animal's ear so that a dog will bite it and create a permanent Mum.

Even though the person did not physically make the wound:

👉 He deliberately caused it.

Safek Tamei Terumah

3️⃣ Must Safek Terumah Be Protected?

The Daf returns to the barrel of Terumah whose Tumah status is uncertain.

Normally there is a Mitzvah to guard Terumah from becoming Tamei.

The question is:

👉 Does that obligation also apply to Terumah which is already Safek Tamei?

Rebbi Eliezer says it must still be protected.

Rebbi Yehoshua says it does not require the same protection.

4️⃣ "Mishmeres Terumosai"

The Gemara initially connects the Machlokes to the Pasuk:

משמרת תרומותי

Could "Terumosai" refer to two types of Terumah?

- Definitely Tahor Terumah.
- Safek Tamei Terumah.

This raises the familiar question of:

👉 Yesh Eim LaMikra or Yesh Eim LaMasores – do we focus on how the word is read or how it is written?

5️⃣ The Amah Ha'Ivriyah

The Gemara challenges this explanation from another Sugya.

Regarding an Amah Ha'Ivriyah, the Torah uses the word:

בבגדו בה

This can be understood in different ways depending on the reading.

One interpretation relates it to Beged – after the master has designated her for marriage.

Another relates it to Bagad – betrayal, referring to the original sale.

👉 This shows that the positions cannot simply be explained by a general rule of Mikra versus Masores.

6️⃣ The Real Machlokes

The Gemara therefore gives a different explanation.

Rebbi Yehoshua understands the obligation to guard Terumah as applying to:

👉 Terumah that is fit for the Kohen.

If it is Safek Tamei and cannot presently be eaten, the same obligation does not apply.

Rebbi Eliezer responds:

👉 Perhaps Eliyahu HaNavi will come and clarify that it was actually Tahor.

Therefore, it still has potential value and should be protected.

Bloodletting – Rebbi Shimon

7️⃣ Davar She'Eino Miskavein

The Mishnah permitted bloodletting in certain circumstances.

Rebbi Shimon's famous principle is:

דבר שאין מתכוין מותר

If the person's intention is to save the Bechor rather than create a Mum:

👉 The procedure itself can be permitted even if a Mum results unintentionally.

But the Gemara now asks whether this is the entire Chiddush.

8️⃣ May He Use the Resulting Mum?

The Beraisa goes further.

Not only may he perform the bloodletting:

👉 If the procedure actually creates a Mum, he may later Shecht the Bechor based on that Mum.

That is a much greater Chiddush.

His intention was genuinely to save the animal, not to manufacture a way of permitting it.

Therefore:

👉 We do not penalize him for the resulting Mum.

Deliberately Creating a Mum

9️⃣ Cutting the Bechor's Ear

The Mishnah now discusses a completely different case.

A person deliberately creates a Mum in his Bechor – for example:

👉 He cuts or punctures its ear so that he can Shecht and eat it.

Here there is no life-saving intention.

He deliberately tried to circumvent the Halachah.

Therefore:

👉 Chazal impose a Knas.

🔟 Rebbi Eliezer – A Permanent Knas

Rebbi Eliezer takes a very strict approach.

If the owner deliberately created the Mum:

👉 He may never benefit from that Mum as a Heter to Shecht the animal.

Even if another genuine Mum subsequently develops, Rebbi Eliezer maintains the Knas.

The attempt to manipulate the Halachah has serious consequences.

1️⃣1️⃣ Chachamim – Wait for Another Mum

The Chachamim agree that the deliberately created Mum cannot be used.

But they are more lenient:

👉 If the Bechor later develops a different Mum naturally, it may then be Shechted based on that new Mum.

The Knas attaches to the Mum that he deliberately created, rather than permanently to the animal.

Cutting Off Tzaraas

1️⃣2️⃣ A Similar Knas

The Gemara compares this to someone who deliberately removes a Baheres of Tzaraas.

If the mark disappears accidentally:

👉 The person can become Tahor.

But if he deliberately cuts it off to escape the laws of Tzaraas:

👉 Chazal do not allow him simply to benefit from his action.

This appears to create a contradiction in the opinions of Rebbi Eliezer and the Chachamim.

1️⃣3️⃣ Why Bechor Is Different

The Gemara distinguishes between:

- A monetary situation involving a Bechor.
- Tzaraas on the person's own body.

With the Bechor, without a strong Knas the owner has little to lose.

He may think:

👉 "I'll create a Mum now. If I get caught, I'll simply wait until another Mum develops."

That makes the attempted shortcut attractive.

Therefore, a stronger Knas may be necessary.

1️⃣4️⃣ Tzaraas Is a Real Risk

With Tzaraas, the person takes a much greater risk.

If he deliberately removes the Baheres and is told that he must wait for another Nega:

👉 Who says another Nega will ever appear?

He could remain stuck indefinitely.

Therefore, the very nature of the situation discourages the wrongdoing, and the structure of the Knas can be different.

When Does He Become Tahor?

1️⃣5️⃣ A New Nega Appears

Suppose someone deliberately removed his original Baheres and later developed a second Nega.

The Gemara asks:

👉 At what point does he become Tahor from the consequences of the first Nega?

Is it immediately when the second Nega appears?

Or:

👉 Only after the second Nega completes its own Taharah process?

This question remains important because of situations where the second Nega cannot immediately be examined.

1️⃣6️⃣ A Chassan During Sheva Brachos

A Chassan who develops a Nega during Sheva Brachos receives time before the Kohen examines it.

Similarly:

👉 During Yom Tov, examination of the Nega can be delayed until after the Regel.

Therefore, our question has a practical Nafkamina.

If the appearance of the second Nega immediately clears the first problem:

👉 He may already be Tahor.

But if the second Nega must first complete its process:

👉 He may have to wait until after Sheva Brachos or Yom Tov.

The Gemara leaves the issue unresolved.

Does the Knas Pass to the Son?

1️⃣7️⃣ Father Created the Mum and Died

Rebbi Yirmiyah asks:

A father deliberately created a Mum in his Bechor and was penalized.

Then the father died.

👉 Does the Knas continue to his son?

Is the penalty against the person who committed the wrongdoing?

Or:

👉 Did Chazal place the Knas on the animal itself?

1️⃣8️⃣ Selling an Eved to a Non-Jew

The Gemara compares this to someone who sells an Eved to a non-Jew.

The sale prevents the Eved from properly living his Torah obligations.

Chazal penalize the seller and require him to redeem the Eved.

If the seller dies:

👉 The obligation can continue to his son.

Why?

Because every day the Eved remains there, he continues losing the opportunity to keep Mitzvos.

Chol HaMoed

1️⃣9️⃣ Planning to Work on Chol HaMoed

The Gemara brings another comparison.

A person intentionally leaves work for Chol HaMoed, planning to claim later that it is a Davar Ha'Aved.

Chazal penalize such behaviour.

But if he dies before doing the prohibited work:

👉 His son is not necessarily penalized.

The father intended to violate the rule, but the actual prohibited act was never completed.

Shemittah

2️⃣0️⃣ Improving a Field During Shemittah

The Daf also compares a field that was improperly improved during Shemittah.

There are different levels of working the land.

Simply clearing certain material may not create the same Knas as:

👉 Substantially fertilizing and improving the field.

If the owner improperly fertilized it and then died:

👉 The son is not automatically penalized for the father's wrongdoing.

This supports the idea that many Knasos are personal to the offender.

Making Terumah Tamei

2️⃣1️⃣ Damage That Cannot Be Seen

The Gemara brings another important example.

Someone deliberately makes another person's Taharos Tamei.

The damage is real:

👉 The food has lost its Taharah status.

But physically, nothing visible has changed.

This is:

היזק שאינו ניכר

Damage that cannot be seen.

The obligation to pay in such cases is a Knas imposed by the Chachamim.

2️⃣2️⃣ Does That Knas Pass to the Children?

If the person who deliberately caused this invisible damage dies:

👉 His children are not penalized for what he did.

Why?

Because the payment itself was a Rabbinic Knas against the person who committed the wrongdoing.

This becomes another important comparison for the question:

👉 Does the Knas for deliberately creating a Mum in a Bechor continue to the son?

📌 Key Chazarah

- The Daf continues the Machlokes whether adding a second Mum to an already blemished Bechor is prohibited.

- Rebbi Meir learns from “Kol Mum” that even an additional Mum is prohibited.
- The Chachamim use “Kol Mum” to prohibit indirectly causing a Mum.
- Safek Tamei Terumah leads to a discussion of whether it must still be protected.
- The Gemara initially considers Yesh Eim LaMikra versus Yesh Eim LaMasores but rejects this as the basis of the Machlokes.
- Rebbi Eliezer says Safek Terumah should be protected because Eliyahu may clarify that it is Tahor.
- Rebbi Shimon permits bloodletting when the intention is to save the Bechor rather than create a Mum.
- The Beraisa adds that if a Mum results from that genuine treatment, the resulting Mum may be used.
- Someone who deliberately creates a Mum in a Bechor receives a Knas.
- Rebbi Eliezer applies a very strong Knas, while the Chachamim allow the animal once another Mum develops naturally.
- The Gemara compares this to deliberately removing a Baheres of Tzaraas.
- A stronger Knas may be needed with Bechor because otherwise the owner has very little to lose by attempting the shortcut.
- The Gemara asks when a person who removed Tzaraas becomes Tahor after another Nega appears.
- A Chassan during Sheva Brachos and a person during Yom Tov may delay examination of a Nega.
- The Gemara asks whether a Knas imposed on a father who deliberately blemished his Bechor passes to his son.
- Selling an Eved to a non-Jew is an example where the consequences continue because the Eved continues losing Mitzvos.
- A Knas for improperly arranging work on Chol HaMoed does not necessarily pass to the son.
- Similarly, a son is not automatically penalized for his father improperly improving a field during Shemittah.
- Deliberately making Taharos Tamei is Hezek She’eino Nikkar, and its payment is a Rabbinic Knas.
- Such a Knas does not automatically pass to the offender’s children.

📘 Catch up, review, download previous Dafim & more: https://www.dafchazarah.co.uk

📲 Now available as an app (Apple, Google & Amazon): https://dafchazarah.co.uk/download

🤝 Sponsor a day: https://dafchazarah.co.uk/sponsor

לעילוי נשמת אמי מורתי רות בת הרב מנחם מנדל