

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah begins with a discussion of animals that may not be used to redeem firstborn donkeys. If a kohen is given an unredeemed firstborn donkey he must immediately redeem it.

2) The author of the Mishnah

The Gemara explains that the Mishnah follows Ben Bag Bag's position.

Ben Bag Bag's position is clarified.

3) The redemption animal

The Gemara inquires whether one can redeem a firstborn donkey with a ben pekua.

After clarifying the inquiry the Gemara relates that the matter is debated by Mar Zutra and R' Ashi.

A discussion between Mar Zutra and R' Ashi about this matter is recorded.

The Gemara inquires whether one can redeem a firstborn donkey with an offspring that resembles a species different than its parents.

The inquiry is further explained.

Two unsuccessful attempts to resolve this inquiry are presented.

The Gemara inquires whether one may use a disqualified korban to redeem a firstborn donkey.

The inquiry is further explained.

R' Mari the son of R' Kahana proves that a disqualified korban may not be used to redeem a firstborn donkey and it is noted that this proof could be reconciled with R' Shimon's opinion as well.

The Gemara inquires whether a firstborn donkey could be redeemed with an animal purchased with produce grown in the shemittah year.

After clarifying the inquiry a ruling of R' Chisda is cited that states that an animal purchased with produce grown in the shemittah year may not be used to redeem a definite firstborn but may be used to redeem a doubtful firstborn.

Two other related rulings from R' Chisda are cited and ex-

(Continued on page 2)

Distinctive INSIGHT

Redeeming a firstborn donkey with an item other than a sheep
אין פודין לא בעגל ולא בחיה

The Mishnah teaches various rules regarding the redemption of a firstborn donkey. The donkey must be redeemed using a sheep. It may not be redeemed using a calf or a non-domesticated animal, even a kosher animal such as a deer. The redemption may not be done with a shechted sheep, and not with a sheep which is a tereifah.

Beis Yosef (Y.D. 321) explains that the ruling in our Mishnah is speaking about a case where the redemption is being done with an animal whose value is less than that of the donkey. In this case, only a live sheep can be effective. However, if the calf, deer or shechted sheep is worth the full value of the donkey, they are no different than any object which may be used to redeem the firstborn donkey for its full value. Turei Even (to Megilla 23b) also writes that if someone takes a sheep to redeem a donkey, and the sheep is actually deformed and not eligible for the redemption, the process is successful if the deformed sheep has the full value of the donkey. If this ineligible sheep does not possess the full value of the donkey, the redemption is not valid. Minchas Chinuch (Mitzvah 22, #4) holds that the redemption is valid, even if the ineligible sheep is not worth full value of the donkey.

Turei Even explains that when something is sanctified by its owner, the owner could technically convene a beis din and reconsider his declaration which caused the sanctification. This is a situation where the sanctity may be redeemed with a transfer of the sanctity even upon a small coin. The firstborn of a donkey, however, is automatically sanctified. Here, the redemption can only be done for full value. Minchas Chinuch disagrees and says that there is no difference in the redemption of an item whether it was sanctified by its owner or whether it became sanctified automatically. In both situations, the redemption need not be upon a coin or item of the full value of the sanctified object.

Minchas Yitzchak (8:118) explains that redeeming the firstborn donkey with a sheep is the ideal manner, and this works no matter what the value is of the sheep. The secondary, less desirable manner, is to redeem the donkey with any other object, but this must be done with an object which is worth the full value of the donkey. If a person takes a sheep and attempts to do the redemption in the best possible way, only to later realize that the sheep was not eligible, his redemption is valid, at least as a secondary method, even though the sheep is not worth the full value of the donkey. He compares this to a situation where someone ate matzah which he thought was guarded from the time of harvest, only to later learn that it was guarded only from the time of grinding. He certainly fulfills his mitzvah, and he need not eat more. Here, too, the redemption is valid and it need not be repeated. ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. What does one do if he has a firstborn donkey and no sheep with which to redeem it?
2. What does one do if he has ten questionable firstborn donkeys?
3. What is the point of dispute between Tanna Kamma and R' Shimon?
4. Which terumah is given from grain acquired from a non-Jew?

HALACHAH Highlight

Redeeming a firstborn child on Shabbos

Redemption of a firstborn son is after thirty days

The Gemara teaches that the time to redeem a firstborn child is after 30 days from the baby's birth. Once 30 days have passed the baby should be redeemed immediately without any delay. Later authorities question the exact nature of this obligation. Is the obligation to redeem the child specifically after 30 days have passed but once that time has passed there is no difference between a redemption that occurs on day 32, 33 or 34? Or perhaps, the only emphasis of the Torah is that the baby should not be redeemed before 30 days passed but there is no obligation to redeem the child specifically after the 30 days have passed other than the general obligation to perform a mitzvah at the earliest opportunity (זריזים מקדימים) (למצוות). A similar question is whether one forgoes the positive command to redeem his son every day he allows to pass without redeeming his son.

Terumas Hadeshen¹ writes that redeeming one's firstborn son, as well as the rest of the priestly gifts are not sacred items before they are given to a kohen and as such there is no prohibition violated if he delays fulfillment of the mitzvah. This has practical significance when the correct time to redeem a firstborn coincides with Shabbos. Even though one could give the redemption money to a kohen before Shabbos on condition that the redemption should take place on Shabbos, nevertheless, the redemption should be performed after Shabbos. The reason to perform the redemption on Shabbos is not because the mitzvah must be done specifically at the earliest possible moment; it is done then merely so that one does not delay the fulfillment of the mitzvah. As such, it is preferable to delay fulfillment of the mitzvah until after Shabbos since the quality of the mitzvah is not negatively impacted by the delay. Teshuvos Chelkas Yaakov²

STORIES Off the Daf

An Unnecessary Delay?

ופדיון הבן אחר שלשים יום

On today's daf we find that one should redeem his firstborn son only after thirty full days have passed. One father was slated to redeem his son at the earliest possible moment on the first possible day and then fly out of the country. The young couple really wanted a particular kohen, who was a good friend, to redeem the child but, unfortunately, it turned out that he would not be able to make it to the pidyon haben on that day. Having what they felt was no choice, they decided to wait until the next day when he could make it.

The father canceled his flight and rescheduled for the flight leaving a day later. But then someone pointed out that this was not acceptable. "How can you put off doing the pidyon on the correct day just because you want to use a particular kohein? There are plenty of kohanim around. You should definitely summon one of these and redeem your son at the earliest possible moment. Failing to do so definitely violates a prohibition."

But the father disagreed. "Why do you assume that I am obligated to redeem the child the very first available day?"¹

When the father asked the author of the Tanya Rabasi, zt"l, about this, he was surprised by the answer he received. "It is an absolute obligation to redeem your child at the earliest possible time, even if one is not

(Overview...continued from page 1)

plained.

R' Chisda's first ruling is unsuccessfully challenged.

A Baraisa is cited in support of the defense of R' Chisda.

The reason this Baraisa does not refute R' Chisda is explained.

4) Receiving an unredeemed firstborn donkey

A Baraisa is cited that explains the Mishnah's ruling related to a kohen who receives an unredeemed firstborn donkey.

R' Nachman in the name of Rabba bar Avuha draws an inference from this Baraisa and explains why it is not obvious.

5) MISHNAH: The Mishnah discusses the halacha of a redemption lamb that dies before it is redeemed. The last ruling relates to where the firstborn donkey dies before the redemption lamb could be given to a kohen.

6) R' Eliezer's position

R' Yosef explains R' Eliezer's position.

Abaye unsuccessfully challenges this position.

A successful challenge to this explanation is presented and Rava offers an alternative explanation for R' Eliezer's ruling.

7) Redeeming a firstborn donkey

A Mishnah is cited that teaches that a firstborn donkey should be redeemed immediately after birth.

This ruling is challenged.

R' Nachman resolves this challenge.

This resolution is unsuccessfully challenged. ■

explains that doing something that resembles a transaction such as redeeming a firstborn boy is only Rabbinically prohibited and if there was a Biblical prohibition against delaying a child's redemption that would override avoiding an activity that looks as though one is violating a Rabbinic injunction. This clearly proves that there is no prohibition against delaying the redemption of a firstborn child. ■

1. שו"ת תרומת הדשן פסקים וכתבים סי' רל"ג.

2. שו"ת חלקת יעקב ח"א סי' פ"ח. ■

on time. Every instant one waits after the proper day, he transgresses a positive commandment..."²

But the Terumas Hadeshen, zt"l, disagreed. "Pidyon Haben and all matnos kehunah are definitely chulin. It follows that one who fails to redeem them has not violated a prohibition per se. Nevertheless, it is improper to delay fulfilling a mitzvah."

The Maharit Algazi, zt"l, makes a similar point. "Only one who delays circumcising a child transgresses a prohibition for delaying the bris. One who delays redeeming his son but then fulfills the mitzvah has not transgressed anything."³ ■

1. תניא רבתי, סי' צ"ח

2. תרומת הדשן, פסקים וכתבים, סי' רל"ג

3. מהרי"ט אלגאזי, פ"א, אות י"ד, ד"ה ואולם אעיקרא