

## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) Clarifying the Mishnah (cont.)

The Gemara unsuccessfully challenges the premise that Rav follows the opinion of R' Shimon that an unintended act is permitted.

Another challenge is presented which forces the Gemara to offer another explanation for Rav's ruling permitting plucking hair before slaughtering on Yom Tov.

This explanation is unsuccessfully challenged.

The Gemara assumes that if Rav agrees with R' Yosi ben HaMeshulam then R' Yosi ben HaMeshulam must agree with Rav that something unintended is prohibited. This assumption is unsuccessfully challenged.

### 2) Plucking hair

R' Ashi in the name of Reish Lakish asserts that plucking the hair must be done by hand.

This assertion is unsuccessfully challenged.

The Gemara inquires whether the allowance to pluck hair to examine a blemish is l'chatchila or בדיעבד.

R' Yirmiyah proves that it is even l'chatchila.

R' Meri cites proof to this conclusion from our Mishnah.

**3) MISHNAH:** The Mishnah discusses whether wool that came off of a bechor while it was alive becomes permitted after the animal is dead. The Mishnah also discusses the status of dangling wool after the animal is dead.

### 4) Clarifying the Mishnah

The Gemara clarifies R' Yosi's understanding of the dispute between Akavya ben Mehalal'el and Chachamim.

R' Assi in the name of Reish Lakish explains the point of dispute between Akavya ben Mehalal'el and Chachamim.

R' Sheishes unsuccessfully challenges this interpretation of the dispute.

When Ravin went to Eretz Yisroel he reported how R' Nachman had interpreted a previously-cited Baraisa and R' Yirmiyah was critical of that interpretation since R' Yochanan had another interpretation of that Baraisa.

A second version of R' Yochanan's interpretation of that Baraisa is cited.

The exchange between R' Assi and R' Chiya bar Abba concerning the correct version of R' Yochanan's interpretation is recorded.

Reish Lakish's assertion, that no Tanna permits benefit from wool that became detached from a bechor before its blemish was confirmed by an expert, is challenged. ■

## Distinctive INSIGHT

*The one that is found is the one that was lost*

נכנס לתוכה טהור שאני אומר הוא קבר שאבד הוא קבר שנמצא דברי רבי

The Mishnah cited a disagreement regarding wool that became detached from a blemished bechor. The animal may not be shorn, but wool that came off by itself is permitted once the animal is shechted according to Akavya b. Mahalal'el. Chachamim prohibit this wool. Reish Lakish explains that here the bechor was inspected by an expert, and the disagreement is whether we suspect that the owner may delay shechting the bechor.

A Baraisa is originally brought to challenge the explanation of Reish Lakish to our Mishnah. The Baraisa discusses a case of a blemished animal which mingled and became lost among unblemished animals. Tanna Kamma holds that even if one blemished animal becomes mixed in many unblemished animals, none of them may be used for an offering. R' Yose disagrees and says that the animals should be inspected, and when the blemished animal is found it alone may not be brought as an offering, but the remaining animals are valid to be brought on the Altar.

The Gemara offers alternative explanations to explain the Baraisa such that its discussion is no longer relevant to Reish Lakish. One of these explanations is cited by R' Assi in the name of R' Yochanan. The case can be where one blemished animal mingled with many unblemished animals. We then inspect the animals until we find one which is blemished. Tanna Kamma holds that we cannot assume that this blemished animal was the one which was lost, because it is possible that another animal has become blemished, and the lost animal is still wandering around in the crowd. Akavya holds that the one we find can be assumed to be the one we lost. The Gemara notes that this disagreement would align with a parallel discussion in another Baraisa. The location of a grave in a field was lost. We

*Continued on page 2)*

## REVIEW and Remember

1. Is plucking hair comparable to shearing?

2. How does R' Meri prove from the Mishnah that it is permitted even l'chatchila to remove a bechor's hair to examine a blemish?

3. Is it permitted to benefit from a bechor's dangling hair?

4. What is the point of dispute between R' Assi's version of R' Yochanan and R' Chiya bar Abba's version?

# HALACHAH Highlight

## Plucking feathers from a bird on Shabbos

התולש את הכנף

One who plucks a feather

The Gemara teaches that one who plucks a feather from a bird on Shabbos has violated the prohibition of “plucking” which is a toladah of the prohibition of shearing. Rosh<sup>1</sup> in the name of Ramban asserts that this prohibition is not limited to one who plucks feathers from a live bird but even one who plucks feathers from a bird that is already dead violates this prohibition. Ramban goes on to permit plucking feathers from even a live bird on Yom Tov if the intent is to eat the bird. Since plucking feathers applies to live as well as dead birds on Yom Tov when plucking the feathers is permitted for food preparation, it should be permitted to pluck them whether the animal is dead or even if it is still alive. Rosh agrees with Ramban that the prohibition against plucking feathers applies even after the bird is dead but disagrees with regards to plucking feathers from a live bird on Yom Tov. He considers plucking feathers from a bird that is still alive a preparatory act - מכשירי אוכל נפש – which is not permitted on Yom Tov since the preparatory act could have been done before Yom Tov.

Sefer Zayis Ra’anan<sup>2</sup> writes that since according to Ramban and Rosh it is prohibited to pluck feathers from a dead bird one may not pick off remaining feathers from a bird that one intends to eat on Shabbos. One who does pluck off those remaining feathers violates the Biblical prohibition against “plucking.” Ketzos HaShulchan<sup>3</sup> notes that common custom is that the people pluck off feathers as they eat chicken on Shabbos so he develops three theories to justify this common practice. One reason is that since nobody uses the feathers that are removed from a bird

(Insight...continued from page 1)

inspect the land, and we find a grave. Rebbe says that the grave we find is the one which was lost. R’ Shimon b. Gamliel says that perhaps this is another grave, and the one lost is still unaccounted for.

Sefer Nimukei Chaim points out that this association between these cases would only be true in a case where we do not know the exact nature of the blemish which the first animal had before it mixed into the herd of unblemished animals. If we knew, for example, that the first animal had a blemished nose, and the blemished animal we find has that exact blemish, all opinions would say that this is the same animal. And even if the blemish was a gash on its side, and we notice that animals normally gore each other, if we find a gash in an animal exactly where it appeared on the first animal, we would again not suspect that this is a different animal. Therefore, the case must be that we did not know the type of blemish the first animal had, so when we inspect the animals and find one with a blemish, R’ Shimon b. Gamliel would say this might be a different animal. ■

that is cooked the removal of the feathers does not constitute any melacha whatsoever. A second theory is that once the feathers are cooked they are no longer considered feathers and thus are not subject to the prohibition. Rav Moshe Feinstein<sup>4</sup> also permits the removal of feathers on Shabbos and explains that cooking them loosens them to the degree that they are no longer fully attached to the bird. Additionally, the feathers are not used for anything. Therefore, if one could spit them out of his mouth as he eats the bird he should do so but if that is not possible one may even remove the feathers before eating the bird. ■

1. רא"ש פ"ג סי' ה'
2. ספר זית רענן סי' א' אות י"ב.
3. קצות השלחן סי' קמ"ג בדה"ש סק"א.
4. שו"ת אג"מ אר"ח ח"ד סי' ע"ד מלאכת בורר אות ט'. ■

# STORIES Off the Daf

## Tangled Skeins

בעלי מומין אסורין בכ"ש

The halachos of a bechor can be fairly vexing at times. One cannot make use of firstborn animals or even the product of their shearing, as we find on today’s daf. When some bechor shearings fell into a large quantity of regular wool, the owner was very dismayed. If the wool prohibited the entire mixture, he would sustain a large financial loss. And he doubted that this combination could possibly be permitted—after all, the Shulchan Aruch rules that even if the bechor’s wool is mixed

with several thousand parts of wool it is forbidden. In this particular case there was one advantage however. Since the wool from a bechor is virgin wool which is exceedingly soft, he could try to weed it all out of the permitted wool which came from mature sheep. But who could tell if he had truly weeded out every bit of the bechor’s wool?

When this question reached the Nodah B’Yehudah, zt”l, he ruled that there was a way to avoid a serious loss in such a case. “Firstly, it is clear that the prohibition to use a bechor’s wool is rabbinic. This is clear from Tosafos in Bechoros 25 and Chulin 36. And obviously the halachah that wool is not nullified in even several thousand is another rabbinic decree.

It therefore seems clear that even if a bechor’s wool was mixed into other wool and could not be distinguished, it would be permitted to sell the wool to a non-Jew—subtracting the value of the bechor’s wool from the price. Your case is even better since you tried to remove the bechor’s wool from the permitted wool. We need not worry that if we permit one to sell the mixture to a non-Jew that he might then sell it to a Jew again, since the prohibition to sell to a Jew is a double d’rabanan: the wool itself and that it is not nullified in a mixture. It is surely not incumbent upon us to add another rabbinic prohibition of our own volition!”<sup>1</sup> ■

1. שו"ת נודע ביהודה, מהדורה תנינא, יו"ד, סי' קצ"ג ■