



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

Bechoros Daf Chuf Hey

- **Q:** The Gemara just said that **Rav** holds like **R' Yose ben Hameshulem** (that pulling out hairs of the animal is not "shearing"), so it would follow that **R' Yose ben Hameshulem** also holds like **Rav** (that an unintended act is assur). However, we find a Braisa regarding a parah adumah that has two hairs that have red roots and black tips, where **R' Yose ben Hameshulem** says that one may cut off the black tips with scissors (so that there not be 2 black hairs) and it is not a problem. Now, cutting with scissors is like shearing and yet **R' Yose** allows it, presumably because he holds that an unintended act is mutar!? **A:** The case of parah adumah is different, because a cow doesn't have wool, and cutting its hair is therefore not "shearing". Therefore, even though an unintended act is assur, this cutting is mutar.
 - **Q:** A Braisa darshens the pasuk to teach that there is an issur of shearing even on animals that don't have wool!? **A:** The reason there is no issur of shearing on the parah adumah is because the parah adumah is only kodesh for bedek habayis, and the issur of shearing is only for animals that have kedusha as a korban.
 - **Q:** **R' Elazar** has said that even kadshei bedek habayis have an issur of shearing!? **A:** That is only D'Rabanan,
 - **Q:** Even if it is only an D'Rabanan, he should not allow the hairs to be cut!? **A:** The parah adumah is not common, and therefore there is no gezeira D'Rabanan regarding cutting its hair.
 - **Q:** Why doesn't he say to redeem the parah adumah, then cut the hairs, and then make it kadosh again? **A:** It is worth a tremendous amount of money and would therefore be difficult to redeem.
 - **Q:** Why can't we rely on **Shmuel**, who says that kodesh worth any amount that was redeemed even on a perutah is fully redeemed? **A:** That is b'dieved, but wouldn't be done l'chatchila.
 - **A:** We can also answer that although **Rav** holds like **R' Yose ben Hameshulem**, **R' Yose ben Hameshulem** does not hold like **Rav**.

V'TOLEISH ES HASAAR UBILVAD SHELO YAZIZENU MIMEKOMO

- **R' Assi in the name of Reish Lakish** said, this removal of the hair was only permitted to be done by hand, not with a keili.
 - **Q:** The Mishna says that it may be removed with a cleaver!? **A:** The Mishna means that the hair may be removed *for* the meat cleaver.

V'CHEIN HATOLEISH ES HASAAR LIROS MAKOM MUM

- **Q:** Does the Mishna mean to allow the pulling out of hair to inspect a mum even l'chatchila, or only means to say that b'dieved if it was done it should not be removed from its place? **A:** **R' Yirmiya** said we can answer from a Braisa which says that **R' Yose ben Hameshulem** allows removal of hair so that a mum can be inspected. We see that it is allowed even l'chatchila – SHEMA MINAH.
 - **R' Mari** said we can see this from our Mishna as well. After saying that hair may be removed for shechita but that the hair must be left in its place, the Mishna then says "similarly this is done for a mum". Now, this can't refer to the statement that the hair must be left in its place, because if it must be left in its place when it is done for shechita – which becomes obvious to all why it is done – then surely the same would have to be done when removed for a mum. Rather, the Mishna means to say that the removal may be done l'chatchila to allow for inspection of a mum – SHEMA MINAH.

MISHNA

- If the wool of a bechor with a mum fell out and was put away and saved and the bechor was then shechted for eating, **Akavya ben Mahalaleil** says the wool then becomes mutar, but the **Chachomim** say it is assur. This is the version of the machlokes according to **R' Yehuda**. However, **R' Yose** said to him, **Akavya** did not allow the wool in this case. Rather, the case of the machlokes is where the wool of a bechor with a mum fell out and was put away and saved and the bechor then died. In that case **Akavya** said the wool becomes mutar and the **Chachomim** say it remains assur.
- If there is wool of a bechor that became detached and is dangling from the bechor, if it still seems to be part of the wool of the animal it is mutar (after the shechita), but if it is obviously no longer part of the rest of the wool, it is assur even after the shechita.

GEMARA

- **Q:** It seems that **R' Yose** says that **Akavya** says the detached wool is assur if the bechor is shechted but is mutar if the bechor dies. Now, if it is mutar when the animal dies it should surely be mutar when it is shechted!? **A:** **R' Yose** means to say that when the bechor is shechted *all agree* that the wool becomes mutar. The machlokes is where the bechor died, in which case **Akavya** says the wool becomes mutar and the **Chachomim** say it remains assur.
- **R' Assi in the name of Reish Lakish** said, the machlokes is where the wool came from a bechor that was already declared by an expert to have a mum. In that case the **Rabanan** say that the wool is assur as a gezeira so that people not delay the shechting of the bechor to allow for more wool to grow and **Akavya** says it is mutar, because he does not think this gezeira is needed. However, if the wool fell off a bechor that has not been confirmed by an expert as having a mum, all would agree that the wool would remain assur.
 - **Q:** **R' Sheishes** asked, a Braisa says, if an animal with a mum became mixed with many other animals, all the animals become assur to be brought on the Mizbe'ach. **R' Yose** says it should be examined. Now, what does **R' Yose** mean? It can't mean that it should be examined until the animal with the mum is found, because in that case even the **T"K** would agree that once the animal with the mum is found all the others become mutar! **R' Nachman in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha** explained that the case of the Braisa is where the wool of a bechor that had a mum became mixed with the wool of chullin animals. The **T"K** of the Braisa is **R' Yehuda**, who say that the wool that fell off a bechor with a mum remains assur, and **R' Yose** follows his view from our Mishna where he says that the **Rabanan** say the wool is mutar once the bechor is shechted. Now, when he says in the Braisa that "it should be examined", presumably he means the mum should be examined to determine if it is a permanent or a temporary mum, and we see that he holds that even without confirmation by an expert it becomes mutar!? **A:** **Rava** said, it may mean that it should be examined to see if it was confirmed by an expert, which is the only way that the wool would become mutar.
 - **Ravin** went to EY and repeated the explanation of **R' Nachman** to **R' Yirmiya**. **R' Yirmiya** told him, that is incorrect based on the explanation of **R' Chiya bar Abba in the name of R' Yochanan** who said that the Braisa is discussing the case of where the animal itself became mixed with the other animals and where an examination of all the animals was then done and there was not a mum found among any of the animals. The machlokes between the **T"K** and **R' Yose** is the machlokes between **R' Meir and the Rabanan** in a Mishna, where **R' Meir** says, if there was a source of tumah in a field and it can no longer be found we say it remains tamei until we can determine what happened to the source of tumah. The **Rabanan** say we need only dig down until we hit rock or unworked soil and can then say it is tahor. Similarly, **R' Yose** of the Braisa holds like the **Rabanan** and therefore says that if the flock was examined and no mum is found they are now all fit to go on the Mizbe'ach. The **T"K** holds like **R' Meir** and therefore says that they are assur until the animal with the mum is found.
 - **R' Assi in the name of R' Yochanan** said that the machlokes is where some of the animals were checked and an animal with a mum was found. The machlokes is the same as a machlokes between **Rebbi and R' Shimon ben Gamliel** in a Braisa. The Braisa says, if a grave was "lost" in

a field, one who enters the field is tamei. If a grave is then found in the field, **Rebbi** says that we assume it is the grave that was lost and one who walks into the field does not become tamei. **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** says, we can't assume it is the same grave and must continue to search the entire field. The **T"K** holds like **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** and **R' Yose** holds like **Rebbi**.

- **R' Assi** doesn't explain like **R' Chiya bar Abba**, because he says that the case of tumah is different – the **Rabanan** hold that way there, because it is possible that an animal or bird came and removed the tumah. However, in the case of the animal with a mum it could not have simply disappeared, and therefore even the **Rabanan** would agree that they remain assur. **R' Chiya bar Abba** says that it is possible that the mum was only a temporary mum and had healed and therefore the **Rabanan** would still say that the animals are mutar.
- **R' Chiya bar Abba** does not say like **R' Assi**, because he says that in the case of the field **R' Shimon** holds that the entire field must be checked, because once we see this field was used for burying we have to be concerned that others were buried there as well. However, in the case of the animals, once an animal with a mum is found we can be sure that there are no others, because there is no reason to believe that any other animal has a mum! **R' Assi** holds that since the animals gore each other it is common to find others with a mum as well.
- **Q:** A Braisa says, if one removes wool from a bechor that doesn't have a mum, even if it later gets a mum and is shechted, the wool that was removed earlier remains assur. This suggests that it is only assur because there was no mum, but if it had a mum that wasn't yet confirmed by an expert the wool would later become mutar. This refutes **Reish Lakish**! **A:** The Tanna refers to an animal with an unconfirmed mum as an animal without a mum.