

דף יומי • בכורות • דף כ"ה

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

THE SUGYA

We begin the daf by diving straight into a classic yeshivish shakla v'tarya on the sugya of davar she'eino miskavein. The Gemara is bothered by a kasha on Rav, who seems to permit plucking hair to clear a space for shechita on Yom Tov. How can Rav permit this if he holds like Rabbi Yehuda that an unintentional melacha is prohibited? The Gemara works through several terutzim, analyzing whether plucking is considered shearing under Torah law, and exploring the unique halachos of shearing a red heifer.

We then move into a deeper analysis of the Mishnah's ruling regarding plucking hair without moving it from its place. The Gemara brings down a chiddush from Rav Ashi in the name of Reish Lakish, who limits this heter to plucking by hand, which leads the Gemara to carefully re-examine the wording of our Mishnah regarding the use of a cleaver.

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

עמוד א' DAF 25A

STATEMENT

מותר.

The previous ruling stated that plucking hair to facilitate slaughtering is **permitted**.

QUESTION

ומי אמר רב הכי?

The Gemara asks: **And did Rav** actually **say this**, that an unintentional melacha is permitted?

OBJECTION

והא אמר רב חייא בר אשי משמיה דרב: מסוכרין דנזייתא אסור להדוקיה ביומא טבא!

But doesn't Rav Chiyya bar Ashi say in the name of Rav: Regarding the cloth stopper of a barrel, it is prohibited to insert it tightly into the spout of the barrel on a Festival, because liquid will inevitably be squeezed out of the cloth, which is a prohibited melacha? This shows that Rav prohibits a davar she'eino miskavein!

ANSWER

בההיא, אפילו רבי שמעון מודה, דאבוי ורבא דאמרי תרוניהו: מודה רבי שמעון בפסיק רישיה ולא מות.

The Gemara answers: **In that** case of the stopper, **even Rabbi Shimon**, who normally permits an unintentional act, **concedes** that it is prohibited, **as Abaye and Rava both say: Rabbi Shimon concedes in a case of 'cut off its head and will it not die?',** meaning an inevitable consequence, that it is prohibited. Squeezing the stopper is a pesik reishei.

OBJECTION

וְהָא אָמַר רַב חִיְיָא בַּר אֲשִׁי אָמַר רַב: הֲלָכָה כְּרַבִּי יְהוּדָה,

The Gemara objects: **But doesn't Rav Chiyya bar Ashi say that Rav says: The halacha is in accordance with Rabbi Yehuda,** who prohibits a *davar she'eino miskavein*?

OBJECTION

וְרַב חָנַן בַּר אַמִּי אָמַר שְׁמוּאֵל: הֲלָכָה כְּרַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן,

And Rav Chanan bar Ami says that Shmuel says: The halacha is in accordance with Rabbi Shimon?

OBJECTION

וְרַב חִיְיָא בַּר אָבִין מִתְּנִי כְּלָא גְבָרִי: רַב אָמַר הֲלָכָה כְּרַבִּי יְהוּדָה, וְשְׁמוּאֵל אָמַר הֲלָכָה כְּרַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן!

And Rav Chiyya bar Avin teaches this dispute **without** mentioning the transmitting **men**, but directly: **Rav says the halacha is in accordance with Rabbi Yehuda, and Shmuel says the halacha is in accordance with Rabbi Shimon!** Thus, Rav clearly holds like Rabbi Yehuda.

RESOLUTION

אֲלָא, לְעוֹלָם סֵבֶר רַב: דְּבַר שְׁאִין מִתְּפִיזִין אָסוּר,

Rather, actually Rav holds that an **unintentional act is prohibited** like Rabbi Yehuda,

RESOLUTION

וְתוֹלֵשׁ לֹא הֵינּוּ גּוֹזְזִין,

and the reason he permits plucking here is because he holds that **plucking is not** considered **shearing** under Torah law,

RESOLUTION

וּבְיוֹם טוֹב הֵינּוּ טַעֲמָא דְשָׂרִי — דְּהָוָה לִיה עוֹקֵר דְּבַר מְגִידוּלוֹ כְּלֹאֲחֵר יָד.

and on a Festival, this is the reason that it is permitted to clear the hair with a cleaver: **because it is** considered **uprooting something from its place of growth in an unusual manner**, which is only a Rabbinic prohibition, and they permitted it for the sake of Simchas Yom Tov.

QUESTION

וְתוֹלֵשׁ לֹא הֵינּוּ גּוֹזְזִין?

The Gemara asks: **And is plucking not** considered **shearing**?

OBJECTION

וְהִתְנַגְּא: הַתּוֹלֵשׁ אֶת הַכְּנָף, וְהַקּוֹטֵמוֹ, וְהַמּוֹרְטוֹ — חַיִּיב שְׁלֹשׁ חֲטָאוֹת.

But isn't it taught in a braisa: One who plucks a large feather from the **wing** of a bird on Shabbos, **and one who snips its tip, and one who pulls out its thin threads, is liable to bring three sin-offerings** because he violated three distinct *melachos*?

OBJECTION

ואמר ריש לקיש: תולש — חייב משום גזוז, קוטים — חייב משום מחתך, מקרט — חייב משום
ממחק!

And Reish Lakish says in explanation: One who plucks is liable due to the melacha of shearing; one who snips is liable due to the melacha of cutting; and one who pulls out the threads is liable due to the melacha of smoothing! We see that plucking is indeed classified under shearing!

ANSWER

שאני כנה, דהיינו אורחיה.

The Gemara answers: Plucking a feather from a wing is different, as that is its normal manner of removal, whereas plucking hair from an animal is unusual and not the normal way of shearing.

INFERENCE

ומדרב סבר כרבי יוסי בן המשולם, רבי יוסי בן המשולם סבר לה כרב,

The Gemara notes: And since Rav holds in accordance with Rabbi Yosei ben HaMeshullam that plucking is not shearing, it must be that Rabbi Yosei ben HaMeshullam holds in accordance with Rav in general,

QUESTION

וסבר רבי יוסי בן המשולם דבר שאין מתכוין אסור?

and does Rabbi Yosei ben HaMeshullam really hold that an unintentional act is prohibited?

OBJECTION

והתנא: שתי שערות — עיקרן מאדים, וראשן משחיר, רבי יוסי בן המשולם אומר: גזוז במספרים,
ואינו חושש.

But isn't it taught in a braisa: Regarding a red heifer that had two hairs whose roots were red but whose tops were black, Rabbi Yosei ben HaMeshullam says: One shears the black tops with scissors, and he need not be concerned about violating the prohibition of shearing a consecrated animal. This is because his intent is only to make the heifer fit, showing that Rabbi Yosei ben HaMeshullam permits an unintentional act!

ANSWER

שאני פרה, דלאו בת גיזה היא.

The Gemara answers: A red heifer is different, as it is not subject to shearing under Torah law because it does not have wool, and that is why it is permitted.

OBJECTION

והתנא: "לא תעבד בכור שורך ולא תגזו בכור צאנה", ואין לי אלא שור בעבודה וצאן בגיזה, מניין
ליתן את האמור של זה בזה ואת האמור של זה בזה? תלמוד לומר: "לא תעבד... ולא תגזו"!

The Gemara objects: But isn't it taught in a braisa: The Torah states, 'You shall do no work with the firstborn of your ox, and you shall not shear the firstborn of your flock.' I only know that an ox is prohibited in labor and sheep in shearing; from where do we derive to apply that which is said of this one to that one, and that which is said of that one to this one? The Torah teaches: 'You shall do no work... and you shall not shear', linking them together. Thus, shearing does apply to cattle, including a red heifer!

ANSWER

אָלאַ, שְׂאֵנִי פֶּרֶה, דֶּקְדָּשִׁי בְּדֶק הַבַּיִת הִיא.

Rather, the Gemara suggests: A red heifer is different, as it has the sanctity of items consecrated for Temple maintenance, which are not subject to the Torah prohibition of shearing.

QUESTION

וְהָאֵמַר רַבִּי אֶלְעָזָר: קִדְּשִׁי בְּדֶק הַבַּיִת אֲסוּרִין בְּגִיזָה וְעִבּוּדָה!

The Gemara asks: But doesn't Rabbi Elazar say: Items consecrated for Temple maintenance are prohibited from being sheared or worked with?

ANSWER

מִדְּרַבָּנָן.

The Gemara answers: That prohibition is only by Rabbinic law.

OBJECTION

וְהָאֵיכָא אִיסוּרָא דְּרַבָּנָן!

The Gemara objects: But there is still a Rabbinic prohibition! Why did Rabbi Yosei ben HaMeshullam permit it?

RESOLUTION

אָלאַ, שְׂאֵנִי פֶּרֶה דִּלָּא שְׂכִיחָא.

Rather, the Gemara answers: A red heifer is different because it is uncommon, and the Rabbis did not apply their decree to uncommon cases.

QUESTION

וְלִיחֲלָה וְלִפְקָה לְחֻלִּין, וְלִיגְזָה וְהִדֵּר לִיקְדֻשָּׁה!

The Gemara challenges: But let him desacralize it and remove it to non-sacred status, and shear it, and then re-consecrate it!

ANSWER

דְּמִיתָ יְקָרִין.

The Gemara answers: Its price is expensive, and it would require a massive sum of money to redeem it.

QUESTION

וְלִיעֲבֹד לָהּ כְּדִשְׁמוּאֵל, דָּאֵמַר שְׁמוּאֵל: הֶקְדֵּשׁ שְׁוֵה מָנָה שְׁחִילָלוֹ עַל שְׁוֵה פְּרוּטָה מְחֻלָּל!

The Gemara asks: But let him act in accordance with Shmuel's ruling, as Shmuel says: A consecrated item worth one hundred dinars that one desacralized upon a coin worth a perutah is desacralized!

ANSWER

אִימּוֹר דָּאֵמַר שְׁמוּאֵל שְׁחִילָלוֹ, לְכַתְּחִלָּה מִי אֵמַר?

The Gemara answers: **You can say that Shmuel said** this post facto, that **he has successfully desacralized** it, but **did he say** one may do so **ab initio**? Therefore, he could not rely on this.

RESOLUTION

איבעית אימא: רב סבר לה כרבי יוסי בן המשולם, ורבי יוסי בן המשולם לא סבר לה כרב.

If you wish, say instead: Rav holds in accordance with Rabbi Yosei ben HaMeshullam that plucking is not shearing, but Rabbi Yosei ben HaMeshullam does not hold in accordance with Rav; rather, he permits a *davar she'eino miskavein*.

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

ותולש את השער, ובלבד שלא יזיזנו ממקומו.

The Mishnah taught: And he plucks the hair, provided that he does not move it from its place.

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

STATEMENT

אמר רב אשי אמר ריש לקיש: לא שנו אלא ביד, אבל בכלי — אסור.

Rav Ashi says that Reish Lakish says: They only taught this allowance to pluck by hand, but with an implement, it is prohibited.

OBJECTION

והקתני: עושה מקום בקופיץ מיכן ומיכן!

The Gemara asks: But doesn't the Mishnah teach: He clears space with a cleaver from here and from there? A cleaver is an implement!

RESOLUTION

תני: "לקופיץ".

The Gemara answers: Emend the text and **teach**: He clears space by hand **for the cleaver** to have room to slaughter.

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

וכן תולש את השער לראות מום.

The Mishnah continues: And likewise, one may pluck the hair to see the place of a blemish.

QUESTION

איבעיא להו: לכתחלה או דיעבד?

An inquiry was raised to them: Does this mean he may do so **ab initio**, or only **post facto**?

PROOF

אמר רבי ירמיה: תא שמע, צמר המסופך באוזן — רבי יוסי בן המשוילם אומר: תולשו ומראה את מומו.

Rabbi Yirmeyah said: Come and hear a proof from a braisa: Regarding wool that is tangled in the ear, Rabbi Yosei ben HaMeshullam says: He plucks it and shows its blemish to a specialist.

PROOF

שמע מינה לכתחלה, שמע מינה.

Learn from this that it is permitted **ab initio**. The Gemara concludes: Indeed, learn from this.

PROOF

אמר רב מרי: אף אנן נמי תנינא, וכן התוילש את השער לראות מקום מום.

Rav Mari said: We also learned this in our Mishnah: 'And likewise, one who plucks the hair to see the place of a blemish.'

PROOF

מאי "וכן"? אילימא שלא (יזינו את) [יזינו מ] מקומו — השתא ומה שוחט, דשחיטתו מוכחת עליו, לא יזינו — לראות מקום מום מיבעיא?

What is the meaning of 'and likewise'? If we say it means that he may not move it from its place, now, if for one who is slaughtering, whose slaughtering proves his intent is not to shear, the Mishnah says he may not move it, is it necessary to say this for one who is merely seeing the place of a blemish, where his intent is less obvious?

PROOF

א לא לאו אתוילש? שמע מינה לכתחלה, שמע מינה.

Rather, is it not referring to the ruling of Rabbi Yosei ben HaMeshullam that one may pluck **ab initio**? Learn from this that it is permitted **ab initio**. The Gemara concludes: Indeed, learn from this.

משנה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מתני' שער בכור בעל מום שנשר, והניחו בחלוו, ואחר כך שחטו — עקבא בן מהללאל מתיר,

MISHNAH: Regarding the hair of a blemished firstborn that fell out, and he placed it in a window-niche, and afterwards he slaughtered the animal, Akavya ben Mahalalel permits benefiting from the hair,

עמוד ב' DAF 25B

MISHNAH

וחכמים אוסרין, דברי רבי יהודה.

And the Sages prohibit using the wool; this is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda.

MISHNAH

אמר לו רבי יוסי: לא בזה התיר עקביא בן מהללאל,

Rabbi Yosei said to him: It was not in this case of a slaughtered firstborn that Akavya ben Mahalalel permitted the wool,

MISHNAH

אלא שער בעל מום שנשר והניחו בחלון ואחר כך מת —

rather, it was in the case of the hair of a blemished firstborn that shed on its own while the animal was alive, and he placed it in a window-compartment, and afterwards the animal died without being slaughtered —

MISHNAH

בזה עקביא בן מהללאל מתיר וחכמים אוסרין.

in this case Akavya ben Mahalalel permits the wool, and the Sages prohibit it even after the animal's death.

MISHNAH

צמר המדולדל בבכור, את שנראה עם הגיזה — מותר, ואת שאינו נראה עם הגיזה — אסור.

Regarding wool that is dangling from a firstborn animal, that which appears to be unified with the fleece when the animal is shorn after its death is permitted, and that which does not appear to be unified with the fleece is prohibited.

גמרא GEMARA

INFERENCE

גמ' מפלל דאסר,

The Gemara begins its analysis: **By inference**, Rabbi Yosei's statement implies that Akavya prohibited the wool if the animal was slaughtered. But this is difficult:

QUESTION

השתא במת — שרי, שחטו מיבעיא?

Now, if in a case where the animal died on its own, Akavya permits the shed wool, is it necessary to say that where he slaughtered it, which is a permitted act of slaughter, that the wool is permitted?

RESOLUTION

אָלָא, לֹא בְּזֶה הִתִּיר עֲקֵבָא וְחֻכָּיִם אוֹסְרִין, שְׁחָטוּ — דְּבָרֵי הַכֹּל שָׂרִי, כִּי פְּלִיגֵי בְּמַת.

Rather, this is what Rabbi Yosei meant: It was not in this case of a slaughtered animal that Akavya permitted and the Sages prohibited, because if he slaughtered it, everyone agrees it is permitted; they only argue in a case where the animal died.

STATEMENT

אָמַר רַבִּי אָסִי אָמַר רִישׁ לָקִישׁ: מַחְלוּקֶת בְּשֶׁהִתִּירוּ מוֹמָחָה,

Rabbi Asi says that Reish Lakish says: The dispute between Akavya and the Sages applies only where an expert had already permitted the animal for slaughter due to its blemish before the wool shed,

EXPLANATION

דָּמַר סָבֵר: גְּזֵרֵינוּ דְּלָמָּא אֵתִי לְשִׁהוּיָהּ, וּמָר סָבֵר: לֹא גְזֵרֵינוּ,

as one Master, the Sages, holds: We decree that the shed wool is prohibited lest he come to delay the slaughtering of the animal in order to collect more shed wool; and one Master, Akavya, holds: We do not decree this.

STATEMENT

אָבָל לֹא הִתִּירוּ מוֹמָחָה — דְּבָרֵי הַכֹּל אָסוּר.

But if an expert had not permitted it before the wool shed, everyone agrees that the wool is prohibited.

OBJECTION

מֵתִיב רַב שֶׁשֶּׁת: בַּעֲלֵי מוֹמִין אוֹסְרִין בְּכֹל שֶׁהוּא, וְרַבִּי יוֹסִי אוֹמֵר: יִבְקֹר.

Rav Sheshet raised an objection from a baraita: Blemished consecrated animals that became mixed up with unblemished ones render the entire mixture prohibited in any amount, and Rabbi Yosei says: Let the matter be investigated.

EXPLANATION

וְהִינֵנוּ כֹּה: מַאי "יִבְקֹר"? אֲלִימָא דְּבַעַל מוּם הוּא, וְלִישְׁקָלֶיהָ — מִכָּלֵל דְּתַנָּא קָמָא אָמַר לָאו?

And we discussed it: What is the meaning of "let it be investigated"? If we say it means to find which one is the blemished animal and remove it, by inference, does the First Tanna say that even if you remove it, the rest remain prohibited? That makes no sense!

EXPLANATION

אָמַר רַב נַחֲמָן אָמַר רַבָּה בַּר אַבּוּה: הֵכָּא בְּגִיזַת בְּכוֹר בַּעַל מוּם עֲסָקִינוּ, שְׁנַתְעָרְבוּ בְּגִיזֵי חוּלִין.

Rather, Rav Nachman says that Rabba bar Avuh says: Here we are dealing with the shearings of a blemished firstborn that became mixed up with shearings of chullin.

EXPLANATION

וּמֵאֵן תַּנָּא קָמָא? רַבִּי יְהוּדָה הִיא, דָּאָמַר: נִשְׁחָטוּ — אָסְרֵי רַבָּנָן.

And who is the First Tanna who prohibits the mixture? It is Rabbi Yehuda, who says in our Mishnah that even if they were slaughtered, the Rabbis prohibit the wool.

EXPLANATION

וְרַבִּי יוֹסִי לְטַעְמִיהָ, דָּאָמַר: נִשְׁחָטוּ — שָׂרוּ רַבָּנָן.

And Rabbi Yosei is consistent with his own reasoning, as he says: If they were slaughtered, the Rabbis permit the wool.

OBJECTION

וְתַתִּי: "יְבוֹקֵר", מַאי "יְבוֹקֵר"? לָאוּ אִי "מוֹם קָבוֹעַ" אִי "מוֹם עוֹבֵר" הוּא, אַךְ עַל גַּב שְׁלֹא הִתִּירוּ מוֹמָקָה.

And yet it teaches: "Let it be investigated." What is the meaning of "let it be investigated"? Is it not to see whether it is a permanent blemish or a temporary blemish, and if it is permanent, the wool is permitted, even though an expert had not yet permitted it before the wool fell off? This is a kasha on Reish Lakish!

RESOLUTION

אָמַר רָבָא: לֹא; יְבוֹקֵר, אִי הִתִּירוּ מוֹמָקָה — אִין, וְאִי לָא — לָא.

Rava said: No; "let it be investigated" means to check if an expert had permitted it before the wool fell off; if yes, it is permitted, and if not, no.

STATEMENT

כִּי סָלִיק רַבִּין, אָמַרָה לְשִׁמְעָתָא קַמִּיה דְּרַבִּי יִרְמְיָה.

When Ravin went up from Bavel to Eretz Yisrael, he said this teaching of Rav Nachman before Rabbi Yirmeyah.

OBJECTION

אָמַר: בְּבִלְאִי טַפְשָׁאִי, מְשוּם דִּיתְבִּי בְּאַרְעָא דְחֹשׁוּכָא אָמְרִי שְׁמַעְתָּא דְּמַחֲשָׁכֹן!

Rabbi Yirmeyah said: Foolish Babylonians! Because they dwell in a dark land, they say dark, unclear teachings!

EXPLANATION

לָא שְׁמִיעַ לָהּ הָא דְאָמַר רַבִּי חִיָּיא בַר אֲבָא אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: מַחֲלוּקָת בְּשִׁבְדָּק וְלֹא מִצָּא.

Did they not hear that which Rabbi Chiyya bar Abba says that Rabbi Yochanan says: The dispute in the baraita is actually about the animals themselves, where he searched the flock for the blemished animal and did not find it?

PROOF

וְקַמִּיפְלָגִי בְּפִלּוּגְתָּא דְּרַבִּי מֵאִיר וְרַבְּנָן, דִּתְנֹן, שְׁהָהּ רַבִּי מֵאִיר אוֹמֵר: כֹּל דְּכֹר שְׁהָהּ בְּחֻזְקַת טוּמְאָה — לְעוֹלָם הוּא בְּטוּמְאוֹתוֹ, עַד שְׁתִּיּוּדַע הַטּוּמְאָה.

And they argue in the dispute of Rabbi Meir and the Rabbis, as we learned in a Mishnah: For Rabbi Meir would say: Any object that was in a presumption of tumah remains forever in its tumah until the location of the tumah becomes known.

PROOF

וְחֻכָּמִים אוֹמְרִים: חוּפֵר עַד שְׁמַגִּיעַ לְסֵלַע אוֹ לְבִתּוּלָהּ.

And the Sages say: He digs until he reaches bedrock or virgin soil, and if he finds nothing, we assume it is tahor. Here too, the Sages hold that since he searched and did not find the blemished animal, we assume it is gone.

STATEMENT

רבי אסי אומר רבי יוחנן: מחלוקת בשפדק ומצא, וקמיפלגי בפלוגתא דרבי ורבן שמעון בן גמליאל.

Rabbi Asi says that Rabbi Yochanan says: The dispute is where he searched and found one blemished animal, and they argue in the dispute of Rabbi and Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel.

PROOF

דתניא: שדה שאבד בה קבר, נכנס בתוכה — טמא.

As it is taught in a braisa: A field in which a grave was lost, anyone who enters into it is tamei.

PROOF

נמצא בתוכה קבר, נכנס לתוכה — טהור, שאני אומר: הוא קבר שאבד הוא קבר שנמצא, דברי רבי.

If a grave was found in it, anyone who enters into it is tahor, because I say: The grave that was lost is the very same grave that was found; this is the statement of Rabbi.

PROOF

רבן שמעון בן גמליאל אומר: תיבדק כל השדה כולה.

Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says: The entire field must be searched to ensure there is not another grave.

QUESTION

ורבי אסי, מאי טעמא לא אומר כרבי חייא בר אבא?

The Gemara asks: And Rabbi Asi, what is the reason he did not say like Rabbi Chiyya bar Abba that they searched and did not find?

ANSWER

אמר לה: בשלמא גבי טומאה, אימר בא עורב ונטלה, בא עכבר ונטלה,

He could say to you: Granted regarding tumah, we can say a raven came and took it, or a mouse came and took it, which is why the Sages say it is gone;

ANSWER

אלא הקא — פעל מום להיכא אזיל?

but here, where did the blemished animal go? It could not have just vanished from the flock!

ANSWER

ואידך? אימר מום עובר תהו ואיתסי.

And the other Sage, Rabbi Chiyya? He says: We can say it was a temporary blemish and it healed, which is why it is no longer found.

QUESTION

ורבי חייא בר אבא מאי טעמא לא אומר כרבי אסי?

And Rabbi Chiyya bar Abba, what is the reason he did not say like Rabbi Asi that they found one?

ANSWER

אמר לך: בשלמא שדה, דרפה למיקבר בה, כי היכי דקבר בה האי — קבר אינש אחריןא.

He could say to you: **Granted a field, whose way is to bury in it, just as this person buried in it, another person might have also buried in it**, which is why Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel is concerned;

ANSWER

אלא קדשים, כיון דבדקי לו וקיימי, דרפייהו למיפל בהו מומא?

but consecrated animals, since they stand as checked and unblemished, is it their way to fall into blemishes so easily that we should assume another one became blemished?

ANSWER

ואידך — אגב דמנגחי אהדדי, שכיח בהו מומא.

And the other Sage, Rabbi Asi? He says: Since they gore one another, blemishes are common among them.

OBJECTION

מיתיבי: התוילש צמר מככור תם, אף על פי שנולד בו מום ושחטו — אסור.

They raised an objection: One who plucks wool from an unblemished firstborn, even though a blemish subsequently developed in it and he slaughtered it, the wool is prohibited.

INFERENCE

טעמא דתם,

The reason it is prohibited is because it was plucked when it was **unblemished**,

SUMMARY

The Gemara resolves the contradiction in Rav's rulings by explaining that plucking hair is not considered shearing under Torah law because it is an unusual manner of removal, and the Rabbis permitted it here for Simchas Yom Tov. In analyzing the opinion of Rabbi Yosei ben HaMeshullam regarding cutting the black tips of hairs on a red heifer, the Gemara clarifies that a red heifer only has the sanctity of items consecrated for Temple maintenance, which are not subject to the Torah prohibition of shearing, and the Rabbis did not apply their Rabbinic decree to such an uncommon case. Finally, the Gemara addresses the practical application of the Mishnah's heter, establishing that plucking is only permitted by hand, and emends the Mishnah's language regarding the cleaver accordingly.

The Gemara is bothered by how we can allow plucking hair to see a blemish or prepare for slaughter, and we delve into the classic yeshivish shakla v'tarya of *davar she'eino miskavein*, an action that brings about an unintended result. We see how the Chachamim carefully weigh the exact nature of our intentions, the inevitability of the outcome, and whether a situation is common or uncommon. It all comes down to a deep precision in how we define our actions and what we are actually trying to accomplish.

In our own *avodas Hashem*, we often find ourselves in situations where we want to do something good, but it might bring along some side effects or unintended consequences. Sometimes we hesitate to act because we are afraid of the 'messiness' or the secondary outcomes of our choices. The sugya teaches us that Hashem looks at the very definition of our actions. If your heart is set on doing a mitzvah, on bringing clarity and holiness into the world, you must learn the halachic guidelines of what is permitted and then move forward with confidence, without letting the fear of unintended side effects paralyze your growth.

Today, when you face a decision where doing the right thing might cause some minor, unintended complications, don't let it stop you. Consult the halacha, clarify your true intention to do the *ratzon Hashem*, and then act with a whole heart.