

דף יומי • בכורות • דף כ"ו

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

THE SUGYA

We start the daf by continuing our deep dive into the sugya of wool that was plucked or fell off a blemished bechor. The Gemara is bothered by a contradiction to Rabbi Asi's ruling from a baraita, and we try to resolve it by analyzing how the Tanna of the baraita defines an "unblemished" animal before an expert has actually ruled on its blemish. This leads us into a major shakla v'tarya regarding whether the ruling of Reish Lakish is subject to a Tannaic dispute.

To understand this, the Gemara brings down a fascinating baraita featuring a dispute between Akavya ben Mahalalel and the Sages regarding wool that fell out of a blemished bechor. We analyze three different ways to understand this dispute, as explained by the First Tanna, Rabbi Yehuda, and Rabbi Yosei. The Gemara then transitions to a new she'ilah raised by Rabbi Yannai regarding wool that fell out on its own from an unblemished Olah-offering, setting up a discussion on the halachic status of such wool.

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

עמוד א' DAF 26A

OBJECTION

הא בעל מום שרי, אף על פי שלא התירו מומקה!

But we can infer from the baraita that if it is a **blemished** firstborn, the use of its plucked wool is **permitted**, even though an expert **did not** yet **permit** the animal for slaughter! This contradicts the ruling of Rabbi Asi.

ANSWER

תנא: כל היכא דלא התירו מומקה — תם קרי ליה.

The Gemara answers: The **Tanna** of that baraita is of the opinion that **anywhere** that an expert **did not** yet **permit it**, he calls it an **unblemished** animal, even if it is physically blemished. Therefore, the baraita's prohibition of wool plucked from an 'unblemished' firstborn includes a blemished one before the expert's ruling.

STATEMENT

לימא כתנאי:

The Gemara suggests: **Shall we say** that this ruling of Reish Lakish is subject to a dispute **between Tannaim**? As we learned in the following baraita:

BRAISA

התולש צמר מבכור תם, אף על פי שנוול בו מום ושחטו — אסור.

One who plucks wool from an unblemished firstborn, even though a blemish subsequently developed in it and he slaughtered it based on that blemish, the use of the plucked wool is **prohibited**.

BRAISA

בְּכוֹר בַּעַל מוֹם שֶׁתֵּלַשׁ מִמֶּנּוּ, וְאַחֵר כֶּה מֵת — עֲקֵבְיָא בֶן מַהֲלֵלָא לִמְתִּיר, וְחֲכָמִים אוֹסְרִים.

But in the case of a blemished firstborn from which he plucked wool and afterwards it died without being slaughtered, Akavya ben Mahalalel permits the use of the wool, and the Sages prohibit it.

BRAISA

אָמַר רַבִּי יְהוּדָה: לֹא בָזָה הַתִּיר עֲקֵבְיָא בֶן מַהֲלֵלָא, אֶלָּא בְּשַׁעַר בְּכוֹר בַּעַל מוֹם שֶׁנֶּשֶׂר וְהִנִּיחוֹ בַּחֲלוֹן, וְאַחֵר כֶּה שִׁחְטוֹ — בָּזָה עֲקֵבְיָא בֶן מַהֲלֵלָא לִמְתִּיר, וְחֲכָמִים אוֹסְרִין.

Rabbi Yehuda said: It was not in this case of an animal that died that Akavya ben Mahalalel permitted the wool, but rather in the case of the hair of a blemished firstborn that fell out on its own, and he placed it in a window-compartment, and afterwards he slaughtered the animal; in this case Akavya ben Mahalalel permits the wool, and the Sages prohibit it.

BRAISA

אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹסֵי: מוֹדָה אָבָא חֲלַפְתָּא בָּזָה שֶׁהוּא מוֹתֵר, אֲבָל בְּיַיְחוד אֲמָרוּ חֲכָמִים: יִנִּיחֵנוּ בַּחֲלוֹן, שְׂמָא יֵשׁ תַּקְוָה.

Rabbi Yosei said: My father, Chalaphtha, concedes in this case of a slaughtered animal that it is permitted. But it was specifically regarding this that the Sages said: Let him place it in the window-compartment, because perhaps there is hope that it will eventually be permitted, since if he slaughters it, everyone agrees it is permitted.

BRAISA

שִׁחְטוֹ — דְּבָרֵי הַכֹּל מוֹתֵר, מֵת — עֲקֵבְיָא בֶן מַהֲלֵלָא לִמְתִּיר וְחֲכָמִים אוֹסְרִים.

If he slaughtered it, all agree that the wool is permitted; if it died, Akavya ben Mahalalel permits it and the Sages prohibit it.

QUESTION

רַבִּי יוֹסֵי — הֵינּוּ תַנָּא קָמָא!

The Gemara asks: The opinion of Rabbi Yosei is identical to that of the First Tanna! Both say that if he slaughtered it, it is permitted, and if it died, they dispute.

QUESTION

אֶלָּא לָאוּ הַתִּירוּ מוֹמָחָה אִיפָא בִּינְיָיָהוּ?

Rather, is it not that the requirement of the expert's permission is the difference between them?

EXPLANATION

דְּתַנָּא קָמָא סָבַר: הַתִּירוּ מוֹמָחָה — אִין, וְאִי לָא — לָא, וְאַתָּא רַבִּי יוֹסֵי לְמִימַר: אַף עַל גַּב דְּלֹא הַתִּירוּ מוֹמָחָה!

For the First Tanna holds: If the expert permitted it before the wool fell out, yes, it is permitted after shechita, but if not, no, it is not permitted. And Rabbi Yosei comes to say: It is permitted even though the expert did not yet permit it before the wool fell out. If so, Reish Lakish's ruling is a Tannaic dispute!

ANSWER

אמר רבא: לא, דכולי עלמא אי התירו מומחה — אין, אי לא התירו — לא,

Rava said: No, that is not the dispute, for everyone agrees that if the expert permitted it beforehand, yes, it is permitted, but if he did not permit it, no, it is not permitted.

EXPLANATION

ושלש מחלוקות בדבר,

And there are three distinct disputes in this matter of how to understand Akavya and the Sages:

EXPLANATION

דתנא קמא סבר: פליגי במת, והוא הדין לשחטו, והאי דקמיפלגי במת — להודיעה פחו דעקביא.

For the First Tanna holds: They dispute in a case where the animal died, and the same law applies to where he slaughtered it—they dispute there too. And the fact that they dispute in the case of where it died is to let you know the far-reaching power of Akavya, who permits it even when it died.

EXPLANATION

ורבי יהודה סבר: במת — דברי הכל אסור, כי פליגי — בשחטו,

And Rabbi Yehuda holds: In a case where it died, all agree that it is prohibited; when they dispute, it is specifically in a case where he slaughtered it.

EXPLANATION

ואתא רבי יוסי למימר: בשחטו — דברי הכל מותר, כי פליגי — במת.

And Rabbi Yosei comes to say: In a case where he slaughtered it, all agree that it is permitted; when they dispute, it is only in a case where it died.

RULING

אמר רב נחמן: הלכה כרבי יהודה, הואיל ותנן בבבכירתא פויתיה, דתנן:

Rav Nachman said: The halacha is like Rabbi Yehuda, since we learned in the chosen tractate, Eduyos, in accordance with his opinion, as we learned there in a Mishnah:

PROOF

שער בכור בעל מום שנשר והניחו בחלון, ואחר כך שחטו — עקביא פן מהללאל מתיר, וחכמים אוסרין.

The hair of a blemished firstborn that fell out and he placed it in a window-compartment, and afterwards he slaughtered it—Akavya ben Mahalalel permits it, and the Sages prohibit it.

PROOF

אמר רב נחמן בר יצחק: מתניתין נמי דיקא, דתנן:

Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak said: Our Mishnah is also precise in supporting this, as we learned in the latter clause of our Mishnah:

MISHNAH

צֶמֶר הַמְדוּלָּדֵל בְּבִכּוֹר, אֶת שֶׁנִּרְאָה עִם הַגִּיזָה — מוֹתֵר, וְאֶת שֶׁאִינוֹ נִרְאָה — אָסוּר.

Dangling wool on a firstborn: that which appears level with the sheared fleece is permitted when shorn after its death, and that which does not appear level with the fleece is prohibited.

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

QUESTION

מִנִּי? אֵילִימָא רַבִּי יוֹסֵי;

The Gemara analyzes this: Whose opinion is this? If we say it is Rabbi Yosei,

OBJECTION

וּבִמְאִי? אֵילִימָא בְּשַׁחֲטוֹ — בֵּין עֲקֻבָּיָא בֵּין רַבֵּנּוּ, אִידֵי וְאִידֵי מִשְׁרָא שְׂרִי!

and in what case does it speak? If we say in a case where he slaughtered it, then according to Rabbi Yosei, both according to Akavya and according to the Rabbis, both this wool and that wool are permitted!

QUESTION

וְאֵלָא בְּמָת?

But rather, must we say it speaks in a case where the animal died?

OBJECTION

וְאִי רַבֵּנּוּ — אִידֵי וְאִידֵי מִיֶּסֶר אָסְרִי,

If the Mishnah follows the Rabbis, both this wool and that wool are prohibited because the animal died.

OBJECTION

וְאִי עֲקֻבָּיָא — אֵיפְכָא מִיַּבְעָא לִיה: נִרְאָה עִם הַגִּיזָה — אָסוּר, דְּמִיתָה קְאָסְרָה לִיה; אִינוֹ נִרְאָה עִם

הַגִּיזָה — מוֹתֵר, דְּמַעֲיָקְרָא תְּלִישׁ!

And if it follows Akavya, he should have required the opposite: that which appears level with the sheared fleece should be prohibited, because the death of the animal prohibits it since it is considered attached; and that which does not appear level with the sheared fleece should be permitted, because from the beginning it was considered detached before death!

EXPLANATION

אֵלָא פְּשִׁיטָא רַבִּי יְהוּדָה, וּבִמְאִי?

Rather, it is obvious that the Mishnah follows Rabbi Yehuda. And in what case does it speak?

OBJECTION

אִי־לִימָא בְּמַת — בֵּין לְעֻקְבָּא בֵּין לְרִבְנָן, אִידִי וְאִידִי מִיֶּסֶר אֶסְרִי!

If we say in a case where the animal died, both according to Akavya and according to the Rabbis, both this wool and that wool are prohibited!

QUESTION

אָלָא לָאוּ בְּשַׁחֲטוּ?

Rather, is it not speaking in a case where he slaughtered it?

OBJECTION

וְאִי עֻקְבָּא — אִידִי וְאִידִי מִשְׁרָא שְׂרִי!

And if it follows Akavya, both this wool and that wool are permitted!

EXPLANATION

אָלָא לָאוּ רִבְנָן הִיא? וְשָׁמַע מִיִּנְחָ: בְּשַׁחֲטוּ פְּלִיגִי.

Rather, is it not that the Mishnah is according to the Rabbis who argue with Akavya? And learn from this that they dispute in a case where he slaughtered it, just as Rabbi Yehuda said.

RESOLUTION

שָׁמַע מִיִּנְחָ.

The Gemara concludes: Indeed, learn from this.

QUESTION

בְּעֵי רַבִּי יֵנְאִי: הַתּוֹלֵשׁ צֶמֶר מֵעוֹלָה תְּמִימָה, מָהוּ?

Rabbi Yannai asked: One who plucks wool from an unblemished Olah-offering, what is the law regarding the use of this wool?

QUESTION

תּוֹלֵשׁ? מִי אֵיכָא מֵאֵן דְּשֶׁרִי?

The Gemara wonders: One who actively plucks it? Is there anyone who permits this? Plucking is a violation of the prohibition against shearing consecrated animals!

QUESTION

אָלָא, צֶמֶר שֶׁנִּתְּלַשׁ מֵעוֹלָה תְּמִימָה, מָהוּ?

Rather, the question must be: Wool that fell out on its own from an unblemished Olah-offering, what is the law?

EXPLANATION

דְּחֻטָּאת וְאַשָּׁם לֹא תִּבְעֵי לָהּ, דְּכִיּוֹן דְּלִכְפָּרָה אָתוּ — לֹא מִשְׁהוּ לָהּ.

The Gemara explains the scope of the question: Do not ask your question regarding a Chatas or an Asham, because since they come for atonement, one does not delay them from being offered, so there is no concern that wool will fall out while waiting.

EXPLANATION

דְּבָכּוֹר וּמַעֲשֵׂר נָמִי, דְּכִיּוֹן דְּלֹא לְכַפֵּרָה אֶתּוּ — מִשְׁהוּ לָהּ.

And regarding a firstborn and animal tithe also do not ask, because since they do not come for atonement, one delays them until they develop a blemish, and we already know their laws.

QUESTION

כִּי תִיבְעִי לָךְ דְּעוּלָה, מֵאִי? כִּיּוֹן

When you should ask your question, it is regarding an Olah-offering: what is the law? Since it does not come for atonement, does one delay it, or not?

צמוד ב' DAF 26B

QUESTION

דְּעִיקָר לֹא לְכַפֵּרָה אֶתּוּ — מִשְׁהִי לָהּ,

Is it that since its primary purpose is not to come for atonement, but rather as a gift to the Kohen, he will delay it and keep it around, and we must therefore forbid the wool?

QUESTION

אוּ דְלָמָּא, כִּיּוֹן דְּעוּלָה נָמִי מְכַפֵּרָא אַעֲשֵׂה — לֹא מִשְׁהִי לָהּ?

Or perhaps, since a burnt offering also effects atonement for neglecting to perform a positive mitzva, he is anxious to get his kapparah and will not delay it, meaning there is no concern?

PROOF

תָּא שְׁמַע: הֲתוּלֵשׁ צֶמֶר מִבְּכוֹר תָּם, אֲרֵי עַל פִּי שְׁנוּלָד בּוּ מוּם, שְׁהָטוּ — אָסוּר.

The Gemara suggests: Come and hear a resolution from a braisa: One who plucks wool from an unblemished firstborn animal, even though a blemish subsequently developed in it and he then slaughtered it on account of its blemish, benefit from the wool is prohibited.

INFERENCE

טַעֲמָא דְתוּלֵשׁ, הָא נִתְלָשׁ — שְׂרִי,

The Gemara infers: The reason it is prohibited is specifically because he plucked it by hand, but if it was torn out on its own, it is permitted,

INFERENCE

וְכָל שֶׁכֵּן עוּלָה דְלֹא מִשְׁהִי לָהּ!

and all the more so in the case of a burnt offering, where he does not delay it, that its torn-out wool should be permitted!

REFUTATION

הוּא הָדִין אֲפִילוּ נִתְלָשׁ נָמִי אָסוּר,

The Gemara rejects this: The same law applies that even if the wool was torn out on its own, it is also prohibited,

EXPLANATION

וְהָאִי דִקְתַּנִּי "תוֹלֵשׁ" לְהוֹדִיעָהּ כְּחוֹ דְעֻקְבָּיָא, דְּכִבְעַל מוֹם אֶפִּילוּ בְּתוֹלֵשׁ נִמְי שְׂרִי.

and this which the braisa teaches using the term "plucks" is to let you know the power of Akavya ben Mahalalel, who maintains that in the case of a blemished animal, even if one plucks the wool, it is also permitted.

QUESTION

וְהָאֵנוּ "נִשְׂר" תָּנוּ!

The Gemara asks: **But didn't we learn** in our Mishnah that the hair "**was shed**" on its own, rather than plucked?

ANSWER

תָּנָא "נִשְׂר" לְהוֹדִיעָהּ כְּחוֹ דְרַבְּנָן, תָּנָא "תוֹלֵשׁ" לְהוֹדִיעָהּ כְּחוֹ דְעֻקְבָּיָא.

The Gemara explains: Our Mishnah taught "was shed" to let you know the power of the Rabbis, who deem the wool prohibited even in such a lenient case; whereas the braisa taught "plucks" to let you know the power of Akavya, who permits it even in such a stringent case.

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

צֶמֶר הַמְּדוּלָּדֵל כּוּי.

We learned in the Mishnah: **Wool that is dangling** from a firstborn but was not completely detached is permitted if it appears to be part of the fleece, but otherwise it is prohibited.

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

QUESTION

הִיכִי דָמִי "אֵינוֹ נִרְאָה עִם הַגִּיזָה"?

The Gemara inquires: **What is considered** a case of "that which does not appear to be part of the fleece"?

ANSWER

אָמַר רַבִּי אֶלְעָזָר אָמַר רִישׁ לָקִישׁ: כָּל שֶׁעִקְרוֹ הֶפּוּהַ כְּלָפִי רֹאשׁוֹ.

Rabbi Elazar said that Reish Lakish said: This includes any strand of wool whose root is overturned and is facing toward its top, pointing outward.

ANSWER

רַב נָתַן בַּר אוֹשְׁעִיָּא אָמַר: כָּל שֶׁאֵינוֹ מְתַמְעָה עִם הַגִּיזָה.

Rav Natan bar Oshaya said: This includes any strand of wool that is not compressed together with the rest of the fleece when the fleece is pressed down.

QUESTION

וְרִישׁ לָקִישׁ, מַאי טַעְמָא לָא אָמַר כָּרַב נָתַן בַּר אוֹשְׁעִיָּא?

The Gemara asks: **And Reish Lakish**, what is the reason he did not state his explanation in accordance with Rav Natan bar Oshaya, whose explanation seems closer to the literal words?

ANSWER

אָמַר רַבִּי אִילְעָא: קָסָבַר רִישׁ לָקִישׁ, לְפִי שְׂאֵי אֶפְשָׁר לְגִיזָה בְּלֹא נִימִין חֲמֻדוֹלָדוֹת.

Rabbi Ile'a said: **Reish Lakish** holds that the Sages did not prohibit strands that are not compressed, because it is impossible for there to be a fleece without dangling strands. If we followed Rav Natan bar Oshaya, the fleece of a dead firstborn would never be permitted.

STATEMENT

הֲדַרְוּ עֲלֵה הַלּוֹחִם בְּהֶמָּה.

May we return to you, "He who purchases a beast"!

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מִתְּנִי' עַד כַּמָּה יִשְׂרָאֵל חֵיבִין לִיטְפֹל בְּכֹכּוֹר?

MISHNAH: Until when must an Israelite tend to and raise a firstborn animal before giving it to the Kohen?

MISHNAH

בַּדָּקָה — שְׁלֹשִׁים יוֹם, וּבַגֹּסֶס — חֲמִשִּׁים יוֹם.

With regard to a small animal, like a sheep or goat, it is thirty days; and with regard to a large animal, like cattle, it is fifty days.

MISHNAH

רַבִּי יוֹסִי אוֹמֵר: בַּדָּקָה — שְׁלֹשָׁה חֳדָשִׁים.

Rabbi Yosei says: With regard to a small animal, it is three months.

MISHNAH

אָמַר לוֹ הַכֹּהֵן בְּתוֹךְ הַזְּמַן: "תִּתְּנֵהוּ לִי" — הָרִיזָה לֹא יִתְּנֶנּוּ לוֹ.

If the Kohen said to him within this period: "Give it to me," this owner may not give it to him.

MISHNAH

וְאִם בַּעַל מוֹם הוּא, וְאָמַר לוֹ: "תִּתְּנֵהוּ לִי שְׂאוֹכְלָנוּ" — מוֹתֵר.

And if it is a blemished firstborn, and the Kohen said to him: "Give it to me so that I may eat it," it is permitted for the owner to give it to him.

MISHNAH

וּבְשַׁעַת הַמִּקְדָּשׁ, אִם הָיָה תָמִים, אָמַר לוֹ: "תֵּן [לִי] וְאֶקְרִיבֶנּוּ" — מוֹתֵר.

And at the time of the Temple, if it was unblemished, and the Kohen said to him: "Give it to me and I will sacrifice it," it is permitted to give it to him.

MISHNAH

הַבְּכוֹר נֹאכָל שָׁנָה בְּשָׁנָה, בֵּין תָּם בֵּין בַּעַל מוּם, שְׁנַיִמָּר: "לִפְנֵי ה' אֱלֹהֶיךָ תֹאכְלֵנוּ שָׁנָה בְּשָׁנָה."

The firstborn is eaten year by year, within its first year, whether it is unblemished or whether it is blemished, as it is stated: "Before Hashem your Elokim you shall eat it year by year".

MISHNAH

נולד לו מום בתוך שנתו — רשאי לקיימו כל שנים עשר חדש.

If a blemish developed in it within its first year, he is permitted to keep it for the entire twelve months of its first year.

MISHNAH

לאחר שנים עשר חדש — אינו רשאי לקיימו אלא שלשים יום.

But if the blemish developed after twelve months have already passed, he is permitted to keep it for only thirty days.

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

QUESTION

גְּמ' מְנַהֵגִי מִיָּלִי?

GEMARA: From where are these matters regarding the thirty and fifty days derived?

ANSWER

אמר רב כהנא: דאמר קרא "בכור בניה תתן לי", "כן תעשה לצאנה".

Rav Kahana said: As the verse states: "The firstborn of your sons you shall give to Me," and immediately afterward it says: "So you shall do with your sheep." This teaches that just as a firstborn son is redeemed at thirty days, so too a sheep is given at thirty days.

ANSWER

"מלאאתה ודמעה לא תאחר", "כן תעשה לשורה".

And the verses also state: "You shall not delay the fullness of your harvest, and of the outflow of your presses," and then: "So you shall do with your ox." This teaches that just as the first fruits are brought on Shavuot, fifty days after Pesach, so too the firstborn ox is given at fifty days.

QUESTION

איפוך אנא!

The Gemara challenges: I could reverse the derivation and say that the ox requires thirty days and the sheep fifty days!

ANSWER

מסתברא דמקדם למקדם, דמאחר לדמאחר.

The Gemara explains: **It is logical that that which is mentioned earlier** in the first verse corresponds to **that which is mentioned earlier** in the second verse, and **that which is mentioned later** corresponds to **that which is mentioned later**.

OBJECTION

אֲדַרְבָּהּ, דְּסָמִיךְ לִיָּהּ לְדָסָמִיךְ לִיָּהּ!

The Gemara objects: **On the contrary, that which is closest to it** in the text should correspond to **that which is closest to it**!

RESOLUTION

אֶלָּא אָמַר רַבָּא: אָמַר קָרָא "תַּעֲשֶׂה", הוֹסִיף לָהּ הַכָּתוּב עֲשֵׂיָּהּ אַחֲרֵת בְּשׁוּרָהּ.

Rather, Rava said: The verse states "you shall do" in the case of the ox, which teaches that the verse added for you another act of doing, i.e., extra time, with your ox beyond the thirty days of the sheep.

QUESTION

וְאֵימָא: שִׁיתִּין!

The Gemara asks: **But** why fifty? **Say** he must keep it for **sixty** days!

ANSWER

לֹא מִסְרָהּ הַכָּתוּב אֶלָּא לְחֻכָּמִים.

The Gemara answers: **The verse only handed over** the exact determination of the time **to the Sages**, who established it as fifty days.

PROOF

תִּנְיָא נָמִי הָכִי: "בְּכוֹר בְּנֶיךָ תִּתֵּן לִי", "כֵּן תַּעֲשֶׂה לְצֹאנְךָ" — יָכוֹל אֶף לְשׁוּרָהּ?

This is also taught in a braisa: "The firstborn of your sons you shall give to Me," "So you shall do with your sheep" — I might have thought this applies even to your ox, that it requires only thirty days?

PROOF

תִּלְמוּד לֹוֹמַר: "תַּעֲשֶׂה" — הוֹסִיף לָהּ הַכָּתוּב עֲשֵׂיָּהּ אַחֲרֵת בְּשׁוּרָהּ, לֹא מִסְרָהּ הַכָּתוּב אֶלָּא לְחֻכָּמִים.

Therefore the verse states: "You shall do" — the verse added for you another act of doing with your ox, and the verse only handed over the determination to the Sages.

PROOF

מָכָאן אָמְרוּ: עַד כַּמָּה יִשְׂרָאֵל חַיִּיבִין לְהַטְפִּיל בְּבִכּוֹר? בְּבִהֶמָּה דְקָה — שְׁלֹשִׁים יוֹם, בְּגִטָּה — חֲמִשִּׁים יוֹם.

From here they said: Until when must an Israelite tend to a firstborn? With regard to a small animal, thirty days; with regard to a large animal, fifty days.

BRAISA

רַבִּי יוֹסֵי אוֹמֵר: בִּדְקָה — שְׁלֹשָׁה חֳדָשִׁים, מִפְּנֵי שִׁטְפוּלָהּ מְרֻבָּה.

Rabbi Yosei says: With regard to a small animal, three months, because its tending is extensive.

EXPLANATION

תנא: מפני ששיניה דקות.

A Tanna **taught** in explanation: This is **because its teeth are small** and it needs more time to nurse.

QUESTION

אם אמר לו הפה בתוך הזמן "תנהו לי", הרי זה לא יתן לו. מאי טעמא?

The Mishnah taught: **If the Kohen said to him within this period: "Give it to me," this owner may not give it to him.**
What is the reason for this?

ANSWER

אמר רב ששת: מפני שנראה ככהן המסייע בבית הגרנות.

Rav Sheshet said: **Because he appears like a Kohen who assists in the granaries** to get gifts, which is a degradation of the priesthood.

BRAISA

תנו רבנן: הכהנים והלוים והעניים המסייעים בבית הרועים, ובבית הגרנות, ובבית המטבחים — אין נותנין להם תרומה ומעשר בשכרן,

The Rabbis taught: **Kohanim, Levi'im, and poor people who assist owners in the shearing place, in the granaries, or in the slaughterhouses** — we do not give them **terumah, ma'aser, or the priestly gifts as their wages** for helping,

BRAISA

ואם עושין כן חיללו, ועליהן הכתוב אומר: "שחתם ברית ה' לי",

and if they do so, they have desecrated the holiness of the gifts, and about them the verse says: "You have corrupted the covenant of Levi,"

BRAISA

ואומר: "ואת קדשי בני ישראל לא תחללו ולא תמותו".

and it says: "And you shall not profane the holy things of the children of Israel, lest you die."

QUESTION

מאי "ואומר"?

The Gemara asks: **What is** the purpose of adding the second verse introduced by "and it says"?

ANSWER

וכי תימא: מיתה לא — תא שמע: "ואת קדשי בני ישראל לא תחללו ולא תמותו".

The Gemara explains: **And if you should say** that they violate a prohibition but the punishment of **death is not** incurred, **come and hear:** "And you shall not profane the holy things of the children of Israel, lest you die."

STATEMENT

ובקשו חכמים לקונסן, ולהיות מפרישין עליהן תרומה משלם,

And the Sages wished to penalize them, and to have them separate terumah from their own intact produce on behalf of the Kohanim who took the gifts as wages,

EXPLANATION

ומפני מה לא קנסום? דלמא אתי לאפרושי מן הפטור על החיוב.

but for what reason did they not penalize them? Lest they come to separate from that which is exempt for that which is obligated, which is halachically invalid.

STATEMENT

ובכולן יש בהן

And in all of them, there is in them a certain status...

SUMMARY

The daf focuses on resolving the Tannaic opinions regarding wool that was detached from a blemished bechor. We analyze the positions of Akavya ben Mahalalel and the Sages, looking at whether they argue in a case where the animal died or where it was slaughtered, and how the requirement of an expert's permission affects the wool's status. Rav Nachman rules that the halacha follows Rabbi Yehuda's understanding because it is supported by the Mishnah in Eduyos, and Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak brings a raaya to this from the wording of our own Mishnah. Finally, the Gemara raises a kasha from Rabbi Yannai regarding wool that fell off an unblemished Olah-offering, distinguishing it from a Chatas or Asham which are brought for atonement.

The Mishnah in our new perek asks a very basic question: "Until when is an Israelite obligated to care for a firstborn animal?" For a small animal like a sheep, it is thirty days, and for a large animal like a cow, it is fifty days. The Gemara brings the source from the pesukim: "The firstborn of your sons you shall give to Me, so shall you do for your oxen and your sheep." But lichoira, why does the Torah make the owner go through all this trouble? If the bechor belongs to the kohen, let the kohen come and take it right away! Why must the owner spend his own money, time, and energy feeding and tending to an animal that isn't even his?

The answer is a deep yesod in avodas Hashem. When Hashem gives us a mitzvah, He does not want us to just "get rid of it" or pass the burden along as quickly as possible. The Torah is telling us: "tappil bo", you must care for it, invest in it, and carry the responsibility yourself for a set time. It is easy to do a mitzvah when it requires no ongoing effort, but the real ratzon Hashem is that we should become nosei b'ol, carrying the weight of the holiness that enters our domain.

We often find ourselves wanting to rush through our obligations, to just "get them over with" so we can move on. Whether it is taking care of a needy family member, preparing for a mitzvah, or even sitting down to learn, the yetzer hara whispers to us to find the quickest way out. But the Torah teaches us that the care itself, the daily bother and the quiet investment of our time, is exactly where the kedushah lies.

Today, when a mitzvah or a chesed opportunity comes your way that requires ongoing effort, do not look for the quickest exit. Embrace the "tippul", the daily care and responsibility, knowing that Hashem wants your personal investment and effort, not just a completed task.