

אם יש בו מום – יעלה וישחוט, ואם לאו – לא ישחוט. רבי שמעון אומר: כל שאין מומו ניכר מבעוד יום – אין זה מן המוכן.

גמ' במאי קא מפלגי? אי נימא ברואין מומין קמפלגי, דרבי יהודה סבר: רואין מומין ביום טוב, ורבי שמעון סבר: אין רואין מומין ביום טוב, ולפלגי ברואין מומין דעלמא.

בכור שנגפל לבור אצטריכא ליה, סלקא דעתך אמינא: משום צער בעלי חיים לערים ולסקיה, ברבי יהושע קא משמע לן.

אי הכי "לא ישחוט"? "לא יעלה וישחוט" מבעי ליה. לא צריכא דעבר ואסקיה, סלקא דעתך אמינא לשחטיה, קא משמע לן.

לשחטיה?! הא תם הוא! לא צריכא, דנפל ביה מומא. והא מוקצה הוא!

אלא דנפל ביה מום עובר מערב יום טוב, והשתא הוה ליה מום קבוע. מהו דתימא: דדעתיה עלויה ונשחטיה, קא משמע לן.

If it has a permanent blemish, owing to which it may be slaughtered and eaten, he may raise it from the cistern and slaughter it; but if it does not have a blemish, or if its blemish is temporary, he may not slaughter it. Rabbi Shimon says: Even if it has a blemish, it is prohibited to slaughter it, as any firstborn animal whose blemish is not perceptible while it is still day, i.e., on the day before the Festival, is not considered to be among the animals prepared prior to the Festival for use on the Festival.

GEMARA The Gemara asks: With regard to what principle do Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Shimon disagree?^N If we say that they disagree about whether or not one may examine blemishes on a Festival, such that Rabbi Yehuda holds that one may examine blemishes on a Festival, and Rabbi Shimon holds that one may not examine blemishes on a Festival,^{NH} if so, let them disagree with regard to examining blemishes in general on a Festival and not only with respect to the particular case of a firstborn that fell into a cistern.

The Gemara answers: It was necessary to teach the disagreement with regard to the case of a firstborn that fell into a cistern,^H as it could enter your mind to say that because of the matter of the suffering of living creatures, one should employ an artifice to circumvent the *halakha* and raise the animal from the cistern. This would be in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehoshua, who states elsewhere (37a) with regard to a different case that one may employ an artifice in order to rescue an animal that fell into a cistern on a Festival. Therefore, the mishna teaches us that Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Shimon disagree even in the case of a firstborn that fell into a cistern.

The Gemara asks: If so, if the mishna mentions the case of a firstborn that fell into a cistern in order to teach that an artifice may not be employed to raise the animal from the cistern, the phrase: He may not slaughter it, is inaccurate. Rather, it should have stated: He may not raise the animal and slaughter it. The Gemara answers: No, this teaching is necessary in a case where he transgressed the prohibition and already raised it, as it could enter your mind to say that he may now slaughter it. Therefore, the mishna teaches us that even then he may not do so.

The Gemara expresses wonder at this answer: How could one think that he may now slaughter it? Isn't the animal unblemished? How could one imagine that it is permitted to slaughter a firstborn that is unblemished? The Gemara answers: This teaching is necessary only in a case where it developed a blemish after it fell. The Gemara challenges this argument: But how could one think that he may now slaughter the animal? Doesn't it fall into the category of *muktze*, as it was not fit to be eaten on the eve of the Festival, since at that time it was still unblemished? In that case, it should remain in the category of *muktze* for the duration of the Festival.

Rather, the mishna is speaking of a case where the animal developed a temporary blemish, one that might eventually heal, on the eve of the Festival, and now, after falling, it has a permanent blemish. Lest you say that his mind was set on the animal as food already before the Festival due to the temporary blemish and therefore he should now be allowed to slaughter it, the mishna teaches us that since it was not fit to be eaten before the Festival, it is not considered prepared for use on the Festival. Rather, it falls into the category of *muktze* and may not be slaughtered.

NOTES

The dispute between Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Shimon – **מחלוקת רבי יהודה ורבי שמעון**: The dispute between Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Shimon has been explained in several ways. Rashi suggests that Rabbi Shimon's stringency is either because the act of permitting a firstborn is considered an act of repair that is prohibited on a Festival, or because it is deemed a violation of the rabbinic prohibition against rendering judgment on a Festival. See the *Hatam Sofer* and the *Ketav Sofer*, who combine these two explanations into one. *Tosafot* argue that the wording of Rabbi Shimon's statement: Is not considered among the animals prepared for use on the Festival, proves that the dispute is related to the *halakhot* of *muktze*. Many early authorities agree and view this as the main reason. However, *Tosafot* themselves indicate that there must be more than one reason involved here, as well as a different reason for the basic prohibition against examining firstborns on Festivals.

ראיית מומים ביום טוב – Examining blemishes on a Festival – Various reasons have been suggested for the prohibition against examining firstborns on a Festival. In the Jerusalem Talmud a view is cited that the dispute relates to the *halakha* that an expert must examine and permit the firstborn. According to Rabbi Shimon, the expert's examination is regarded like the rendering of judgment, and that is what permits the firstborn, and so the examination is prohibited on a Festival; whereas in Rabbi Yehuda's opinion the blemish itself renders the firstborn permitted, and the expert's decision is a mere clarification and confirmation of that status without any real judgment taking place. The *Ra'avad* suggests two other reasons for stringency. First, if it turns out that the firstborn does not have a blemish, one will have moved a *muktze* object on a Festival. Second, there is a concern that the expert might be overly lenient in his judgment so that there will be food for the joy of the Festival (see *Bigdei Yom Tov*).

In the *Migdal Oz* it is explained that the reason for the stringent ruling is that drunkenness is common on a Festival, which might lead the expert to err in his judgment. The *Rambam* explains that the blemishes of sacred animals may not be examined, because if the Sage rules that an animal is permitted, the owner might slaughter it on the Festival even though it is *muktze*.

HALAKHA

ראיית מומים ביום טוב – Examining blemishes on a Festival – One may not examine the blemishes of a firstborn on a Festival. The *halakha* is ruled in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Shimon, based on the conclusion of the Gemara (*Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim 498:9*).

A firstborn that fell into a cistern – בכור שנגפל לבור: If an unblemished firstborn falls into a cistern on a Festival, one may not raise it from the cistern, but one may feed it where it is. Even if one transgresses this prohibition and brings the animal up, and then discovers that it is in fact blemished, he may not slaughter it (*Shulhan Arukh, Oraḥ Hayyim 498:9*).

NOTES

They already said that one may not examine – הרי אמרו – אין רואין: Several later authorities point out that this does not appear to present a difficulty to Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi at all, as the same *baraita* in which the Sages issued that statement also states that it is a matter of dispute. They note that Rashi hints at this difficulty and attempts to resolve it. The author of the *Rishon LeTziyyon* writes that Rabbi Shimon ben Menasya did not cite this *baraita* as a challenge to Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi; rather, he did so merely to remind him that the matter is disputed and that a lenient ruling is not straightforward in this case.

Perek III
Daf 26 Amud b

NOTES

Father would teach – אבא תני – Some explain that this is not referring to Rav Nahman's own father but to Rabba's father, Rav Huna. This clarifies the question he asks: If the father prohibits it, how can the son hold it is permitted (Rabbi Yosef Hanina Meizlish)?

If he transgressed and examined it – אם עבר וביקר – The reason that this is prohibited *ab initio* even though the animal was certainly prepared before the Festival is that the Sages sought to apply their decrees to all cases, so that even in a case where the examination of an animal is prohibited not only as a stringency, but according to the letter of the law, people would not come to treat this activity lightly (Rabbi Aharon HaLevi).

From the fact that it is taught in three parts – מדקתני – Why does Abaye rely on that *baraita* rather than the statement of Rav Nahman's father? One answer is that the first *baraita* was well known and taught in the study halls, whereas only a few scholars were familiar with the other one. Another explanation is that when Rav Nahman said that his father would teach, he did not mean that he would cite from a *baraita*, but rather that he would explain the mishna in that way. If so, the father's words constitute an amoraic statement, which lacks the authority of a *baraita* (Rabbi Aharon HaLevi; Ritva).

HALAKHA

If it developed a blemish after birth – נולד ואחר כך – If a firstborn animal was born on a Festival and later that day developed a blemish, and its owner unlawfully showed it to a Sage, who permitted it, it may be slaughtered on the Festival (*Peri Hadash; Shulhan Arukh HaRav*). However, some authorities prohibit it (*Peri Megadim; Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim 498:9*).

If it was born with its blemish – נולד הוא ומומו עמו – If a firstborn animal was born on a Festival with a blemish, and its owner unlawfully showed it to a Sage, who permitted it, he may proceed to slaughter it (*Shulhan Arukh, Orah Hayyim 498:9*).

תנו רבנן: בכור תם שנפל לבור, רבי יהודה הנשיא אומר: ירד מנמחה ויראה, אם יש בו מום – יעלה וישחוט, ואם לאו – לא ישחוט. אמר לו רבי שמעון בן מנסיא: הרי אמרו אין רואין מומין ביום טוב. כיצד? נולד בו מום מערב יום טוב – אין מבקרין אותו ביום טוב, נולד בו מום

The Sages taught the following *baraita*: With regard to an unblemished firstborn that fell into a cistern on a Festival, Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says: An expert in these matters goes down into the cistern and examines the animal. If it now has a permanent blemish as a result of the fall, he may raise it from the cistern and slaughter it; but if not, then even if he proceeds to raise it, he may not slaughter it, even if afterwards it develops a blemish. Rabbi Shimon ben Menasya said to him: The Sages of earlier generations already said that one may not examine^N blemishes on a Festival. How so? If a blemish came into being on the eve of a Festival, one may not examine it on the Festival itself to see whether it is in fact of the type that permits the animal to be slaughtered. And if the blemish came into being

ביום טוב, רבי שמעון אומר: אין זה מן המוכן. ושיון שאם נולד הוא ומומו עמו שזה מן המוכן.

on the Festival itself, Rabbi Shimon says: It is not considered to be among the animals prepared prior to the Festival for use on the Festival; therefore, even if it was examined by an expert, it may not be slaughtered. And Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Shimon agree that if the animal was born with its blemish, it is considered to be among the animals prepared for use on the Festival.

דרש רבה בר רב הונא: נולד הוא ומומו עמו – מבקרין אותו ביום טוב לכתחלה. אמר ליה רב נחמן: אבא תני: אם עבר וביקר – מביקר, ואת אמרת מבקרין אותו לכתחלה?

Rabba bar Rav Huna taught the *halakha* as follows: If a firstborn was born with its blemish, experts may examine it on a Festival *ab initio*, and if the blemish is found to be permanent, the animal may then be slaughtered. Rav Nahman said to him: Father would teach^N on this matter that if he transgressed and examined it,^N it is considered examined after the fact, and you say that one may examine it even *ab initio*?

אמר אביי: פותיה דרבה בר רב הונא מסתברא, מדקתני תלתא בבב: "נולד בו מום מערב יום טוב – אין מבקרין אותו ביום טוב." לכתחלה הוא דלא, הא דיעבד – שפיר דמי.

Abaye said: It stands to reason that the *halakha* is in accordance with the opinion of Rabba bar Rav Huna from the fact that the *baraita* is taught in three parts,^N which suggests that each part contains a novel *halakha*. The first section states: If a firstborn developed a blemish on the eve of a Festival one may not examine it on the Festival itself, from which one can learn that it is only *ab initio* that one may not examine it; but after the fact, it seems well, and the examination is valid.

"נולד בו מום ביום טוב, רבי שמעון אומר: אין זה מן המוכן" – דאפילו דיעבד נמי לא. והדר תני: ושיון שאם נולד ומומו עמו שזה מן המוכן – דאפילו לכתחלה נמי.

The second section of the *baraita* states: If it developed a blemish on the Festival itself, Rabbi Shimon says: It is not considered to be among the animals prepared prior to the Festival for use on the Festival. In other words, even after the fact, no, if the animal was examined by an expert, it may not be slaughtered and eaten.^H And then in the third section it teaches: And Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Shimon agree that if the animal was born with its blemish,^H it is considered to be among the animals prepared for use on the Festival. The fact that the *baraita* taught this *halakha* as an independent clause indicates that even *ab initio* as well, the animal may be examined.

והא כי אתא רב אושעיא, אתא ואיתי מתניתא בידיה: בין שנולד בו מום מערב יום טוב, ובין שנולד בו מום ביום טוב, חכמים אומרים: אין זה מן המוכן!

The Gemara raises an objection: But isn't it so that when Rav Oshaya came from Eretz Yisrael to Babylonia, he came and brought the following *baraita* in his hand: Whether the animal developed a blemish on the eve of the Festival or it developed a blemish on the Festival itself, the Rabbis say: It is not considered to be among the animals prepared for use on the Festival, so that even after the fact, if the animal was examined, it may not be slaughtered and eaten. According to this, the allowance granted in the case of a firstborn that was born with its blemish can be only after the fact, as argued by Rav Nahman, and not *ab initio*, as maintained by Rabba bar Rav Huna. Why, then, does Abaye accept the opinion of the latter and not that of the former?

Hillel raised a dilemma – **בְּעֵי מִינְיָה הֲלֵל** – Some ask: Since Hillel was aware of the *baraita* with regard to a firstborn, why did he need to ask the question? They answer that Hillel originally understood the *baraita* in accordance with Rabba bar Rav Huna that the *baraita* permits the examination of a firstborn born with a blemish *ab initio*; therefore, when Rava ruled that there is a prohibition of *muktze* for half of Shabbat, Hillel cited the *baraita* in opposition to his view. Rava should be understood, even according to the Gemara's conclusion, as maintaining that even if a firstborn animal is born blemished, examining it is nevertheless prohibited *ab initio* (Rishon LeTziyyon).

וְאֵלָּא קִשְׁיָא הֵךְ! הֵיכִי אֵדָא בְּרַ אֹכְמֵי הֵיא, דְּמִשְׁבֵּשׁ וְתַנִּי.

The Gemara asks: **But if so, that *baraita* cited earlier, which presents these *halakhot* differently, is difficult.** The Gemara answers: This does not pose a problem, as **that *baraita* was taught by Adda bar Ukhmei, who would often confuse the opinions in the text and teach an inaccurate version of the dispute; therefore, his version is unreliable.**

אָמַר רַב נַחְמָן בַּר יִצְחָק: מִתְּנִיתִין נָמִי דִּי יִקָּא, דְּקִתְנִי: רַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן אֹמֵר: כָּל שְׂאִין מוּמוֹ נִבְרַח מִעֲרַב יוֹם טוֹב – אִין זֶה מִן הַמוֹכֵן. מֵאִי "אִין מוּמוֹ נִבְרַח" – אֵילִמָּא שְׂאִין מוּמוֹ נִבְרַח כָּלֵל – פְּשִׁיטָא, צְרִיקָא לְמִימַר?

Rav Nahman bar Yitzhak said: **The mishna is also precise in its wording according to the opinion that no blemish may be examined *ab initio*. As the mishna teaches that Rabbi Shimon says:** Even if the animal has a blemish, it is prohibited to slaughter it, since **any firstborn animal whose blemish is not perceptible on the eve of the Festival while it is still day is not considered to be among the animals prepared prior to the Festival for use on the Festival.** What is the meaning of the phrase: **Whose blemish is not perceptible? If we say that its blemish is not perceptible at all, it is obvious. Need it be said that an animal whose blemish was not perceptible at all prior to the Festival is not considered prepared for use on the Festival?**

אֵלָּא – דְּלָא אֶתְחַזִּי לְחֻכְמָא מִעֲרַב יוֹם טוֹב אִם מוּם קְבוּעַ אִם מוּם עוֹבֵר. קִתְנִי מִיֵּהָת "אִין זֶה מִן הַמוֹכֵן", שְׁמַע מִינְהָ.

Rather, one must say that the animal had a perceptible blemish, but **it was not shown to a Sage on the eve of the Festival to determine whether it is a permanent blemish or a temporary blemish. In any event, the mishna teaches: It is not considered to be among the animals prepared prior to the Festival for use on the Festival, which indicates that it is not considered prepared even after the fact.** It follows that the allowance granted in the case of a firstborn that was born with its blemish is also only after the fact, but the blemish may not be examined *ab initio*. The Gemara concludes: **Indeed, learn from this that this is so.**

בְּעֵי מִינְיָה הֲלֵל מִרְבָּא: יֵשׁ מוֹקְצָה לְחֻצֵי שַׁבָּת אוֹ אִין מוֹקְצָה לְחֻצֵי שַׁבָּת? הֵיכִי דְמִי, אִי דְאֶחָזִי בֵּין הַשְּׁמֻשׁוֹת – אֶחָזִי; אִי דְלָא אֶחָזִי – לָא אֶחָזִי.

§ Hillel raised a dilemmaⁿ before Rava: **Is there a prohibition of *muktze* for half of Shabbat or is there no prohibition of *muktze* for half of Shabbat?** The Gemara asks: **What are the circumstances of this case? If an item was fit for eating or for some other purpose at twilight between Friday and Shabbat, it would then be fit for the entire Shabbat. And if it was not fit at twilight, it is not fit for the entire day, as anything considered *muktze* at twilight remains so throughout Shabbat. How, then, could there be a case of an item that is considered *muktze* for half of Shabbat?**

לָא צְרִיקָא, דְּאֶחָזִי וְהָדֵר אֶדְחִי וְהָדֵר אֶחָזִי, מֵאִי אָמַר לֵיהּ: יֵשׁ מוֹקְצָה.

The Gemara explains: **No, it is necessary to raise this dilemma in a case where the item had once been fit for use, and then became disqualified on Shabbat itself for some reason, and then once again became fit.** It is about such a case that Hillel asked: **What is the *halakha*?** Rava said to Hillel: **There is a prohibition of *muktze* for half of Shabbat, that is to say, once an item becomes disqualified for use on Shabbat, it retains that status for the rest of the day.**

אֵיתִיבֵיהּ: וְשׁוּיִן שְׂאֵם נוֹלָד וּמוּמוֹ עָמוּ שְׂזָה מִן הַמוֹכֵן. וְאֵמַאי נִימָא: הֵיאֵי בְּכוֹר מִעֵיקְרָא הָוָה חֲזִי אַגְבֵּי אִמִּיהָ, אֶתְלִיד לֵיהּ – אֶדְחִי לֵיהּ, אֶחָזִי לְחֻכְמָא – אֶשְׁתְּרִי לֵיהּ.

Hillel raised an objection from the previously cited *baraita* that taught: **And Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Shimon agree that if the animal was born with its blemish, it is considered to be among the animals prepared before the Festival for use on the Festival. But why should this be? Let us say as follows: This firstborn was fit at the outset to be eaten on account of its mother, as had its mother been slaughtered before giving birth to the firstborn, it would have been permitted to eat them both. This being the case, when the firstborn was born, it became disqualified, since once a firstborn is born, it may not be eaten until it acquires a permanent blemish. And later, when he showed it to a Sage, it once again became permitted to him.** This shows that although the animal had the status of *muktze* for part of the day of the Festival, it did not retain that status for the entire day.

אָמַר אַבְיִי וְאֵיתִימָא רַב סַפְרָא: כְּגוֹן דִּיתְבִּי דִּינִי הָתָם.

Abaye said, and some say it was Rav Safra who said: Here, the *baraita* is referring to a case **where judges were sitting there, observing the firstborn as it was being born, and they immediately saw that it was blemished. Therefore, the animal never lost its permitted status even for a moment.**

Muktze for half of Shabbat – מוקצה לחצי שבת: If an item was fit to be eaten or moved at twilight, and it later became disqualified over the course of Shabbat, and then it once again became fit, it is permitted to move it. The *halakha* is in accordance with the second version of the discussion in the Gemara, based on the accepted principle of ruling according to the latter version (*Shulḥan Arukh, Orah Hayyim 310:3*).

Muktze that became fit – מוקצה שהוכשר: Food items whose preparation was completed before Shabbat may be eaten on Shabbat even if their owner was unaware of their fit state, in accordance with the opinion of Rav Kahana (*Shulḥan Arukh, Orah Hayyim 310:4*).

Where the fruits were fit but not completely fit – דאחוו ולא אחוו: With regard to dried figs and raisins that reached a stage in their drying process at which some people would eat them while others would not, if their owner designated them as food before Shabbat, they are not considered *muktze*. However, if they are not fit to be eaten at all, designation is ineffective, in accordance with the Gemara (*Shulḥan Arukh, Orah Hayyim 310:5*).

NOTES

Fit at the outset – מעיקרא הוה חוי: Although a firstborn is inherently sanctified and need not be actively consecrated, it has no sanctity while it is inside its mother's womb, as its sanctity derives not from its conception but from being born first.

איבא דאמרי, אמר ליה: אין מוקצה לחצי שבת. לימא מסייע ליה: ושון שאם נולד ומומו עמו שזיה מן המוכן. והא בכור מעיקרא הוה חוי אגב אמה, אתיליד ליה – אדחי ליה, אחוייה לחכם – אשתרי ליה.

אמר אבוי ואיתימא רב ספרא: כגון דיתבי דיני התם.

תא שמע: היה אוכל בענבים והותיר, והעלן לגג לעשות מהן צמוקין, בתאנים והותיר והעלן לגג לעשות מהן גרוגרות – לא יאכל מהן עד שיזמין מבעוד יום. וכן אתה מוצא באפרסקין, ובחבושין, ובשאר כל מיני פירות.

היכי דמי? אי דחו – למה ליה הזמנה? אי דלא חוו – כי אזמין להו מאי הווי?

וכי תימא דלא ידע אי חוו אי לא חוו, והאמר רב כהנא: מוקצה שביבש, ואין הבטלים מכירין בו – מותר.

אלא לאו דחו ואדחו והדר אחוו, ואי אמרת אין מוקצה – למה להו הזמנה? אלא מאי – יש מוקצה? כי אזמין להו מאי הוי?

לא צריכא דאחוו ולא אחוו, דאיבא אינשי דאכלי ואיבא אינשי דלא אכלי. אזמין – גלי דעתייה, לא אזמין – לא גלי דעתייה.

אמר רבי זירא: תא שמע מפולין ועדשים דהא פולין ועדשים מעיקרא חוו לכוס, שדיניהו בקדרה – אדחו להו.

Some say that Rava said the opposite to Hillel: There is no prohibition of *muktze* for half of Shabbat,¹¹ that is to say, even if an item becomes disqualified for use on Shabbat, once it becomes fit again, it is no longer prohibited. The Gemara responds: Let us say that the previously cited *baraita* supports Rava: And Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Shimon agree that if the animal was born with its blemish, it is considered to be among the animals prepared before the Festival for use on the Festival. But wasn't this firstborn fit to be eaten at the outset¹² on account of its mother; and then when it was born it became disqualified; and then later, when he showed it to a Sage, it once again became permitted to him? This indicates that for half of Shabbat there is no prohibition of *muktze*.

Abaye said, and some say it was Rav Safra who said: This proof is inconclusive, as the *baraita* may be referring to a case where judges were sitting there when the firstborn was born, and they immediately saw that it was blemished; therefore the animal never acquired the status of *muktze* at all.

The Gemara suggests: Come and hear a proof from a different *baraita*: If one was eating grapes and left some over and took them up to the roof to dry in order to make them into raisins, or if he was eating figs and left some over and took them up to the roof in order to make them into dried figs, he may not eat from them on Shabbat unless he designates them as food to be eaten while it is still day. Otherwise, they are prohibited as *muktze*. And you would find the same with regard to peaches, and quinces, and all other types of fruit that one left out to dry. It is prohibited to eat any of them on Shabbat due to the prohibition of *muktze*.

The Gemara proceeds to clarify this *baraita*: What are the circumstances? If they are fit to be eaten, as they have already dried, why does he require prior designation? Since he placed them there in order to eat them after they dried, they should be considered food that has been designated to be eaten. And if they are not fit to be eaten, as they are yet not dry, even if he designates them the day before, what of it? Of what use is such designation, seeing that the fruit is still unfit to be eaten?

And if you say the *baraita* is referring to a case where he could not ascend to the roof to examine them, and therefore he did not know whether they were fit or unfit, so that his designation was conditional, there is a difficulty. As didn't Rav Kahana say: If fruit had been set aside for drying, and it dried and became fit for eating before Shabbat, but the owner did not know about it before Shabbat but only on Shabbat, the fruit is permitted, since he removed it from his mind only for as long as it would be unfit for eating.¹³

Rather, is the *baraita* not referring to a case where the fruits were fit, and then became disqualified, and then once again became fit, and therefore they have the status of *muktze*? And if you say that there is no prohibition of *muktze* for half of Shabbat, why do they require prior designation? The Gemara refutes this argument: Rather, what then do you say, that there is in fact a prohibition of *muktze* for half of Shabbat? In that case, if he designates them the day before, what of it? How does his designation permit that which is prohibited as *muktze*?

The Gemara answers: No, the *baraita* is necessary for a case where the fruits were fit but not completely fit,¹⁴ meaning that there are people who eat them in that state and there are other people who do not eat them. Therefore, if he designated them as food to be eaten, he has revealed his intention that he is included among those who do eat them; if he did not designate them as food, he has not revealed his intention. Therefore, no proof can be adduced from here.

Rabbi Zeira said: Come and hear a resolution to the problem raised above from the *halakha* governing beans and lentils cooked on a Festival. As beans and lentils at the outset, at twilight, when they are still raw and uncooked, are fit to be chewed as they are and are therefore not in the category of *muktze*; then, when he casts them into the pot to cook them, they become disqualified because while they are being cooked they are fit neither to be chewed raw nor to be eaten cooked.