



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

Chullin Daf Kuf Lamed Aleph

- There was a Levi who would grab “the gifts” that were meant for the Kohen. When this was told to **Rav** he said, is it not enough that we don't take his gifts from him, but he also takes from the Kohanim!?
 - **Q:** What does **Rav** hold? If he holds that Levi'im are included in the “ahm”, we *should* take the gifts from him as well!? If they are not included in “ahm”, then they are patur even D'Oraisa!? **A:** **Rav** was unsure whether they are included in “ahm”, therefore it is possible that they are chayuv to give the gifts, but Beis Din would not force them to do so.
 - **Q: R' Pappa** repeated this and **R' Idi bar Avin** asked him, there is a Braisa that says as follows. There are 4 gifts for the poor that apply in a vineyard – peret, oleilos, shikcha, and peyah (the Gemara gives the source to each of these from pesukim), there are 3 gifts for the poor that apply to grains – leket, shikcha, and peyah (the Gemara gives the source for each of these from pesukim), and there are two gifts for the poor that apply to fruit of the tree – shikcha and peyah (the Gemara gives the source to each of these from pesukim). The owner of these fields does not get any “tovas hana'ah” (he may not benefit from the gratitude by deciding who to give it to, which the Gemara learns from the pasuk which says that these must be “left” in the field), and even if the owner is poor himself he may not keep any of these gifts (the Gemara learns this from the pasuk of “lo silaket le'ani” as being a directive even to a poor person). Regarding maaser ani which is distributed to the poor in the owner's house, the owner does get the tovas hana'ah (the Gemara learns this from the fact that the pasuk says the maaser is “given” to the poor person), and even the poorest of people must give this maaser (the Gemara learns this from a gezeira shava from leket). With regard to the other gifts that are given to the Kohen, such as the zero'ah, the lechayayim, and the keiva, we do not take them from a Kohen for a Kohen, or from a Levi for a Levi. Now, this suggest that we don't take them from a Levi for another Levi, but that we would take it from a Levi for a Kohen, which shows that a Levi is included in the category of “ahm”!? **A:** The Braisa is referring to something that is similar to the zero'ah, namely maaser rishon.
 - **Q:** Maaser rishon belongs to the Levi! Why would it be taken from him to be given to a Kohen!? **A:** It is like **R' Elazar ben Azarya** said in a Braisa, that the Levi'im were penalized and lost their rights to get maaser rishon.
 - **Q:** He said they lost their right to get maaser rishon, he never said that they even get maaser rishon taken from them!? **A:** Rather, when the Braisa says “zero'ah” is referring to something that is like the zero'ah, namely the gift of reishis hageiz, which is taken from a Levi and given to a Kohen.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, any gifts that are kadosh, like teruma, terumas maaser, and challah, are taken from a Levi to be given to a Kohen. However, any gift that is not kadosh, like the zero'ah, lichayayim, and the keiva, are not taken from the Levi. The Braisa clearly says that they are not included in “ahm”!? **A:** The Braisa is referring to something that is *like* the zero'ah, but not the zero'ah itself – namely, it is referring to maaser rishon after the Levi'im were penalized by Ezra.
 - **Q:** a Mishna says, one who shechts an animal for a Kohen or for a goy is patur from having to give “the gifts”. This implies that one who shechts for a Levi

would have to give them!? **A:** The proper implication is that one who shechts for a Yisrael does not have to give them.

- **Q:** If that is so, the Mishna should have said that one who shechts an animal for a Levi or for a goy is patur from having to give “the gifts”!? Also, a Braisa clearly says that one who shechts an animal for a Levi or a Yisrael is chayuv to give the gifts!? This refutes **Rav**!? **A:** **Rav** will say that it is actually a matter of machlokes among Tanna'im. A Braisa regarding the pasuk that talks about the kapara of Yom Kippur says that “ahm hakahal” refers to Yisraelim and “yichaper” refers to the Levi'im. Another Braisa says that “yichaper” refers to the non-Jewish slaves. The machlokes between them must be whether or not the Levi'im are included in the category of “ahm”. **Rav** was unsure which Braisa to pasken like and that is why he was unsure whether they are included in the category of “ahm”.
 - **Mareimar** darshened that the halacha follows the view of **Rav** (that we do not collect the gifts from Levi'im) and like **R' Chisda** (that one who damages the gifts does not have to pay the Kohen for them).
- **Ulla** would give his gifts to a female Kohen. **Rava** asked him, a Mishna says that the mincha of a female Kohen is eaten but the mincha of a male Kohen is not. Now, the pasuk says that every “minchas Kohen” must be totally burned and not eaten. If you hold that “Kohen” includes a female Kohen, her mincha should also not be eaten!? **Ulla** said, that parsha says “Aharon ubanav”, which is why it is limited to male Kohanim.
 - **Divei R' Yishmael** said that the gifts must be given to a male Kohen, not a female Kohen, because we learn from the parsha of mincha that “Kohen” refers to male Kohanim.
 - **Divei R' Eliezer ben Yaakov** taught that it may even be given to a female Kohen. The reason is that the word “Kohen” (which is generally limited to males) is written twice. This creates a double exclusion, which becomes an inclusion.
 - **R' Kahana** ate the gifts on account of his wife (whose father was a Kohen). The same was done by **R' Pappa, R' Yeimar, and R' Idi bar Avin**.
- **Ravina** said, **Mareimar** told me that the halacha follows **Rav**, the halacha follows **R' Chisda**, the halacha follows **Ulla**, and the halacha follows **R' Ada bar Ahava** who said that if the daughter of a Levi had a bechor he is patur from needing to be redeemed.