



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

### Chullin Daf Kuf Lamed Hey

#### PEREK REISHIS HAGEIZ -- PEREK ACHAD ASSAR

##### MISHNA

- The mitzvah of reishis hageiz (giving a portion of the first of one's shearing to a Kohen) applies in EY and in chutz laaretz, when the Beis Hamikdash is standing and after the Churban, to animals of chullin but not to animals of kodesh.
- The mitzvah of zero'ah lichayayim and keiva is more stringent than reishis hageiz in that it applies to cattle and sheep and goats, whether one shechts many animals or few, whereas reishis hageiz only applies to sheep, and only when shearing many sheep.
  - How many is "many sheep"? **B"R** say it is 2 sheep as we find that a pasuk refers to 2 sheep as a "flock". **B"H** say it is 5 sheep, as a pasuk refers to 5 sheep as a flock.
    - **R' Dosa ben Hurkinas** says it must be 5 sheep of which was shorn a maneh and a half of wool per sheep, in order to be chayuv in reishis hageiz. The **Chachomim** say it must be 5 sheep but they could have been shorn to produce any amount.
  - How much must be given to the Kohen? The weight of 5 sela'im of Yehuda, which is 10 sela'im of the Galil, which is enough to make a small garment. This is based on the pasuk of "titein lo", which teaches that it must be enough to be a useful gift.
  - If the owner dyed the wool before he had a chance to give it to the Kohen, he is patur. If he whitened it but did not dye it, he is still chayuv.
  - If one buys the wool of a goy's flock he is patur. If he buys the wool of another Yid's flock, if he left over wool with the seller it is the seller who is chayuv, but if he did not, it is the buyer who is chayuv.
    - If one has two species of sheep – one white and the other of some color – and he sold the colored ones but not the white ones, or if he sold the males and not the females, each one must give the reishis hageiz for himself.

##### GEMARA

- The reason that the mitzvah doesn't apply to sheep of kodesh is that the pasuk says "tzoncha", which excludes the sheep of kodesh.
  - **Q:** If not for the pasuk we would have said they are chayuv? Animals of kodesh may not be sheared!? **A:** That is true for kodashim to be put on the Mizbe'ach. We are discussing kodashim of bedek habayis, which may be shorn, and are still patur from reishis hageiz.
    - **Q: R' Elazar** has said that even kodashim of bedek habayis may not be shorn!? **A:** That is only D'Rabanan. Therefore, we would have thought that if someone does shear the sheep he must give reishis hageiz. The pasuk teaches that he does not.
    - **Q:** The wool belongs to hekdes, so how could we have even thought to give it to a Kohen!? **A:** We would have thought that the wool should be redeemed and given to the Kohen.
      - **Q:** Redemption requires that the animal stand before us, and that can't be done with this wool!? Now, according to the view that kodashim of bedek habayis doesn't have this requirement it is understandable, but according to the view that it is required how could we think that it should be given to a Kohen!? **A: R' Mani bar Patish in the name of R' Yannai** said, the case we are dealing with is where someone made the sheep hekdes except for the wool. We would think that that wool is chayuv in reishis hageiz. The pasuk therefore teaches that it is not.

- **Q:** Based on this answer we can have this case regarding kodashim of the Mizbe'ach as well!? **A:** Kodashim of the Mizbe'ach could not be shorn, because it would weaken them.
- **Q:** We should have this same concern regarding kodashim of bedek habayis!? **A:** The case is that he made it hekdesch "except for the wool and making it weak".
- **Q:** If so, we can have this case regarding kodashim of the Mizbe'ach as well!? **A:** The kedusha of kodashim of the Mizbe'ach spreads to the entire animal, including the wool.
- **Rava** said, the Mishna is discussing where one made the wool kodesh (not the animal). We would have thought that it must be redeemed and given to the Kohen. The pasuk therefore says "geiz tzoncha titein lo", which teaches that the only shearing that is chayuv is when the shearing can be immediately followed by the giving to the Kohen. This excludes the case where it must first be redeemed before it can be given.
  - **Q:** According to him what does "tzoncha" teach? **A:** It comes to teach as stated in a Braisa. The Braisa says, with regard to an animal owned in partnership, **R' Illai** says it is patur based on the pasuk of "tzoncha". The **Rabanan** say "tzoncha" comes to exclude an animal owned in partnership with a goy.
    - **Q:** How does **R' Illai** learn to exclude an animal owned in partnership with a goy? **A:** He learns it from the beginning of the pasuk that says "reishis digancha" (regarding terumah). The **Rabanan** say that the word "reishis" separates and we could therefore not learn from it. **R' Illai** says, the "vuv" connects the two. The **Rabanan** say, if the Torah wanted them connected it wouldn't have written "reishis" or the "vuv". **R' Illai** said, the Torah wanted to separate them, because one is monetary kedusha and one is kedushas haguf, but then wanted to connect them.
    - We can also say that the **Rabanan** agree that the "vuv" connects them, but they argue regarding produce owned in partnership with a goy – the **Rabanan** say it would be chayuv in terumah.
    - We can also say that **R' Illai** excludes the wool of all partnerships (with a Yid or with a goy) from "tzoncha", because they are both patur for the same reason – it is not owned by the person alone. The **Rabanan** say there is a difference, because a goy is not chayuv in the mitzvah, and "tzoncha" ("your" sheep) can even refer to a partnership as long as it is all Jewish owned.
      - **Rava** said, **R' Illai** would agree that in regard to terumah, produce of a Jewish partnership would be chayuv. Although the pasuk says "digancha", which should exclude produce owned even by a Jewish partnership, the pasuk says "terumoseichem" (plural) which includes it. The word "digancha" comes to exclude produce owned in partnership with a goy.
        - With regard to challah, although the pasuk says "reishis", which we could learn from reishis hageiz with a gezeira shava to teach that partnership owned dough is patur, the pasuk says "arisoseichem", which comes to include dough owned in partnership.
          - **Q:** If not for "arisoseichem" we would learn from reishis hageiz to say it is chayuv? Why not instead learn the gezeira shava from terumah to teach that it is patur!? **A:** Rather, "arisoseichem" teaches that the dough must be of a certain size to be chayuv.
        - With regard to peyah, although the pasuk says "sadcha" which would teach that a field owned in partnership is patur, the pasuk says "artzichem", which comes to include a field owned in partnership. The word "sadcha" will exclude a field owned in partnership with a goy.

- With regard to a bechor, although the pasuk says “bivkarcha uvitzoncha”, which would teach that an animal owned in partnership is patur, the pasuk says “bikarchem v’tzonchem”, which comes to include an animal owned in partnership. The words “bivkarcha uvitzoncha” will exclude an animal owned in partnership with a goy.
- With regard to mezuzah, although the pasuk says “beisecha”, which would teach that a house owned in partnership is patur, the pasuk says “l’maan yirbu yimeichem vimei vineichem”, which comes to include a house owned in partnership. The word “beisecha” will teach the ruling of **Rabbah**, that the mezuzah should be placed on the right side when entering the house.
- With regard to maaser, although the pasuk says “digancha”, which would teach that grain owned in partnership is patur, the pasuk says “maasroseichem”, which comes to include grain owned in partnership. The word “digancha” will exclude grain owned in partnership with a goy.
- With regard to zero’ah lichayayim, and keiva, although the pasuk says “v’nosson”, which could be used to learn a gezeira shava from reishis hageiz and teach that an animal owned in partnership is patur, the pasuk says “zovchei hazevach”, which comes to include an animal owned in partnership.
  - **Q:** If not for “zovchei hazevach” we would learn from reishis hageiz to say it is chayuv? Why not instead learn the gezeira shava from terumah to teach that it is patur!? **A:** Rather, “zovchei hazevach” teaches the ruling of **Rava**, that the claim of the Kohen is on the butcher.
- With regard to bikkurim, although the pasuk says “artzicha”, which would teach that a field owned in partnership is patur, the pasuk says “b’artzam”, which comes to include a field owned in partnership. The words “artzicha” will exclude a field in chutz laaretz.
- With regard to tzitzis, although the pasuk says “kiskuscha”, which would teach that a garment owned in partnership is patur, the pasuk says “bigdeyhem”, which comes to include a garment owned in partnership. The words “kiskuscha” will teach the ruling of **R’ Yehuda** that a borrowed garment is patur from tzitzis for the first 30 days.
- With regard to “makeh” (the requirement to build a fence on a roof), although the pasuk says “ligagecha”, which would teach that a roof owned in partnership is patur, the pasuk says “ki yipol hanofeil mimenu”, which comes to include a roof owned in partnership. The words “ligagecha” will exclude the roof of a Beis Medrash or Beis Hakneses.