



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

Chullin Daf Kuf Lamed Vuv

- **Q:** The previous Gemara quoted **Rava's** drasha that according to **R' Illai** there are a number of cases when the pasuk says "your" in the singular and still a partnership would be included, because the pasuk also says "your" in the plural, and that supersedes. **R' Bibi bar Abaye** said this is incorrect. For we find a Braisa where **R' Illai** says that an animal owned in partnership is patur from the halacha of bechor, based on the pasuk that says "bikarcha" and "tzoncha" ("your" in the singular). This is so even though the pasuk also says "bikarchem" and "tzonchem" ("your" in the plural)!? **A:** The Gemara says this is not a refutation, because that pasuk is speaking to all of Klal Yisrael, and that is why it is written in the plural.
 - **Q: R' Chanina of Sura** said that **Rava's** drasha is incorrect, based on a Braisa where **R' Illai** says that an animal owned in partnership is patur from having to give the gifts, based on a gezeira shava of "nesina" from reishis hageiz. Now, if **Rava** is correct that **R' Illai** says that grain owned in partnership is chayuv in terumah, why isn't this gezeira shava of "nesinah" learned from terumah to teach that an animal owned in partnership would be chayuv in the gifts!? This proves that **R' Illai** says that grain owned in partnership is patur from terumah as well!
 - **Q:** If **R' Illai** darshens this gezeira shava he should say that just as terumah only applies in EY, the gifts should also only apply in EY!? **A: R' Yose of Neharbil** said, **R' Illai** actually holds that the gifts only must be given in EY. In fact, **R' Illai** says in a Braisa that the gifts and reishis hageiz only apply in EY. **Rava** explains, **R' Illai** learns reishis hageiz from a gezeira shava from terumah as well.
 - **Q: Abaye** asked, if he learns reishis hageiz from a gezeira shava from terumah he should say that just as until terumah is separated the grain is tevel, the wool should be tevel until the reishis hageiz is separated from it!? **A: Rava** said, the pasuk of "v'reishis geiz tzoncha titen lo" teaches that there is no status to the wool until it is separated.
 - **Q:** He should say that just as a non-Kohen is chayuv misah and a chomesh for eating terumah, he should also be chayuv misah and a chomesh for using the reishis hageiz!? **A:** The pasuk regarding this punishment for terumah says "bo" and "alav" to teach that these punishments don't apply to reishis hageiz.
 - **Q:** He should say that just as terumah has a first and second maaser after it, the same should be true for reishis hageiz!? **A:** The pasuk calls it "reishis", to teach that there is nothing other than this first portion.
 - **Q:** He should say that just as terumah may not be separated from the new crop for the old crop the same should be true that he may not take from the new shearings for the old ones!? **A: R' Illai** actually holds that one may not take from the new shearings for the old ones.
 - **Q:** He should say that just like terumah, if it was grown in a condition of chiyuv it is chayuv, and if not it is patur (e.g. if he bought grown produce attached to the ground from a goy it would be patur), we should say the same thing regarding the wool, and yet our Mishna says that even if a Yid buys the rights to wool when it is fully grown he is chayuv in reishis hageiz!? **A:** Our Mishna does not follow **R' Illai**.
 - **Q:** He should say that just like terumah, one may not take terumah from one species for another, the same should be true for reishis hageiz!? **A: R' Illai** holds that one may not take reishis hageiz from one species for another, as our Mishna says that if there are white sheep and colored ones reishis hageiz must be taken from each species.

- **Q:** The Mishna only says to do that as good advice, not as a halacha. We can prove that from the next part of the Mishna that says that the wool of the males should be given separately from the wool of the females. Now, that is only said so that he not give for all of it from the females, which is higher quality wool, and is said as good advice. The same is true for the white and colored sheep!? **A:** We already said earlier that our Mishna does not follow **R' Illai**.
- **Q:** He should say that just like terumah must have a noticeable remainder after the terumah is taken, the same should be true for reishis hageiz!? **A:** **R' Illai** holds that that is so, and we can prove that he holds this way from a Braisa.
- **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, nowadays the world conducts itself in accordance with the lenient views of these 3 elders: like **R' Illai** with regard to reishis hageiz when he says that it only applies in EY, like **R' Yehuda ben Beseira** regarding divrei Torah when he says that a baal keri may learn Torah, and like **R' Yoshiya** regarding kilayim when he says that one is only chayuv when he plants wheat, barley, and grape seeds all together at once.

CHOMER BIZRO'AH...

- **Q:** Why doesn't the Mishna say that reishis hageiz has a chumra in that it applies to treifos, whereas the gifts do not? **A:** **Ravina** said the Mishna follows **R' Shimon**, who says that reishis hageiz does not apply to animals that are treifos.
 - **Q:** What is the basis for this view? **A:** He learns a gezeira shava of "nesina" from the gifts to teach that this too does not apply to animals that are treifos.
 - **Q:** Why doesn't he also darshen the gezeira shava of nesina from terumah and learn that just as terumah only applies in EY the same is true for reishis hageiz? Our Mishna says that it applies even in chutz laaretz!? **A:** Rather the reason of **R' Shimon** is that he learns a gezeira shava of "tzon" from maaser, which teaches that just as maaser doesn't apply to treifos the same is true for reishis hageiz.
 - **Q:** Why doesn't he also darshen the gezeira shava of tzon from bechor and learn that just as bechor applies to treifos the same is true for reishis hageiz? **A:** It makes more sense to learn it from maaser, since reishis hageiz and maaser are similar in the ways that they both don't only apply to males, don't apply to non-kosher animals, apply to many animals, don't get kedusha from the womb, don't apply to people, both apply to ordinary offspring, and were not given before Har Sinai.
 - **Q:** Maybe it makes more sense to learn from bechor, because reishis hageiz and bechor are similar in the ways that they both apply to orphaned animals, to animals that were purchased, to animals owned in partnership, to animals given as gifts, apply even when there is no Beis Hamikdash, both are given to a Kohen, both don't have to be made kodesh, and both may be offered for sale!? In fact, there are more ways that it is similar to bechor than to maaser!? **A:** **R' Shimon** felt it is more logical to learn an ordinary offspring from another ordinary offspring, than to learn from a bechor.