

דף יומי • חלין • דף ק"ל

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

THE SUGYA

We begin the tenth perek of Maseches Chullin, which deals with the halachos of the three priestly gifts given from a slaughtered animal: the zeroa (foreleg), the lechayayim (jaw), and the keivah (maw). The Mishnah starts by clarifying where and when these matnos kehunah apply, establishing that they are obligatory both in Eretz Yisrael and chutz la'aretz, and both during the time of the Beis HaMikdash and after its churban. However, they only apply to chullin (non-sacred animals) and not to kodashim (sacrificial animals).

The Mishnah goes on to explain why we might have thought kodashim should be obligated in these gifts through a kal vachomer, and how the Torah uses a pasuk to exclude them. We also learn a major yesod regarding the status of redeemed kodashim: if an animal had a permanent blemish before it was consecrated and was then redeemed, it is treated like chullin and is obligated in these gifts. However, if it was consecrated first and only later developed a blemish, it retains a higher level of sanctity even after redemption and is exempt from the matnos kehunah.

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

עמוד א' DAF 130A

משנה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מתני' הירוע והלחיים והקבה

The foreleg, and the jaw, and the maw, which are the three priestly gifts from a slaughtered non-sacred animal,

MISHNAH

נוהגין בארץ ובחוץ לארץ,

apply both in the Land of Eretz Yisrael and outside of the Land,

MISHNAH

בפני הבית ושל לא בפני הבית,

in the presence of the Temple and not in the presence of the Temple,

MISHNAH

בחולין אבל לא במוקדשין.

and they apply to non-sacred animals, but not to sacrificial animals.

MISHNAH

שְׁהִיָּה בְּדִין,

The Mishnah explains: **For it was** logical to say **by right** of a kal vachomer that sacrificial animals should be obligated in these gifts:

MISHNAH

ומה אם החולין, שאינן חייבים בקֶּזֶה ושוק – חייבים במתנות,

And what is the law if **non-sacred animals**, which are **not obligated** in giving the **breast and thigh** to the Kohen, are nevertheless **obligated** in these three priestly gifts;

MISHNAH

קדשים, שחייבים בקֶּזֶה ושוק – אינו דין שחייבים במתנות?

then **sacrificial animals**, which are **obligated** in giving the **breast and thigh**, is it not logical that they should be **obligated** in these three gifts as well?

MISHNAH

תלמוד לומר: "וַאֲתַן אֹתָם לְאַהֲרֹן הַכֹּהֵן וּלְבָנָיו לְחֶק עוֹלָם" – אין לו אֶלָּא מה שאמור בענין.

Therefore, **the verse teaches**: "And I have given them to Aaron the priest and to his sons as a due forever", which teaches that the Kohen **has only what is stated in the matter**, namely the breast and thigh, but not the three gifts.

MISHNAH

כָּל הַקֹּדָשִׁים שֶׁקָּדַם מוֹם קְבוּעַ לְהַקְדִּישׁוֹ, וְנִפְדּוּ –

All sacrificial animals whose permanent blemish preceded their consecration, and they were redeemed,

MISHNAH

חייבין בבכורה ובמתנות,

are obligated in the law of **the firstborn**, meaning their offspring can become a firstborn, **and in the priestly gifts** when slaughtered,

MISHNAH

ויוצאין לחולין להגזז ולהעבד,

and they emerge to non-sacred status to be shorn and to be worked,

MISHNAH

וילדו ויחלבן מותר לאחר פדיון.

and their offspring and their milk are permitted after their redemption.

MISHNAH

והשוטטן בחיץ פטור, ואין עושין תמורה,

And one who slaughters them outside the Beis HaMikdash courtyard is exempt from kares, and they do not make a substitute animal holy if one tries to exchange them,

MISHNAH

ואם מתו – יפדו, חוץ מן הבכור ומן המעשר.

and if they died before being redeemed, they may be redeemed even after death to be fed to dogs, except for the firstborn and the tithe of animals, which have inherent sanctity.

MISHNAH

כל שקדם הקדשן את מום (את מומן), או מום עובר קודם להקדשן, ולאחר מפאן נולד להם מום קבוע, ונפדו –

But any sacrificial animal whose consecration preceded their blemish, or which had a temporary blemish prior to their consecration, and after this a permanent blemish developed in them, and they were redeemed,

MISHNAH

פטורין מן הבכורה ומן המתנות,

are exempt from the law of the firstborn and from the priestly gifts,

MISHNAH

ואינן יוצאין לחולין להגזז ולהעבד.

and they do not emerge to non-sacred status to be shorn and to be worked.

MISHNAH

וילדן וחלבן אסור לאחר פדיונן,

And their offspring conceived before redemption and their milk are prohibited after their redemption,

MISHNAH

והשוחרטן בחוץ – חייב, ועושין תמורה, ואם מתו – יקברו.

and one who slaughters them outside the courtyard is liable to kares, and they make a substitute animal holy, and if they died before redemption, they must be buried and may not be redeemed to be fed to dogs.

גמרא GEMARA

GEMARA

גמ' טעמא דכתב רחמנא "אותם", הא לא הכי הוה אמינא קדשים חייבין במתנות?

The Gemara analyzes the Mishnah's kal vachomer: The reason we exclude sacrificial animals is only because the Merciful One wrote "them", implying but were it not for this, I would have said that sacrificial animals are obligated in the three priestly gifts based on the kal vachomer?

QUESTION

איכא למיפרה: מה לחולין שפן חייבין בכורה!

But **there is a refutation** to this kal vachomer: **What** is unique about **non-sacred animals**? That they are obligated in the law of the **firstborn**, which is not the case with sacrificial animals!

ANSWER

תיתי מזכרים –

The Gemara suggests: **Let it be derived from male** non-sacred animals, which do not give birth and are thus exempt from the law of the firstborn, yet are obligated in the three gifts!

OBJECTION

מה לזכרים, שפן חייבין בראשית הגז!

The Gemara refutes this: **What** is unique about **males**? That they are obligated in the first of the shearing, whereas sacrificial animals are exempt from this!

ANSWER

מתיישים –

The Gemara suggests: Let it be derived **from male goats**, which are exempt from the first of the shearing because their hair is not wool, yet they are obligated in the three gifts!

OBJECTION

מה לתיישים, שפן נכנסין לדיר להתעשר!

The Gemara refutes this: **What** is unique about **male goats**? That they **enter the corral to be tithed** under the animal tithe, whereas sacrificial animals do not!

ANSWER

מזקנים –

The Gemara suggests: Let it be derived **from old** male goats, which have already entered the corral in previous years and are no longer subject to the animal tithe, yet are obligated in the three gifts!

OBJECTION

מה לזקנים, שפן נכנסו לדיר להתעשר!

The Gemara refutes this: **What** is unique about **old** male goats? That they at least **entered the corral** in the past **to be tithed**, which is not true of sacrificial animals!

ANSWER

מלקוח ויתום –

The Gemara suggests: Let it be derived **from a purchased** animal **or an orphaned** animal, which are completely exempt from the animal tithe, yet are obligated in the three gifts!

OBJECTION

מה ללקוח ויתום, שפן נכנסין במינן לדיר להתעשר!

The Gemara refutes this: **What** is unique about a purchased or orphaned animal? **That they enter in their species into the corral to be tithed**, meaning other animals of their species are subject to the tithe!

RESOLUTION

בְּמִינָן קְאָמְרֵת? קִדָּשִׁים נָמִי, בְּמִינָן נִכְנָסִין לְדִיר לְהַתְעָשֵׂר.

The Gemara responds: **Do you say** it is because of **their species**? **Sacrificial animals also, in their species, enter the corral to be tithed**, since non-sacred animals of their species are tithed! Thus, the kal vachomer would indeed stand, and therefore the verse "them" is necessary to exclude sacrificial animals.

QUESTION

וַיְהִי חוּלִין חֵיִבִּין בְּחֶזֶה וְשׁוֹק מִקַּל וְחוּמָר:

The Gemara asks: **And let non-sacred animals be obligated in the breast and thigh from a kal vachomer** in the opposite direction:

QUESTION

וּמָה קִדָּשִׁים, שְׂאִין חֵיִבִּים בְּמִתְנֹת, חֵיִבִּין בְּחֶזֶה וְשׁוֹק;

And what is the law if sacrificial animals, which are not obligated in the three gifts, are obligated in the breast and thigh;

QUESTION

חוּלִין, שְׂחֵיבִין בְּמִתְנֹת, אִינוּ דִּין שְׂחֵיבִין בְּחֶזֶה וְשׁוֹק?

then **non-sacred animals, which are obligated in the three gifts**, is it not logical that they should be obligated in the **breast and thigh** as well?

ANSWER

אָמַר קָרָא: "וְזֶה יִהְיֶה מִשְׁפַּט הַכֹּהֲנִים", "זֶה" – אֵין, מִיַּדִּי אַחֲרִינָא – לֹא.

The Gemara answers: **The verse states: "And this shall be the priests' due"**, which teaches: **"This"**, namely the three gifts, **yes**, they receive from non-sacred animals, but **any other thing**, such as the breast and thigh, **no**, they do not receive.

QUESTION

אֵלָא טַעְמָא דְכָתַב רַחֲמָנָא "זֶה", הָא לֹא הָכִי הָוָה אָמִינָא חוּלִין חֵיִבִּין בְּחֶזֶה וְשׁוֹק?

The Gemara asks: **But is the reason** only because the Merciful One wrote **"this"**, implying **but were it not for this**, I would have said that non-sacred animals are obligated in the breast and thigh?

QUESTION

וְהָא בְּעֵי תְנוּפָה, הֵיכָא לִינוּפִינָהוּ?

But surely the breast and thigh **require waving**, and where would we wave them?

QUESTION

אֵי אַפְרָאי – "לִפְנֵי ה' כְּתִיב,

If you say we wave them **outside** the Temple, **"before Hashem"** is **written** regarding waving, which means it must be done in the Temple courtyard!

EXPLANATION

אִי אֲנֹאִי – קָא מְעִיִּיל חוּלִין לְעֹזְרָה, הִלְכָּהּ לֹא אֶפְשָׁר.

If you suggest that they should be waved **inside** the Beis HaMikdash, he is **bringing non-sacred** meat into the Temple **courtyard**, which is forbidden. **Therefore, it is not possible** to perform the waving of the breast and thigh with chullin, and we do not need a pasuk to exclude them.

QUESTION

אָלֹא "זֶה" לָמָּה לִי?

Rather, if so, **why do I** need the word "**this**" in the pasuk "And this shall be the priests' due"?

ANSWER

לְכַדְרֵב חֲסֵדָא, דְּאָמַר רַב חֲסֵדָא: הַמְזִיק מִתְּנוּת כְּהוֹנָה אוֹ שָׁאֲכָלָן – פָּטוּר מִלְּשָׁלֵם.

It is needed **for that which** Rav Chisda taught, as Rav Chisda said: One who damages priestly gifts, or who ate them before giving them to a kohen, is **exempt from paying** their value to the kohen, because the word "this" implies that only the gifts themselves are the kohen's due, but not their monetary replacement.

STATEMENT

גּוֹפֵא, אָמַר רַב חֲסֵדָא: הַמְזִיק מִתְּנוּת כְּהוֹנָה, אוֹ שָׁאֲכָלָן – פָּטוּר מִלְּשָׁלֵם.

The Gemara now analyzes **the matter itself**: Rav Chisda said: One who damages priestly gifts, or who ate them, is **exempt from paying** for them.

QUESTION

מֵאִי טַעְמָא?

What is the **reason** for this?

ANSWER

אִיבָעִית אִימָא דְּכֹתִיב "זֶה", וְאִיבָעִית אִימָא מְשׁוּם דְּהִוָּה לִיה מָמוֹן שְׂאִין לוֹ תוֹבָעִים.

If you want, say it is **because it is written "this"**, which limits the obligation to the gifts themselves. And if you want, say instead that it is **because it is money that has no specific claimants**, since the owner can give these gifts to any kohen he chooses, so no individual kohen has the standing to sue him in court.

OBJECTION

מִיתִיבִי: "זֶה יִהְיֶה מִשְׁפָּט הַכֹּהֲנִים" – מִלְּמַד שֶׁמִּתְּנוּת דִּין.

The Gemara **raises an objection** from a braisa: The pasuk says, "And this shall be the judgment of the priests"—this teaches that the gifts are a judgment.

QUESTION

לְמֵאִי הִלְכָּתָא? לֹא לְהוֹצִיאָן בְּדִינֵין?

Regarding what halacha is this said? Is it not to extract them through judges in court? If a kohen can sue to extract them, then they are considered money that has claimants, which contradicts Rav Chisda!

ANSWER

לא, לחולקו בדייניו.

The Gemara answers: No, it means to distribute them through judges, meaning the court can direct the owner to which kohanim he should distribute them.

EXPLANATION

וכדרב שמואל בר נחמני, דאמר רב שמואל בר נחמני אמר רבי יונתן: מניין שאין נוטנין מתנה לכהן עם הארץ?

And this is in accordance with that which Rav Shmuel bar Nachmani taught, as Rav Shmuel bar Nachmani said that Rabbi Yonatan said: From where do we know that we do not give a gift to a kohen who is an am ha'aretz?

PROOF

שנאמר: "ויאמר לעם ליושבי ירושלים לתת מנת לפתנים וללויים למען יחזקו בתורת ה'", כל המחזיק בתורת ה' – יש לו מנת, ושאינו מחזיק בתורת ה' – אין לו מנת.

As it is stated: "And he commanded the people who dwelt in Yerushalayim to give the portion of the priests and the Levites, so that they may hold fast to the Torah of Hashem." This teaches: Anyone who holds fast to the Torah of Hashem has a portion, and anyone who does not hold fast to the Torah of Hashem has no portion. The court enforces this distribution.

OBJECTION

תא שמע: רבי יהודה בן בתירא אומר: "משפט" – מלמד שהמתנות דין. יכול אפילו חזה ושוק דין? תלמוד לומר "זה".

Come and hear a kasha from another braisa: Rabbi Yehuda ben Beteira says: "Judgment" teaches that the gifts are a judgment. I might have thought that even the breast and thigh of shlamim are a judgment? Therefore, the Torah says "This" to exclude them.

QUESTION

למאי? אילימא לחולקו בדייניו – אטו חזה ושוק לא בדייניו מיחלקו?

Now, regarding what halacha is this said? If we say it is to distribute them through judges, is that to say that the breast and thigh are not distributed through judges to proper kohanim? They certainly are!

INFERENCE

אלא לאו (להוציא) [להוציא] בדייניו.

Rather, is it not referring to extracting them through judges? This proves that the three gifts can be extracted in court, which contradicts Rav Chisda!

ANSWER

הכא במאי עסקינן, דאתו לידיה.

The Gemara answers: **Here we are dealing with a case where they already came into his hand**—the kohen had already taken possession of the gifts, and the owner snatched them back.

QUESTION

אי דאתו לידיה, מאי למימרא?

The Gemara asks: **If they came into his hand, what is there to say?** Of course the court extracts them from the thief; they are already the kohen's personal property!

ANSWER

דאתו לידיה בטבלייהו, וקסבר האי תנא: מתנות שלא הורמו – כמי שהורמו דמיין.

The Gemara answers: It is a case **where they came into his hand while they were still untithed**—the kohen acquired the whole animal before the gifts were separated—and this Tanna holds: **Gifts that have not yet been separated are considered as if they have already been separated**, so they belong to the kohen, and taking them back is considered theft.

OBJECTION

תא שמע: בעל הבית שהיה עובר ממקום למקום, וצריק ליטול לקט, שכחה, ופאה, ומעשר עני – נוטל, ולכשיחזור ישלם, דברי רבי אליעזר.

Come and hear another kasha from a Mishnah: **A homeowner who was traveling from place to place, and needs to take leket, shikchah, pe'ah, or poor man's tithe** because he ran out of money, **may take them, and when he returns home he must pay** the value of what he took to the poor; **these are the words of Rabbi Eliezer**. This shows that one must pay for gifts he consumed!

ANSWER

אמר רב חסדא: מדת חסידות שנו כאן.

Rav Chisda said: **They taught a measure of piety here**; strictly speaking, he is exempt from paying.

OBJECTION

אמר רבא: תנא תני "ישלם", ואת אמרת מדת חסידות שנו כאן!?

Rava said in wonderment: **The Tanna explicitly teaches "he must pay"**, and you say they taught a measure of piety here?!

QUESTION

ועוד, מדרבי אליעזר ליקום וליתוב?

And furthermore, should we stand and ask a kasha from Rabbi Eliezer, whose opinion is not the accepted halacha?

OBJECTION

אלא מסיפא, וחכמים אומרים: עני היה באותה שעה,

Rather, the kasha is **from the latter clause** of that Mishnah: **And the Sages say: He was a poor man at that moment**, so he was entitled to take them.

INFERENCE

טעמא דעני, הא עשיר – משלם.

We infer: **The reason** he is exempt is because **he was poor**, but if he were **wealthy**, he would have to pay!

QUESTION

אמאי? ליהוי כמזיק מתנות כהונה או שאכלן!

Why should he pay? **Let it be like one who damages priestly gifts or eats them**, where Rav Chisda says he is exempt!

ANSWER

אמר רב חסדא: מדת חסידות שנו כאן.

Rav Chisda said: Even according to the Rabbis, if he were wealthy, his obligation to pay is only a **measure of piety** they taught here.

OBJECTION

תא שמע: מנין לבצל הבית שאכל פירותיו טבלין, וכן לוי שאכל מעשרותיו טבלין, מנין שפטור מן התשלומין?

Come and hear another kasha: **From where** do we know that a homeowner who ate his untithed produce, and likewise a **Levite** who ate his untithed tithes, **from where** do we know that he is exempt from payment to the kohen or Levite?

PROOF

תלמוד לומר: "ולא יחללו את קדשי בני ישראל אשר ירימו" – אין לה בהן אלא משעת הרמה ואילך.

The Torah teaches: "And they shall not profane the holy things of the children of Israel which they shall set aside"—**you have no claim on them except from the time of setting aside and onwards.**

INFERENCE

הא משעת הרמה ואילך מיהא משלם, אמאי? ליהוי כמזיק מתנות כהונה או שאכלן!

We infer: **But from the time of setting aside and onwards**, he would indeed pay! Why? **Let it be like one who damages priestly gifts or eats them**, who is exempt!

ANSWER

הכא נמי

The Gemara answers: **Here too...**

SUMMARY

The Gemara launches into a classic shakla v'tarya to test the Mishnah's kal vachomer, trying to find a refutation (pirchah) based on the unique stringencies of chullin, such as the law of the firstborn (bechor) or the first of the shearing (reishis hagez). Each time the Gemara suggests a specific case of chullin that is exempt from these stringencies—such as male goats, old goats, or orphaned animals—it finds a way to show that the species as a whole is still subject to those rules, meaning the kal vachomer remains strong and we truly need the pasuk's exclusion of "them" to exempt kodashim. Finally, the Gemara turns the logic around, asking why we do not apply a kal vachomer to obligate chullin in the breast and thigh (chazei v'shok) that

are normally given from kodashim, and explains why a pasuk is needed to exclude this, even though waving chullin in the Beis HaMikdash would present a major halachic problem.

למעשה WHAT TO TAKE HOME

The Gemara is bothered by a beautiful kasha: if sacrificial animals are obligated in the breast and thigh, lichaira we should learn a kal vachomer that non-sacred animals (chullin) are also obligated in them! The Gemara answers that this is physically impossible. To give the breast and thigh, the Torah requires tenufah (waving) "before Hashem" in the Beis HaMikdash. If you wave it outside, it is not "before Hashem"; if you bring your chullin inside the Azarah to wave it, you are bringing non-sacred items into the holy courtyard, which is strictly forbidden. Mimeila, the Torah's beautiful avodah of waving cannot be performed on your everyday chullin.

Look at the deep yesod the Gemara is teaching us here. Sometimes we look at a high, lofty level of avodas Hashem, like the holy tenufah in the Beis HaMikdash, and we think, "Why can't I do that in my everyday life? Why can't my regular, mundane day have that same intense, burning holiness?" But the Torah is telling us: there is a boundary. You cannot force the specific avodah of the Beis HaMikdash into your chullin. If you try to force a level of holiness that does not belong to your current situation, you end up bringing "chullin into the Azarah", you ruin the very structure Hashem set up for you.

Your avodah today is not to copy someone else's lofty level or to force a spiritual practice that doesn't fit your life. Hashem wants you to serve Him davka within the boundaries of your own life, with the specific mitzvos and gifts that belong to your situation. True holiness is not about escaping your boundaries, but about sanctifying the exact place where Hashem has put you.

Today, focus on doing one simple, everyday action, like eating a meal, doing business, or speaking to a family member, with the proper boundaries and quiet kavanah, without looking for extra, lofty spiritual heights that do not belong to the moment.