

דף יומי • חזקוני • דף קל"ו

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

THE SUGYA

We begin this daf by continuing our deep dive into the halachos of partnership and how it affects various mitzvos. The Gemara goes through a fascinating list of mitzvos—including tithes, the priestly gifts of the foreleg, cheeks, and maw, bikkurim, tzitzis, and building a parapet (ma'akeh) on a roof. For each of these, the Gemara analyzes the tension between the singular and plural lashon of the pesukim, showing how we might have thought a partnership is exempt, and how the Torah ultimately includes them. We also learn the source for why a borrowed cloak is exempt from tzitzis for the first thirty days, and why shuls and batei midrash are exempt from a ma'akeh.

As the sugya develops, the Gemara brings a major challenge to Rava's assumptions from the shittah of Rabbi Ilai. Rabbi Ilai holds that partners are actually exempt from the law of the firstborn, and by extension, from other mitzvos like the priestly gifts and even terumah. This leads the Gemara into a beautiful shakla v'tarya regarding the gezeirah shavah of "giving" and how far we carry the comparison between these different matnos kehunah, specifically regarding whether they apply outside the Land of Israel.

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

עמוד א' DAF 136A

EXPLANATION

דָּרָה בִּיאָתָהּ מִזֵּן הַיְמָיִן.

The Torah means that you must place the mezuzah in **the way of your entry**, which is **from the right** side, because a person normally steps forward with his right foot first.

STATEMENT

מַעֲשֵׂר, אֵף עַל גַּב דְּכָתִיב "מַעֲשֵׂר דְּגִנָּה" – דִּילָךְ אֵין, דְּשׁוּתָפוֹת לָא.

Regarding **tithes**, **even though it is written**: "**The tithe of your grain**," which implies: **yours, yes**, you are obligated, but that **of partnership, no**, you are exempt,

STATEMENT

כָּתַב רַחֲמָנָא "מַעֲשֵׂרֹתֵיכֶם".

yet **the Merciful One writes** in the plural: "**your tithes**," to teach that partners are also obligated.

QUESTION

אָלָא "מַעֲשֵׂר דְּגִנָּה" לְמַאי אֵתָא?

But if so, "**the tithe of your grain**" in the singular, **for what purpose does it come**?

ANSWER

למעוטי שותפות דגוי.

It comes to **exclude a partnership of a non-Jew** from the obligation of tithing.

STATEMENT

מתנות, אף על גב דכתב רחמנא "ונתן".

Regarding the priestly **gifts** of the foreleg, cheeks, and maw, **even though** the Merciful One writes: "And he shall give,"

EXPLANATION

איכא למימר, גליף "נתינה" "נתינה" מראשית הגז – מה להלן דשותפות לא, אף כאן דשותפות לא.

where **there is** room to say that we should **learn** a gezeirah shavah of "giving" and "giving" from the first of the shearings: **just as there**, by the shearings, an animal of **partnership** is **no**, exempt, **so too here**, by the priestly gifts, an animal of **partnership** is **no**, exempt,

STATEMENT

כתב רחמנא "מאת זוכי הזבח".

yet the Merciful One writes: "from those who slaughter the slaughtering," in the plural, to include partners.

QUESTION

אלא טעמא דכתב רחמנא "מאת זוכי הזבח", הא לאו הכי הוה אמינא גליף מראשית הגז?

The Gemara asks: **But is the reason** that partners are obligated only **because** the Merciful One writes: "from those who slaughter the slaughtering," **so that** if not for this, I would have said we should learn the exemption of partners from the first of the shearings?

OBJECTION

אדרבה גליף מתרומה.

On the contrary, let us learn the law of partners **from terumah**, where partners are obligated!

RESOLUTION

אין הכי נמי, מאת "זוכי הזבח" למה לי?

The Gemara answers: **Yes, indeed it is so**, we would have learned it from terumah. But if so, "from those who slaughter the slaughtering," **why do I need it?**

EXPLANATION

לכדרכא, דאמר רבא: הדין עם הטבח.

It is needed **for that which** Rava said, as Rava said: **The judgment** and claim of the Kohen is with the **butcher** who slaughtered the animal, and not with the buyer.

STATEMENT

בכורים, אף על גב דכתב "ארצה" – דידך אין, דשותפות לא.

Regarding first fruits, even though it is written: "your land," implying: yours, yes, you are obligated, but that of partnership, no,

STATEMENT

כתב רחמנא "בכורי כל אשר (בארצה) (בארצם),"

yet the Merciful One writes: "The first fruits of all that is in their land," in the plural, to include partners.

QUESTION

א לא "ארצה" למה לי?

But if so, "your land" in the singular, why do I need it?

ANSWER

למעוטי חוצה לארץ.

It is to exclude land outside of the Land of Israel from the mitzvah of bikkurim.

STATEMENT

ציצית, אף על גב דכתב רחמנא "כסותך" – דידך אין, דשותפות לא.

Regarding tzitzis, even though the Merciful One writes: "your garment," implying: yours, yes, but that of partnership, no,

STATEMENT

כתב רחמנא "על כנפי בגדיהם לדורותם,"

yet the Merciful One writes: "on the corners of their garments throughout their generations," in the plural, to include partners.

QUESTION

וא לא "כסותך" למה לי?

But if so, "your garment" in the singular, why do I need it?

ANSWER

לכדרב יהודה, דאמר רב יהודה: טלית שאולה פטורה מן הציצית כל שלשים יום.

It is needed for that which Rav Yehuda taught, as Rav Yehuda said: A borrowed cloak is exempt from tzitzis all of the first thirty days.

STATEMENT

מעקה, אף על גב דכתב רחמנא "לגגך" – דידך אין, דשותפות לא.

Regarding a parapet, even though the Merciful One writes: "for your roof," implying: yours, yes, but that of partnership, no,

STATEMENT

כתב רחמנא "כי יפל הנפל ממנו",

yet the Merciful One writes: "lest the fallen one fall from it," which is a general warning that applies to any dangerous roof.

QUESTION

אלא "גגך" למאי אתא?

But if so, "your roof" in the singular, for what purpose does it come?

ANSWER

למעוטי בתי כנסיות ובתי מדרשות.

It comes to exclude shuls and houses of study, which are not private dwellings.

OBJECTION

אמר רב ביבי בר אבאי: ליתנהו להני כלי, דתנא: בהמת השותפין חייבת בבכורה, ורבי אלעאי פוטר.

Rav Beivai bar Abaye said: These rules of Rava are not correct, as it is taught in a braisa: An animal of partners is obligated in the law of the firstborn, but Rabbi Ilai exempts it. This shows Rabbi Ilai exempts partners from other mitzvos too!

QUESTION

מאי טעמא דרבי אלעאי?

What is the reason of Rabbi Ilai?

ANSWER

דכתיב: "בקרך וצאנך",

Because it is written: "your herd and your flock" in the singular.

QUESTION

וקא כתיב: "בקרکم וצאנכם"!

The Gemara asks: But isn't it written: "your herds and your flocks" in the plural?

ANSWER

דכולהו ישראל.

The Gemara answers: That plural refers to the firstborns of all of Israel together, not to partners.

OBJECTION

אמר רב חנינא מסורא: ליתנהו להני כלי, דתנא: בהמת השותפין חייבת במתנות, ורבי אלעאי פוטר.

Rav Chanina of Sura said: These rules of Rava are not correct, as it is taught in a braisa: An animal of partners is obligated in the priestly gifts, but Rabbi Ilai exempts it.

QUESTION

מאי טעמא?

What is the reason?

ANSWER

גליף "נתינה" "נתינה" מראשית הגז – מה להלן דשותפות לא, אף כאן דשותפות לא.

He learns a gezeirah shavah of "giving" and "giving" from the first of the shearings: just as there, by the shearings, an animal of partnership is no, exempt, so too here, by the priestly gifts, an animal of partnership is no, exempt.

INFERENCE

ואי סלקא דעתך בתרומה מיחייב, גליף "נתינה" "נתינה" מתרומה!

And if it should enter your mind to say that Rabbi Ilai agrees that in terumah partners are obligated, let us learn "giving" "giving" from terumah instead!

INFERENCE

אלא ששמע מינה בתרומה נמי פוטר.

Rather, learn from this that in terumah also, Rabbi Ilai exempts partners. Thus, Rava's list of concessions is completely refuted.

QUESTION

אי מה תרומה, בארץ – אין, בחוצה לארץ – לא, אף מתנות, בארץ – אין, בחוצה לארץ – לא!

The Gemara asks: If we compare priestly gifts to terumah, then just as terumah in the Land of Israel is yes, obligated, but outside of the Land, no, so too priestly gifts, in the Land, yes, but outside of the Land, no! But we know priestly gifts apply everywhere!

ANSWER

אמר רבי יוסי מנהרביל: אין, והתנא, רבי אלעאי אומר: מתנות אין נוהגין אלא בארץ.

Rabbi Yose of Neharbil said: Yes, indeed, Rabbi Ilai holds this way, and so it is taught in a braisa: Rabbi Ilai says: Priestly gifts do not apply except in the Land of Israel.

STATEMENT

וכן היה רבי אלעאי אומר: ראשית הגז אין נוהג אלא בארץ.

And so too Rabbi Ilai would say: The first of the shearings does not apply except in the Land of Israel.

QUESTION

מאי טעמא דרבי אלעאי?

What is the reason of Rabbi Ilai regarding the first of the shearings?

ANSWER

אמר רבא: גליף "נתינה" "נתינה" מתרומה: מה תרומה, בארץ – אין, בחוצה לארץ – לא, אף ראשית הגז, בארץ – אין, בחוצה לארץ – לא.

Rava said: He learns "giving" "giving" from terumah: just as terumah in the Land is yes, but outside of the Land, no, so too the first of the shearings, in the Land, yes, but outside of the Land, no.

QUESTION

אמר ליה אבאי: אי מה תרומה טובלת, אף ראשית הגז טובלת?

Abaye said to him: If we compare them, then just as terumah makes the rest of the produce tevel (forbidden to eat until separated), does the first of the shearings also make the rest of the wool tevel?

ANSWER

אמר ליה: אמר קרא "וראשית גז צאנה תתן לו" – אין לה בו אלא מראשיתו ואילתה.

Rava said to him: The verse says: "And the first of the shearing of your flock you shall give to him" — meaning you have nothing in it of a prohibition except from its first separation and onwards, but the rest of the wool is never forbidden.

QUESTION

אי מה תרומה חייבים עליה מיתה וחומש, אף ראשית הגז חייבים עליו מיתה וחומש?

Abaye asked: If so, just as terumah, a non-Kohen who eats it is liable to death at the hands of Heaven and must pay an extra fifth, is the first of the shearings also subject to death and a fifth?

ANSWER

אמר קרא: "ומתו בו", "ויספה עליו" – "עליו" ולא על ראשית הגז, "בו" ולא בראשית הגז.

Rava answered: The verse says: "And they shall die for it," and "he shall add a fifth to it" — "to it" (terumah) and not to the first of the shearings, "for it" and not for the first of the shearings.

QUESTION

אי מה תרומה ראשון ושני אחריה, אף ראשית הגז ראשון ושני אחריה!

Abaye asked: If so, just as terumah is called "first" and there is a second tithe after it, so too the first of the shearings should be called "first" and have a second gift after it!

ANSWER

אמר קרא "ראשית", אין לה בו אלא ראשית בלבד.

Rava answered: The verse says: "first," meaning you have nothing in it except the first alone, with no second gift.

QUESTION

אי מה תרומה, מחדש על הישן – לא, אף ראשית הגז, מחדש על הישן – לא?

Abaye asked: If so, just as terumah from new crop for old crop is no, forbidden, so too the first of the shearings, from new shearings for old shearings is no, forbidden?

ANSWER

אין.

Rava answered: Yes, that is indeed the law.

OBJECTION

וְהִתְנַחֵּא: הֵיוּ לוֹ שְׁתֵּי רְחִלּוֹת, גָּזוּ וְהִנִּיחַ, גָּזוּ וְהִנִּיחַ, שְׁתֵּי שָׁנִים וְשָׁלֹשׁ שָׁנִים – אֵין מְצַטְרְפוֹת.

Abaye challenged: **But isn't it taught in a braisa: If one had two sheep, and he sheared them and set aside the wool, and sheared them the next year and set aside the wool, over two or three years, they do not combine** to reach the minimum of five sheep?

INFERENCE

הָא הָמֵשׁ – מְצַטְרְפוֹת.

But we infer: if he had **five** sheep and sheared them over several years, they **do combine**! This contradicts the rule that new and old do not combine.

QUESTION

וְהִתְנַחֵּא: אֵין מְצַטְרְפוֹת!

The Gemara asks: **But isn't it taught in another braisa: They do not combine** at all?

RESOLUTION

אֵלָא שְׁמַע מִינָּה: הָא דְרַבִּי אֶלְעָאי, וְהָא דְרַבְּנָן.

Rather, learn from this: This braisa which says they do not combine is the view of **Rabbi Ilai**, and that braisa which says they do combine is the view of **the Rabbis**.

QUESTION

אִי מָה תְּרוּמָה, גִּדָּל בְּחֵיּוֹב – חֵיּיב, גִּדָּל בְּפֻטוֹר – פֻּטוֹר, אַךְ רֵאשִׁית הֵגְז נָמִי: גִּדָּל בְּחֵיּוֹב – חֵיּיב, בְּפֻטוֹר – פֻּטוֹר!

Abaye asked: **If so, just as terumah**, that which **grew in obligation is obligated**, and that which **grew in exemption is exempt**, so too the first of the shearings also: that which **grew in obligation is obligated**, and that which **grew in exemption is exempt**!

QUESTION

וְגַבִּי תְּרוּמָה מִנָּלָן?

The Gemara asks: **And regarding terumah**, from where do we know this rule?

ANSWER

דִּתְנַחֵּא: יִשְׂרָאֵל שֶׁלָּקַח שָׂדֶה בְּסוּרְיָא מִגּוֹי, עַד שֶׁלֹּא הִבִּיֵּאָה שְׁלִישׁ – חֵיּיב, מִשְׁהִבִּיֵּאָה שְׁלִישׁ – רַבִּי עֲקִיבָא מְחַיֵּיב בְּתוֹסֻפֹּת, וְחֻכָּמִים פּוֹטְרִין.

As it is taught in a braisa: An Israelite who bought a field in Syria from a non-Jew, if he bought it **before it reached a third** of its growth, the crop is **obligated** in terumah. But if he bought it **after it reached a third** of its growth, **Rabbi Akiva obligates the owner in the additional growth**, but **the Sages exempt** it entirely, because it grew in exemption.

OBJECTION

וְכִי תִּימָא הָכִי נָמִי, וְהִתְנַחֵּא: הֲלֹקַח גִּז צֹאן גּוֹי – פֻּטוֹר מִרֵּאשִׁית הֵגְז, הָא צֹאנוּ לְגִזּוּז – חֵיּיב!

And should you say that for **Rabbi Ilai so too here** by shearings, if he bought the sheep after the wool grew it is exempt, **but** didn't we learn in a Mishnah: **One who buys the sheared wool of a non-Jew's sheep is exempt from the first of the**

shearings, which implies: **but** if he buys **his sheep to shear**, he is **obligated**, even though the wool grew while owned by a non-Jew!

RESOLUTION

מתניתין

The Gemara answers: That **Mishnah** is the view of the Rabbis, whereas Rabbi Ilai indeed exempts it.

עמוד ב' DAF 136B

EXPLANATION

דלא כרבי אלעאי.

We must say that our Mishnah is **not in accordance with** the opinion of **Rabbi Ilai**, who holds that if the wool grew under the ownership of a non-Jew, one is exempt from separating the first sheared wool.

QUESTION

אי מה תרומה, ממין על שאינו מינו – לא, אף ראשית הגז ממין על שאינו מינו – לא?

Abaye further asks Rava: **If** we compare the first sheared wool to teruma, can we say that **just as** with regard to **teruma**, separating from one **type on behalf of that which is not of its same type** is **not** permitted, **so too**, with regard to **the first sheared wool**, separating from one **type on behalf of that which is not of its same type** is **not** permitted?

QUESTION

וגבי תרומה מנל?

The Gemara asks: **And with regard to teruma, from where do we** derive that one may not do so?

ANSWER

דתנא: היו לו שני מיני תאנים, שחורות ולבנות, וכן שני מיני חטין – אין תורמים ומעשרים מזה על זה.

The Gemara answers: **As it is taught** in a braisa: **If one had two types of figs, black figs and white figs, and similarly, if he had two types of wheat, one may not separate teruma and tithes from this type on behalf of that type.**

STATEMENT

רבי יצחק אומר משום רבי אלעאי: בית שמאי אומרין אין תורמין, ובית הלל אומרין תורמין.

Rabbi Yitzchak says in the name of Rabbi Ilai: Beit Shammai say that **one may not separate teruma** from one of these on behalf of the other, and Beit Hillel say that **one may separate teruma** from one on behalf of the other, as they consider all forms of figs or wheat to be a single type.

STATEMENT

אף ראשית הגז ממין על שאינו מינו – לא.

But all agree that with regard to two distinct types of food, one may not separate teruma from one type on behalf of another type. So too, with regard to **the first sheared wool**, perhaps one may **not** separate from one **type on behalf of that which is not of its same type**.

ANSWER

אין, וְהַתֵּנוּ: הֵיוּ לוֹ שְׁנֵי מִינִים שְׁחוּפוֹת וְלִבְנוֹת, מְכַר לוֹ שְׁחוּפוֹת אֶכָּל לֹא לִבְנוֹת – זֶה נוֹתֵן לְעֶצְמוֹ וְזֶה נוֹתֵן לְעֶצְמוֹ.

Rava replied: **Yes**, this is indeed the halacha. **And we learned** in our Mishnah: If the seller **had two types** of sheep, **gray and white**, and **he sold him the gray fleece but not the white** fleece, then **this** seller **gives** the first sheared wool **for himself** from the wool that he kept, **and that** buyer **gives** the first sheared wool **for himself** from the wool that he bought. This implies that they are two different types and cannot be separated for one another.

OBJECTION

אֵלָּא מַעֲתָה, סִיפָּא דְקִתְנִי: זְכָרִים אֶכָּל לֹא נִקְבוֹת – זֶה נוֹתֵן לְעֶצְמוֹ וְזֶה נוֹתֵן לְעֶצְמוֹ, הֲכִי נָמִי מְשׁוּם דְתַרִי מִינֵי נִינְהוּ?

The Gemara objects: **If that is so**, then consider **the latter clause, which teaches**: If he sold the fleece of the **male** sheep but **not** of the **female** sheep, then **this** seller **gives** the first sheared wool **for himself** from the wool that he kept, **and that** buyer **gives** the first sheared wool **for himself** from the wool that he bought. **Is this also because they are two** different types? Clearly, male and female sheep are not considered different types!

EXPLANATION

אֵלָּא, עֲצָה טוֹבָה קָא מְשַׁמַּע לֵן, דְּלִיתִיב לֵיהּ מִהָאִי דְרַבִּינָהּ וּמִהָאִי דְאִשּׁוּן.

Rather, the Mishnah **teaches us good advice**, that **he should give** the priest **from this** wool which is soft and from that wool **which is hard**, rather than giving him entirely from the softer female fleece on behalf of the male fleece.

EXPLANATION

הָכָא נָמִי, עֲצָה טוֹבָה קָא מְשַׁמַּע לֵן, דְּלִיתִיב לֵהוּ מִתְרוּיָהוּ.

Here too, with regard to the gray and white sheep, the Mishnah **teaches us good advice**, that **he should give** the priests **from both of them**, rather than giving the first sheared wool entirely from the more valuable white fleece.

RESOLUTION

הָא אֻקְיָמָנָא לְמַתְנִיתִין דְּלֹא פְּרָבִי אֶלְעָאִי.

According to this, the Mishnah permits separating from one type on behalf of another. This is difficult according to Rabbi Ilai! The Gemara answers: **We already established that our Mishnah is not in accordance with Rabbi Ilai.**

QUESTION

אִי מָה תְּרוּמָה, בְּעֵינֵינוּ רֵאשִׁית שְׁשִׁירָה נִיכְרִין, אִף רֵאשִׁית הִגְזוּ שְׁשִׁירָה נִיכְרִין?

The Gemara challenges further: **If** we compare the first sheared wool to teruma, can we say that **just as** with regard to **teruma**, we **require** it to be a **first gift whose remainders are evident**, so **too**, with regard to **the first sheared wool**, we **require that its remainders are evident**?

ANSWER

אִין.

The Gemara responds: **Yes**, it is indeed so.

PROOF

וְהִתְנַחֵם: הָאוֹמֵר "כָּל גֶּרְנִי תְרוּמָה וְכָל עֵיסָתִי חֶלֶה" – לֹא אָמַר כָּלוּם, הָא "כָּל גֶּזְיִי רֵאשִׁית" – דְּבָרָיו
קִיָּמִין, וְתִנָּחֵם אִידָךְ: לֹא אָמַר כָּלוּם.

The Gemara cites a proof: **And we learned** in a Mishnah: **One who says**, "All my granary is teruma, or all my dough is challah," **has not said anything**. We can infer from here: **But** if he said, "All my shearing is first sheared wool," his words are valid. And yet it is taught in another braisa: If he said so, he has not said anything!

INFERENCE

אֵלָּא לָאוּ שְׁמַע מִינָּה, הָא רַבִּי אֶלְעָאי, וְהָא רַבְּנָן.

Rather, must you not conclude from here that this braisa, which says his words are meaningless, is in accordance with Rabbi Ilai, who compares the first sheared wool to teruma, and that Mishnah, which implies his words are valid, is in accordance with the Rabbis, who do not compare them?

RESOLUTION

שְׁמַע מִינָּה.

The Gemara affirms: **Conclude from here** that this is correct.

STATEMENT

אָמַר רַב נַחֲמָן בַּר יִצְחָק: הָאִידָנָא נְהוּג עֲלֵמָא כְּהִנֵּי תֵּלֶת סָבִי,

Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak said: Nowadays, the world conducts itself in accordance with these three elders:

STATEMENT

כְּרַבִּי אֶלְעָאי בְּרֵאשִׁית הָגֵז, דְּתִנָּחֵם: רַבִּי אֶלְעָאי אוֹמֵר: רֵאשִׁית הָגֵז אֵינוֹ נוֹהֵג אֶלָּא בְּאֶרֶץ.

It is in accordance with Rabbi Ilai with regard to the first sheared wool, as it is taught in a braisa: Rabbi Ilai says: The first sheared wool applies only in the Land of Israel.

STATEMENT

וּכְרַבִּי יְהוּדָה בֶּן בֶּטֵיירָה בְּדִבְרֵי תוֹרָה, דְּתִנָּחֵם: רַבִּי יְהוּדָה בֶּן בֶּטֵיירָה אוֹמֵר: אֵין דְּבָרֵי תוֹרָה מְקַבְּלִין
טוּמְאָה.

And it is in accordance with Rabbi Yehuda ben Beteira with regard to words of Torah, as it is taught in a braisa: Rabbi Yehuda ben Beteira says: Words of Torah do not receive impurity, and therefore one who experienced a seminal emission may study Torah without immersing first.

STATEMENT

וּכְרַבִּי יוֹשִׁיָּה בְּכָלֵאִים, דְּתִנָּחֵם: רַבִּי יוֹשִׁיָּה אוֹמֵר: לְעוֹלָם אֵין חֵיִיב עַד שְׂיִזְרַע חֹטָה וּשְׁעוֹרָה וְחֶרֶץ
בְּמַפּוֹלֶת יָד.

And it is in accordance with Rabbi Yoshiya with regard to diverse kinds, as it is taught in a braisa: Rabbi Yoshiya says: One is never liable by Torah law until he sows wheat, barley, and a grape pit with a single hand motion in a vineyard.

MISHNAH

חומר בזרוע [וכו.].

The Mishnah states: There are **more stringent elements in the** mitzvah of the **foreleg**, the jaw, and the maw than in the mitzvah of the first sheared wool, etc.

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

OBJECTION

וליתני חומר בראשית הגז, שנוהג בטֵרְפוֹת, מה שאין כן במתנות!

The Gemara objects: **But let the Mishnah teach a more stringent element in the first sheared wool, that it applies to tereifos, which is not the case with regard to the** priestly gifts, which do not apply to a tereifah!

ANSWER

אמר רבינא: הא מני? רבי שמעון היא, דתנא: רבי שמעון פוטר את הטֵרְפוֹת מראשית הגז.

Ravina said: Whose opinion is this Mishnah? It is Rabbi Shimon, as it is taught in a braisa: Rabbi Shimon exempts tereifos from the first sheared wool.

EXPLANATION

מאי טעמא דרבי שמעון? ל"י "נתינה" "נתינה" ממתנות – מה מתנות, טרפה – לא, אף ראשית הגז נמי, טרפה – לא.

What is the reason of Rabbi Shimon? He derives a verbal analogy from the word "giving" written by first sheared wool and the word "giving" from the priestly gifts: Just as with regard to the priestly gifts, a tereifah is not subject to them, so too, with regard to the first sheared wool as well, a tereifah is not subject to it.

QUESTION

ואי ל"י נתינה נתינה ממתנות, ל"י נתינה נתינה מתרומה, מה תרומה: בארץ – אין, בחוצה לארץ – לא, אף ראשית הגז נמי: בארץ – אין, בחוצה לארץ – לא.

The Gemara asks: And if he derives a verbal analogy from "giving" "giving" from the priestly gifts, let him derive "giving" "giving" from teruma: Just as with regard to teruma, in the Land of Israel yes, it applies, but outside the Land of Israel no, so too, with regard to the first sheared wool as well, in the Land of Israel yes, but outside the Land of Israel no.

QUESTION

אלמה תנן: ראשית הגז נוהג בארץ ובחוצה לארץ?

Why, then, did we learn in the Mishnah: The first sheared wool applies in the Land of Israel and outside the Land of Israel?

EXPLANATION

אֵלָא, הֵיִינוּ טַעְמָא דְרַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן, דִּילֵיף "צֹאן" "צֹאן" מִמַּעֲשֵׂר – מִהּ מַעֲשֵׂר, טֵרֶפֶה – לֹא, אֶף רֵאשִׁית הֵגֵז, טֵרֶפֶה – לֹא.

Rather, this is the reason of Rabbi Shimon, as he derives a verbal analogy from the word "sheep" written by first sheared wool and the word "sheep" from animal tithe: Just as with regard to animal tithe, a tereifah is not subject to it, so too, with regard to the first sheared wool, a tereifah is not subject to it.

EXPLANATION

וְהֵתָם מִנֵּלֶן? דְּכֵתִיב "כָּל אֲשֶׁר יַעֲבֹר תַּחַת הַשֶּׁבֶט" – פֶּרֶט לְטֵרֶפֶה שְׂאִינָה עוֹבֶרֶת.

And there, by animal tithe, from where do we derive this? As it is written: "All that passes under the staff," which excludes a tereifah, which cannot pass normally.

QUESTION

וְלֵילֵךְ "צֹאן" "צֹאן" מִבְּכֹר – מִהּ בְּכֹר אֲפִילוֹ טֵרֶפֶה, אֶף רֵאשִׁית הֵגֵז אֲפִילוֹ טֵרֶפֶה!

The Gemara asks: But let him derive "sheep" "sheep" from a firstborn animal: Just as a firstborn is holy even if it is a tereifah, so too, the first sheared wool should apply even to a tereifah!

ANSWER

מִסְתַּבְּרָא מִמַּעֲשֵׂר הָהוּא לִיה לְמִילָה, שְׁפָן זְכָרִים טְמֵאִין. בְּמֵרוּבֵין, מֵרַחֵם. אָדָם, פְּשׁוּט, לְפָנֵי הַדְּבֹר.

The Gemara answers: It is more logical that he should derive it from animal tithe, because they share common aspects: male animals, non-kosher animals, multiple animals, from the womb, man, a plain firstborn, and before the Torah was given.

OBJECTION

אֲדִרְפֶּה, מִבְּכֹר הָהוּא לִיה לְמִילָה, שְׁפָן: יָתוֹם, שְׁלֻקְחוֹ. בְּשׁוֹתְפוֹת, נִתְּנוֹ; בְּפָנֵי כֹהֵן.

The Gemara objects: On the contrary, he should derive it from a firstborn, because they share other common aspects: an orphan, one that was purchased, in partnership, given to a priest, and in the presence of a priest!

SUMMARY

The daf establishes that while singular terms in the Torah (like "your grain" or "your roof") might imply an exemption for partners, plural terms are written to include them, leaving the singular words to teach other specific halachos—such as excluding non-Jewish partners from tithing, excluding land outside of Eretz Yisrael from bikkurim, and excluding public places like shuls from the mitzvah of ma'akeh. However, this structure is challenged by the shittah of Rabbi Ilai, who learns a gezeirah shavah of "giving" from the first of the shearings to exempt partners from priestly gifts and terumah altogether. The Gemara concludes by exploring Rabbi Ilai's shittah that both the priestly gifts and the first of the shearings only apply in Eretz Yisrael, prompting a detailed discussion between Abaye and Rava on how far we compare these mitzvot to terumah regarding the halachos of tevel, the penalty of death at the hands of Heaven, and paying an extra fifth.

The Gemara on our daf is busy with a fascinating shakla v'tarya about the words the Torah uses to describe our obligations. We see a recurring pattern: the Torah writes "your grain," "your garment," or "your roof" in the singular, which lichaira implies that a mitzvah only applies to something you own completely on your own. Yet, the Torah also uses plural terms like "your tithes" or "their garments" to teach us that even when we are in a partnership, we are still fully chayav in the mitzvah.

This is a deep yesod in our avodas Hashem. When a person is part of a group, a community, or a partnership, the yetzer hara tries to weaken his sense of responsibility. We tend to think, "Since I am not the sole owner here, and others are involved, the achrayus doesn't fall on me. Let someone else take care of the mezuzah, the tzitzis, or the safety of the roof." The Torah is mechadesh that a partnership does not dilute your personal obligation. Hashem wants your individual connection to the mitzvah, even when you are sharing the load with others.

In our daily lives, we are partners in so many things, our homes, our local shuls, our workplaces, and our communities. It is easy to slip into a mindset of "someone else will do it." But the Torah's message is clear: "their garments" means it is still "your garment." You cannot hide behind the partnership. You must look at every communal need and every shared space with the same care and achrayus as if you owned it entirely on your own.

Today, find one communal or shared responsibility, whether it is cleaning up a mess in the local bais medrash, helping with a family chore, or taking care of a shared workspace, and treat it with the exact same care and urgency as if it were your own private concern.