

דף יומי • חזקוני • דף קל"ב

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

THE SUGYA

We begin the daf by continuing our sugya regarding who is eligible to receive the priestly gifts of the foreleg, jaws, and maw. The Gemara focuses on whether a Kohen's daughter may receive and eat these gifts, bringing a fascinating machlokes between the academies of Rabbi Yishmael and Rabbi Eliezer ben Yaakov, and we see the actual hanhaga of several Amoraim who ate these gifts on account of their wives. We also clarify the final halachic rulings regarding these gifts and the exemption of a Levi's daughter from Pidyon Haben.

From there, the Gemara moves into a deep discussion regarding the status of a hybrid animal and a koy. We analyze a machlokes between Rabbi Eliezer and the Rabbis regarding whether a hybrid offspring of a sheep and a goat, or a sheep and a wild beast, is obligated in these gifts, and how we apply the rule of hamotzi mechavero alav hara'aya when there is a doubt about the animal's parentage.

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

עמוד א' DAF 132A

ANSWER

מטונה: "אחרון ובניו" כתובין בפירשה.

Ulla replied: I can prove my ruling **from your own burden**, meaning from the very source of your objection: "**Aaron and his sons**" are written in the passage discussing the meal-offering of a Kohen, which teaches that only male Kohanim, and not their daughters, may eat it. This proves that when the Torah says "Kohen" elsewhere without specification, it includes a daughter of a Kohen.

BRAISA

דבי רבי ישמעאל תנא: "כהן" – ולא כהנת, וילמוד סתום מן המפורש.

The Gemara cites Tannaitic opinions on this: The school of the academy of Rabbi Yishmael taught: Wherever the Torah says "**Kohen**" regarding gifts, it means a male Kohen and not a female Kohen, and let us learn the unspecified reference to "Kohen" from the explicit verse of "Aaron and his sons" by the meal-offering, which excludes daughters.

BRAISA

דבי רבי אליעזר בן יעקב תנא: "כהן", ואפילו כהנת – הוי מיעוט אחר מיעוט אחר מיעוט אלא לרבות.

And the school of the academy of Rabbi Eliezer ben Yaakov taught: Wherever the Torah says "**Kohen**" regarding gifts, it means a male Kohen and even a female Kohen. Why? Because the verse mentions "the priest" twice, which is an exclusion after an exclusion, and there is a rule that an exclusion after an exclusion serves only to include, in this case, the daughter of a Kohen.

STATEMENT

רב כהנא אכל בשביל אשתו, רב פפא אכל בשביל אשתו, רב יימר אכל בשביל אשתו, רב אידי בר אבין אכל בשביל אשתו.

The Gemara relates: **Rav Kahana ate the priestly gifts on account of his wife** who was a Kohen's daughter; **Rav Pappa ate them on account of his wife**; **Rav Yeimar ate them on account of his wife**; and **Rav Idi bar Avin ate them on account of his wife**.

RULING

אמר רבינא: אמר לי מרימר, הלכתא כוותיה דרב, והלכתא כוותיה דרב חסדא, והלכתא כוותיה דעולא.

Ravina said: Mareimar said to me, the halacha is like Rav that Levites are exempt from giving gifts, **and the halacha is like Rav Chisda** that one who damages or consumes gifts is exempt from paying, **and the halacha is like Ulla** that gifts may be given to a Kohen's daughter.

RULING

והלכתא כוותיה דרב אדא בר אבהו: לוייה שילדה – בנה פטור מחמש סלעים.

And the halacha is like Rav Adda bar Ahava who said: **A female Levite who gave birth to a firstborn**, even if she is married to an Israelite, **her son is exempt from the five sela** of Pidyon Haben.

BRAISA

תנו רבנן: הזרוע והלחי והקבה נוהגים בכלאים ובכזי.

The Rabbis taught in a braisa: The obligation of **the foreleg, the jaws, and the maw** applies to a hybrid animal and to a **koy**, which is a creature of doubtful status.

BRAISA

רבי אליעזר אומר: כלאים הפא מן העז ומן הרחל – חייב במתנות, מן התייש ומן הצבייה – פטור מן המתנות.

Rabbi Eliezer says: A hybrid that comes from a goat and a ewe is obligated in the gifts, but a hybrid from a male goat and a doe is exempt from the gifts.

QUESTION

מכדי קיימא לן דלענין פסוי הדם ומתנות לא משכחת ליה אלא בצבי הפא על התיישה, ובין לרבי אליעזר בין לרבנן מספקא להו אי חוששין לזרע האב, אי אין חוששין.

The Gemara asks: **Now, we establish that regarding covering the blood and the gifts, you do not find a dispute between Rabbi Eliezer and the Rabbis except in the case of a deer that mates with a female goat**, and both according to **Rabbi Eliezer and according to the Rabbis, they are in doubt whether we concern ourselves with the seed of the father, or whether we do not concern ourselves** with it.

EXPLANATION

ובשה ואפילו מקצת שיה קמיפלגי:

And they only disagree regarding whether the obligation applies to a sheep and even a partial sheep:

EXPLANATION

מר סבר: "שה" – ואפילו מקצת שה, ומר סבר: "שה" ואפילו מקצת שה לא אמרינן.

One Master, the Rabbis, holds: "A sheep" means even a partial sheep, and one Master, Rabbi Eliezer, holds: We do not say "a sheep" means even a partial sheep.

QUESTION

בשלמא רבי אליעזר דפטור, קסבר "שה" ולא מקצת שה,

The Gemara continues its question: Granted, Rabbi Eliezer who exempts the owner is understandable, as he holds that the Torah requires "a sheep" and not a partial sheep,

QUESTION

אלא לרבנן, נהי נמי דקסברי "שה" ואפילו מקצת שה, פלגא לשקול, ואידך פלגא לימא ליה:
אייתי ראיה דאין חוששין לזרע האב ושקול!

but according to the Rabbis, even though they hold "a sheep" means even a partial sheep, let the Kohen take half of the gifts, and regarding the other half, let the owner say to him: Bring proof that we do not concern ourselves with the seed of the father, and then take it!

ANSWER

אמר רב הונא בר חייא: מאי חייב נמי דקא אמר – חייב בחצי מתנות.

Rav Huna bar Chiyya said: What does "obligated" also mean that the Rabbis said? It means obligated in half of the gifts.

OBJECTION

מתיב רבי זירא: כוי – יש בו דרכים שוין לבהמה, ויש בו דרכים שוין לחיה, ויש בו דרכים שוין
לחיה ולבהמה.

Rabbi Zeira challenged this: We learned in a braisa: A koy has ways in which it is equal to a domesticated animal, and it has ways in which it is equal to a wild beast, and it has ways in which it is equal to both a wild beast and a domesticated animal.

OBJECTION

פיצד? חלב אסור כחלב בהמה, ודמו חייב לכסות פדם החיה,

How so? Its fat is forbidden like the fat of a domesticated animal, and its blood is obligated to be covered like the blood of a wild beast.

OBJECTION

דרכים שוין לבהמה ולחיה – שדמו וגידו אסורין כבהמה וחיה, וחייב בזרוע ולחינים וחקקה, ורבי
אליעזר פוטר.

The ways in which it is equal to both a domesticated animal and a wild beast are: that its blood and its sciatic nerve are forbidden like those of a domesticated animal and a wild beast, and it is obligated in the foreleg, the jaws, and the maw, and Rabbi Eliezer exempts.

OBJECTION

וְאִם אֵתָּא, חַיִּיב בְּחֻצֵי מִתְּנוֹת מִבְּעֵי לִיהָ!

And if it is so that the Rabbis only obligate half, it should have said "obligated in half of the gifts"!

ANSWER

אֵיידִי דִּתְנָא חֵלְבֹּ וְדָמֹ, דְּלֹא מִתְנִי "חֻצִּי" חֻצִּי, מְשֻׁם הָכִי לֹא קָא תְנִי "חֻצִּי".

The Gemara answers: Since the Tanna taught about its fat and its blood, where he could not teach "half" or "half" because fat and blood cannot be half-forbidden, therefore he did not teach "half" regarding the gifts either, to keep the style consistent.

STATEMENT

כִּי אֶתָּא רַבִּין, אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: כּוֹי לְרַבְּנָן חַיִּיב בְּכוּלָּהוּ מִתְּנוֹת,

When Ravin came, he said in the name of Rabbi Yochanan: A koy, according to the Rabbis, is obligated in all of the gifts,

PROOF

דִּתְנִינָא: "שׁוֹר", מָה תִּלְמוּד לּוֹמַר "אִם שׁוֹר" – לְרַבּוֹת אֶת הַכִּלָּאִים. "שֶׁה", מָה תִּלְמוּד לּוֹמַר "אִם שֶׁה" – לְרַבּוֹת אֶת הַכּוֹי.

as it is taught in a braisa: The verse says "ox"; what does the verse teach when it says "if an ox"? To include a hybrid. The verse says "sheep"; what does the verse teach when it says "if a sheep"? To include the koy. Thus, there is a special inclusion for the full gifts.

QUESTION

וּרְבִי אֱלִיעֶזֶר, הָאִי "אִם" לְמָה לִּי? מִיבְּעֵי לִיהָ לַח לֶק.

And Rabbi Eliezer, what does he do with this "if"? He needs it to divide the cases, to teach that each animal is a separate obligation.

ANSWER

וּרְבִנּוּ, לַח לֶק מִנָּא לָהּ? נִפְקָא לָהּ מִ"אֶת זֹבְחֵי הַזֶּבַח".

And the Rabbis, from where do they derive to divide the cases? They derive it from the words "from those who slaughter the slaughtering."

ANSWER

וּרְבִי אֱלִיעֶזֶר, הָאִי "מֵאֵת זֹבְחֵי הַזֶּבַח" מֵאִי עֵבִיד לִיהָ? מִבְּעֵי לִיהָ לְכַדְרָבָא, דְּאָמַר רַבָּא: הַדִּין עִם הַטָּבַח.

And Rabbi Eliezer, what does he do with this "from those who slaughter the slaughtering"? He needs it for that which Rava said, as Rava said: The claim of the Kohen for the gifts is with the slaughterer.

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

בְּכוֹר שֶׁנִּתְעַרְבַּ בְּמֵאָה, בְּזֶמַן שֶׁמֵּאָה שׁוֹחֲטִין אֶת כּוֹלָן – פּוֹטְרִים אֶת כּוֹלָן, אֶחָד שׁוֹחֵט אֶת כּוֹלָן – פּוֹטְרִים לוֹ אֶחָד.

MISHNAH: A firstborn animal that became mixed up among one hundred ordinary animals: When one hundred different people slaughter all of them, they are all exempt from giving the priestly gifts, because each owner can say his animal is the firstborn which is exempt. But if one person slaughters all of them, they exempt for him one animal's worth of gifts.

MISHNAH

הַשּׁוֹחֵט לַכֹּהֵן וְלִגְוִי – פָּטוּר מִן הַמִּתְּנוּת, וְהַמְּשַׁתֵּף עִמָּהּ – צָרִיךְ שִׁירְשׁוּם, וְאִם אָמַר: "חֹוֶץ מִן הַמִּתְּנוּת" – פָּטוּר מִן הַמִּתְּנוּת.

One who slaughters for a Kohen or for a non-Jew is exempt from the gifts. And one who partners with them must make a mark on the animal to show the Kohen's or non-Jew's share. And if the Israelite partner said when buying his share: "I buy this except for the gifts," he is exempt from the gifts.

MISHNAH

אָמַר: "מְכוֹר לִי בְּנֵי מַעֲיָה שֶׁל פָּרָה", וְהָיָה בָּהֶן מִתְּנוּת – נוֹתֵנָן לַכֹּהֵן, וְאִינוּ מִנְּכָה לוֹ מִן הַדָּמִים.

If one said to a butcher: "Sell me the innards of the cow," and the gifts (the maw) were among them, he must give them to the Kohen, and he does not deduct from the price he pays the butcher.

MISHNAH

לָקַחְוּ הֵימָנוּ בְּמִשְׁקָל – נוֹתֵנָן לַכֹּהֵן, וּמִנְּכָה לוֹ מִן הַדָּמִים.

But if he bought them from him by weight, he gives them to the Kohen, and he deducts their value from the price he pays the butcher.

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

QUESTION

וְאֵמָא? יָבֵא עָלֵיו כֹּהֵן מְשִׁנֵּי צִדְדִין, וְלֵימָא לֵיהּ: אֵי בְּכוֹר הוּא – כּוֹלֵיהּ דִּידֵי הוּא, וְאִי לֹא בְּכוֹר הוּא – הֵב לִי מִתְּנֵתָאִי.

GEMARA: And why are they all exempt when one hundred people slaughter them? Let the Kohen come upon each owner from two sides, and let him say to him: If it is a firstborn, it is entirely mine, and if it is not a firstborn, give me my gifts!

עמוד ב' DAF 132B

RESOLUTION

אָמַר רַב אוֹשַׁעְיָא: בָּבֵא לִידֵי כֹהֵן וּמְכָרוּ לְיִשְׂרָאֵל בְּמוֹמוֹ.

Rav Oshaya said in response: The Mishnah is dealing with a case where the firstborn animal came into the possession of a Kohen while it was unblemished, and then it developed a blemish, and he sold it to an Yisrael in its blemished state. In this case, the Kohen cannot claim it back, because he already received his due.

MISHNAH

הַשּׁוֹחֵט לַכֹּהֵן וְלַגּוֹי, פֶּטוּר מִן הַמִּתְּנוּת.

We learnt in the Mishnah: **One who slaughters** an animal **for a Kohen or for a gentile** is exempt from the priestly gifts of the foreleg, the jaw, and the maw.

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

QUESTION

וְלִיתַּנִּי: כִּהֵן וְגוֹי פֶּטוּרִין מִן הַמִּתְּנוּת?

The Gemara asks: **And let** the Tanna **teach** more simply: **A Kohen and a gentile** are exempt from the gifts? Why did the Mishnah use the longer phrasing of "one who slaughters for them"?

ANSWER

אָמַר רָבָא: זֹאת אוֹמְרָת, הַדִּין עִם הַטֹּבָח.

Rava said: That is to say, this phrasing teaches us that **the law** and the claim of the Kohen **is with the butcher** who slaughters the animal, and not with the owner. Therefore, the exemption depends on who is doing the slaughtering and for whom.

STATEMENT

דָּרַשׁ רָבָא: "מֵאֵת הָעָם" – וְלֹא מֵאֵת הַכֹּהֲנִים, כְּשֶׁהוּא אוֹמֵר "מֵאֵת זֹכְחֵי הָעֹבֵחַ" – הָיָה אוֹמֵר אֶפִּילוּ טֹבָח כִּהֵן בַּמִּשְׁמָע.

Rava expounded the pasuk: The Torah says, "**From the people**"—and not from the Kohanim, meaning that Kohanim do not have to give the gifts from their own animals. However, **when it says "from those who perform the slaughter," you must say** that this teaches that **even a butcher who is a Kohen is included** in the obligation to give the gifts if he slaughters an animal belonging to an Yisrael.

STATEMENT

אוֹשֵׁפִיזְכָּנִיָּה דְּרַבִּי טַבְלָא כִּהֵן הָיָה, וְהָיָה דְּחִיק לֵיהּ מִלְּתָא.

The Gemara relates: **The host of Rabbi Tavla was a Kohen, and he was hard-pressed for money.**

STATEMENT

אָתָא לְקַמִּיָּה דְּרַבִּי טַבְלָא, אָמַר לֵיהּ: זֵיל אִישְׁתַּתְּרַב בְּהַדֵּי טַבְחֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, דְּמַגּוּ דְּמַפְטְרֵי מִמִּתְּנָתָא, מִשְׁתַּתְּפֵי בְּהֶדְרָה.

He came before Rabbi Tavla for advice. **Rabbi Tavla said to him:** Go and enter into a partnership with Yisrael butchers. Since an animal owned in partnership with a Kohen is exempt from the gifts, **since they will be exempt from the gifts** because of you, **they will gladly partner with you** for free.

STATEMENT

חִיבִיָּה רַב נַחֲמָן, אָמַר לִיה: וְהָא רַבִּי טַבְלָא פִטְרֵן!

The Kohen did so, but Rav Nachman obligated him to give the gifts. The Kohen said to him: But Rabbi Tavla exempted us!

STATEMENT

אָמַר לִיה: זִיל אֲפִיק, וְאִי לָא – מִפִּיקְנָא לָהּ רַבִּי טַבְלָא מֵאוּנָךְ.

Rav Nachman said to him: Go and remove the gifts and give them to another Kohen, and if not, I will remove Rabbi Tavla from your ear—meaning, I will disprove his ruling and show you that he is incorrect.

QUESTION

אֲזַל רַבִּי טַבְלָא קָמִיה דְּרַב נַחֲמָן, אָמַר לִיה: מַאי טַעְמָא עֵבִיד מָר הָכִי?

Rabbi Tavla went before Rav Nachman and said to him: What is the reason that the Master did this, ruling against our Mishnah which exempts a partner?

ANSWER

אָמַר לִיה: דְּכִי אֲתָא רַבִּי אַחָא בַר חֲנִינָא מִדְּרוּמָא, אָמַר רַבִּי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ בֶּן לֵוִי, זְקֵנִי דְרוּם אָמְרוּ: כֹּהֵן טַבַּח – שְׁתֵּים וְשָׁלֹשׁ שָׁבָתוֹת פֶּטוּר מִן הַמִּתְנּוֹת, מִכָּאן וְאֵילָּה חִיִּיב בְּמִתְנּוֹת.

Rav Nachman said to him: For when Rabbi Acha bar Chanina came from the South, he said that Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi and the Elders of the South said: A Kohen who is a butcher is exempt from the gifts for the first two or three weeks, because he is not yet established as a commercial butcher; but from this point forward, he is obligated in the gifts because he is now a professional butcher. The same applies to your partner.

OBJECTION

אָמַר לִיה: וְהָא רַבִּי טַבְלָא פִטְרֵן! אָמַר לִיה: וְלַעֲבִיד לִיה מָר מִיָּהָת כְּרַבִּי אַחָא בַר חֲנִינָא!

Rabbi Tavla said to him: But let the Master at least act for him in accordance with Rabbi Acha bar Chanina and exempt him for the first three weeks!

RESOLUTION

אָמַר לִיה: הָנִי מִילִי דְלָא קָבַע מְסַחְתָּא, אֲבָל הָכָא הָא קָבַע מְסַחְתָּא.

Rav Nachman said to him: That applies only where he did not set up a butcher shop immediately, but here, he has already set up a butcher shop, so he is obligated right away.

STATEMENT

אָמַר רַב חֲסִידָא: הָאִי כֹהֵנָא דְלָא מִפְּרִישׁ מִתְנַתָּא – לִיְהוִי בְּשִׁמְתָא דְאַלְהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל.

Rav Chisda said: Any Kohen who does not separate the gifts to give to another Kohen when he slaughters, let him be under the excommunication of the God of Israel.

STATEMENT

אָמַר רַבָּה בַר רַב שֵׁילָא: הָנִי טַבְחֵי דְהוּצָל קִיָּמִי בְּשִׁמְתָא דְרַב חֲסִידָא הָא עֲשָׂרִים וְתַרְתֵּי שָׁנִין.

Rabba bar Rav Sheila said: Those butchers of Huzal have stood under the excommunication of Rav Chisda for these twenty-two years because they refused to separate the gifts.

QUESTION

למאי הלכתא? אי לימא דתו לא משמתינן להו – והא תנא: כמה דברים אמורים? במצות לא תעשה, אבל במצות עשה, כגון אומרים לו "עשה סוכה" ואינו עשה, "לולב" ואינו עשה, "עשה ציצית" ואינו עשה – מכין אותו עד שתצא נפשו!

The Gemara asks: **For what halachic purpose** did Rabba bar Rav Sheila mention this twenty-two year period? If we say that we **do not excommunicate them any longer** than twenty-two years, **but isn't it taught in a braisa: In what case are these words said**, that we do not pressure a person indefinitely? **Regarding a negative commandment** where he already transgressed, **but regarding a positive commandment**—such as where we say to him, "Make a succah," and he does not do so, "Take a lulav," and he does not do so, "Make tzitzis," and he does not do so—we strike him until his soul departs! So we should excommunicate them forever until they comply!

ANSWER

אלא, דקנסין להו בלא אתרייתא, כי הא דרבא קניס אטמא, רב נחמן בר יצחק קניס גלימא.

Rather, it means **that we fine them even without forewarning** because they are established transgressors. **Just as Rava fined** a recalcitrant butcher by taking away the entire **thigh** of his animal, and **Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak fined** a person by taking away his **cloak** to pay for the gifts.

STATEMENT

ואמר רב חסדא: זרוע לאחד, וקבה לאחד, לחיים לשניים.

And Rav Chisda said: The foreleg should be given to **one** Kohen, and the maw to **one** Kohen, but the jaw, which consists of two cheeks, may be given to **two** Kohanim.

QUESTION

איני? והא כי אתא רב יצחק בר יוסף אמר: במערבא פלגינן להו גרמא גרמא!

The Gemara asks: **Is that so?** But when Rav Yitzchak bar Yosef came from Eretz Yisrael, he said: **In the West**, in Eretz Yisrael, **they divide them bone by bone**, giving even smaller parts to different Kohanim!

ANSWER

התם בדתורא.

The Gemara answers: **There**, in Eretz Yisrael, they were dealing **with the ox of a bull**, which is very large, so even a single bone has a respectable amount of meat on it to be considered a proper "gift."

STATEMENT

אמר רבה בר בר חנה, אמר רבי יוחנן: אסור לאכול מבמהה שלא הורמה מתנותיה.

Rabba bar bar Chana said that Rabbi Yochanan said: It is forbidden to eat from an animal whose gifts have not been separated.

STATEMENT

אמר רבה בר בר חנה, אמר רבי יוחנן: כל האוכל מבמהה שלא הורמה מתנותיה – כאילו אוכל טבלים, ולית הלכתא כוותיה.

Rabba bar bar Chana said that Rabbi Yochanan said: Anyone who eats from an animal whose gifts have not been separated is as if he eats tevel, untithed produce. The Gemara notes: But the halachah is not in accordance with his opinion; rather, the animal is permitted to be eaten even before the gifts are separated.

STATEMENT

אמר רב חסדא: מתנות כהונה אין נאכלות אלא צלי, ואין נאכלות אלא בחרדל.

Rav Chisda said: The priestly gifts may only be eaten roasted, and they may only be eaten with mustard.

EXPLANATION

מאי טעמא? אמר קרא: "למשחה" – לגדולה, בדרך שהמלכים אוכלים.

What is the reason? The pasuk says regarding the gifts: "For a consecrated portion"—which means for greatness, in the manner that kings eat, and kings eat roasted meat with mustard.

STATEMENT

ואמר רב חסדא: עשרים וארבע מתנות כהונה, כל כהן שאינו בקי בהן – אין נותנין לו מתנה.

And Rav Chisda said: Regarding the twenty-four priestly gifts, any Kohen who is not expert in them, we do not give him a gift.

REFUTATION

ולאו מילתא היא, דתנא: רבי שמעון אומר: כל כהן שאינו מודה בעבודה – אין לו חלק בכהונה, שנאמר: "המקריב את דם השלמים ואת החלב מבני אהרן לו תהיה שוק הימין למנה".

The Gemara notes: But this is not a correct matter, as it was taught in a braisa: Rabbi Shimon says: Any Kohen who does not believe in the Temple service has no portion in the priesthood, as it is said: "He among the sons of Aaron who offers the blood of the peace-offerings and the fat, to him shall belong the right thigh for a portion." This shows that only one who rejects the service is excluded.

BRAISA

אין לי אלא זה בלבד, מניין לרבות חמש עשרה עבודות, כגון: היציקות, והפלילות, והפתיתות, והמליחות, תנופות, והגשות, [והקמיצות], הקטרות, [והמציות], [והמליקות].

The braisa continues: I only have this service of offering the blood and fat alone; from where do we derive to include the fifteen other services, such as: the pourings of oil, and the mixings, and the breakings of the meal-offerings, and the saltings, the wavings, and the bringings near to the Altar, and the scoopings, the burnings, and the squeezings of the bird's blood, and the pinchings of the bird's neck?

SUMMARY

The daf establishes that the halacha follows Ulla that a Kohen's daughter may receive the priestly gifts, and we see that several Amoraim did so in practice. We then learn that a hybrid animal and a koy are subject to a machlokes between Rabbi Eliezer and the Rabbis; the Rabbis hold they are obligated in the gifts, which the Gemara explains either means they are obligated in half the gifts due to the doubt of its parentage, or that a special ribuy from the pesukim includes them fully. Finally, we begin a new Mishnah teaching that if a firstborn animal—which is exempt from these gifts—is mixed up among

one hundred ordinary animals, the owners are exempt if different people slaughter them, as each can claim his animal is the exempt firstborn, but if one person slaughters them all, he must set aside the value of one animal's gifts.

למעשה WHAT TO TAKE HOME

The Gemara brings down a beautiful halachic reality: Rav Kahana, Rav Pappa, Rav Yeimar, and Rav Idi bar Avin all ate the priestly gifts of the foreleg, jaws, and maw on account of their wives who were daughters of Kohanim. Lichoira, these great Amoraim were not Kohanim themselves, yet because they were married to a Kohen's daughter, they were zocheh to eat these holy matnos kehunah. The Torah's holiness did not just stay with the wife; it extended to her husband, bringing him directly into the circle of the Kohen's avodah.

This teaches us a massive yesod in our own avodas Hashem. A person might think, "I am not the one doing the actual learning or the specific mitzvah right now; I am just the supporter, the spouse, or the partner." The sugya is telling us that in ruchniyus, connection is real. When you support your spouse's learning, when you help a friend do a mitzvah, or when you stand by someone who is serving Hashem, you are not a bystander. You become a partner in the very holiness of that act, eating from the same spiritual table.

Today, look for one small way to actively support, encourage, or facilitate someone else's mitzvah or Torah learning, and realize that by doing so, you are sharing directly in that very same kedushah.