

Until he dyed it

עד שצבעו –

OVERVIEW

maintains that שינוי קונה and supports his view from the משנה that states if the owner dyed the ראשית הגז, he is פטור from giving it to the כהן, for (supposedly) the owner was קונה it through שינוי. Ordinarily the concept of שינוי קונה means that the object which originally belonged to the owner is transferred to the new owner who acquires it through שינוי. However here the ראשית הגז initially belonged to the ישראל; how is שינוי קונה applicable here¹. It would seem therefore, that we are discussing a case where the ישראל set aside the ראשית הגז for the כהן, so that it became the property of the כהן and nevertheless the ישראל does not have to give it to him, since the ישראל was קונה the ראשית הגז through the שינוי of צביעה. However תוספות rejects this explanation entirely.

אין לפרש שצבע חלקו של כהן² מה שהפריש לו מן הגיזה³ -

It should not be understood that he dyed the portion of the כהן; meaning that he dyed what he set aside from the shearing for the כהן –

explains why the 'אין לפרש' is unacceptable:

דלא שייכא ביה הפרשה כמו גבי תרומה דהפרשה שייכא ביה⁴ -

For the concept of 'setting aside' הגז for the כהן is not applicable; in contrast to תרומה where 'הפרשה' is applicable -

[אבל] הפרשת ראשית הגז אין כלום מה שמפריש לצד אחד וכאילו לא הפרישו:

[However] the setting aside of הגז for the כהן; whatever he sets aside is meaningless, and it is considered as if he set nothing aside.

SUMMARY

There is no concept of הפרשה by ראשית הגז. It becomes the property of the כהן only when he receives it, not before.

¹ See 'Thinking it over'.

² See 'Overview'. Alternately; תוספות is suggesting that we can be discussing a case where we was not צובע the entire wool (not as לא maintained previously בד"ה, but only the wool which he was מפריש for הגז ראשית. Nevertheless he is not obligated to give the כהן the non-dyed wool. תוספות rejects this approach.

³ This would explain how we derive שינוי קונה from ראשית הגז. Or it would allow the משנה to be discussing a case where he was not צובע all the wool. See previous footnote # 2.

⁴ When the owner sets aside part of his grain for the כהן and proclaims it תרומה, it becomes תרומה with all the restrictions applicable to תרומה; there is no such concept by הגז ראשית.

THINKING IT OVER

How is the question in the 'Overview' addressed (according to תוספות)?⁵

⁵ See 'חז' ר"נ אות סט ומנחת יהודה אות כ'.