

דף יומי • בכורות • דף כ"ד

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

THE SUGYA

We begin the daf by analyzing Rav's ruling regarding the halacha in our chapter. The Gemara is bothered by a redundancy: if Rav already established that the halacha follows the anonymous Mishnah throughout the entire chapter, why did he need to explicitly state that the halacha follows Rabbi Yosei ben HaMeshullam, who is the anonymous Tanna of our Mishnah? The Gemara explains that this explicit ruling was necessary to teach us a major chiddush in the rules of psak: a dispute in a Braisa does not break the anonymity of a Mishnah, meaning we still paskin like the anonymous Mishnah even if a Braisa argues on it.

This leads the Gemara into a deep discussion of a Braisa where Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel argues on the Rabbis regarding a nursing animal purchased from a non-Jew. The Tanna Kamma holds we fear the animal is nursing another's offspring out of mercy, making the next birth a doubt-firstborn, while Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says we go by the presumptive status that she is nursing her own. The Gemara raises a kasha on the exact parameters of Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel's sevara, analyzing whether an animal only shows mercy to another's offspring if she herself has given birth, or if she never shows mercy to another's offspring at all.

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

עמוד א' DAF 24A

QUESTION

הלכה פרבי יוסי בן המשולם למה לי?

The Gemara asks: **The halakha is in accordance with Rabbi Yosei ben HaMeshullam, why do I need** Rav to state this explicitly? Since he already said that the halakha is like the anonymous Mishnah throughout the entire chapter, and Rabbi Yosei ben HaMeshullam is the anonymous Tanna of our Mishnah, this is redundant!

ANSWER

אי אמר הלכתא דכוליה פירקין, ולא אמר הלכתא פרבי יוסי בן המשולם, הוה אמינא: אדרבי יוסי בן המשולם קאי,

The Gemara explains: **If Rav had said** only that **the halakha** is in accordance with the anonymous Tanna of our entire chapter, **and he had not said** explicitly that **the halakha is in accordance with Rabbi Yosei ben HaMeshullam**, I would have said that Rav **is referring** only to **Rabbi Yosei ben HaMeshullam's** rulings in this chapter,

EXPLANATION

ומאי "בכוליה פירקין"? דרבי יוסי תרתי אמר,

and what is the meaning of his phrase **"throughout our entire chapter"** which implies multiple rulings? It means **that Rabbi Yosei said two** separate rulings in this chapter,

INFERENCE

וּפְּלוּגְתָּא דְּבִרְיִיתָא פְּלוּגְתָּא הִיא.

and we would have concluded that Rav holds that a **dispute in a Braisa** against an anonymous Mishnah is considered a valid **dispute** that breaks the anonymity of the Mishnah, and therefore we would not rule like the other anonymous Mishnah in our chapter which is disputed by a Braisa.

EXPLANATION

אֲשָׁמְעִינוּ הֵלָכָה כְּרַבִּי יוֹסִי — לֹא־שָׁמְעִינוּ דְּאֶדְרָבּוֹן שְׁמַעוֹן בֶּן גַּמְלִיאֵל קָאֵי, וּפְּלוּגְתָּא דְּבִרְיִיתָא לָאוּ פְּלוּגְתָּא הִיא.

Therefore, Rav **teaches us** explicitly that **the halakha is in accordance with Rabbi Yosei ben HaMeshullam**, to **teach us** that when he said "throughout our entire chapter" **he is referring** also to **Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel's** anonymous ruling in the later Mishnah, **and** this proves that a **dispute in a Braisa** is **not** considered a valid **dispute** to break the anonymity of a Mishnah.

QUESTION

מַאי בְּרִייתָא?

The Gemara asks: **What is** this **Braisa** that disputes Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel's ruling?

BRAISA

דִּתְנִינָא: הַלּוֹקֵחַ בְּהֵמָה מִנִּיקָה מִן הַגּוֹי, הֵבִיא אַחֲרָיו בְּכוֹר מִסֶּפֶק, מִפְּנֵי שְׁמִרְחֻמָּתָא אֶף עַל פִּי שְׂאִינָה יוֹלֶדֶת.

As it is taught in a Braisa: One who purchases a nursing animal from a non-Jew, the offspring that comes after it (the one currently nursing) is a **firstborn out of doubt**, because we say that an animal sometimes **shows mercy** and nurses another's offspring **even though she did not give birth** at all.

BRAISA

רַבּוֹן שְׁמַעוֹן בֶּן גַּמְלִיאֵל אוֹמֵר: דְּבַר בְּהִזְקָתוֹ.

Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says: The matter stands in its **presumptive status**, meaning we assume she is nursing her own offspring, and she has definitely given birth, so the next one is not a firstborn.

BRAISA

וְכֹן הָיָה רַבּוֹן שְׁמַעוֹן בֶּן גַּמְלִיאֵל אוֹמֵר: הַנֶּכְנֵס לְתוֹךְ עֶדְרוֹ בַּלַּיְלָה וַרְאָה כְּעֶשֶׂר כְּחֹמֶשׁ עֶשְׂרֵה, מִבְּכִירוֹת וְשְׂאִינָן מִבְּכִירוֹת, יוֹלֶדֶת.

And so would Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel say: One who enters into his flock at night and saw about ten or fifteen mother animals, some **giving birth for the first time** and some that are **not giving birth for the first time**, and all of them were **giving birth**,

BRAISA

לְמַחֵר הַשָּׂבִים וּמֵצֵא זָכָרִים (תְּלוּיֹת) [תְּלוּיִין] בְּשֹׂאִין מִבְּכִירוֹת, וְנִקְבּוֹת תְּלוּיֹת מִבְּכִירוֹת — אֵינוֹ חוֹשֶׁשׁ שֶׁמָּא בָּנָה שֶׁל זֶה בָּא לוֹ אֶצֶל זֶה.

and the next day he arose early and found the **male** offspring **clinging to** and nursing from the mothers that are **not giving birth for the first time**, and the **females clinging to** and nursing from the mothers **giving birth for the first time**, he does **not fear** lest the offspring of this mother came to that mother. Rather, we assume each is nursing its own.

QUESTION

איבעיא להו: דָּבָר בְּחֻזְקָתוֹ דְּקָאֻמַּר רַבּוֹן שְׂמַעוֹן בֶּן גַּמְלִיאֵל, דְּאִינָה מְרַחֶמֶת אֶלָּא אִם כּוֹן יוֹלְדֶת — הָא הֵיכָא דְּאוּלִיד הֵי יִשְׁיִינוּ לְרַחוּמֵי,

A dilemma was raised before them: When Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel said "the matter stands in its presumptive status," did he mean **that** an animal **does not show mercy** to nurse another's offspring **unless** she gave birth, but where she did give birth **we do fear** for her **showing mercy** to another's offspring?

QUESTION

או דְּלָמָּא: דִּידָהּ מְרַחֶמָא, דְּלָא דִּידָהּ לָא מְרַחֶמָא לִיהָ?

Or perhaps he meant: **She shows mercy** only to **her own** offspring, but to one that is **not her own**, she **does not show mercy** to **it** at all, even if she gave birth?

QUESTION

לְמַאי נִפְקָא מִינָהּ?

The Gemara asks: **What is the practical difference** of this inquiry?

ANSWER

לְמַלְקָא עֲלֵהּ מִשּׁוּם "אוֹתוֹ וְאֶת בְּנוֹ".

The Gemara answers: **To** determine whether one is **flogged for** slaughtering **it** together with the nursing young **because of** the prohibition of "**it and its offspring**" on the same day.

EXPLANATION

אִי אָמַרְתָּ דִּידָהּ מְרַחֶמָא, דְּלָא דִּידָהּ לָא מְרַחֶמָא — לָקִי,

If you say that **she shows mercy** only to **her own**, but to one **not her own** she **does not show mercy**, then it is certain that this is her offspring, and he **is flogged**.

EXPLANATION

וְאִי אָמַרְתָּ דְּלָא דִּידָהּ נִמְי מְרַחֶמָא — לָא לָקִי. מַאי?

But if you say that to one **not her own** she **also shows mercy**, then there is a doubt, and he **is not flogged**. **What** is the law?

PROOF

תָּא שְׂמַע, רַבּוֹן שְׂמַעוֹן בֶּן גַּמְלִיאֵל אוֹמֵר: הַלּוֹקֵחַ בְּהֵמָה מִן הַגּוֹי — אֵינוֹ חוֹשֵׁשׁ שְׂמָא בְּנָה שֶׁל אַחֶרֶת הָיָה.

Come and hear a proof from our Mishnah, where **Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel** says: **One who purchases** a nursing animal **from a non-Jew** **does not fear** lest the nursing young **was the offspring of another** animal. This implies she only nurses her own!

REFUTATION

מִי קִתְּנִי "הוּא"? "הִיא" קִתְּנִי!

The Gemara rejects this: **Does it teach** "**it is**" the offspring of another? "**It was**" the offspring of another **is what it teaches**!

EXPLANATION

הָכִי קֹאֵמֶר: אֵינוּ חוֹשֵׁשׁ שְׂמָא בְּנָה שֶׁל אַחֶרֶת, אֲלֵא אִם כֵּן הִיָּה לָהּ וְלָד מֵעִיקָרָא.

This is what it is saying: He does not fear lest it is the offspring of another, unless she had an offspring originally, meaning she only nurses if she gave birth, but we still don't know if she would nurse another's offspring once she has given birth.

PROOF

תָּא שְׁמַע: נִכְנַס בְּתוֹךְ עֶדְרוֹ וְרָאָה אֶת הַמְּבִירֹת מְנִיקוֹת, וְאֵת שְׂאֵינָן מְבִירֹת מְנִיקוֹת — אֵינוּ חוֹשֵׁשׁ שְׂמָא בְּנָה שֶׁל זֶה בָּא לוֹ אֶצֶל זֶה, אוֹ שְׂמָא בְּנָה שֶׁל זֶה בָּא לוֹ אֶצֶל זֶה.

Come and hear another proof from the Braisa: If he entered into his flock and saw the first-time mothers nursing, and those that are not first-time mothers nursing, he does not fear lest the offspring of this one came to that one, or lest the offspring of that one came to this one.

PROOF

אֲמַאי? לִיחֻשׁ דְּלָמָא רַחֲמֵי רַחִים!

Why not? Let us fear lest she showed mercy to another's offspring, since they all gave birth! This proves she only nurses her own.

REFUTATION

בְּמָקוֹם דִּידָהּ, לָא שְׁבָקָא דִּידָהּ וּמְרַחֲמָא דְּלָא דִּידָהּ.

The Gemara rejects this: In a place where her own offspring is present, she does not leave her own and show mercy to one that is not her own. But where her own is not there, she might nurse another's.

PROOF

תָּא שְׁמַע: דְּכָר בְּחֻזְקָתוֹ כּו'.

Come and hear another proof from the Braisa: "The matter stands in its presumptive status," etc.

PROOF

מַאי לָאוּ רִישָׁא דּוּמְיָא דְּסִיפָא? מָה סִיפָא וְדָאי דִּידָהּ, אֶף רִישָׁא וְדָאי דִּידָהּ.

Is it not that the first clause is similar to the latter clause? Just as the latter clause is a case where it is certainly her own offspring, so too the first clause is a case where we assume it is certainly her own offspring, because she does not nurse another's.

REFUTATION

מִיָּדֵי אִירִיָּא? הָאִי כְּדָאִיתָא, וְהָאִי כְּדָאִיתָא.

The Gemara rejects this: Are the cases comparable? This first clause stands as it is, and that second clause stands as it is. They are different cases.

EXPLANATION

וּמַאי "וְכֵן"? אֶפְטוּרָה דְּכְבוּרָה.

And what is the meaning of the connection "and so"? It refers to the exemption from firstborn status in both cases, not that the mechanism of certainty is the same.

STATEMENT

אמר רבה בר בר חנה אמר רבי יוחנן: ראה חזיר שפרוה אחר רחל, פטורה מן הבכורה, ואסור באכילה "עד יבא ויורה צדק לקם".

Rabba bar bar Chanah said that Rabbi Yochanan said: If one saw a pig that was clinging after and nursing from a ewe, the ewe's next offspring is **exempt** from the law of firstborn, but the pig itself is **forbidden to be eaten** as a doubt "until Eliyahu comes and teaches righteousness to you."

EXPLANATION

פטור מן הבכורה — כמאן? כרפן שמעון בן גמליאל, ואסור באכילה — כרפנן.

The Gemara analyzes this: The ruling that the next offspring is **exempt from the law of firstborn**, like **whom** is this? It is like **Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel**, who says she only nurses if she gave birth. **But** the ruling that the pig is **forbidden to be eaten**, lest it actually came out of the ewe, is **like the Rabbis** who hold of "yotzei" (that which emerges from the tamei is tamei, and here we worry it emerged from the tahor ewe and is kosher, but we rule stringently).

OBJECTION

ותו, אי כרפנן, מאי "עד יבא ויורה צדק לקם"? "עד שיודע לה דבר" מיבעי ליה!

And furthermore, if it is like the Rabbis, what is the meaning of "until he comes and teaches righteousness to you"? "Until the matter becomes known to you" is what it should have said, since it is a standard doubt of fact!

EXPLANATION

וכי תימא: מספקא ליה אי הלכה כרפן שמעון בן גמליאל אי כרפנן.

And if you say that Rabbi Yochanan was **in doubt** whether the halakha is like Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel or like the Rabbis, and therefore ruled stringently on both sides,

OBJECTION

אי מספקא ליה — אמאי פטורה מן הבכורה?

if he was **in doubt**, why did he rule definitely that the next offspring is **exempt from the law of firstborn**? It should be a doubt!

OBJECTION

ותו: מי מספקא ליה? והאמר רבה בר בר חנה אמר רבי יוחנן: כל מקום ששנה רפן שמעון בן גמליאל במשנתינו — הלכה כמותו, חוץ מערב, וציצין, וראיה אחרונה!

And furthermore, was he really **in doubt**? But didn't Rabba bar bar Chanah say that Rabbi Yochanan said: Everywhere that Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel taught in our Mishnah, the halakha is like him, except for the cases of Guarantor, Tzidan, and the Last Proof!

RESOLUTION

לעולם פשיטא ליה הלכה כרפן שמעון בן גמליאל, מיהו מספקא ליה אי סבר רפן שמעון בן גמליאל יולדת מרחמת, או אינה מרחמת.

Rather, actually it was obvious to him that the halakha is like Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel, but he was in doubt whether Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel holds that a mother that gave birth shows mercy to another's offspring, or if she does not show mercy to another's offspring.

QUESTION

אי הכי, עד דאשמעין חזיר, לישמעין טלה, ולמילקי עליה משום "אותו ואת בנו"!

The Gemara asks: If so, instead of teaching us this doubt using a pig, let him teach us using a kosher lamb, and the doubt would be whether one is flogged for it because of "it and its offspring"!

ANSWER

חזיר איצטריקא ליה, דאי אשמעין טלה, הנה אמינא: אם תמצא לומר דסבר יולדת מרחמא — דמינה, דלא מינה — לא.

The Gemara answers: A pig was necessary for him to teach, for if he had taught us using a lamb, I would have said: If you say that Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel holds that a mother that gave birth shows mercy, that is only to one of its own species, but to one not of its own species, she does not show mercy.

EXPLANATION

אשמעין חזיר, דמרחמת, ואפילו דלא מינה נמי, דאיכא למימר דלמא מרחמא.

Therefore, he teaches us using a pig, to show that she might show mercy even to one not of her own species, as we can say that perhaps she shows mercy even to a pig.

STATEMENT

והיינו דאמר רבי יוחנן: בעי

And this is what Rabbi Yochanan asked as a dilemma:

עמוד ב' DAF 24B

QUESTION

אחאי בריבי: ראה חזיר שפרוה אחר רחל, מהו?

The Sage Achai beribbi raised a she'elah: If one saw an animal with the appearance of a pig that was trailing after a ewe, what is the halachic status of this animal?

QUESTION

מאי קמיבעיא ליה?

The Gemara asks: What is the dilemma he is raising?

OBJECTION

אלימא לבכורה, וקמיבעיא ליה אי הלכתא ברבן שמעון בן גמליאל אי הלכתא ברבנן, תיבעי ליה טלה!

If we say he is inquiring with regard to the firstborn status of the future offspring of this ewe, and he is raising a dilemma as to whether the halacha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel, or whether the halacha is in

accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis, then let the dilemma be raised with respect to a regular lamb trailing after a ewe, rather than this unusual case of a pig-like animal!

ANSWER

כִּי קָמִיעָא לִיה, לְבִכּוּרָה וְאֵלִיפָא דְרַבְנָן, לְאֲכִילָהּ וְאֵלִיפָא דְרַבָּן שְׁמַעְיוֹן בֶּן גַּמְלִיאֵל.

The Gemara answers: **When he raised the dilemma**, he raised it on two fronts: **with regard to the firstborn status** of the future offspring, **and this was according to the opinion of the Rabbis**; and also **with regard to the eating** of this pig-like animal, **and this was according to the opinion of Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel**.

EXPLANATION

לְבִכּוּרָה, וְאֵפִילוּ לְרַבְנָן דְּאִמְרֵי מְרַחֲמָא, כִּי מְרַחֲמָא דְמִינָהּ, דִּלָּא מִינָהּ — לָא, אוּ דְלָמָּא דִּלָּא מִינָהּ
נָמִי מְרַחֲמָא?

The Gemara explains: He inquired **with regard to the firstborn status**, and this applies **even according to the Rabbis**, who **say** that an animal **is merciful** and will nurse another animal's offspring. The question is: **When it is merciful**, is that only toward an offspring **of its own species**, but toward an offspring **not of its own species**, it is **not** merciful, so this pig-like animal must be its own offspring? **Or perhaps**, even toward an offspring **not of its own species**, it is **also merciful**, and therefore we have no proof that this ewe has already given birth?

EXPLANATION

לְאֲכִילָהּ, וְאֵפִילוּ לְרַבָּן שְׁמַעְיוֹן בֶּן גַּמְלִיאֵל — אִם תִּמְצָא לומר סָבֵר: יוֹלָדֶת מְרַחֲמָא דְמִינָהּ, דִּלָּא
מִינָהּ — לָא; אוּ דְלָמָּא: דִּלָּא מִינָהּ נָמִי מְרַחֲמָא?

And he also inquired **with regard to the eating** of this pig-like animal, and this applies **even according to Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel**: **If you say** that he **holds** that **an animal that has given birth is merciful** and will nurse, is that only toward an offspring **of its own species**, but toward an offspring **not of its own species**, it is **not** merciful, which would mean this pig-like animal is indeed the offspring of the kosher ewe and is permitted to be eaten? **Or perhaps**, even toward an offspring **not of its own species**, it is **also merciful**, and therefore the pig-like animal is not its offspring and is forbidden?

RESOLUTION

תִּיקוּ.

The Gemara concludes: The dilemma **shall stand** unresolved.

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מִתְּנִי רַבִּי יוֹסֵי בֶּן הַמְּשׁוּלָּם אוֹמֵר: הַשּׁוֹחֵט אֶת הַבְּכוֹר, עוֹשֶׂה מְקוֹם בְּקוֹפִיץ מִיָּפֶן וּמִיָּפֶן, וְתוֹלֵשׁ אֶת
הַשַּׁעַר, וּבִלְבַד שְׁלֹא יִזְיָנוּ מִמְּקוֹמוֹ, וְכֵן תוֹלֵשׁ אֶת הַשַּׁעַר לְרֹאוֹת מְקוֹם מוֹם.

MISHNAH: Rabbi Yosei ben HaMeshullam says: One who slaughters a firstborn animal, and needs to clear the neck of hair for the shechitah, **makes a space with a cleaver from here and from there**, and **plucks the hair**, provided that he **does not move it from its place** so that it remains looking as if it was not sheared. **And likewise**, one **plucks the hair** in this manner to **see the place of a blemish** so a Chacham can examine it.

STATEMENT

גמ' אמר רב: הלכה כרבי יוסי בן המשולם.

GEMARA: Rav said: The halacha is in accordance with Rabbi Yosei ben HaMeshullam.

QUESTION

בעו מיניה מרב הונא: כנגדו ביום טוב מהו?

The Sages raised a dilemma before Rav Huna: In the parallel case of one who wishes to pluck hair to slaughter a non-sacred animal on a Yom Tov, what is the halacha?

EXPLANATION

טעמא דרבי יוסי בן המשולם משום דקסבר תולש לאו היינו גוזז, וביום טוב אסור, דהנה ליה עוקר דבר מגידולו.

Is the reason of Rabbi Yosei ben HaMeshullam to permit this by a firstborn because he holds that plucking is not the same as shearing, and therefore it is not the d'Oraisa melacha of shearing, but on Yom Tov it is still Rabbinically forbidden, because it is considered uprooting something from its place of growth?

EXPLANATION

או דלמא בעלמא סבר רבי יוסי בן המשולם תולש היינו גוזז, והיינו טעמא דשרי, דהנה ליה דבר שאין מתכנין, וביום טוב דבר שאין מתכנין מותר?

Or perhaps in general Rabbi Yosei ben HaMeshullam holds that plucking is the same as shearing, and this is the reason that it is permitted here, because it is an unintentional act, since his intent is only to clear a space for the knife, and on Yom Tov an unintentional act is permitted?

STATEMENT

אמר להו: זילו שילוח לרב חננאל, אי אמר הלכה כרבי יוסי בן המשולם, איפשוט לכו.

Rav Huna said to them: Go and ask Rav Chananel, Rav's disciple; if he says that Rav indeed said the halacha is in accordance with Rabbi Yosei ben HaMeshullam, I will resolve the dilemma for you.

STATEMENT

אתו שילוח, אמר להו: הכי אמר רב: הלכה כרבי יוסי בן המשולם.

They went and asked him, and he said to them: This is what Rav said: The halacha is in accordance with Rabbi Yosei ben HaMeshullam.

RULING

אתו לקמיה דרב הונא, אמר להו: כנגדו ביום טוב מותר.

They came before Rav Huna, and he said to them: In the parallel case on Yom Tov, it is permitted to pluck the hair to facilitate the shechitah.

אִתְּמַר נָמִי, אָמַר רַב חַנְנִיָּה בַּר שְׁלָמְיָא מִשְׁמִיָּה דְרַב: כְּנִגְדּוֹ בְּיוֹם טוֹב

It was also stated by other Amoraim: Rav Chananya bar Shelamya said in the name of Rav: In the parallel case on Yom Tov, it is permitted to pluck the hair.

SUMMARY

The Gemara attempts to resolve this inquiry regarding Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel's view by bringing several proofs from the Mishnah and Braisas, analyzing cases of first-time mothers and older mothers nursing in a flock. The Gemara distinguishes between a situation where an animal's own offspring is present—where she certainly would not leave her own to nurse another—and a situation where her offspring is not present. Finally, the Gemara discusses a ruling from Rabba bar bar Chanah in the name of Rabbi Yochanan regarding a pig found nursing from a ewe, which exempts the ewe's next offspring from the law of the firstborn but leaves the pig's status as a doubt until Eliyahu HaNavi arrives.

לְמַעֲשֶׂה WHAT TO TAKE HOME

The Gemara is deeply bothered by a question of nature: does an animal only show mercy and nurse its own offspring, or will it nurse another's young as well? Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel teaches us a beautiful rule of nature: "In a place where her own offspring is present, she does not leave her own and show mercy to one that is not her own." An animal has a natural, deep-seated connection to its own child, and as long as its own is there, it will not divert its focus to another.

Think about the yesod here for our own lives. Hashem put a natural instinct in the world that we focus on what is truly ours. In our avodas Hashem, we each have our own unique neshama, our own specific portion in Torah, and our own distinct family and life circumstances. The yetzer hara loves to make us look at everyone else's portion, tempting us to "nurse" from fields that do not belong to us, or to wish we had someone else's life, talents, or spiritual strengths.

But the real avodah is to realize that "in a place where your own is present," you must not leave it. Hashem gave you your specific family, your specific chavrusa, and your specific nisyonos because that is your davka portion. When you focus on what is truly yours, you find the natural warmth, energy, and connection that Hashem built into your neshama.

Today, when you feel tempted to compare yourself to others or wish you had their portion, stop and say: "Hashem, this is the portion You gave me, and this is where I belong." Focus your heart and energy entirely on your own family, your own learning, and your own avodah.