

דף יומי • חלין • דף פ"ב

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

THE SUGYA

We begin the daf by continuing our discussion on the Mishnah's list of animals that are exempt from the prohibition of "it and its offspring" (oto v'es b'no) when slaughtered. The Gemara focuses on the red heifer (parah adumah) and the heifer whose neck is broken (eglah arufah), analyzing whether their slaughter is considered a "fit slaughter" and questioning the authenticity of these cases in our Mishnah's text.

We then move into a new Mishnah that deals with the practical halachos of two people who buy a cow and its offspring. The Gemara discusses who has the right to slaughter first and the status of the second buyer if he goes ahead anyway. Finally, we learn a new Mishnah detailing the lashes incurred when multiple generations of animals—such as a mother, daughter, and granddaughter—are slaughtered on the same day, leading into a deep halachic analysis of the Torah's wording.

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

עמוד א' DAF 82A

EXPLANATION

ואמר רבי שמעון בן לקיש: אומר היה רבי שמעון, פרה נפדית על גבי מערכתה.

And Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish said: Rabbi Shimon would say that the red heifer can be redeemed with money even upon its pyre, right before it is burned. Since it can be redeemed and eaten, its slaughter is considered a fit slaughter, which is why Rabbi Shimon had to explicitly exempt it in our Mishnah.

ANSWER

אמר רב שמן בר אבא אמר רבי יוחנן: פרת חטאת אינה משנה.

Rav Shemen bar Abba said that Rabbi Yochanan said: The case of the heifer of purification in the Mishnah is not an authentic Mishnah text, as it was inserted by an error, and Rabbi Shimon actually agrees that one who slaughters it is liable.

QUESTION

ועגלה ערופה, לאו שחיטה ראיה היא?

The Gemara asks: **And** as for the heifer whose neck is broken, is its slaughter not a fit slaughter? Why does the Mishnah exempt one who slaughters it?

PROOF

והתנן: נמצא ההורג עד שלא תערף העגלה – תצא ותרעה בעדר.

But didn't we learn in a Mishnah: If the murderer was found before the heifer's neck was broken, the heifer shall go out and graze in the herd, because it is not consecrated? This proves that before its neck is broken, it is permitted to derive benefit from it, so its slaughter is fit!

ANSWER

אמר רבי שמעון בן לקיש משום רבי ינאי: עגלה ערופה אינה משנה.

Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish said in the name of Rabbi Yannai: The case of the heifer whose neck is broken is not an authentic **Mishnah** text, and Rabbi Shimon actually holds that one is liable.

QUESTION

ומי אמר רבי ינאי הכי? והאמר רבי ינאי: גבול שמעתי בה, ושכחתי, ונסבין חבריא לומר: ירידתה לנחל איתן אוסרתה.

The Gemara asks: **And did Rabbi Yannai really say this? But didn't Rabbi Yannai say: I heard a boundary, a specific point, regarding when it becomes forbidden, but I forgot what it was; and the colleagues inclined to say that its descent to the rugged valley is what forbids it?**

OBJECTION

ואם איתא, לישני: כאן קודם ירידה, כאן לאחר ירידה.

And if it is so that Rabbi Yannai holds the Mishnah is authentic, **let him resolve** the contradiction by saying: **Here**, where he is liable, it is **before the descent**; **there**, where he is exempt, it is **after the descent**, when it is already forbidden to derive benefit from it! Why say the Mishnah is not authentic?

RESOLUTION

אמר רב פנחס בריה דרב אמאי: אנו משמיה דרבי שמעון בן לקיש מתנינן לה, עגלה ערופה אינה משנה.

Rav Pinchas the son of Rav Ami said: We learn this statement in the name of Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish himself, and not in the name of Rabbi Yannai, that the **heifer whose neck is broken** is **not** an authentic **Mishnah** text.

QUESTION

אמר רב אשי: כי הוינן בי רב פפי קשיא לן, מי אמר רבי שמעון בן לקיש הכי?

Rav Ashi said: When we were in the study hall of Rav Pappi, this was difficult for us: Did Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish really **say this**, that the heifer whose neck is broken is not an authentic Mishnah?

PROOF

והא איתמר, צפורי מצורע מאימתי נאסרין? רבי יוחנן אמר: משעת שחיטה, ורבי שמעון בן לקיש אמר: משעת לקיחה,

But was it not stated that there is an Amoraic dispute: **From when are the birds of a metzora forbidden** for benefit? **Rabbi Yochanan said: From the time of slaughter;** and **Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish said: From the time of taking** and designating them.

EXPLANATION

ואמרין: מאי טעמא דרבי שמעון בן לקיש? גמר "קיקה" "קיקה" מעגלה ערופה.

And we said: What is the reason of Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish? He derives it by a gezerah shavah of "**taking**" written by the birds **from "taking"** written by **the heifer whose neck is broken**. Just as the heifer is forbidden from the moment of taking, so

are the birds. Thus, Reish Lakish holds the heifer is forbidden while alive, making its slaughter unfit, so he would agree with our Mishnah's exemption!

RESOLUTION

אֵלָא אָמַר רַבִּי חִיָּיא בַּר אֲבָא אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: עֲגָלָה עָרוּפָה אֵינָה מִשְׁנָה.

Rather, Rabbi Chiyya bar Abba said that Rabbi Yochanan said: The case of the heifer whose neck is broken is not an authentic Mishnah text. It was Rabbi Yochanan, not Reish Lakish, who said this.

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מִתְנִי שְׁנַיִם שָׁלְקוּ פָּרָה וּבָנָהּ, אִיזָה שָׁלַח רֵאשׁוֹן יִשְׁחוּט רֵאשׁוֹן, וְאִם קִדַּם הַשֵּׁנִי – זָכָה.

MISHNAH: Two people who purchased a cow and its offspring, each buying one of them, whichever purchased first shall slaughter first, and if the second preceded him and slaughtered first, he has merited and the first must wait.

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

STATEMENT

גְּמִ' אָמַר רַב יוֹסֵף: לְעֵנֶן דִּינָא תָּנָן,

GEMARA: Rav Yosef said: We learned this regarding a matter of a court judgment, meaning that the first purchaser only has legal recourse to prevent the second from slaughtering first, but there is no actual prohibition if the second does so.

PROOF

תָּנָא: אִם קִדַּם הַשֵּׁנִי – הָרִי זֶה זָרִיז וְנִשְׁכָּר, זָרִיז – דְּלֹא עָבַד אִיסוּרָא, וְנִשְׁכָּר – דִּקְאָכִיל בִּשְׂרָא.

A Sage taught in a Baraita: If the second preceded and slaughtered, he is diligent and rewarded; diligent because he did not perform a prohibition, and rewarded because he eats meat on that day.

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מִתְנִי שְׁחַט פָּרָה וְאַחֵר כֶּה שְׁנֵי בָנֶיהָ – סוּפֵג שְׁמוֹנִים,

MISHNAH: If one slaughtered a cow and afterwards slaughtered its two offspring on the same day, he receives eighty lashes, forty for each offspring.

MISHNAH

שְׁחַט שְׁנֵי בָנֶיהָ וְאַחֵר כֶּה שְׁחָטָהּ – סוּפֵג אֶת הָאַרְבָּעִים,

If he slaughtered its two offspring and afterwards slaughtered it, he receives forty lashes, because the prohibition was only violated when the mother was slaughtered.

MISHNAH

שְׁחָטָהּ וְאֶת בִּתָּהּ וְאֶת בִּתְּהָתָהּ – סוֹפֵג שְׁמוֹנִים.

If he slaughtered it, and then its daughter, and then its daughter's daughter, he receives eighty lashes.

MISHNAH

שְׁחָטָהּ וְאֶת בִּתָּהּ, וְאַחֲרַיָּהּ שָׁחַט בָּתָּהּ – סוֹפֵג אֶת הָאַרְבָּעִים.

If he slaughtered it and its daughter's daughter, and afterwards slaughtered its daughter, he receives forty lashes.

MISHNAH

סוּמָחוֹס אוֹמֵר מִשּׁוֹם רַבִּי מֵאִיר: סוֹפֵג שְׁמוֹנִים.

Sumachos says in the name of Rabbi Meir: He receives eighty lashes, because slaughtering the daughter violates the prohibition in relation to both its mother and its offspring.

GEMARA

QUESTION

גַּמְ' אַמַּאי? "אוֹתוֹ וְאֶת בְּנוֹ" אָמַר רַחֲמָנָא, וְלֹא בְנוֹ וְאוֹתוֹ!

GEMARA: The Gemara asks: **Why** is one liable when slaughtering the offspring first and then the mother? "It and its offspring" said the Merciful One in the Torah, and not "its offspring and it"!

ANSWER

לֹא סָלָקָא דַּעְתָּהּ, דִּתְנִינָא: "אוֹתוֹ וְאֶת בְּנוֹ" – אֵין לִי אֶלָּא אוֹתוֹ וְאֶת אִמּוֹ מִנִּין?

The Gemara answers: Do not let this enter your mind, as it is taught in a Baraita: "It and its offspring"—I only know the prohibition applies to it and its offspring (parent then offspring); from where do we know it applies to it and its mother (offspring then parent)?

כְּשֶׁהוּא אוֹמֵר "לֹא תִשְׁחָטוּ" – הָרִי כָּאֵן שְׁנַיִם, הָא כִּיצַד? אֶחָד הַשּׁוֹחֵט אֶת הַפֶּרָה, וְאֶחָד הַשּׁוֹחֵט אֶת אִמָּהּ, וְאֶחָד הַשּׁוֹחֵט אֶת בְּנָהּ – שְׁנַיִם הָאֲחֵרוֹנִים חֵיִבִּין.

When it says "you shall not slaughter" in the plural, behold here are two people addressed. How so? Whether one slaughters the cow, or one slaughters its mother, or one slaughters its offspring, the latter two are liable. This proves the prohibition applies in both directions.

צמוד ב' DAF 82B

QUESTION

הֲאִי מִיִּבְעִי לִיהָ לְגוּפִיהָ?

The Gemara asks: But **this** verse is required for itself, to teach the basic prohibition of slaughtering an animal and its offspring on the same day? How can we use it to teach that two people are prohibited?

ANSWER

אם כן, לכתוב "לא תשחוט", מאי "לא תשחוט"?

The Gemara answers: **If so**, that the Torah only wanted to teach the basic prohibition, **let it write "you shall not slaughter"** in the singular form, lo tishchat. **What** is the meaning of the plural form "**you shall not slaughter**", lo tishchatu? It must be to teach that even two people are prohibited.

OBJECTION

ואפתי מיפעי ליה, דאי כתב רחמנא "לא תשחוט" הוה אמינא: חד – אין, תרי – לא. כתב רחמנא "לא תשחוט", ואפילו תרי!

The Gemara objects: **But still, it is required** to write the plural, **for if the Merciful One had written "you shall not slaughter"** in the singular, **I would have said:** For **one** person to do both, **yes**, it is forbidden, but for **two** people, where one slaughters the mother and another slaughters the offspring, **no**, it is not forbidden. Therefore, **the Merciful One wrote "you shall not slaughter"** in the plural, to teach **and even** if **two** people do it, it is forbidden!

RESOLUTION

אם כן, לכתוב "לא ישחוט"! מאי "לא תשחוט"? שמע מינה תרתי.

The Gemara answers: **If so**, that this is all the Torah meant, **let it write "they shall not be slaughtered"** in the passive voice, which would cover any case. **What** is the meaning of the active plural "**you shall not slaughter**"? **Learn from it two** things: that even two people are forbidden, and that both slaughtering the offspring after the mother and the mother after the offspring are forbidden.

MISHNAH מִשְׁנָה

MISHNAH

שחטה ואת בת בתה,

We learned in the Mishnah: If **one slaughtered** an animal **and its daughter's daughter**, and then slaughtered its daughter, he gets eighty lashes according to Sumachos.

GEMARA גְּמָרָא

QUESTION

אמר ליה אבבי לרב יוסה: מאי טעמא דסומכוס?

Abaye said to Rav Yosef: **What is the reasoning of Sumachos** for giving eighty lashes?

QUESTION

קא סבר סומכוס: אכל שני זיתי חלב בהעלם אחד – חייב שתי חטאות.

Does **Sumachos hold** as a general rule that if one **ate two olive-bulks of forbidden fat in one lapse of awareness**, he is **liable to bring two sin-offerings** because he violated the prohibition twice?

EXPLANATION

ובדין הוא דלישמעינו בעלמא, והאי דקא משמע לן בהא, להודיעה כחן דרבנן, דאף על גב דגופין מוח לקין – פטרי רבנן.

And by right, the Mishnah should have let us hear this dispute in a general case of eating forbidden fat, and this that it lets us hear the dispute specifically in this case of slaughtering, is to let you know the power of the Rabbis, that even though the animals are distinct bodies, the Rabbis still exempt him from the second set of lashes.

QUESTION

או דלמא קסבר סומכוס: אכל שני זיתי חלב בהעלים אחד אינו חייב אלא אחת, והכא היינו טעמא – הואיל וגופין מוח לקין?

Or perhaps Sumachos holds that if one ate two olive-bulks of forbidden fat in one lapse of awareness, he is only liable for one sin-offering, and here, this is the reason he gets eighty lashes: since they are distinct bodies, which makes them separate transgressions?

ANSWER

אמר ליה: אין, קסבר אכל שני זיתי חלב בהעלים אחד חייב שתי חטאות.

Rav Yosef said to him: Yes, Sumachos indeed holds that if one ate two olive-bulks of forbidden fat in one lapse of awareness, he is liable for two sin-offerings.

QUESTION

ממאי? מדתנן: הזורע כלאים כלאים לוקה.

The Gemara asks: From where does Rav Yosef know this? From that which we learned in a Baraisa: One who sows diverse seeds, diverse seeds, is flogged.

EXPLANATION

מאי לוקה? אילימא לוקה אחת – פשיטא! ועוד, מאי כלאים כלאים? אלא פשיטא שתי מלקיות.

The Gemara analyzes: What is the meaning of "is flogged"? If we say it means he is flogged once, that is obvious! And furthermore, why does the Baraisa repeat "diverse seeds, diverse seeds"? Rather, it is obvious that he receives two sets of lashes.

QUESTION

במאי עסקינן? אילימא בזה אחר זה ובשתי התראות – תנינא: נזיר שהיה שותה יין כל היום אינו חייב אלא אחת, אמרו לו: 'אל תשתה!' והוא שותה, 'אל תשתה!' והוא שותה – חייב על כל אחת ואחת.

The Gemara continues: With what are we dealing? If we say we are dealing with sowing one after the other, and with two separate warnings, we already learned this in a Mishnah: A Nazirite who was drinking wine all day is only liable for one set of lashes; but if they said to him, "Do not drink!" and he drinks, "Do not drink!" and he drinks, he is liable for each and every one. So we do not need a Baraisa to teach this.

ANSWER

אלא פשיטא בבת אחת ובהתראה אחת.

Rather, it is obvious that we are dealing with sowing two types of diverse seeds at the same time, and with a single warning.

QUESTION

מני? אי לימא רבנן דפליגי עליה דסומכוס – השתא, ומה התם דגופין מוחלקין פטרי רבנן, הכא לא כל שפן?

Now, whose opinion is this Baraisa? If we say it is the Rabbis who argue with Sumachos in our Mishnah, that cannot be:

Now, if there, where the animals are distinct bodies, the Rabbis exempt him from a second set of lashes, here, where seeds are not distinct bodies, is it not all the more so that they would exempt him?

INFERENCE

א לא לאו סומכוס היא?

Rather, is it not that this Baraisa is the opinion of Sumachos, proving that he holds one can get two sets of lashes for violating a single prohibition twice under one warning?

REFUTATION

לא, לעולם רבנן, ומילתא אנב אורחיה קא משמע לן דאיכא תרי גוויי כלאים.

The Gemara rejects this: No, actually the Baraisa can be in accordance with the Rabbis, and he sowed with two separate warnings. And the reason it repeated the words "diverse seeds" is that by the way, it lets us hear a matter: that there are two types of diverse seeds that are forbidden.

EXPLANATION

ולאפוקי מדרבי יאשיה, דאמר רבי יאשיה: עד שיזרע חטה ושיעורה וחרצן במפולת יד, קא משמע לן דכי זרע חטה וחרצן ושיעורה וחרצן נמי מחייב.

And this is to exclude the view of Rabbi Yoshiyah, for Rabbi Yoshiyah said: One is not liable until he sows wheat, barley, and a grape seed together with a single throw of the hand. Therefore, the Baraisa lets us hear that when he sows wheat and a grape seed, or barley and a grape seed, he is also liable for each combination separately.

PROOF

תא שמע: אכל מזה פזית ומזה פזית – סופג שמונים.

The Gemara suggests: Come and hear a proof from another Baraisa: If one ate an olive-bulk of this forbidden fat and an olive-bulk of that forbidden fat, he receives eighty lashes.

STATEMENT

רבי יהודה אומר: אינו סופג אלא ארבעים.

Rabbi Yehuda says: He only receives forty lashes.

QUESTION

היכי דמי? אי לימא בזה אחר זה ובשתי התראות – מאי טעמא דרבי יהודה?

The Gemara analyzes: What are the circumstances? If we say he ate them one after the other, and with two warnings, what is the reason of Rabbi Yehuda for exempting him from the second set of lashes?

EXPLANATION

התראת ספק היא, ושמעינו ליה לרבי יהודה דאמר: התראת ספק לא שמה התראה.

Is it because **it is a doubtful warning**, since at the time of the warning we did not know if he would eat enough to be liable, **and we have heard Rabbi Yehuda say that a doubtful warning is not considered a valid warning?**

PROOF

דתניא: הכה את זה וחזר והכה את זה, קלל את זה וחזר וקלל את זה, או שהכה שניהם בבת אחת, או שקלל שניהם בבת אחת – חייב.

As it is taught in a Baraisa: If a son **struck this parent and went back and struck that parent**, or **cursed this parent and went back and cursed that parent**, or if he **struck both of them at the same time**, or **cursed both of them at the same time**, he is **liable** to the death penalty.

STATEMENT

רבי יהודה אומר: בבת אחת – חייב, בזה אחר זה – פטור.

Rabbi Yehuda says: If he did it **at the same time**, he is **liable**; but if he did it **one after the other**, he is **exempt** because the warning was doubtful.

ANSWER

אלא פשיטא בבת אחת ובהתראה אחת.

Rather, it is **obvious** that the Baraisa of the eighty lashes is dealing with eating them **at the same time**, and with a **single warning**.

QUESTION

ומאן תנא קמא? אילימא רבנן דפליגי עליה דסומכוס – השתא, ומה התם דגופין מוחלקין פטרי רבנן, הכא לא כל שפון?

And who is the **First Tanna** who says he gets eighty lashes? If we say it is the **Rabbis** who argue with Sumachos, now, if **there, where** the animals are **distinct bodies**, the **Rabbis** exempt him, **here**, where it is just two pieces of fat, is it not **all the more so** that they would exempt him?

INFERENCE

אלא לאו סומכוס היא!

Rather, is it not that the **First Tanna** is **Sumachos**, proving that Sumachos holds one gets two sets of lashes for two olive-bulks under one warning?

REFUTATION

לא, לעולם בזה אחר זה, ורבנן, והאי תנא סבר לה כאידה תנא דרבי יהודה.

The Gemara rejects this: **No**, actually we are dealing with eating them **one after the other**, and the **First Tanna** is the **Rabbis**. And this **Tanna** holds like the **other Tanna** who argues with **Rabbi Yehuda** on another matter.

EXPLANATION

דאמר: התראת ספק שמה התראה, דתניא: "לא תותירו ממנו עד בקר והנותר ממנו עד בקר באש תשרפו" –

Who said: A doubtful warning is considered a valid warning. As it is taught in a Baraisa: "You shall not leave over any of it until morning, and that which is left over of it until morning you shall burn in fire" —

SUMMARY

The Gemara first analyzes the opinions of Reish Lakish and Rabbi Yochanan regarding the status of the red heifer and the eglah arufah, with various Amoraim suggesting that these cases are actually scribal errors and not authentic parts of our Mishnah. Next, the Gemara clarifies that if two people buy a mother and its offspring, the first buyer has the legal right to slaughter first, but if the second buyer precedes him, he is considered "diligent and rewarded" and does not violate a prohibition. We then analyze the source for the prohibition of "oto v'es b'no" applying in both directions—whether one slaughters the parent first or the offspring first—deriving this from the plural phrasing of "lo tishchatu" in the Torah.

למעשה WHAT TO TAKE HOME

In our sugya, we learn a fascinating halachah regarding two people who bought a cow and its calf. The halachah is that whoever bought first has the right to slaughter first. But the Gemara brings a Baraita with a beautiful twist: if the second buyer ran ahead and slaughtered his animal first, he is called "zariz v'nischar", diligent and rewarded. Why? Because he didn't actually violate any prohibition himself, and lichoira, he gets to eat his meat today without waiting.

Look at the deep yesod the Torah is teaching us here. Sometimes in life, we find ourselves in a situation where things didn't go according to the official order. You had a plan, a structure, a specific way things were "supposed" to go, but someone else stepped in or circumstances changed. The natural reaction is to get upset, to feel like we lost out, or to dwell on the mess-up. But the Torah shows us a different way to look at reality. The second buyer didn't do anything wrong; he simply acted, and mimeila, he is eating meat today.

This is a powerful lesson in emunah and how we view the daily events of our lives. When things happen out of order, or when someone else gets the head start we thought was ours, Hashem is telling us: look at the reality in front of you right now. Don't waste your energy on what "should" have been. Find the good, find the opportunity to serve Hashem in the present situation, and be "zariz v'nischar" with what you have.

Today, if a plan gets disrupted or someone takes a turn ahead of you, do not get frustrated or try to force the old order. Instead, accept the new reality with a smile, find the immediate good in it, and move forward with alacrity.