

דף יומי • חזקוני • דף פ"ו

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

THE SUGYA

We start off on our daf with the Gemara continuing to analyze the shakla v'tarya between Rav Dimi and Ravin regarding Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi's instructions to Rabbi Chiyya. The Gemara explains how each Amora uses a style of "it is not necessary" to teach us a major chiddush—either that an unfit slaughter is not considered slaughter, or that the slaughter of a bird is indeed a Torah obligation. Along the way, the Gemara brings a beautiful and warm Agaddah about the immense merit of Rabbi Chiyya and his sons, whose presence in Eretz Yisrael protected the entire generation from natural disasters and crop failures, even though they themselves suffered from poverty and loss.

Next, we learn a new Mishnah that deals with the halachos of a deaf-mute, an imbecile, or a minor who slaughters. If others are supervising them, the slaughter is kosher, and the observer must cover the blood. However, if they slaughtered unsupervised, the Mishnah discusses whether we are exempt from covering the blood and whether the prohibition of "it and its offspring" (oto v'es b'no) applies. The Gemara immediately launches into a deep analysis of the Sages' view, questioning why they distinguish between the halachos of covering the blood and the halachos of "it and its offspring."

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

עמוד א' DAF 86A

ANSWER

לא מיבעיא קאמר:

The Gemara answers: Rav Dimi **is speaking** utilizing the style of "**it is not necessary**" to teach both cases, but rather one is taught because of the other.

EXPLANATION

לא מיבעיא "צא נחור" דלאו שחיטה היא כלל,

It is not necessary to teach the case where Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi said, "**Go out and tear loose** the windpipe and gullet," since that **is not** an act of **slaughter at all** and obviously does not require covering the blood.

EXPLANATION

אבל "צא טרוף" אימא שחיטה שאינה ראויה שמה שחיטה וליבעי כסוי,

But in the case where he said, "**Go out and render** the bird a **tereifa**" by making a small cut, I might say that an **unfit slaughter** is nevertheless **considered slaughter**, and therefore **it should require covering** of the blood.

EXPLANATION

קא משמע לן כדרבי חייא בר אבא.

Therefore, Rav Dimi **teaches us** that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi holds **in accordance with** the statement of Rabbi Chiyya bar Abba that an unfit slaughter is not considered slaughter.

QUESTION

וּלְמַאן דְּאָמַר "צֵא נְחוּר", מַאי טַעְמָא לָא אָמַר "צֵא טְרוּף"?

The Gemara asks: **And according to the one who says** that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi said, "Go out and tear loose," what is the reason he **did not say**, "Go out and render the bird a tereifa"?

QUESTION

וְכִי תִימָא קְסָבֵר שְׁחִיטָה שְׂאִינָה רְאוּיָה שְׁמָה שְׁחִיטָה,

And if you would say that the reason is because Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi **holds** that an unfit slaughter is considered slaughter, and he wanted to avoid a case that might require covering,

OBJECTION

וְהָא אָמַר רַבִּי חִיָּיא בַר אֲבָא אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: רָאָה רַבִּי דְּבָרֵיו שֶׁל רַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן בְּכֶסְוֵי הַדָּם, וּשְׁנָא בְּלִשׁוֹן חֲכָמִים!

but didn't Rabbi Chiyya bar Abba say that Rabbi Yochanan said: Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi saw as correct the words of Rabbi Shimon regarding covering the blood, and taught it in the Mishnah in the language of "the Sages" as the anonymous ruling? So Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi clearly holds that an unfit slaughter is not considered slaughter!

ANSWER

לָא מִיבְעָא קְאָמַר:

The Gemara answers: Ravin, who holds that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi said "Go out and tear loose," also **is speaking** utilizing the style of "it is not necessary."

EXPLANATION

לָא מִיבְעָא "צֵא טְרוּף", דְּשְׁחִיטָה שְׂאִינָה רְאוּיָה לָא שְׁמָה שְׁחִיטָה,

It is not necessary to teach the case of "Go out and render the bird a tereifa," since we already know that an unfit slaughter is **not considered slaughter** and does not require covering.

EXPLANATION

אָבֵל "צֵא נְחוּר" – אֵימָא: אֵין שְׁחִיטָה לְעוֹף מִן הַתּוֹרָה, וּנְחִירְתּוֹ זֶה הִיא שְׁחִיטָתוֹ, וְלִיבְעֵי כְּסוּי,

But in the case of "Go out and tear loose," I might say that **there is no** obligation of kosher slaughter for a bird from the Torah, and therefore **its tearing loose is considered its slaughter**, and so it should require covering of the blood.

EXPLANATION

קָא מִשְׁמַע לֵן "כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוִּיתִיה".

Therefore, Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi **teaches us** that slaughter of a bird is indeed a Torah obligation, as derived from the words "as I have commanded you."

QUESTION

וּמִי גָפֵל לִיָּה יֹאנִיבָא בְּכִיתָגִיָּה?

The Gemara asks on the story itself: **And did moths really fall into his flax?**

OBJECTION

וְהָאֵמֶר רַבִּין בַּר אֲבָא, וְאָמַר לֵה אָמַר רַבִּי אֲבִין בַּר שֶׁבָא: מִשְׁעָלוּ בְּנֵי הַגּוֹלָה פְּסָקוּ הַזִּיקִין וְהַזְעוֹת וְהַרוּחוֹת וְהָרָעָמִים, וְלֹא הִחְמִיץ יֵינֵם, וְלֹא לָקָה פְּשִׁתָּנָם.

But didn't Ravin bar Abba say, and some say Rabbi Avin bar Sheva said: From when the people of the Exile ascended from Babylonia to Eretz Yisrael, shooting stars, earthquakes, storm winds, and thunder ceased, and their wine did not sour, and their flax was not stricken?

OBJECTION

וְנִתְּנוּ חֲכָמִים עֵינֵיהֶם בְּרַבִּי חִיָּיא וּבָנָיו.

And the Sages cast their eyes upon Rabbi Chiyya and his sons, attributing this blessing to their great merit! If so, how could Rabbi Chiyya's own flax be ruined?

ANSWER

כִּי מִהֲנִיָּא זְכוּתָיָהּ – אֲעֻלָּמָא, אֲדִידָהּ – לָא.

The Gemara answers: **When their merit is effective**, it is effective **for the world**, but **for themselves**, **no**, it does not protect them from suffering.

PROOF

בְּדָרְבַּי יְהוּדָה אָמַר רַב, דָּאֵמַר רַב יְהוּדָה אָמַר רַב: בְּכָל יוֹם וַיּוֹם פֶּת קוֹל יוֹצֵאת וְאוֹמֶרֶת: כָּל הָעוֹלָם כּוּלּוּ נִיזוֹן בְּשִׁבְלֵי חֲנִינָא בְּנִי, וְחֲנִינָא בְּנִי דִּי לֹא בִּקְבַּח חֲרוּבִין מְעַרְבֵי שַׁבַּת לְעַרְבֵי שַׁבַּת.

This is in accordance with what Rav Yehuda said in the name of Rav, as Rav Yehuda said in the name of Rav: Every single day a Heavenly Voice goes out and says, "The entire world is sustained for the sake of Chanina my son, yet for Chanina my son, a kav of carobs is enough for him from one Erev Shabbos to the next Erev Shabbos."

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מִתְּנִי חֵרֶשׁ שׁוֹטֵה וְקָטָן שֶׁשָּׁחֲטוּ, וְאַחֵרִים רוֹאִין אוֹתָם – חַיִּיב לְכַסּוֹת.

MISHNAH: A deaf-mute, an imbecile, or a minor who slaughtered, and others are seeing them to ensure they slaughtered correctly, the one who saw them is **obligated to cover** the blood.

MISHNAH

בֵּינָם לְבֵין עֶצְמָן – פֶּטוּר מִלְּכַסּוֹת.

If they slaughtered **between themselves** without supervision, one is **exempt from covering** the blood.

MISHNAH

וְכֵן לְעֶנְיָן אוֹתוֹ וְאֵת בְּנוֹ, שֶׁשָּׁחֲטוּ וְאַחֵרִים רוֹאִין אוֹתָן – אָסוּר לְשַׁחוּט אַחֲרֵיהֶם,

And likewise regarding the matter of "it and its offspring" on the same day: if they slaughtered and others are seeing them, it is forbidden to slaughter the offspring after them.

MISHNAH

בֵּינוּ לְבֵין עֶצְמָן – רַבִּי מֵאִיר מִתִּיר לְשַׁחוּט אַחֲרֵיהֶן, וְחֻכָּמִים אוֹסְרִים,

If they slaughtered **between themselves**, Rabbi Meir permits slaughtering the offspring after them, and the Sages forbid doing so.

MISHNAH

וּמוֹדִים שָׂאֵם שָׁחַט – שְׂאִינוּ סוֹפֵג אֶת הָאַרְבָּעִים.

And the Sages **agree that if one** went ahead and slaughtered, he does not receive the forty lashes.

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

QUESTION

גָּמ' וְרַבָּנָן, מַאי שְׁנָא רִישָׁא דְּלֹא פְּלִיגִי, וּמַאי שְׁנָא סִיפָא דְּפְּלִיגִי?

GEMARA: And as for the Sages, what is different about the first clause of the Mishnah where they do not argue and agree that one is exempt from covering, and what is different about the latter clause where they do argue?

ANSWER

רִישָׁא, אִי אָמְרִינוּ חַיִּיבִין לְכַסּוֹת, אָמְרִי: שְׁחִיטָה מְעַלְזִיתָא הִיא, וְאַתִּי לְמִיכַל מְשַׁחֲטָתָן.

The Gemara answers: In **the first clause**, if we say we are obligated to cover the blood, people will say, "It is a proper slaughter," and they will come to eat from their slaughter, which is forbidden.

OBJECTION

סִיפָא נָמִי, כִּיּוֹן דְּקָאמְרִי רַבָּנָן אֶסּוּר לְשַׁחוּט אַחֲרֵיהֶם, אָמְרִי: שְׁחִיטָה מְעַלְזִיתָא הִיא, וְאַתִּי לְמִיכַל מְשַׁחֲטָתָן!

The Gemara challenges: In **the latter clause** also, since the Sages say it is forbidden to slaughter after them, people will likewise say, "It is a proper slaughter," and they will come to eat from their slaughter!

ANSWER

סִיפָא, אָמְרִי: בְּשָׂרָא דְּלֹא קָא מִיבְעָיָא לֵיהּ.

The Gemara answers: In **the latter clause**, when they see he does not slaughter the offspring, people will just say: "He does not need meat" right now, so they won't assume the first slaughter was valid.

OBJECTION

רִישָׁא נָמִי, אָמְרִי: לְנִגְרָה תְּצִירוּ הוּא צְרִיךְ!

The Gemara challenges: In **the first clause** also, if he covers the blood, people will just say: "He needs to clean his courtyard" from the mess of blood!

ANSWER

שְׁחַט בְּאַשְׁפָּה, מַאי אִיכָא לְמִימַר?

The Gemara responds: If he **slaughtered on a garbage dump** where cleaning is not needed, **what is there to say?** There, covering the blood would certainly look like a mitzvah.

ANSWER

בָּא לִימְלָהּ, מַאי אִיכָא לְמִימַר?

And if he **comes to ask** the Beis Din whether he is obligated to cover, **what is there to say?** If they tell him to cover, it will look like they validated the slaughter.

QUESTION

וְלִיטַעְמִיהּ, סִיפָא נָמִי, בָּא לִימְלָהּ – מַאי אִיכָא לְמִימַר?

The Gemara asks: **And according to your reasoning**, in the latter clause **also**, if he **comes to ask** whether he may slaughter the second animal, **what is there to say?** If they tell him it is forbidden, he will assume the first slaughter was valid!

RESOLUTION

אַלָּא, רַבָּנן אָכּוּלָהּ מִלְּתָא פְּלִיגִי, וְנִטְרִי לִיהּ לְרַבִּי מֵאִיר עַד דְּמַסִּיק לָהּ לְמִלְתָּא, וְהָדָר פְּלִיגִי עִלּוּיָהּ.

Rather, the Gemara answers: **The Sages argue on the entire matter**, including the first clause, **and they waited for Rabbi Meir until he finished his words, and then they argued on him** on all of it.

QUESTION

בְּשִׁלְמָא רַבָּנן לְחוּמָרָא, אַלָּא רַבִּי מֵאִיר – מַאי טַעְמָא?

The Gemara asks: **Granted, the Sages rule stringently** because they are in doubt. **But Rabbi Meir, what is the reason** he permits it outright?

ANSWER

אָמַר רַבִּי יַעֲקֹב אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹחָנָן: מַחֲיִיב הָיָה רַבִּי מֵאִיר עַל שְׁחִיטָתוֹ מְשׁוּם נִבְלָה.

Rabbi Yaakov said that Rabbi Yochanan said: Rabbi Meir would obligate one who eats from their slaughter because of **eating nevelah**—meaning he is certain that their unsupervised slaughter is invalid.

EXPLANATION

מַאי טַעְמָא? אָמַר רַבִּי אַמִּי: הוֹאִיל וְרֹב מַעֲשֵׂיהֶן מְקוּלָּקָלִים.

What is the reason? Rabbi Ammi said: Since the majority of their actions are flawed, we assume this slaughter was also ruined.

STATEMENT

אָמַר לִיהּ רַב פָּפָא לְרַב הוּנָא בְּרִיהּ דְּרַב יְהוֹשֻׁעַ, וְאָמַרִי לָהּ רַב הוּנָא בְּרִיהּ דְּרַב יְהוֹשֻׁעַ לְרַב פָּפָא:

Rav Pappa said to Rav Huna the son of Rav Yehoshua, and some say Rav Huna the son of Rav Yehoshua said to Rav Pappa:

QUESTION

מאי איריך רוב? אפילו מיעוט נמי, דהא רבי מאיר חייש למיעוטא, סמוך מיעוטא לחזקה, ואתרע ליה רובא?

Why specify a majority? Even if only a **minority** of their actions were flawed, it would be the same, since **Rabbi Meir** is **concerned for the minority**. And when you **join the minority** of flawed slaughters to the **chazakah** of the animal being forbidden while alive, **the majority** of valid slaughters is **broken**!

PROOF

דתנו: תינוק שנמצא בצד העיסה ובצק בידו, רבי מאיר מטהר, וחכמים מטמאין, מפני שדרךו של תינוק לטפח.

As we learned in a Mishnah: A child who was found next to dough, and dough is in his hand, Rabbi Meir rules the dough **pure**, and the Sages rule it **impure**, because it is the way of a child to pat dough.

EXPLANATION

ואמרין: מאי טעמא דרבי מאיר? קסבר: רוב תינוקות מטפחין, ומיעוט אין מטפחין, ועיסה זו בחזקת טהרה עומדת.

And we said in explaining this: What is the reason of Rabbi Meir? He holds: A majority of children pat dough, and a minority do not pat dough. And this dough stands with a **chazakah** of **purity**, so we join the minority to the **chazakah** to rule it pure.

צמוד ב' DAF 86B

QUESTION

סמוך מיעוטא לחזקה ואיתרע ליה רובא.

We say **append the minority** of children who do not touch things to the **presumptive status** of purity of the dough, and thereby **the majority** of children who do touch things is **weakened**, so the dough is **tahor**. But here, by **shechitah**, can we do that?

ANSWER

אם אמרו ספק טומאה לטהר, יאמרו ספק איסור להתיר?

If they said to rely on a minority and a **chazakah** in a case of **uncertain impurity** to **purify** the dough, will they say to rely on it in a case of **uncertain prohibition** to **permit** the animal? Certainly not! Therefore, without a majority, Rabbi Meir could not permit it.

STATEMENT

הורה רבי כרבי מאיר, והורה רבי כחכמים.

The Gemara notes: **Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi ruled** in one case **like Rabbi Meir**, that the **shechitah** of a **cheresh**, **shoteh**, and **katan** is valid to permit its offspring, **and** in another case **Rabbi ruled like the Sages**, that it is **assur**.

QUESTION

הי מינניהו דאחריתא?

The Gemara asks: **Which of them is the later**, definitive ruling from which Rabbi did not retract?

PROOF

תא שמע: דרבי אבא בריה דרבי חייא בר אבא ורבי זירא הוו קיימי בשוקא דקיסרי, אפתחא דבי מדרשא.

Come and hear a proof: For Rabbi Abba the son of Rabbi Chiyya bar Abba and Rabbi Zeira were standing in the market of Caesarea, at the entrance of the Beis Medrash.

STATEMENT

נפק רבי אמי אשפחניהו, אמר להו: לא אמינא לכו בעידן בי מדרשא לא תקימו אבראי, דילמא איבא אינש דמיצטרקא ליה שמעתא ואתי לאיטרודי.

Rabbi Ami came out and found them. He said to them: Did I not tell you that at the time of the Beis Medrash being in session you should not stand outside? Perhaps there is a person to whom a halachah is needed, and he will come to be **confused** because you are not inside to answer him.

STATEMENT

רבי זירא על, רבי אבא לא על.

Rabbi Zeira entered the Beis Medrash, but Rabbi Abba did not enter.

STATEMENT

יתבי וקא מיבעיא להו: הי מינניהו אחריתא?

The talmidim inside were sitting and they raised a dilemma: Which of them, of Rabbi's two rulings, is the later one?

STATEMENT

אמר להו רבי זירא: לא שבקתון לי דאישיליה לסבא, דילמא שמייע ליה מאבוא, ואבוא מיניה דרבי יוחנן, דרבי חייא בר אבא כל תלתין יומין קא מהדר תלמודיה קמיה דרבי יוחנן.

Rabbi Zeira said to them: You did not let me know this while I was outside, so that I could ask the elder, Rabbi Abba, perhaps he heard it from his father, Rabbi Chiyya bar Abba, and his father from Rabbi Yochanan; for Rabbi Chiyya bar Abba every thirty days would review his learning before Rabbi Yochanan.

QUESTION

מאי הוי עלה?

The Gemara asks: **What was** the conclusion about it?

PROOF

תא שמע, דשלח רבי אלעזר לגולה: הורה רבי כרבי מאיר.

Come and hear a proof, for Rabbi Elazar sent to the Exile in Bavel: Rabbi ruled like Rabbi Meir.

QUESTION

וְהָא פִּרְכָּנָן נָמִי אִוְרִי!

The Gemara asks: **But he also ruled like the Sages!** Why did Rabbi Elazar only mention the ruling like Rabbi Meir?

ANSWER

אֵלָא לָאוּ שְׁמַע מִינָּהּ הָא דְאַחֲרִיתָא?

Rather, is it not correct to learn from this that this ruling like Rabbi Meir is the later, final one?

RESOLUTION

שְׁמַע מִינָּהּ.

The Gemara concludes: Yes, learn from this that so it is.

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מִתְּנִי שְׁחַט מֵאָה חַיּוֹת בְּמָקוֹם אֶחָד – כִּסּוּי אֶחָד לְכֹלָן, מֵאָה עוֹפוֹת בְּמָקוֹם אֶחָד – כִּסּוּי אֶחָד לְכֹלָן, חֵיהּ וְעוֹף בְּמָקוֹם אֶחָד – כִּסּוּי אֶחָד לְכֹלָן.

MISHNAH: If one slaughtered one hundred wild animals in one place, one covering of the blood is sufficient for all of them; if he slaughtered one hundred birds in one place, one covering is sufficient for all of them; if he slaughtered a wild animal and a bird in one place, one covering is sufficient for all of them.

MISHNAH

רַבִּי יְהוּדָה אָמַר: שְׁחַט חֵיהּ – יְכַסְּנָהּ, וְאַחֲרַיָּהּ כֶּה יִשְׁחוּט אֶת הָעוֹף.

Rabbi Yehuda says: If he slaughtered a wild animal, he must cover its blood immediately, and only afterward may he slaughter the bird.

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

BRAISA

גְּמ' תַּנּוּ רַבָּנָן: חֵיהּ – כָּל מִשְׁמַע חֵיהּ, בֵּין מְרֻבָּה וּבֵין מוֹעֲטָת;

GEMARA: The Rabbis taught in a Braisa: The word 'wild animal' in the pasuk implies any wild animal, whether many or few;

BRAISA

עוֹף – כָּל מִשְׁמַע עוֹף, בֵּין מְרֻבָּה וּבֵין מוֹעֲט;

and the word 'bird' implies any bird, whether many or few.

BRAISA

מכאן אמרו: שחט מאה חיות במקום אחד – כסוי אחד לכולן, מאה עופות במקום אחד – כסוי אחד לכולן, חיה ועוף במקום אחד – כסוי אחד לכולן.

From here they said: If one slaughtered one hundred wild animals in one place, one covering is sufficient for all of them; if he slaughtered one hundred birds in one place, one covering is sufficient for all of them; if he slaughtered a wild animal and a bird in one place, one covering is sufficient for all of them.

BRAISA

רבי יהודה אומר: שחט חיה – בכסנה, ואחר כך לשחוט את העוף, שנאמר: "חיה או עוף".

Rabbi Yehuda says: If he slaughtered a wild animal, he must cover its blood, and only afterward may he slaughter the bird, as it is stated: 'A wild animal or a bird'—the word 'or' divides them.

BRAISA

אמרו לו: הרי הוא אומר "כי נפש כל בשר דמו בנפשו הוא",

The Rabbis said to him: But behold, it says: 'For as to the life of all flesh, its blood is with its life', which groups them together.

QUESTION

מאי קא מהדר ליה?

The Gemara asks: What are they answering him with this pasuk?

EXPLANATION

הכי קאמרי ליה רבנן: האי "או" מיבעי ליה לחלק.

This is what the Rabbis are saying to him: This word 'or' is needed to divide them, to teach that one is obligated to cover the blood even if he only slaughtered a wild animal alone or a bird alone.

EXPLANATION

ורבי יהודה: לחלק – מ"דמו" נפקא,

And Rabbi Yehuda argues: The rule to divide them and obligate each one individually is derived from the word 'its blood', which is singular.

EXPLANATION

ורבנן: "דמו" טובא משמע, דכתיב: "כי נפש כל בשר דמו בנפשו הוא".

And the Sages argue: The word 'its blood' implies many types of blood as well, as it is written: 'For as to the life of all flesh, its blood is with its life'.

STATEMENT

אמר רבי חנינא: מודה הנה רבי יהודה לענין ברכה, שאינו מברך אלא ברכה אחת.

Rabbi Chanina says: Rabbi Yehuda would concede regarding the matter of the berachah, that he only recites one berachah for both coverings.

QUESTION

אָמַר לִיה רַבִּינָא לְרַב אַחָא בְרִיה דְּרַבָּא, וְאָמַרִי לָהּ רַב אַחָא בְרִיה דְּרַבָּא לְרַב אָשִׁי: מַאי שָׁנָא
מִתְלַמִּידֵי דְרַב?

Ravina said to Rav Acha the son of Rava, and some say Rav Acha the son of Rava said to Rav Ashi: How is this
different from the disciples of Rav?

PROOF

דְּרַב בְּרוּנָא וְרַב חַנַּנְאֵל תְּלַמִּידֵי דְרַב הָווּ יְתִבִּי בְּסַעוּדָתָא, קָאִי עֲלִייהוּ רַב יֵיבָא סָבָא, אָמְרוּ לֵיהּ: הֵב
לִיבְרִיָּה. הָדוּר אָמְרוּ לֵיהּ: הֵב לִישָׁתִּי.

For Rav Bruna and Rav Chananel, the disciples of Rav, were sitting at a meal, and Rav Yeiba Sava was standing over
them serving them. They said to him: 'Bring us water so we may bentch.' Then they changed their minds and said to him:
'Bring us wine so we may drink.'

PROOF

אָמַר לָהּ רַב יֵיבָא סָבָא: הֵכִי אָמַר רַב, בִּיּוֹן דְּאָמַר "הֵב לִיבְרִיָּה" אֵיתִסֵּר לֵיהּ לְמִשְׁתֵּי חֲמָרָא.

Rav Yeiba Sava said to them: So said Rav: Once a person says 'Bring water so we may bentch,' it is forbidden for him to
drink wine without a new berachah, because he has taken his mind off the meal.

OBJECTION

הֵכָא נָמִי, בִּיּוֹן דְּאֵיטְפַל לֵיהּ לְכֶסוּי אִיחִיב לֵיהּ לְבִרְכָּה.

Here too, once he busies himself with the first covering, he should be obligated in a new berachah for the second one,
since he interrupted his shechitah!

SUMMARY

The Gemara resolves the dispute between Rav Dimi and Ravin by explaining that both Amoraim agree on the underlying
halachos but use different pedagogical approaches to teach what is not strictly necessary. After a brief Agadic discussion on
how the merit of tzaddikim like Rabbi Chiyya and Chanina ben Dosa sustains the entire world while they themselves live in
scarcity, the Gemara transitions to the next Mishnah. This Mishnah rules that unsupervised slaughter by a deaf-mute, an
imbecile, or a minor is invalid; therefore, one is exempt from covering the blood. Regarding "it and its offspring," Rabbi Meir
permits slaughtering the offspring afterward because the first slaughter was definitely invalid, while the Sages rule stringently
due to doubt. The Gemara concludes by exploring the Sages' reasoning, suggesting they actually argue on the entire
Mishnah, and begins analyzing Rabbi Meir's certain ruling that unsupervised slaughter by these individuals is halachically
classified as nevelah.

We see a remarkable and painful yesod in our sugya. The Gemara asks how it could be that Rabbi Chiyya's flax was ruined by pests, when the Gemara itself testifies that in the merit of Rabbi Chiyya and his sons, the entire world's crops and wine were blessed and protected. The Gemara answers with the famous words of Rav: "When their merit is effective, it is effective for the world, but for themselves, no." The tzaddik Chanina ben Dosa sustains the entire world, yet he himself must suffice with a meager measure of carobs from week to week.

Think about the depth of this Chazal. Sometimes, a Yid works tirelessly for the klal, pours his heart out in tefillah for others, or brings immense light and blessing into his community, yet in his own personal life, he faces struggles, parnassah worries, or pain. The yetzer hara comes and whispers a kasha: "If you are doing so much good, why are you suffering? Why isn't your own 'flax' protected?"

The teretz is that Hashem runs His world with a deep, hidden cheshbon. A person's public avodah and their private nisyonos are two completely different accounts. Your ability to bring shefa to the world is a gift Hashem channels through you, but your personal challenges are custom-tailored to polish your own neshama and bring you closer to Him. We cannot measure our personal standing with Hashem based on our material success.

Today, when you daven or do a chesed, do it completely for the sake of Heaven without expecting an immediate "payback" in your personal affairs. If you are facing a personal struggle despite your best efforts in avodas Hashem, accept it with emunah, knowing that your zechusim are absolutely real and protecting the world, even if Hashem has chosen a path of growth and challenge for you personally.