

דף יומי • חליון • דף ע"ח

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

THE SUGYA

We begin this daf by concluding the fifth perek of Maseches Chullin, Perek Behemah Hamakshah, with a beautiful and hainish discussion about having rachmanus on one's fellow Yid. The Gemara teaches us that when a person is going through a tzarah, they must let the tzibbur know so that others can daven to Hashem on their behalf. This is derived from the metzora who must call out "Impure, impure!" to publicize his distress and awaken the tefillos of the community.

Immediately following this, we begin the sixth perek, Perek Oto Ve'es Beno, which deals with the severe d'Oraisa prohibition of slaughtering an animal and its offspring on the same day. The Mishnah outlines the various applications of this mitzvah, showing how it applies both in Eretz Yisrael and Chutz la'Aretz, in the times of the Beis HaMikdash and when it is not standing, and to both chullin (non-sacred animals) and kodashim (sacrificial animals). The Mishnah details the halachic status of the meat and the lashes incurred under different permutations of chullin and kodashim slaughtered inside or outside the Azarah.

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

עמוד א' DAF 78A

EXPLANATION

דְּנִיכְחוּשׁ חֵילֶיהָ,

that its strength should be weakened by the stones, preventing it from shedding its fruit,

QUESTION

אֵלָא סוּקְרוֹ בְּסִיקְרָא אַמַּאי?

but as for painting it with red paint, why is it permitted? What benefit is there in this?

ANSWER

כִּי הֵיכִי דְלִיחְזִינָהּ אֵינְשֵׁי וְלִיבְעֵי רַחֲמֵי עֵילָיָהּ.

The Gemara answers: One does so in order that people will see it and pray for mercy upon it, that the tree should become fruitful.

PROOF

בְּדִתְנָא: "וְטָמָא טָמָא יִקְרָא" – צָרִיךְ לְהוֹדִיעַ לְרַבִּים, וְרַבִּים מְבַקְּשִׁים עָלָיו רַחֲמִים.

As it is taught in a baraita: The verse regarding a leper states: "And he shall cry: Impure, impure!" This teaches that a person who suffers a misfortune needs to inform the public, and the public will seek mercy on his behalf.

PROOF

וְכֵן מִי שֶׁאֵירַע בּוֹ דָּבָר – צָרִיךְ לְהוֹדִיעַ לְרַבִּים, וְרַבִּים מְבַקְּשִׁים עָלָיו רַחֲמִים.

And likewise, whoever has a bad thing happen to him needs to inform the public, and the public will seek mercy on his behalf.

STATEMENT

אָמַר רַבִּינָא: כִּמָּאן תְּלִינן כּוּבְסָא בְּדִיקָלָא, כִּמָּאן?

Ravina said: Like whom is our practice when we hang bunches of unripe dates on a palm tree that casts off its fruit? Like whom is this done, seeing as it resembles the ways of the Amorites?

STATEMENT

כִּי הָאִי תַנָּא.

It is like this very tanna of the baraita, who says that a person must publicize his distress so that others will pray for him.

STATEMENT

הֲדַרְנוּ עֲלֶיךָ בְּהֶמָּה הַמַּקְשָׁה.

May we return to you, Perek Behe mah Hamakshah.

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מִתְּנִי אוֹתוֹ וְאֵת בְּנוֹ נוֹהֵג בֵּין בָּאֶרֶץ בֵּין בְּחוּצָה לְאֶרֶץ,

MISHNAH: The prohibition of slaughtering an animal itself and its offspring on the same day applies both in Eretz Yisrael and outside of Eretz Yisrael,

MISHNAH

בְּפָנֵי הַכֹּהֵן וְשֶׁלֹא בְּפָנֵי הַכֹּהֵן,

both in the presence of the Temple and not in the presence of the Temple,

MISHNAH

בְּחוּלִין וּבְמוֹקֵדִין.

and both with regard to non-sacred animals and with regard to sacrificial animals.

MISHNAH

כִּיצַד? הַשּׁוֹחֵט אוֹתוֹ וְאֵת בְּנוֹ,

How so? One who slaughters an animal itself and its offspring,

MISHNAH

חוּלִין בְּחוּץ – שְׁנֵיהֶם כְּשֵׁרִים, וְהַשְׁנִי סוּפֵג אֶת הָאֲרָבָעִים.

and both were **non-sacred** animals slaughtered **outside** the Temple courtyard; **both of them are fit** for consumption, **but the** one who slaughters the **second receives the forty** lashes for violating the prohibition.

MISHNAH

קִדְּשִׁים בַּחוּץ – הָרֹאשׁוֹן חַיִּיב כֶּרֶת, וְשֵׁנִיָּהֶם פְּסוּלִים, וְשֵׁנִיָּהֶם סוּפְגִים אֶת הָאַרְבָּעִים.

If they were **sacrificial** animals slaughtered **outside** the Temple courtyard; for **the first**, the slaughterer is **liable to karet** for slaughtering a holy offering outside the Sanctuary, **and both of them are disqualified** as offerings, **and both of them receive forty** lashes apiece — the first for slaughtering outside, and the second for violating the prohibition of 'itself and its offspring'.

MISHNAH

חוּלִין בְּפָנִים – שְׁנֵיהֶם פְּסוּלִין, וְהַשְּׁנִי סוּפֵג אֶת הָאַרְבָּעִים;

If they were **non-sacred** animals slaughtered **inside** the Temple courtyard; **both of them are disqualified**, because it is forbidden to slaughter non-sacred animals in the Azarah, **and the second** slaughterer **receives the forty** lashes.

MISHNAH

קִדְּשִׁים בְּפָנִים – הָרֹאשׁוֹן כָּשֵׁר וּפְטוּר, וְהַשְּׁנִי סוּפֵג אֶת הָאַרְבָּעִים וּפְסוּל.

If they were **sacrificial** animals slaughtered **inside** the Temple courtyard; **the first is fit** as an offering **and** the slaughterer is **exempt** from punishment, **but the second** slaughterer **receives the forty** lashes **and** the second animal is **disqualified**, as it was slaughtered on the same day as its parent.

MISHNAH

חוּלִין וְקִדְּשִׁים בַּחוּץ – הָרֹאשׁוֹן כָּשֵׁר, וּפְטוּר, וְהַשְּׁנִי סוּפֵג אֶת הָאַרְבָּעִים, וּפְסוּל.

If the first was **non-sacred** **and** the second was **sacrificial**, and both were slaughtered **outside** the Temple courtyard; **the first is fit** for eating **and** the slaughterer is **exempt**, **and the second** slaughterer **receives the forty** lashes **and** the animal is **disqualified** as an offering.

MISHNAH

קִדְּשִׁים וְחוּלִין בַּחוּץ – הָרֹאשׁוֹן חַיִּיב כֶּרֶת וּפְסוּל, וְהַשְּׁנִי כָּשֵׁר, וְשֵׁנִיָּהֶם סוּפְגִים אֶת הָאַרְבָּעִים.

If the first was **sacrificial** **and** the second was **non-sacred**, and both were slaughtered **outside** the Temple courtyard; for **the first**, the slaughterer is **liable to karet** **and** the animal is **disqualified**, **and the second is fit** for consumption, **and both** slaughterers **receive forty** lashes.

MISHNAH

חוּלִין וְקִדְּשִׁים בְּפָנִים – שְׁנֵיהֶם פְּסוּלִין, וְהַשְּׁנִי סוּפֵג אֶת הָאַרְבָּעִים.

If the first was **non-sacred** **and** the second was **sacrificial**, and both were slaughtered **inside** the Temple courtyard; **both of them are disqualified**, **and the second** slaughterer **receives forty** lashes.

MISHNAH

קִדְּשִׁים וְחוּלִין בְּפָנִים – הָרֹאשׁוֹן כָּשֵׁר וּפְטוּר, וְהַשְּׁנִי סוּפֵג אֶת הָאַרְבָּעִים וּפְסוּל.

If the first was **sacrificial** **and** the second was **non-sacred**, and both were slaughtered **inside** the Temple courtyard; **the first is fit** **and** the slaughterer is **exempt**, **and the second** slaughterer **receives forty** lashes, **and** the second animal is **disqualified** because it was non-sacred in the courtyard.

MISHNAH

חולין בחוץ ובפנים – הראשון כשר, ופטור, והשני סופג את הארבעים, ופסול.

If both were **non-sacred** and the slaughter of the first was **outside** and the second was **inside**; the **first is fit** and the slaughterer is **exempt**, and the **second** slaughterer **receives forty lashes** and the animal is **disqualified**.

MISHNAH

קדשים בחוץ ובפנים – הראשון חייב כרת, והשניהם סופגים את הארבעים, והשניהם פסולים.

If both were **sacrificial**, and the first was slaughtered **outside** and the second **inside**; the **first** slaughterer is **liable to karet**, and **both** slaughterers **receive forty lashes**, and **both** animals are **disqualified**.

MISHNAH

חולין בפנים ובחוץ – הראשון פסול, ופטור, והשני סופג את הארבעים, וכשר.

If both were **non-sacred** and the first was slaughtered **inside** and the second **outside**; the **first is disqualified** and the slaughterer is **exempt**, and the **second** slaughterer **receives forty lashes** and the second animal is **fit**.

MISHNAH

קדשים בפנים ובחוץ – הראשון כשר, ופטור, והשני סופג את הארבעים, ופסול.

If both were **sacrificial**, and the first was slaughtered **inside** and the second **outside**; the **first is fit** and the slaughterer is **exempt**, and the **second** slaughterer **receives forty lashes** and the second animal is **disqualified**.

גמרא GEMARA

GEMARA

גמ' תנו רבנן: מנין לאותו ואת בנו שנוהג במוקדשין?

GEMARA: The Sages taught in a baraita: From where is it derived that the prohibition of slaughtering an animal itself and its offspring applies to sacrificial animals?

PROOF

תלמוד לומר: "שור או כשב או עז כי יולד",

The verse states: "When a bull, or a sheep, or a goat, is born," which refers to sacrificial offerings,

PROOF

ובתבב בתריה: "ושור או שׂה אתו ואת בנו לא תשחטו ביום אחד" – לימד על אותו ואת בנו שנוהג במוקדשין.

and it is written afterward: "And whether it be a cow or a ewe, you shall not slaughter it and its offspring both in one day." This proximity teaches that the prohibition of itself and its offspring applies to sacrificial animals.

QUESTION

ואימא: במוקדשין – אין, בחולין – לא!

The Gemara asks: **But** say that **to sacrificial animals, yes**, the prohibition applies, but **to non-sacred animals, no**, it does not apply!

ANSWER

”שור” הפסיק הענין.

The Gemara answers: The word “**bull**” in the second verse **separated the matter** from the previous section, making it a new, general commandment that applies to all animals.

QUESTION

ואימא: בחולין – אין, במוקדשין – לא!

The Gemara asks: **But** say that **to non-sacred animals, yes**, it applies, but **to sacrificial animals, no**, it does not apply!

ANSWER

כתיב: ”ושור” – וי”ו מוסיף על ענין ראשון.

The Gemara answers: **It is written**: “**And a cow**” — the letter **vav** meaning ‘and’ **adds to the first matter**, connecting it to the previous section regarding sacrifices.

QUESTION

אי מה קדשים כלאים לא, אף אותו ואת בנו כלאים לא?

The Gemara asks: **If so, just as in sacrificial animals, a hybrid animal is not acceptable as an offering, so too**, the prohibition of **itself and its offspring** should **not** apply to a hybrid?

OBJECTION

אלמה תנא: אותו ואת בנו נוהג בכלאים ובכוי?

Why, then, is it taught in a baraita: The prohibition of **itself and its offspring** applies to a hybrid and to a koy?

OBJECTION

ועוד, ”שה” כתיב, ואמר רבא:

And furthermore, “a lamb” is written in the verse regarding itself and its offspring, **and Rava said** on this...

עמוד ב' DAF 78B

STATEMENT

זה בנה אב – כל מקום שנאמר ”שה” אינו אלא להוציא את הכלאים.

This established a **paradigm** for other cases: **Wherever it is stated “seh” in the Torah, it is only to exclude the offspring of diverse kinds.**

ANSWER

אמר קרא ”או” לרבות את הכלאים.

The Gemara answers: **The verse states “or”** in the passage of oto v'es b'no **to include the offspring of diverse kinds** in the prohibition.

QUESTION

האי "או" מיבעי ליה לחלק, דסלקא דעתך אמינא: עד דשחיט שור ובנו שוה ובנו לא מיחייב, קא משמע לן.

The Gemara challenges: But **this "or" is required by it to separate** the prohibitions, as it might enter your mind to say: **Until he slaughters both a bull and its offspring and a sheep and its offspring on the same day he is not liable**; therefore, the word "or" **teaches us** that one is liable for either one alone.

ANSWER

לחלק – מ"בנו" נפקא.

The Gemara responds: The need **to separate** them **is derived from** the singular word "**its offspring**" rather than "their offspring."

QUESTION

ואפתי מיבעי ליה לכדתנא: אילו נאמר "שור ושוה ובנו", היתי אומר: עד שישחוט שור ושוה ובנו, תלמוד לומר: "שור או שוה אותו ואת בנו".

The Gemara challenges: **And still, it is required for that which is taught in a Braisa**: If it were stated: "A bull and a sheep and its offspring," I would have said: One is not liable until he slaughters a bull and a sheep and the offspring of one of them; therefore, **the verse states: "A bull or a sheep... it and its offspring."**

QUESTION

מאי לאו מ"או" נפקא ליה?

What, is it not from the word "**or**" **that** the Braisa **derives it**? If so, "or" is not available to include diverse kinds.

ANSWER

לא, מ"אותו".

The Gemara responds: **No**, it is derived **from** the word "**it**" (oto).

QUESTION

הניחא לרבנן, דמייתר להו "אותו", אלא לחנניה, דלא מייתר ליה "אותו", לחלק מנא ליה?

The Gemara asks: **This works out well according to the Rabbis, for whom "it" is superfluous** and available for this derivation; **but according to Chananya, for whom "it" is not superfluous, from where does he derive to separate** them?

ANSWER

לחלק לא צריה קרא, דסבר לה כרבי יונתן.

The Gemara answers: **To separate** them, Chananya **does not need** a verse, as he holds in accordance with Rabbi Yonatan regarding the use of conjunctions.

BRAISA

דתנא: "איש אשר יקלל את אביו ואת אמו", אין לי אלא אביו ואמו, אביו שלא אמו ואמו שלא אביו מניין? תלמוד לומר: "אביו ואמו קלל" – אביו קלל, אמו קלל, דברי רבי יאשיהו.

As it is taught in a Braisa: From the verse, "A man who curses his father and his mother," I have only derived that he is liable if he curses both his father and his mother together. From where do we derive that he is liable for cursing his father without his mother, or his mother without his father? The verse states: "His father and his mother he has cursed" — meaning, if his father he cursed, or if his mother he cursed, he is liable; this is the statement of Rabbi Yoshiya.

BRAISA

רבי יונתן אומר: משמע שניהם כאחד, ומשמע אחד בפני עצמו, עד שיפרוט לה הפתוב "יחדו".

Rabbi Yonatan says: The phrasing implies both of them together, and it also implies each one on its own, unless the verse specifies for you "together" (yachdav). Thus, Chananya, who holds like Rabbi Yonatan, does not need a verse to separate the prohibitions, leaving "or" free to include diverse kinds.

QUESTION

מאי חנניה, ומאי רבנן?

The Gemara asks: What is this dispute between Chananya and what is the opinion of the Rabbis that was mentioned?

BRAISA

דתנא: אותו ואת בנו נוהג בנקבות, ואינו נוהג בזכרים. חנניה אומר: נוהג בין בזכרים ובין בנקבות.

As it is taught in a Braisa: The prohibition of "it and its offspring" applies to females, i.e., a mother and its offspring, but it does not apply to males, i.e., a father and its offspring. Chananya says: It applies both to males and to females.

QUESTION

מאי טעמא דרבנן?

The Gemara asks: What is the reasoning of the Rabbis?

BRAISA

דתנא: יכול יהא אותו ואת בנו נוהג בין בזכרים ובין בנקבות?

As it is taught in a Braisa: One might think that "it and its offspring" should apply both to males and to females.

BRAISA

ודין הוא: חייב כאן, וחייב באם על הבנים; מה כשחייב באם על הבנים – בנקבות ולא בזכרים, אף כשחייב כאן – בנקבות ולא בזכרים.

And indeed, it is a logical derivation: The Torah obligated here regarding an animal and its offspring, and it obligated regarding the mother bird over the young; just as when it obligated regarding the mother bird over the young, it applies only to females and not to males, so too when it obligated here, it should apply only to females and not to males.

BRAISA

לא, אם אמרת באם על הבנים, שכן לא עשה בה מזומן כשאינו מזומן, תאמר באותו ואת בנו, שעשה בו מזומן כשאינו מזומן?

The Braisa refutes this: No! If you say so regarding the mother bird over the young, where the Torah did not make prepared birds equivalent to unprepared ones, shall you say so regarding "it and its offspring," where the Torah made prepared animals equivalent to unprepared ones?

תלמוד לומר: "אותו" – אחד ולא שנים.

Therefore, **the verse states: "it" (oto)** — to teach that the prohibition applies to only **one** parent **and not** to **two** parents.

אחר שחלק הכתוב, זכיתי לדין: חייב פאן וחיוב פאם על הבנים – מה פשחייב פאם על הבנים –
בנקבות ולא בזכרים, אף פשחייב פאן – בנקבות ולא בזכרים.

After the verse separated them, limiting the prohibition to one parent, I have merited to return to the logical derivation: The Torah obligated here and obligated regarding the mother bird over the young — just as when it obligated regarding the mother bird over the young, it applies to females and not to males, so too when it obligated here, it applies to females and not to males.

ואם נפשך לומר, "בנו" – מי שבנו פרוה אחריו, יצא זכר שאין בנו פרוה אחריו.

And if you wish to say an alternative proof: The verse says "its offspring" (b'no) — referring to **one** whose offspring clings after it, which **excludes the male**, whose offspring does not cling after it.

מה אם נפשך לומר?

The Gemara asks: **What is** the meaning of "**and if you wish to say**"? Why is the second proof necessary?

וכי תימא "אותו" זכר משמע, הרי הוא אומר "בנו" – מי שבנו פרוה אחריו, יצא זכר שאין בנו פרוה אחריו.

The Gemara answers: **Lest you say that "it" (oto) implies a male, therefore it says "its offspring" (b'no)** — referring to **one** whose offspring clings after it, which **excludes the male**, whose offspring does not cling after it.

SUMMARY

The Gemara begins its analysis of Perek Oto Ve'es Beno by seeking the source in the Torah for applying this prohibition to sacrificial animals. Through a detailed limud of the pesukim, the Gemara connects the parsha of sacrifices to the prohibition of "it and its offspring," establishing that the law encompasses both holy and non-sacred animals. The Gemara then raises questions regarding whether this prohibition applies to hybrid animals, such as a crossbreed, or a koy, analyzing the specific terminology used in the Torah to define the boundaries of this mitzvah.

In the closing of Perek Behemah Hamakshah, the Gemara teaches us a beautiful and deeply moving principle of Jewish life. We learn that a metzora is commanded to call out, "Impure, impure!" and that we paint a failing tree red so that passersby will notice it. Why? So that the public will see their distress and pray for them. Chazal tell us clearly: "Whoever has a bad thing happen to him needs to inform the public, and the public will seek mercy on his behalf."

Think about what this means for our daily avodah. Sometimes, when we are going through a difficult nisayon, a health struggle, or parnassah worries, our natural instinct is to pull back, hide our pain, and suffer in silence. We might feel embarrassed or think we shouldn't burden others. But the Torah is teaching us the exact opposite. Hashem created the world such that we need each other's tefillos. By sharing our pain with our fellow Yidden, we are not showing weakness; we are opening the gates of rachamim.

This goes both ways. When someone shares a struggle with you, it is not just casual conversation. It is a holy invitation. Hashem brought that information to your ears because He wants you to stop what you are doing and daven for them. The power of a community crying out for an individual is limitless, and it is one of the greatest acts of chesed we can perform.

Today, when someone mentions a difficulty they are facing, whether it is a health issue, a child struggling, or financial stress, do not just offer a polite nod. Take ten seconds right then and there to say a short, heartfelt prayer to Hashem on their behalf.