

דף יומי • חלין • דף פ"ד

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

THE SUGYA

We begin the daf by continuing the shakla v'tarya regarding the exemption of kisuy hadam for consecrated birds that were slaughtered. The Gemara works through a kasha on our Mishnah's authorship, analyzing whether it follows Rabbi Meir or Rabbi Shimon, and brings a teretz from Rav Yosef that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi edited the Mishnah using different Tannaitic views. We also learn a limud from the pesukim that excludes consecrated birds because they lack more than just pouring and covering, and we explore a drasha comparing birds to chayos to exclude consecrated species.

Next, the Gemara brings a fascinating exchange between Rava and a heretic who tries to argue that domesticated animals (behemos) should also require kisuy hadam. Rava uses a pasuk to push off this argument, leading into a detailed halachic discussion about the status of blood versus water for the halachos of mikvah. Finally, we begin a beautiful Aggadic section based on a Braisa that teaches us derech erez and proper conduct in worldly matters, specifically regarding how often a person should eat meat and how to manage one's livelihood responsibly.

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

עמוד א' DAF 84A

QUESTION

וְלִיכְסִינָהּ וְלִיכְסִינָהּ?

The Gemara asks: **But let one redeem them** after they were slaughtered **and let one cover them**, meaning cover their blood?

ANSWER

בְּעִינֵי הַעֲמָדָה וְהַעֲרָכָה.

The Gemara answers: This is not possible, because **we require standing and valuation** before a kohen in order to redeem a consecrated animal, and a slaughtered bird cannot be stood up.

QUESTION

וּבִמְאֵן?

The Gemara asks: **And in accordance with whose** opinion is our Mishnah written?

OBJECTION

אִי כְּרַבִּי מְאִיר, דָּאָמַר: הַכֹּל הָיָה בְּכֹלֵל הַעֲמָדָה וְהַעֲרָכָה – הָאָמַר: שְׁחִיטָה שְׂאִינָהּ רְאוּיָה שְׂמָה שְׁחִיטָה!

If you say it is **in accordance with Rabbi Meir, who said: Everything**, including animals consecrated for Temple maintenance, **was included in** the requirement of **standing and valuation**, and therefore they cannot be redeemed after slaughter—but

didn't he say that a slaughtering that is not fit to permit the meat for eating is still considered a halachic slaughtering? If so, one should still be obligated to cover the blood even without redemption!

OBJECTION

אי כרבי שמעון, דאמר: שחיטה שאינה ראויה לא שמה שחיטה – האמר: לא היו בכלל העמדה והערכה?

And if you say it is in accordance with Rabbi Shimon, who said: A slaughtering that is not fit is not considered a halachic slaughtering, and therefore it needs redemption to make the slaughtering fit—but didn't he say that animals consecrated for Temple maintenance were not included in the requirement of standing and valuation? If so, let one redeem them after slaughter and then cover their blood!

ANSWER

אמר רב יוסה: רבי היא, ונסיב לה אליבא דתנאי;

Rav Yosef said: It is Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi who edited our Mishnah, and he formulated it in accordance with the opinions of different Tannaim.

EXPLANATION

בשחיטה שאינה ראויה – סבר לה כרבי שמעון, בהעמדה והערכה – סבר לה כרבי מאיר.

Regarding a slaughtering that is not fit, he holds like Rabbi Shimon that it is not considered a halachic slaughtering; and regarding standing and valuation, he holds like Rabbi Meir that it applies to Temple maintenance, so they cannot be redeemed after slaughter. Therefore, there is no obligation of kisuy hadam.

RESOLUTION

ואיבעית אימא: כולה רבי שמעון היא, ושאיני הכא דאמר קרא "וַיִּשְׁפּוּ וַיִּכָּסֶה",

And if you want, say instead: The entire Mishnah is Rabbi Shimon, and it is different here because the verse says, "And he shall pour out its blood and cover it."

EXPLANATION

מי שאינו מחוסר אלא שפיכה וכסוי, יצא זה שמחוסר שפיכה פדייה וכסוי.

This teaches that the mitzvah applies only to that which is not lacking anything other than pouring and covering; excluded is this bird of Temple maintenance, which is lacking pouring, redemption, and covering.

STATEMENT

והשתא דאתית להכי, אפילו תימא קדשי מזבח.

And now that you have arrived at this explanation, you may even say that the Mishnah is referring to consecrated birds of the Altar.

EXPLANATION

מי שאינו מחוסר אלא שפיכה וכסוי – יצא זה, שמחוסר שפיכה, גרידה, וכסוי.

For the rule is: Only that which is not lacking anything other than pouring and covering requires kisuy; excluded is this bird offering, which is lacking pouring, scraping the blood off the Altar, and covering.

STATEMENT

מר בר רב אשי אמר: אמר קרא "חיה או עוף", מה חיה אינה קדש, אף עוף אינו קדש.

Mar bar Rav Ashi said: The verse says, "An undomesticated animal or a bird." Just as an undomesticated animal is not consecrated, since wild beasts are never offered on the Altar, so too, the bird must be one that is not consecrated.

QUESTION

אי מה חיה שאין במינו קדש, אף עוף שאין במינו קדש, אוציא תורין ובני יונה, שיש במינו קדש!

The Gemara asks: If so, then say: Just as an undomesticated animal is a category where there is no consecrated species in its kind, so too, the bird must be one where there is no consecrated species in its kind; and if so, I should exclude turtledoves and young pigeons, since there are consecrated offerings in their kind!

ANSWER

לא, בחיה – מה חיה לא חלקת בה, אף עוף לא תחלוק בו.

The Gemara answers: No, "like an undomesticated animal" means: Just as with an undomesticated animal you did not make a distinction in it between different species, so too with a bird, you should not make a distinction in it, and all non-sacred birds are included.

QUESTION

אמר ליה יעקב מינאה לרבא: קיימא לן חיה בכלל בהמה לסימנין, אימא נמי בהמה בכלל חיה לכסוי.

Yaakov the heretic said to Rava: We establish that an undomesticated animal is included in the category of a domesticated animal regarding the kosher signs; say also then that a domesticated animal is included in the category of an undomesticated animal regarding the covering of the blood!

ANSWER

אמר ליה: עליה אמר קרא "על הארץ תשפכנו כמים", מה מים לא פעי כסוי, אף האי נמי לא פעי כסוי.

Rava said to him: Concerning your argument, the verse says regarding a domesticated animal, "You shall pour it out upon the earth like water." Just as water does not require covering, so too, this blood of a domesticated animal does not require covering.

QUESTION

אלא מעתה, יטבילו בו?

The Gemara asks: If that is so, let one immerse ritually impure vessels in it to purify them, just as one can immerse in water!

ANSWER

אמר קרא: "אך מעין ובור מקנה מים יהיה טהור", הני אין, מידי אחרינא לא.

The Gemara answers: The verse says, "But a spring or a cistern, a gathering of water, shall be clean." These, yes, they purify, but any other thing, no, it does not purify.

QUESTION

ואימא: הני מילי למעוטי שאר משקין, דלא איקרו מימ, אבל דם דאיקרי מימ – הכי נמי?

The Gemara asks: **But say:** This applies only to exclude other liquids which are not called water, but blood, which is called **water** in the verse, **indeed yes**, one should be able to immerse in it!

ANSWER

תרי מיעוטי כתיבי: "מעין מימ" ו"בור מימ".

The Gemara answers: **Two exclusionary terms are written:** "A spring of water" and "a cistern of water," which excludes even blood.

QUESTION

אימא: אידי ואידי למעוטי שאר משקין, חד למעוטי זוחליו, וחד למעוטי מכוונסין!

The Gemara asks: **But say:** This and that are to exclude other liquids, one to exclude flowing liquids and one to exclude gathered liquids!

ANSWER

תלתא מיעוטי כתיבי: "מעין מימ", "בור מימ", "מקוה מימ".

The Gemara answers: **Three exclusionary terms are written:** "A spring of water," "and a cistern of water," and "a gathering of water." This leaves an extra exclusion to rule out blood.

BRAISA

תנו רבנן: "אשר יצוד", אין לי אלא אשר יצוד, נצודין ועומדין מאליהן מנין, כגון אוזין ותרנגולים?

The Rabbis taught in a Braisa: The verse says, "**Who hunts.**" I only have the obligation of covering the blood for that **which is hunted**; from where do we know that it applies to animals that are **already caught and standing on their own**, such as geese and chickens?

EXPLANATION

תלמוד לומר "יציד", מכל מקום.

The verse teaches: "Game," implying in any case.

QUESTION

אם כן, מה תלמוד לומר "אשר יצוד"?

If so, why does the verse teach "who hunts"?

ANSWER

למדה תורה דרך ארץ, שלא יאכל אדם בשר אלא כהזמנה הזאת.

The Torah is teaching proper conduct, that a person should not eat meat unless he has prepared it through **this preparation**, meaning only occasionally, like one who must hunt for his food.

BRAISA

תנו רבנן: "כִּי יִרְחִיב ה' אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֶת גְּבֻלְךָ" – לְמַדָּה תוֹרָה דִּרְךָ אֶרֶץ, שֶׁלֹּא יֵאָכֵל אָדָם בֶּשָׂר אֶלָּא לְתַאֲבוֹן.

The Rabbis taught in a Braisa: "When Hashem your Elokim shall expand your boundary"—the Torah is teaching proper conduct, that a person should not eat meat unless he has a craving for it, and not as a daily staple.

EXPLANATION

יָכוֹל יִקַּח אָדָם מִן הַשּׁוּק וְיֵאָכֵל? תִּלְמִיד לֹא מֵר: "וְזָבַחַת מִבְּקָרְךָ וּמִצֹּאֲנֶךָ."

I might have thought a person may buy meat from the market and eat it regularly; the verse teaches: "And you shall slaughter from your cattle and from your sheep," implying from your own herds.

EXPLANATION

יָכוֹל יִזְבַּח כָּל בְּקָרוֹ וְיֵאָכֵל, כָּל צֹאֲנוֹ וְיֵאָכֵל? תִּלְמִיד לֹא מֵר: "מִבְּקָרְךָ" – וְלֹא כָּל בְּקָרְךָ, "מִצֹּאֲנֶךָ" – וְלֹא כָּל צֹאֲנֶךָ.

I might have thought he may slaughter all his cattle and eat, or all his sheep and eat; the verse teaches: "From your cattle"—and not all your cattle, "from your sheep"—and not all your sheep, so that he does not lose his livelihood.

STATEMENT

מִפֶּה אֶמַר רַבִּי אֶלְעָזָר בֶּן עֲזַרְיָה: מִי שֵׁישׁ לוֹ מָנָה – יִקַּח לֶפְסוֹ לִיטְרָא יֵרֶק,

From here Rabbi Elazar ben Azaryah said: One who has a maneh, which is one hundred dinar, should buy for his stewpot a litra of vegetables;

STATEMENT

עֲשָׂרָה מָנָה – יִקַּח לֶפְסוֹ לִיטְרָא דְּגָיִים,

one who has ten maneh should buy for his stewpot a litra of fish;

STATEMENT

חֲמִשִּׁים מָנָה – יִקַּח לֶפְסוֹ לִיטְרָא בֶּשָׂר,

one who has fifty maneh should buy for his stewpot a litra of meat;

STATEMENT

מֵאָה מָנָה – יִשְׁפֹּתוּ לוֹ קִדְרָה בְּכָל יוֹם.

and only one who has one hundred maneh, they may set a pot of meat for him every day.

STATEMENT

וְאֵינָהּ אֵימַת? מֵעֶרֶב שַׁבָּת לְעֶרֶב שַׁבָּת.

And as for the others who have less, when do they eat meat? From Shabbos eve to Shabbos eve.

STATEMENT

אָמַר רַב: צְרִיכִין אָנוּ לְחַוֵּשׁ לְדִבְרֵי זָקֵן.

Rav said: We must be concerned for the words of the Elder, Rabbi Elazar ben Azaryah, and manage our expenses carefully.

STATEMENT

אמר רבי יוחנן: אבא ממשפחת בריאים הוה, אכל כגון אנו, מי שיש לו פרוטה בתוך כיסו – יריצנה לחנוני.

Rabbi Yochanan said: My father was from a family of healthy, robust people who did not need to eat meat constantly, but as for us who are weak, whoever has a perutah in his pocket should run it to the shopkeeper to buy food to sustain himself.

STATEMENT

אמר רב נחמן: כגון אנו לוויז ואוכלין.

Rav Nachman said: As for us, we even borrow and eat meat, because our health depends on it.

EXPLANATION

”כבשים ללבושה” – מגז כבשים יהא מלבושה,

The Gemara expounds: “Lambs are for your clothing”—from the shearings of lambs should be your clothing, meaning do not spend more on clothes than the value of your sheep’s wool;

EXPLANATION

”ומחיר שדה עתודים” – לעולם ימכור אדם שדה ויקח עתודים, ואל ימכור אדם עתודים ויקח שדה.

“And goats are the price of a field”—a person should always sell a field and buy goats, which produce immediate income, and a person should not sell goats and buy a field, which requires heavy investment.

EXPLANATION

”וידי חלב עזים” – דיו לאדם שיתפרנס מחלב גדיים וטלאים שבתוך ביתו.

“And there will be enough goats’ milk”—it is enough for a person to sustain himself from the milk of the kids and lambs that are inside his house, without seeking luxuries.

EXPLANATION

”ללחמה ללחם ביתך” – לחמה קודם ללחם ביתך.

“For your food, for the food of your household”—your own food comes before the food of your household, meaning the provider must stay strong first.

EXPLANATION

”וחיים לנערותיך” – אמר מר זוטרא בריה דרב נחמן: תז חיים לנערותיך, מיכז למדה תורה דרך ארץ שלא ילמד אדם את בנו בשר ויין.

“And sustenance for your maidens”—Mar Zutra the son of Rav Nachman said: Give only basic sustenance to your maidens; from here the Torah teaches proper conduct, that a person should not accustom his son to meat and wine, so he does not become a glutton.

STATEMENT

Rabbi Yochanan said:

עמוד ב' DAF 84B

STATEMENT

הרוצה שיתעשר יעסוק בבקמה דקה.

One who wishes to become wealthy should engage in raising small domesticated animals, such as sheep and goats, which yield high profits with low maintenance costs.

STATEMENT

אמר רב חסדא, מאי דכתיב: "ועשתרת צאנך" – שמעשרות את בעליהן.

Rav Chisda said: What is the meaning of that which is written in the Torah: "And the flocks [ve'ashterot] of your sheep"? It means that sheep enrich [me'ashrot] their owners, as the word ashterot is homiletically linked to osher, wealth.

STATEMENT

ואמר רבי יוחנן: כסא דחרשין, ולא כסא דפושרין.

And Rabbi Yochanan said: It is preferable to drink a cup of witches, meaning a cup of water that might have been affected by witchcraft, and one should not drink a cup of lukewarm water, which is extremely harmful to one's health.

EXPLANATION

והני מילי בכלי מתכות, אבל בכלי חרש לית לן בה.

The Gemara qualifies this: And this applies only to lukewarm water that is metal vessels, but in earthenware vessels we have no problem with it, as it does not pose a health risk.

EXPLANATION

ובכלי מתכות נמי לא אמרו, אלא דלא שדי בהו ציביא, אבל שדי בהו ציביא לית לן בה.

And even in metal vessels, we said that lukewarm water is harmful only where one did not cast flavorings into them, such as wood chips or herbs, but if he cast flavorings into them, we have no problem with it.

EXPLANATION

וכי לא שדי בהו ציביא נמי לא אמרו, אלא דלא ציץ, אבל ציץ לית לן בה.

And even when one did not cast flavorings into them, we said this only where the water had not been boiled and then cooled down to lukewarm, but if it had been boiled, we have no problem with it.

STATEMENT

ואמר רבי יוחנן: מי שהניח לו אביו מעות ורוצה לאבדן – ילפש כלי פשתן, וישתמש בכלי זכוכית, וישכור פועלים ואל ישב עמהן.

And Rabbi Yochanan said: One whose father bequeathed him money and he seeks to lose it quickly, should wear linen garments, and should use glass vessels, and should hire laborers and not sit with them to supervise their work.

EXPLANATION

לְבוּשׁ כְּלִי פִשְׁתָּן – בְּכִיתָנָא רוֹמִיתָא. וְיִשְׁתַּמֵּשׁ בְּכִלֵּי זָכוּכִית – בְּזוּגֵיתָא חִיּוֹרְתָא. וְיִשְׁכּוֹר פּוֹעָלִים וְאֵל יָשֵׁב עִמָּהֶן – בְּתוֹרֵי דְנַפְיֵשׁ פְּסִידִיָּהּ.

The Gemara explains: When he said **he should wear linen garments**, this was said **with regard to Roman linen**, which is very expensive and wears out quickly. **And** when he said **he should use glass vessels**, this was said **with regard to white glass**, which is highly fragile and costly to replace. **And** when he said **he should hire laborers and not sit with them**, this was said **with regard to laborers working with oxen, whose potential for damage is great** if they are not watched, as they can easily ruin a field.

STATEMENT

דַּרְשׁ רַב עֲוִירָא, זִימְנִין אָמַר לֵה מְשָׁמִיָּה דְרַבִּי אָמִי, וְזִימְנִין אָמַר לֵה מְשָׁמִיָּה דְרַבִּי אָסִי: מַאי דְכָתִיב "טוֹב אִישׁ חוֹנֵן וּמִלֻּחַ יִכְלֹכַל דְּבָרָיו בְּמִשְׁפָּט?"

Rav Avira expounded, sometimes he said it in the name of Rabbi Ami, and sometimes he said it in the name of Rabbi Assi: What is the meaning of that which is written: "Good is the man who is gracious and lends, who orders his affairs with justice"?

EXPLANATION

לְעוֹלָם יֹאכַל אָדָם וְיִשְׁתֶּה פָחוֹת מִמָּה שְׁיֵשׁ לוֹ, וְיִלְבָּשׁ וְיִתְכַסֶּה בְּמָה שְׁיֵשׁ לוֹ, וְיִכְבֵּד אִשְׁתּוֹ וּבָנָיו יוֹתֵר מִמָּה שְׁיֵשׁ לוֹ, שֶׁהֵן תְּלוּיִין בּוֹ וְהוּא תְּלוּי בְּמִי שְׁאָמַר וְהָיָה הָעוֹלָם.

This teaches that a person should always eat and drink less than what is within his means, and he should dress and cover himself in accordance with his means, and he should honor his wife and children by providing them with food and clothing more than what is within his means; as they are dependent on him, and he is dependent on the One Who spoke and the world came into being, and Hashem will provide him with the means to honor them.

STATEMENT

דַּרְשׁ רַב עֵינָא אֶפְתָּחָא דְבֵי רֵישׁ גְּלוּתָא: הַשּׁוֹחֵט לַחֹלָה בְּשַׁבַּת חֵיִיב לְכַסּוֹת.

Rav Eina expounded at the entrance of the house of the Exilarch: One who slaughters a wild animal or bird for a sick person on Shabbos, for whom it is permitted to slaughter because of danger to life, is obligated to cover the blood on Shabbos.

OBJECTION

אָמַר לָהּ רַבָּה: אֲשֶׁתּוּמָא קָאָמַר, לִישְׁמַטוּהָ לְאַמּוּרִיָּה מִיָּנִיָּה, דִּתְנִיָּא: רַבִּי יוֹסִי אוֹמֵר: כּוֹי אֵין שׁוֹחֲטִין אוֹתוֹ בְּיוֹם טוֹב, וְאִם שְׁחָטוּ אֵין מְכַסִּין אֶת דָּמוֹ.

Rabba said to them: He is saying an astonishing thing! Remove his interpreter from before him to silence him, as it is taught in a baraisa: Rabbi Yosei says: One may not slaughter a koy on Yom Tov because of the doubt whether its blood requires covering, and if he slaughtered it, one does not cover its blood on Yom Tov.

PROOF

מִקָּל וְחוֹמֵר: וּמָה מִלָּה שְׁוֹדָאָה דּוּחָה שַׁבַּת, אֵין סְפִיקָה דּוּחָה יוֹם טוֹב, כְּפֻסִּי שְׁאֵין וְדָאוּ דּוּחָה שַׁבַּת, אֵין דִּין שְׁאֵין סְפִיקוֹ דּוּחָה יוֹם טוֹב?

Rabbi Yosei proves this from an a fortiori inference: If circumcision, whose definite obligation overrides Shabbos, yet its doubtful obligation does not override Yom Tov; then covering the blood, whose definite obligation does not override Shabbos, is it not logical that its doubtful obligation does not override Yom Tov?

OBJECTION

אמר לו: תקיעת שופר בגבולים תוכיח, שאין ודא דוחה שבת, וספיקה דוחה יום טוב!

The Sages said to him: The sounding of the shofar in the provinces will prove otherwise, as its definite obligation does not override Shabbos, and yet its doubtful obligation overrides Yom Tov!

REFUTATION

השיב רבי אלעזר הקפר בריבי תשובה: מה למילה שפן אינה נוהגת בלילי ימים טובים, תאמר בכסוי שנוהג בלילי ימים טובים!

Rabbi Elazar HaKappar the Distinguished responded with a refutation of Rabbi Yosei's inference: What is unique about circumcision is that it is not practiced on the nights of Yom Tov, but only during the day. Can you say the same regarding covering the blood, which is practiced on the nights of Yom Tov? Since covering the blood is more inclusive, perhaps its doubtful obligation does override Yom Tov.

STATEMENT

אמר רבי אבא: זה אחד מן הדברים שאמר רבי חייא "אין לי עליהם תשובה", והשיב רבי אלעזר הקפר בריבי תשובה.

Rabbi Abba said: This is one of the matters regarding which Rabbi Chiyya said, "I have no refutation for them," and Rabbi Elazar HaKappar the Distinguished responded with a refutation that successfully answered it.

PROOF

קתני מיהת, כסוי שאין ודאו דוחה שבת.

Rabba continues his proof: In any event, the baraita teaches that covering the blood is a mitzvah whose definite obligation does not override Shabbos.

QUESTION

מאי ודאו דכסוי דלא דחי שבת? לאו השוחט לחולה בשבת?

What is the case of a definite obligation of covering that does not override Shabbos? Is it not a case of one who slaughters for a sick person on Shabbos? This proves that even when the slaughterer is permitted, one does not cover the blood on Shabbos, which contradicts Rav Eina.

QUESTION

ודלמא דעבר ושחט?

The Gemara asks: But perhaps the baraita is referring to a case where one transgressed and slaughtered for a healthy person on Shabbos? In that case, he may not cover the blood, but if he slaughtered for a sick person with permission, perhaps he must cover it.

ANSWER

דומיא דמילה: מה מילה בפרשות, אף כסוי נמי בפרשות.

The Gemara answers: The covering of the blood in the a fortiori inference must be **similar to circumcision: Just as circumcision is performed with permission**, as it is a mitzvah, **so too, covering** the blood must refer to a case where the slaughter was done **with permission**, meaning for a sick person. Thus, the baraita indeed refutes Rav Eina.

STATEMENT

אָמְרוּ לוֹ: תְּקִיעַת שׁוֹפָר פֶּגְבוּ לִין תּוֹכֵיחַ, שְׂאִין וְדָאָה דּוֹחָה שְׁבֶת, וְסְפִיקָה דּוֹחָה יוֹם טוֹב.

The Gemara returns to the baraita: **They said to him: The sounding of the shofar in the provinces will prove** otherwise, **as its definite obligation does not override Shabbos, and yet its doubtful obligation overrides Yom Tov.**

QUESTION

מַאי סְפִיקָה? אִילּוּמָא סְפִיק חוּל סְפִיק יוֹם טוֹב – הַשְׁתָּא וְדָאֵי יוֹם טוֹב דְּחִיָּא, סְפִיק יוֹם טוֹב סְפִיק חוּל
מִיבַעֲיָא?

The Gemara asks: **What is its doubtful obligation? If we say** it is a case of **doubt** whether the day is **a weekday or Yom Tov**, i.e., the second day of Rosh Hashanah in the diaspora, this is difficult: **Now, if the shofar overrides a definite Yom Tov, is it necessary** to say that it overrides **a doubt of Yom Tov and a doubt of a weekday?**

SUMMARY

In this daf, the Gemara resolves the authorship of the Mishnah regarding consecrated birds, explaining that it either combines the views of Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Shimon or follows Rabbi Shimon's view that kisuy hadam only applies when the bird is not lacking any other steps like redemption or scraping the blood. The Gemara then derives from the comparison of birds to chayos that consecrated birds are excluded from kisuy, and refutes a heretic's claim that behemos require kisuy by comparing their blood to water, which leads to a discussion excluding blood from being used as a mikvah. We conclude with a Braisa teaching derech erez from the Torah's pesukim, emphasizing that a person should only eat meat occasionally and should manage his household finances carefully, ensuring he does not slaughter all his cattle and lose his livelihood.

The Gemara on our daf brings down a beautiful, foundational teaching of Rabbi Elazar ben Azariah and the Chachamim about how a Yid should manage his household and his pocket. The Torah teaches us a deep lesson in derech erez: a person must live within, and even slightly below, his means. If you have a certain amount of money, you eat vegetables; if you have more, you eat fish; only if you are truly wealthy do you eat meat daily. But then the Gemara adds a striking chiddush: a person must always honor his wife and children *beyond* what he can afford, because they depend on him, and he depends on Hashem.

Look at the beautiful yeshivish lomdus here. When it comes to your own physical desires, your food and your personal comforts, the Torah tells you to be careful, to calculate, and to hold back. Do not spend what you do not have. But when it comes to the feelings, the dignity, and the happiness of your wife and children, the normal rules of calculation are set aside. You are mechuyav to show them warmth, to make them feel secure, and to provide for them with a generous hand, even if it requires a stretch.

Why? Because the Gemara says they depend on you, and you depend on Hashem. When you step up and act with bitachon, going beyond your natural limits to bring joy and kavod to your family, Hashem acts with you middah k'neged middah. He steps out of the natural limits of parnassah to provide for you. True shalom bayis and the chinuch of our children require us to be nosei b'ol, to put our own desires last and our family's needs first.

Today, make a conscious decision to hold back on a personal luxury or convenience, and instead use those resources, or simply your own time and energy, to bring a smile, a treat, or a word of deep appreciation to your wife or children.