

Only his father and his mother

אלא אביו ואמו –

OVERVIEW

The תורה writes¹ כי איש איש אשר יקלל את אביו ואת אמו מות יומת אביו ואמו קלל דמיו בו. It is the view of ר' יאשיה (if not for the conclusion of ר' יאשיה) since it says (אביו ואמו קלל) (with a connecting וי"ו) it can mean that he is only liable if he curses his father and mother (but not if he cursed only one of them). ר' יונתן, however, maintains that a וי"ו alone does not necessarily mean both together, unless the פסוק writes יחדיו. Our תוספות explains the need for יחדיו and how ר' יונתן derives his view.

דסתמא משמע שניהם כאחד.

For presumptively (according to ר' יאשיה) the וי"ו indicates both of them (the father and the mother) together (even without adding יחדיו) –

תוספות responds to an anticipated difficulty:

והא דכתיב (דברים כג) יחדיו בשעטנו איצטריך לשתי תכופות³ -

And this that יחדיו is written by שעטנו; that יחדיו is necessary to teach us that two stiches are required to transgress the prohibition of שעטנו,

ויחדו דלא תחרוש (שם) איצטריך דאי לא יחדו הוה אמינא אפילו אין קשורים במחרישה -

And the יחדיו which is written by לא תחרוש [do not plow] is also necessary, for if not for יחדיו, I would have thought even if they (the שור והמור) are not tied to the plow -

אלא שמנהיגם בבת אחת⁵ או אפילו בזה אחר זה -

But rather I would think he is liable even if he leads them together, or even one after the other. Therefore the תורה writes יחדיו that they both need to be tied to the plow. This concludes תוספות comments according to ר' יאשיה. Now תוספות addresses ר' יונתן -

ורבי יונתן נמי דאמר עד שיפרוט לך הכתוב יחדו -

And similarly ר' יונתן who maintains that unless the פסוק specifies יחדיו it can

¹ ויקרא (קדושים) כ, ט.

² In it reads יחדיו and פשתים צמר ופשתים יחדיו. Since it states (with a וי"ו) so I know that it means you cannot wear צמר ופשתים together (but you are permitted to wear either צמר or פשתים separately), why is the word יחדיו necessary according to ר' יאשיה.

³ Only two stiches make the צמר ופשתים together – יחדיו, but not one stich alone (alternately one may wear a garment of wool and a garment of linen together).

⁴ In it reads יחדיו and שור וחמור יחדיו. The same question applies here (see footnote # 2); according to ר' יאשיה, why was it necessary to state יחדיו since it says שור וחמור (with a וי"ו), we know that it means with a שור וחמור together (but not separately, which is obviously permitted).

⁵ Perhaps תוספות means that he is plowing (not with a שור וחמור) and coincidentally he is also leading a שור וחמור together or בזה אחר זה, or he has two plows, or they are pushing the plow (see רש"י).

mean each one separate, even though they are connected with a וי"ו;⁶ so ר' יונתן -

לא מהתם יליף מדאיצטריך התם למיכתב יחדו דהא איצטריך כדפירשית⁷ -

Does not derive it from כלאים ושעטנו, **that since it was necessary there to write יחדו**, therefore we can assume the elsewhere it does not mean both together, this is not his source, **for it was necessary** to write יחדו **as I explained** -

אלא מסברא קאמר דהוי משמע הכי:

Rather ר' יונתן **said** his opinion based on logic, **for this is the way it seems** that even though there is a וי"ו, that does not necessarily mean that it has to be both together.

SUMMARY

מחרישה by יחדו is necessary to exclude one תכיפה or not tied to the respectively; ר' יונתן derives his rule based on logic, not from the 'extra' יחדו.

THINKING IT OVER

According to ר' יונתן, logically, a וי"ו does not mean it has to be together, therefore, presumably, by שעטנו (for instance) if the תורה would not write יחדו it could mean that it is אסור to wear either צמר or פשתים; now that it says יחדו it means that the איסור is only with צמר and פשתים together. How therefore would ר' יונתן derive the rule of תכיפות by שתי שעטנו,⁸ and similarly that the שור וחמור need to be tied to the by מחרישה.⁹

⁶ ר' יונתן maintains that even though two words are connected with a וי"ו, it does not necessarily mean that we require both of them together, unless the תורה writes יחדו; presumably meaning unless the תורה writes יחדו as it did by כלאים. One could assume that ר' יונתן derives his rule from the fact that the תורה needed to write יחדו by כלאים, because otherwise we may have thought that it is אסור with even one of them (it would be אסור to plow with either an ox or a donkey, or it would be אסור to wear either צמר or פשתים), this proves that wherever the תורה does not write יחדו, there is no requirement that it be both together. [This seems to be on שיטת רש"י. צה, א ד"ה עד.] תוספות rejects this notion.

⁷ The יחדו by שעטנו teaches that it must be two stiches, and the כלאים by יחדו teaches that they must be tied to the plow (but even without יחדו we would know that it must be both צמר and פשתים by שעטנו). תוספות maintains that ר' יונתן also agrees to these דרשות. Therefore we cannot derive from here that if does not say יחדו it can be each one individually. See 'Thinking it over'.

⁸ See footnote # 7.

⁹ See מהר"ם and ריטב"א.