



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

Bechoros Daf Vuv

- **Q:** If a cow has a firstborn that looks like a donkey, but it is at least a little bit similar to the cow, is it subject to bechor? Do we say that when a goat has a firstborn that looks like a sheep or visa-versa it is chayuv in bechor when the offspring looks a little similar to the mother because the goat and the sheep are both types of kosher animals, and they are both animals whose bechoros have physical kedusha, but in the case of the cow with the firstborn that looks like a donkey, since the cow is a kosher type of animal and the donkey is not, and the bechor of a cow gets physical kedusha whereas the bechor of a donkey only gets monetary kedusha it will not be subject to bechor? Or, maybe we say that since the cow and the donkey are both species that are subject to a law of bechor, this offspring will also be subject to a law of bechor? **Q2:** If you say that since the cow and the donkey are both species that are subject to a law of bechor, this offspring will also be subject to a law of bechor, what about a case where a donkey had a firstborn that looked like a horse? In this case the species of a horse is not subject to bechor and therefore it shouldn't be subject here either, or maybe since the horse is similar to the donkey in that they are both types of non-kosher animals, it does become kodesh? **Q3:** If you say that since the horse is similar to the donkey in that they are both types of non-kosher animals, it does become kodesh, what about the case where a cow has a firstborn that looks like a horse? Do we say that since one is a type of kosher animal and one is a type of non-kosher animal, and since cows are subject to bechor and horses are not, this firstborn is not subject to bechor, or do we say that since it is at least a little similar to its mother that is enough to make it subject to bechor? **A:** A Braisa says, if a kosher animal has a firstborn that looks like a non-kosher animal it is patur from bechor. However, if it looks at least a little like the mother it is chayuv in bechor. Presumably this even includes the case of a cow that gave birth to something that looks like a horse and teaches that it would be subject to bechor!
 - The Gemara says this is not a proof, because it may be referring to the case of a cow that gave birth to something that looks like a donkey.
 - **Q:** Maybe we can answer from a Braisa. The Braisa says, if a cow has a firstborn that looks like a donkey or if a donkey has a firstborn that looks like a horse it is patur from bechor, but if it looks at least a little like the mother it is chayuv in bechor. Now, presumably this last statement refers to both cases and we can answer two of our questions based on the Braisa! **A:** It may be that that statement was only going on the case of the cow that had a firstborn that looked like a donkey.
 - **Q:** If that is true, why did the Braisa give the case of the donkey that had a firstborn that looked like a horse? If it was to teach the first ruling, that it is not subject to bechor, we would know that from the fact that a cow that has a firstborn that looks like a donkey is not subject to bechor even though they are both species that are subject to bechor, which is the first case of the Braisa! **A:** We would say that it is only in the case of the cow with the firstborn donkey that it is patur from bechor, because they are so different – the cow has horns and split hooves whereas the donkey does not have horns or split hooves. However, in the case of the donkey and the horse, since they are more similar looking we would say that it would be subject to bechor. That is why the Braisa had to give that case as well.

UMAH HEIN BA'ACHILA...

- **Q:** Why did the Mishna have to add general rule that “something that comes from a kosher animal is kosher and something that comes from a non-kosher animal is not kosher”? **A:** It gave the rule to be clear and prevent people from getting mixed up and saying that the offspring of a kosher animal that looks like a non-kosher animal is not kosher, and visa-versa. One would

mistakenly say so by saying that we follow whatever the offspring looks like. The Mishna is teaching that we follow the mother.

- **Q:** How do we know this halacha? **A:** A Braisa says, “ach es zeh lo sochlu mimaalei hageira umimafrisei haparsa” teaches that there is an animal that chews its cud and has split hooves and yet we may not eat it – this refers to a kosher animal that is born to a non-kosher animal. Maybe instead say that it refers to a non-kosher animal that is born to a kosher animal (and the pasuk would be explained to mean that there is something that comes from an animal that has split hooves and chews its cud and yet it may not be eaten)? The pasuk therefore says “gamal...tamei hu”, which teaches that “it” – an actual camel is not kosher, but a non-kosher animal born to a kosher animal is kosher. **R’ Shimon** says, “gamal” is written twice in the pesukim, one teaches that a camel born to a camel is not kosher, and one teaches that a camel born to a cow is also not kosher.
 - The **Rabanan** will say that one “gamal” teaches that the camel itself is assur and the other teaches that the milk of a camel is assur. **R’ Shimon** says that the extra word “es hagamal” teaches that the milk of a camel is assur. The **Rabanan** don’t darshen the “es” words in the Torah.
 - **Q: R’ Acha the son of Rava** asked **R’ Ashi**, if not for these drashos we would think that the milk of a camel is mutar? We learn from the pesukim regarding sheratzim that liquids that come from non-kosher creatures are also not kosher!? **A:** We would think that since the fact that even milk of a kosher animal is a chiddush that it is mutar according to the view that it is the blood of the animal that turns into milk, maybe the milk of a non-kosher animal is mutar as a chiddush as well. Even according to the view that the milk is not from the blood, it is still a chiddush to say that it is mutar from a kosher animal, because it comes from a live animal and should be treated as eiver min hachai. Therefore, we would think to say that the milk of a non-kosher animal is mutar through a chiddush as well. The Torah therefore needs to teach that the milk of a non-kosher animal is also not kosher.
 - **Q:** How do we know that the milk of a kosher animal is kosher? It can’t be based on the fact that we know that basar b’chalav is assur so it must be that milk alone is mutar, because maybe milk alone is assur to eat but mutar b’hana’ah whereas basar b’chalav is even assur b’hana’ah!? Even according to **R’ Shimon** who says that basar b’chalav is mutar b’hana’ah we can say that milk by itself is assur to eat and basar b’chalav makes one chayuv in malkus!? It also can’t be based on the pasuk that teaches that the milk of a passul korbon is assur which may suggest that the milk of a regular animal is mutar, because it may be that the milk of a regular animal is assur to eat but mutar b’hana’ah, whereas the milk of a passul korbon is even assur b’hana’ah!? It also can’t be based on a pasuk that says that “let the milk of goats be enough for your food...” because that may mean that the milk should be sold to buy food. **A:** It is from the pasuk that says that Yishai gave Dovid cheese to bring to the war. This must have been to eat, because there is no buying and selling done at war. **A2:** The pasuk praises EY as “flowing milk and honey”. It would not praise with something that is assur to eat. **A3:** Another pasuk tells to go eat wine and milk.
 - **Q:** If we say that from the fact that “gamal” is written twice it was done so for a drasha, what drasha will we make with the fact that “shafan”, “arneves”, and “chazir” are all written twice? Rather, it is not repeated for a drasha, but as a Braisa says, it is repeated to teach regarding one new species of animal!? **A:** If there is a drasha to make, we do so (as we did for “gamal”).