



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

Bechoros Daf Zayin

- A Braisa says, if a sheep has a firstborn that looks like a goat, or visa-versa, it is patur from bechor, but if it looks at least a little like the mother it is chayuv. **R' Shimon** says it is not subject to bechor unless its head and majority of its body are like the mother.
 - **Q:** With regard to eating this offspring, does **R' Shimon** require that its head and majority of its body be like the mother in order for it to be mutar? Maybe it is regarding bechor that the pasuk says "ach bechor shor" which teaches that the mother and the firstborn have to be the same, but regarding eating it the Torah says that a camel can't be eaten, but something that is born with a mutation can be eaten as long as it looks somewhat like the mother? Or maybe we say there is no difference between the laws of bechor and of eating it? **A:** A Braisa says, if a kosher animal has an offspring that is of a non-kosher animal it is assur to eat it. If its head and majority of its body are like the mother it is subject to bechor. This must follow **R' Shimon** and we see that he requires this even for eating it!
 - The Gemara says this is not a valid proof. It may be that the requirement of having its head and majority of its body like the mother is only for bechor. In fact, since the Braisa stops talking about eating and moves onto the topic of bechor, this would suggest that this requirement is only required for bechor!
 - The Gemara says this is not a valid proof. It may be that he requires this for eating also, and the reason the Braisa stresses the point regarding bechor is because we would think that the pasuk of "ach bechor shor" teaches that having its head and majority of its body like the mother is not enough to make it chayuv in bechor.
 - **Q:** Maybe we can answer from a Braisa. The Braisa says, the pasuk says "es zeh lo sochlu mimaalei hageira umimafrisei haparsa". The word "zeh" teaches that one may not eat an offspring of a cow that looks *entirely* like a camel, but one would be allowed to eat the offspring if it looked at least a little like the mother. This refers to an offspring from a kosher mother and father, but which looks like a non-kosher animal. One would think that even if the mother is a non-kosher animal the same rule would apply. The pasuk therefore says "sei kvasim v'sei izim", which **R' Yehoshua** says teaches that both the mother and the father must be of the kosher species. **R' Eliezer** says these words come to teach that if the mother is a kosher animal and the father is not, and the offspring looks like a non-kosher animal, the offspring may still be eaten. Now, this Braisa refers to the offspring as a "non-kosher animal" (which is the view of **R' Shimon**) and yet it says that if it looks at least a little like the mother it may be eaten. This must be what **R' Shimon** holds! **A:** It may be that this Tanna holds like **R' Shimon** regarding one point but not regarding the other. Therefore there is no proof as to what he actually holds with this.
 - **Others** ask a question on this Braisa and by answering that question, they answer the question regarding the view of **R' Shimon** as well. The Braisa spoke of the case where the mother was a kosher animal and the father was a non-kosher animal. How is this possible? **R' Yehoshua ben Levi** said that a kosher animal that mates with a non-kosher animal cannot produce offspring!? **R' Yirmiya** said, the case that is being referred to is where the father was a kosher animal that looked like a non-kosher animal and follows **R' Shimon** who says that such an animal is assur, and yet the Braisa says that if it looks a little like the mother it

is mutar! The Gemara says, it may be that this Tanna holds like **R' Shimon** regarding one point but not regarding the other. Therefore, there is no proof as to what he actually holds with this.

- **Q:** This suggests that **R' Eliezer** holds that when something is caused by two things – one of which is mutar and one of which is assur – the result is mutar, whereas **R' Yehoshua** would hold it is assur. However, we have actually learned the opposite – where an offspring is born to a mother that is a treifa and to a father that is healthy, **R' Eliezer** says it may not be brought as a korbon and **R' Yehoshua** says that it may be! **A:** Normally **R' Eliezer** says this type of situation produces an assur product. However, in the case of the kosher mother and non-kosher father, the pasuk says “sei kvasim” and “sei izim” when it could have left out the second “sei”. The fact that it didn’t do so teaches that as long as even the mother alone is a kosher animal the offspring will be kosher. **R' Yehoshua** says, that normally this situation is mutar, but in this case it is assur, because the pasuk uses the plural of “kvasim, izim”, to teach that both parents must be kosher animals.
 - We can answer from a Braisa. The Braisa says, **R' Shimon** says that the pesukim say “gamal” twice to teach that even a camel that is born to a cow is assur. However, if its head and majority of its body looks like the mother it is mutar to be eaten. **SHEMA MINA** that **R' Shimon** requires this for eating as well.

SHEHAYOTZEI MIN HATAMEI...

- **R' Sheishes** asked, what is the halacha with regard to the urine of a donkey – is it assur?
 - **Q:** Why didn’t he ask this question regarding the urine of horses and camels? **A:** Their urine is not cloudy and is therefore not similar to milk, and we therefore would say it is simply water and is mutar. However, the urine of a donkey is cloudy. His question is, is it because it is a bodily excretion and is therefore assur or is simply water that became cloudy from the heat of its flesh and is mutar.
 - **R' Sheishes** said, the Mishna says that something that comes from a non-kosher animal is not kosher. It doesn’t say “mitamei” but rather says “min hatamei”, which comes to teach that the urine is assur.
 - **Others** say that he didn’t ask regarding the urine of horses and camels because, people don’t drink that. People do drink the urine of donkeys as a remedy for jaundice, that is why he asked about that. He answered that this comes from a non-kosher animal and it therefore is also not kosher.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that bee honey is mutar because it is not an excretion of the bees. The same should be said for the urine of donkeys!? **A:** He holds like **R' Yaakov** who says that the only reason bee honey is mutar is based on a drasha of the pesukim. Although urine is similarly not an excretion of the animal, since it does not have this drasha it would be assur.
 - With regard to the egglike pieces that come out of a female yachmur, some **Rabanan** thought to say that it is the beitzim of the male and is therefore assur as eiver min hachai. **R' Safra** said that it is actually the zerah of a male deer who mated with it.
 - **R' Huna** said, the skin that covers the face of a newborn donkey is mutar. This is because it is considered to be a discharge, not part of the animal itself.
 - **R' Chisda** said, there is a Braisa that proves this point, because the Braisa says that skin in the case of a human baby is always tahor (even if the fetus or mother have died). We see that it is not considered to be part of the mother or baby.

MISHNA

- If a non-kosher fish swallowed a kosher fish, the kosher fish is mutar to be eaten. If a kosher fish swallowed a non-kosher fish, the non-kosher fish is assur to be eaten. The reason for this is that the swallowed fish did not grow inside the fish that swallowed it.

GEMARA

- The fact that the Mishna says that the kosher fish was “swallowed” by the non-kosher fish, and not that it was simply found inside the non-kosher fish, it seems to be that the reason that it is mutar is only because we know that it was swallowed. If we didn’t know that, we would have to assume that this fish grew inside the non-kosher fish and it would be assur. This concern is based on a Braisa that says that non-kosher fish produce offspring internally to the mother’s body whereas kosher fish lay eggs.
 - **Q:** Based on this we should still say that the fish that was swallowed was already digested and the fish that we see inside is an offspring of the non-kosher fish!? **A: R’ Sheishes** said, the Mishna is discussing where the kosher fish was found in the intestines of the non-kosher fish, which means that it was swallowed. **R’ Pappa** said, the Mishna is discussing where the kosher fish was found in the throat of the non-kosher fish, which means that it was swallowed. **R’ Nachman** said, the Mishna is discussing where the kosher fish was found fully mature in the non-kosher fish, which means that it was swallowed. **R’ Ashi** said, most fish only produce offspring of their own species, and since this is not, it is as if we saw it be swallowed in front of us.