

דף יומי • בכורות • דף ו'

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

THE SUGYA

We begin the daf by continuing our shakla v'tarya on how we know that only a donkey's firstborn is subject to the mitzvah of peter chamor, and not other non-kosher animals like horses or camels. The Gemara brings a kasha from Rav Achai on the drasha of the double mention of "peter chamor" in the Torah, leading us to a deeper discussion of klal u'prat (generalization and detail) and how the Rabbis and Rabbi Yosei HaGelili argue over the structure of the pesukim.

From there, the Gemara moves into a fascinating series of she'eilos regarding anomalous births. We analyze the halachic status of a firstborn when a kosher animal gives birth to a non-kosher-looking species, or vice versa, such as a cow that gives birth to a donkey-like offspring, or a donkey that gives birth to a horse-like offspring. The Gemara wants to know if having some physical characteristics of the mother (miktzas simanim) is enough to make the offspring kadosh.

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

עמוד א' DAF 6A

STATEMENT

תלמוד לומר: "פטר חמור" "פטר חמור" שני פעמים —

Therefore, **the verse states** the phrase: "Firstborn of a donkey" and "firstborn of a donkey" a total of **two times**.

STATEMENT

פטרי חמורים אמרתי לה, ולא פטרי סוסים וגמלים.

This teaches that **firstborns of donkeys I said to you** are subject to the mitzvah, **but not firstborns of horses or camels**.

OBJECTION

פריה רב אחאי:

Rav Achai refutes this: How can the extra verse alone exclude other animals?

EXPLANATION

אי כתב רחמנא חד, הוה אמינא דכר שהיה בכלל, ויציא מן הכלל ללמד, לא ללמד על עצמו יצא
אלא ללמד על הכלל כולו יצא, ולעולם בשא.

If the Merciful One had written the term only **once**, I would say that a donkey is an item that was included in the **generalization** of all non-kosher animals, and **emerged from the generalization** to teach us something. And we have a rule: It emerged from the generalization **not** just to teach about itself, but rather it emerged to teach about the entire **generalization**. And accordingly, **actually** all non-kosher animals should be redeemed **with a lamb**.

EXPLANATION

כתב רחמנא "פטר חמור" אחרינא, פטרי חמורים ולא פטרי סוסים וגמלים,

Therefore, the Merciful One writes "firstborn of a donkey" another time, to teach that only firstborns of donkeys must be redeemed with a lamb, but not firstborns of horses or camels.

OBJECTION

ואימא: מעטינהו משה, ולעולם בכל דבר!

But then say that the second verse only excluded them from redemption with a lamb, but actually they must still be redeemed with any other item!

ANSWER

אם כן, לכתוב רחמנא: "פטר חמור תפדה בש"ו" ו"חמור תפדה בש"ו".

The Gemara answers: If so, let the Merciful One write: "The firstborn of a donkey you shall redeem with a lamb," and: "A donkey you shall redeem with a lamb."

QUESTION

"פטר חמור תפדה בש"ו", "פטר חמור תפדה בש"ו" למה לי?

Why do I need the exact repetition of "a firstborn of a donkey you shall redeem with a lamb," and "a firstborn of a donkey you shall redeem with a lamb"?

ANSWER

פטרי חמורים אמרתי לה, ולא פטרי סוסים וגמלים.

It must be to teach: Firstborns of donkeys I said to you are subject to the mitzvah, but not firstborns of horses or camels at all.

QUESTION

ותנא דידן, למעוטי סוסים וגמלים, מנא ליה?

And as for our Tanna of the Mishnah, who uses this repetition for a different drasha, from where does he derive to exclude horses and camels?

ANSWER

אמר רב פפא: כל מקנה תזכר — כלל, שור ושה וחמור — פרט,

Rav Pappa said: The verse says, "From all your livestock you shall take the males" — this is a generalization. "An ox and a lamb and a donkey" — this is a detail.

STATEMENT

כלל ופרט — אין בכלל אלא מה שבפרט,

And we have a rule of a generalization and a detail: there is nothing in the generalization except that which is in the detail.

INFERENCE

שור ושה וחמור — אין, מידי אחרינא — לא.

Therefore, **an ox, a lamb, and a donkey** — **yes**, they have firstborn sanctity, but **any other thing** — **no**.

QUESTION

ורבי יוסי הגלילי?

And how does **Rabbi Yosei HaGelili** respond to this?

ANSWER

”פטר” הפסיק הענין,

He holds that the word “**firstborn**” in the phrase “and the firstborn of a donkey” **interrupted the matter**, so it is not a standard generalization and detail.

QUESTION

ורבנו?

And how do **the Rabbis** respond?

ANSWER

וי”ו הדר עריב קרא.

They hold that the letter **vav**, meaning “and,” **returned and combined it** back into the list.

QUESTION

ורבי יוסי הגלילי?

And how does **Rabbi Yosei HaGelili** respond to that?

ANSWER

לא לכתוב לא וי”ו ולא ”פטר”.

He says: If they were meant to be combined, **let the Torah write neither the vav nor the word “firstborn”**.

QUESTION

ורבנו?

And how do **the Rabbis** explain this?

ANSWER

אידי דהא קדושת דמים, והא קדושת הגוף — פסיק להו והדר עריב להו.

They say: **Since this** donkey has only **sanctity of value**, and **those**, the ox and lamb, have **inherent sanctity**, the Torah **separated them** with the word “firstborn” and **then combined them** again with the vav.

QUESTION

איבעיא להו: פרה שילדה מין חמור, ויש בו מקצת סימנין — מהו?

A **dilemma** was raised before them: In the case of a cow that gave birth to a donkey-like species, and it has some of the **characteristics** of the mother, **what is the halacha**?

EXPLANATION

עו שְׂיִלְדָּה מִיֵּן רָחֵל, וְרָחֵל שְׂיִלְדָּה מִיֵּן עֵז, דְּכִי יֵשׁ מְקָצֶת סִמָּנִין — חֵיִיבֶת בְּבִכּוּרָה,

Perhaps when the Mishnah ruled regarding a goat that gave birth to a ewe-like species, and a ewe that gave birth to a goat-like species, that when there are some characteristics of the mother it is obligated in the law of the firstborn,

EXPLANATION

דִּהָא טְהוֹרָה וְהָא טְהוֹרָה, הָא קְדוּשַׁת הַגּוֹרֵף וְהָא קְדוּשַׁת הַגּוֹרֵף.

that is because this is a kosher animal and that is a kosher animal, and this has inherent sanctity and that has inherent sanctity.

EXPLANATION

הִכָּא, דִּהָא טְמֵאָה וְהָא טְהוֹרָה, הָא קְדוּשַׁת הַגּוֹרֵף וְהָא קְדוּשַׁת דָּמִים — לָא,

But here, where this offspring resembles a non-kosher animal and this mother is a kosher animal, and this mother's species has inherent sanctity and that offspring's species has sanctity of value — perhaps no, it is not holy?

EXPLANATION

אוּ דְלָמָּא: כִּיּוֹן דְּאִידֵי וְאִידֵי בְּנֵי מִיקְדָּשׁ בְּבִכּוּרָה — קְדוּשׁ?

Or perhaps, since both this mother and that offspring's species are subject to sanctity of the firstborn, it is holy?

QUESTION

וְאִם תִּמְצִי לֹאמַר: כִּיּוֹן דְּאִידֵי וְאִידֵי מִיקְדָּשׁ בְּבִכּוּרָה קְדוּשׁ, חֲמוּר שְׂיִלְדָּה מִיֵּן סוּס מַהוּ?

And if you say: Since both this and that are subject to sanctity of the firstborn it is holy, then in the case of a donkey that gave birth to a horse-like species, what is the halacha?

EXPLANATION

הִכָּא וְדָאִי לָא פֶת מִיקְדָּשׁ בְּבִכּוּרָה הוּא, אוּ דְלָמָּא כִּיּוֹן דָּמִין טְמֵאָה הוּא קְדוּשׁ?

Do we say here, the horse is certainly not subject to sanctity of the firstborn, so it is exempt? Or perhaps, since it is a non-kosher species born from a non-kosher species, it is holy?

QUESTION

אִם תִּמְצֵא לֹאמַר: כִּיּוֹן דָּמִין טְמֵאָה הוּא קְדוּשׁ, פֶּרָה שְׂיִלְדָּה מִיֵּן סוּס מַהוּ?

And if you say: Since it is a non-kosher species it is holy, then in the case of a cow that gave birth to a horse-like species, what is the halacha?

EXPLANATION

הִכָּא וְדָאִי הָא טְהוֹרָה וְהָא טְמֵאָה, הָא פֶת מִיקְדָּשׁ בְּבִכּוּרָה וְהָא לָא פֶת מִיקְדָּשׁ בְּבִכּוּרָה, אוּ דְלָמָּא סִמָּנִין מִילְתָּא הִיא?

Do we say here, certainly this is a kosher animal and that is a non-kosher animal, and this is subject to sanctity of the firstborn and that is not subject to sanctity of the firstborn, so it is exempt? Or perhaps having some characteristics is a significant matter and makes it holy?

PROOF

תָּא שְׁמַע: בְּהֵמָה טְהוֹרָה שֶׁיָּלְדָה מִיֵּן בְּהֵמָה טְמֵאָה — פְּטוּרָה מִן הַבְּכוֹרָה, אִם יֵשׁ בּוֹ מְקַצַּת סִימָנִין — חֵיִיבָת בְּבִכּוֹרָה.

Come and hear a proof from a Baraisa: A kosher animal that gave birth to a non-kosher animal species is exempt from the firstborn laws; but if it has some of the characteristics of the mother, it is obligated in the firstborn laws.

QUESTION

מָאִי לֹא אָפִילוּ פֶּרָה שֶׁיָּלְדָה מִיֵּן סוֹס?

Is it not referring even to a cow that gave birth to a horse-like species?

ANSWER

לֹא, פֶּרָה שֶׁיָּלְדָה מִיֵּן חֲמוֹר.

The Gemara rejects this: No, it refers only to a cow that gave birth to a donkey-like species.

PROOF

תָּא שְׁמַע: פֶּרָה שֶׁיָּלְדָה מִיֵּן חֲמוֹר, וְחֲמוֹר שֶׁיָּלְדָה מִיֵּן סוֹס — פְּטוּרָה מִן הַבְּכוֹרָה, אִם יֵשׁ בּוֹ מְקַצַּת סִימָנִין — חֵיִיבָת בְּבִכּוֹרָה.

Come and hear another proof: A cow that gave birth to a donkey-like species, and a donkey that gave birth to a horse-like species, are exempt from the firstborn laws; but if it has some of the characteristics of the mother, it is obligated in the firstborn laws.

QUESTION

מָאִי לֹא אֶתְרוּיָהוּ?

Is it not that the ruling of being obligated if it has characteristics applies to both of them?

ANSWER

לֹא, אֶפְרָה שֶׁיָּלְדָה מִיֵּן חֲמוֹר.

The Gemara rejects this: No, it refers only to a cow that gave birth to a donkey-like species.

OBJECTION

אָבֵל חֲמוֹר שֶׁיָּלְדָה מִיֵּן סוֹס, לְמָאִי קִתְּנִי לָהּ? לְפִטּוּרָא? פְּשִׁיטָא!

But if so, regarding a donkey that gave birth to a horse-like species, for what purpose did the Tanna teach it? To teach that it is exempt if it has no characteristics? That is obvious!

EXPLANATION

הַשְּׁתָּא, וּמָה פֶּרָה שֶׁיָּלְדָה מִיֵּן חֲמוֹר, דְּאִידִי וְאִידִי בְּנֵי מִיקְדָּשׁ בְּבִכּוֹרָה נִינְחוּ, אָמְרַת: אִם יֵשׁ בּוֹ מְקַצַּת סִימָנִין — אִין, וְאִי לֹא — לֹא,

Now, if regarding a cow that gave birth to a donkey-like species, where both this and that are subject to sanctity of the firstborn, you said: if it has some characteristics, yes, it is holy, and if not, no,

QUESTION

חמור שילדה מין סוס מיבעיא?

is it necessary to state that a donkey that gave birth to a horse-like species is exempt without characteristics?

ANSWER

איצטריה, סלקא דעתה: התם הוא דיש לה קרנים, והא אין לה קרנים; הא פרסותיה סדוקות, והא פרסותיה קלוטות.

The Gemara answers: It was necessary, for it might enter your mind to say: There, in the case of a cow, it is distinct because the mother has horns and this offspring has no horns; this mother has split hooves and this offspring has uncloven hooves.

EXPLANATION

אבל הכא, דאידי ואידי אין לה קרנים, אידי ואידי פרסותיה קלוטות, אימא חמור אדום בעלמא הוא, קמשמע לן.

But here, where both this and that have no horns, and both this and that have uncloven hooves, I might say it is merely a red donkey and should be holy even without characteristics. Therefore, it comes to teach us that it is exempt.

QUESTION

ומה הן באכילה כו'. למא לי למיתני "שהיוצא"?

The Mishnah stated: And what is their status regarding eating, etc. Why do I need to teach the rule of "that which emerges" from them?

ANSWER

סימנא בעלמא הוא, דלא תיחלף לה, דלא תימא: זיל בתריה דידיה, והאי טהור מעל'א הוא, והאי טמא מעל'א הוא, אלא זיל בתר אימיה.

It is merely a sign, so that you will not be confused, so that you will not say: Go after the offspring itself, and this is a completely kosher animal, and this is a completely non-kosher animal; rather, go after its mother.

QUESTION

מןא הני מילי? דתנו רבנן:

From where are these words derived? As the Rabbis taught in a Baraisa:

STATEMENT

"אך את זה לא תאכלו ממצלי הגרה וממפריסי הפרסה" —

The verse says: "But this you shall not eat from those that chew the cud and from those that have split hooves".

EXPLANATION

יש לה שהוא מעלה גרה ומפריס פרסה ואי אתה אוכלו, ואיזה זה? טהור שגולד מן הטמא.

This implies: You have that which chews the cud and has split hooves and you may not eat it. And which is this? A kosher animal that was born from a non-kosher animal.

QUESTION

או אינו אלא טמא הנוֹלָד מן הטהור, ומאי "ממעלי הגרה וממפריסי הפרסה"?

Or perhaps it is only a non-kosher animal born from a kosher animal, and what is the meaning of "from those that chew the cud and from those that have split hooves"?

עמוד ב' DAF 6B

EXPLANATION

הכי קאמר:

This is what the Tanna of the Braisa is saying to explain the verse:

EXPLANATION

דבר הבא ממעלי הגרה וממפריסי הפרסה לא תיכול,

A thing that comes from animals that chew their cud and have split hooves you shall not eat if it does not have kosher signs itself.

EXPLANATION

תלמוד לומר: "גמל... טמא הוא" —

To counter this, the verse teaches: "The camel... is impure for you",

EXPLANATION

הוא טמא, ואין טמא הנוֹלָד מן הטהור טמא אלא טהור.

meaning that it, the camel itself, is impure, but a non-kosher animal that is born from a kosher animal is not impure, but rather it is kosher.

STATEMENT

רבי שמעון אומר: "גמל" "גמל" שני פעמים,

But Rabbi Shimon says: The Torah writes "camel" and "camel" two times in the context of the forbidden animals,

STATEMENT

אחד גמל הנוֹלָד מן הגמלה, ואחד גמל הנוֹלָד מן הפרה.

one to forbid a camel that is born from a female camel, and one to forbid a camel that is born from a cow.

QUESTION

ורבנן, האי "גמל" "גמל" מאי עבדי ליה?

The Gemara asks: And the Rabbis, who argue with Rabbi Shimon, what do they do with this repetition of "camel" "camel"?

ANSWER

חד לאסור עצמו, וחד לאסור חלבו.

The Gemara answers: They use **one** verse **to forbid** the camel itself, and **one** verse **to forbid** its milk.

QUESTION

ורבי שמעון, לאסור חֲלָבוּ מִנָּא לִיה?

The Gemara asks: **And Rabbi Shimon**, from where does he derive to forbid its milk?

ANSWER

נפקא ליה מ"את הגמל".

The Gemara answers: **He derives it from** the extra word "et" in the phrase "**et** the camel".

EXPLANATION

ורבנן, "אתים" לא דרשי.

The Gemara asks: **And the Rabbis**, why don't they learn it from there? Because they **do not expound** the word "**et**".

BRAISA

כדתנאי: שמעון העמסוני הֵחָה דורש כָּל "את" וְ"את" שבתורה,

As it is taught in a Braisa: **Shimon HaAmsoni** would expound every single occurrence of "**et**" in the Torah to include something else.

BRAISA

כיון שהגיע ל"את ה' אלהיך תירא" פירש.

Once he reached the verse "**You shall fear Hashem your Elokim**," which has the word "**et**", **he withdrew** from this method of learning, because who else could one be commanded to fear like Hashem?

BRAISA

אמרו לו תלמידיו: רבי, כָּל "אתין" שדרשת מה תהא עליהם?

His students said to him: Rabbi, all the occurrences of "**et**" that you expounded until now, what will be with them?

BRAISA

אמרה להם: כִּשְׁם שֶׁקִּבַּלְתִּי שָׂכָר עַל הַדְרִישָׁה, כֹּךָ אֲנִי מְקַבֵּל שָׂכָר עַל הַפְרִישָׁה.

He said to them: Just as I received reward for the expounding, so I receive reward for the withdrawing.

BRAISA

עד שבא רבי עקיבא ולימד: "את ה' אלהיך תירא" — לרבות תלמידי חכמים.

The matter stood **until** Rabbi Akiva came and taught: "**You shall fear Hashem your Elokim**" — the word "**et**" comes to **include** Torah scholars, that one must fear them as well.

QUESTION

אמר ליה רב אחא בריה דרבא לרב אשי:

Rav Acha the son of Rava said to Rav Ashi:

QUESTION

אָלס מענטש, טעמא דרפנו מ"גמל" "גמל", ורב' שמעון מ"את הגמל",

But if so, that the reason of the Rabbis to forbid camel's milk is from "camel" "camel" and Rabbi Shimon learns it from "et the camel",

QUESTION

הא לאו הכי הוה אמינא חלב דבהמה טמאה שרי?

then if not for this special derivation, would I have said that the milk of a non-kosher animal is permitted?

QUESTION

מאי שנא מהא דתנא: "הטמאים" — לאסור צירן, ורוטבן, וקיפה שלהן?

How is it different from that which is taught in a Braisa regarding creeping things: "The unclean ones" — the extra letter "heh" comes to forbid their juice, and their gravy, and their congealed residue? We see that any liquid coming from a non-kosher creature is forbidden!

ANSWER

איצטריה, סלקא דעתה אמינא: הואיל דבהמה טהורה נמי חידוש הוא,

Rav Ashi answered: A special verse was necessary, because it might enter your mind to say: Since the milk of a kosher animal is also a novelty,

ANSWER

דאמר מר: דם נעפר ונעשה חלב,

as the Master said: Blood is spoiled and becomes milk, and blood is forbidden,

ANSWER

וכיון דחידוש הוא — בבהמה טמאה נמי לישתרי, קא משמע לן.

and since it is a novelty that the Torah permitted milk, by a non-kosher animal it should also be permitted as part of this novelty; therefore it teaches us that it is forbidden.

QUESTION

הניחא למאן דאמר דם נעפר ונעשה חלב,

The Gemara challenges: This works out well according to the one who says that blood is spoiled and becomes milk,

QUESTION

אָלס למאן דאמר איברייה מתפרקין הימנה ואין נפשה חוזרת עליה עד עשרים וארבעה חדש, מאי איכא למימר?

but according to the one who says that milk is not made from blood, but rather a nursing woman's limbs are disjointed and her soul does not return to her until twenty-four months, and that is why she does not menstruate, what is there to say? Why is milk a novelty?

ANSWER

אִיצְטְרִיה, סֵלָקָא דַּעְתָּהּ אֲמִינָא: הוּאִיל וְלִיכָא מִיַּדִּי דָּאֲתִי מַחֵי וְשִׁרְיָה רַחֲמָנָא,

The Gemara answers: It was **necessary**, because it might enter your mind to say: Since there is nothing that comes from a living animal that the Merciful One permits,

ANSWER

וְהֵאֵי חֵלֶב כִּי אָכַר מִן הַחַי הוּא, וְשִׁרְי,

and this milk is like a limb from the living, and yet it is permitted,

ANSWER

וְהִילְכָהּ אֶפִּילוּ בְּבִהֶמָה טְמֵאָה לִישְׁתֵּרִי, קָא מְשַׁמַּע לֵן.

and therefore, since it is a novelty, even in a non-kosher animal it should be permitted; therefore it teaches us that it is forbidden.

QUESTION

וְחֵלֶב דְּבִהֶמָה טְהוֹרָה מִנָּלָן דְּשִׁרְי?

The Gemara asks: **And the milk of a kosher animal**, from where do we know that it is permitted to eat?

QUESTION

אִילִימָא מִדְּאָסֵר רַחֲמָנָא "בְּשָׂר בְּחֵלֶב", הָא לְחוּדְיָה שְׁרִי,

If we say from the fact that the Merciful One forbade meat cooked in milk, which implies that milk by itself is permitted,

OBJECTION

וְאִימָא: חֵלֶב לְחוּדְיָה אָסוּר בְּאֲכִילָה וּמוּתָר בְּהִנָּאָה, בְּשָׂר בְּחֵלֶב — בְּהִנָּאָה נִמִּי אָסוּר!

we can reject this: **But** say that milk by itself is forbidden to eat but permitted for benefit, whereas meat in milk is forbidden for benefit as well!

OBJECTION

וְלִרְבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן, דְּשִׁרְי בְּהִנָּאָה, מְשַׁפְּחֵתָּ לָהּ לְמִילְקֵי עַל בִּישּׁוּלֶיהָ!

And according to Rabbi Shimon, who permits meat in milk for benefit, you find a reason for the Torah to write the prohibition: **to make one liable to lashes for cooking them** together, even if milk alone is forbidden!

ANSWER

אֶלָּא מִדְּגַלִּי רַחֲמָנָא דְּבִפְסוּלֵי הַמוּקְדָּשִׁין, "תִּזְבַּח" — וְלֹא גִיזָה, "בְּשָׂר" — וְלֹא חֵלֶב,

Rather, we derive it from that which the Merciful One revealed regarding disqualified consecrated animals that were redeemed, where the verse says: "You may slaughter" — but not shear its wool, and you may eat its "meat" — but not drink its milk,

ANSWER

הָא דְּחוּלִין שְׁרִי.

which implies that the milk of non-sacred animals is permitted.

OBJECTION

ואימא: דחולין אסור באכילה ושרי בהנאה, דקדשים בהנאה נמי אסור!

The Gemara rejects this: **But** say that the milk of non-sacred animals is forbidden to eat and permitted for benefit, whereas that of consecrated animals is forbidden for benefit as well!

ANSWER

אלא, מדכתוב: "וְיָדִי חֵלֶב עֲזִים לְלֶחְמִי לְלֶחֱמִי בֵּיתְךָ וְחַיִּים לְנַעֲרוֹתֶיךָ."

Rather, we derive it from that which is written in Mishlei: "And there will be enough goats' milk for your food, for the food of your household, and life for your maidens."

QUESTION

ודילמא לסחורה?

The Gemara asks: **But perhaps** it means to use the milk for business to buy food?

ANSWER

אלא מדכתוב "וְיָדִי חֵלֶב עֲזִים לְלֶחְמִי לְלֶחֱמִי בֵּיתְךָ וְחַיִּים לְנַעֲרוֹתֶיךָ."

Rather, we derive it from that which is written when Yishai sent Dovid to his brothers: "And these ten cheeses of milk bring to the captain of the thousand."

QUESTION

ודילמא לסחורה?

The Gemara asks: **But perhaps** it was for business?

ANSWER

אטו דרכה של מלחמה לסחורה!?

The Gemara answers: Is it the way of war to do business? He sent it to them to eat!

ANSWER

ואיבעית אימא מהכא: "אֶרֶץ זֶבֶת חֵלֶב וְדָבָשׁ", וְאִי לָא דְשָׁרִי, מִשְׁתַּבַּח לָן קָרָא בְּמִידֵי דְלֵא חֲזִי?

And if you want, say we learn it from here: "A land flowing with milk and honey." And if it were not permitted, would the verse praise Eretz Yisrael with something that is not fit to eat?

ANSWER

ואיבעית אימא מהכא: "לְכוּ שִׁבְרוּ וְאָכְלוּ, וּלְכוּ שִׁבְרוּ בְּלֹא כֶסֶף וּבְלֹא מַחִיר יֵין וְחֵלֶב."

And if you want, say we learn it from here: "Go, buy and eat; and go, buy without money and without price, wine and milk."

QUESTION

אלא מעתה, "שפן" "שפן", "ארנבת" "ארנבת", "חזיר" "חזיר", להני הוא דאתו?

The Gemara asks: **But if so**, that repetitions of animal names come to forbid their milk, then the repetitions of "hyrax" "hyrax", "hare" "hare", "pig" "pig" in the Torah, **do they come for these** laws to forbid their milk?

ANSWER

אֵלָא לְכַדְתְּנִיא: לָמָּה נִשְׁנו בְּבִהְמָה — מִפְּנֵי "הַשְּׂוֹעָה", וּבְעוֹפוֹת — מִפְּנֵי "הָרָאָה".

Rather, they must come **for that which is taught** in a Braisa: **Why were** the non-kosher animals **repeated** in Devarim? **Because of the shesuah**, a creature with two backs, **and** the non-kosher **birds because of the ra'ah**, which are only mentioned in Devarim.

OBJECTION

"גַּמַּל" "גַּמַּל" נִמִּי לְהַכִּי הוּא דִּאֲתָא!

If so, the repetition of "camel" "camel" **also comes for this** reason, and not to forbid its milk!

ANSWER

כָּל הֵיכָא דְאִיכָא לְמִידְרָשׁ דְּרָשִׁינוּ.

The Gemara answers: **Wherever there is** room to **expound** and derive multiple halachos, **we expound**.

BRAISA

תָּנוּ רַבָּנֵי: רָחֵל שְׂיָלְדָה מִיַּד עֵז, וְעֵז שְׂיָלְדָה מִיַּד רָחֵל — פְּטוּרָה מִן הַבְּכוֹרָה,

The Rabbis taught in a Braisa: A ewe that gave birth to a species of goat, or a goat that gave birth to a species of ewe — it is exempt from the law of the firstborn,

BRAISA

וְאִם יֵשׁ בּוֹ מִקְצַת סִמָּנִים — חֵיִיבָתָּ.

but if it has some of the signs of its mother, the mother is **obligated** to treat it as a firstborn.

BRAISA

רַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן אוֹמֵר: עַד שְׂיִהָא רֵאשׁוֹ וְרוּבּוֹ דּוֹמָה לְאִמּוֹ.

Rabbi Shimon says: It is not a firstborn **until its head and most of its body resemble its mother**.

QUESTION

אִיבְעִיא לְהוֹ: לְאִכְלָהּ, מִי בְּעֵי רַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן רֵאשׁוֹ וְרוּבּוֹ, אוּ לֹא?

A dilemma was raised to them: Regarding eating a kosher animal born from a non-kosher animal, does Rabbi Shimon require its head and most of its body to resemble the mother to be permitted, or not?

EXPLANATION

לְעֻנְיָ בְּכוֹרָה, כְּתִיב: "אֶךְ ... בְּכוֹר שׁוֹר", עַד שְׂיִהָא הוּא שׁוֹר וּבְכוֹרוֹ שׁוֹר.

The Gemara explains the sides of the question: Regarding the matter of the firstborn, it is written: "But... the firstborn of a bull", which teaches that it is not holy **until it is a bull** and its firstborn is a bull.

EXPLANATION

אָבֵל לְאַכִּילָהּ, גָּמֵל הוּא דְאָמַר רַחֲמָנָא דְאַסִּיר, הָא

But regarding eating, it is only a camel that the Merciful One said is forbidden, but this offspring is not a camel...

SUMMARY

The daf concludes that the repetition of "peter chamor" or the rules of klal u'prat serve to exclude other non-kosher animals from the mitzvah of redemption. We then analyze several cases of unusual births, bringing a Baraisa to resolve whether a cow giving birth to a donkey-like species, or a donkey giving birth to a horse-like species, is obligated in the firstborn laws. The Gemara establishes that if the offspring has some characteristics of the mother, it is obligated, but we must carefully distinguish between cases where both species are subject to firstborn sanctity and cases where one is completely exempt.

לְמַעֲשֶׂה WHAT TO TAKE HOME

The Gemara on our daf brings down the famous story of Shimon HaAmsoni, who spent his entire life expounding every single "es" in the Torah to teach us something new. But when he reached the pasuk, "Es Hashem Elokecha tira", You shall fear Hashem, he stopped. He realized that nothing can be compared or added to the fear of Hashem Himself. When his talmidim asked him, "Rebbi, what will be with all the drashos you worked so hard on?" he answered them with incredible greatness: "Just as I received reward for the expounding, so I receive reward for the withdrawing."

Think about the sheer gadlus of this. Shimon HaAmsoni was ready to set aside his entire life's work, his reputation, and his intellectual pride, the moment he realized it did not align with the absolute truth of ratzon Hashem. In our own avodah, we often get so invested in our projects, our personal ways of doing things, or our desire to always be right and have the last word. We feel that if we back down, we lose everything.

Shimon HaAmsoni teaches us a major yesod in yiras Shamayim: sometimes, the greatest ratzon Hashem is specifically in the backing down. When you stop, when you withdraw from a machlokes, or when you admit you were wrong even though it hurts your pride, you are not losing. Mimeila, you are earning the exact same reward from Hashem for stopping as you did for pushing forward.

Today, when you find yourself in a situation where your ego wants you to push forward, to argue, or to insist on your way, stop and think of Shimon HaAmsoni. Take a deep breath, step back, and say to yourself: "I am choosing to receive reward for withdrawing."