

דף יומי • חזקוני • דף פ'

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

THE SUGYA

We begin this daf by continuing our deep dive into the halachos of crossbreeding, specifically focusing on the offspring of a deer and a goat. The Gemara analyzes the machlokes between Rabbi Eliezer and the Rabbis regarding the word "seh" (sheep) and whether a partial sheep is included in this definition. This has major practical ramifications for the mitzvos of covering the blood (kisuy hadam), the priestly gifts (matnos kehunah), and the prohibition of slaughtering an animal and its offspring on the same day (oto v'es bno).

We then move into a fascinating discussion regarding the "koy"—a creature of doubtful status. The Sages analyze whether it is a domesticated animal (behemah) or a wild beast (chayah), bringing down various Tannaitic opinions, including whether it is a distinct creation or a hybrid. We also learn about the status of forest goats, exploring whether they are fit for the Altar and whether their chelev (fat) is permitted, which hinges on how we classify them among the kosher animals listed in the Torah.

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

עמוד א' DAF 80A

EXPLANATION

בְּשֵׁה וְאֶפִּילוֹ מִקְצֵת שֶׁה,

They disagree **regarding** the term "**sheep**" to determine if it means **and even a partial sheep** is included in the law.

EXPLANATION

רַבֵּנוּ סָבְרִי: "שֶׁה" – וְאֶפִּילוֹ מִקְצֵת שֶׁה,

The Rabbis hold that the word "**sheep**" indicates **and even a partial sheep** is considered a domesticated animal,

EXPLANATION

וְרַבִּי אֶלְיעֶזֶר סָבַר: "שֶׁה" – וְלֹא מִקְצֵת שֶׁה.

and Rabbi Eliezer holds that the word "**sheep**" indicates that it must be entirely a sheep, **and not a partial sheep**.

STATEMENT

אָמַר רַב פָּפָא: הִלְכָּהּ, לְעִנְיַן פְּסוּי הַדָּם וּמִתְנֻנּוֹת, לֹא מִשְׁכַּחַת אֶלָּא בְּצִבְי הַכֹּהֵן עַל הַתִּיּוֹשָׁה.

Rav Pappa said: Therefore, regarding the matter of covering the blood and the priestly gifts, you do not find a case where they disagree **except** in the case of a deer that mates with a female goat.

EXPLANATION

דִּבְיוֹ לְרַבְּנָנוּ, וּבֵין לְרַבִּי אֶלְיעֶזֶר, מִסְפָּקָא לְהוּ אִי חוֹשְׁשִׁין לְזִרְעַתָּהּ אוֹ לֹא.

For both according to the Rabbis and according to Rabbi Eliezer, they are in doubt whether we concern ourselves with the seed of the father or not.

EXPLANATION

וְקָא מִיפְלָגִי בִּ"שָׁה וְאַפִּילוּ מְקַצֵּת שָׁה."

And they disagree regarding whether the word "sheep" means and even a partial sheep.

STATEMENT

לְעֵנִין אוֹתוֹ וְאֵת בְּנוֹ, מִשְׁפַּחַתָּהּ לֵה בֵּין בְּתִישׁ הַבָּא עַל הַצִּבְיָה, וּבֵין בְּצִבֵּי הַבָּא עַל הַתִּישָׁה.

Regarding the matter of "it and its offspring" on the same day, you find it as a case of dispute either in the case of a male goat that mates with a doe, or in the case of a deer that mates with a female goat.

EXPLANATION

בְּתִישׁ הַבָּא עַל הַצִּבְיָה, וְלֹאִיסוּרָא דְרַבְנָן סְבָרִי: דִּילְמָא חוֹשְׁשִׁין לְזֶרַע הָאָב, "שָׁה וְאַפִּילוּ מְקַצֵּת שָׁה" אָמְרִינָן, וְאַסוּר.

In the case of a male goat that mates with a doe, and regarding the prohibition without lashes, the Rabbis hold: Perhaps we concern ourselves with the seed of the father, and we say "sheep and even a partial sheep," and therefore it is prohibited ab initio.

EXPLANATION

וּרְבִי אֱלִיעֶזֶר סְבָר: נִהִי נָמִי דְחוֹשְׁשִׁין לְזֶרַע הָאָב, "שָׁה וְאַפִּילוּ מְקַצֵּת שָׁה" לָא אָמְרִינָן.

And Rabbi Eliezer holds: Even though indeed we concern ourselves with the seed of the father, we do not say "sheep and even a partial sheep."

EXPLANATION

בְּצִבֵּי הַבָּא עַל הַתִּישָׁה, וּלְמַלְקוֹת.

And in the case of a deer that mates with a female goat, and regarding the liability for lashes:

EXPLANATION

רַבְנָן סְבָרִי: נִהִי נָמִי דְחוֹשְׁשִׁין לְזֶרַע הָאָב, "שָׁה וְאַפִּילוּ מְקַצֵּת שָׁה" אָמְרִינָן, וּמַלְקִינָן לִיה.

The Rabbis hold: Even though indeed we concern ourselves with the seed of the father, we say "sheep and even a partial sheep," and we flog him.

EXPLANATION

וּרְבִי אֱלִיעֶזֶר סְבָר: אִיסוּרָא אִיכָא, מְלָקוֹת לֵיכָא.

And Rabbi Eliezer holds: There is a prohibition, but there are no lashes.

EXPLANATION

אִיסוּרָא אִיכָא, דְלִמָּא אֵין חוֹשְׁשִׁין לְזֶרַע הָאָב, וְהָאִי שָׁה מְעַלְיָא הוּא.

There is a prohibition, because perhaps we do not concern ourselves with the seed of the father, and this offspring is a proper sheep like its mother.

EXPLANATION

מלקות ליכא, דלמא חוששין לזרע האב. ו"שה ואפילו מקצת שה" לא אמרינן.

But there are no lashes, because perhaps we concern ourselves with the seed of the father, and we do not say "sheep and even a partial sheep."

STATEMENT

אמר רב יהודה: כוי – בריה בפני עצמה היא, ולא הכריעו בה חכמים אם מין בהמה היא אם מין חיה היא.

Rav Yehuda said: A koy is a distinct creation, and the Sages did not decide regarding it whether it is a species of domesticated animal or whether it is a species of wild animal.

STATEMENT

רב נחמן אמר: כוי – זה איל הבר.

Rav Nachman said: A koy, this is the wild ram.

PROOF

כתנאי: כוי – זה איל הבר, ויש אומרים: זה הפא מן התיש ומן הצבירה.

The Gemara notes: This is like a dispute between Tanna'im in a braisa: A koy, this is the wild ram; and some say: This is that which comes from the mating of a male goat and a doe.

PROOF

רבי יוסי אומר: כוי בריה בפני עצמה היא, ולא הכריעו בה חכמים אם מין חיה אם מין בהמה.

Rabbi Yosei says: A koy is a distinct creation, and the Sages did not decide regarding it whether it is a species of wild animal or whether it is a species of domesticated animal.

PROOF

רבן שמעון בן גמליאל אומר: מין בהמה היא, ושל בית דושאי היו מגדליו מהן עדרים עדרים.

Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says: It is a species of domesticated animal, and those of the house of Dushai would raise herds upon herds of them.

STATEMENT

אמר רבי זירא אמר רב ספרא אמר רב המנונא: הגי עזי דבאלא פשרות לגבי מזבח.

Rabbi Zeira said that Rav Safra said that Rav Hamnuna said: These forest goats are fit for the Altar as sacrifices,

EXPLANATION

סבר לה פי הא דאמר רבי יצחק: עשר בהמות מנה הכתוב, ותו לא.

for he holds in accordance with this which Rabbi Yitzchak said: The verse enumerated ten kosher animals, and no more.

EXPLANATION

והגי מדלא קחשיב להו בהדי חיות – שמע מינה דעז גינהו.

And these, since the verse did not count them among the wild animals, learn from this that they are a species of goat.

OBJECTION

מתקין לה רב אחא בר יעקב: ואימא "אייל וצבי" – פרט, "כל בהמה" – כלל.

Rav Acha bar Yaakov challenged this: But say that the verse is interpreted as a generalization and a specification: "Deer and gazelle" is a specification, "any animal" is a generalization.

OBJECTION

פרט וכלל – נעשה כלל מוסף על הפרט, איכא טובא.

When we have a specification and a generalization, the generalization becomes an addition to the specification, and thus there are many other wild animals that are kosher.

RESOLUTION

אם כן, כל הני פרטי למה לי?

The Gemara answers: If so, why do I need all these specifications of the seven wild animals?

OBJECTION

מתקין לה רב אחא בריה דרב איקא: ודלמא מינא דאקו נינהו!

Rav Acha the son of Rav Ika challenged this: But perhaps they are a species of wild goat which is listed in the verse!

QUESTION

אמר ליה רב אחא בריה דרבא לרב אשי, ואמרי לה רב אחא בריה דרב אויא לרב אשי: דלמא מינא דתאו או מינא דזמר נינהו?

Rav Acha the son of Rava said to Rav Ashi, and some say it was Rav Acha the son of Rav Avya to Rav Ashi: Perhaps they are a species of wild ox or a species of mountain sheep?

STATEMENT

אמר ליה רב חנן לרב אשי: אמיתר שרי תרבייהו.

Rav Chanan said to Rav Ashi: Ameimar permitted their fat, proving he held they are a species of domesticated goat.

QUESTION

בעא מיניה אבא בריה דרב מנימין פר חייא מרב הונא פר חייא: הני עזי דבאלא מהו לגבי מזבח?

Abba the son of Rav Minyamin bar Chiyya asked of Rav Huna bar Chiyya: These forest goats, what is the law regarding bringing them to the Altar?

ANSWER

אמר ליה: עד כאן לא פליגי רבי יוסי ורבנן אלא בשור הבר.

He said to him: Rabbi Yosei and the Rabbis do not disagree except regarding the wild ox.

PROOF

דתנן: שור הבר מין בהמה הוא, רבי יוסי אומר: מין חיה.

As we learned in a Mishnah: The wild ox is a species of domesticated animal; Rabbi Yosei says: It is a species of wild animal.

EXPLANATION

דְּרַבְנָן סְבָרִי: מִדְּמִתְּרָגְמִינָן "תֹּרֵפֶלָא", מֵינָא דְּבֵהֶמָּה הוּא, וְרַבִּי יוֹסֵי סָבַר: מִדְּקָא חָשִׁיב לִיָּה בְּהֵדִי חַיִּוֹת, מֵינָא דְּחַיָּה הוּא.

For the Rabbis hold: Since we translate it as "wild ox," it is a species of domesticated animal; and Rabbi Yosei holds: Since the verse counts it among the wild animals, it is a species of wild animal.

ANSWER

אָבֵל הָנִי, דְּבָרֵי הַכֹּל מֵינָא דְּעֹז נִינְהוּ.

But these forest goats, all agree that they are a species of goat.

OBJECTION

מִתְקִיף לָהּ רַב אַחָא בְּרִיה דְּרַב אִיקָא: וְדִלְמָא מֵינָא דְּאָקוּ נִינְהוּ!

Rav Acha the son of Rav Ika challenged this: But perhaps they are a species of wild goat!

QUESTION

אָמַר לִיָּה רַבִּינָא לְרַב אָשִׁי: וְדִלְמָא מֵינָא דְּתָאוּ, אוּ מֵינָא דְּזֻמְרָא נִינְהוּ!

Ravina said to Rav Ashi: But perhaps they are a species of wild ox, or a species of mountain sheep!

STATEMENT

אָמַר לִיָּה רַב נַחֲמָן לְרַב אָשִׁי: אַמֵּימָר שְׂרִי תִרְפִּיָּיהוּ.

Rav Nachman said to Rav Ashi: Ameimar permitted their fat.

מִשְׁנָה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

כִּיצַד הַשּׁוֹחֵט וְכוּ'.

We learned in the Mishnah: **How** is the case of **one who slaughters** "it and its offspring" on the same day, etc.

גְּמָרָא GEMARA

STATEMENT

אָמַר רַבִּי אוֹשְׁעָא: כּוֹלָה מִתְּנִיתִין דְּלָא כְּרַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן,

Rabbi Oshaya said: Our entire Mishnah is not in accordance with Rabbi Shimon.

EXPLANATION

ממאי? מדקא תני: קדשים בחוץ הראשון חייב כרת, ושניהם פסולים, ושניהם סופגים את הארבעים.

From where do we derive this? From that which it teaches: If one slaughtered consecrated animals outside the Temple, the first slaughterer is liable to kares, and both animals are invalid, and both slaughterers receive forty lashes.

EXPLANATION

מכדי שמעינו ליה לרבי שמעון דאמר: שחיטה שאינה ראויה – לא שמה שחיטה,

Now, we have heard Rabbi Shimon who says: A slaughter that is not fit to permit the animal for eating is not called a slaughter to create a prohibition,

עמוד ב' DAF 80B

EXPLANATION

קמא מיקטל קטליה,

Regarding the first animal, since it was slaughtered outside the Temple courtyard, he has merely killed it like a carcass, and it is not considered a valid slaughtering.

EXPLANATION

שני מתקבל בפנים הוא,

Therefore, the second animal is one that is fit to be accepted inside the Temple courtyard, as the prohibition of "it and its offspring" does not apply to an invalid slaughtering.

QUESTION

כרת נמי ליחייב.

If so, when he slaughters the second one outside, let him also be liable to receive kareit for slaughtering a sacrificial animal outside the Temple!

STATEMENT

חולין בפנים – שניהם פסולין, והשני סופג את הארבעים.

Similarly, if both animals were non-sacred animals slaughtered inside the Temple courtyard, the Mishnah states that both of them are unfit, and the second one receives forty lashes for violating "it and its offspring."

EXPLANATION

מכדי שמעינו ליה לרבי שמעון דאמר: שחיטה שאינה ראויה – לא שמה שחיטה,

Now, we have heard Rabbi Shimon who says: An unfit slaughtering is not called a slaughtering.

EXPLANATION

קמא מיקטל קטליה,

Since non-sacred animals slaughtered in the Temple courtyard are forbidden, the first slaughtering is unfit, so he has merely killed it.

QUESTION

שני אמאי סופג את הארבעים?

If so, for **the second** animal, **why does he receive forty** lashes?

STATEMENT

קדשים בפנים – הראשון כשר ופטור, והשני סופג את הארבעים, ופסול.

Furthermore, if they were **sacrificial** animals slaughtered **inside** the Temple courtyard, **the first is fit** and he is **exempt** from lashes, **but the second receives forty** lashes and is **unfit**.

EXPLANATION

מכדי שמעינו ליה לרבי שמעון דאמר: שחיטה שאינה ראויה לא שמה שחיטה,

Now, we have heard Rabbi Shimon who says: An unfit slaughtering is not called a slaughtering.

EXPLANATION

שחיטת קדשים נמי שחיטה שאינה ראויה היא, דכמה דלא זריק דם – לא מישתרי בשור.

The slaughtering of sacrificial animals is also an unfit slaughtering, because as long as he has not sprinkled the blood, the meat is not permitted to be eaten.

QUESTION

שני אמאי סופג את הארבעים, ופסול?

If so, for **the second** animal, **why does he receive forty** lashes, **and** why is it **unfit**?

INFERENCE

אלא שמע מינה דלא כרבי שמעון.

Rather, learn from this that our Mishnah is **not in accordance with Rabbi Shimon**.

QUESTION

פשיטא דהכי איתה?

The Gemara asks: **Is it not obvious that this is so?** Why did Rabbi Oshaya need to state this?

ANSWER

שחיטת קדשים איצטריכא ליה,

The Gemara answers: The case of **the slaughtering of sacrificial animals** was **necessary for him** to state,

EXPLANATION

סלקא דעתך אמינא: שחיטת קדשים שחיטה ראויה היא,

lest it enter your mind to say: The slaughtering of sacrificial animals is a fit slaughtering even according to Rabbi Shimon,

EXPLANATION

דָּהָא אִי נָחַר וְזָרִיק דָּם – לֹא מִיִּשְׁתְּרִי בְּשָׂר, וְכִי שָׁחַט – מִיִּשְׁתְּרִי בְּשָׂר, וְשִׁחֲטָהּ רְאוּיָהּ הִיא;

for if he stabbed the animal and sprinkled the blood, the meat is not permitted, but when he slaughtered it, the meat is permitted through the sprinkling, and thus it is a fit slaughtering;

EXPLANATION

קא משמע לו.

therefore, Rabbi Oshaya **teaches us** that even this is considered an unfit slaughtering according to Rabbi Shimon, and the Mishnah is indeed not like him.

QUESTION

וְלִילְקִי נָמִי מְשׁוּם לָאו דְּמַחוּסָּר זְמַן,

The Gemara asks: In the case of sacrificial animals inside, **let him also be flogged because of the prohibition of** an animal **whose time has not yet arrived** to be sacrificed, since the second animal cannot be offered until the next day?

PROOF

דְּתַנָּא: מַנֵּיז לְכָל הַפְּסוּלִין שְׂבֻשׁוֹר וְשְׂבֻשָּׁה שְׂהוּא בִּ"לֹא יִרְצָה"?

As it is taught in a Braisa: From where is it derived regarding all the disqualifications of the bull and of the lamb, that offering them is a violation of "it shall not be accepted"?

PROOF

תְּלָמוּד לומר: "שֹׂשׂוֹר וְשָׂה שְׂרוּעַ וְקָלוּט וְגו'", לִימַד עַל הַפְּסוּלִין שְׂבֻשׁוֹר וְשְׂבֻשָּׁה, שְׂהוּא בִּ"לֹא יִרְצָה"!

The verse states: "Either a bull or a lamb that has a limb too long or too short..." and concludes "but for a vow it shall not be accepted." This **taught regarding all the disqualifications of the bull and of the lamb**, including an animal whose time has not yet arrived, **that it is prohibited under "it shall not be accepted"**!

ANSWER

כִּי קָא חָשִׁיב לְאִי דִ"אוֹתוֹ וְאֶת בְּנוֹ" – לְאִי נּוֹכְרָאִי לֹא קָא חָשִׁיב.

The Gemara answers: **When** the Mishnah **reckons prohibitions of "it and its offspring,"** it does not reckon unrelated prohibitions.

QUESTION

וְלֹא? וְהָא קְדָשִׁים בַּחוּץ, דְּלְאִי נּוֹכְרָאִי נִינְהוּ, וְקָא חָשִׁיב,

The Gemara asks: **And does it not? But** what about the case of sacrificial animals outside, which are unrelated prohibitions, and yet the Mishnah **reckons them**?

EXPLANATION

דְּקִתְנִי: קְדָשִׁים בַּחוּץ – הָרָאוּשׁוֹן חַיִּיב כָּרֶת, וְשְׁנֵיהֶם סוֹפְגִין אֶת הָאַרְבָּעִים.

As it teaches: If they were sacrificial animals outside, the first is liable to karet, and both of them receive forty lashes.

EXPLANATION

בְּשֵׁלֶמָה שֵׁנִי, מְשֻׁם לֹא דִּ"אֹתוֹ וְאֶת בְּנוֹ",

Granted, the second animal is flogged because of the prohibition of "it and its offspring,"

QUESTION

אֲלֵא רִאשׁוֹן אֲמַאי סוֹפֵג? לֹא מְשֻׁם לֹא דְשְׁחוּטֵי חוּץ?

but the first, why does he receive lashes? Is it not because of the unrelated prohibition of slaughtering outside the Temple?

ANSWER

כֹּל הֵיכָא דְלִיכָא לֹא דִּ"אֹתוֹ וְאֶת בְּנוֹ" – חָשִׁיב לְאִי נִוְכָרָאִי,

The Gemara answers: **Wherever there is no prohibition of "it and its offspring"** violated by that slaughtering, such as the first animal, the Mishnah **reckons unrelated prohibitions**;

EXPLANATION

וְכֹל הֵיכָא דְאִיכָא לֹא דִּ"אֹתוֹ וְאֶת בְּנוֹ" – לֹא חָשִׁיב לְאִי נִוְכָרָאִי.

but wherever there is a prohibition of "it and its offspring" violated, it does not reckon unrelated prohibitions.

STATEMENT

רַבִּי זֵירָא אָמַר: הֵנָּח לְמַחוּסָר זְמַן, דְּהַכְתּוּב

Rabbi Zeira said: Leave aside the prohibition of an animal whose time has not yet arrived, as the verse

SUMMARY

On this daf, the Gemara clarifies the exact parameters of the dispute between Rabbi Eliezer and the Rabbis regarding hybrid offspring, showing how their doubts about paternal seed and the definition of "seh" affect the lashes for oto v'es bno. We then explore the identity of the koy, with Rav Nachman identifying it as a wild ram, while others view it as a hybrid or a unique creation. Finally, the Gemara discusses forest goats, concluding that they are a species of goat whose fat is permitted, before transitioning into a new Mishnah regarding the laws of oto v'es bno and analyzing it according to the view of Rabbi Shimon regarding a slaughter that is not fit (shechitah she'eina re'uyah).

In today's daf, we find the Sages deeply engaged in defining the status of the koy, a creature of doubtful identity. Is it a domesticated animal (behemah) or a wild beast (chayah)? Rabbi Yosei teaches us a profound perspective: "A koy is a distinct creation, and the Sages did not decide regarding it." Rather than forcing this unique creature into a rigid, pre-existing category, the Torah recognizes its status as a "briyah bifnei atzmah", a distinct creation with its own unique reality.

How often do we look at our fellow Yidden, or even at ourselves, and try to force them into neat, pre-packaged boxes? We want to label people immediately: are they this type of Jew or that type? When someone does not fit our standard definitions, we might feel uncomfortable or dismissive. But Hashem created a vast world with many different kinds of souls. Some people are a "briyah bifnei atzmah", they have a unique path in their avodah, a different temperament, or a specific set of challenges that do not fit the standard mold.

Instead of trying to force every person, or every child of ours, into a rigid category, we must learn the lesson of the koy. We must respect the distinct nature of each neshama. Hashem made them exactly as they are, with their own specific purpose in this world. Our job is not to categorize them, but to help them shine in their own unique way.

Today, when you meet someone who doesn't seem to fit into your usual categories of people, catch yourself before you judge or label them. Instead, smile and remind yourself that every single Yid is a unique creation of Hashem, with their own special path in serving Him.