

דף יומי • פכורות • דף ז'

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

THE SUGYA

We are continuing our sugya on the daf regarding the shittah of Rabbi Shimon about a kosher animal that gives birth to a non-kosher looking offspring, like a camel born from a cow. The Gemara is trying to figure out the exact parameters of Rabbi Shimon's shittah: does he require the offspring's head and the majority of its body to actually resemble the kosher mother to be muttar for eating, or is a partial resemblance enough to permit it?

We will also delve into a fascinating discussion about whether different species can crossbreed and become pregnant from one another. The Gemara brings down a memra from Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi about the biological impossibility of certain crossbreedings, which leads us to a deep analysis of the halachic concept of "zeh v'zeh gorem" — when both a permitted and a forbidden factor combine to produce a result.

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

עמוד א' DAF 7A

QUESTION

אִישְׁתַּנִּי מִגִּמְלָה שְׁפִיר דְּמִי, אוּ דְלָמָּא לֹא שְׁנָא?

Since **it has changed from** looking like an ordinary **camel**, is it **fine** and permitted to eat, **or perhaps there is no difference**, and Rabbi Shimon still forbids it?

PROOF

תָּא שְׁמַע: בְּהֵמָה טְהוֹרָה שֶׁיָּלְדָה מִיֵּן בְּהֵמָה טְמֵאָה — אָסוּר בִּאֲכִילָהּ, וְאִם דּוּמָה רִאשׁוֹ וְרוּבּוֹ לֹאמוּ — חֵיִיב בְּכוֹרָה.

Come and hear a proof from a braisa: If a **kosher animal** gave birth to a type of **non-kosher animal**, the offspring is **forbidden for consumption** in accordance with Rabbi Shimon; **but if its head and the majority of its body resemble its mother, it is obligated in the laws of the firstborn**.

INFERENCE

שְׁמַע מִינֶה: לֹאֲכִילָהּ נִמְי בְּעֵי רַבִּי שְׁמַעוֹן רִאשׁוֹ וְרוּבּוֹ!

Learn from it that **for consumption** as well, Rabbi Shimon requires that **its head and the majority of its body resemble the mother**, and a partial resemblance is not enough!

REFUTATION

לֹא, לְכַוְנָה דְּוָקָא.

The Gemara rejects this proof: **No**, this requirement is **specifically for the laws of the firstborn**.

INFERENCE

דִּיקָא נְמִי, דְּקָא שְׂבָקָה לְאַכִּילָה וְקָם לִיה אֶבְכוּר.

The language of the braisa **is also precise**, as the tanna **leaves** the halacha of **consumption and stands on** the halacha of the **firstborn** when stating this condition.

INFERENCE

שָׁמַע מִינֶה: לְבְכוּרָה הוּא דְּבָעֵי רַבִּי שִׁמְעוֹן רֵאשׁוֹ וְרוּבוֹ, אֲבָל לְאַכִּילָה — לֹא.

Indeed, **learn from it** that **it is for** the firstborn that Rabbi Shimon requires its head and the majority of its body to resemble the mother, **but for consumption, no**, he does not require this, and even a partial resemblance suffices.

REFUTATION

לְעוֹלָם אֵימָא לָהּ: לְאַכִּילָה נְמִי בְּעֵי, וּבְכוּרָה אֵי צִטְרִיהּ.

The Gemara rejects this: **Actually, I will say to you** that **for consumption as well he requires** its head and the majority of its body to resemble the mother, **and yet it was necessary** to state this condition specifically regarding the **firstborn**.

EXPLANATION

סָלְקָא דְּעֵתָהּ אֲמִינָא: הוּאִיל וּכְתִיב "אֶךָ בְּכוֹר שׁוֹר", עַד שְׁיָהָא הוּא שׁוֹר וּבְכוּרוֹ שׁוֹר, וְלֹא תִסְגִּי לִיה בְּרֵאשׁוֹ וְרוּבוֹ עַד דְּאֵיכָא כּוּלָּיהּ, קִמְשַׁמַּע לָן.

Because **it might enter your mind** to say: Since it is written, "But the firstborn of an ox," this implies that firstborn status does not apply **unless he is an ox and his firstborn is fully an ox**, and it would not suffice for him with its head and the majority of its body until there is its whole body resembling an ox. Therefore, the tanna **teaches us** that a resemblance of the head and majority of the body does suffice.

PROOF

תָּא שָׁמַע: "אֶךָ אֵת זֶה לֹא תֹאכְלוּ מִמֶּעַלֵי הַגֵּרָה וּמִמִּפְרִי־סִי הַפָּרָסָה", זֶה — אֵי אֶתָּה אוֹכֵל, אֲבָל אֶתָּה אוֹכֵל הֶבֶא בְּסִימָן אֶחָד.

Come and hear another proof from a braisa: The Torah states, "Nevertheless these you shall not eat of them that chew the cud, or of them that divide the hoof." This indicates: **This animal you may not eat**, but you may eat that which comes with **one characteristic** of its mother.

EXPLANATION

וְאִי זֶה זֶה הֶבֶא בְּסִימָן אֶחָד? זֶה טִמְאָה הַנוֹלָד מִן הַטֹּהוֹר, וְעֶבְרוֹ מִן הַטֹּהוֹר.

And which is this that comes with one characteristic? This is a non-kosher looking animal that is born from a kosher mother, and its conception was from a kosher father.

STATEMENT

יְכוּל אֲפִילוּ עֶבְרוֹ מִן הַטִּמְאָה? תִּלְמוּד לומר: "שֶׁה כְּשָׂבִים וְשֶׁה עֲזִים", עַד שְׁיָהָא אָבִיו כֶּכֶּשׁ וְאִמּוֹ כֶּכֶּשֶׁה, דְּבָרֵי רַבִּי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ.

One might have thought that this is permitted even if its conception was from a non-kosher father. Therefore, the verse teaches: "A lamb of sheep, and a lamb of goats," which implies that it is not kosher unless its father is a sheep and its mother is a sheep. This is the statement of Rabbi Yehoshua.

STATEMENT

רבי אליעזר אומר: לא בא הכתוב להתיר את המותר, אלא להוסיף על המותר, ואיזה זה? טמא הנולד מן הטהור ועבורו מן הטמא.

Rabbi Eliezer says: The verse did not come to permit that which is already permitted, but rather to add to that which is permitted. And which is this? A non-kosher looking animal that is born from a kosher mother and its conception was from a non-kosher father.

EXPLANATION

או אינו אלא עבורו מן הטהור? תלמוד לומר: "שור שה כשבים ושה עזים" מכל מקום.

Or perhaps it is only permitted where its conception was from a kosher father? The verse teaches: "An ox, a lamb of sheep, and a lamb of goats," which by repeating the word "seh" indicates that it is permitted in any case, even if only the mother was kosher.

INFERENCE

קרי ליה "טמא", כרבי שמעון, וקאמר: אבל אתה אוכל הפא בסימן אחד!

In any event, the tanna calls it "non-kosher" in accordance with Rabbi Shimon, who deems a camel born to a cow forbidden, and yet he says: But you may eat that which comes with one characteristic of its mother! This shows that Rabbi Shimon does not require the head and majority of the body to resemble the mother.

ANSWER

האי תנא סבר ליה כוותיה בחדא, ופליג עליה בחדא.

The Gemara answers: This tanna holds like him in one matter, that a camel born to a cow is forbidden, but disagrees with him in one other matter, as this tanna permits it if it has even one characteristic of the mother, whereas Rabbi Shimon requires the head and majority of the body.

OBJECTION

ואיכא דמקשי ומתיב: עבורו מן הטמא — מי מעבדא?

And there are those who ask and raise an objection on this braisa: Where its conception was from a non-kosher animal, can a kosher animal become pregnant from a non-kosher one?

OBJECTION

והאמר רבי יהושע בן לוי: לעולם אין מתעברת לא טמאה מן הטהור, ולא טהורה מן הטמא, ולא גסה מן הדקה, ולא דקה מן הגסה, ולא בהמה מן חיה, ולא חיה מן בהמה.

But didn't Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi say: Actually, there is never a pregnancy, not of a non-kosher animal from a kosher one, nor of a kosher animal from a non-kosher one, nor of a large animal from a small one, nor of a small animal from a large one, nor of a domesticated animal from a wild animal, nor of a wild animal from a domesticated animal?

EXPLANATION

חז"ן מרבי אליעזר ומח' לוקתו, שהיו אומרים חיה מתעברת מבמה!

This is true except for Rabbi Eliezer and his disputants, who would say that a wild animal can become pregnant from a domesticated animal, but all agree that a kosher animal cannot become pregnant from a non-kosher one!

RESOLUTION

ואמר רבי ירמיה: דאיעבר מקלוט בן פרה, ואליכא דרבי שמעון קאמר, וקאמר: אבל אתה אוכל
הבא בסימן אחד!

And Rabbi Yirmeya said in resolution: The braisa is a case where she became pregnant from a closed-hoofed animal that is the offspring of a cow, which is possible. And the tanna stated this in accordance with Rabbi Shimon, and he says: But you may eat that which comes with one characteristic of the mother!

ANSWER

האי תנא סבר לה כוותיה בחדא, ופלגי עליה בחדא.

The Gemara repeats: This tanna holds like him in one matter, but disagrees with him in one other matter.

QUESTION

למימרא, דרבי אליעזר סבר: זה וזה גורם — מותר, ורבי יהושע סבר: זה וזה גורם — אסור?

The Gemara asks: Is this to say that Rabbi Eliezer holds that where this and that cause the offspring, it is permitted, and Rabbi Yehoshua holds that where this and that cause it, it is forbidden?

OBJECTION

והא איפכא שמעינן להו: ולד טריפה, רבי אליעזר אומר: לא יקרב לגבי מזבח, ורבי יהושע אומר:
יקרב לגבי מזבח!

But didn't we hear them say the opposite regarding the offspring of a treifah animal that mated with a kosher animal?
Rabbi Eliezer says: It may not be offered upon the Altar because the treifah mother is a causing factor, and Rabbi
Yehoshua says: It may be offered upon the Altar because this and that caused it!

RESOLUTION

בעלמא סבר רבי אליעזר: זה וזה גורם — אסור, ושאיני הכא, דאם פן נכתוב קרא: "שה כשבים
ועזים", "שה" "ושה" למה לי? שמע מינה: שה — מכל מקום.

The Gemara resolves this: In general, Rabbi Eliezer holds that where this and that cause it, it is forbidden, but here it is different. For if so, that it is forbidden, let the verse write: "A lamb of sheep and goats." Why do I need the repetition of "lamb" and "lamb"? Learn from it that a lamb is permitted in any case.

RESOLUTION

ורבי יהושע אומר לה: בעלמא זה וזה גורם — מותר, והכא אם פן לכתוב קרא: "שור כשב ועז",
"כשבים ועזים" למה לי? שמע מינה עד שיהא אביו כבש ואמו כבשה.

And Rabbi Yehoshua could say to you: In general, where this and that cause it, it is permitted, but here, if so, let the verse write: "An ox, a sheep, and a goat." Why do I need "sheep and goats" in the plural? Learn from it that it is not kosher unless its father is a sheep and its mother is a sheep.

PROOF

תא שמע: רבי שמעון אומר, "גמל" "גמל" שני פעמים — אחד גמל הנולד מן הגמל, ואחד גמל הנולד מן הפרה, ואם ראשו ורובו דומה לאמו — מותר באכילה.

Come and hear a proof from a braisa: Rabbi Shimon says: "Camel," "camel," is written two times in the Torah, to forbid both a camel born from a camel, and a camel born from a cow; but if its head and the majority of its body resemble its mother, it is permitted for consumption.

INFERENCE

שמע מינה, לאכילה נמי כפי רבי שמעון ראשו ורובו, שמע מינה.

Learn from it that for consumption as well, Rabbi Shimon requires that its head and the majority of its body resemble the mother. The Gemara concludes: **Learn from it** that this is indeed so.

משנה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

שהיוצא מן הטמא וכו'.

We learned in the Mishnah: **That which comes out from the non-kosher** is non-kosher, etc.

גמרא GEMARA

QUESTION

בעו מינה מרב ששת: מי רגלים של חמור, מהו?

They asked of Rav Sheshes: **The urine of a donkey**, what is its status? Is it permitted or forbidden to drink?

QUESTION

ותיבעי ליה דסוסים וגמלים?

The Gemara asks: **And let him ask about** the urine of horses and camels as well?

ANSWER

דסוסים וגמלים לא מיבעיא להו, דלא עכירי ולא דמו לחלב, מצי עול מצי נפוק.

The Gemara answers: Regarding the urine of horses and camels, they had no question, because they are not turbid and do not resemble milk; they are clearly just water that went in and water that came out.

EXPLANATION

כי קמיבעיא להו דחמור, דעכירי ודמו לחלב, מאי?

When they had a question, it was regarding the urine of a donkey, which is turbid and resembles milk. What is the halacha?

QUESTION

מגופיה קא מימצצי ואסירי, או דלמא מיא עול מיא נפוק, והאי דעכירי — הבלא דבישרא הוא?

Is it secreted from its body and therefore forbidden, or perhaps water went in and water came out, and this that it is turbid is merely due to the heat of the flesh?

ANSWER

אמר להו רב ששת, תניתוה: שהיוצא מן הטמא — טמא, והיוצא מן הטהור — טהור.

Rav Sheshes said to them: You learned it in our Mishnah: That which comes out from the non-kosher is non-kosher, and that which comes out from the kosher is kosher.

INFERENCE

”מטמא” לא קאמר, אלא ”מן

The Mishnah does not say “from a non-kosher animal,” but rather “from the...

עמוד ב' DAF 7B

EXPLANATION

הטמא”, והני נמי מינא דטמא הוא.

The verse says **the non-kosher** animal, which includes anything that comes from it, **and these** fluids of a donkey are also a type of **non-kosher** substance, and are therefore forbidden.

STATEMENT

ואיכא דאמרי, דסוסיים וגמלים לא קא מיפעיא להו, דלא שתו אינשי.

And there are those who say a different version of this discussion: With regard to the urine of horses and camels, they did not raise the dilemma, because people do not drink it, so there is no reason to permit it.

QUESTION

כי קמיפעיא להו דחמור, דשתו אינשי ומעלו לירקונא, מאי?

When they raised the dilemma, it was with regard to the urine of a donkey, which people drink as a refuah, and since it is beneficial for curing jaundice, what is the halacha? Is it permitted because it is just a waste product, or is it forbidden?

ANSWER

אמר להו רב ששת, תניתוה: היוצא מן הטמא טמא, והיוצא מן הטהור טהור — והני נמי מטמא קאתי.

Rav Sheshet said to them: You learned the answer to your dilemma in our Mishnah: That which emerges from the non-kosher animal is non-kosher, and that which emerges from the kosher animal is kosher; and these fluids also come from a non-kosher animal, the donkey, so they are forbidden.

OBJECTION

מִיתִיבִי: מִפְּנֵי מָה אָמְרוּ דְּבַשׁ דְּבוֹרִים מוֹתֵר? מִפְּנֵי שְׂמִכְנִיסוֹת אוֹתוֹ לְגוֹפָן, וְאֵין מִמְצוֹת אוֹתוֹ מְגוֹפָן.

The Gemara raises an objection from a Braisa: For what reason did the Sages say that the honey of bees is permitted? It is because they bring it into their body, but they do not excrete it from their body as a bodily secretion. So too, donkey urine is not a bodily secretion, so why is it forbidden?

RESOLUTION

הוא דאמר רבבי יעקב, דאמר: דובשא רחמנא שרייה.

The Gemara answers: Rav Sheshet stated his ruling in accordance with Rabbi Yaakov, who says that the Merciful One permitted honey as a special exception, but other secretions from non-kosher animals remain forbidden.

PROOF

דתנא, רבי יעקב אומר: "אף את זה תאכלו מכל שרץ העוף" — זה אתה אוכל, ואי אתה אוכל שרץ עוף טמא.

As it is taught in a Braisa, Rabbi Yaakov says: The pasuk states, "Yet these may you eat of all winged swarming things." We derive: This you may eat, but you may not eat a non-kosher winged swarming thing.

QUESTION

שרץ עוף טמא בהדיא כתיב!

The Gemara asks: But the prohibition against eating a non-kosher winged swarming thing is written explicitly in another pasuk! Why do we need this derivation?

ANSWER

אלא שרץ עוף טמא אי אתה אוכל, אכל אתה אוכל מה שעוף טמא משריץ, ואיזה זה? זה דבש דבורים.

Rather, the derivation must be: A non-kosher winged swarming thing you may not eat, but you may eat that which a non-kosher winged swarming thing discharges from its body. And what is this? This is the honey of bees.

STATEMENT

יכול אף דבש הגזין והצירעין? אמרת: לא.

The Braisa continues: One might have thought that even the honey of gizzin and wasps should be permitted. Therefore, you must say: No, they are forbidden.

QUESTION

ומה ראית לרבות דבורים, ולהוציא הגזין והצירעין?

And what did you see to include the honey of bees as permitted, and to exclude the honey of gizzin and wasps?

ANSWER

מרבה אני דבש דבורים שאין לו שם לווי, ומוציא אני דבש הגזין והצירעין שיש לו שם לווי.

I include the honey of bees, which does not have a modifier because it is called simply "honey", and I exclude the honey of gizzin and wasps, which has a modifier because it is always specified by the name of the insect.

INFERENCE

כַּמָּאן אֲזֵילָא הָא דְתַנְיָא: דְּבִשׁ הַגִּזִּין וְהַצִּירְעִין טָהוֹר וּמוֹתֵר בְּאַכִּילָהּ? דִּלָּא כְּרַבִּי יַעֲקֹב.

The Gemara asks: In accordance with whom goes that which is taught in a Braisa: The honey of gizzin and wasps is tahor and permitted for eating? This is not in accordance with Rabbi Yaakov, who forbids it.

INFERENCE

טָהוֹר — אֲלֵמָא בְּעֵי מַחְשְׁבָהּ.

The Gemara notes: Since the Braisa says it is **tahor**, meaning not susceptible to tumah, it is apparent that it requires intention to eat it to make it food, whereas bee honey is susceptible to tumah even without intention.

PROOF

תַּנְיָא נָמִי הָכִי: דְּבִשׁ בְּכוּוּרָתוֹ מְטֵמָא טוּמְאָת אֹכֵלֵין שְׁלֵא בְּמַחְשְׁבָהּ.

This is also taught in a Braisa: The honey of bees in its hive becomes tamei with the tumah of foods, even without intention to eat it.

STATEMENT

חָלִי דִּיחֲמוּרְתָא, סְבוּר רַבָּנָן לְמִימַר: בִּיעֵי נִינְהוּ וְאַסִּירָן.

With regard to the chunks discharged from the womb of a female fallow deer, the Rabbis thought to say: They are eggs, and are therefore forbidden as a limb from a living animal.

EXPLANATION

אָמַר רַב סַפְרָא: זֶרְעָא דְאִילָא הוּא, דְּאִזִּיל בְּתֵר אִילָתָא, וְאִידֵי דִּרְחֻמָּה צֵר לָא מְזַדְקָא, וְאִזִּיל בְּתֵר יִחֲמוּרְתָא וְנִתְרִי.

Rav Safra said: It is the semen of a hart, which goes after the hind, and since her womb is narrow she does not mate with him, and so he goes after the female fallow deer, and these hardened chunks of semen fall out of her.

RULING

אָמַר רַב הוּנָא: עוֹר הַבָּא כְּנֶגֶד פָּנָיו שֶׁל חֲמוֹר — מוֹתֵר, מֵאִי טַעְמָא? פִּירְשָׁא בְּעָלְמָא הוּא.

Rav Huna says: The skin that comes opposite the face of a donkey at birth, meaning the fetal sac, is permitted to be eaten. What is the reason? It is merely a secretion, not a part of the animal.

PROOF

אָמַר לִיהִי רַב חֲסֵדָא: תַּנְיָא דְּמִסִּיעַ לָהּ: עוֹר הַבָּא כְּנֶגֶד פָּנָיו שֶׁל אָדָם, בֵּין חַי בֵּין מֵת — טָהוֹר.

Rav Chisda said to him: There is a Braisa that supports you: The skin that comes opposite the face of a person, whether the newborn is alive or dead, is tahor and does not convey corpse tumah.

QUESTION

מֵאִי לָאוּ בֵּין הוּא חַי וְאִמּוֹ חַיָּה, בֵּין הוּא מֵת וְאִמּוֹ מֵתָהּ?

Is it **not** to be understood as: **Whether he is alive and his mother is alive, or whether he is dead and his mother is dead**, it is tahor because it is just a secretion?

ANSWER

לא, בין הוא חי ואמו מתה, בין הוא מת ואמו חיה.

Rav Huna answered: **No**, it means **either he is alive and his mother is dead, or he is dead and his mother is alive**, so only one of them is dead. But if both are dead, it might be tamei.

OBJECTION

והתנא: בין הוא חי ואמו חיה, בין הוא מת ואמו מתה!

Rav Chisda objected: **But isn't it taught** explicitly in another version of the Braisa: **Whether he is alive and his mother is alive, or whether he is dead and his mother is dead**, it is tahor!

RESOLUTION

אי תנא, תנא.

Rav Huna said: **If it is taught** in a Braisa, **it is taught**, and I cannot argue with it.

משנה MISHNAH

MISHNAH

מתני' דג טמא שבלע דג טהור, וטהור שבלע דג טמא, אסור באכילה, לפי שאינו גידולו.

MISHNAH: A non-kosher fish that swallowed a kosher fish, the kosher fish is permitted for eating. And a kosher fish that swallowed a non-kosher fish, the non-kosher fish is forbidden for eating, because it is not its offspring but rather a swallowed foreign body.

גמרא GEMARA

INFERENCE

גמ' טעמא דחזיניה דבלע, הא לא חזיניה דבלע — אמרי: אשרוצי אשריץ.

GEMARA: **The reason** it is permitted is **that we saw that it swallowed it**; but if we did not see that it swallowed it, we say: **It spawned** it, and it is forbidden as the offspring of a non-kosher fish.

PROOF

מנלן? דתנא: דג טמא משריץ, דג טהור מטיל ביצים.

From where do we know that we must have this concern? **As it is taught** in a Braisa: **A non-kosher fish spawns** live offspring, whereas **a kosher fish lays eggs**. Therefore, a kosher fish found inside a non-kosher fish might have been spawned by it.

QUESTION

אִי הָכִי, כִּי חֲזִינָא דְּבָלַע אֶמְרִינֵן: הָאִי אֵינֶפֶלָא, וְהָאִי אֲשֶׁרוּצִי אֲשֶׁרִיץ!

The Gemara challenges: If so, even when we saw that it swallowed a kosher fish, we should say: That swallowed fish was digested, and this fish that we found inside is what it spawned, and it should be forbidden!

ANSWER

אָמַר רַב שֵׁשֶׁת: כְּגוֹן שֶׁמָּצְאוּ דֶּרֶךְ הָרִיעִי.

Rav Sheshet says: It is a case where he found it in the digestive tract, which is not where a fish spawns its offspring.

ANSWER

רַב פָּפָא אָמַר: כְּגוֹן שֶׁמָּצְאוּ דֶּרֶךְ בֵּית הַבְּלִיעָה.

Rav Pappa said: It is a case where he found it in the throat, which is clearly swallowed.

ANSWER

רַב נַחֲמָן אָמַר: כְּגוֹן שֶׁמָּצְאוּ שְׁלֵם.

Rav Nachman said: It is a case where he found it whole, so we know it was swallowed and not spawned.

ANSWER

רַב אָשִׁי אָמַר: רֹב דְּגִים בְּמִינֵן מִשְׁרִיצִין, וּכְמִי שֶׁבָּלַע לְפָנֵינוּ דְּמִי.

Rav Ashi said: Most fish spawn their own kind, and since this is a different kind, it is considered as if it swallowed it in front of us.

BRAISA

תָּנוּ רַבָּנֵי: דָּג טָמֵא — מִשְׁרִיץ, דָּג טָהוֹר — מְטִיל בֵּיצִים, כָּל הַמוֹלִיד — מְנִיק, וְכָל הַמְטִיל בֵּיצִים — מְלַקֵּט, חוּץ מִעֲטֹלָה שְׂאֵף עַל פִּי שֶׁמְטִיל בֵּיצִים — מְנִיק.

The Rabbis taught: A non-kosher fish spawns live offspring, a kosher fish lays eggs; any creature that gives birth to live young nurses them, and any creature that lays eggs gathers food for its young, except for the bat, which, even though it lays eggs, nurses its young.

SUMMARY

The Gemara attempts to resolve Rabbi Shimon's view on whether a camel-like offspring born to a cow is muttar, bringing a braisa regarding the laws of firstborns and consumption, and analyzing whether the requirement of "head and majority of the body" applies to both. We then bring a braisa featuring a machlokes between Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Yehoshua regarding an offspring born to a kosher mother but fathered by a non-kosher animal, which prompts the Gemara to address Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi's rule that kosher and non-kosher species cannot crossbreed, resolving that the case must refer to a father that was a closed-hoofed offspring of a cow. Finally, the Gemara analyzes the underlying principles of Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Yehoshua regarding "zeh v'zeh gorem" (dual causation), contrasting their views here with their opinions on the offspring of a treifah animal.

The Gemara is deeply occupied with the concept of "yotzei", that which emerges from something else. We learn the fundamental rule: "hayotzei min hatamei tamei, v'hayotzei min hatahor tahor", that which comes from the impure is impure, and that which comes from the pure is pure. The identity of the offspring is determined by its source, its mother. Even when an animal looks completely different on the outside, like a non-kosher camel born from a kosher cow, we look at its origin to determine its true status.

In our own avodas Hashem, we must apply this same deep look. The yetzer hara loves to make us focus only on the outside, on the immediate appearance of a situation or a person. Sometimes a person looks far away, or a situation looks completely dark and "tamei," like something that cannot possibly be elevated. But the Torah is teaching us to look at the source, the neshama, the "mother" from which it was born. Every single Yid has a holy source, a neshama that is a chelek Eloka mima'al. No matter how much they might look like a "camel" on the outside, their essence is tahor because of where they come from.

This is also true for our daily actions. Before you do something, ask yourself: what is the "mother" of this action? What is its source? Am I doing this mitzvah out of genuine love for Hashem, or is it coming from a place of pride? When we ensure that the source of our actions is pure, then even if the execution is not yet perfect, the outcome remains holy.

Today, look past the external appearance of a difficult situation or a fellow Yid who seems distant. Remind yourself of their holy source, and treat them with the respect and love that their pure neshama deserves.