

דף יומי • חלין • דף ע"ט

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

THE SUGYA

In this daf, we continue our deep dive into the sugya of "oto v'es beno" (slaughtering an animal and its offspring on the same day) and how it applies to the father. We explore the opinion of Chananya, who holds that the prohibition applies to the father as well as the mother, and how this connects to the fundamental question of "chayshinun l'zera ha'av" — whether we concern ourselves with the seed of the father in determining the species of the offspring.

We will also learn about the halachos of kilayim (diverse kinds) regarding mules, examining how we determine their maternal lineage through physical signs like their voice, ears, and tail. The Gemara then transitions into a discussion regarding the status of a hybrid animal (a cross between a goat and a ewe) and the koy (an animal of doubtful status) regarding the prohibition of "oto v'es beno."

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

עמוד א' DAF 79A

EXPLANATION

וְלַחֲנַנְיָה, כְּתִיב "אוֹתוֹ" דְּמִשְׁמַע זָכָר, וְכְתִיב "בְּנוֹ" – מִי שֶׁבְּנוֹ פָּרוּהָ אַחֲרָיו דְּמִשְׁמַע נְקֵבָה, הֲלָכָה נוֹהֵג בֵּין בְּזָכָרִים בֵּין בְּנִקְבּוֹת.

And according to Chananya, the reason for his ruling is that it is written "it" [oto], which indicates a male parent, and it is written "its offspring" [beno] — meaning that parent whose offspring clings after it, which indicates a female parent. Therefore, the prohibition of slaughtering an animal and its offspring on the same day applies both to males and to females.

RULING

אָמַר רַב הוּנָא בַּר חִיָּיא אָמַר שְׁמוּאֵל: הֲלָכָתָא כְּחֲנַנְיָה,

Rav Huna bar Chiyya said that Shmuel said: The halacha is in accordance with Chananya, that the prohibition applies to the father as well.

STATEMENT

וְאַזְדָּא שְׁמוּאֵל לְטַעְמִיהּ, דְּתַנּוּ: רַבִּי יְהוּדָה אוֹמֵר: הַנּוֹלָדִים מִן הַסּוֹס, אֵף עַל פִּי שְׂאֵבִיהֶן חֲמוּר – מוֹתְרִין זֶה בָּזָה, אֲבָל הַנּוֹלָדִין מִן הַחֲמוּר עִם הַנּוֹלָדִין מִן הַסּוֹס – אֲסוּרִין.

And Shmuel follows his own line of reasoning, as we learned in a Mishnah: Rabbi Yehuda says: Those mules born from a female horse, even though their father is a donkey, are permitted to mate one with another; but those born from a female donkey mated with those born from a female horse are prohibited to mate with each other because of the prohibition of diverse kinds [kilayim].

STATEMENT

וְאָמַר רַב יְהוּדָה אָמַר שְׁמוּאֵל: זֶה דְּבַר רַבִּי יְהוּדָה, דָּאָמַר אֵין חוּשְׁשִׁין לְזֶרַע הָאָב, אֲבָל חֲכָמִים
אוֹמְרִים: כָּל מִינֵי פִרְדּוֹת אַחַת הֵן.

And Rav Yehuda said that Shmuel said: This is the statement of Rabbi Yehuda, who says we do not concern ourselves with the seed of the father in determining the species of the offspring, but rather we look only at the mother. But the Sages say: All types of mules are one species, and they may mate with each other.

EXPLANATION

מֵאֵן חֲכָמִים? חֲנַנְיָה הוּא, דָּאָמַר חוּשְׁשִׁין לְזֶרַע הָאָב, וְהָאִי בַר סוּסִיא וְחִמְרָא, וְהָאִי בַר חִמְרָא וְסוּסִיא –
כּוֹלָהוּ חֶדָא מִינָא נִינְהוּ.

Who are "the Sages" mentioned here? It is Chananya, who says we do concern ourselves with the seed of the father. And therefore, this mule which is the offspring of a horse and a donkey, and that mule which is the offspring of a donkey and a horse — all of them are one species, since both have horse and donkey components.

QUESTION

אִיבַעְיָא לְהוֹ: מִי פְשִׁיט לִיָּה לְרַבִּי יְהוּדָה דְּאֵין חוּשְׁשִׁין לְזֶרַע הָאָב, אוּ דְלָמָּא סְפּוּקִי מְסַפְקָא לִיָּה?

A dilemma was raised before them: Is it certain to Rabbi Yehuda that we do not concern ourselves with the seed of the father, or perhaps he is in doubt about it?

EXPLANATION

לְמַאי נִפְקָא מִינָהּ? לְמִישְׁרָא פְּרִי עִם הָאֵם,

The Gemara asks: What is the practical difference of this inquiry? The Gemara answers: To permit mating the offspring with the species of its mother.

EXPLANATION

אִי אָמַרְתָּ: מִיפְשֻׁט פְּשִׁיטָא לִיָּה – פְּרִי עִם הָאֵם שְׂרִי, אָלָּא אִי אָמַרְתָּ: סְפּוּקִי מְסַפְקָא לִיָּה – פְּרִי עִם
הָאֵם אָסוּר. מַאי?

If you say it is certain to him that we ignore the father's seed, then mating the offspring with the mother's species is permitted, as they are both considered the same species. But if you say he is in doubt, then mating the offspring with the mother's species is prohibited, out of concern that the father's seed might determine the species. What is the resolution?

PROOF

תָּא שְׁמַע: רַבִּי יְהוּדָה אוֹמֵר: כָּל הַנוֹלָדִים מִן הַסּוֹס, אַךְ עַל פִּי שְׂאֵבֵיהֶן חֲמוּר – מוֹתְרִין זֶה בָּזָה.

Come and hear a proof from our Mishnah: Rabbi Yehuda says: All those born from a female horse, even though their father is a donkey, are permitted to mate one with another.

INFERENCE

הִכֵּי דְמִי? אֵילִימָא דְאִבּוּה דְהָאִי חֲמוּר וְאִבּוּה דְהָאִי חֲמוּר – צְרִיכָא לְמִימַר?

What are the circumstances? If we say that the father of this male mule is a donkey and the father of that female mule is a donkey, does it need to be said that they may mate? Since both their mothers are horses and both their fathers are donkeys, they are identical!

INFERENCE

אֵלָא לָאוּ דְאָבוּה דְהָאִי סוּס וְאָבוּה דְהָאִי חֲמוֹר; וְקִתְנֵי מוֹתְרִים זֶה עִם זֶה, אֵלֶּמָּה מִיפְשִׁט פְּשִׁיטָא לִיהָ!

Rather, is it not that the father of this male mule is a horse, and the father of that female mule is a donkey? And yet it teaches that they are permitted one with another! Consequently, it is certain to him that we do not concern ourselves with the father's seed.

REFUTATION

לֹא, לְעוֹלָם דְאָבוּה דְהָאִי חֲמוֹר, וְאָבוּה דְהָאִי חֲמוֹר. וּדְקָאמְרִת: צָרִיכָא לְמִימָר?

The Gemara rejects this: No, actually we are dealing with a case where the father of this one is a donkey and the father of that one is a donkey. And as for what you said: "Does it need to be said?" — yes, it is necessary.

EXPLANATION

מָהוּ דְתִימָא: אֲתִי צַד דְסוּס מְשַׁתְּמֵשׁ בְּצַד חֲמוֹר, וְצַד חֲמוֹר מְשַׁתְּמֵשׁ בְּצַד סוּס, קָא מְשַׁמַּע לָן.

Lest you say: The horse side of the male comes and mates with the donkey side of the female, and the donkey side of the male mates with the horse side of the female, which would violate the prohibition of diverse kinds, therefore he teaches us that they are considered a single species and may mate.

PROOF

תָּא שְׁמַע: רַבִּי יְהוּדָה אָמַר, פְּרֻדָּה שֶׁתִּבְעָה – אֵין מְרַבִּיעִין עָלֶיהָ לֹא סוּס וְלֹא חֲמוֹר, אֵלָא מִינָהּ.

Come and hear another proof from a Braisa: Rabbi Yehuda says: A female mule that is in heat — we do not mate with her either a horse or a donkey, but rather only one of her own kind, another mule.

INFERENCE

וְאִי אָמְרִת מִפְשִׁט פְּשִׁיטָא לִיהָ לְרַבֵּעַ עַלֶּה מִינָא דְאָמָה!

And if you say it is certain to him that we ignore the father's seed, let us mate with her the species of her mother! Why is that forbidden?

RESOLUTION

דְּלֹא יוֹדְעִינוּ מִינָא דְאָמָה מָאִי נִיהוּ.

The Gemara answers: This is a case where we do not know what the species of her mother is.

OBJECTION

וְהָא "אֵלָא מִינָהּ" קִתְנֵי?

The Gemara objects: But does it not teach "but rather one of her own kind", which implies we do know her kind?

RESOLUTION

הֲכִי קָאָמַר: אֵין מְרַבִּיעִין עָלֶיהָ לֹא מִין סוּס וְלֹא מִין חֲמוֹר, לְפִי שְׂאִין יוֹדְעִין בְּמִינָהּ.

The Gemara explains: This is what it is saying: We do not mate with her either the species of a horse or the species of a donkey, because we do not know her mother's species, and therefore we must mate her only with another mule.

QUESTION

וְלִיבְדוּק בְּסִימָנֶיהָ? דָּאָמַר אָבַי: עֲבִי קָלִיָּה – בַּר חֲמָרָא, צְנִיף קָלִיָּה – בַּר סוּסָיָא.

The Gemara asks: **But let us check her by her physical signs!** As Abaye said: If its voice is deep, it is the offspring of a female donkey; if its voice is shrill, it is the offspring of a female horse.

STATEMENT

וְאָמַר רַב פָּפָא: רִבְרָבָן אוֹדְנִיָּה וְזוּטְרָא גְנוּבְתִּיָּה – בַּר חֲמָרָא, זוּטְרָן אוֹדְנִיָּה וְרִבָּה גְנוּבְתִּיָּה – בַּר סוּסָיָא.

And Rav Pappa said: If its ears are large and its tail is small, it is the offspring of a female donkey; if its ears are small and its tail is large, it is the offspring of a female horse.

RESOLUTION

הָכָא בְּמַאי עֲסָקִינוּ? בְּאֵלָמֶת וְגִידָמֶת.

The Gemara answers: **With what are we dealing here?** With a mute mule whose voice cannot be heard, and whose ears and tail are **lopped off**, so her signs cannot be checked.

QUESTION

מַאי הוּא עֲלֵהּ?

The Gemara asks: **What is the conclusion of this matter?**

PROOF

תָּא שְׁמַע, דָּאָמַר רַב הוּנָא בְּרִיהּ דְּרַב יְהוֹשֻׁעַ: הֲכֹל מוֹדִין בְּפָרִי עִם הָאִם שְׂאֵסוּר.

Come and hear, as Rav Huna the son of Rav Yehoshua said: Everyone agrees regarding mating the offspring with the mother's species that it is prohibited.

INFERENCE

שְׁמַע מִינֵה סְפּוּקֵי מְסַפְקָא לִיָּהּ, שְׁמַע מִינֵהּ.

Learn from this that he is in doubt about whether we concern ourselves with the father's seed. The Gemara confirms: **Learn from this** that it is so.

STATEMENT

אָמַר לִיָּהּ רַבִּי אָבָא לְשִׁמְעִיָּה: אִי מְעִיִּלְתָּ לִּי כּוֹדֵנִיתָא בְּרִיסְפָּק, עֵינִי לְהִנָּה דְּדַמְיִין לְהִדָּדִי, וְעֵינִי לִּי. אֵלְמָא קְסָבֵר: אֵין חוֹשְׁשִׁין לְזֶרַע הָאָב.

Rabbi Abba said to his attendant: If you bring mules in for me to the team, look for those that resemble one another and bring them in for me. Consequently, he holds: We do not concern ourselves with the seed of the father, and physical resemblance is sufficient to establish that they are of the same maternal species.

עמוד ב' DAF 79B

EXPLANATION

וְסִימָנֶיהָ דְּאוֹרֵייתָא.

And he holds that these **distinguishing characteristics** apply by Torah law, and can therefore be relied upon.

BRAISA

תנו רבנן: אותו ואת בנו נוהג בכלאים ובכוי.

The Rabbis taught in a baraita: The prohibition of slaughtering an animal **itself and its offspring** on the same day applies to the offspring of **diverse kinds** of animals **and to the koy**.

BRAISA

רבי אליעזר אומר: כלאים הפא מן העז ומן הרחל – אותו ואת בנו נוהג בו, כוי – אין אותו ואת בנו נוהג בו.

Rabbi Eliezer says: With regard to a **hybrid that comes from** the mating of a **goat and a ewe**, the prohibition of **itself and its offspring** applies to it; but with regard to a **koy**, the prohibition of **itself and its offspring** does not apply to it.

STATEMENT

אמר רב חסדא: איזהו כוי שנחלקו בו רבי אליעזר וחכמים? זה הפא מן התייש ומן הצבייה.

Rav Chisda says: What is the **koy** about which Rabbi Eliezer and the Sages disagree? This is the offspring that comes from the mating of a **male goat and a doe**.

QUESTION

היכי דמי? אילימא בתייש הפא על הצבייה, וילדה, וקא שחיט לה ולברה –

The Gemara asks: What are the **circumstances** of the case? If we say that we are dealing with a **male goat that mates with a doe, and she gave birth** to this offspring, and one **slaughters her and her offspring** on the same day—

OBJECTION

והאמר רב חסדא: הפל מודים בהיא צבייה ובנה תיש, שפטור! שה ובנו אמר רחמנא, ולא צבי ובנו!

but doesn't Rav Chisda say: All concede in a case where **she is a doe and her offspring is a goat** because she mated with a goat, **that** the one who slaughters them both on the same day is **exempt** from lashes? For **the Merciful One** states in the Torah: "A sheep... and its offspring," and not a deer and its offspring!

ANSWER

אלא בצבי הפא על התיישה וילדה, וקא שחיט לה ולברה,

Rather, we must be dealing with a **deer that mates with a female goat**, and she gave birth to this offspring, and one **slaughters her and her offspring** on the same day.

OBJECTION

והאמר רב חסדא: הפל מודים בהיא תיישה ובנה צבי – שחיט, "שה" אמר רחמנא, ובנו כל דהו!

But doesn't Rav Chisda say: All concede in a case where **she is a female goat and her offspring is a deer** because she mated with a deer, **that** the one who slaughters them both on the same day is **liable**? For **the Merciful One** states in the Torah: "A sheep," and its offspring of any kind, even if it is a deer!

RESOLUTION

לְעוֹלָם, בְּתִישׁ הַבָּא עַל הַצִּבְיָה, וְיָלְדָה בֵּת, וּבֵת יָלְדָה בֶּן, וְקָא שְׁחִיט לָהּ וְלַבָּרָה.

Actually, the dispute is with regard to a male goat that mates with a doe, and she gave birth to a female offspring, which is a koy, and this female offspring gave birth to a male offspring, and one slaughters her—the mother koy—and her offspring on the same day.

EXPLANATION

רבנן סברי: חוששין לזרע האב, ושה – ואפילו מקצת שה.

The Rabbis hold: We are concerned for the seed of the father, meaning the father's genetic contribution is significant, and the word "sheep" in the verse means even if it is only partially a sheep, since its father was a goat.

EXPLANATION

ורבי אליעזר סבר: אין חוששין לזרע האב, ושה ואפילו מקצת שה – לא אמרינן.

And Rabbi Eliezer holds: We are not concerned for the seed of the father, and therefore we do not say that "a sheep" includes even that which is only partially a sheep.

QUESTION

ולפלוג בחוששין לזרע האב, בפלוגתא דחנניה ורבנן?

The Gemara asks: But let them disagree directly on whether we are concerned for the seed of the father, which is the dispute of Chananya and the Rabbis as to whether the prohibition of "itself and its offspring" applies to the father as well!

RESOLUTION

אי פליגי בההיא, הוה אמינא: בהא אפילו רבנן מודו, ד"שה ואפילו מקצת שה" לא אמרינן, קא משמע לן.

The Gemara answers: If they had disputed only in that case, I would have said: In this case of a koy, even the Rabbis concede that we do not say "a sheep" includes even that which is only partially a sheep. Therefore, the baraita teaches us that the Rabbis hold this rule applies here too.

OBJECTION

וקא דתנן: כוי אין שוחטין אותו ביום טוב, ואם שחטו – אין מכסין את דמו.

The Gemara challenges: But that which we learned in a Mishnah: A koy, we may not slaughter it on a Festival ab initio, and if he did slaughter it, we do not cover its blood on the Festival.

INFERENCE

במאי עסקינן? אלימא בתיש הבא על הצביה וילדה, בין לרבנן בין לרבי אליעזר – לשחוט וליכסי, צבי ואפילו מקצת צבי.

With what case are we dealing? If we say it is with a male goat that mates with a doe, and she gave birth, then whether according to the Rabbis or according to Rabbi Eliezer, let him slaughter it and cover its blood, since it is a deer, and we should say even if it is only partially a deer it requires covering!

INFERENCE

אַלָּא בְּצִבֵּי הַבָּא עַל הַתִּיּוֹשָׁה וְיָלְדָהּ, אִי לְרֵבֶנּוּ – לְשַׁחוּט וְלִיכָסִי, אִי לְרַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר – לְשַׁחוּט וְלֹא לִיכָסִי.

Rather, we must be dealing with a deer that mates with a female goat, and she gave birth. But if this is according to the Rabbis, let him slaughter it and cover its blood because of its father; and if it is according to Rabbi Eliezer, let him slaughter it and not cover its blood at all, as it is a domesticated animal like its mother!

RESOLUTION

לְעוֹלָם בְּצִבֵּי הַבָּא עַל הַתִּיּוֹשָׁה, וְרֵבֶנּוּ סְפוּקִי מִסַּפְקָא לְהוּי אִי חוֹשְׁשִׁין לְזֶרַע הָאָב אִי אֵין חוֹשְׁשִׁין.

The Gemara answers: Actually, we are dealing with a deer that mates with a female goat, and the Rabbis are in doubt whether we are concerned for the seed of the father or whether we are not concerned.

INFERENCE

וּמִדְלָרְבֶּנּוּ מִסַּפְקָא לְהוּי, לְרַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר פְּשִׁיטָא לִיה.

And from the fact that the Rabbis are in doubt, it must be that to Rabbi Eliezer it is certain that we do not concern ourselves with the father's seed.

OBJECTION

וְהָא דִּתְנִינָא: הַזְרוּעַ וְהַלְחִיִּים וְהַקֶּבֶה נוֹהֲגִים בְּכוֹי וּבְכִלְאִים.

The Gemara objects: But that which is taught in a baraita: The foreleg, the cheeks, and the maw of the priestly gifts apply to a koy and to a hybrid.

BRAISA

רַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר אוֹמֵר: כָּלֵאִים הַבָּא מִן הָעִז וּמִן הָרֶחֶל – חַיִּיב בְּמִתְנוּת, מִן הַכוֹי – פֶּטוּר מִן הַמִּתְנוּת.

Rabbi Eliezer says: A hybrid that comes from a goat and a ewe is obligated in the gifts, but that which comes from the koy is exempt from the gifts.

INFERENCE

בְּמַאי עֲסָקִינוּ? אִילִימָא בְּתִיּוֹשָׁה הַבָּא עַל הַצִּבִּיָּה וְיָלְדָהּ, בְּשִׁלְמָא לְרַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר דְּפִטֵּר, קָסְבֵּר "שֶׁה" וְאַפִּילוּ מִקְצַת שֶׁה" לֹא אִמְרִינוּ.

With what case are we dealing? If we say it is with a male goat that mates with a doe, and she gave birth, it is understandable according to Rabbi Eliezer who exempts it, for he holds we do not say "a sheep" includes even that which is only partially a sheep.

INFERENCE

אַלָּא לְרֵבֶנּוּ, נָהִי דְקָסְבֵּרִי "שֶׁה" וְאַפִּילוּ מִקְצַת שֶׁה", בְּשִׁלְמָא פְּלִגָּא לָא יְהִיב לִיה, אִידָּךְ פְּלִגָּא לִימָא לִיה: אִיִּיתִי רִאֲיָה דְחוֹשְׁשִׁין לְזֶרַע הָאָב, וּשְׁקוּל.

But according to the Rabbis, granted that they hold "a sheep" includes even that which is only partially a sheep, it is understandable that he does not give him half the gifts, but as for the other half, let the owner say to the Kohen: "Bring proof that we are concerned for the seed of the father, and then take it!" Why then are they fully obligated?

ANSWER

אָלֶּא, בְּצִבֵּי הַבָּא עַל הַתִּישָׁה וַיֵּלֶדָה.

Rather, we must be dealing with a deer that mates with a female goat, and she gave birth.

INFERENCE

בְּשִׁלְמָא לְרַבֵּנּוּ, מֵאִי "חַיִּיב" – בְּחֻצֵּי מִתְּנֻת; אֶלֶּא לְרַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר, לִיחַיִּיב בְּכוֹלָהּ מִתְּנֻת?

It is understandable according to the Rabbis, for what is the meaning of "liable"? It means for half of the gifts. But according to Rabbi Eliezer, let him be liable for all of the gifts, since the mother is a goat and he does not care about the father's seed!

RESOLUTION

לְעוֹלָם בְּצִבֵּי הַבָּא עַל הַתִּישָׁה וַיֵּלֶדָה, וְרַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר נִמְי סְפוּקֵי מְסַפָּקָא לִיהִי אִי חוֹשְׁשִׁין לְזֶרַע הָאָב אוֹ לֹא, וְכִיּוֹן דְּלְרַבֵּנּוּ מְסַפָּקָא לְהוּ וְלְרַבִּי אֱלִיעֶזֶר מְסַפָּקָא לִיהִי, בְּמֵאִי פְּלִיגִי?

Actually, we are dealing with a deer that mates with a female goat, and she gave birth, and Rabbi Eliezer is also in doubt whether we are concerned for the seed of the father or not. And since the Rabbis are in doubt and Rabbi Eliezer is in doubt, in what do they disagree?

SUMMARY

The Gemara establishes that Shmuel rules in accordance with Chananya, who holds that "oto v'es beno" applies to the father. This leads to a detailed analysis of Rabbi Yehuda's view on whether we ignore the father's seed, concluding that Rabbi Yehuda is actually in doubt on the matter, which prohibits mating a mule with its mother's species. Finally, the Gemara introduces a baraita discussing whether the prohibition of "oto v'es beno" applies to hybrids and the koy, highlighting a dispute between the Rabbis and Rabbi Eliezer.

In today's sugya, the Gemara delves into a fascinating doubt: do we concern ourselves with the "seed of the father" (chosheshin le'zera ha'av) when determining the identity of an offspring, or do we look only at the mother? We see the Sages and Rabbi Yehuda grappling with cases of mixed parentage, trying to determine the true identity of a creature when its lineage is split. Even when physical signs are obscured, like a mute mule whose ears and tail are lopped off, the Torah demands we look deeper to understand its true nature.

This contains a profound lesson for our own avodah. Every single one of us is a product of different influences. We have a neshama, a pure spark of Hashem, but we also have a physical body and a yetzer hara. Sometimes, we look at ourselves and feel like that "mute mule", our spiritual voice feels silent, our positive signs are hidden, and we feel spiritually compromised or mixed up. We might wonder: "Who am I really? Which side of my lineage defines me?"

The Torah's answer is that we must never ignore our true spiritual heritage. You are the child of the King of kings. No matter how many mixed influences or struggles you carry from the physical world, your primary identity is defined by your divine source. Just as the halacha carefully traces the lineage of every creature to ensure it is treated according to its true identity, you must recognize your own holy pedigree and live up to it.

Today, when you feel conflicted or spiritually sluggish, stop and remind yourself of your true lineage: "I am a child of Hashem, and my neshama is completely pure." Let that realization guide your next action.