



Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h

Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

Koy

Rav Yehudah said: The *koy* is an independent creature (*not a product of mixed breeding*), and the Sages were unable to determine if it is a species of *beheimah*, or is it a species of *chayah*. Rav Nachman said: It is a wild ram.

The Gemora notes that this is a matter of a Tannaic dispute: The *koy* is the wild ram. Others say that the *koy* is the offspring of a male goat which mated with a female deer. Rabbi Yosi says: The *koy* is an independent creature (*not a product of mixed breeding*), and the Sages were unable to determine if it is a species of *beheimah*, or is it a species of *chayah*. Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says: It is a type of *beheimah*, and the Dushai household would raise many flocks of them.

Rabbi Zeira said in the name of Rabbi Safra in the name of Rav Hamnuna: Those goats raised in the forest are fit (*as sacrifices*) to the Altar.

The Gemora notes that he holds like Rabbi Yitzchak, who said: There are ten types of animals (*beheimah and chayah*) mentioned in the Torah (*that are fit for consumption*), and there are no more (*animals that are kosher*). And since these (*forest goats*) were not mentioned in the listing of *chayos*, this proves that they

are included in the species of goats (*which is a beheimah, and fit to be used as a korban*).

Rav Acha bar Yaakov asks: [*Why are there only ten kosher animals?*] Perhaps the hart and deer (*mentioned in the Torah*) are specifications, and ‘all animals’ is a generalization, and the principle is that when a generalization follows a specification, the generalization adds onto the specification, and there are (*in fact*) more (*and perhaps these goats are chayos*)?

The Gemora answers: if that would be the case, there would be no reason for the Torah to specify all those (*ten*) animals. [*Obviously, there are no other kosher chayos besides those mentioned in the Torah.*]

Rav Acha the son of Rav Ika asked: Perhaps they are included within the species of *Akko* (*mentioned in the Torah among the chayos*)?

Others asked to Rav Ashi: Perhaps they are included within the species of *te’o* or *zamer* (*mentioned in the Torah among the chayos*)?

Rav Chanan said to Rav Ashi: Ameimar permitted the fat of these forest goats to be eaten (*for he considered them to be chayos*).

Abba the son of Rav Minyamin bar Chiya inquired of Rav Huna bar Chiya: What is the law with regard to these goats raised in the forest? Are they fit (*as sacrifices*) to the Altar?

He replied: It was only with regard to the wild ox that Rabbi Yosi disagreed with the Rabbis, for we have learned in a *Mishna*: A wild ox is a species of *beheimah*. Rabbi Yosi said: It is a species of a *chayah*. And their argument is as follows: The Rabbis maintain that since the *Targum* (Onkelos) renders this as *torbala* - 'the forest ox,' it is certainly a species of *beheimah*, whereas Rabbi Yosi maintains that since it is reckoned together with the other species of *chayos*, it is a species of *chayah*, but these forest goats, according to all views, belong to the species of goats.

Rav Acha the son of Rav Ika asked: Perhaps they are included within the species of *Akko* (*mentioned in the Torah among the chayos*)?

Ravina asked to Rav Ashi: Perhaps they are included within the species of *te'vo* or *zamer* (*mentioned in the Torah among the chayos*)?

Rav Chanan said to Rav Ashi: Ameimar permitted the fat of these forest goats to be eaten (*for he considered them to be chayos*). (80a)

Rabbi Shimon

Rabbi Oshaya said: Our entire *Mishna* is not in accordance with Rabbi Shimon. From where do I know this? The *Mishna* reads: If both animals were *kodashim*, and they were slaughtered outside the Temple Courtyard, he who slaughtered the first incurs the

punishment of *kares*, and both animals are invalid (*the first because it was slaughtered outside, and the second because of oso v'es b'no*), and both slaughterers incur lashes (*the first because it was slaughtered outside, and the second because of oso v'es b'no*). [The second does not incur the punishment of *kares*, for the sacrifice is not fit to be offered inside, for its mother was slaughtered on that day.] Now let us consider: We know that according to Rabbi Shimon, a slaughtering which does not render the animal fit (*for consumption*) is not regarded as a slaughtering. Accordingly, as the first one was merely killed (*for a korban slaughtered outside the Courtyard is unfit for consumption, it is therefore, according to R' Shimon, not regarded as a shechitah – although regarding the prohibition of slaughtering outside the Courtyard, he will incur the punishment of kares*), the second is acceptable as an offering inside (even on that day, for its mother was not 'slaughtered'), and he who slaughters it outside should also incur the penalty of *kares*.

And furthermore, the *Mishna* reads: If both animals were *chullin*, and they were slaughtered inside the Temple Courtyard, they are both invalid (*for one is forbidden from slaughtering chullin inside of the Temple Courtyard, and the animal will be prohibited for benefit*), and he who slaughtered the second incurs lashes (*for violating the prohibition of oso v'es b'no*). Now, let us consider: We know that according to Rabbi Shimon, a slaughtering which does not render the animal fit (*for consumption*) is not regarded as a slaughtering. Accordingly, as the first one was merely killed; why then should the one who slaughtered the second incur lashes (*he did not 'slaughter' a mother and its offspring on the same day*)?

And furthermore, the *Mishna* reads: If both animals were *kodashim*, and they were slaughtered inside the Temple Courtyard, the first is valid and there is no liability (*for it was done properly*), and he who slaughtered the second incurs lashes (*for violating the prohibition of oso v'es b'no*), and it is invalid (*for since its mother was slaughtered on that day, it is premature*). Now, let us consider: We know that according to Rabbi Shimon, a slaughtering which does not render the animal fit (*for consumption*) is not regarded as a slaughtering. Now, the slaughtering of a consecrated animal is by itself a slaughtering which does not render the animal fit, for as long as the blood has not been thrown (*on the Altar*), the meat is not permitted to be eaten. Why is it then that he who slaughtered the second one incurs lashes, and why is it invalid? Evidently, the *Mishna* is not in accordance with Rabbi Shimon.

The *Gemora* notes the novelty of this: It was only necessary to have said this with regard to the clause dealing with the slaughtering of consecrated animals, for you might have thought that the slaughtering of a consecrated animal is a slaughtering which is fit, for if one were to stab the animal and throw its blood, the meat would not be permitted to be eaten, whereas if one were to slaughter it, the meat would be permitted to be eaten. Consequently, it is a slaughtering which is fit. He therefore teaches us that this is not so. (80a 80b)

DAILY MASHAL

Onkelos was a very great Torah scholar who translated the Torah into Aramaic. A translation is a complicated matter, as anyone who has translated an important text can attest. Since every translation is in essence an

“interpretation”, more than mere knowledge of the two languages is necessary. The translator must be absolutely true to the meaning of the source text, and therefore Onkelos’ tremendous feat was his ability to translate the Chumash in accordance with the teachings of our Sages that had been handed down from generation to generation, all the way back to Moshe Rabbeinu. His translation, one that we still have today, is known as “Targum Onkelos”, and is widely studied by Jews everywhere as part of the mitzvah of “*Shnayim Mikra v'echad Targum*” — the mitzvah for each individual to study the Torah portion of the week twice each week in the Chumash, along with the “Targum” translation of “Targum Onkelos”.

Ohr Sameach writes that it is important to point out that the halachic authorities write that the practice of kissing the mezuzah has a basis in this historical event recorded in a Gemora, in which Onkelos touched the mezuzah as he left his house in custody of the Roman soldiers. Besides our showing love for the mitzvah of mezuzah by touching and kissing a mezuzah when passing by one, we also recall the message of Divine Providence taught to us by Onkelos: G-d protects us and our homes.