



## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

### Maseches Avodah Zarah, Daf י"ז – Daf לז

Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas R' Avrohom Abba ben R' Dov HaKohen,

A"H v'l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

-----Daf י"ז---17-----

EIN BONIN...

- **Rabbah bar Chana in the name of R' Yochanan** said, there are 3 kinds of "basilkas": those of non-Jewish kings, those of bathhouses, and those of storehouses. **Rava** said, it is mutar to help them build two of these and assur to help them with one of them – and the pasuk of "lesur malcheyhem b'zikim" can help one remember that it is the one of the kings that is assur. **Others** say that **Rava** said that it is mutar to help them build all of these.
  - **Q:** Our Mishna clearly said that it is assur to help them build a "basilki"! **A:** The Mishna should be understood as saying that a basilki *of* a gardom, a stadium and a bimah may not be built for them. The basilki is not an item on its own.
- A Braisa says, when **R' Eliezer** was arrested by the Romans for heresy (i.e. for learning Torah), they took him up to the gardom to be judged. The officer said to him, "Why does such an old man busy himself with such stupidity!?" **R' Eliezer** said, "The Judge is trusted by me". He said this in reference to Hashem, but the officer thought that he was referring to him. Therefore, the officer told him, since you trusted in me, I swear that you will be acquitted. When **R' Eliezer** got home he was inconsolable (feeling that he must have done an aveira that caused him to be punished in the way he was). **R' Akiva** said, maybe it is because you once heard some teaching of heresy and you agreed with it, and that is why you were arrested for "heresy"? **R' Eliezer** said, you in fact remind me of such an incident. It once happened that a heretic told me that the pasuk of "ki mei'esnan kibatza v'ahd esnan zona yashuvu" teaches that although if a zonah is paid with an animal, that animal can't be brought into the Azarah, it can be used to make a bathroom for the Kohen Gadol (the pasuk is understood as saying that the zonah comes from a dirty place and the animal should therefore go to a dirty place). **R' Eliezer** said that he liked that drush, and that must be why he was arrested for heresy, because the pasuk says "harcheik mei'aleha darkecha" – referring to heresy, and "v'ahl tikrav ehl pesach beisah" – referring to the government. **Others** say that "harcheik mei'aleha darkecha" – refers to heresy and the government, and "v'ahl tikrav ehl pesach beisah" – refers to a zonah.
  - **Q:** How far must one distance himself from the house of a zonah? **A: R' Chisda** said, 4 amos.
  - The **Rabanan** use the pasuk of "ki mei'esnan kibatza v'ahd esnan zona yashuvu" for a drasha of **R' Chisda**, to teach that every zonah will eventually have to come onto paying a person for z'nut.
  - The view of **R' Chisda**, that one must distance himself 4 amos from the house of a zonah is argued on by **R' Pedas**, who says that the Torah only makes z'nut assur with arayos, without any requirement to distance 4 amos.
  - When **Ulla** would come back from yeshiva he would kiss his sisters on their arms.
    - This conflicts with another statement of **Ulla**, where he says that any type of closeness between a man and a woman is assur, to distance oneself from arayos.
  - **Mar Ukva** darshened a pasuk to teach that Gehennom has "two daughters" – heresy and government (they remain in Gehennom to be punished).
  - The Gemara darshens a pasuk to teach that most who serve avoda zara don't do teshuva. Even if one does do teshuva he dies quickly, so that he not fall back into his evil ways.
    - **Q:** How can you say that one who does teshuva from heresy dies right away? There was a woman who told **R' Chisda** that the smallest of her sins was having her younger son fathered by her older son, and she wanted to do teshuva on all her sins. **R' Chisda** told the people to prepare her tachrichin, because as a true baalas teshuva she would die, and yet she did not die. Now, if this was her smallest sin, we can presume that she also sinned with heresy, and yet she did not die immediately!? **A:** She did not do a full teshuva from her heresy, and that is why she did not die.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Others** asked, how could you say that one only dies after doing teshuva from heresy, but not after doing teshuva from other aveiros? We see that **R' Chisda** felt this woman would die for her teshuva!? The Gemara answers, since she said that was her smallest aveira, it must be that she also sinned with heresy, and that is why he felt she would die.
- **Q:** How could you say that one only dies after doing teshuva from heresy, but not after doing teshuva from other aveiros? We find that **R' Elazar ben Drurya** committed tremendous levels of aveiros of zenus, and when he finally did teshuva he immediately died, and a Bas Kol called out and said "**R' Elazar ben Drurya** is ready for Olam Habbah". We see that for zenus one dies immediately after teshuva as well!? **A:** He was so attached to the aveira of zenus that it was like someone who is attached to heresy, and therefore Hashem took his life so that he not return to his sinful ways.
  - **Rebbi** cried upon hearing this story and said, there are those who can acquire their place in Olam Habbah over many years, and there are those who do so in a single moment. **Rebbi** said, not only are baalei teshuva accepted in Heaven, rather in Heaven they even refer to the person as "rebbe"!
- **R' Chanina and R' Yonason** were walking and reached a fork in the road. One path would make them pass a place of avoda zara and the other would make them pass a place of zonos. One said to the other, let us rather go and pass the avoda zara, because the Yetzer Hara for avoda zara has been killed. The other said, let us rather go and pass the zonos so that we can fight and win over our Yetzer Hara and get rewarded for doing so. They decided to go by the zonos. As they got close, the zonos went back into their rooms. The one who had suggested to go and pass the avoda zara asked the other, how did you trust yourself to walk by the zonos? He answered based on a pasuk, which is darshened to teach that one's Torah protects him from matters of zenus.
- A Braisa says, when **R' Elazar ben Prata** and **R' Chanina ben Tradyon** were arrested by the Romans, **R' Elazar** told **R' Chanina**, you are lucky that you were only arrested for one thing (teaching Torah), whereas I was arrested for 5 things. **R' Chanina** said, you are lucky, because you were arrested for 5 things but will be saved from execution, whereas I was arrested for one thing and will be executed, because you are involved in Torah and gemilas chasadim, whereas I am only involved with Torah. This accords with **R' Huna**, who says that one who only busies himself with Torah is like one who has no God.
  - **Q:** Can we say that **R' Chanina** was not involved with gemilas chasadim? A Braisa says, **R' Eliezer ben Yaakov** says, one should not give his money to the communal tzedaka fund unless it is run by a talmid chochom like **R' Chanina**. We see that he ran the tzedaka fund!? **A:** He was very trustworthy to watch over the funds, but he was not involved in the running of the fund.
  - **Q:** We find that **R' Chanina** once mistakenly gave his matanos l'evyonim to poor people without telling them it was to be used for the Purim seudah, and when he realized his mistake he took his own personal money and gave additional money to poor people for their Purim seudah. We see he did do chessed!? **A:** He did chessed, but not to the extent that he felt he should have.
  - The Gemara explains, the Romans came to **R' Elazar ben Prata** and asked him, "Why did you learn Torah and why did you steal?" He replied to them, "If one is busy with the sword (stealing) he cannot be busy with the book (Torah), and visa-versa, and since this charge is not valid, the other is not valid either". They asked him, "Why do they call you rebbe?" He said, it is because I am the teacher of the weavers. They went and brought him two spindles of thread and asked him, "Which is the shesi string and which is the eirev string?" A miracle happened and a female bee flew onto the shesi and a male bee flew onto the eirev, which let him know which was which. They then asked him, "Why didn't you go to Bei Avidan (where they had their avoda zara)?" He said, it is because I am an old man and I was afraid I would be trampled. They said, "No old man ever got trampled there!" A miracle happened, and an old man was trampled there that very day. They then asked him, "Why did you let your slave free?" He said, "I did not do so". They brought a witness who got up to testify against him, but Eliyahu came and told him, "The same way a miracle happened to combat the other claims, another one will happen here and all will see

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

your wicked ways”. The witness did not listen. At the moment that he got up a message was sent that he must deliver a letter to the king. As he went onto the road, Eliyahu came and threw him 40 parsah away, so that he could not come and testify.

### -----Daf 17-----18-----

- The Gemara tells of how the Romans persecuted **R' Chanina ben Tradyon**. They went to **R' Chanina** and asked him why he studied Torah. He answered, it is as Hashem commanded me. They sentenced him to death by burning, his wife to death, and his daughter to live in a house of zonos. He was sentenced to burning as a punishment from Hashem for saying the Shem Hameforesh.
  - **Q:** How could he do that when a Mishna says that one who does so doesn't get a portion in Olam Habbah!? **A:** He said it for purposes of learning, and that is allowed.
    - **Q:** So why was he punished? **A:** Because he said it in public.
  - The Gemara continues, that his wife was punished with death by Hashem, because she didn't protest his saying of the Shem Hameforesh. From here we see that one who can protest and doesn't, is punished for it.
  - His daughter was punished in the way that she was, because when she once walked by the Roman officials they mentioned how beautiful she walked. She then paid careful attention to the way that she walked.
  - When the three of them left the courthouse they all said that their punishment was justly deserved, and stated pesukim to show this point. **Rebbi** said, how great were these great tzaddikim, that they thought of these 3 pesukim at the time that they were saying that their punishment was just.
- A Braisa says, when **R' Yose ben Kisma** became sick, **R' Chanina ben Tradyon** went to visit him. **R' Yose** said to him, you see that the Romans have been sent by Heaven to rule over us, and have destroyed the Beis Hamikdash and killed many of our tzaddikim, and Hashem allows the Romans to continue to exist, and yet I have heard about you that you continue to learn and teach Torah in public!? **R' Chanina** said, they will have mercy on me from Heaven. **R' Yose** said, I am speaking logical to you and you are saying Heaven will have mercy on you? I would be surprised if they don't end up burning you with your Sefer Torah! **R' Chanina** asked **R' Yose** whether he (**R' Chanina**) would be secure in his place in Olam Habbah. **R' Yose** asked for an example of an incident as to how he acted. **R' Chanina** told him the story of the tzedaka money that got mixed with the matanos l'evyonim (stated in the Gemara earlier). **R' Yose** said, based on that, I hope to have the same portion in Olam Habbah like you will have. A short time later **R' Yose** died and the Romans caught **R' Chanina** studying and teaching Torah. They wrapped him in the Sefer Torah, surrounded him with twigs and lit him on fire. They put a wet piece of wool on his heart to make him live longer and suffer. His daughter asked him why this is fair. He said, if I was burned alone, I would also not understand, but now that I am being burned with the Sefer Torah, I know that when Hashem punishes for what is being done to the Sefer Torah, He will also punish for what is being done to me. His talmidim asked him what he sees. He said, I see the parchment being burned, but the letters flying off into the air. They told him, why don't you also open your mouth to allow the flames in so that you will not suffer more? He said, it is better that Hashem take my neshama than I harm myself. The executioner asked **R' Chanina**, if I increase the flames and take away the wool from your heart, do you promise me that I will go into Olam Habbah? **R' Chanina** promised that he would. The executioner did so, and then threw himself into the fire, killing himself. A Bas Kol called out that **R' Chanina** and the executioner are ready to enter Olam Habbah. **Rebbi** cried when he heard this and said, there are those who can be koneh their portion in Olam Habbah in one instance and others who are only koneh it after many years.
  - **R' Meir's** wife, Brurya, was another daughter of **R' Chanina**. She told **R' Meir**, it is disgraceful that my sister is forced to live among the zonos. **R' Meir** packed bribe money and went to try to secure her release. He said, if she has not done an aveira, a miracle will happen and she will be released. If not, she will not be released. He wanted to test her to see if she had given in to do an aveira. He disguised himself and tried to convince her to be mezaneh with him, but she refused multiple times. He said, we can see that she has not done an aveira, because she must have refused all advances. He went to the guard and offered him the bribe money in exchange for her release. He said, he is afraid of the

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

government. **R' Meir** told him, keep half the money for yourself and give the other half to bribe the government officials. He asked, what am I to do when there is no more money left to bribe them? **R' Meir** said, just say the words "God of Meir, answer me" and you will be saved. They tested it out by inciting attack dogs to come and attack them. When they said "God of Meir answer me" the dogs turned away. When the government found out what happened they took this guard to be hanged. He said "God of Meir answer me" and they could not hang him. They asked him what is going on that this is happening. He told them what had taken place. They etched a picture of **R' Meir** on the gates to the city so that people would recognize him and have him arrested. One time he was recognized by people. He ran into the house of zonos, or some say he ran into a non-kosher restaurant and stuck one finger into the food and licked a different finger (making it seem like he was eating the food), or some say that Eliyahu came, appearing like a zonah, and hugged him, and the people who saw this said, that can't be **R' Meir**, because he would never do that. After this incident, **R' Meir** ran away to Bavel.

- A Braisa says, if someone goes to a stadium where they have bull fights, or to a place where they have entertainment and saw magicians, snake charmers, or different kinds of clowns and jesters, it is considered to be a "place of leitzim", regarding which the pasuk says "ashrei ha'ish asher lo halach...ki ihm b'Toras Hashem cheftzo". This teaches that going to these places leads a person to bitul Torah.
  - **Q:** Another Braisa says that it is mutar to go to their stadiums, because if it is a Yid who is getting killed he can yell to try and save him, and one may go to the other places if it will help to save Yidden as long as he is not considered to be counted among the people who do the killings. Now, regarding the other places we can say the earlier Braisa says it is assur because that is talking about where he is counted among them, but the Braisa contradicts the earlier Braisa regarding stadiums!? **A:** It is actually a machlokes among Tanna'im whether one may go to these stadiums, as we find a Braisa that says that one may not go to a stadium because it is considered to be a place of leitzim, but **R' Nosson** says it is mutar because he may be able to yell and save a Yid, and so that he may be able to provide testimony to a woman to allow her to remarry.
- A Braisa says, **R' Meir** says, one may not go to the theaters or circuses of the goyim, because they do this for the avoda zara. The **Chachomim** say, in a place where they do this for the avoda zara it is assur as a suspicion of avoda zara, in a place where they don't it is assur as a place of leitzim.
  - **Q:** What is the difference between these opinions? **A:** **R' Chanina of Sura** said, the difference would be where someone went (although it is assur) and transacted business there. According to **R' Meir** the proceeds would be assur as avoda zara. According to the **Rabanan** it would not be assur.
- **R' Shimon ben Pazi** darshened the pasuk of "ashrei ha'ish asher lo halach ba'atzas resha'im uviderech chata'im lo amad". He said this teaches that if one goes down a path of aveira he will "stand" there (stay around there, not just pass through), and once he stands there he will "sit" there, and once he sits there he himself will mock the Torah.
  - **R' Elazar** darshened a pasuk to teach that one who mocks (he is a "leitz") will suffer yisurin. **Rava** would plead with the **Rabanan** not to be leitzim so that they not suffer yisurim.
  - **R' Katina** darshened a pasuk to teach that one who mocks is punished with having his sustenance diminished.
  - **Reish Lakish** darshened a pasuk to teach that one who mocks, goes to Gehenom.
    - **R' Oshaya** darshened a pasuk to teach that people who act with arrogance go to Gehenom.
  - **R' Tanchum bar Chanilai** darshened a pasuk to teach that one who mocks causes the world to be destroyed.
    - **R' Elazar** said, mockery is so bad that it is initially punished with suffering of yisurim and eventually punished with destruction of the world.
- **R' Shimon ben Pazi** darshened the pasuk of "ashrei ha'ish asher lo halach" as referring to one who never went to the theaters and circuses of the goyim, "uviderech chata'im lo amad" refers to one who did not go hunting for sport, "uvimoshav leitzim lo yashav" refers to one who didn't go to their performances. A person may say that not going to these places is enough, and therefore he can then just sleep all day. The pasuk therefore says, "uvisoraso yehigeh yomam valayla".

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Shmuel bar Nachmeini in the name of R' Yonason** darshened the pasuk of “ashrei ha'ish asher lo halach ba'atzas resha'im” as referring to Avrohom Avinu who did not follow the Dor Haflaga, “uviderech chata'im lo amad” as referring to that he did not go along with the people of Sedom, “uvimoshav leitzim lo yashav” refers to that he did not stay with the Plishtim, who were leitzanim.

### -----Daf 19-----

- The pasuk says “ashrei ish yarei es Hashem”. Is only a man praiseworthy for this, but not a woman? **R' Amram in the name of Rav** said, the pasuk means – praiseworthy is a person who does teshuva when he is still young. **R' Yehoshua ben Levi** said, it means praiseworthy is the person who is strong like a man to win over his Yetzer Harah.
  - The pasuk says “b'mitzvosav chafetz me'od”. **R' Elazar** said, this teaches that one should want to do a mitzvah for the sake of the mitzvah itself, not for the sake of the reward for doing the mitzvah.
  - The pasuk says “ki ihm b'Toras Hashem cheftzo”. **Rebbi** said, this teaches that a person can only be successful at learning a topic that he wants to learn.
    - **R' Avdimi bar Chama** said, the pasuk teaches that if one engages in Torah, Hashem takes care of his needs.
    - **Rava** said, the pasuk teaches that a person can only be successful at learning a topic that he wants to learn.
      - **Rava** also said, when one begins to learn, it is called “Hashem's Torah” (“b'Toras Hashem cheftzo”). When a person fully understands the learning, it becomes “his” Torah (“uviToraso yehigeh yomam valayla”).
      - **Rava** also said, a person should first learn from his rebbi so that he has a handle on the basics. Only then should he begin a deeper delve.
      - **Rava** also said based on another pasuk, a person should always learn even if he forgets what he is learning, and even if he doesn't really understand what he is learning.
      - **Rava** darshens a contradiction in pesukim to teach that initially a person should be like a bird flying from place to place – looking for the right rebbi. Eventually, he will then become a rebbi himself, and will teach to others who will come to him to learn.
      - **Rava** darshens other pesukim to teach that initially a talmid runs away from people who ask him questions, because he doesn't know the answers. Eventually, he will become comfortable enough to answer questions in public.
      - **Ulla** said, one pasuk refers to Torah knowledge as a “bor” and in another place it is referred to as flowing water. Initially there is a limited amount of knowledge he will achieve, but later he will be able to gain a lot more knowledge – like flowing water.
    - **Rava in the name of R' Sechora in the name of R' Huna** darshened a pasuk to teach that if a person just keeps learning new things without reviewing, his learning will not be retained. However, if he learns small amounts and reviews before he moves on, he will retain his learning.
      - **Rava** said, the **Rabanan** know this, but are not careful about it. **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, I was careful with it and I retained my learning.
      - **R' Shizbi in the name of R' Elazar ben Azarya** darshened a pasuk to teach that if a person learns a lot to try and impress others, he will not live long. **R' Sheishes** darshens the same pasuk to teach that a talmid who uses careful methods in his learning will retain his learning.
      - **R' Dimi** said, this can be compared to a bird catcher who must break the wing of his catch before he tries to move to another bird, or else he will lose the bird he already caught.
    - **R' Yannai** darshens a pasuk to teach that if a person learns everything from only one rebbi, he will not have success. When **R' Chisda** told this to his talmidim, they all left him and went to learn by **Rabbah**, who then told them, this is only true with regard to learning methods of logic.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

However, with regard to learning the texts of the learning, it is actually better if it is all learned from one rebbi.

- **R' Tanchum bar Chanilai** darshened a pasuk to teach that a person should divide his years into 3 – one third should be spent learning mikra, one third Mishna, and one third Gemara.
  - **Q:** How can one know how many years he will live? **A:** He should divide his days into thirds, and learn each of these every day.
- **Rava** darshened a pasuk to teach that if a person makes regular times for learning Torah, he will be successful in everything that he does. If not, the rebbi and the talmid are considered to be resha'im and don't see success.
- **R' Abba in the name of R' Huna in the name of Rav** darshens a pasuk that discusses the "killing" of people as referring to a talmid that paskens when he is not fit to pasken.
  - **Q:** How long must a person wait until he is mature enough to pasken? **A:** Until he is 40 years old.
    - **Q:** We find that **Rabbah** paskened, and he only lived until 40!? **A:** If a person is equal in Torah to the other posek of the locale, he may pasken even before reaching 40.
  - **R' Acha bar Ada in the name of Rav** darshened this pasuk to teach that even the casual conversation of talmidei chachomim should be studied to be learned from.
- **R' Yehoshua ben Levi** said, there is a concept that is written about in the Torah, repeated in the Nevi'im, and discussed a third time in the Kesuvim – whoever engages in Torah learning, his possessions will cause him to succeed. He then brings the 3 pesukim.
- **R' Alexandri** would call out, "Who wants life?" Everyone would gather around him and say "Give us life!" He said, the pasuk says "Mi ha'ish hechafetz chayem...netzor leshoncha meira..." A person may say that as long as he doesn't speak bad he is good and can even waste his time sleeping. The pasuk therefore says "Sur meirah va'asei tov", and "tov" refers to Torah.

HIGIYA LAKIPAH MAKOM SHEMAAMIDIN BAH AVODAS KOCHAVIM

- **R' Elazar in the name of R' Yochanan** said, if one was oiver and built this with them, his wages remain mutar.
  - **Q:** This seems obvious – the dome is only an accessory for avoda zara, and according to **R' Akiva and R' Yishmael** such items only become assur once they are used for worship!? **A:** **R' Yirmiya** said, **R' Elazar** meant to say that even if the Yid worked on the avoda zara itself, his wages would be mutar.
  - **Q:** This makes sense according to the view that an avoda zara only becomes assur once it is worshipped. However, according to the view that it becomes assur as soon as it is made, why is the money mutar? **A:** **Rabbah bar Ulla** said, **R' Elazar** was referring to the wages for knocking in the final nail and completing the avoda zara. The avoda zara only becomes assur upon that final blow, and the wages for that final blow is worth less than a pruta. Therefore, it remains mutar.
    - We see from here that **R' Elazar** holds that wages are not earned at the end of the job, but are rather earned throughout the job as the work is done, and are payable at the completion of the job.

-----Daf 20-----

MISHNA

- [The Hagaos Hagra delete this entire bracketed statement: We may not make jewelry for avoda zara – things like chokers, nose rings, or rings. **R' Eliezer** says, if he will be paid, it is mutar.]
- We may not sell to goyim things that are still attached to the ground. However, we may sell these items to them once they have been cut from the ground. **R' Yehuda** says, we may sell them things that are attached to the ground if it is sold on condition that they will be cut down.

GEMARA

- **Q:** How do we know this halacha (regarding items attached to the ground)? **A:** **R' Yose bar Chanina** said, the pasuk says "lo sichaneim", which we darshen to mean that one should not give a goy a holding in land.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** That pasuk is used to teach that one should not be complimentary of a goy!? **A:** For that drasha the pasuk should have said “lo sichuneim”. The fact that it says “sichaneim” allows us to darshen both drashos.
- **Q:** The pasuk is needed for a drasha that one should not give a present to a goy!? **A:** For that drasha the pasuk should have said “lo sechineim”. The fact that it says “sichaneim” allows us to darshen all the drashos. In fact a Braisa explicitly learns all three drashos from this pasuk.
  - Whether a Yid may give a present to a goy is actually the subject of a machlokes. There is a Braisa where **R’ Meir** says that a neveila may be given or sold to a goy or a ger toshav. **R’ Yehuda** says it may be given to a ger toshav or sold to a goy. We see a machlokes whether or not something may be given to a goy.
  - The Braisa quoted above said one drasha of the pasuk that one should not be complimentary of a goy. This supports **Rav**, who says that it is assur to say “Look how beautiful that non-Jewish woman is”.
    - **Q:** A Braisa says that **R’ Shimon ben Gamliel** said “mah rabu maasecha Hashem” when he once saw a beautiful non-Jewish woman!? **A:** **Rav** would say that **R’ Shimon** praised Hashem for creating a beautiful person. He did not compliment the woman.
      - **Q:** A Braisa learns from the pasuk of “v’nishmarta mikol davar rah” that it is assur to look at a woman altogether, and is even assur to look at a woman’s clothing!? **A:** **R’ Shimon** encountered the woman by surprise, as they both approached a corner from different angles. Had he seen her coming, he would have known not to look at her.
        - **R’ Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said it is assur to look at a woman’s clothing even if it is hanging on a wall (and she is not wearing it). **R’ Pappa** said, this is only if he knows the woman who wears this clothing. **Rava** said, the words of the Braisa suggest like **R’ Pappa** says.
          - **R’ Chisda** said, this is only if it is old clothing that he once saw her wear. If it is new clothing that he has never seen her wear, it is not assur. This must be true, because if not, how do we give women’s clothing to a tailor to complete? The Gemara says this is no proof, because we find that a farmer may physically bring about the mating of animals and we are not concerned that this will cause him to have improper thoughts, since this is being done in his line of work. The same would be for a tailor.
        - The Braisa said that the Malach Hamaves stands on top of a dying person with his sword outstretched. This scares the person and causes his mouth to open. The Malach then lets a drop of poison into the person’s mouth. This poison causes him to die, causes his body to rot, and causes his face to change color.
          - **Q:** This seems to argue on the father of **Shmuel**, who said that the Malach Hamaves told him that if he was not concerned for the honor of people, he would totally rip open the area of the neck as is done by the slaughter of an animal. This shows that he kills by slaughtering!? **A:** It may be that the poison cuts the trachea and esophagus.
          - The Braisa supports **R’ Chanina bar Kahana**, who said that in the yeshiva of **Rav** they said that if one wants that his meis should not rot, he should turn the meis over onto his face (which would stop the spread of the poison, and would therefore prevent the rotting).

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- A Braisa says, the pasuk of “v’nishmarta mikol davar rah” teaches that a person should not have impure thoughts by day which then cause him to become tamei at night. From here **R’ Pinchas ben Yair** said, learning Torah brings to being careful, which brings to zrizus, which brings to cleanliness, which brings to prishus, which brings to purity, which brings to chasidus, which brings to humility, which brings to yiras cheit, which brings to kedusha, which brings to ruach hakodesh, which brings to techiyas hameisim. Chassidus is greater than them all, as the pasuk says “az dibarta bichazon lachasidecha”.
  - This argue with **R’ Yehoshua ben Levi**, who said that humility is the greatest of them all.

EIN MOCHRIN LAHEN...

- A Braisa says, **R’ Yehuda** says we may sell to them a tree on the condition that it be chopped down, and he must make sure that it then gets chopped down. **R’ Meir** says we only sell them a tree that is already chopped down. **R’ Yehuda** says we sell them unripe grain on the condition that it be cut down, and he must make sure that it then gets cut down. **R’ Meir** says we only sell them unripe grain that is already cut down. **R’ Yehuda** says we may sell them standing grain on the condition that it is then cut, and he must make sure that it is then cut. **R’ Meir** says we may only sell them grain that has already been cut.
  - All these cases are necessary to be stated. If we would only say the case of the tree we would say it is only there that **R’ Meir** says it must be cut beforehand, because he loses nothing by leaving it attached to the ground and we are therefore concerned that he will leave it attached to the ground. However, in the case of the grain we would say that he would agree that since it will get damaged if left in the ground we can even sell it to him on a condition that he cut it. If we did not state the case of the unripe grain we would say that in that case since the benefit of leaving it attached to the ground is apparent, maybe **R’ Yehuda** would agree that selling it on a condition would not be allowed. If we would only say the case of the unripe grain, we would say that it is only there that **R’ Meir** doesn’t allow sale on a condition to cut it, because we are concerned that he will not cut it, but in the other cases we would say that he agrees with **R’ Yehuda**.
  - **Q:** What is the halacha if a Yid sells an animal to a goy on the condition that the animal be shechted? Maybe it is only in the above cases that **R’ Yehuda** would allow a sale on a condition, because the items remain in the field of the Yid, and he will therefore see to it that they get cut down, but in the case of an animal, where it is taken into the goy’s reshus, maybe he would agree that we can’t sell on a condition, out of concern that the goy will not shecht it? Or maybe there is no difference and **R’ Yehuda** would allow it in the case of the animal as well? **A:** A Braisa says that **R’ Yehuda** allows a Yid to sell an animal to a goy on the condition that it be shechted, and he has to then make sure that it gets shechted. **R’ Meir** says that we may only sell him an animal that was already shechted.

-----Daf אב---21-----

MISHNA

- We may not rent houses to goyim in EY (as a gezeira that it may lead to selling them a house in EY, which is assur as giving them an ownership in EY), and certainly may not rent fields to them in EY. In Surya we may rent houses to them, but not fields. In chutz laaretz we may even sell houses to them and may rent fields to them. This is the view of **R’ Meir**. **R’ Yose** says, in EY we may rent houses to goyim, but may not rent fields to them. In Surya we may even sell houses to them, and may rent fields to them. In chutz laaretz we may sell houses and fields to them.
  - Even in a place where they said it is mutar to rent houses to goyim, that is not meant that we may rent them a house to live in, because a goy brings avoda zara into the house in which he lives, which would be assur for the Yid based on the pasuk of “lo savi so’eiva ehl beisecha”.
- In all places it is assur to rent to them a bathhouse, because a bathhouse is always known as belonging to the Yid (even when it is rented to someone else).



## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

### GEMARA

- **Q:** Why is it that the issur of renting fields is more obvious than that of renting houses? You can't say it is because the selling of a field would involve two issurim – giving them ownership in land in EY, and removing the field from a maaser obligation – because selling a house also involves two issurim – giving them ownership in EY and removing the house from the mitzvah of mezuzah!? **A: R' Mesharshiya** said, the mezuzah obligation is on the one who lives in the house, not the owner of the house, and therefore the act of selling the house doesn't change the mezuzah obligation. Based on this, selling a house to them would involve one problem and selling a field would involve two. That is why the issur to sell a field to them, and the gezeira not to rent a field to them, is more obvious.

### BESURYA MASKIRIN BATIM...

- **Q:** The reason we can't sell them a house in Surya is a gezeira that it may lead to selling a house to them in EY. If so, we should also not be allowed to rent a house to them in Surya as a gezeira that it may lead to renting a house to them in EY!? **A:** Renting to them in EY is itself a gezeira, so we do not make a gezeira to strengthen another gezeira.
  - **Q:** The issur of renting a field to them in Surya is a gezeira to a gezeira, and yet it is assur!? **A:** Selling a field in Surya is assur based on halacha, not based on a gezeira. This is because **R' Meir** holds that Dovid's conquering of Surya gave it the status of EY itself. Therefore, regarding fields, which involve two issurim, he is goizer that even renting to a goy is assur. Regarding houses, which only involve one issur, he does treat Surya more leniently than EY and allows for the renting of houses.

### B'CHUTZ LAARETZ...

- **R' Meir** allows the sale of houses to them outside EY, but not the sale of fields to them outside EY. This is because the sale of fields in EY involve two issurim, so he is goizer even outside EY. The sale of houses in EY involves only one issur, so he is not goizer outside EY.

### R' YOSE OMER B'ERETZ YISRAEL MASKIRIN LAHEM BATIM...

- **R' Yose** holds this way, because he is goizer regarding fields, whose sale involves two issurim, but is not goizer regarding houses, whose sale involves only one issur.

### UBISURYA MOCHRIN...

- **R' Yose** holds that Surya does not have the status of EY. Therefore, he is goizer regarding the selling of fields, whose sale in EY involves two issurim, but is not goizer regarding the selling of houses, whose sale in EY involves only one issur.

### UBICHUTZ LAARETZ MOCHRIN...

- **R' Yose** holds, that since chutz laaretz is far away from EY, we don't have to be goizer against selling in chutz laaretz to prevent the selling in EY.
- **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** paskened that the halacha follows **R' Yose**.
  - **R' Yosef** said, this is as long as he does not sell or rent houses to goyim in a way that he creates a neighborhood of goyim.
    - **Q:** What is considered to be a "neighborhood"? **A:** A Braisa says a neighborhood is a minimum of three people.
      - **Q:** We should be concerned that a Yid will sell his house to one goy, and the goy will then sell portions of his house to two other goyim, thereby making a neighborhood of three goyim!? **A: Abaye** said, we only need to be concerned for immediate possibilities, not eventual ones.

### AHF BIMAKOM SHE'AMRU L'HASKIR

- The Mishna here implies that there are some places where it is assur to rent houses to goyim altogether. The Mishna is following the view of **R' Meir**, because according to **R' Yose** it is always mutar to rent houses to goyim.

### UBICHOL MAKOM LO YISKOR...

- A Braisa says, **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** says, a person may not rent out his bathhouse to a goy, because it is always known as being owned by the Yid (the owner), and the goy will do melacha there on Shabbos and Yom Tov, and people will assume that the melacha is being done on behalf of the Yid.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** The Braisa seems to suggest that renting to a Kuti would be mutar. But, a Kuti does melacha on Chol Hamoed, and we should therefore have the same concern – that he will do melacha on Chol Hamoed in the bathhouse and people will assume that it is being done on behalf of the Yid!? **A:** The melachos needed to be done in a bathhouse are mutar for a Yid to do on Chol Hamoed as well. Therefore, there is no issue with renting to them.
- **Q:** The Braisa seems to suggest that it would not be a problem to rent a field to a goy (assuming it did not run afoul of the gezeiros in the Mishna), because even if the goy does melacha there on Shabbos and Yom Tov, people know that a field is given to sharecroppers and will assume that the goy is a sharecropper, and is not doing the melacha on behalf of the Yid. Why don't we say that regarding a bathhouse as well, people will say that the goy is involved in some of profit sharing arrangement, and therefore is doing the melacha on his own behalf? **A:** Such an arrangement is not typically done for bathhouses, and therefore people will assume that any melacha done is being done on behalf of the Yid.
- A Braisa says, **R' Shimon ben Elazar** said, a Yid may not rent his field to a Kuti, because it remains to be known as the field of the owner, and this Kuti will do melacha in the field on Chol Hamoed.
  - **Q:** The Braisa suggests that renting a field to a goy would be mutar, because when people see the goy doing work, they will assume that the goy is a sharecropper in the field. Why don't we say that when a Kuti does work in the field they will also assume that he is a sharecropper and any work he does is on his own behalf? **A:** **R' Shimon ben Elazar** does not hold that people will assume that the goy is a sharecropper. Rather, the reason he allows renting to a goy is because he holds that if the Yid tells the goy not to do work on Shabbos, he will listen and will not do work. That is why we can rent a field to him. However, a Kuti will not listen when he is told not to work the field on Chol Hamoed, because he feels that he knows the halachos better than the Yid, and holds that working on Chol Hamoed is mutar.
    - **Q:** If so, why does he say that the reason it is assur is because it remains known as the field of the Yid? The reason it is assur is because of "lifnei iver" of having the Kuti work the field on Chol Hamoed!? **A:** Understand the Braisa as giving two reasons: one because of lifnei iver, and an additional reason, because it remains to be known as the field of the owner.

### -----Daf כב---22-----

- There was a Yid and a goy who together accepted the sharecropping of a field. The goy worked the field on Shabbos and the Yid worked it on Sunday. This arrangement was presented to **Rava** and he allowed it. **Ravina** asked **Rava**, a Braisa says that such an arrangement may not be done unless it was entered into at the time the sharecropping agreement was entered into!? **Rava** became embarrassed. It then became known that this arrangement had been entered into at the time of the sharecropper agreement. Therefore, **Rava's** ruling was correct.
  - **R' Geviha of Kasil** said, the case presented was where the Yid and goy arranged that the goy should get the fruits of the years of orlah and the Yid would get the fruits after the years of orlah. It was that case that was brought to **Rava**, and he permitted it.
    - **Q:** How can this have been the case when **Ravina** asked from a Braisa that discusses working on Shabbos!? **A:** **Ravina** taught the Braisa to support **Rava's** ruling, because it shows that when an arrangement is made at the onset, it is permitted.
      - **Q:** This can't be, because we are told that **Rava** became embarrassed!? **A:** That actually never happened.
  - **Q:** What is the halacha if the Yid and the goy never made an agreement with regard to Shabbos and they are now ready to divide the profits – can the Yid not say anything and simply take half the profits or must he make some concession to account for Shabbos? **A:** The Braisa said that it is mutar if they made the arrangement initially. This suggests that if no arrangement was made it would be assur.
    - **Q:** The Braisa continued and said that if at the time of division of profits they specifically say that the goy will take the Shabbos profits and the Yid will instead get the profits of a different day, it is assur. This suggests that if nothing at all is said it would be mutar!? **A:** Rather, no proof can be brought from this Braisa.

# Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

HADRAN ALACH PEREK LIFNEI IDEIHEN!!!

PEREK EIN MAAMIDIN -- PEREK SHEINI

## MISHNA

- We may not leave animals in the stables of an inn owned by a goy, because they are suspected regarding bestiality. We may also not seclude women with a goy, because they are suspected regarding zenus. We may not even seclude a Jewish man with them, because they are suspected regarding murder of Jews.

## GEMARA

- **Q:** A Braisa says, we may buy animals from goyim even if we intend to use these animals as a korbon, and we are not concerned that the goy was mezaneh with the animal or that he designated it or used it for avoda zara. Now, we can understand why we don't have the concern regarding avoda zara, because if he had designated it or used it for avoda zara he would not sell it to a Yid. However, why is there no concern for bestiality? **A: R' Tachlifa in the name of R' Shila bar Avina in the name of Rav** said, a goy would not be mezaneh with his own animal, out of concern that he would cause it to be unable to produce offspring.
  - **Q:** That makes sense why we could buy a female animal from them, but why can we buy a male animal from them? **A: R' Kahana** said, bestiality between a man and a male animal causes the animal to become weak, and therefore a goy would not do that to his own animal.
  - **Q:** A Braisa allows purchasing an animal from the goy's shepherd. Now, since it is not the shepherd's animal, why are we not concerned for bestiality? **A:** He is afraid to be mezaneh with the animal, because if he were to be caught he would lose his money.
    - **Q:** If so, why does a Braisa say that it is assur to give an animal to be cared for by a non-Jewish shepherd (because of lifnei iver for bestiality)? We should say that he would be afraid to be mezaneh with the animal for this reason!? **A:** He is afraid of a goy finding out, because he knows that all goyim engage in bestiality and therefore may end up finding out. He does not know that Yidden know that goyim act in this way, and therefore he is not afraid that the Yid will find out.
  - **Q:** We should not be allowed to buy male animals from female goyim out of concern that she was mezaneh with it!? **A:** She is scared to do that with the animal, because the animal would then follow her around and people would realize that she must have been mezaneh with this animal.
    - **Q: R' Yosef** taught a Braisa that says that a widow may not have a dog (out of fear that she will be mezaneh with it) and may not host the talmidim (for fear of zenus with them). Now, based on what we just said, there should only be a concern with the talmidim, but with the dog, since if she is mezaneh with it, it will cling to her and people will find out, she would not be mezaneh!? **A:** She is not concerned if the dog clings to her, because people will say it is clinging to her because she threw it a piece of meat (others animals don't eat meat and therefore any clinging to her would be because she was mezaneh with it).
  - **Q:** Why can't we leave female animals in the stables of an inn owned by a goy (which a Braisa had said is assur)? **A: Mar Ukva bar Chama** said, it is because a goy is often found by his friend's wife. At times he will go to visit her and she won't be there, and he will see the Yid's animal and be mezaneh with it. **A2:** Even if he finds her there he will choose to be mezaneh with a Yid's animal rather than the woman, as we have been taught elsewhere, and as **R' Yochanan** has said that the snake put an impurity into Chava that caused that people should have the desire for things that are assur – like bestiality.
    - **Q:** If so, why doesn't this impurity affect Yidden as well? **A:** Yidden were rid of this impurity when they stood at Har Sinai. Goyim were not there and therefore continue to have the impurity.
  - **Q:** Are we allowed to leave birds at the inn of a goy or is there a concern for zenus with birds as well? **A:** We have learned that **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel in the name of R' Chanina** said that he

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

saw a goy buy a bird, be mezaneh with it, strangle it, roast it, and then ate it. We see that zenus is even a concern by birds as well.

### -----Daf 23-----

- The Mishna said that goyim are suspected of bestiality. The Gemara brought a Braisa that said we may buy animals from a goy for purposes of a korban, which suggests that they are not suspected of bestiality. The Gemara brought an answer of **Rav**. The Gemara now moves on to other answers.
  - **Ravina** said, the Mishna is discussing the halacha l'chatchila, and the Braisa is discussing the halacha b'dieved. We can prove that there is a difference between l'chatchila and b'dieved from another part of our Mishna. The Mishna says it is assur for a woman to seclude with goyim because they are suspected regarding zenus. Now, another Mishna says that if a woman is taken prisoner by goyim, if she was imprisoned regarding a monetary matter, she is mutar to her husband when she is released. If she was imprisoned because of a capital matter, she is assur to her husband when she is released. Now, if they are suspect regarding zenus she should be assur in the first case as well!? Rather, we see that there is a difference between l'chatchila (which is the subject of our Mishna) and b'dieved (which is the subject of the Braisa).
    - The Gemara says, this is no proof. It may be that the reason she remains mutar to her husband when she was captured for a monetary matter is that they will not be mezaneh with her for fear of losing the money they seek to get. Therefore, it does not prove that b'dieved is different than l'chatchila.
  - **R' Pedas** said, the Mishna follows the view of **R' Elazar** and the Braisa follows the view of the **Rabanan**, of a Mishna. The Mishna regarding para adumah says, **R' Eliezer** says the para adumah may not be purchased from goyim and the **Rabanan** say that it may. Presumably, the machlokes is that **R' Eliezer** says we must be concerned for bestiality among the goyim and the **Rabanan** say that we are not concerned for that.
    - **Q:** Who says that this is the basis for their machlokes? It may be that they all agree that we need not be concerned for bestiality. The machlokes is whether we must be concerned that the goy placed a small item on the cow, which according to **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** would make the cow passul. **R' Eliezer** says we must be concerned for this and the **Rabanan** say that we need not be concerned for this! **A:** Even **R' Eliezer** would agree that there is no concern for this, because a goy would not risk losing the substantial profit he stands to make from a para adumah, just for putting a small item on it.
      - **Q:** Using that same logic we should say that a goy would not commit bestiality with the cow and risk his substantial profit!? **A:** Regarding bestiality he has his yetzer harah that takes hold of him and doesn't let him logically consider the monetary risk.
    - **Q:** Who says that this is the basis for their machlokes? A Braisa taught by **Shila** says, the reason for **R' Eliezer** is based on the pasuk of "dabeir ehl Bnei Yisrael v'yikchu eilecha", from which he learns that the para adumah must be purchased from a Yid, and not a goy!? **A:** The end of that Mishna regarding para adumah says that **R' Eliezer** similarly says that all korbanos purchased from goyim are passul. Now, if his reason is solely based on **Shila**, all other korbanos should not become passul. Rather, we must say that **R' Eliezer's** reason is that he holds that goyim are suspected of committing bestiality.
    - **Q:** Maybe the **Rabanan** only argue with **R' Eliezer** regarding a para adumah, since it is so valuable the goyim will not be mezaneh with it. However, maybe they agree that goyim are suspected with regard to other korbanos? **A:** If so, who is the view in the Braisa that says that we may buy animals from them for korbanos? It would not be the view of **R' Eliezer** or the **Rabanan**!? Also, a Braisa clearly says that the **Rabanan** hold that animals of goyim may be used for all korbanos, based on a pasuk.
    - **Q:** With regard to para adumah they only argue when there is a concern that bestiality was done. However, if we knew that the cow was used for zenus all would agree that the animal

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

would be passul for para adumah. Maybe we can say that this proves that the para adumah is considered to be “kodshei Mizbe’ach”, because if it is only in the category of “kodshei bedek habayis” (and only has monetary kedusha) it would not become passul because of zenus? **A:** The Gemara says this is no proof. It may be that it only has monetary kedusha. However, since the pasuk refers to the para adumah as a “chatas” it becomes passul if it was used for zenus.

- **Q:** If so, it should likewise become passul if was born in an unnatural way (through a cesarean section), just as a chatas would, and yet a Braisa says that **R’ Shimon** says it would not be passul in that case!? **A:** Rather, although the para adumah only has monetary kedusha, since it becomes passul with a mum, it similarly becomes passul with matters of zenus and avoda zara. This is based on the pasuk that says “ki mash’chasam bahem mum bam”, which equates a mum with “hash’chasa”, and **R’ Yishmael** taught a Braisa which learns from pesukim that “hash’chasa” refers to matters of zenus and to matters of avoda zara.