



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

Avodah Zarah Daf Tes Zayin

AGALIM USYACHIM

- A Braisa says, **R' Yehuda** allows the sale of a broken animal, because it cannot be healed and live and is therefore certainly purchased for slaughter. The **Rabanan** said to him, it is possible that it is purchased to produce offspring, in which case it would continue to live and cause people to think that selling large animals to goyim is permitted. **R' Yehuda** said, when it gives birth you can make such a sale assur. The Gemara explains, **R' Yehuda** holds that a maimed animal will not mate.

BEN BESEIRA MATIR B'SUS

- A Braisa says, **Ben Beseira** allows the selling of a horse, because the work done with it is not the type of work for which a Yid would be chayuv a chatas if his animal did that work on Shabbos (a horse is used to ride on, and for such work a person would not be chayuv a chatas). **R' Yose** says it is assur for two reasons: a horse is considered to be a weapon, and it is considered to be a large animal.
 - **Q:** We can understand that it is considered to be a weapon, because it can kill with its hooves. What is meant that it is assur because "it is considered to be a large animal"? **A:** **R' Yochanan** said, when a horse gets old and can no longer carry people, it is used to turn the mill to grind, and the goy will have it do that on Shabbos.
 - **R' Yochanan** paskens like **Ben Beseira**.
- **Q:** What is the halacha regarding an ox that was fattened prior to sale (and is therefore not fit to work)? This can be asked according to **R' Yehuda** who allows the sale of a broken animal – maybe he allows that because it will never be able to do work, but a fattened animal could become fit for work if it is put on a proper diet, so maybe even **R' Yehuda** would agree that this is assur. This can also be asked according to the **Rabanan** who say that the sale of a broken animal is assur. Maybe they say that is assur, because a broken animal is too lean to be useful for slaughter, and therefore we have to be concerned that although it will not be kept for work, it will be kept for breeding. However, a fattened animal is presumably purchased strictly for slaughter and maybe therefore it would be mutar. What is the halacha? **A:** We find that **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, the house of **Rebbi** would have to bring a fattened ox to the king on their holiday. One year they used 40,000 coins to bribe them that they could bring it the day after the holiday. The next year they used 40,000 coins to bribe them that they could bring it already slaughtered. The third year they used 40,000 coins to bribe them to stop the requirement altogether. Now, why was it so important to **Rebbi** that he be able to bring it already slaughtered? Presumably, it was so that it not be possible for the king to keep it alive for an extended period, which would lead to people thinking it is mutar to sell or gift large animals to goyim. We see that even selling a fattened animal is considered to still be a problem!
 - This is no proof. Why did **Rebbi** spend all that money to delay bringing it to the day after the holiday? The reason is that **Rebbi** wanted to have the requirement of bringing it to be stopped altogether. He thought that his best chance at making that happen was to get it to happen in stages over time. Therefore, bringing it already slaughtered was part of a larger plan, not an end onto itself.
 - **Q:** If a fattened ox is given proper diet, will it actually be able to do work again? **A:** **R' Ashi** said, Zevida told me that such an animal can actually do double the amount of work as a regular animal.

MISHNA

- We may not sell to goyim – bears, lions, or anything that can cause damage to the rabim. We may not help them to build a "basilki" (a tall building in which they judge people and throw

people to their deaths), a “gardom” (a building used to judge capital cases), a stadium used for bull fighting, or a “bimah” (a tall, narrow building from which people would be pushed to their death). However, we may help them build their single-stone altars, and their bathhouses. When they reach the building of the dome, on which they put their avoda zara, it is assur to help them build that.

GEMARA

- **R’ Chanin bar R’ Chisda** (or **R’ Chanan bar Rava**) said that **Rav** said, a large chaya is treated as a small beheima with regard to the halachos of how much it has to move to be considered alive before the shechita, but is not treated like a small beheima with regard to the halachos of selling such animals to goyim (rather, it is always assur to sell large chayos to goyim). **R’ Chanin** himself said, large chayos are treated like small beheimos with regard to selling them to goyim as well – meaning, it is based on the custom of the place whether to allow it.
 - **Q:** Our Mishna said that the reason bears and lions may not be sold to them is because they cause damage. This suggests that large chayos that don’t cause damage may be sold to them. This supports **R’ Chanin** and refutes **Rav** (who said it would be assur)!? **A:** **Rabbah bar Ulla** said, the Mishna did not mean to allow the sale of chayos that do not cause damage, but rather meant to allow the sale of maimed chayos, like a maimed lion, and this follows the view of **R’ Yehuda**, who allows the sale of a maimed animal. **A2:** **R’ Ashi** said, a lion is always considered to be maimed with regard to work (it is never used to do work) and therefore **R’ Yehuda** would even allow the sale of a healthy lion. Therefore, our Mishna does not support **R’ Chanin**.
 - **Q:** A Braisa clearly says that even in places where the minhag is to allow the sale of small animals to goyim, it is still assur to sell large chayos to them. This is a **TEYUFTA of R’ Chanan bar Rav**.
 - **Ravina** asked regarding the contradiction between our Mishna and the Braisa, and then answered. Our Mishna says that we can’t sell them bears and lions, because they cause damage, which suggests that we may sell them things that don’t cause damage. The Braisa says that just as we may not sell them large beheimos, we may likewise not sell them large chayos, even in a place where the minhag is to allow the sale of small beheimos. This seems to not allow even chayos that don’t cause damage (e.g. they are tamed animals)!? **Ravina** answered, the Mishna meant to allow the sale of a maimed lion, according to the view of **R’ Yehuda**. **R’ Ashi** said, a lion is always considered to be maimed with regard to work (it is never used to do work) and therefore **R’ Yehuda** would even allow the sale of a healthy lion as long as it is not dangerous, and the Mishna follows the view of **R’ Yehuda**. The Braisa follows the view of the **Rabanan** who argue on **R’ Yehuda**.
 - **R’ Nachman** asked, who says that a lion is considered to be a “large chaya”? Maybe it is considered to be a “small chaya”, and if so, there is no contradiction between the Mishna and the Braisa.
 - The Gemara says, **R’ Ashi** made an inference from the Mishna that refuted **R’ Chanan**. The Mishna said that we can’t sell them bears and lions, because they cause damage, which suggests that we may sell them things that don’t cause damage. Further, the reason the Mishna gave the example of a lion is because a regular lion is considered “broken” with regard to doing work. This suggests, that other animals that could do work would always be assur to sell to goyim. This is a **TEYUFTA of R’ Chanan bar Rava**.
 - **Q:** What type of work can a large chaya do? **A:** **Abaye** said, **Mar Yehuda** told me that Mar Yochni would use wild donkeys to grind the millstones.
 - **R’ Zeira** said that in the yeshiva of **R’ Yehuda** they asked him who was the author of the ruling that says that a large chaya is treated like a small beheima with regard to the halachos of how much it has to move to be considered alive before the shechita – was it **Rav** or **Shmuel**. As **R’ Zeira** traveled he heard it repeated in the name of **Shmuel** and elsewhere in the name of **Rav**. He said, it must be that it was taught by both of them.