



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

### Avodah Zarah Daf Chuf Gimmel

- 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 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.