



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

Avodah Zarah Daf Lamed Ches

- **R' Shmuel bar Yitzchak in the name of Rav** said, anything that can be eaten raw is not assur if it is cooked by a goy. In Pumbedisa they said, **R' Shmuel bar Yitzchak in the name of Rav** said, anything that is not significant enough to be found on the table of kings is not assur if it is cooked by a goy.
 - The difference between these versions is small fish, mushrooms, and cereal (they are not eaten raw, but are also not found on the tables of kings).
- **R' Assi in the name of Rav** said, small, salted fish are not subject to the issur of bishul akum.
 - **R' Yosef** said, if a goy roasted them, they may be used for the eiruv (since it was edible before the roasting, it is not assur as bishul akum). However, if a goy made fish fried in fats and flour, it may not be used for the eiruv (since it may not be eaten).
 - **Q:** This would seem obvious!? **A:** We would think to say that the fats is the main ingredient, and since that is not subject to bishul akum it should be allowed for the eiruv. **R' Yosef** teaches that the flour is the main ingredient, and therefore it is subject to bishul akum and assur to use for the eiruv.
- **R' Bruna in the name of Rav** said, if a goy lit a field on fire, all the grasshoppers that get roasted by this fire are assur
 - **Q:** Why are they assur? It can't be talking about where he is not sure which are the kosher grasshoppers, because then it would be assur even if a Yid had lit the fire. It also can't mean that it is assur as "bishul akum", because **R' Chanan bar Ami in the name of R' Pedas in the name of R' Yochanan** said that when the goy cooks something without the intent to cook it (e.g. he burns the head of an animal to remove its hair, but in the process the meat now became edible) it is not assur as bishul akum. This goy who lit the field to clear it, and did not intend to roast the grasshoppers, should not make them assur as bishul akum!? **A:** The reason it is assur is because he can no longer recognize which is kosher and which is not. The reason he gave the case of where the goy lit the field is because that is how the incident actually took place.
 - **Ravina** said, based on the ruling of **R' Chanan bar Ami in the name of R' Pedas in the name of R' Yochanan**, if a goy fires up an oven to dry a keili or something with the fire, and the Yid had previously buried a gourd in the oven before it was fired up, the gourd may be eaten when it is cooked.
 - **Q:** This seems obvious!? **A:** We would think that he intends to "cook" the keili to dry it, and therefore any food that also gets cooked from that fire should become assur as bishul akum. He therefore teaches that he intends to harden the keili, not cook it, and the food is therefore mutar.
- **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, if a Yid puts meat on top of coals and a goy passed by and turned it over on the coals, the meat is mutar.
 - **Q:** What is the case? If we say that it would have been cooked without the goy turning it over, then it is obvious that it is mutar!? If it would not have been cooked had he not turned it over, then why is it mutar? **A:** The case is that the goy's turning it over quickened the cooking. We would have thought that this act is therefore significant enough to make it assur. **Shmuel** teaches that it is mutar.
 - **Q:** **R' Assi in the name of R' Yochanan** said, that if a Yid cooked food like the cooking of "Ben Drusai" (which generally means it is cooked 1/3 of normal cooking) then it does not become assur as bishul akum if a goy cooks it after that, but if it was cooked for less than that it would become assur. This seems to contradict **Shmuel** who doesn't seem to care how much the Yid had cooked the meat before the goy turned it over!? **A:** **R' Assi** is talking about a case where the

Yid took it off the fire and a goy then put it back onto the fire (the Yid's cooking came to an end). In **Shmuel's** case the meat would have continued cooking even without the goy turning it over. That is the difference.

- A Braisa says this as well. The Braisa says, as long as the Yid put the food on the fire, a goy can then stir or turn over the food and it would not be a problem.
- **Q:** What if a goy put the meat on the fire and a Yid came and turned it over? **A: R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, it is mutar based on a kal v'chomer – if it is mutar when a goy finishes the cooking, it will definitely be mutar when a Yid finishes the cooking.
 - We have learned this as well in a ruling of **Rabbah bar bar Chana in the name of R' Yochanan**, who said that when a Yid placed it there and a goy turned it, or if a goy placed it there and a Yid turned it, it is mutar. It is only assur when the goy begins and completes the cooking.
 - **Ravina** said, therefore, with regard to bread, if a goy lit the oven and a Yid puts the bread in, or visa-versa, or even if the goy lights it and puts the bread in but the Yid stirred the coals, the bread is mutar.
 - With regard to fish salted by a goy (which, because of the salt, no longer needs to be cooked), **Chizkiya** said it is mutar (this is not called cooking) and **R' Yochanan** said it is assur. With regard to an egg roasted by a goy, **Bar Kappara** said it is mutar (since the shell prevents the goy from actually touching the food that is eaten) and **R' Yochanan** said it is assur. **R' Dimi** said that regarding salted fish and roasting an egg, **Chizkiya and Bar Kappara** said it is mutar and **R' Yochanan** said it is assur.
 - **R' Chiya Parva'ah** was asked by the Reish Galusa regarding the halacha of an egg roasted by a goy. He said that **Chizkiya and Bar Kappara** said it is mutar and **R' Yochanan** said it is assur and we follow the view of the two against the single view. **R' Zvid** told them that this is incorrect, because **Abaye** said we follow the stringent view of **R' Yochanan**. The people of the Reish Galusa then poisoned **R' Zvid** for being stringent, and he died.
- A Braisa says, “kafrisin” (the shell of the “tzlaf” fruit, which can be eaten raw but is also eaten cooked), leek (which is eaten raw), “hemtalya”, hot water (which doesn't change form when cooked), and dried grain (which also doesn't change form), of goyim, are mutar. An egg roasted by a goy is assur. With regard to the oil of a goy, **R' Yehuda Hanasi** and his Beis Din were matir it.
 - A Braisa gives other names for “hemtalya”, and then explains based on a story that it is a mixture of seeds placed into warm water and the shoots that grow from them are then eaten.
- A Braisa says, the date residue (used to make beer by pouring hot water on it) of goyim, if the water used on them was cooked in a large pot it is assur. If it was cooked in a small pot it is mutar.
 - **R' Yannai** explained, a “small pot” means it is not large enough for a small “dror” bird to go into it (so there is no concern that the pot was used to cook non-kosher things).
 - **Q:** Maybe they cut up the bird and put it in!? **A:** Rather, if it is so small that the *head* of the dror cannot fit in, there is no concern.
 - **Q:** Another Braisa says that it is mutar whether a large pot or a small pot is used!? **A:** The first Braisa holds that “nosein taam lifgam” is assur and this Braisa holds that it is mutar.
- **R' Sheishes** said, oil that is cooked by a goy is assur. **R' Safra** argued and said that it is not assur, for the following reasons. There is no concern that wine was mixed in, because that would make the oil spoil; there is no concern for bishul akum, because oil can be eaten in its raw state; and there is no concern that the non-kosher pots used to cook the oil caused non-kosher flavors to go into the oil, because nosein taam lifgam is mutar.
- They asked **R' Assi**, what is the halacha regarding dates that were cooked by a goy? Sweet ones are for sure mutar because they are eaten raw. Bitter ones are for sure

assur, because they are only eaten cooked. What about the ones in between? **R' Assi** said, this is not a question, because **Levi** has said that they are assur.

- With regard to “shesisa’ah” (flour made from dried kernels), **Rav** said it is mutar and the father of **Shmuel and Levi** said it is assur.
 - If it is made of wheat or barley all would agree that it is mutar (because it is never made with vinegar). If it is made of lentils with vinegar, all would agree that it is assur. The machlokes is when it is made of lentils and water, and the machlokes is whether we have to be goizer for the case of when it is made with lentils and vinegar. **Others** say that all would be goizer in that case, and the machlokes is when it is made of wheat and barley, and the machlokes is whether we must be goizer in that case as well.
 - The Gemara says that “nowadays” people buy this from goyim and are not concerned for the view of the father of **Shmuel and Levi**.

UKVASHIN SHEDARKAN LASEIS B'SOCHAN YAYIN

- **Chizkiya** said, this is only mutar b'hana'ah when it is the custom to put in wine or vinegar, but it is not known if it was actually added. However, if it is known to have been added it would even be assur b'hana'ah.
 - **Q:** Why is this different than muryas, which the **Rabanan** said is mutar b'hana'ah even though it has wine in it? **A:** In that case the wine is added to remove the bad smell. In this case the wine is added to give it a good taste.
 - **R' Yochanan** argued and said that even if it is known to have been added it would be mutar b'hana'ah.
 - **Q:** Why is this different than muryas, which **R' Meir** said is assur b'hana'ah? **A:** The wine in the muryas is eaten along with the muryas. The wine in the preserves is not eaten along with the preserved vegetables.