



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

### Avodah Zarah Daf Mem Aleph

#### PEREK KOL HATZLAMIM -- PEREK SHLISHI

##### MISHNA

- **R' Meir** says that all images (of a full or partial human) are assur (even b'hana'ah) because they are worshipped once a year. The **Chachomim** say, no image is assur unless it has in its hand a staff, a bird, or a ball. **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** says, an image that has anything in its hand is assur.

##### GEMARA

- **Q:** If all images are worshipped once a year, why is it that the **Rabanan** say they are not assur?  
**A:** **R' Yitzchak bar Yosef in the name of R' Yochanan** said, where **R' Meir** lived they would worship such things once a year, and because **R' Meir** is concerned for the minority he was goizer all other places because of this place. The **Rabanan** are not concerned for the minority and were therefore not goizer.
- **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, the Mishna is referring to statues of kings. **Rabbah bar Chana in the name of R' Yochanan** said, this is when these images are placed at the entrance to the city.
- **Rabbah** said, the machlokes between **R' Meir and the Rabanan** is regarding images in the villages, but all agree that images in the large cities are mutar, because they are made only to beautify the city.
  - **Q:** In the villages all would agree that they are made to worship, so if the machlokes is regarding the villages, how do the **Rabanan** say that they are not assur!? **A:** Rather, it must be that **Rabbah** said that the machlokes is regarding the images in the cities, but all would agree that the images erected in the villages are assur.

##### VACHACHOMIM OMRIM EINAN ASSURIN...

- Holding a staff is symbolic of the goyim saying that this image rules over the entire world. Holding a bird is symbolic of the image holding the entire world in his hand as one does a bird. Holding a ball is symbolic of the image holding the entire world in his hand as one does to a ball.
- A Braisa adds three things that if held by the image it makes it assur. They are: a sword, a crown, and a ring.
  - The Mishna didn't mention these, because originally the **Rabanan** thought that holding a sword only symbolizes that it is a robber, but they then realized that it symbolizes its domination over the world. With regard to the crown, they initially thought it symbolized one who makes wreaths, but they then realized that it symbolizes the crown of a king. With regard to a ring, initially they thought that it symbolizes the ring of a messenger. They then realized that it symbolizes domination and the signing of death for people.

##### R' SHIMON BEN GAMLIEL...

- A Braisa says, this is even if the image is holding a pebble or a splinter of wood.
  - **Q:** **R' Ashi** asked, what if the image is holding excrement? Does it symbolize that all are like excrement to the image, and the image is therefore assur, or does it symbolize that the image is like excrement in the eyes of everyone else? **TEIKU**.

##### MISHNA

- If a person finds the broken pieces of an image, they are mutar. If he found the form of a hand or of a foot they are assur, because such objects are worshipped.

- **Shmuel** said, even if one finds broken pieces of an avoda zara that was worshipped, they are mutar b'hana'ah.
  - **Q:** Our Mishna said that broken pieces of images are mutar, which suggests that broken pieces of an avoda zara would not be mutar!? **A:** The Mishna means to include broken pieces of avoda zara as well. The reason it speaks of broken images is because it wants to then give the case of the hand or foot, to teach that they would be assur.
  - **Q:** Why are the hand and foot assur? They are broken pieces and should therefore be mutar!? **A:** **Shmuel** explained the Mishna to be speaking of a hand or foot that was found on a pedestal (which indicates that they are worshipped as is).
- With regard to an avoda zara that broke on its own, **R' Yochanan** said it is assur b'hana'ah, because the owner was not mevatel it, and **Reish Lakish** said it is mutar, because when the owner sees it broken he is mevatel it and says – it can't even save itself, can I really think it will save me!?
  - **Q:** **R' Yochanan** asked **Reish Lakish**, the pasuk says that when the Plishtim saw their avoda zara lying on the floor with its head and hands broken they no longer would walk on that floor again. This shows that they are not mevatel the avoda zara even after it breaks!? **A:** **Reish Lakish** said, that is not a proof. The Plishtim said that the "power" that was in the avoda zara must have transferred from it to the floor, and they didn't step on the floor because they felt it now was the avoda zara.
  - **Q:** Our Mishna said that broken pieces of images are mutar, which suggests that broken pieces of an avoda zara would not be mutar and refutes **Reish Lakish**!? **A:** The inference should not be that broken pieces of avoda zara are assur, rather the inference is that images themselves are assur, and the Mishna is following the view of **R' Meir**.
  - **Q:** From the view of **R' Meir** we can understand the view of the **Rabanan**. If **R' Meir** holds that images are assur but broken pieces are mutar, then the **Rabanan** must hold that although an avoda zara is assur, broken pieces of an avoda zara are mutar. This refutes **R' Yochanan**!? **A:** The reason **R' Meir** holds that broken pieces of an image are mutar is because there is a "sfek sfeika" – there is a safek whether or not the image was ever worshipped, and even if it was, there is a safek that maybe the goy was mevatel it. That is why the broken pieces are mutar. However, with an avoda zara that is known to have been worshipped, there is only one safek, that maybe he was mevatel the avoda zara. This one safek is not enough to remove the certainty that this is avoda zara.
    - **Q:** Is it true that a safek cannot remove the status of something that is certain? A Braisa says, that if a "chaver" dies and leaves over a storehouse of produce, the produce is considered to be ready to eat (i.e. all ma'aser is assumed to have been given). Now, the produce had a definite status of "tevel", and yet, the possibility that the chaver gave ma'aser is enough to remove that definite status!? **A:** We say like **R' Chanina Choza'ah**, that a chaver has certainly given ma'aser from anything in his possession. Therefore, it is a certainty that is changing the original, certain status. **A2:** It is only a possibility that it was tevel, because **R' Oshaya** says that a person can bring his produce into his house before the threshing and in that way circumvent the ma'aser obligation. Based on that, it is only a possibility that the produce is tevel, and therefore, the possibility that he gave ma'aser can change the status of the possible tevel.
    - **Q:** Is it true that a safek cannot remove the status of something that is certain? A Braisa says, **R' Yehuda** said, there was a story where a woman threw a stillborn into a ditch, and a Kohen bent over the ditch (possibly making himself an "ohel" over the stillborn) to determine if the stillborn was a boy or a girl (because there are different halachos of tumah and tahara depending on the gender of the child). Although the Kohen should have become tamei by doing so, the **Chachomim** said he was tahor, because there were weasels in that ditch (and we assume that the stillborn was dragged away before the Kohen bent over the ditch). In this case, the stillborn was definitely thrown into the ditch, and yet, the **Chachomim** said that the Kohen is tahor because of the possibility that the stillborn was dragged away!? **A:** The story was that the woman threw an afterbirth into the ditch, but it was not certain whether it had the status of a

child (in which case it would give off tumah) or not. Therefore, it never had the status of being certainly tamei. **A2:** It was certainly tamei, but it is also a certainty that the weasel dragged it away, because it does so immediately. One certainty can change the status of another certainty.

- **Q:** The Braisa says the Kohen bent over to see whether it was a boy or a girl. That means it surely developed enough to have the status of a child!? **A:** The Braisa means that the Kohen bent over to see whether the thing thrown in had the status of a child, and if it did, to see whether it was a male or a female.