



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

### Avodah Zarah Daf Mem Beis

- The Gemara stated a machlokes 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:** Our Mishna says, if a person found the figure of a hand or a foot they are assur b'hana'ah, because such things are worshipped. Now, according to **Reish Lakish** they should be mutar because they are broken pieces of an avoda zara that broke on its own!? **A: Shmuel** has explained the Mishna to be referring to a hand or foot that is on its own pedestal. Therefore, they are worshipped, and are not simply broken pieces of an avoda zara.
  - **Q:** A Mishna says, a goy can be mevatel his own avoda zara and the avoda zara of another goy, but a Yid cannot be mevatel the avoda zara of a goy. Now, if the Yid breaks an avoda zara it should be no worse than an avoda zara that breaks on its own, and it should therefore also be mutar b'hana'ah according to **Reish Lakish**!? **A: Abaye** said, the Mishna is talking about where the Yid dented the avoda zara, but did not break it.
    - **Q:** Even denting the avoda zara should be enough to make it batel, because a Mishna says that denting alone is enough!? **A:** That Mishna is referring to where a goy dents it, but a Yid's denting it would not be enough.
    - **Rava** said that a Yid's denting would be enough to be mevatel an avoda zara. However, the **Rabanan** were goizer that a Yid can never be mevatel an avoda zara, as a gezeira that the Yid would first pick up the avoda zara (and thereby be koneh it) and then be mevatel it, in which case the bitul wouldn't work, because the avoda zara of a Yid cannot be made batel.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says, if a goy took stones from the Markulis avoda zara and used them to pave a road, the road is mutar to be used. If a Yid took stones from the Markulis avoda zara and used them to pave a road, the road is assur to be used. Now, the Yid's doing so should be no worse than an avoda zara that broke on its own, and therefore according to **Reish Lakish** it should be mutar!? **A:** Here too we will answer like **Rava**.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says, if a goy chips off a piece of an avoda zara (i.e. an asheira tree) for the goy's own needs, the chipped off piece and the avoda zara become mutar. If he did so for the purpose of caring for the avoda zara, the avoda zara remains assur but the chipped off piece is mutar. If a Yid chipped off a piece of an avoda zara, whether it was for the needs of the Yid or for the needs of the avoda zara, the piece and the avoda zara are assur. Now, the Yid's doing so should be no worse than an avoda zara that broke on its own, and therefore according to **Reish Lakish** it should be mutar!? **A:** Here too we will answer like **Rava**.
  - **Q:** A Mishna says, **R' Yose** says that a Yid may dispose of a metal avoda zara by grinding it into powder and throwing it into the wind. The **Chachomim** disagreed, because they said the powder will act as fertilizer, which will provide hana'ah. Now, the Yid's doing so should be no worse than an avoda zara that broke on its own, and therefore according to **Reish Lakish** it should be mutar!? **A:** Here too we will answer like **Rava**.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says, **R' Yose ben Yasyan** said, if a Yid found the figure of a dragon with its head cut off, and he is uncertain whether it was cut off by a goy or by a Yid, it is mutar. However, if he knows with certainty that it was done by a Yid, it is assur. Now, the Yid's doing so should be no worse than an avoda zara that broke on its own, and therefore according to **Reish Lakish** it should be mutar!? **A:** Here too we will answer like **Rava**.

- **Q:** A Mishna says, **R' Yose** says one may not plant vegetables under an asheira tree even in the winter, because the falling leaves of the tree fertilize the ground and provide a benefit for the vegetables. Now, this is like a case of where an avoda zara broke on its own, so according to **Reish Lakish** it should be mutar!? **A:** This case is different, because the main part of the avoda zara (the tree) remains in existence, that is why even the leaves area assur.
  - **Q:** The case stated above was where the person chipped off a piece of the tree, and the tree remained in existence, and yet the Braisa there said that although the tree remains assur the chipped off piece is mutar!? **A: R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua** said, the falling leaves happen in the natural course of the tree's growth. Things that happen in the natural course cannot make it batel.
- **Q: Reish Lakish** asked **R' Yochanan**, a Mishna says, if there is a nest on top of a tree of hekdesch, one may not have hana'ah from it, but would not be subject to me'ilah if he did. If there is a nest on top of an asheira tree, he may knock it down with a stick (and may then use the nest). Now, presumably the bird built this nest with twigs from this asheira tree, and yet the Mishna says that he may have hana'ah from the nest. This refutes **R' Yochanan** who says that when it breaks on its own it remains assur!? **A:** The Mishna is talking about where the bird brought twigs from elsewhere and built its nest on that tree. In fact, this must be the case, because if twigs of the tree were used, then why in the first case regarding hekdesch is he not subject to me'ilah if he has hana'ah from the nest? Clearly, the case is that the bird used twigs from elsewhere.
  - The Gemara says, this is no proof that the Mishna must be talking about twigs that came from elsewhere, because the Mishna may be discussing a nest built with twigs that grew after the tree was made hekdesch, and the Mishna holds that there is no me'ilah on something that grew after the item was made hekdesch.
  - **R' Avahu in the name of R' Yochanan** said, when the Mishna says that he may knock the nest down and use it, the Mishna means he may take the chicks that are inside the nest, but not that he may use the materials of the actual nest.
    - **R' Yaakov** said to **R' Yirmiya bar Tachlifa**, I will explain the Mishna according to the explanation of **R' Yochanan**. With regard to benefitting from the chicks in the nest, that would be mutar whether the tree is hekdesch or an asheira tree. With regard to eggs in the nest, they would be assur whether the tree is of hekdesch or an asheira tree (because they need the tree and the **Rabanan** were therefore goizer). **R' Ashi** added, chicks that need their mother are considered to be eggs for this purpose.

#### MISHNA

- If a person finds a keili that has the figure of the sun, the moon, or of a dragon on it, they must be thrown into the Yam Hamelech. **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** says, if they are on prestigious keilim they are assur. If they are on less than prestigious keilim they are mutar.

#### GEMARA

- **Q:** Does this mean that goyim only worship these three forms and nothing else? A Braisa says that if a goy shechts an animal for the sake of a malach who is appointed over mountains, or hills, or seas, or rivers, or the desert, or the sun, the moon, the stars or constellations, for the sake of Michael the great prince or for the sake of a tiny worm, the animal that was shechted is assur b'hana'ah. We see that goyim worship many forms!? **A: Abaye** said, with regard to worship, the goyim worship anything they can find. However, when making a keili with a form they would only do the form of the 3 listed in the Mishna. Any other form found on a keili is purely decorative.
- **R' Sheishes** would take the difficult Mishnayos and Braisos and teach them. He taught one of these Braisos as follows. The Braisa says, all portrayals of "mazalos" are mutar except for those of the sun and the moon. All portrayals of faces are mutar except for that of a human. All figures are mutar except for the figure of a dragon.

- **Q:** The Braisa said all portrayals of mazalos are mutar except for those of the sun and moon. What is being discussed? It can't be referring to making these portrayals, because the pasuk of "lo saasun iti" teaches that portrayals of all mazalos are assur!? **A:** Rather, it must be referring to finding something with these portrayals on it, in which case it is only assur when it is of the sun or moon. In this way the Braisa is agreeing with our Mishna.
  - **Q:** If the Braisa is referring to finding an item, that would mean the next part of the Braisa says that if something is found with portrayal of a human face it is assur. That would argue with our Mishna, which says that only the sun, moon, and a dragon are assur!? **A:** Rather, we must say that the Braisa is referring to *making* portrayals, and holds like **R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua** who says that making a portrayal of the human face is assur.
  - **Q:** If the Braisa is referring to *making* a portrayal, that would mean that the end of the Braisa is saying that the making of the figure of a dragon is assur. This can't be, because the pasuk of "lo saasun iti" teaches that only the making of the figures of mazalos are assur, not that of a dragon!? **A:** Rather, we must say that the Braisa is discussing finding an item with the figure of the dragon on it, and the Braisa follows our Mishna which says that such a keili is assur.
- **Q:** Based on all the above, are we to say that the beginning and end of the Braisa discuss the finding of an item and the middle part of the Braisa refers to the making of these portrayals!? **A:** **Abaye** said, that is what we must say. **Rava** said, the entire Braisa can be explained to be referring to the finding of items with these portrayals on it, and the Braisa follows the view of **R' Yehuda** in a Braisa who says, that also the portrayals of a nursing woman and of "Sar Apis" are assur (and the Braisa is referring to these human images when it says that it would be assur).
  - The form of a nursing woman would be assur, because that is meant to represent Chava, who "nursed" the entire world, and would be assur if the form is made holding a child and nursing the child. "Sar Apis" refers to the form of Yosef, which is assur if the form is made holding a measure and is measuring.