



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

### Avodah Zarah Daf Mem Hey

#### MISHNA

- If goyim worship mountains or hills, the mountains and hills remain mutar, but what is on them (e.g. the coverings of silver or gold that the goyim put on them) are assur, based on the pasuk of "lo sachmod kesef v'zahav aleyhem". **R' Yose Haglili** says, the pasuk of "eloheyhem ahl heharim" teaches that the mountains themselves are not considered avoda zara, and "eloheyhem...ahl hagva'os" teaches that the hills themselves are not considered to be avoda zara. If so, why is an asheira tree assur (the pasuk also says "under every green tree", which should similarly be darshened to teach that the tree itself is not assur)? It is because there is human involvement (a human planted the tree) and anything in which there is human involvement can become assur. **R' Akiva** said, I will explain the pasuk as follows. The Torah is telling the Yidden, when you enter EY you should know that wherever you find a mountain, a hill, or a green tree, there will be an avoda zara there.

#### GEMARA

- **Q: R' Yose Haglili** seems to be saying the same thing as the **T"K**? **A: Rami bar Chama in the name of Reish Lakish** said, the machlokes would be regarding the coverings of these mountains (the silver and gold that the goyim covered the mountain with). According to the **T"K** it does not have the status of the mountain itself, and will therefore be assur, but according to **R' Yose Haglili** it gets the status of the mountain itself and is therefore also mutar. **R' Sheishes** said all would hold that the covering would not have the status of the mountain itself and would therefore be assur. The machlokes is regarding a tree that was planted without intent to make it into avoda zara, but the goy later worshipped it as avoda zara. The **T"K** holds such a tree is mutar and **R' Yose Haglili** holds it is assur. We can learn that this is the view of **R' Yose** from his last statement in the Mishna where he says "and anything in which there is human involvement can become assur". That phrase is coming to include something – it is coming to include the case of a tree that was planted without intent for avoda zara but was then later worshipped.
  - **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda** holds that such a tree is assur as well. In a Braisa he says, we would think to darshen "v'tachas kol eitz raanan" like we darshen "eloheyhem ahl heharim" and "eloheyhem ahl hagva'os", and should learn that the tree itself can never become assur. The pasuk therefore says "va'asheyreyhem tisrifun ba'eish", which teaches that the trees must be burned. If they must be burned, we obviously cannot darshen "v'tachas kol eitz raanan" to teach that the tree itself is mutar. Now, since he does not use this pasuk to teach that only trees planted with intent for avoda zara are assur, we see that he holds like **R' Yose Haglili**.
    - **Q:** If so, what does the pasuk of "v'tachas kol eitz raanan" come to teach? **A:** It teaches like **R' Akiva** in our Mishna.
    - **Q:** How does the **T"K** of our Mishna darshen "va'asheyreyhem tisrifun ba'eish"? **A:** They use it to teach that only a tree that was planted with intent for avoda zara becomes assur.
    - **Q: R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda** also needs the pasuk to teach this, so how does he know that even a tree planted without such intent can become assur through worship? **A:** He learns it from "va'asheyreyhem tigadeyun", which, by saying that the tree must be "cut", seems to be referring to a tree whose roots would be mutar, but whose growth would be assur. This must refer to a tree that was planted without intent for avoda zara and was then worshipped. The Torah says that the original growth is mutar, and the growth that happened after the worship becomes assur.

- **Q:** The Braisa said that the source for **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda's** view was the pasuk of "va'asheyreyhem tisrifun ba'eish", not the pasuk of "tigadeyun"! **A:** In the Braisa **R' Yose** was saying, if the Torah would not have written the pasuk of "va'asheyreyhem tisrifun ba'eish", we would have said that the pasuk of "tigadeyun" refers to a tree that was planted with intent for avoda zara. Now that the Torah wrote the pasuk of "va'asheyreyhem tisrifun ba'eish", the pasuk of "tigadeyun" is extra, and therefore comes to teach that even a tree that was planted without intent for avoda zara, but was later worshipped, also becomes assur.
- **Q:** How do the **Rabanan** who argue (and say that a tree planted without intent for avoda zara is mutar) darshen the pasuk of "tigadeyun"? **A:** They use it for the teaching of **R' Yehoshua ben Levi**, who says that the mitzvah of "cutting down" avoda zara in EY precedes the mitzvah of conquering EY, and the mitzvah of conquering EY precedes the mitzvah to "eradicate" avoda zara in EY. This was taught by **R' Yosef** in a Braisa where he said that the pasuk of "v'nitztem es mizbichosam" means you should break them and leave them there, and "v'shibartem es matzeyvosam" means you should smash them and leave them there. **R' Huna** explains this to mean that after breaking them, go and chase their worshippers. Only after that should you return and burn the pieces to eradicate them.
  - **Q:** How will **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda** learn this concept (regarding precedence of the mitzvos)? **A:** He learns it from the pasuk of "abeid t'abdun", which teaches that they should be destroyed and then later destroyed again. The **Rabanan** would use this pasuk to teach that one who destroys an avoda zara must make sure to uproot it.
  - **Q:** How will **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda** learn this concept? **A:** He will learn it from the pasuk of "v'ibadtem es shemam min hamakom hahu". The **Rabanan** will use this pasuk to teach that one should give an avoda zara a derogatory nickname.