



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

Avodah Zarah Daf Mem Tes

- The Gemara just explained the Mishna in a way which results that **R' Yose** holds that when an assur and mutar thing combine to produce an item, the item is assur.
 - **Q:** How can this be? In a Mishna regarding Orlah **R' Yose** says that when an assur and mutar thing combine to produce a new tree it is mutar!? You can't answer that it is only regarding the stringent area of avoda zara that **R' Yose** says such an item would be assur, because with regard to a field that was fertilized with fertilizer of avoda zara or a cow that was fattened with food of avoda zara, there is one Braisa that says they are mutar and one Braisa that says they are assur. Presumably, the Braisa that says they are mutar follows **R' Yose** and the one that says they are assur follows the **Rabanan**. This means that **R' Yose** says the item is mutar even when avoda zara is one of the factors!?
A: We can say that the Braisa that says they are assur follows **R' Eliezer** and the Braisa that says they are mutar follows the **Rabanan**, based on a machlokes in a Mishna.
 - **Q:** Where do we find these views of **R' Eliezer and the Rabanan**? It can't be from the following Mishna regarding yeast, which says that when yeast of chullin and yeast of terumah fell into a dough, each one by itself not being large enough to make the dough rise, but together making the dough rise, **R' Eliezer** says we look at whichever yeast fell in last: if the terumah fell in last, the dough becomes assur to a non-Kohen, but if the chullin fell in last it is mutar. The **Chachomim** say that the order doesn't matter, rather if there is not enough issur to cause the dough to rise, it will not become assur. **Abaye** explained that **R' Eliezer** only holds that way when the terumah yeast was removed. However, if both yeasts remain in the dough, the dough is assur because a combination of 2 things, one of which is assur, is also assur. This would seem to show that **R' Eliezer** holds that when an assur and mutar thing combine to produce an item, the item is assur! This can't be the source of his view, because maybe the reason of **R' Eliezer** is not like **Abaye** says. Maybe it is because he follows whatever fell in last, whether or not the terumah was removed! **A:** Rather, the view of **R' Eliezer** can be seen in the following Mishna. The Mishna discusses using wood of an asheirah tree (which is assur b'hana'ah). The Mishna says that if one fired up a new oven (that was never before fired up) with asheirah wood, the oven must be crushed. If it is used in an old oven, it must be left to cool down. If bread was baked in the oven (either the new oven at any time after the asheira wood was put in, or in an old oven before it was left to cool down) the bread becomes assur b'hana'ah, and if the bread becomes mixed in others, they all become assur b'hana'ah. **R' Eliezer** agrees that the oven becomes assur but says that one may "redeem" that assur benefit onto money and dispose of the money. The **Rabanan** say that one can't redeem avoda zarah. We see that **R' Eliezer** holds that when an assur and mutar thing combine to produce an item (i.e. the bread), the item is assur.
 - **Q:** Where do we find the view of the **Rabanan**? It can't be the view of the **Rabanan** in the Mishna regarding the asheira wood, because they are even more machmir than **R' Eliezer**!? **A:** Rather, it must be the view of the **Rabanan** in the Mishna regarding the yeast.
 - **Q:** Maybe the **Rabanan** are only meikel in the case of yeast, but would not be likewise meikel in the case of avoda zara!? **A:** Rather, we can say that the Braisa (from the beginning of this Daf) that says that the field fertilized with avoda zara and the cow fattened with avoda zara are

mutar, follows **R' Yose**, whereas the second Braisa that says they are assur follows the **Rabanan**. We will then have to explain our Mishna as **R' Yose** saying to the **Rabanan**, "According to me, I hold that when assur and mutar things combine to produce an item, the item is mutar, and therefore it is mutar to plant vegetables under an asheira tree in the winter. However, according to you, who hold that when assur and mutar things combine to produce an item, the item is assur, you must also say that it is assur to plant vegetables under an asheira tree even in the winter (because the falling leaves act as fertilizer for the vegetables)! The **Rabanan** however hold like **R' Mari the son of R' Kahana**, that the detriment of the shade cancels out the benefit of the leaves.

- **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** paskened like **R' Yose**.
 - There was a garden that was fertilized with fertilizer of avoda zara. **R' Amram** asked **R' Yosef** whether it was mutar. He answered, that **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** paskened like **R' Yose**, and therefore it is mutar.

MISHNA

- If a person took branches from an asheira tree, they are assur b'hana'ah. If one fired up a new oven (that was never before fired up) with asheirah wood, the oven must be crushed. If it is used in an old oven, it must be left to cool down. If bread was baked in the oven (either the new oven at any time after the asheira wood was put in, or in an old oven before it was left to cool down) the bread becomes assur b'hana'ah, and if the bread becomes mixed in others, they all become assur b'hana'ah. **R' Eliezer** (agrees that the oven becomes assur but) says that one may "redeem" that assur benefit onto money and dispose of the money. The **Rabanan** said to him that one can't redeem avoda zarah.
- If a person took a splinter to use as a tool used by a weaver, the splinter is assur b'hana'ah. If a garment was woven using it, the garment becomes assur b'hana'ah. If the garment becomes mixed among others, and those others becomes mixed in others, they are all assur b'hana'ah. **R' Eliezer** says that one may "redeem" that assur benefit onto money and dispose of the money. The **Rabanan** said to him that one can't redeem avoda zarah.

GEMARA

- Both these cases are necessary to be given. If we only had the first case we would say that only in that case **R' Eliezer** says the benefit can be "redeemed" because when the bread is completed the wood was already totally destroyed, but in the case of the woven garments, the splinter still exists throughout and therefore maybe he would say it is assur. If we only had the second case we would say that the **Rabanan** say it is assur in that case only because the splinter remains in existence throughout, but in the first case where the wood is destroyed, maybe they would agree with **R' Eliezer**.
- **R' Chiya the son of Rabbah bar Nachmeini in the name of R' Chisda in the name of Ze'iri** said, that the halacha follows **R' Eliezer** (that the benefit can be "redeemed").
 - **R' Ada bar Ahava** said, this is only in the case of the bread (and the weaving, where in both cases the issur is not recognizable in the item). However, if there is a barrel of yayin nesech mixed among barrels of wine, we would not allow the owner to redeem the value of the yayin nesech. **R' Chisda** said, that even in that case we would allow him to do so. We find that **R' Chisda** actually paskened this way in practice in a case that was brought before him.

MISHNA

- How is one mevatel an asheira tree? If he removed dry branches from it (to use as firewood) or moist branches (for his own use), or he took a stick, or a twig, or even a leaf from it, it becomes batel. If he took off even a small piece, but did so for the benefit of the tree, it remains assur. If the person did so for his own purpose, it becomes mutar.

GEMARA

- **Q:** When a small piece is removed for the benefit of the tree itself, what is the halacha regarding the piece that was removed? **A:** There is a machlokes between **R' Huna and Chiya bar Rav** – one said it is assur and the other said it is mutar.
 - A Braisa says like the view that the piece is mutar. The 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.
- We have learned with regard to an avoda zara that broke on its own, **Rav** said he must be mevatel each and every piece. **Shmuel** said (as explained by the Gemara) that an avoda zara that broke on its own only needs to be made batel if it broke in the course of its natural growth.
 - **Q:** Maybe the machlokes between them is that **Rav** says goyim even worship the pieces of a broken avoda zara and **Shmuel** holds that they don't? **A:** It may be that all agree that they even worship the broken pieces. The machlokes here may be regarding a case where the broken pieces were further broken into smaller pieces. **Rav** says that they even worship those, and **Shmuel** says they do not. **A2:** We can say that all would agree that when broken pieces were further broken into smaller pieces they are mutar. They argue regarding an avoda zara that is made of pieces that can be put together even by one who is not an expert. In this case **Rav** says that since anyone can put it together it does not become batul, and **Shmuel** holds that since this did not come apart in its course of natural growth, it is mutar and doesn't need to be made batel.

HADRAN ALACH PEREK KOL HATZLAMIM!!!