



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

Avodah Zarah Daf Nun

PEREK R' YISHMAEL -- PEREK REVI'I

MISHNA

- **R' Yishmael** says, if 3 stones are found one next to the other next to a Markulis avoda zara (Markulis is made by putting one stone on top of two other stones), they are assur. If there are only 2 next to the Markulis, they are mutar. The **Chachomim** say, the stones that seem to be with the Markulis are assur, and the ones that don't seem to be with it, are mutar.

GEMARA

- **Q:** The view of the **Rabanan** makes sense, because they must hold that goyim worship even pieces of an avoda zara. Therefore, when stones are found that appear to be from the Markulis, we say they were part of it and fell off, and are still worshipped, and are therefore assur. If they don't appear to come from it, we say they are mutar. However, what does **R' Yishmael** hold? If he holds that they worship even broken pieces, then even if there are only two stones they should be assur, and if he holds they do not, then even three should be mutar!? **A: R' Yitzchak bar Yosef in the name of R' Yochanan** said, if the stones are known to have fallen from the Markulis, all would agree that the stones are assur, because even according to the view that the goyim do not worship broken pieces, that is only true for an avoda zara that doesn't usually fall apart, but Markulis is made from separate pieces and therefore normally falls apart and would therefore remain assur. The machlokes is regarding stones which we don't know where they came from. Even then, if they are close enough that we can say they fell from the Markulis, all would agree that they are assur. The machlokes is regarding stones that are a bit distanced from the Markulis.
 - **Q:** The Mishna says the machlokes is regarding stones that are "next to Markulis"!? **A:** The Mishna means that the stones are within 4 amos of the Markulis, but not very close. In this case, **R' Yishmael** holds that the goyim make a smaller Markulis next to a larger Markulis. Therefore, when there are three stones, which is the number needed to make a Markulis, we say they are assur, but if there are only two we say they are mutar. The **Rabanan** hold that they don't make a smaller one next to a larger one. Therefore, it doesn't make a difference how many stones are there – if they appear to be from the Markulis they are assur, and if not they are mutar.
 - **Q: R' Yochanan** said that if the stones are known to have fallen from the Markulis, all would agree that the stones are assur, because broken pieces of a Markulis are definitely assur. A Braisa says that the machlokes between **R' Yishmael and the Rabanan** is even when the stones are known to have fallen from the Markulis. This refutes **R' Yochanan**!? **A: Rava** said, amend the Braisa to say that the machlokes is when the stones are found near the Markulis.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that **R' Yishmael** holds that even two stones are assur if they are "within the grasp of the Markulis", and three are assur even when they are further away. This refutes **R' Yochanan**!? **A: Rava** said, the Braisa is discussing where they are within "one grasp" of the Markulis (there is nothing in between the Markulis and the stones) and **R' Yochanan** is discussing where they are within "two grasps", for example, where there is a mound between the Markulis and the stones.
 - **Q:** Can it be that **R' Yishmael** holds that 3 stones lying next to each other are assur as an independent Markulis? A Braisa says that Markulis is only when the three stones are set up so that there are 2 next to each other with the third on top of them!? **A: Rava** said,

that Braisa is referring to the primary Markulis (but the smaller ones that are put next to the primary don't need this configuration).

- The house of King Yannai was destroyed and goyim came and set up a Markulis there. Other goyim who did not believe in this avoda zara came and took stones from this and used it to pave streets. Some **Rabanan** did not walk on these streets and others did. The ones who did not walk on these streets held like **R' Gidal in the name of R' Chiya bar Yosef in the name of Rav**, who darshened a pasuk to teach that the offering of avoda zara can never become batel. Therefore, since all the stones that were added to the original Markulis were added as offerings and could therefore never become batel. The ones who did walk on these street held that for an offering of avoda zara to be assur it has to be similar to the korbanos that are offered in the Beis Hamikdash, and that is why these stones are mutar.
 - **R' Yosef bar Abba** said that **Rabbah bar Yirmiya** came to our city and taught a Braisa that said, 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. **Rabbah bar Yirmiya** said, there is noone who can explain the reason for this! **R' Sheishes** said, I can explain it. You must find the Braisa difficult because of the ruling of **R' Gidal**. However, the stones are mutar, because they are not like the korbanos offered in the Beis Hamikdash.
 - **R' Yosef bar Abba** said that **Rabbah bar Yirmiya** came to our city and taught a Braisa that said, one may deworm or apply a smelly substance to a tree during shmitta, but not during Chol Hamoed. One may not prune a tree during either of these times, but during both of these times one may smear oil on a branch that was pruned before these times. **Rabbah bar Yirmiya** said, there is noone who can explain the reason for this! **Ravina** said, I can explain it. What did **Rabbah** find difficult? It can't be that he didn't understand why deworming is mutar during shmitta but not on Chol Hamoed, because during shmitta it is assur to "work" the field, but there is no issue of "tircha", and deworming is only a tircha. However, on Chol Hamoed even tircha is assur. It also can't be that he didn't understand that difference between the allowance to apply a smelly substance but the issur to prune, because the reason is that applying the smelly substance only serves to preserve the tree whereas pruning serves to strengthen the tree. It also can't be based on another Braisa which says it is mutar to put on the smelly substance on a tree before Rosh Hashana of shmitta, which suggests that it would be assur to do so on shmitta itself, so how can this Braisa allow it on shmitta, because we can answer this contradiction by saying that one Braisa refers to the process done to preserve the tree and it is therefore mutar on shmitta and the other Braisa refers to when it is done to strengthen the tree and it is therefore assur on shmitta. It also can't be based on another Braisa which says it is mutar to smear oil on figs and to fatten them with oil before Rosh Hashana of shmitta, which suggests that it would be assur to do so on shmitta itself, so how can this Braisa allow it on shmitta, because we can answer this contradiction by saying that smearing a branch with oil merely preserves the tree, but fattening the fruit makes them better and is therefore assur! **R' Sama the son of R' Ashi** told **Ravina**, what **Rabbah** found difficult to understand is why it is mutar to smear a pruned branch with oil on Chol Hamoed, but it is assur to put the smelly substance on a tree on Chol Hamoed. They are both done to preserve the tree, so why is one assur and one mutar? It was for this reason that he said there is noone who can explain this.
 - **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, with regard to an avoda zara that is normally served by shaking a stick in front of it, if a person breaks a stick in front of it he would be chayuv, but if he threw the stick in front of it he would be patur.

- **Q: Abaye** asked **Rava**, why is it that he is chayuv for breaking it, since it is similar to the Avodah of shechting a korbon, but he is patur for throwing it, which is similar to the Avodah of throwing the blood onto the Mizbe'ach? **A: Rava** said, in order to be chayuv the throwing must be in a way that the thrown item breaks up (like the blood when it is thrown).
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, if a person gave excrement to an avoda zara to eat (he smeared it on its face) or poured urine in front of it, he is chayuv (even if this is not the normal way to serve this avoda zara). Now, the urine breaks up when it is poured, but the excrement does not, so according to **Rava**, why is he chayuv!?
A: The Braisa is referring to watery excrement, which breaks up when it is thrown.
- **Q:** Maybe we can say that the halacha of **Rav** (that breaking the stick is like shechita) is actually the subject of a machlokes among Tanna'im. A Braisa says, if a person shechted a grasshopper for avoda zara, **R' Yehuda** says he is chayuv and the **Chachomim** say he is patur. Maybe we can say that **R' Yehuda** holds any act that is similar to shechting would make one chayuv and the **Chachomim** hold that it has to be more similar to an actual korbon (shechting a grasshopper is not considered shechita at all). Based on this, **Rav** would hold like **R' Yehuda**. **A:** It may be that all require a greater similarity to an actual korbon (and therefore breaking a stick would not be viewed as shechita). The machlokes here is specific to a grasshopper, because its neck is similar to the neck of an animal, and that is why **R' Yehuda** says he would be chayuv (but he would agree that he would not be chayuv for the breaking of a stick).