



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

Avodah Zarah Daf Nun Aleph

- **R' Nachman in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha in the name of Rav** said, with regard to an avoda zara that is worshipped with a stick, if a person breaks the stick in front of it he is chayuv and the stick becomes assur (even if this is not the normal way of serving this avoda zara). If he throws the stick in front of it he is chayuv (if this is the normal way to serve it) but the stick is not assur.
 - **Rava** asked **R' Nachman**, the reason why the stick is assur when it is broken in front of it is because it is like shechita of a korban. If so, throwing it should make it assur as well, because it is similar to the throwing of blood onto the Mizbe'ach!? **R' Nachman** said, throwing is only similar when it is done to a substance that falls apart when thrown (like blood), and that is why the stick does not become assur.
 - **Q:** If so, why do the stones used to worship the Markulis become assur? **A: R' Nachman** said, I also had this question, and ultimately it was answered by **Rav** who said that the stones thrown to Markulis are viewed as expanding the avoda zara itself, and that is why they are assur.
 - **Q:** This answer makes sense according to the view that an avoda zara of a goy becomes assur as soon as it is made, even before it is worshipped. However, according to the view that it is only assur once it is worshipped, the stones should not become assur until they are worshipped!? **A: R' Nachman** said, each stone is thrown with intent to add to the avoda zara and to act as an offering to all the stones thrown before it, so all previous stones have in fact been worshipped.
 - **Q:** The last stone to be thrown should be mutar!? **A: R' Nachman** said, if you can find the last stone to be thrown you can go and take it. **A2: R' Ashi** said that each stone thrown is meant as an offering to all previous stones and to itself. Therefore, even the last one has been worshipped.
 - **Q:** A Mishna says, if one finds garments, money, or keilim on top of a Markulis, they are mutar. If he found vines that have clusters of grapes or wreaths of grain or wine, oil, flour, or anything else of which is brought on the Mizbe'ach, they are assur. Now, with regard to wine, oil, and flour it makes sense they are assur, because they are also offered on the Mizbe'ach and they break apart when thrown. However, clusters of grapes and wreaths of grain are not offered on the Mizbe'ach and do not fall apart when thrown, so why are they assur? **A: Rava in the name of Ulla** said, the Mishna is discussing when these items were harvested with intent for avoda zara.
- **R' Avahu in the name of R' Yochanan** said, we learn that one who offers an animal with a mum to an avoda zara is patur, based on the pasuk of "zoveyach la'elohim yacharam bilti LaShem livado". This teaches that it is only assur when it is something that is done on the Mizbe'ach.
 - **Rava** queried, what kind of mum was **R' Yochanan** referring to? It can't refer to an animal with cataracts, because such an animal can be offered by a goy on his "bamah" to Hashem, so certainly they are considered offerings with regard to avoda zara!? Rather, it refers to an animal with a missing limb, as said by **R' Elazar**, who darshens the pasuk regarding the bringing of the animals into the teiva of "umikol hachai mikol basar shnayim mikol..." to teach that Bnei Noach cannot bring a korban that is missing a limb. The goyim then took this standard and used it for their avoda zara as well.
 - **Q:** That pasuk is needed to exclude the bringing of a treifa into the teiva, and is therefore not available to exclude animals that are missing a limb!? **A:** A treifa is excluded from the pasuk of "l'chayos zerah".
 - **Q:** That makes sense according to the view that a treifa cannot give birth. However, what about the view that a treifa can give birth? **A:** That

view would say that a treifa is excluded by the word “itach”, which teaches that the animals had to be like Noach, who was not a treifa.

- **Q:** Maybe Noach was a treifa? **A:** The pasuk says he was “tamim” (complete).
- **Q:** Maybe “tamim” refers to his ways? **A:** The pasuk says he was a tzaddik, so that already teaches that he was complete in his ways.
- **Q:** Maybe “tamim” refers to his ways and “tzaddik” refers to his deeds? **A:** It can’t be that Noach was a treifa, because then when Hashem said to take in animals “like you” He meant that only animals that were treifos should be brought into the teiva. That does not make sense.
- **Q:** If we exclude treifos based on “itach”, why do we need the pasuk of “l’chayos zerah”? **A:** From “itach” we would think to exclude a treifa only so that they don’t die during the year in the teiva and can provide companionship for Noach, but an old or sterile animal would be ok. The pasuk therefore says “l’chayos zerah” to teach that the animal must be able to have offspring.
- **R’ Elazar** darshens a pasuk to teach that one who shechts a korbon to Markulis will be chayuv. The pasuk says “v’lo yizbichu ohd es zivcheyhem lasi’irim”. This is not needed to teach that one is chayuv when it is the normal way of serving an avoda zara, because another pasuk says “eicha yavdu hagoyim ha’eileh es eloheyhem”, so the pasuk must be teaching about when it is not the normal way of serving that avoda zara.
 - **Q:** The pasuk is not available for that drasha, because a Braisa uses it to teach that if an animal was made kadosh before the issur of bamos was put in place it is still assur to offer it on a bamah!? **A: Rava** said, both drashos can be learned from the pasuk, as it can be read as saying “v’lo yizbichu” and “v’lo ohd”.

MISHNA

- If money, clothing, or keilim were found on top of a Markulis, they are mutar. If there were vines with clusters of grapes on it, or wreaths of grain, or wine, oil, or flour, or any type of thing that is brought on the Mizbe’ach in the Beis Hamikdash, they are assur.

GEMARA

- **Q:** How do we know that the items in the first category are mutar? **A: R’ Chiya bar Yosef in the name of R’ Oshaya** said, one pasuk says that the wood, stone, silver or gold that “is with them” (the avoda zara) is assur. Another pasuk says that the silver and gold that is “on them” is assur. This teaches that “with them” must be like “on them” – just like it is only assur when it is “on them” (i.e. the silver and gold) if it is there for beautification, so too is the case when it is “with them” (the wood and stone).
 - **Q:** Maybe compare in the reverse and teach that just as wood and stone is assur even when not there for beautification, the same is for silver and gold? **A:** If that is so, there would be no reason to have the pasuk of “on them”.
 - **Q:** Money (i.e. coins) are put there for beautification and yet the Mishna says it is mutar!? **A:** The Yeshiva of **R’ Yannai** said that the Mishna is discussing where the money was in a purse that was hung around the neck of the avoda zara.
 - **Q:** Clothing are put there for beautification and yet the Mishna says it is mutar!? **A:** The Yeshiva of **R’ Yannai** said that the Mishna is discussing where the clothing was folded up and out on its head.
 - **Q:** Keilim are put there for beautification and yet the Mishna says it is mutar!? **A: R’ Pappa** said, the Mishna is discussing where they put an upside down bowl on its head.
- **R’ Assi bar Chiya** said, anything that is found within the curtain that is put around an avoda zara, even if it is water or salt, is assur as an offering of avoda zara. If it is outside the curtain, then if it is something put there to beautify the avoda zara it is assur, if not it is mutar.
 - **R’ Yose bar Chanina** said, we have a tradition that there is no difference between within the curtain or outside the curtain with regard to Pe’or and Markulis.

- **Q:** What does that mean? It can't mean that even items (like water and salt) found inside the curtain are mutar, because the reason for that would be because these two avoda zaras are treated with greater respect, but that is not true, because people go to the bathroom in front of Pe'or!? **A:** Rather, it means that even items found outside the curtain are treated as if they are found inside and are assur.

MISHNA

- With regard to an avoda zara that had a garden or a bathhouse, the halacha is that it may be used by a Yid if he doesn't have to pay for it, but he may not use it if he must pay. If the garden or bathhouse belonged to the avoda zara and some other person in partnership, a Yid may use them even if he must pay.
- The avoda zara of a goy becomes assur immediately when it is made. The avoda zara of a Yid only becomes assur from the time it is worshipped.

GEMARA

- **Abaye** said, when the Mishna discusses monetary payment it means monetary payment to the priests of the avoda zara. The Gemara says, this comes to exclude payment to regular worshippers, which would be mutar.
 - **Some** say that **Abaye** was talking about the case of the Mishna regarding the garden and bathhouse owned in partnership. **Abaye** said that it is mutar if the payment only goes to the other partner, and not if it also goes to the priests.
 - The second version of **Abaye** would certainly agree with the first version, but the first version may disagree with the second version and may hold that since there is another partner it would even be mutar if some of the money went to the priest.

AVODAS KOCHAVIM SHEL OVEID KOCHAVIM ASSURAH MIYAD

- The Mishna follows **R' Akiva** of a Braisa. The Braisa says, **R' Yishmael** says, the pasuk says "abeid t'abdun es kol hamikomos asher avdu sham hagoyim" – this refers to keilim that were used for avoda zara. We would think that it even includes keilim that were made but not finished, or even finished but not yet brought to the avoda zara, or even brought but not yet used in the service, that they should also be assur. The pasuk therefore says, "asher avdu sham hagoyim", which teaches that they are not assur until they are used in the service of the avoda zara. From here we learn that the avoda zara of a goy only becomes assur once it is worshipped and the avoda zara of a Yid becomes assur as soon as it is made. **R' Akiva** says the reverse is true: the avoda zara of a goy becomes assur immediately when it is made, whereas the avoda zara of a Yid only becomes assur from the time it is worshipped.
 - **Q:** The pasuk talks about "mikomos" (places), so how can this be understood to be referring to keilim!? **A:** We have learned that places don't become assur – as the pasuk teaches that the mountains do not become assur. Therefore, we must understand the issur to be referring to keilim.
 - **Q:** We said the pasuk is referring to keilim, so how does **R' Yishmael** extrapolate the halacha of an actual avoda zara? **A:** The pasuk continues and says "es eloheyhem", which creates a hekesh from the keilim to the actual avoda zara, and teaches that both only become assur once served. **R' Akiva** doesn't darshen this hekesh, because he says that the word "es" creates separation.