



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

Avodah Zarah Daf Nun Gimmel

MISHNA

- How is a goy mevatel an avoda zara? If he cuts off the tip of its ear, of its nose, or of its finger, or if he dents it without actually cutting anything off, it becomes batel. If he spit in front of it, or urinated in front of it, or dragged it through the mud, or threw excrement at it, it does not become batel. If he sold it or gave it to a creditor as a "mashkon", **Rebbi** says it makes it batel and the **Chachomim** say it does not become batel.

GEMARA

- **Q:** In the case of denting it without cutting anything off, how has he made it batel? **A: R' Zeira** said, the Mishna is discussing where he dented its face and thereby rid it of its form.
- **Q:** How do we know that spitting, urinating, etc. don't make it batel? **A: Chizkiya** learns from a pasuk that a goy only does this temporarily, but ultimately returns to serving his avoda zara.

MACHRA OY MASHKINA REBBI OMER BITEIL...

- **Ze'iri in the name of R' Yochanan and R' Yirmiya bar Abba in the name of Rav** argue – one says the machlokes in the Mishna is only when it is sold or given as a mashkon to a non-Jewish smelter, but if it was sold or given to a Jewish smelter all would agree that it becomes batel; the other holds that the machlokes is only when it is given to a Jewish smelter.
 - **Q:** According to the second opinion, does this mean that the machlokes is only when it is given to a Yid, but if given to a goy all would agree that it is not batel, or does he mean that the machlokes is whether he gives it to a Yid or to a goy? **A:** A Braisa says, that **Rebbi** said, "My view (that the avoda zara becomes batel) seems to be correct when he sold it to be destroyed and the view of my colleagues (that it is not batel) seem to be correct when he sold it to be worshipped". Now, this can't be understood literally, because there would be no machlokes if it was sold to actually be destroyed or to actually be worshipped. Rather, "sold to be destroyed" must refer to it being sold to a Yid, and "sold to be worshipped" must refer to when it is sold to a goy, and we see that the machlokes is in that case as well.
 - The Gemara says, this is not necessarily a proof. The Braisa could mean that **Rebbi** says that his view is accepted by the **Rabanan** when it is sold to a Yid, meaning that they only argue when it is sold to a goy.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, if a Yid bought silver scraps from a goy and then realized that among the scraps there was an avoda zara, if he had not yet given payment, he should give it back to the goy to have him make it batel. If he already gave payment, he must destroy it. We see from here that selling to a Yid does not make it batel. Now, if the machlokes is even when it is sold to a Yid, the Braisa can be following the view of the **Rabanan**, but if there is no machlokes when it is sold to a Yid, who does the Braisa follow!? **A:** That case is different, because the goy sold it thinking they were all scraps. He didn't realize there was an avoda zara mixed in and therefore could not have made it batel.
 - A Braisa says, if a goy gave the avoda zara as a mashkon, or a ruin fell on top of it, or it was stolen by robbers, or the goy left it and went overseas, if he intends to return and get it in the future like the war of Yehoshua, it does not become batel.
 - All these cases are necessary to be taught. If we would only say the case of the loan, we would say in that case it is not batel, because he didn't actually sell it, but when the ruin fell on it and he did not dig it out, it should surely become batel. The Braisa therefore teaches that it is not batel in that case either. If we would only say that case we would say it does not become batel, because he feels it is safely buried and can be retrieved whenever he wants, but when it is

stolen, since he didn't try to get it back it should become batel. If we would only say that case we would say that the owner says to himself – if the robber was a goy he will worship it, and if he was a Jew he will sell it to someone who will worship it, and therefore the owner is not mevatel it. However, when he leaves it and goes overseas, the fact that he didn't take it with him should show that he was mevatel it. The Braisa therefore teaches that even in that case it is not batul.

- **Q:** What is meant by “if he intends to return and get it in the future like the war of Yehoshua”? **A:** It means, if he intends to return, like the goyim of the war of Yehoshua, who thought they would win and return and therefore were not mevatel their avoda zara.
 - **Q:** Why does the Braisa use the war of Yehoshua as a point of comparison? **A:** He thereby teaches another halacha incidentally, as taught by **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav**, who says that if a Yid stands up a brick to bow down to it, and before he does so a goy comes and bows to it, the goy makes it assur even though it does not belong to him. **R' Elazar** explained, this can be learned from the pasuk that teaches that there were asheira trees in EY. Now, EY belonged to the Yidden from when it was given to Avrohom, so how could a goy make a tree assur when it did not belong to him? Rather, the reason is that by worshipping the Eigel, the Yidden showed that avoda zara was acceptable to them, and the goyim were therefore their shiluchim to worship the trees. Similarly, when a Yid stands up the brick he shows that avoda zara is acceptable to him, and the goy is therefore doing his shelichus when he bows down to the brick.
 - **Q:** Maybe the Yidden only found the worshipping of the Eigel acceptable, but not other avoda zara? **A:** The Yidden said, “eileh elohecha Yisrael” – written in the plural, showing that they desired the worship of many avoda zara.
 - **Q:** We should say that only the trees worshipped up to the time of the Eigel are assur, but those worshipped after the Yidden did teshuva should not have become assur? **A:** It is impossible to know which ones were worshipped before and which ones after. Therefore they were all assur.

MISHNA

- With regard to an avoda zara whose worshippers abandoned it, if this happened during peaceful times the avoda zara becomes mutar. If it happened during times of war, it remains assur.
- With regard to pedestals that were set up along a king's path so that he could put his avoda zara on it when he passes by, they are mutar, because the avoda zara is only put there when the kings pass by.

GEMARA

- **R' Yirmiya bar Abba in the name of Rav** said, the “House of Nimrod” (the tower that was built by the people of the “Dor Haflaga”) is treated like an avoda zara whose worshippers abandoned it in times of peace and it is therefore mutar. This is so, even though when Hashem scattered them about it was like a time of war, still, since they could have returned to it and did not, it became batel.

BIMUSYA'OS SHE' MELACHIM HAREI EILU MUTAROS

- **Q:** Why are they mutar because they are only used when the king passes by? At that time they are still used for avoda zara and should therefore be assur!? **A: Rabbah bar bar Chana in the name of R' Yochanan** said, the Mishna is referring to a path that is not often taken by the king. The fact that he decides not to take that path even though these pedestals are set up there shows that they are not true avoda zara items.
- When **Ulla** came to Bavel he sat on a damaged pedestal that had been used for avoda zara. **R' Yehuda** said to him, **Rav and Shmuel** have both said that a damaged pedestal is assur, and this is even according to the view that goyim do not worship broken pieces of an avoda zara! **Ulla** said,

R' Yochanan and Reish Lakish have both said that a damaged pedestal is mutar, and this is even according to the view that goyim do worship broken pieces of an avoda zara.

- A Braisa says like **R' Yochanan and Reish Lakish**.