



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

Avodah Zarah Daf Nun Zayin

- It once happened in Biram that a goy climbed a tree to take a lulav, and on the way down unintentionally touched wine with the tip of the lulav. **Rav** allowed the wine to be sold to goyim. **R' Kahana and R' Assi** asked him, you said that even a one day old goy makes wine into yayin nesech by touching it (and such a child obviously has no intent for avoda zara)!? **Rav** said, I said the child makes it assur to drink, but does not make it assur b'hana'ah.
 - **Q: R' Simi bar Chiya** asked **Rav**, a Braisa says that with regard to non-Jewish slaves that were purchased or that were born in the Jew's house to his unconverted non-Jewish maidservant, and these slaves were given a bris milah but had not yet toveled in a mikvah, if they are "adults", which means they understand avoda zara, the wine they touch still has the status of yayin nesech. If they are "minors", which means that they don't yet understand avoda zara, the wine they touch does not have the status of yayin nesech. We see that the wine touched by a one day old child does not have the status of yayin nesech!? **A:** The Braisa's ruling regarding yayin nesech (the Braisa discusses other things as well) only refers to the slaves that were born in the Jew's house to his maidservant. In that case we are meikel regarding the wine.
 - **Q:** The Braisa says "and also", which seems to say that the bought slaves and the ones born in his house have the same halacha!? **A:** That is regarding the other halacha of the Brasia (regarding their status as a zav).
 - **Q:** That only makes sense according to the version of the Braisa that says that the purchased slaves are tamei like a zav, so we need the comparison to teach that the slaves born in his house are tamei as well. However, according to the version that the bought slaves are tahor, we do not need a comparison to teach that the slaves born in his house are tahor as well (it is obvious)!? **A:** The comparison is needed to teach that just as regarding the slaves born in his house, it is only when they have not yet gone to the mikvah that they make wine into yayin nesech, but once they have gone to the mikvah there is no longer a problem of them touching the wine, the same would be true for the purchased slaves as well. This comes to exclude the view of **R' Nachman in the name of Shmuel**, who says that when slaves are purchased they continue to make yayin nesech even after they have gotten a bris milah and have gone to the mikvah, until "the mention of avoda zara disappears from their mouths", which **R' Yehoshua ben Levi** explained to mean, until 12 months after the slave is purchased.
 - **Q:** The Braisa said, that yayin nesech is only a problem if they have not yet gone to the mikvah, but once they have gone it would no longer be a problem. This refutes the ruling of **R' Nachman**!? **A:** The Braisa's ruling was only referring to slaves born in the Yid's house.
 - **Q:** The Braisa says "and also", which seems to say that the bought slaves and the ones born in his house have the same halacha!? **A:** That is regarding the other halacha of the Brasia (regarding their status as a zav).
 - **Q:** That only makes sense according to the version of the Braisa that says that the purchased slaves are tamei like a zav, so we need the comparison to teach that the slaves born in his house are tamei as well. However,

according to the version that the bought slaves are tahor, we do not need a comparison to teach that the slaves born in his house are tahor as well (it is obvious)!? **A:** The comparison is needed to teach that purchased slaves are like slaves born to the Yid in that just as slaves born to him, only the adults make yayin nesech, the same is true for purchased slaves. This comes to exclude the ruling of **Rav**, which said that even a one day old child who touches wine makes it into yayin nesech.