



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

### Avodah Zarah Daf Samach Daled

- **R' Nachman, Ulla, and Avimi bar Pappi** were sitting together and **R' Chiya bar Ami** was sitting near them. They asked, what is the halacha if a Jew was hired by a goy to break and destroy barrels of yayin nesech – would the wages be mutar? Do we say that the Yid wants this wine to continue to exist until he is able to break them, and therefore the wages are assur, or maybe we say that it is mutar to do anything that will help to destroy assur things like avoda zara, and therefore the wages are mutar? **R' Nachman** said, he should go and break them, and may he be blessed for doing so.
  - **Q:** Maybe we can say that a Braisa supports **R' Nachman**. A Braisa says we may not dig the ground for a goy for the sake of klayim, but we may uproot klayim plants for him to destroy them. Now, the ones who offered this Braisa as a support felt that the Braisa follows **R' Akiva**, who says that it is even assur to *maintain* klayim (and one who does so would get malkus), and yet he allows working with klayim for the purpose of destroying them (even though the Yid wants this klayim to continue to exist until he is able to destroy them). Presumably, the same would be true for working with yayin nesech! **A:** It may be that the Braisa only follows the **Rabanan** who argue on **R' Akiva** and hold that it is mutar to maintain klayim, and that is why it is mutar to work to destroy them, but yayin nesech would be different.
    - **Q:** If the Braisa follows the **Rabanan**, why does it only teach that we may uproot klayim? According to them it is even mutar to maintain klayim!? **A:** The Braisa is talking about a case where he does the work for free, and the Braisa follows **R' Yehuda**, who says it is assur to give gifts to goyim. The Braisa teaches that if the Yid destroys the klayim, it is mutar.
    - The Gemara says, from Braisa's ruling according to the view of **R' Yehuda** we can also infer what **R' Akiva** would hold. Even though **R' Yehuda** holds it is assur to do something for free for a goy, he says it is mutar if the Yid is destroying the klayim. Similarly, although **R' Akiva** holds that maintaining klayim is assur, he would agree that if the intent is to destroy the klayim, it is mutar. Therefore, even if the Braisa follows the view of the **Rabanan**, we can see what **R' Akiva** would hold, and the same would hold true for klayim. Therefore, this Braisa is a proof for **R' Nachman's** ruling.
- This same group then asked, if a goy sold an avoda zara, does the money become assur as the avoda zara itself or not? **R' Nachman** said, it makes sense that the money is not assur. We can see this from **Rabbah bar Avuha**, who told people who came to him to convert to Yiddishkeit that they should first sell their avoda zaras and then convert, so that the money will be mutar.
  - **Q:** It may be that in that case it is not assur, because the fact that they were converting means that they most definitely were mevatel their avoda zara, and that is why the money is mutar! **A:** Rather, we can learn that the money is mutar from a Braisa. The Braisa says, if a Yid is owed money by a goy, and the goy sells his avoda zara or yayin nesech and brings the money to the Yid, the money is mutar. However, if he told the Yid, wait until I sell my avoda zara or yayin nesech and will bring you the proceeds, the money would be assur. We see from the first case that the money from the sale of the avoda zara is mutar!
    - **Q:** What is the difference between the first and second case of the Braisa? **A:** **R' Sheishes** said, in the second case the Yid wants the avoda zara to continue to exist, and that is why it is assur.
      - **Q:** Wanting the avoda zara to exist in this way is not assur!? A Mishna says that when a ger inherits his father along with his father's other son

(who is a goy), he may suggest that the estate be divided so that the goy ends up with the avoda zara or the yayin nesech and the ger ends up with other items of value in its place. We see that desiring the avoda zara to continue to exist in this way is mutar!? **A: Rava bar Ulla** said, the Mishna is talking about a case where the avoda zara has value even when it is broken in pieces (e.g. it is made of gold). Therefore, the ger does not care if the avoda zara remains intact.

- **Q:** This answer can work in a case of avoda zara, but it cannot work in a case of yayin nesech, because in that case if the barrels break all the wine (and the value) will be lost!? **A:** The Mishna is talking about where the wine is in Hadriyani earthenware keilim, which absorb the wine very much, and broken pieces of this keili are then placed in water, turning it into wine
    - **Q:** Although he doesn't care if the barrels stay whole, he does care about its existence with regard to it being stolen or lost (he doesn't want it lost in that way), and still we see that it is mutar for him to take other assets instead of that wine!? **A:** Rather, **R' Pappa** said, you can't bring a proof from the inheritance by a ger, because the **Rabanan** were very meikel in that case so that the ger should not return to the ways of a goy in order to obtain his full inheritance. In fact, a Braisa suggests this as well.
- This same group then asked, can a ger toshav be mevatal an avoda zara? Do we say that only one who worships avoda zara can be mevatal avoda zara, and since a ger toshav does not worship avoda zara he can't be mevatal it, or do we say that since a ger toshav is a goy he can be mevatal? **R' Nachman** said, it makes sense to say that only one who worships can be mevatal.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says, if a Yid finds the avoda zara of a goy he may instruct a goy to be mevatal it before it comes into his (the Yid's) hands. Once it comes into his hands he can no longer instruct a goy to be mevatal. For the **Chachomim** said that a goy can be mevatal his own avoda zara and the avoda zara of another goy, whether he worships it or not. Now, what does the Braisa mean "whether he worships it *or not*"? It can't be referring to a goy who worships a different avoda zara, because that is already included in "the avoda zara of his friend"! Rather, it must be referring to a ger toshav, and we see that a ger toshav can be mevatal an avoda zara!? **A:** It may be that this is not referring to a ger toshav. Rather, the Braisa first makes reference to a goy being mevatal the avoda zara of his friend when the two of them worship the same avoda zara, and the Braisa then makes reference to a goy being mevatal the avoda zara of his friend when the two of them worship different avoda zaros. However, no reference is made to a ger toshav.
  - **Q:** A Braisa discusses a number of halachos regarding a ger toshav and then discusses the status of his wine. The Braisa then says, that with respect to all other matters the ger toshav has the status of a goy. Presumably this refers to the fact that he can be mevatal an avoda zara like a goy!? **A: R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, this doesn't refer to being mevatal an avoda zara. This refers to his inability to relinquish his rights in a chatzer to allow Yidden to carry in that chatzer on Shabbos. A Braisa teaches that only a Yid can relinquish his rights, but a goy cannot.