



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

Avodah Zarah Daf Samach Vuv

- If aged yayin nesech is mixed with grapes, all would agree that the grapes only become assur if the wine imparts taste into them. If new yayin nesech mixed with grapes, **Abaye** says it would be assur if even the smallest amount of wine mixed in and **Rava** says it would only be assur if it imparts flavor into the grapes. **Abaye** says when two items are mixed we follow the flavor to decide whether they are of the "same kind", and new wine and grapes have the same taste and are therefore the "same kind" and become assur with even the smallest amount. **Rava** says we follow the name in deciding whether things are of the "same kind" and new wine is "wine" whereas grapes are "grapes", therefore they are of two different kinds and only become assur if the assur item imparts a taste into the other item.
 - **Q:** Our Mishna said, if yayin nesech falls onto grapes and they are cracked, they become assur. Now, presumably the Mishna is referring to new wine that fell onto grapes, and we see that the grapes only become assur when they get flavor from the yayin nesech!?
A: No, the Mishna means that the grapes become assur even if there is the smallest amount of yayin nesech that fell onto them.
 - **Q:** The end of the Mishna gives a general rule that when an assur thing gives off flavor, if it is a good flavor the other item becomes assur, if not the other item remains mutar. Clearly, the Mishna is dealing with issues of flavor, and not a minute amount!? **A:** **Abaye** would say that the Mishna is talking about a case where old wine mixed with the grapes, in which case they are of "different kinds" and that is why it follows flavor.
 - With regard to wine vinegar and beer vinegar, or with regard to yeast of wheat and yeast of barley, **Abaye** says we follow taste when determining if things are of "like kinds" and these things have different tastes and are therefore not "like kinds". Therefore, they are only assur when the assur item imparts its flavor on the other item. **Rava** says even a minute amount will make it assur, because we follow the name when deciding if something is of "like kind", and since they are both vinegar and both yeast, they are considered of "like kind" and are assur with the smallest amount.
 - **Abaye** brings a proof from a Mishna which says that spices combine and make the food assur (if they were assur, even if neither on its own could have spiced the entire food), and **Chizkiya** said, they only combine when they are of the same type that blend together and together will flavor the food. **Abaye** said, we see that we follow taste in deciding whether things are of "like kind", and that is why these spices combine. However, if we follow the name, these spices should not combine! **Rava** would say this is no proof, because the Mishna may be following **R' Meir** who darshens a pasuk to teach that all assur things combine.
 - With regard to assur vinegar that fell into wine, all would agree that the wine is only assur if it got the taste of the vinegar. If assur wine fell into vinegar, **Abaye** says it would be assur based on even the smallest amount, and **Rava** says it would only be assur if the wine imparted its flavor to the vinegar. **Abaye** holds that even the smallest amount makes it assur, because wine that smells like vinegar and tastes like wine is considered to be vinegar, and therefore they are considered to be of "like kind". **Rava** says that wine that smells like vinegar and tastes like wine is considered to be wine, and therefore they are not of "like kind".
 - With regard to a hole made in a barrel of wine through which they would smell the wine to ascertain its quality, if a goy smells the wine of a Yid through such a hole, the wine is mutar. For a Yid to smell the wine of a goy, **Abaye** says it is assur, because smell is

considered to be a matter of significance, and **Rava** says it is mutar because smell is not significant.

- **Rava** said, my view is based on a Mishna that says that if one baked bread in an oven that was fired with cumin of terumah, the bread remains mutar, because the bread only has the fragrance, not the taste, of the cumin. **Abaye** said this case is different, because the cumin is already burned by the time the bread is baked in the oven.
- **R' Mari** said, we can say this is the same machlokes as we find among Tana'im in a Mishna. The Mishna says, if one removes hot bread from the oven and places it on top of a barrel of terumah wine: **R' Meir** says the bread may only be eaten by Kohanim (it has absorbed the flavor of the wine), **R' Yehuda** says it may be eaten by a non-kohen, and **R' Yose** says if it is wheat bread it may be eaten by anybody, but if it is barley bread it may only be eaten by a Kohen, because such bread draws in the fragrance. Apparently, **R' Meir** holds like **Abaye** and **R' Yehuda** holds like **Rava**.
 - **Rava** is forced to agree to the above understanding. **Abaye** can say that all agree that aroma is considered significant, and the machlokes is only regarding the bread, where it doesn't absorb the aroma significantly (but a person does absorb the aroma through the hole in the barrel). This can be seen from the way **Rabbah bar bar Chana in the name of Reish Lakish** explains the Mishna. He says that all agree that hot bread on an open barrel may only be eaten by Kohanim, and cold bread on a closed barrel may be eaten by anybody. The machlokes is regarding hot bread on a closed barrel or cold bread on an open barrel, whether or not it is absorbed in that case. However, smelling through the hole in the barrel would be regarded by all as a case of hot bread on an open barrel.