



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

### Avodah Zarah Daf Samach Ches

- The Gemara stated a machlokes regarding a mixture where the assur item in the mixture is “nosein taam lifgam” – **R' Meir** said it is still assur and **R' Shimon** said it is mutar.
  - **Ulla** said, the machlokes is where the assur item initially enhanced the taste of the mixture and later made it worse. However, if it made it worse from the very beginning all would agree that the mixture is mutar.
    - **Q: R' Chaga** asked **Ulla**, a Braisa says that they even argue where assur wine fell into beans or assur vinegar fell into beans. Now, in this case the assur item made the taste worse even from the beginning and yet we see that they argue!?
    - A: Ulla** said, the Braisa is talking about where the beans were cold and then heated up, in which case the assur item first made the taste better and later made it worse.
  - **R' Yochanan** said the machlokes is where the assur item imparted a bad taste from the very beginning.
    - **Q:** Does he mean that the machlokes is in this case as well as in the case of where it was initially good and then turned bad, or does he mean that the machlokes is *only* in the case where it was bad from the beginning, but if it was initially good all would agree that it is assur? **TEIKU**.
    - **R' Amram** said it can't be that **R' Yochanan** said this (that **R' Meir** holds it is assur even when it was “nosein taam lifgam” immediately) and there is not some source in a Mishna. **R' Amram** searched and found a Mishna that says that if yeast of chullin fell into chullin dough in an amount that was enough to make it rise and then more yeast of terumah or kilayim fell into the dough in an amount enough to make the dough rise, the dough is assur. **R' Shimon** says the dough would be mutar. Now, since the dough already rose, the additional yeast is considered to be “nosein taam lifgam” from the very beginning, and we see that the **T”K (R' Meir)** and **R' Shimon** argue, which is what **R' Yochanan** said.
      - **R' Zeira** said, this is not a proof for **R' Yochanan**. The case of the dough may be different, because the additional yeast that is added can make the entire dough into yeast, and therefore it is not considered a bad thing for the dough.
      - Maybe we can bring a proof for **R' Yochanan** from a Braisa. The Braisa says, if yeast of terumah and chullin fell into a dough and each yeast was in the amount for itself to make the dough rise and the dough then rose, the dough is assur, but **R' Shimon** says it is mutar. If the terumah fell in first all agree that it would be assur. If the chullin fell in first it would be assur, but **R' Shimon** says it would be mutar. Now, in this last case the assur item made the dough worse right from the beginning and still we see there is a machlokes! You can't say that here too we can say like **R' Zeira** said, because the later part of the Braisa says that if assur wine fell onto beans it is assur, but **R' Shimon** says it is mutar. Now this is a case where it made it worse right from the beginning and still we see that they argue! You can't say that the case is like **Ulla** said, that it was initially good and then became bad, and still they argue, because the Braisa says that when the terumah yeast fell in first all agree that the dough is assur, which means that they don't argue when it was first good and later became bad! Rather, we see from here that even when it

is bad from the very beginning, there is still a machlokes between **R' Meir and R' Shimon**, SHEMA MINAH.

- **Q:** Why does this Braisa need to bring all these three cases? We need the case of the wine that fell onto the beans to teach that they even argue when the assur thing makes the mixture bad even initially. We need the case of the terumah yeast falling into the dough before the chullin yeast to teach that when it initially makes it better and later makes it worse all agree that it is assur. However, why do we need the case of where the terumah and chullin yeast fell in at the same time? We already learned that when it makes it bad initially it is assur, so in this case where it first makes it bad later on for sure the **T"K** will hold that it is assur!? **A: Abaye** said, that case is needed to teach the extent of the view of **R' Shimon**. The **T"K** said to **R' Shimon**, you must agree that since the terumah yeast made the dough rise quicker than it would have with only the chullin yeast, it should make it assur. **R' Shimon** responded, it is the two yeasts together that made it rise and it is the two of them together that then made the dough worse. **R' Shimon** follows his view elsewhere that even two assur items don't combine to make a mixture assur. Surely an assur and mutar item will also not combine to make a mixture assur.
- It once happened that a mouse fell into a barrel of beer (and remained there long enough to impart its taste into the beer). **Rav** said that the beer was assur. The **Rabanan** said to **R' Sheishes**, it must be that **Rav** holds that "nosein taam lifgam" is assur. **R' Sheishes** said, generally **Rav** holds that "nosein taam lifgam" is mutar. However, the issur regarding sheratzim is a chiddush, since sheratzim are repulsive to people anyway and yet the Torah made it assur, that is why in a case involving sheratzim he says that "nosein taam lifgam" is assur. The **Rabanan** asked him, if so, sheratzim should transmit tumah whether they are wet or dry and yet a Mishna says they only transmit tumah when they are wet!? The Gemara says, based on that logic, shichvas zera should also even transfer tumah when dry, because people are certainly repulsed from zera. Rather, the reason it transmits only when wet is because we learn from the pasuk that it must be in a condition in which it is fit to produce offspring (which is when it is wet). Similarly, we can learn from the pasuk of sheretz that it only transmits tumah when it is in the condition at the time of death (which is when it is still wet).
  - **Q: R' Simi of Nehardai** asked, how can we say that a mouse is repulsive when we see it is even served to kings!? **A:** He answered, only field mice are served to kings. The mouse that **R' Sheishes** said is repulsive is a city mouse.
  - **Rava** said, the halacha is that "nosein taam lifgam" is mutar. With regard to **Rav** saying that the mouse makes the beer assur, **Rava** said he is not sure whether that is because **Rav** holds that "nosein taam lifgam" is assur, in which case we don't pasken like **Rav**, or whether he holds "nosein taam lifgam" is mutar, but he holds that the taste of a mouse actually enhances the flavor of the beer.
  - **Q:** What is the halacha if a mouse fell into vinegar? **A: R' Hillel** said to **R' Ashi**, this once happened in **R' Kahana's** house and he said the vinegar was assur. **R' Ashi** said, that case is not a proof, because in that case the mouse disintegrated into the vinegar (and was never removed) and that is why the vinegar was assur.
  - **Ravina** thought to say that the mouse would become batul in 100 times its amount of vinegar. He said it should be no worse than terumah. **R' Tachlifa bar Giza** said to him, maybe a mouse is like spices of terumah, which never become batul!? **R' Achai** said it becomes batul in 50 times its size of vinegar. **R' Shmuel the son of R' Ika** said a mouse becomes batul in 60 times its size of beer.
    - The Gemara paskens that whether it fell into vinegar or into beer it becomes batel in 60 times its size, and that is the measurement for all assur items in the Torah.