



Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Avodah Zarah, Daf לז – Daf לא

Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas R' Avrohom Abba ben R' Dov HaKohen, A"H
vl'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

-----Daf לא---31-----

- **R' Assi in the name of R' Yochanan in the name of R' Yehuda ben Beseira** said, there are three categories of wine of goyim. There is yayin nesech, which is assur b'hana'ah and a kezayis of it gives off a stringent level of tumah (like a meis). There is "stam yeinam" (wine of a goy that is not known to have been poured to avoda zara), which is assur b'hana'ah and gives off tumah like other liquids when there is a minimum amount of a revi'is. There is the wine of a Yid that was given to a goy to watch, which becomes assur for the Yid to drink, but is mutar b'hana'ah.
 - **Q:** A Mishna says that when a Yid gives his produce to a goy to watch it's given the status of the goy's produce with regard to shmitta and maaser (i.e. we assume that the goy exchanged the Yid's produce for his own, and the Yid must therefore treat it as if no maaser was given, etc.). If so, why is the wine mutar b'hana'ah!? **A: R' Yehuda ben Beseira** was talking about where the Yid's wine was given a special place in the goy's reshus, and was locked or sealed so that only the Yid would have access to it.
 - **Q:** If so, it should even be mutar for the Yid to drink it!? In fact, **R' Tanchum of Parvad** taught a Braisa of **Bar Kappara** to **R' Yochanan** which said that if a Yid gives his wine to a goy to watch, the Yid is allowed to drink that wine!? **A: R' Zeira** said, the Braisa of **Bar Kappara** follows **R' Eliezer** of a Braisa who says that if one buys or rents a house in the chatzer of a goy and leaves wine there which is locked up and sealed, the wine is mutar for the Yid to drink, and **R' Yehuda ben Beseira** follows the **Rabanan** who argue on **R' Eliezer**.
 - **R' Chiya the son of R' Chiya bar Nachmeini in the name of R' Chisda in the name of Rav** said (others have a different version of who said the following), the halacha follows **R' Eliezer**.
- **R' Elazar** said, everything is considered to be guarded even if it has only one seal, except for wine. **R' Yochanan** said, even wine is considered to be guarded even if it has only one seal. The Gemara explains that they don't argue – **R' Yochanan** holds like **R' Eliezer** and **R' Elazar** holds like the **Rabanan** (of the machlokes quoted above).
 - **Others** say that **R' Elazar** said, everything is considered to be guarded if it has a double seal, except for wine. **R' Yochanan** said, even wine is considered to be guarded if it has a double seal. The Gemara explains that they don't argue – all agree with the **Rabanan** – but **R' Yochanan** holds that the **Rabanan** only argue with **R' Eliezer** regarding one seal, but would agree when there is a double seal, and **R' Elazar** holds that they argue even when there is a double seal.
 - **Q:** What is considered to be a double seal? **A: Rava** said, if there is a bowl turned over on the opening of the barrel and that bowl is pasted down and is stamped with a seal, that would be a double seal. If there is a closed barrel and there is a basket pulled tightly over the barrel, that would be a double seal. If there is a tied wine flask inside a tied leather bag, if the opening to the flask is facing the bottom of the bag, it is considered to be a double seal. If it is facing the top of the bag, it is not considered to be a double seal. If the tied flask's opening is folded into itself and then tied and sealed again, that alone would be considered a double seal.
- A Braisa says, initially they said that the wine of certain Kuti towns were assur because of the nearby towns of idol worshippers. They then changed their minds to say that the open barrels in those Kuti towns are assur, but the closed ones are mutar.
 - The Gemara explains, initially they thought that Kutim are not particular if goyim touch their barrels of wine – whether they are opened or closed. At the end they held that Kutim are not particular regarding open barrels, but are particular regarding closed barrels.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** Are closed barrels really mutar? A Braisa says that we are concerned even when closed barrels are sent with a Kuti. This shows that we feel they are not particular if goyim touch the closed barrels!? **A: R' Zeira** said, the first Braisa is discussing in a city, and this second Braisa is discussing on the road (a Kuti is not particular there, because he doesn't think anyone will see).
 - **Q: R' Yirmiya** asked, the barrels in the city were initially brought via a road!? **A:** Rather, **R' Yirmiya** said, the first Braisa is discussing during the wine pressing season. At that time people frequent the roads and the Kuti is therefore afraid to allow a goy to touch the barrel.
- We have learned, why is it that we say that the **Rabanan** said that beer of goyim is assur? **Rami bar Chama in the name of R' Yitzchak** said, it is because drinking their beer would lead to intermarriage with them. **R' Nachman** said, it is because we are concerned that they left it uncovered (and a snake left venom in it).
 - **Q:** At what point are we concerned that the snake came? It can't be while the beer is brewing, because we leave the vats uncovered at that time as well!? It can't be once the beer is in the barrel, because we leave the barrels uncovered then as well!? **A:** He is referring to a place where they allow the water used in the process to sit and settle. If that water is left uncovered, it makes the beer assur.
 - **Q:** If so, if the beer aged or fermented it should be mutar, because **Rebbi** has said that snake venom would not allow a liquid to age or ferment properly!? **A:** Old beer is assur as a gezeira on account of new beer.
 - **R' Pappa** would drink the beer of a goy once it was taken out of the goy's store. **R' Acha** would drink it once it was brought into his house. The Gemara explains, they both held the reason their beer is assur is because it can lead to intermarriage, and by drinking it away from the goy it is therefore mutar, but **R' Achai** was more machmir and required a further distancing.
 - **R' Shmuel bar Bisna** went to Margevan (a place where the Yidden were suspected of drinking wine of goyim) and refused to drink their wine and their beer. He wouldn't drink their wine out of suspicion that it was wine of a goy, and wouldn't drink their beer so that other people not think that if the beer of these people is mutar their wine is mutar as well.
 - **Rav** said, the beer of an Aramean is mutar, but my son **Chiya** should not drink from it.
 - **Q:** If it is mutar for others it should have been mutar for him as well, and if it is assur for him it should be assur for all others as well!? **A: Rav** holds the reason beer is assur is because of giluy. However, the bitterness of the beer neutralizes the venom for the most part. Still, if someone is physically not well, it can make him worse. Therefore, since **Chiya** was not well, he instructed him not to drink it.
 - **Shmuel** said, all sheratzim have venom, but only the venom of a snake can kill a person.
 - **Shmuel** told **Chiya bar Rav**, I will tell you something that your father said. The reason that the Arameans drink from uncovered liquids and don't die is because they eat shekatzim and remasim, which cause their bodies to heat up and neutralize the venom.
 - **R' Yosef** said, beer vinegar of an Aramean is assur, because they mix the sediment of yayin nesech into it.
 - **R' Ashi** said, if the Aramean brings it out directly from his storehouse it is mutar, because once the wine is mixed into it, it spoils and would not be stored.

-----Daf לב-----32-----

V'CHERES HADRIYANI

- **Q:** What is this Hadriyani earthenware? **A: R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, it refers to the earthenware of King Hadrianus.
 - **R' Dimi** said, there was land that had never been worked. Hadrianus planted vineyards there and it produced a very strong wine. He put the wine into new earthenware keilim, that absorbed the wine. His men then broke these keilim and took little pieces with them to war. They would soak these pieces in water and the water would become wine, which they would then drink. **R' Yehoshua ben Levi** said, our best quality wine is only as good as the wine produced after the third soaking of those pieces in water.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** May these pieces be used to support a bed on? The Yid wants the pieces to remain intact, and therefore indirectly wants the yayin nesech to remain as well. Is that mutar or assur? **A:** We find that **R' Elazar** and **R' Yochanan** argue about this – one says it is assur and the other says it is mutar.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that the leather jars and bottles of goyim into which a Yid's wine was placed make the wine assur to drink but mutar b'hana'ah. **Shimon ben Guda** testified to **R' Gamliel's** son that **R' Gamliel** even drank such wine in Akko, but they did not agree with him. With regard to softer leather bottles of goyim, **R' Shimon ben Gamliel in the name of R' Yehoshua ben Kefusai** said that they may not be used to make a saddle for a Yid's donkey. Now, this is a case of where he doesn't really care about the absorbed yayin nesech, and only cares that it remain because he wants the leather to remain intact, and yet we see that it is assur!? **A:** Based on this logic we should say that it should be assur to buy the earthenware jugs from goyim (even if they won't be used by the Yid to store his wine), and yet we know this is done. Why should there be a difference between the leather and earthenware keilim? Rather **Rava** said, the reason the leather keili is assur to be used as a saddle is a gezeira that the Yid's own leather keili may get a hole and he will take the leather of the saddle to use to patch the hole. However, the issur is not because of the existence of the yayin nesech in the saddle.
 - **Q:** According to the view that when one wants the yayin nesech to continue to exist only because he wants the other item (e.g. the saddle) to exist, it is assur, why is it that buying their regular earthenware keilim is mutar? **A:** The yayin nesech absorbed in a regular earthenware keili is not significant, and is therefore mutar. The wine absorbed in Hadriyani earthenware is significant, and that is why it is assur.
 - **Q:** How could the Braisa say that the testimony of **Shimon ben Guda** was not accepted? Another Braisa specifically says that the testimony of **Shimon ben Godeya** was accepted!? **A:** The first Braisa is referring to the other Rabanan, and they did not accept the testimony. The second Braisa is referring to **R' Gamliel's** son, who did agree with the testimony. **A2:** **Shimon ben Guda** is a different person than **Shimon ben Godeya**.

V'OROS LIVUVIN

- A Braisa says, what is assur as a skin that was pierced at the heart (and is assur as avoda zara)? It is a skin that is ripped opposite the heart, and is pierced with a window-like opening. If it has dried blood on it, it means it was ripped while the animal was alive and it is therefore assur. If there is no blood, it is mutar.
 - **R' Huna** said, we can only rely on the absence of blood if the skin was not yet salted. If it was salted, we have to be concerned that that salt removed the blood.

R' SHIMON BEN GAMLIEL OMER BIZMAN SHEHAKERAH...

- **R' Yosef in the name of R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said the halacha follows **R' Shimon ben Gamliel**. **Abaye** asked, by saying the halacha follows him, this suggests that there are those who argue on him. Is that so? **R' Yosef** said, what is the difference? In either case, the halacha follows **R' Shimon**! **Abaye** said, what is the point of learning that the halacha follows him if there is no one who argues with him!?

BASAR HANICHNAS LAAVODAS KOCHAVIM MUTAR

- **Q:** Presumably this animal was shechted by a goy. Who is the Tanna who holds that an animal shechted by a goy is mutar b'hana'ah? **A:** **R' Chiya bar Abba in the name of R' Yochanan** said it does not follow **R' Elazar**, because **R' Elazar** holds that an unspecified intent of a goy is for his avoda zara.

V'HAYOTZEI ASSUR MIPNEI SHEHU K'ZIVCHEI MEISIM

- Why is it that meat that leaves the place of avoda zara is assur b'hana'ah? It is because it was definitely offered as a korban to the avoda zara. This follows the view of **R' Yehuda ben Beseira** in a Braisa who compares the korban of avoda zara to a meis and says that it gives off tumah to anything under the same roof as it. Similarly, he would compare it to a meis and say that it is assur b'hana'ah.

HAHOLCHIN L'TARFUS ASSURIN LASEIS V'LASEIS IMAHEM

- **Shmuel** said, with regard to a goy who is travelling to worship his avoda zara, when he is travelling there we may not transact with him, because he will go and give thanks to his avoda zara. When he is on his way back it is mutar to transact with him, because he will no longer do so. If a Yid is travelling to worship an avoda zara, it is

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

mutar to transact with him when he is on the way to the avoda zara, because we can assume that he will not follow through with worshipping the avoda zara. When he is on his way back after leaving the avoda zara it is assur to transact with him, because once he worshipped once, he is likely to return and thank the avoda zara then.

- **Q:** A Braisa says that if a Yid is travelling to worship an avoda zara, it is assur to transact with him when he is on the way to the avoda zara and when he is on the way back!? **A: R' Ashi** said, that is referring to a Yid who is a mumar, who we feel will certainly end up going to serve the avoda zara.
- A Braisa says, if a goy is going to a fair of avoda zara, it is mutar to transact with him when he is on the way there and when he is on his way back. If a Yid is going to a fair of avoda zara, it is mutar to transact with him when he is on the way there and assur to transact with him when he is on his way back.
 - **Q:** The reason it is assur to deal with a Yid when he is on the way back is because we assume that the money he has, was made from selling an avoda zara at the fair. If so, why is it mutar to deal with a goy when he is on his way back? If it is because we assume the money the goy has is not from the sale of avoda zara, but rather from something else, we should make the same assumption regarding a Yid!? **A:** If the Yid had something other than an avoda zara to sell, he would not have gone to that fair to sell it. Rather, he would have stayed home and sold it there. Therefore, we must assume that the money he made at the fair was from selling an avoda zara.

-----Daf ל"ג-----33-----

V'HABA'IN MUTARIN

- **Reish Lakish** said, this is only if the goy is returning by himself. However, if he is with other goyim who are returning from the avoda zara it is assur to deal with him, because we say that it is possible that he intends to return.

NODOS HA'OVDEI KOCHAVIM V'KANKANEYHEM

- A Braisa says, the leather flasks of a goy which are smooth and not lined with tar and are new are mutar (they don't absorb in a short amount of time). If they are old or lined with tar, they are assur. If a goy poured tar into the flask to line it and mixed wine into the tar (to remove the bad smell and taste), but a Yid was standing there as he did so, we are not concerned and the flask may be used.
 - **Q:** If the goy puts in wine, what does it help to have the Yid standing there? **A: R' Pappa** said, the Braisa means that if a goy is pouring in the tar and a Yid is there and pours wine into the mixture, and another Yid is there as this is done, we are not concerned and the flask may be used.
 - **Q:** If it is a Yid who is putting in the wine, why do we need another Yid to be standing there and watching? **A:** We are concerned that since the Yid with the wine is preoccupied, he would not even notice if the goy took the wine and poured it to avoda zara.
 - **R' Zvid** said the case is as we initially understood (a goy is pouring the wine and a Yid is there watching). We are not concerned that he may be using yayin nesech, because the wine that gets mixed into the tar becomes totally unnoticeable and even its taste totally disappears. The reason a Yid must be there is so that after the tar dries he can make sure that the goy does not put in more wine, because putting in wine at that point would leave a taste of the yayin nesech in the flask, which would make it assur.
 - Based on this **R' Pappi** said, if a goy pours some wine into a container of salt of a Yid, it remains mutar, because the taste of the wine totally disappears. **R' Ashi** disagreed and said, when mixed into tar it totally disappears, but when mixed in salt it does not.
 - Bar Adi the Arab once grabbed leather flasks from **R' Yitzchak bar Yosef**, put his own wine into them, and when he was done using them he returned them. **R' Yitzchak** asked what can be done to make them mutar to use. **R' Yirmiya** told him that **R' Ami** paskened that they can be filled with water for 3 days and emptied out (this would remove the yayin nesech that was absorbed into them). **Rava** said, this means that they must be emptied out and refilled every 24 hours for 3 days.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- They thought that this ruling only works for keilim of a Yid into which wine of a goy was poured, but would not work for keilim of a goy. However, **Ravin in the name of Reish Lakish** said, this even works to make the keilim of goyim mutar for us to use.
- **R' Acha the son of Rava** thought that this only works for leather flasks, but not for earthenware keilim. **R' Ashi** told him that this method even works for earthenware keilim.
- A Braisa says, the earthenware keilim of a goy which are smooth and not lined with tar and are new (brand new) are mutar. If they are old (used even once) or lined with tar, they are assur. If a goy poured wine into them the Yid can fill it with water for 3 days (as explained above, to remove the flavor of the wine) and they then become mutar. Another method is for the Yid to put in fish oils or fats, which immediately kill the taste of the wine and make it mutar.
 - **Q:** Is using the fish fats and oils a method l'chatchila or only b'dieved? **A: R' Zvid bar Oshaya** taught a Braisa that says it can even be done l'chatchila.
 - **R' Yehuda Nesi'ah** asked **R' Ami**, if the Yid puts the earthenware keili back into the oven and they became white from the heat, would that make them mutar? **R' Ami** said, if the fish fats can burn out the yayin nesech, then certainly fire can burn out the yayin nesech.
 - **R' Yochanan** (or **R' Assi in the name of R' Yochanan**) similarly said, if these keilim are put back into the oven and the tar lining fell off from the heat, they become mutar. **R' Ashi** said, the lining doesn't have to actually fall off. Rather, even if it becomes loose from the fire the keilim become mutar.
 - If the Yid puts burning pieces of wood into the keili, **R' Acha and Ravina** argue – one says that the keili would remain assur and the other says that it would make the keili mutar. The Gemara paskens like the view that it remains assur.
 - **Q:** Can a Yid put beer into a keili that has absorptions of yayin nesech? **A: R' Nachman and R' Yehuda** say the beer would become assur and **Rava** says it would be mutar.
 - **Ravina** allowed **R' Chiya the son of R' Yitzchak** to put beer into such a keili, but **R' Chiya** mistakenly put in wine. Still, this did not cause **Ravina** to be goizer for such a case.
 - **R' Yitzchak bar Bisna** had keilim made of animal dung that had absorbed yayin nesech. He filled them with water (to remove the wine) and placed them in the sun (thinking this would be an even more effective process), which caused the keilim to burst from the heat. **R' Abba** told him, you caused the loss of the keilim unnecessarily, because the **Rabanan** only required that they be filled with water, not that they be left in the sun.
 - **R' Yosana in the name of R' Ami** said that keilim made of "nesser" can never have the yayin nesech removed from them. **R' Yose bar Avin** explained that these are keilim made from earth which is used for "alum".
 - Parzak the goy took keilim from Yidden and put his yayin nesech into them, and when he was done he returned them to the owners. They asked **R' Yehuda** what can be done to these keilim. He told them that these keilim are of the type that no one would store wine in them for long periods of time. Therefore, they should just be rinsed with water and will be mutar.
 - **R' Avira** said, the keilim of the Arameans, which are made of a red clay that allows for little absorption, can simply be rinsed after yayin nesech has been put into them. **R' Pappi** said that the same is true for earthenware keilim of Bei Michsei, which also don't absorb a lot.
 - With regard to earthenware cups (which are used for drinking, and not used for storing wine), **R' Assi** said they are assur and **R' Ashi** said they are mutar.
 - If the first time they were ever used was when yayin nesech was put into them, all would agree that they are assur. The machlokes is if yayin nesech was put into them at a later time. **Others** say that if the first or second time they were ever used was when yayin nesech was put into them, all would agree that they are assur. The machlokes is if yayin nesech was put into them at a later time, beginning with the third use. The Gemara paskens that if it was placed into the cups for the first or second use, they are assur. If after that, they are mutar.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Zvid** said, with regard to earthenware keilim that are covered with lead, if they are black or white they are mutar (the coating does not allow for absorption). If they are green they are assur, because they are mixed with earth of “alum” (which are absorbent). If the keilim have cracks in them, even the white and black ones would be assur.
- **Mareimar** darshened that coated earthenware keilim that were used for yayin nesech, whether the keilim are black, white or green, are mutar.
 - **Q:** Why is this different than when these keilim were used for chametz and a person now wants to use them for Pesach? With regard to Pesach we find that **Mareimar** was asked, earthenware keilim which have a metal glossy finish on them, may they be used on Pesach after having been used for chametz? Do we say that the metal finish prevents the earthenware from absorbing the chametz? Green keilim are made of a super absorptive material and even with a metal coating, they clearly cannot be purged and used on Pesach. The question is regarding the white and black ones. Also, if there are cracks, it clearly cannot be used. The question is regarding smooth ones with no cracks. **Mareimar** said, I see that even these keilim become moist on the exterior, which means that they surely absorb. Since earthenware can never fully purge, they will be assur. Why is it that we allow these types of keilim which had “yayin nesech” in them? **A:** The chametz keilim were used with heat. The keilim used for yayin nesech were only used for cold.

-----Daf 77-----34-----

- **R' Akiva** went to Ginzak, and he was asked: 1) is there a concept of fasting for a few hours?; 2) are the barrels used by goyim to store wine mutar or assur?; 3) what clothing did Moshe wear during the 7 days of Milu'im, when he acted as the Kohen Gadol? **R' Akiva** did not know the answers. He asked in the Beis Medrash and was told: 1) there is such a concept, and one who fasts for only a few hours does say Aneinu; 2) these barrels become mutar for use after 12 months; 3) Moshe wore a white, linen garment made for this purpose. **R' Kahana** said, he wore a white linen garment that had no hems or seams.

HACHARTZANIM VIHAZAGIM SHEL OVDEI KOCHAVIM...

- A Braisa says, the grape seeds and grape peels of goyim, when they are moist they are assur and when they are dry they are mutar.
 - **Q:** What is considered moist and what is considered dry? **A:** **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, they are “moist” for 12 months after the grapes were pressed and “dry” after that.
 - **Rabbah bar Chana in the name of R' Yochanan** said, when they are assur they are even assur b'hana'ah, and when they are mutar they are even mutar to eat.
 - **R' Zvid** said, the sediment of the wine of an Aramean is mutar after 12 months.
 - **R' Chaviva the son of Rava** said, the bottles of goyim that had yayin nesech in them are mutar after 12 months.
 - **R' Chaviva** said, the leather bags used by travelers to store their wine become mutar after 12 months.
 - **R' Acha the son of R' Ika** said, the pulpy residue of grapes of an Aramean becomes mutar after 12 months.
 - **R' Acha the son of Rava** said, these red and black bottles of goyim become mutar after 12 months.

V'HAMURYAS

- A Braisa says, the “muryas” of a professional chef who is a goy is mutar (because he would not add wine to the mixture). **R' Yehuda ben Gamliel in the name of R' Chanina ben Gamliel** said, also the “chilak” (a small kosher fish that is easily mixed up with a similar non-kosher fish) of a professional fisherman goy is mutar (because he will make sure to remove the non-kosher fish from the mixture).
 - **Avimi the son of R' Avahu** taught a Braisa that says that the “muryas” of a professional chef who is a goy is mutar. He then added, that is only the first and second time that he uses a particular fish to get its oils

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

(they would process the fish multiple times for this purpose). After that, it is assur because he at that point he puts in wine.

- It once happened that a ship carrying muryas came to the Akko port, and **R' Abba of Akko** sent people to guard it so that the goyim merchants don't mix wine into it. **Rava** asked him, how are we to know that wine wasn't mixed in before it reached EY? **R' Abba** said, this muryas comes from a place where wine is more expensive than muryas, so they wouldn't have mixed in wine. In EY muryas is more expensive than wine, so we need to make sure that a goy does not mix in wine to increase the amount of the muryas mixture.
 - **R' Yirmiya** asked **R' Zeira**, why were they not concerned that the ship passed by Tzor, where wine was also inexpensive, and there should be concern that wine was mixed in there!? **R' Zeira** said, the water there is very rough and a ship would therefore not venture into that area.

UGVINAS BEIS UNAIKI

- **Reish Lakish** said, the reason the cheese of Beis Unaiki is assur is because most of the calves of that town are shechted for avoda zara (and the rennet of these animals used in the cheese making process would make the cheese assur).
 - **Q:** Why is **Reish Lakish** only concerned because *most* of the calves are shechted for avoda zara? Even if it was only a minority of the calves that were shechted to avoda zara the cheese should be assur according to **R' Meir**, because **R' Meir** is even concerned for a minority!? **A:** If there would only be a minority of the calves that are shechted for avoda zara, that would mean that most calves are not, and that there are other animals (besides calves) that are used for cheese making that are also not shechted for avoda zara. This means that the assur cheese would only be a minority of a minority, which even **R' Meir** is not concerned for.
 - **Q:** **R' Shimon ben Elyakam** asked **Reish Lakish**, why would the cheese become assur just because the calf was shechted for avoda zara? You (**Reish Lakish**) hold that if when one shechts an animal he has in mind that he intends to throw its blood to avoda zara or offer its fats to avoda zara it would not make the animal assur at that point. If so, why does the animal become assur? **A:** **Reish Lakish** said, the Mishna is talking about a case where the person said that the act of shechita is itself being done as a form of worship to the avoda zara. In that case the animal becomes assur right then.

AMAR R' YEHUDA SHA'AL R' YISHMAEL

- **R' Achdivoy in the name of Rav** said, if a man is mekadesh a woman using the wastes of an animal that was sentenced to death by stoning for killing a person (this animal is assur b'hana'ah) it is a valid kiddushin, but if he uses the wastes of an animal that was offered to avoda zara, it would not be a valid kiddushin. This difference can be explained based on logic – the owner wants his animal to look fatter when he is offering it to avoda zara, and therefore the issur is on the wastes of the animal as well (since that helps to make the animal seem fatter), but the owner of an animal that is being put to death does not care if the animal looks fatter. It can also be explained based on pesukim – the pasuk regarding avoda zara says “lo yidbak b'yadcha me'uma”, whereas the pasuk regarding the animal sentenced to death says “v'lo yei'acheil es bisaro”, which suggests that its meat is assur but its wastes are mutar.
 - **Rava** said, we have learned both of these rulings in our Mishna. The Mishna says that the rennet of an Olah is mutar even though the animal is assur b'hana'ah, which would mean that its wastes would be mutar, and likewise the wastes of an animal sentenced to death would also be mutar. The Mishna also says that the rennet of an animal offered to avoda zara is assur, which would mean that the wastes of such an animal would be assur as well.
 - **Q:** **R' Yishmael** said in the Mishna that if the reason the cheese is assur is because they use the rennet of animals of avoda zara, the cheese should even be assur b'hana'ah. Why didn't **R' Yehoshua** answer that it is not assur b'hana'ah because it is not noticeable in the cheese!? **A:** Since the rennet is what turns the milk into cheese, it is considered to be noticeable in the cheese, even though the actual rennet is not noticeable.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

-----Daf לך 35-----

HISI'UY L'DAVAR ACHER...

- **Q:** What is meant by the pasuk “ki tovim dodecha miyayin”? **A:** **R’ Dimi** said, Klal Yisrael says to Hashem, the words of the **Rabanan** are more pleasant to us than the Torah itself (**R’ Yehoshua** used this to tell **R’ Yishmael** that it is very important to follow the gezeira of the **Rabanan** regarding the cheese of goyim).
 - **Q:** Why did **R’ Yehoshua** choose this pasuk to give this message (there are others that do so more clearly)? **A:** **R’ Shimon ben Pazi** (or **R’ Shimon bar Ami**) said, he was trying to teach from the beginning of the pasuk – “yishakeini minshikos pihu”. **R’ Yehoshua** was telling **R’ Yishmael** to “press his lips together” and not to ask on this gezeira of the **Rabanan**.
 - **Q:** Why did **R’ Yehoshua** not want **R’ Yishmael** asking on this gezeira? **A:** **Ulla** (or **R’ Shmuel bar Abba**) said, this was a new gezeira and we do not try and explain the reason for a new gezeira.
 - **Q:** What is the reason for this gezeira that the cheese of a goy is assur? **A:** **R’ Shimon ben Pazi** (or **R’ Yehoshua ben Levi**) said, it is for concern that a snake left its venom in it.
 - **Q:** Why couldn’t **R’ Yehoshua** have given this reason? **A:** This is based on **Ulla**, who said that when a gezeira is made in EY they do not give the reason for a full year. The reason is, that if there is someone who does not agree with the reason and the gezeira, he would come to disparage it. Without knowing the reason, he cannot do so.
 - **Q:** **R’ Yirmiya** showed his disagreement with this reason for the gezeira. He said, if this is the reason, then if the cheese dried or properly aged it should be mutar, because **R’ Chanina** said that snake venom would not allow something to dry or age properly!? **A:** **R’ Chanina** said, the reason is that every cheese has some liquid from the milk left over in it. We are concerned that that liquid may be from non-kosher milk.
 - **Shmuel** said the reason for the gezeira is that the goyim make their cheese using the stomach of a neveila.
 - **Q:** This suggests that the rennet of the neveila would be mutar and it is only the stomach meat that causes the problem. However, **Shmuel** has explained a Mishna to state that the rennet of an animal shechted by a goy – which is neveila – is assur!? **A:** This Mishna was taught before **R’ Yehoshua** retracted in the Mishna, when he still held that rennet of neveila is assur. The statement of **Shmuel** saying that only the actual stomach is assur was said after **R’ Yehoshua** retracted.
 - **R’ Malkiya in the name of R’ Ada bar Ahava** said the reason for the gezeira is that the goyim smear pig fats onto their cheese.
 - **R’ Chisda** said, it is because they make the cheese using their wine vinegar.
 - **R’ Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, it is because they make the cheese using the sap of an orlah tree.
 - **Q:** This would seem to only follow **R’ Eliezer** of a Mishna who says that cheese that is made using the sap of an orlah tree is assur, because sap is considered to be fruit of the tree? **A:** The Mishna can even follow **R’ Yehoshua**, who argues and says that the sap of the orlah tree is mutar, but says that the sap of the orlah *fruit* is assur, and that may be the sap that **R’ Nachman bar Yitzchak** referred to.
 - **Q:** According to **R’ Chisda’s** and **R’ Nachman bar Yitzchak’s** reasons the cheese should even be assur b’hana’ah!? This remains a KASHYEH.
 - **R’ Nachman the son of R’ Chisda** darshened the pasuk of “I’reyach shimanecha tovim” as comparing a talmid chochom to a flask of fragrant oil – when it is uncovered its fragrance spreads, when it is covered it does not (when a talmid chochom teaches Torah to others his reputation will spread). Even more, “alamos aheyvucha” teaches that things that were hidden to him (things that he could not understand) become open to him (he understands them easily). Even more, these words can be darshened to teach

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

that he will merit a long life. Even more, these words can be darshened to teach that he will merit both in Olam Hazei and in Olam Habbah.

MISHNA

- The following items of a goy are assur, but are mutar b'hana'ah: the milk that was milked by a goy without a Yid seeing it, the bread of a goy, and their oil. **Rebbi** and his Beis Din permitted their oil. The Mishna continues with its list: the cooked food of a goy is assur to eat but is mutar b'hana'ah, as are the items that they pickle and preserve and usually put in wine or vinegar, the cut up "taris" fish (a species of small fish), their fish brine that does not have "kilbis" fish swimming in it (these kilbis only grow in the brine of kosher fish, and their absence shows that there must be non-kosher fish mixed in), their "chilak" fish (a small kosher fish that does not yet have their fins and scales), their "chiltis" (a sharp flavored grain, which takes in the grease of the knife used to cut it), and their "salkundis" salt. All these things are assur, but are not assur b'hana'ah.

GEMARA

- **Q:** What is the concern with their milk? It can't be that we are concerned that they will give the milk of a non-kosher animal, because the milk of a kosher animal is white and the milk of a non-kosher animal is yellowish, and therefore we would know if we are given non-kosher milk!? If we are concerned that he mixes in some non-kosher milk into the kosher milk, the Yid can try and make some of it into cheese – if it becomes cheese we will know that it is kosher milk, because we have been taught that only kosher milk can turn into cheese!? **A:** The case is where he doesn't want it to make cheese, and therefore it can't be tested in that way.
 - **Q:** Let him take a little and test it anyway!? **A:** Every cheese has some liquid from the milk left over in it, and therefore this test would be inconclusive for this purpose. This can also be a reason why their milk is assur even when the Yid wants the milk to use it all to make cheese.

V'HAPAS

- **R' Kahana in the name of R' Yochanan** said, the bread baked by a goy was not later allowed by Beis Din (it remains assur).
 - **Q:** This implies that there is someone who says that the bread is mutar? **A:** Yes. When **R' Dimi** came from EY he said that **Rebbi** was once in the field and a goy brought him bread that was baked in large quantities in a large oven, and he wondered that since the reason to be goizer on the bread is to prevent intermarriage, why were the **Rabanan** goizer even in the fields, where this concern is not really present? People thought that this comment meant that **Rebbi** was saying that the bread of a goy is mutar, however, this was not true. **R' Yosef** (or **R' Shmuel bar Yehuda**) said that the story was a different one. Once **Rebbi** saw that there was not enough bread for the talmidim and asked "Is there no baker here?" The people thought he was referring to a non-Jewish baker, and therefore thought that he was making the bread of a goy mutar. However, he was actually referring to a Jewish baker.
 - **R' Chelbo** said, even according to the view that the bread of a non-Jewish baker is mutar, that is only when there is no Jewish baker who can provide the necessary bread.
 - **R' Yochanan** said, even according to the view that the bread of a non-Jewish baker is mutar, that is only in the field, where there is no concern of it leading to intermarriage.
 - **Eivo** was biting and eating the bread of a goy in the fields at the border of the city. **Rava** (or **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak**) said to the talmidim, do not say any rulings in the name of **Eivo**, because he eats the bread of a goy.

-----Daf 17-----36-----

V'HASHEMEN SHELAHEN

- **Rav** said, it was Daniel who made this gezeira against their oil. **Shmuel** said, the oil is assur because it absorbs the flavors that were absorbed into the tamei keilim of the goyim, and the oil becomes tamei.
 - **Q:** Does everyone only eat things that are not tamei? **A:** **Shmuel** meant that it absorbs the flavors that were absorbed into the non-kosher keilim of the goyim.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Shmuel** told **Rav**, according to me it makes sense that **R' Simlai of Lod** said that **R' Yehuda** and his Beis Din could have been matir the oil of a goy, because they held that the taste of the non-kosher items are “nosein taam lifgam”, and therefore don't make the oil assur. However, according to you who says that Daniel made the gezeira, how could **R' Yehuda Hanasi** come along and be mevatel a gezeira of Daniel? A Mishna says that a Beis Din cannot be mevatel the directive of another Beis Din unless they are greater than them in wisdom and in number!? **Rav** said, we cannot trust **R' Simlai** that **R' Yehuda** was mevatel the gezeira, because the people of Lod don't properly treat the gezeiros of the **Rabanan**. **Shmuel** asked, should I let **R' Simlai** know what you said? At first **Rav** was embarrassed, but he then quoted a pasuk which says that Daniel decided that he would not eat from the king's bread or from the “wine of his drinks”. The plural use of “drinks” teaches that he was referring to two drinks – wine and oil. **Rav** held that Daniel decided this and ruled this way for all of Klal Yisrael. **Shmuel** held that he decided this for himself, and did not rule so for others.
 - **Q:** We find that **Baali in the name of Avimi Nosa'ah in the name of Rav** said, that the gezeira making the bread, oil, wine and daughters of goyim assur were part of the 18 gezeiros enacted by **Shammai and Hillel**. We see that **Rav** himself said it was not from Daniel!? You can't answer that Daniel made the gezeira, but noone followed this gezeira until it was reenacted by **Shammai and Hillel**, because then what would be the point of **Rav** telling us that it was enacted by Daniel? **A:** Daniel was only goizer when in the city, whereas **Shammai and Hillel** were even goizer for people when in the fields.
 - **Q:** How could **R' Yehuda Hanasi** be mevatel a gezeira of **Shammai and Hillel**? We have learned that a Beis Din cannot be mevatel the directive of another Beis Din unless they are greater than them in wisdom and in number!? Further, **Rabbah bar bar Chana in the name of R' Yochanan** said, a Beis Din can always be mevatel the words of another Beis Din *except* for the 18 gezeiros of **Shammai and Hillel**!? **A:** **R' Mesharshiya** said, the reason why these 18 cannot be made batul is because the gezeiros were widely accepted and practiced throughout Klal Yisrael. The gezeira regarding the oil was not widely practiced and accepted, and that is why it was allowed to be made batel. It was therefore made batel, because it was a gezeira which most Yidden are not able to uphold.
 - **Q:** What was the gezeira regarding the daughters of goyim? **A:** **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, they were goizer that non-Jewish girls have the status of niddos from when they are babies. **Geniva in the name of Rav** said, all the gezeiros (on their bread, oil, wine, and daughters) were a gezeira for avoda zara. As we find that **R' Acha bar Ada in the name of R' Yitzchak** said that they were goizer on the bread and oil of a goy on account of the wine of a goy, and were goizer on their wine on account of their daughters, and were goizer on their daughters on account of avoda zara, and they were goizer on a different matter on account of a different matter.
 - **Q:** The daughters of goyim are assur D'Oraisa, based on the pasuk of “lo tishchatein bam”!? **A:** The pasuk only refers to the 7 nations of EY. They came along and were goizer for other goyim as well.
 - **Q:** **R' Shimon ben Yochai** darshens a pasuk to teach that the daughters of all goyim are assur D'Oraisa. According to him, what was the gezeira? **A:** This issur D'Oraisa is only to marry them. The gezeira was that even zenus with them is assur.
 - **Q:** The Beis Din of Shem was already goizer on zenus with goyim, as we find that Yehuda paskened that Tamar be put to death for being mezaneh!? **A:** Rather, the gezeira of Shem was regarding a Jewish woman being mezaneh with a goy, out of concern that she will follow his idolatrous ways. **Shammai and**

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Hillel were goizer that even a Jewish man with a female goy is assur as well.

- **Q:** The issur of a Jew with a non-Jewish woman is a Halacha L'Moshe MiSinai, which says that the "kana'im" may kill such a person!? **A:** That only teaches regarding when the zenus is publicly known. **Shammai and Hillel** were goizer even for when it is done privately.
- **Q:** The issur of zenus in private was already assur based on a gezeira of the Beis Din of the Chashmona'im!? **A:** This Beis Din was only goizer on actual zenus. **Shammai and Hillel** were goizer even on seclusion with a non-Jewish woman.
- **Q:** **R' Yehuda** has said that the Beis Din of Dovid was goizer on seclusion!? **A:** That gezeira was for seclusion of a Yid with a Jewish woman.
- **Q:** We find that **R' Yochanan in the name of R' Yishmael** said, that seclusion of a man and a woman is based on a "remez" from a pasuk, which means it is D'Oraisa!? **A:** The issur of seclusion D'Oraisa only applies to a man secluding with a married woman. Dovid was goizer against seclusion with an unmarried woman as well. The talmidim **B'S and B'H** were goizer even against seclusion with a non-Jewish woman.
 - **Q:** What is meant that "they were goizer on a different matter on account of a different matter"? **A:** **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, they were goizer that children of goyim have a din of a zav. This was done to prevent Jewish children from associating with them.
 - At first **Rebbi** said this even applies to a child of one day old. He then retracted and held like **R' Chiya**, who said that it begins at the age when a child is capable of having zenus (a boy at 9 and a girl at 3).

-----Daf ל"ז-----37-----

- **R' Yehuda Nesiah** was leaning on his attendant, **R' Simlai**, and told him, "You were not in the Beis Medrash yesterday when we were matir the oil of goyim". **R' Simlai** said, "You should even be matir the bread of goyim". **R' Yehuda Nesiah** said, "If we do that they will call us the Beis Din who is matir everything!", as we find in a Mishna where **R' Yose ben Yoezer Ish Tzreida** was matir three things (he was matir a certain type of grasshopper, he said that all liquids of the butchering area in the Beis Hamikdash are tahor, and he said that one who touches a corpse is tamei) and the **Rabanan** referred to him as "Yosef the one who is matir"! **R' Simlai** said, **R' Yose** was different, because he was matir three things, whereas you, even if you are matir the bread of a goy, will only have been matir two things. **R' Yehuda Nesiah** said, "I was also matir another thing, and therefore making their bread mutar would be a third thing for me as well."
 - **Q:** What was the other thing that he was matir? **A:** A Mishna says, if a husband says "This is your get if I do not come back within 12 months" and he then died within those 12 months, the get is not valid. The Gemara on that Mishna brings a Braisa that says, in the case of this Mishna the **Rabanan** allowed her to remarry. **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, the **Rabanan** is the view of the Beis Din that allowed the use of the oil of goyim, and they follow **R' Yose**, who says that the date on the document is the equivalent of him saying "from now". We see that it was **R' Yehuda Nesiah** who was matir in this Braisa.
 - **R' Abba the son of R' Chiya bar Abba** said that **R' Yehuda Nesiah** paskened like the Braisa, but that the others disagreed with him.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Elazar** asked an elderly man, when **R' Yehuda Nesiah** allowed her to remarry, did he allow her to do so immediately (since he will clearly not be coming), or only after the 12 months have passed (because it is only then that the condition is fulfilled)?
 - **Q:** Why couldn't he ask this on the case of the Mishna where he said "from now" and then died within the 12 months? **A:** He could have, but he met the old man who was on the Beis Din of **R' Yehuda Nesiah**, so he asked him about that case where he was actually matir.
- **Abaye** said, all agree that if a man says, "This is your get when the sun rises", that the get is only effective in the morning, and if he died during the night before, the get would be passul. If he said, "This is your get on the condition – ahl menas – that the sun rises", all agree that it takes effect immediately, because **R' Huna** previously said that "ahl menas" is like saying "from now". The machlokes is only in the case where he said, "If the sun comes out". In that case the Braisa holds like **R' Yose**, that it is as if he said "from now", because the get is dated, and the Mishna does not hold like **R' Yose** and therefore the get is not effective immediately.
- We learned above that **R' Yose ben Yoezer Ish Tzreida** was matir three things: he was matir a certain type of grasshopper, he said that all liquids of the butchering area in the Beis Hamikdash are tahor, and he said that one who touches a corpse is tamei – and the **Rabanan** referred to him as "Yosef the one who is matir".
 - **Q:** What type of grasshopper was he matir? **A:** **R' Pappa** said, it was a "shoshviva", and the machlokes between **Yose ben Yoezer** and those that argue with him was whether a grasshopper with a long head is mutar (**R' Yose** holds it is and the others hold it is not), and **R' Chiya bar Ami in the name of Ulla** said, it was a "susbil", and all would agree that a grasshopper with a long head is assur, and the machlokes is regarding a grasshopper whose wings barely cover a majority of its body (**R' Yose** holds any majority suffices and the others hold that it must be a noticeable majority).
 - **Q:** What did he mean when he said that the liquids of the butchering area in the Beis Hamikdash are tahor? **A:** **Rav** said, it means that they are literally tahor, and cannot become tamei. **Shmuel** said, it means they can't make other things tamei, but they themselves can become tamei.
 - **Rav** holds that liquids are only tamei D'Rabanan, and in the Mikdash the **Rabanan** are not goizer. **Shmuel** said, that **Yose ben Yoezer** said that the liquids of the Mikdash butchering area don't make other items tamei, but are tamei themselves. This is because **Shmuel** holds that liquids are tamei themselves D'Oraisa, but make other items tamei only D'Rabanan, and in the Mikdash the **Rabanan** are not goizer.
 - **Q:** By saying that one who touches a corpse is tamei he should have been called "Yosef the one who makes assur", not the matir!? Further, the fact that one who touches a corpse is tamei is a halacha D'Oraisa, so this was not his ruling!? **A:** D'Oraisa only the person who touches the corpse is tamei. The **Rabanan** came along and said that if the person who touched a corpse then touches a second person, the second person becomes tamei. **Yose ben Yoezer** said that the second person would not become tamei.
 - **Q:** The pasuk of "v'chol asher yigah bo hatamei yitmah" teaches that even D'Oraisa the second person would become tamei!? **A:** The **Rabanan in front of Rava** said in the name of **Mar Zutra the son of R' Nachman in the name of R' Nachman**, that D'Oraisa if the first person is touching the meis when he also touches the second person, the second person becomes tamei for a full 7 days, and if the first person was not touching the meis when he touched the second person, the second person becomes tamei only until nightfall. The **Rabanan** then said that in either case the second person becomes tamei for 7 days. **Yose ben Yoezer** then said that we follow the D'Oraisa in this case.
 - **Rava** said to the **Rabanan** (when they told him the above), I told you not to "hang empty pitchers on **R' Nachman**" (don't say things in his name that he

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

didn't say). In fact, what **R' Nachman** said was that **Yose ben Yoezer** ruled that safek tumah in the reshus harabim is tahor.

- **Q:** That is a Halacha L'Moshe MiSinai learned from sotah!? **A:** **R' Yochanan** had said that this is the halacha, but that one is not to pasken this way in public. **Yose ben Yoezer** came along and paskened this way in public. A Braisa suggests this way as well.
 - **R' Yannai** did not follow this psak when there was nothing lost by making the people go to the mikvah to become tahor (there was no food that was touched that was already made tamei).

V'HASHLAKOS

- **Q:** From where do we know that this is assur? **A:** **R' Chiya bar Abba in the name of R' Yochanan** said, the pasuk that talks of the Yidden's desire to buy food from Sichon says they would buy food and water. The pasuk thereby compares food to water to teach that they only bought food in a raw state.
 - **Q:** If so, if a goy took grain and dried it in an oven it should also be assur, and yet a Braisa says that that would be mutar!? **A:** Rather, the comparison to water teaches that only things that have not changed in form may be bought from them (cooked foods change form, but dried grains do not).
 - **Q:** If so, if a goy ground wheat into flour it should be assur, and yet a Braisa says that it would be mutar!? **A:** Rather, the comparison to water teaches that only things that have not changed in form through fire may be bought from them (cooked foods change form through fire, but dried grains and ground flour do not).
 - **Q:** The pasuk makes no mention of fire whatsoever!? **A:** Rather, eating something cooked by a goy is only assur D'Rabanan (so that a Yid not be accustomed to eat by the goy and eventually eat things that are not kosher), and the pasuk is only an "asmachta".