



Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Avodah Zarah, Daf מד – Daf לה

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

-----Daf לה---38-----

- **R' Shmuel bar Yitzchak in the name of Rav** said, anything that can be eaten raw is not assur if it is cooked by a goy. In Pumbedisa they said, **R' Shmuel bar Yitzchak in the name of Rav** said, anything that is not significant enough to be found on the table of kings is not assur if it is cooked by a goy.
 - The difference between these versions is small fish, mushrooms, and cereal (they are not eaten raw, but are also not found on the tables of kings).
- **R' Assi in the name of Rav** said, small, salted fish are not subject to the issur of bishul akum.
 - **R' Yosef** said, if a goy roasted them, they may be used for the eiruv (since it was edible before the roasting, it is not assur as bishul akum). However, if a goy made fish fried in fats and flour, it may not be used for the eiruv (since it may not be eaten).
 - **Q:** This would seem obvious!? **A:** We would think to say that the fats is the main ingredient, and since that is not subject to bishul akum it should be allowed for the eiruv. **R' Yosef** teaches that the flour is the main ingredient, and therefore it is subject to bishul akum and assur to use for the eiruv.
- **R' Bruna in the name of Rav** said, if a goy lit a field on fire, all the grasshoppers that get roasted by this fire are assur
 - **Q:** Why are they assur? It can't be talking about where he is not sure which are the kosher grasshoppers, because then it would be assur even if a Yid had lit the fire. It also can't mean that it is assur as "bishul akum", because **R' Chanan bar Ami in the name of R' Pedas in the name of R' Yochanan** said that when the goy cooks something without the intent to cook it (e.g. he burns the head of an animal to remove its hair, but in the process the meat now became edible) it is not assur as bishul akum. This goy who lit the field to clear it, and did not intend to roast the grasshoppers, should not make them assur as bishul akum!? **A:** The reason it is assur is because he can no longer recognize which is kosher and which is not. The reason he gave the case of where the goy lit the field is because that is how the incident actually took place.
 - **Ravina** said, based on the ruling of **R' Chanan bar Ami in the name of R' Pedas in the name of R' Yochanan**, if a goy fires up an oven to dry a keili or something with the fire, and the Yid had previously buried a gourd in the oven before it was fired up, the gourd may be eaten when it is cooked.
 - **Q:** This seems obvious!? **A:** We would think that he intends to "cook" the keili to dry it, and therefore any food that also gets cooked from that fire should become assur as bishul akum. He therefore teaches that he intends to harden the keili, not cook it, and the food is therefore mutar.
- **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, if a Yid puts meat on top of coals and a goy passed by and turned it over on the coals, the meat is mutar.
 - **Q:** What is the case? If we say that it would have been cooked without the goy turning it over, then it is obvious that it is mutar!? If it would not have been cooked had he not turned it over, then why is it mutar? **A:** The case is that the goy's turning it over quickened the cooking. We would have thought that this act is therefore significant enough to make it assur. **Shmuel** teaches that it is mutar.
 - **Q:** **R' Assi in the name of R' Yochanan** said, that if a Yid cooked food like the cooking of "Ben Drusai" (which generally means it is cooked 1/3 of normal cooking) then it does not become assur as bishul akum if a goy cooks it after that, but if it was cooked for less than that it would become assur. This seems to contradict **Shmuel** who doesn't seem to care how much the Yid had cooked the meat before the goy turned it over!? **A:** **R' Assi** is talking about a case where the Yid took it off the fire and a goy then put it back onto the fire (the Yid's cooking came to an end).

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

In **Shmuel's** case the meat would have continued cooking even without the goy turning it over. That is the difference.

- A Braisa says this as well. The Braisa says, as long as the Yid put the food on the fire, a goy can then stir or turn over the food and it would not be a problem.
- **Q:** What if a goy put the meat on the fire and a Yid came and turned it over? **A:** **R' Nachman bar Yitzchak** said, it is mutar based on a kal v'chomer – if it is mutar when a goy finishes the cooking, it will definitely be mutar when a Yid finishes the cooking.
 - We have learned this as well in a ruling of **Rabbah bar bar Chana in the name of R' Yochanan**, who said that when a Yid placed it there and a goy turned it, or if a goy placed it there and a Yid turned it, it is mutar. It is only assur when the goy begins and completes the cooking.
 - **Ravina** said, therefore, with regard to bread, if a goy lit the oven and a Yid puts the bread in, or visa-versa, or even if the goy lights it and puts the bread in but the Yid stirred the coals, the bread is mutar.
 - With regard to fish salted by a goy (which, because of the salt, no longer needs to be cooked), **Chizkiya** said it is mutar (this is not called cooking) and **R' Yochanan** said it is assur. With regard to an egg roasted by a goy, **Bar Kappara** said it is mutar (since the shell prevents the goy from actually touching the food that is eaten) and **R' Yochanan** said it is assur. **R' Dimi** said that regarding salted fish and roasting an egg, **Chizkiya and Bar Kappara** said it is mutar and **R' Yochanan** said it is assur.
 - **R' Chiya Parva'ah** was asked by the Reish Galusa regarding the halacha of an egg roasted by a goy. He said that **Chizkiya and Bar Kappara** said it is mutar and **R' Yochanan** said it is assur and we follow the view of the two against the single view. **R' Zvid** told them that this is incorrect, because **Abaye** said we follow the stringent view of **R' Yochanan**. The people of the Reish Galusa then poisoned **R' Zvid** for being stringent, and he died.
- A Braisa says, “kafrisin” (the shell of the “tzlaf” fruit, which can be eaten raw but is also eaten cooked), leek (which is eaten raw), “hemtalya”, hot water (which doesn't change form when cooked), and dried grain (which also doesn't change form), of goyim, are mutar. An egg roasted by a goy is assur. With regard to the oil of a goy, **R' Yehuda Hanasi** and his Beis Din were matir it.
 - A Braisa gives other names for “hemtalya”, and then explains based on a story that it is a mixture of seeds placed into warm water and the shoots that grow from them are then eaten.
- A Braisa says, the date residue (used to make beer by pouring hot water on it) of goyim, if the water used on them was cooked in a large pot it is assur. If it was cooked in a small pot it is mutar.
 - **R' Yannai** explained, a “small pot” means it is not large enough for a small “dror” bird to go into it (so there is no concern that the pot was used to cook non-kosher things).
 - **Q:** Maybe they cut up the bird and put it in!? **A:** Rather, if it is so small that the *head* of the dror cannot fit in, there is no concern.
 - **Q:** Another Braisa says that it is mutar whether a large pot or a small pot is used!? **A:** The first Braisa holds that “nosein taam lifgam” is assur and this Braisa holds that it is mutar.
- **R' Sheishes** said, oil that is cooked by a goy is assur. **R' Safra** argued and said that it is not assur, for the following reasons. There is no concern that wine was mixed in, because that would make the oil spoil; there is no concern for bishul akum, because oil can be eaten in its raw state; and there is no concern that the non-kosher pots used to cook the oil caused non-kosher flavors to go into the oil, because nosein taam lifgam is mutar.
- They asked **R' Assi**, what is the halacha regarding dates that were cooked by a goy? Sweet ones are for sure mutar because they are eaten raw. Bitter ones are for sure assur, because they are only eaten cooked. What about the ones in between? **R' Assi** said, this is not a question, because **Levi** has said that they are assur.
- With regard to “shesisah” (flour made from dried kernels), **Rav** said it is mutar and the father of **Shmuel and Levi** said it is assur.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- If it is made of wheat or barley all would agree that it is mutar (because it is never made with vinegar). If it is made of lentils with vinegar, all would agree that it is assur. The machlokes is when it is made of lentils and water, and the machlokes is whether we have to be goizer for the case of when it is made with lentils and vinegar. **Others** say that all would be goizer in that case, and the machlokes is when it is made of wheat and barley, and the machlokes is whether we must be goizer in that case as well.
- The Gemara says that “nowadays” people buy this from goyim and are not concerned for the view of the father of **Shmuel and Levi**.

UKVASHIN SHEDARKAN LASEIS B'SOCHAN YAYIN

- **Chizkiya** said, this is only mutar b'hana'ah when it is the custom to put in wine or vinegar, but it is not known if it was actually added. However, if it is known to have been added it would even be assur b'hana'ah.
 - **Q:** Why is this different than muryas, which the **Rabanan** said is mutar b'hana'ah even though it has wine in it? **A:** In that case the wine is added to remove the bad smell. In this case the wine is added to give it a good taste.
 - **R' Yochanan** argued and said that even if it is known to have been added it would be mutar b'hana'ah.
 - **Q:** Why is this different than muryas, which **R' Meir** said is assur b'hana'ah? **A:** The wine in the muryas is eaten along with the muryas. The wine in the preserves is not eaten along with the preserved vegetables.

-----Daf ל"ט-----39-----

V'TARIS TRUFAH V'TZIR SHE'EIN BAH DAGAH...

- **Q:** What is “chilak”? **A: R' Nachman bar Abba in the name of Rav** said, it is the “sultanis” fish (which doesn't grow its fins and scales until it matures). The reason it is assur is because similar looking non-kosher fish are typically mixed in with them when they are caught.
 - A Braisa says, fish that don't yet have fins and scales, but which would grow them as they mature, are mutar (and the Braisa gives examples). Fish that have fins and scales now, but which lose them when they are pulled from the water, are also mutar (and the Braisa gives examples of this type of fish).
 - **R' Avahu** announced in Caesarea that fish innards and fish eggs may be bought from any person (even a goy), because in this place the fish only come from Pilusa and Aspamya, and those places don't have non-kosher fish.
 - This is similar to **Abaye**, who says that the “chilak” of the Bav River is mutar (because there are no similar non-kosher fish there).
 - **Q:** Why are there no non-kosher fish there? It can't be because it has a swift current and non-kosher fish can't swim in such a current, because we find that they do! It can't be because the water is salty and fish without scales can't survive there, because we see that they do! **A:** Rather it is because the river bed does not promote the growth of non-kosher fish.
 - **Ravina** said, now that other rivers flow into the Bav River, the chilak fish from there may not be bought from a goy.
- **Abaye** said the sea donkey is a kosher fish and the sea ox is not. The way to remember this is, that it is the opposite of the way it is on land. **R' Ashi** said the shefar nuna is kosher and the kedash nuna is not.
- **R' Akiva** went to Ginzak and they brought him a fish that looked like a certain non-kosher fish. He covered it with a basket and it thrashed around in the basket. He then looked at the basket and saw thin scales on the basket, and therefore said that the fish was kosher. **R' Ashi** had a similar story and he took the fish and held it against the sun and saw thin scales and therefore said it was kosher. Another time **R' Ashi** took a fish and covered it with a white bowl and saw it had black scales against the white bowl and said it was kosher. **Rabbah bar bar Chana** was once served a kosher fish and heard someone refer to it by the name of a non-kosher fish. He took this as a sign that he should not eat it. In the morning he examined it more closely and saw that there were some non-kosher fish mixed in with that kosher fish.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

V'HAKORET SHEL CHILTIS

- **Q:** Why is this assur? **A:** It is because the goy cuts it with his non-kosher knife, and even though we say “nosein taam lifgam is mutar”, because this grain is sharp, it sweetens the non-kosher fats on the knife and therefore is considered to be “nosein taam lishvach” and is assur.
- **R' Levi's** servant would sell chiltis and people would buy from him. After **R' Levi** died, the people asked **R' Yochanan** whether they can continue buying from the servant. **R' Yochanan** said, the servant of a chaver has the status of a chaver as well, and therefore it is mutar.
 - **R' Huna bar Menyumei** bought techeiles from the wife of **R' Amram Chasida**. He asked **R' Yosef** if he is allowed to use it, but he didn't know the answer. He then met Chanan the tailor, who told him that he once had a similar incident and **R' Yehuda of Hagrunya** told him that **Shmuel** said the wife of a chaver has the status of a chaver as well, and therefore it was mutar. In fact, a Braisa says this as well. It says that the wife of a chaver has the status of a chaver, the slave of a chaver has the status of a chaver, the family and household of a chaver continue to have his status unless they become suspect of being different, and a chatzer in which it is known that valid techeiles is sold continues with this presumption of validity until they have been shown to be selling passul.
 - A Braisa says, if the wife or daughter of an ahm haaretz married a chaver, or if the slave of an ahm haaretz was sold to a chaver, they must accept the rules of being a chaver in order to be considered a chaver. However, if the wife or daughter of a chaver married an ahm haaretz or if the servant of a chaver was sold to an ahm haaretz, **R' Meir** says they do not need to accept the rules of chaverus in order to be trusted as a chaver, and **R' Yehuda** says that they do.
- **Rav** said that the acronym of “chavis” – milk, meat, wine, and techeiles – are assur if they have only one seal, but the items represented by the acronym of “chamfag” – chiltis, muryas, bread, and cheese – are mutar with even just one seal.
 - Bread only needs one seal for the following reason. The goy would not switch out old bread for fresh bread, or wheat bread for barley bread, because the Yid would notice the switch. He would only switch out bread of equal kind and quality. For such a switch he would not bother to make the switch if there was even one seal.
 - **Q:** Why is it that one seal is enough for cheese but not for milk? **A: R' Pappa** said, remove milk from the first list and replace it with “a cut of fish that has no siman on it that it is kosher”.
 - **Q:** That is essentially the same thing as meat, which is already listed!? **A: Rav** lists two types of meat.
- **Shmuel** said that the acronym of “bayis” – meat, wine, and techeiles – are assur if they have only one seal, but the items represented by the acronym of “machag” – muryas, chiltis, and cheese – are mutar with one seal. **Shmuel** doesn't list the cut of fish, because he holds that that is covered under the item of “meat”.
- A Braisa says, one may not buy items represented by the acronym “yimach mechag” – wine, muryas, milk, salkunderis salt, chiltis, and cheese – in Surya, unless it was bought from someone who you know you can trust to be selling kosher items. With regard to all these items, if he is a guest by someone (even by a storekeeper from whom he couldn't buy these items) he may eat them in his house (the storekeeper may sell non-kosher to others, but is careful to eat kosher himself).
 - This supports **R' Yehoshua ben Levi**, who says that if a baal habayis sent a person these items as a gift, they are mutar. This is because the baal habayis surely only eats kosher, and the gift was sent from items in his house that he intended to eat from.

UMELACH SALKUNDERIS

- **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** explained, this is the salt that all the bakers of Rome eat (they mix in the fats of non-kosher fish).
- A Braisa says, **R' Meir** says, black salkunderis salt is assur, but white salkunderis salt is mutar. **R' Yehuda** says, white salkunderis salt is assur and black salkunderis salt is mutar. **R' Yehuda ben Gamliel in the name of R' Chanina ben Gamliel** says, both are assur.
 - **Rabbah bar bar Chana in the name of R' Yochanan** explained, the view that says white is assur is because the color means there is the innards of white, non-kosher fish mixed in. The view that says

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

black is assur is because the color means there is the innards of black, non-kosher fish mixed in. The view that says both are assur is because both of these innards are mixed in.

- **R' Avahu in the name of R' Chanina ben Gamliel** said, there was an old goy in his neighborhood who would coat this salt with pig fats.

HAREI EILU ASSURIM

- **Q:** What is this phrase in the Mishna coming to exclude? **A:** According to **Chizkiya** this comes to exclude preserved foods into which we *know* that wine was added. Such food would be assur b'hana'ah as well. According to **R' Yochanan** it comes to exclude muryas and Beis Unaiki cheese, and the Mishna would be following **R' Meir**, who holds that these are assur b'hana'ah.

MISHNA

- The following are even mutar to eat: milk that was milked by a goy while a Yid was watching; honey; clusters of grapes even though they are dripping are not considered to be "muchshar l'kabel tumah"; preserved foods into which it is not normal to put wine or vinegar; taris fish that is not chopped up; fish brine that has kilbis fish in it; the leaf of chiltis (they are not cut with knives); and the round cakes of olives. **R' Yose** says, the olives with pits ready to fall out are assur. Grasshoppers (even if kosher) that come from the basket that is in front of the store are assur. The ones that come from the storage area are mutar. The same differentiation applies to terumah as well.

GEMARA

- The Mishna teaches what is taught in a Braisa as well. The Braisa says, a Yid may sit next to a goy's herd of animals (even if he can't see the goy from there) and have the goy milk the animals and bring him the milk, and it would be mutar to drink.
 - **Q:** What is the case? If there is no non-kosher animals in the herd, why does the Yid need to be there? If there are non-kosher animals, how does it help if he can't even see which animal the goy is milking? **A:** The case is that there are non-kosher animals, and when the Yid stands he can see, but when he sits he cannot see. Since he can see when standing, the goy is afraid to mix in any non-kosher milk.

V'HADVASH

- There is no concern that he will mix in wine, because that would ruin the honey. There is no concern for bishul akum, because honey can be eaten raw. There is no concern for the non-kosher flavors absorbed in the pot, because "nosein taam lifgam" is mutar.

V'HADAVIDVANIYOS AHF AHL PI SHEMINATFOS...

- **Q:** A Braisa says that **Hillel** agreed with **Shammai** that grapes in a basket as they are being harvested, which has juice running from them, is considered to be muchshar l'kabel tumah!? **A:** In that case the grapes are being taken to the press, so he wants the liquid. In our Mishna the grapes are not being taken to the press, and he therefore doesn't want the liquid.

-----Daf 40-----

V'TARIS SHE'EINA TRUFAH

- A Braisa says, what is considered taris fish that is not chopped up? It is when its head and spine are recognizable. What is "brine that has fish in it"? As long as there is even one or two kilbis fish swimming in it.
 - **Q:** If even one kilbis is enough, why does the Braisa need to say that two is enough? **A:** If the barrels of brine are open there needs to be two. If they are closed, even one is enough.
 - We have learned, **R' Huna** says the fish is only mutar if the head and spine are recognizable. **R' Nachman** says it is either the head *or* the spine that need to be recognizable.
 - **Q:** **R' Ukva bar Chama** asked, a Mishna says that the way to tell a kosher fish is by seeing its fins and scales. If seeing the head and spine is also a way of telling if it is kosher, the Mishna should have said so!? **A:** **Abaye** said, there are some kosher fish that have heads that look like that of non-kosher fish, and for that reason the only absolute sign is fins and scales.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Yehuda in the name of Ulla** said, the machlokes is whether one may dip something into that brine. However, with regard to eating the fish itself, all agree that it is assur unless the head and spine are recognizable.
 - **R' Zeira** said, initially I would dip into the brine if I recognized the head or the spine. After hearing the statement of **R' Yehuda in the name of Ulla**, I do not even dip into the brine unless I recognize the head and the spine.
 - **R' Pappa** paskened that it is not mutar unless the head and spine of each and every fish in the mixture is recognizable.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, that when there are many pieces of fish, as long as there is a sign on one of the pieces that it is kosher, they are all kosher. This refutes **R' Pappa**!? **A:** **R' Pappa** would say that the Braisa is discussing where all the pieces in question match up to make one fish. We would think that we need to be concerned that they are not truly all of one fish, but the pieces happen to match up. The Braisa therefore teaches that we are not concerned for that.
- There was a boatload of tzachanta fish that came to Sichra. **R' Huna bar Chinina** inspected and found scales on the boat, and therefore was matir the fish. **Rava** said, how can you permit based on this in a place where it is common for there to be scales!? **Rava** therefore had it announced that the boatload of fish was assur. **R' Huna bar Chinina** announced that it was mutar.
 - **R' Yirmiya MiDifti** said, **R' Pappa** told me that **R' Huna** was only matir to dip into the brine of the fish, but not to eat the fish themselves. **R' Ashi** said, **R' Pappa** told me that **R' Huna** was even matir eating the fish themselves. **R' Ashi** said that he does not prohibit eating the fish because of the statement of **R' Pappa**, and does not permit the fish based on the statement of **R' Yehuda in the name of Ulla**.
- **R' Chinina bar Idi** said to **R' Adda bar Ahava**, if a goy brings a boatload of barrels of brine and there is kilbis fish in one of the barrels, then if all the barrels are open they are all mutar. If they are all closed, the one with the kilbis is mutar and the others are assur. **R' Chinina** said that he heard this ruling from **Rav, Shmuel, and R' Yochanan**.
- **R' Kahana in the name of Rav** said, the innards of fish and their eggs may only be bought from one who is expert in identifying kosher fish.
 - **Q:** **Ulla** asked **R' Dustai of Biri**, **Rav's** statement seems to suggest that non-kosher fish also have eggs (if not, it should be evident that a fish with eggs is kosher). However, a Braisa says that only kosher fish have eggs, and non-kosher fish give birth to live fish!? **A:** **R' Dustai** said to remove "and their eggs" from **Rav's** statement. **R' Zeira** said even non-kosher fish have eggs. The difference is that eggs of kosher fish hatch outside the mother's body and the eggs of non-kosher fish hatch inside the mother's body.
 - **Q:** Why can't we look at the eggs to determine if they are from a kosher fish, because a Braisa gives the physical differences between the eggs of kosher fish and the eggs of non-kosher fish!? **A:** **Rava** said, the ruling was said in a case where the eggs had dissolved, and the physical characteristics could no longer be seen.
 - **Q:** What does one do if there is no expert present? **A:** **R' Yehuda** said, if the seller is a Yid and he says that he himself took these innards from a kosher fish, we can believe him. **R' Nachman** said, the seller would have to show you the actual fish from which the innards were taken. **R' Yehuda** paskened like his own view in practice for Adda the caterer.

V'ALEH SHEL CHILTIS

- **Q:** This is obvious! Why would we think the leaf is assur!? **A:** The Mishna is referring to the grains on the leaf. We would think they were cut by the goy and put on the leaf. The Mishna teaches that they were on the leaf and fell off. Therefore, they are mutar as well.

V'ZEISEI GLUSKA'OS HAMIGULGALIN

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** Why would we think this is assur? **A:** The Mishna is discussing where they are very soft. We would think that wine must have been mixed into it. The Mishna teaches that they are soft, because of the oil that comes from them.

V'R' YOSE OMER SHLACHIN ASSURIN

- **R' Yose bar Chanina** said, this refers to an olive, that when it is picked up the pit falls out.

HACHAGAVIN HABA'IN...

- A Braisa explains that grasshoppers, shells from a tzlaf tree fruit, and leeks, that are taken from the storage areas are mutar, but the ones taken from the display of a store are assur, because the owner pours wine over it. The same differentiation would be made for apple cider, because the owner mixes wine into the cider that is in the display.
- A Braisa says, one time **Rebbi** had stomach pains. He asked if anyone knew whether the apple cider of goyim is mutar. **R' Yishmael the son of R' Yose** said, my father once had stomach pain, and they brought him apple cider of a goy, and the cider was 70 years old, and he drank it and was healed. They went and found this aged apple cider for **Rebbi**, and he too was cured.

V'CHEIN L'TRUMAH

- **Q:** What does this mean? **A:** **R' Sheishes** said, the same differentiation is made for a Kohen who is suspect to be selling terumah as chullin – that which is in front of him is assur, but that which he brings from storage is mutar. The reason it is mutar is because he is afraid to lie about them. He is afraid that if he is caught lying the **Rabanan** will take it all away from him.

HADRAN ALACH PEREK EIN MAAMIDIN!!!

-----Daf נ"ד-----41-----

PEREK KOL HATZLAMIM -- PEREK SHLISHI

MISHNA

- **R' Meir** says that all images (of a full or partial human) are assur (even b'hana'ah) because they are worshipped once a year. The **Chachomim** say, no image is assur unless it has in its hand a staff, a bird, or a ball. **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** says, an image that has anything in its hand is assur.

GEMARA

- **Q:** If all images are worshipped once a year, why is it that the **Rabanan** say they are not assur? **A:** **R' Yitzchak bar Yosef in the name of R' Yochanan** said, where **R' Meir** lived they would worship such things once a year, and because **R' Meir** is concerned for the minority he was goizer all other places because of this place. The **Rabanan** are not concerned for the minority and were therefore not goizer.
- **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said, the Mishna is referring to statues of kings. **Rabbah bar bar Chana in the name of R' Yochanan** said, this is when these images are placed at the entrance to the city.
- **Rabbah** said, the machlokes between **R' Meir and the Rabanan** is regarding images in the villages, but all agree that images in the large cities are mutar, because they are made only to beautify the city.
 - **Q:** In the villages all would agree that they are made to worship, so if the machlokes is regarding the villages, how do the **Rabanan** say that they are not assur!? **A:** Rather, it must be that **Rabbah** said that the machlokes is regarding the images in the cities, but all would agree that the images erected in the villages are assur.

VACHACHOMIM OMRIM EINAN ASSURIN...

- Holding a staff is symbolic of the goyim saying that this image rules over the entire world. Holding a bird is symbolic of the image holding the entire world in his hand as one does a bird. Holding a ball is symbolic of the image holding the entire world in his hand as one does to a ball.
- A Braisa adds three things that if held by the image it makes it assur. They are: a sword, a crown, and a ring.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- The Mishna didn't mention these, because originally the **Rabanan** thought that holding a sword only symbolizes that it is a robber, but they then realized that it symbolizes its domination over the world. With regard to the crown, they initially thought it symbolized one who makes wreaths, but they then realized that it symbolizes the crown of a king. With regard to a ring, initially they thought that it symbolizes the ring of a messenger. They then realized that it symbolizes domination and the signing of death for people.

R' SHIMON BEN GAMLIEL...

- A Braisa says, this is even if the image is holding a pebble or a splinter of wood.
 - **Q: R' Ashi** asked, what if the image is holding excrement? Does it symbolize that all are like excrement to the image, and the image is therefore assur, or does it symbolize that the image is like excrement in the eyes of everyone else? **TEIKU**.

MISHNA

- If a person finds the broken pieces of an image, they are mutar. If he found the form of a hand or of a foot they are assur, because such objects are worshipped.

GEMARA

- **Shmuel** said, even if one finds broken pieces of an avoda zara that was worshipped, they are mutar b'hana'ah.
 - **Q:** Our Mishna said that broken pieces of images are mutar, which suggests that broken pieces of an avoda zara would not be mutar!? **A:** The Mishna means to include broken pieces of avoda zara as well. The reason it speaks of broken images is because it wants to then give the case of the hand or foot, to teach that they would be assur.
 - **Q:** Why are the hand and foot assur? They are broken pieces and should therefore be mutar!? **A:** **Shmuel** explained the Mishna to be speaking of a hand or foot that was found on a pedestal (which indicates that they are worshipped as is).
- With regard to an avoda zara that broke on its own, **R' Yochanan** said it is assur b'hana'ah, because the owner was not mevatel it, and **Reish Lakish** said it is mutar, because when the owner sees it broken he is mevatel it and says – it can't even save itself, can I really think it will save me!?
 - **Q: R' Yochanan** asked **Reish Lakish**, the pasuk says that when the Plishtim saw their avoda zara lying on the floor with its head and hands broken they no longer would walk on that floor again. This shows that they are not mevatel the avoda zara even after it breaks!? **A: Reish Lakish** said, that is not a proof. The Plishtim said that the "power" that was in the avoda zara must have transferred from it to the floor, and they didn't step on the floor because they felt it now was the avoda zara.
 - **Q:** Our Mishna said that broken pieces of images are mutar, which suggests that broken pieces of an avoda zara would not be mutar and refutes **Reish Lakish**!? **A:** The inference should not be that broken pieces of avoda zara are assur, rather the inference is that images themselves are assur, and the Mishna is following the view of **R' Meir**.
 - **Q:** From the view of **R' Meir** we can understand the view of the **Rabanan**. If **R' Meir** holds that images are assur but broken pieces are mutar, then the **Rabanan** must hold that although an avoda zara is assur, broken pieces of an avoda zara are mutar. This refutes **R' Yochanan**!? **A:** The reason **R' Meir** holds that broken pieces of an image are mutar is because there is a "sfek sfeika" – there is a safek whether or not the image was ever worshipped, and even if it was, there is a safek that maybe the goy was mevatel it. That is why the broken pieces are mutar. However, with an avoda zara that is known to have been worshipped, there is only one safek, that maybe he was mevatel the avoda zara. This one safek is not enough to remove the certainty that this is avoda zara.
 - **Q:** Is it true that a safek cannot remove the status of something that is certain? A Braisa says, that if a "chaver" dies and leaves over a storehouse of produce, the produce is considered to be ready to eat (i.e. all ma'aser is assumed to have been given). Now, the produce had a definite status of "tevel", and yet, the possibility that the chaver gave ma'aser is enough to remove that definite status!? **A:** We say like **R' Chanina Choza'ah**, that a chaver has certainly given ma'aser

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

from anything in his possession. Therefore, it is a certainty that is changing the original, certain status. **A2:** It is only a possibility that it was tevel, because **R' Oshaya** says that a person can bring his produce into his house before the threshing and in that way circumvent the ma'aser obligation. Based on that, it is only a possibility that the produce is tevel, and therefore, the possibility that he gave ma'aser can change the status of the possible tevel.

- **Q:** Is it true that a safek cannot remove the status of something that is certain? A Braisa says, **R' Yehuda** said, there was a story where a woman threw a stillborn into a ditch, and a Kohen bent over the ditch (possibly making himself an "ohel" over the stillborn) to determine if the stillborn was a boy or a girl (because there are different halachos of tumah and tahara depending on the gender of the child). Although the Kohen should have become tamei by doing so, the **Chachomim** said he was tahor, because there were weasels in that ditch (and we assume that the stillborn was dragged away before the Kohen bent over the ditch). In this case, the stillborn was definitely thrown into the ditch, and yet, the **Chachomim** said that the Kohen is tahor because of the possibility that the stillborn was dragged away!? **A:** The story was that the woman threw an afterbirth into the ditch, but it was not certain whether it had the status of a child (in which case it would give off tumah) or not. Therefore, it never had the status of being certainly tamei. **A2:** It was certainly tamei, but it is also a certainty that the weasel dragged it away, because it does so immediately. One certainty can change the status of another certainty.
 - **Q:** The Braisa says the Kohen bent over to see whether it was a boy or a girl. That means it surely developed enough to have the status of a child!? **A:** The Braisa means that the Kohen bent over to see whether the thing thrown in had the status of a child, and if it did, to see whether it was a male or a female.

-----Daf 42-----

- The Gemara stated a machlokes with regard to an avoda zara that broke on its own: **R' Yochanan** said it is assur b'hana'ah, because the owner was not mevatel it, and **Reish Lakish** said it is mutar, because when the owner sees it broken he is mevatel it and says – it can't even save itself, can I really think it will save me!?
 - **Q:** Our Mishna says, if a person found the figure of a hand or a foot they are assur b'hana'ah, because such things are worshipped. Now, according to **Reish Lakish** they should be mutar because they are broken pieces of an avoda zara that broke on its own!? **A: Shmuel** has explained the Mishna to be referring to a hand or foot that is on its own pedestal. Therefore, they are worshipped, and are not simply broken pieces of an avoda zara.
 - **Q:** A Mishna says, a goy can be mevatel his own avoda zara and the avoda zara of another goy, but a Yid cannot be mevatel the avoda zara of a goy. Now, if the Yid breaks an avoda zara it should be no worse than an avoda zara that breaks on its own, and it should therefore also be mutar b'hana'ah according to **Reish Lakish**!? **A: Abaye** said, the Mishna is talking about where the Yid dented the avoda zara, but did not break it.
 - **Q:** Even denting the avoda zara should be enough to make it batel, because a Mishna says that denting alone is enough!? **A:** That Mishna is referring to where a goy dents it, but a Yid's denting it would not be enough.
 - **Rava** said that a Yid's denting would be enough to be mevatel an avoda zara. However, the **Rabanan** were goizer that a Yid can never be mevatel an avoda zara, as a gezeira that the Yid would first pick up the avoda zara (and thereby be koneh it) and then be mevatel it, in which case the bitul wouldn't work, because the avoda zara of a yid cannot be made batel.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, if a goy took stones from the Markulis avoda zara and used them to pave a road, the road is mutar to be used. If a Yid took stones from the Markulis avoda zara and used them to pave a road, the road is assur to be used. Now, the Yid's doing so should be no worse than an avoda zara that broke on its own, and therefore according to **Reish Lakish** it should be mutar!? **A:** Here too we will answer like **Rava**.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** A Braisa says, if a goy chips off a piece of an avoda zara (i.e. an asheira tree) for the goy's own needs, the chipped off piece and the avoda zara become mutar. If he did so for the purpose of caring for the avoda zara, the avoda zara remains assur but the chipped off piece is mutar. If a Yid chipped off a piece of an avoda zara, whether it was for the needs of the Yid or for the needs of the avoda zara, the piece and the avoda zara are assur. Now, the Yid's doing so should be no worse than an avoda zara that broke on its own, and therefore according to **Reish Lakish** it should be mutar!? **A:** Here too we will answer like **Rava**.
- **Q:** A Mishna says, **R' Yose** says that a Yid may dispose of a metal avoda zara by grinding it into powder and throwing it into the wind. The **Chachomim** disagreed, because they said the powder will act as fertilizer, which will provide hana'ah. Now, the Yid's doing so should be no worse than an avoda zara that broke on its own, and therefore according to **Reish Lakish** it should be mutar!? **A:** Here too we will answer like **Rava**.
- **Q:** A Braisa says, **R' Yose ben Yasyan** said, if a Yid found the figure of a dragon with its head cut off, and he is uncertain whether it was cut off by a goy or by a Yid, it is mutar. However, if he knows with certainty that it was done by a Yid, it is assur. Now, the Yid's doing so should be no worse than an avoda zara that broke on its own, and therefore according to **Reish Lakish** it should be mutar!? **A:** Here too we will answer like **Rava**.
- **Q:** A Mishna says, **R' Yose** says one may not plant vegetables under an asheira tree even in the winter, because the falling leaves of the tree fertilize the ground and provide a benefit for the vegetables. Now, this is like a case of where an avoda zara broke on its own, so according to **Reish Lakish** it should be mutar!? **A:** This case is different, because the main part of the avoda zara (the tree) remains in existence, that is why even the leaves area assur.
 - **Q:** The case stated above was where the person chipped off a piece of the tree, and the tree remained in existence, and yet the Braisa there said that although the tree remains assur the chipped off piece is mutar!? **A:** **R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua** said, the falling leaves happen in the natural course of the tree's growth. Things that happen in the natural course cannot make it batel.
- **Q:** **Reish Lakish** asked **R' Yochanan**, a Mishna says, if there is a nest on top of a tree of hekdesch, one may not have hana'ah from it, but would not be subject to me'ilah if he did. If there is a nest on top of an asheira tree, he may knock it down with a stick (and may then use the nest). Now, presumably the bird built this nest with twigs from this asheira tree, and yet the Mishna says that he may have hana'ah from the nest. This refutes **R' Yochanan** who says that when it breaks on its own it remains assur!? **A:** The Mishna is talking about where the bird brought twigs from elsewhere and built its nest on that tree. In fact, this must be the case, because if twigs of the tree were used, then why in the first case regarding hekdesch is he not subject to me'ilah if he has hana'ah from the nest? Clearly, the case is that the bird used twigs from elsewhere.
 - The Gemara says, this is no proof that the Mishna must be talking about twigs that came from elsewhere, because the Mishna may be discussing a nest built with twigs that grew after the tree was made hekdesch, and the Mishna holds that there is no me'ilah on something that grew after the item was made hekdesch.
 - **R' Avahu in the name of R' Yochanan** said, when the Mishna says that he may knock the nest down and use it, the Mishna means he may take the chicks that are inside the nest, but not that he may use the materials of the actual nest.
 - **R' Yaakov** said to **R' Yirmiya bar Tachlifa**, I will explain the Mishna according to the explanation of **R' Yochanan**. With regard to benefitting from the chicks in the nest, that would be mutar whether the tree is hekdesch or an asheira tree. With regard to eggs in the nest, they would be assur whether the tree is of hekdesch or an asheira tree (because they need the tree and the **Rabanan** were therefore goizer). **R' Ashi** added, chicks that need their mother are considered to be eggs for this purpose.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

MISHNA

- If a person finds a keili that has the figure of the sun, the moon, or of a dragon on it, they must be thrown into the Yam Hamelech. **R' Shimon ben Gamliel** says, if they are on prestigious keilim they are assur. If they are on less than prestigious keilim they are mutar.

GEMARA

- **Q:** Does this mean that goyim only worship these three forms and nothing else? A Braisa says that if a goy shechts an animal for the sake of a malach who is appointed over mountains, or hills, or seas, or rivers, or the desert, or the sun, the moon, the stars or constellations, for the sake of Michael the great prince or for the sake of a tiny worm, the animal that was shechted is assur b'hana'ah. We see that goyim worship many forms!? **A:** **Abaye** said, with regard to worship, the goyim worship anything they can find. However, when making a keili with a form they would only do the form of the 3 listed in the Mishna. Any other form found on a keili is purely decorative.
- **R' Sheishes** would take the difficult Mishnayos and Braisos and teach them. He taught one of these Braisos as follows. The Braisa says, all portrayals of "mazalos" are mutar except for those of the sun and the moon. All portrayals of faces are mutar except for that of a human. All figures are mutar except for the figure of a dragon.
 - **Q:** The Braisa said all portrayals of mazalos are mutar except for those of the sun and moon. What is being discussed? It can't be referring to making these portrayals, because the pasuk of "lo saasun iti" teaches that portrayals of all mazalos are assur!? **A:** Rather, it must be referring to finding something with these portrayals on it, in which case it is only assur when it is of the sun or moon. In this way the Braisa is agreeing with our Mishna.
 - **Q:** If the Braisa is referring to finding an item, that would mean the next part of the Braisa says that if something is found with portrayal of a human face it is assur. That would argue with our Mishna, which says that only the sun, moon, and a dragon are assur!? **A:** Rather, we must say that the Braisa is referring to *making* portrayals, and holds like **R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua** who says that making a portrayal of the human face is assur.
 - **Q:** If the Braisa is referring to *making* a portrayal, that would mean that the end of the Braisa is saying that the making of the figure of a dragon is assur. This can't be, because the pasuk of "lo saasun iti" teaches that only the making of the figures of mazalos are assur, not that of a dragon!? **A:** Rather, we must say that the Braisa is discussing finding an item with the figure of the dragon on it, and the Braisa follows our Mishna which says that such a keili is assur.
 - **Q:** Based on all the above, are we to say that the beginning and end of the Braisa discuss the finding of an item and the middle part of the Braisa refers to the making of these portrayals!? **A:** **Abaye** said, that is what we must say. **Rava** said, the entire Braisa can be explained to be referring to the finding of items with these portrayals on it, and the Braisa follows the view of **R' Yehuda** in a Braisa who says, that also the portrayals of a nursing woman and of "Sar Apis" are assur (and the Braisa is referring to these human images when it says that it would be assur).
 - The form of a nursing woman would be assur, because that is meant to represent Chava, who "nursed" the entire world, and would be assur if the form is made holding a child and nursing the child. "Sar Apis" refers to the form of Yosef, which is assur if the form is made holding a measure and is measuring.

-----Daf 43-----

- A Braisa says, what is the figure of a dragon? **R' Shimon ben Elazar** explains, it has fins along its spine. **R' Assi** showed that **R' Shimon** was referring to its neck.
 - **R' Chama the son of R' Chanina** paskened like **R' Shimon ben Elazar**.
 - **Rabbah bar bar Chana in the name of R' Yehoshua ben Levi** said, I was once walking with **R' Elazar Hakapar** and he found a ring with a figure of a dragon on it. He met a non-Jewish child, but didn't say anything to him. He then met a non-Jewish adult and told him to be mevatel the avoda zara on the ring.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

The goy refused to do so. **R' Elazar** hit him and the goy was then mevatel it. We can learn 3 things from this story: first, that a goy can be mevatel the avoda zara of another goy; second, that only a goy that understands the concept of avoda zara can be mevatel it (which is why he didn't have the child be mevatel it); third, a goy can be mevatel an avoda zara even when he was forced to do so.

- **Q: R' Chanina** asked, does **R' Elazar Hakapar** not agree with the Braisa that says that when one loses something in a public area the finder may keep it, because the owner despairs of ever finding it? Since the ring was found in a public place, the owner was certainly “meyaeish”, and if so that should constitute a bitul, and no further bitul should have been needed!? **A: Abaye** said, although the owner is meya'eish from finding the ring, he is not miya'eish from the ring being continued as an avoda zara. He says to himself, if a goy finds it, he will continue to worship it, and if a Yid finds it, since it is valuable, he will sell it to a goy who will then continue to worship it. That is why **R' Elazar** had to make the goy be mevatel it.
- **Q:** A Mishna says, **R' Gamliel** had many shapes of moons on a board on a wall in his attic. He would use them as a visual aid to help the witnesses describe the new moon as they saw it. **Q:** How could he make these shapes of the moon? The pasuk of “Lo saasun iti” teaches that one may not make forms in the image of the Heavenly bodies!? **A: Abaye** said, the pasuk only prohibits making forms of things that can be reproduced (like the keilim of the Beis Hamikdash), but not things that can't be reproduced (like the Malachim, etc.).
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that the pasuk prohibits making forms in the image of Hashem's Heavenly servants!? **A:** **Abaye** said, the pasuk only prohibits making the 4 faces from the Kisei Hakavod all together (the face of a human, an ox, an eagle, and a lion). Making a moon would not be assur.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that one may not make a human face even without making the other 3!? **A: R' Huna the son of R' Idi** said, he learned from **Abaye's** lessons, that a human face alone is assur based on the pasuk of “Lo saasun iti”, which can be read as “osi”, meaning one may not make the “form” of Hashem, which is meant to refer to a human face. However, other forms are not assur unless they are the 4 together, mentioned above.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that the pasuk of “Lo saasun iti” teaches that one may not even make the form of Malachim!? **A: Abaye** said, the pasuk only prohibits making forms of Hashem's servants of the uppermost heaven, not of the lower heavens (the moon is in the lower heavens).
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, the pasuk of “asher bashamayim” teaches that one may not make the form of the sun, moon or stars!? **A:** It is only assur to make these if one intends to worship them.
 - **Q:** If the Braisa is referring to worshipping them, even the form of a small worm should be assur!? **A:** It actually would also be assur based on the word of “mitachas” in the pasuk.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, the pasuk of “Lo saasun iti” teaches that one may not even *make* the forms of the sun, moon, or stars (even if it is not being made to worship them)!? **A: R' Gamliel** did not actually make the forms. He had them made for him by a goy.
 - **Q: R' Yehuda** had a signet ring with a human form made for him by a goy, and yet **Shmuel** told him that he must deface it!? **A:** That case was different, because the form protruded from the ring, and he wanted to make sure that no one would suspect **R' Yehuda** of worshipping the protruding form.
 - **Q:** We find that a human form was in the shul in Naharda'ah and there was no concern that people would be suspected of worshipping it!? **A:** Noone would suspect a tzibbur of worshipping these forms, only individuals.
 - **Q: R' Gamliel** was an individual, and yet there was no concern that he would be suspect!? **A:** He was the Nasi and always had many people around. Therefore, he was considered to be a tzibbur. **A2:** He had the moon in pieces. He would only put it together when needed for witnesses. Therefore, he would not become suspect. **A3:** He made these to use to teach others regarding them, which is mutar to do.

R' SHIMON BEN GAMLIEL OMER...

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** What is considered to be a prestigious keili and what is considered to be less than a prestigious keili? **A:** **Rav** said, if the portrayal is on the upper rim of the keili, it is considered prestigious, and if it is on the walls or bottom of the keili it is not. **Shmuel** said, both of those would not be prestigious. Rather, prestigious means that the portrayal is on a bracelet, a nose ring, or a ring (i.e. jewelry).
 - A Braisa says like **Shmuel**.

-----Daf 72-----44-----

MISHNA

- **R' Yose** said that one may dispose of a metal avoda zara by grinding it into powder and throwing it into the wind or the sea. The **Chachomim** said, that would also become fertilizer and the pasuk says "lo yidbak b'yadcha me'uma min hacheirem".

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, **R' Yose** said to the **Rabanan**, the pasuk says that Moshe took the Eigel and grinded it into powder, which shows that this may be done!? The **Rabanan** said, that is no proof. Moshe took the powder and mixed it into water and gave the water to drink to Klal Yisrael, and this water punished the people who were guilty of sin. However, this would not be an effective way of destroying an avoda zara. **R' Yose** said to them, the pasuk says that King Assa took an avoda zara, ground it and burned it in the Kidron Valley (which shows we are not concerned for it being fertilizer)!? The **Rabanan** said, that is no proof, because nothing grows in the Kidron Valley, and that is why that was not a problem. [A Mishna seems to say that things did grow in the Kidron Valley!? The Gemara says, certain places in the valley did have things growing there and others did not, and King Assa did this in a place that did not.] **R' Yose** said to them, the pasuk says that King Chizkiya ground up the copper snake that Moshe had made (and which people later began to worship as an avoda zara). This shows that one may dispose of avoda zara in this way!? The **Rabanan** said, the pasuk teaches that Moshe made this copper snake from his own money. Therefore, in truth it didn't become assur by other worshipping it, since a person cannot make the property of someone else assur. Chizkiya ground it up not because it was assur b'hana'ah, but rather only because the people were treating it as an avoda zara. **R' Yose** said to them, the pasuk says that when the Plishtim were fleeing from Dovid and his army they abandoned their avoda zara in the battlefield, and the Yidden took them, and "vayisa'eim" – which we understand to mean that they ground them up, and threw them into the wind!? The **Rabanan** said, that is no proof, because another pasuk describing that time says that Dovid burned them. The Gemara explains, the word "vayisa'eim" actually means that the Yidden carried away the avoda zara. **R' Huna** explained that initially they burned the idols that were left there, but then Itai Hagiti came and was mevatel the avoda zaros, so the remaining ones were taken for their value. In fact, the pesukim tell how Dovid took the crowns of one of the avoda zaros and wore it on his head.
 - The Gemara darshens pesukim to teach that Dovid had a special crown that fit him perfectly in the place of his head tefillin, which let enough room to allow for him to wear tefillin as well. **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** darshened another pasuk to teach that the crown only fit the descendants of Dovid who were worthy of being king.
 - **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** explains the pasuk that says that Adoniya said he will be king to mean that he tried to fit the crown on his head, but it would not fit properly.
 - **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, the pasuk says that Adoniya had 50 men running in front of his chariots. This refers to 50 men who had their spleens removed and the skin and flesh from their soles removed (spleens and skin under the soles are what cause people to have to run slower).

MISHNA

- Pruklus ben Plusfus asked **R' Gamliel** in Akko, while he was bathing in the bathhouse of Afroditi (it was located in the chatzer of an avoda zara), "The pasuk says 'lo yidbak b'yadcha me'uma min hacheirem' so how do you bathe in this bathhouse!?" **R' Gamliel** said, "We don't answer in a bathhouse". When **R' Gamliel** left the bathhouse he

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

said to him, “I did not come into its domain, it came into my domain (meaning, the bathhouse was there first and the avoda zara came later and cannot now prevent me from being allowed to bathe there). Also, the bathhouse was not made to beautify the avoda zara, rather the avoda zara was made to beautify the bathhouse (which shows that the avoda zara is secondary to the bathhouse). Another reason, if I were to give you a lot of money you would not go into your avoda zara naked, or as a baal keri, or urinate in front of it, and yet this avoda zara is at a place where people urinate there! The Torah says “eloheihem”, which teaches that it is only assur to benefit from an avoda zara that is treated as a god, and this one is not”.

GEMARA

- **Q:** How could **R' Gamliel** have answered him in the bathhouse (he told him that we are not allowed to answer in a bathhouse, which is itself an answer)? **Rabbah bar bar Chana in the name of R' Yochanan** has said that it is mutar to think in Torah anywhere except for a bathhouse and a bathroom!? Even if he spoke to him in a language other than Lashon Hakodesh it would still be assur, as **Abaye** says! **A:** A Braisa says, when he left the bathhouse he told him that we may not answer in a bathhouse.
- **R' Chama bar Yosef Biribi in the name of R' Oshaya** said, that it was not a true answer that **R' Gamliel** gave, but **R' Chama bar Yosef** said, it was a true answer.
 - **R' Oshaya** felt it was not a true answer, because we see that defecating in front of Baal Pe'or is considered a form of worship, so why did he say it is not an avoda zara just based on the fact that people urinate in front of it, and **R' Chama bar Yosef** said it was a true answer, because Baal Pe'or is different, because that is precisely how one worships that avoda zara.
 - **Abaye** explained, **R' Oshaya** felt it was not a true answer, because **R' Gamliel** said it was mutar only because the bathhouse was there first, however a Mishna says it would be mutar even if the avoda zara was there first, as long as the person need not show appreciation to the avoda zara for using it, but **R' Chama** felt it was true, because the mere use by **R' Gamliel** of the bathhouse would be considered showing appreciation, because he was a prestigious person.
 - **R' Simi bar Chiya** explained, **R' Oshaya** felt it was not a true answer, because **R' Gamliel** said it is not an avoda zara since people urinate in front of it, but a Mishna says that urinating in front of an avoda zara does not make it batel! **R' Chama** said that the Mishna is referring to when he does that one time, which was done in a fit of anger, and he later calms down. However, here it was done all the time and therefore it shows that it was not a true avoda zara.
 - **Rabbah bar Ulla** explained, **R' Oshaya** felt it was not a true answer, because **R' Gamliel** implied that if the bathhouse was made to beautify the avoda zara, it would have been assur to use the bathhouse. However, a Braisa says that a verbal consecration to an avoda zara is not effective, and therefore it would still not have made it assur! **R' Chama** said, that although the bathhouse would not become assur b'hana'ah, maybe it would still be assur to use it if doing so beautifies the avoda zara.