



## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Avodah Zarah, Daf נא – Daf מה

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 מה---45-----

### MISHNA

- If goyim worship mountains or hills, the mountains and hills remain mutar, but what is on them (e.g. the coverings of silver or gold that the goyim put on them) are assur, based on the pasuk of “lo sachmod kesef v'zahav aleyhem”. **R' Yose Haglili** says, the pasuk of “eloheyhem ahl heharim” teaches that the mountains themselves are not considered avoda zara, and “eloheyhem...ahl hagva'os” teaches that the hills themselves are not considered to be avoda zara. If so, why is an asheira tree assur (the pasuk also says “under every green tree”, which should similarly be darshened to teach that the tree itself is not assur)? It is because there is human involvement (a human planted the tree) and anything in which there is human involvement can become assur. **R' Akiva** said, I will explain the pasuk as follows. The Torah is telling the Yidden, when you enter EY you should know that wherever you find a mountain, a hill, or a green tree, there will be an avoda zara there.

### GEMARA

- **Q: R' Yose Haglili** seems to be saying the same thing as the **T”K**? **A: Rami bar Chama in the name of Reish Lakish** said, the machlokes would be regarding the coverings of these mountains (the silver and gold that the goyim covered the mountain with). According to the **T”K** it does not have the status of the mountain itself, and will therefore be assur, but according to **R' Yose Haglili** it gets the status of the mountain itself and is therefore also mutar. **R' Sheishes** said all would hold that the covering would not have the status of the mountain itself and would therefore be assur. The machlokes is regarding a tree that was planted without intent to make it into avoda zara, but the goy later worshipped it as avoda zara. The **T”K** holds such a tree is mutar and **R' Yose Haglili** holds it is assur. We can learn that this is the view of **R' Yose** from his last statement in the Mishna where he says “and anything in which there is human involvement can become assur”. That phrase is coming to include something – it is coming to include the case of a tree that was planted without intent for avoda zara but was then later worshipped.
  - **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda** holds that such a tree is assur as well. In a Braisa he says, we would think to darshen “v'tachas kol eitz raanan” like we darshen “eloheyhem ahl heharim” and “eloheyhem ahl hagva'os”, and should learn that the tree itself can never become assur. The pasuk therefore says “va'asheyreyhem tisrifun ba'eish”, which teaches that the trees must be burned. If they must be burned, we obviously cannot darshen “v'tachas kol eitz raanan” to teach that the tree itself is mutar. Now, since he does not use this pasuk to teach that only trees planted with intent for avoda zara are assur, we see that he holds like **R' Yose Haglili**.
    - **Q:** If so, what does the pasuk of “v'tachas kol eitz raanan” come to teach? **A:** It teaches like **R' Akiva** in our Mishna.
    - **Q:** How does the **T”K** of our Mishna darshen “va'asheyreyhem tisrifun ba'eish”? **A:** They use it to teach that only a tree that was planted with intent for avoda zara becomes assur.
    - **Q: R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda** also needs the pasuk to teach this, so how does he know that even a tree planted without such intent can become assur through worship? **A:** He learns it from “va'asheyreyhem tigadeyun”, which, by saying that the tree must be “cut”, seems to be referring to a tree whose roots would be mutar, but whose growth would be assur. This must refer to a tree that was planted without intent for avoda zara and was then worshipped. The Torah says that the original growth is mutar, and the growth that happened after the worship becomes assur.
      - **Q:** The Braisa said that the source for **R' Yose the son of R' Yehuda's** view was the pasuk of “va'asheyreyhem tisrifun ba'eish”, not the pasuk of “tigadeyun”? **A:** In the Braisa **R'**

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

**Yose** was saying, if the Torah would not have written the pasuk of “va’asheyreyhem tisrifun ba’eish”, we would have said that the pasuk of “tigadeyun” refers to a tree that was planted with intent for avoda zara. Now that the Torah wrote the pasuk of “va’asheyreyhem tisrifun ba’eish”, the pasuk of “tigadeyun” is extra, and therefore comes to teach that even a tree that was planted without intent for avoda zara, but was later worshipped, also becomes assur.

- **Q:** How do the **Rabanan** who argue (and say that a tree planted without intent for avoda zara is mutar) darshen the pasuk of “tigadeyun”? **A:** They use it for the teaching of **R’ Yehoshua ben Levi**, who says that the mitzvah of “cutting down” avoda zara in EY precedes the mitzvah of conquering EY, and the mitzvah of conquering EY precedes the mitzvah to “eradicate” avoda zara in EY. This was taught by **R’ Yosef** in a Braisa where he said that the pasuk of “v’nitatztem es mizbichosam” means you should break them and leave them there, and “v’shibartem es matzeyvosam” means you should smash them and leave them there. **R’ Huna** explains this to mean that after breaking them, go and chase their worshippers. Only after that should you return and burn the pieces to eradicate them.
  - **Q:** How will **R’ Yose the son of R’ Yehuda** learn this concept (regarding precedence of the mitzvos)? **A:** He learns it from the pasuk of “abeid t’abdun”, which teaches that they should be destroyed and then later destroyed again. The **Rabanan** would use this pasuk to teach that one who destroys an avoda zara must make sure to uproot it.
  - **Q:** How will **R’ Yose the son of R’ Yehuda** learn this concept? **A:** He will learn it from the pasuk of “v’ibadtem es shemam min hamakom hahu”. The **Rabanan** will use this pasuk to teach that one should give an avoda zara a derogatory nickname.

### -----Daf 46-----

- A Braisa was taught to **R’ Sheishes** that said as follows. If goyim worship mountains or hills, the mountains and hills are mutar and the worshippers are put to death with sayif. If they worshipped grains or vegetables, they become assur and the worshippers are put to death with sayif. **R’ Sheishes** said, this Braisa follows the view of **R’ Yose bar Yehuda**, who says that a tree that was planted without intent for avoda zara and was then worshipped, becomes assur (which is why the grain and vegetables become assur).
  - **Q:** Maybe the Braisa is talking about things that were planted with intent for avoda zara? **A:** The Braisa compares the grain to the case of the mountains – just as the mountain was not “planted” with that intent, it must be referring to grain that was also not planted with that intent.
- We have learned, with regard to stones that were detached from a mountain and were then worshipped, the sons of **R’ Chiya** and **R’ Yochanan** argue – one said they become assur and the other said they are mutar.
  - The one who said they are mutar holds that they are like the mountain itself – just as the mountain has no human involvement and is therefore mutar, so too these stones have no human involvement and are therefore mutar.
    - **Q:** A mountain is different in that it is attached to the ground!? **A:** An animal refutes that logic, because it is not attached to the ground and also doesn’t become assur when it is worshipped.
      - **Q:** Maybe an animal is different because it is a live being? **A:** A mountain refutes that. The argument can go back and forth, with the result that the common characteristic among them is that there is no human involvement and they are mutar. Therefore, we can say that the stones that became detached from the mountain are also mutar.
        - **Q:** Maybe the common characteristic between them is that they have not changed from their original state, but the stone has changed from its original state of being attached to the mountain and therefore it is not

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

mutar!? **A:** Rather, we can learn that the detached stone is mutar from the case of an animal with a mum (which did change from its original state) and a mountain. Or, we can also learn it from the case of an animal without a mum and a dried up tree (that has changed from its original state and is mutar).

- The one who says the stones are assur holds that the pasuk of “shakeitz tishaktzenu v’sa’eiv tisa’avenu” teaches that although we can use logic to show that something is not assur for purposes of avoda zara, do not use that logic, and the item is assur.
- **Q:** Maybe we can prove that it is the sons of **R’ Chiya** who said that the stones are mutar. **Chizkiya (R’ Chiya’s son)** once asked, if a person stands up an egg to bow down to it, does it become assur. They thought that he meant that it was stood up for that purpose and he then bowed down to it, and the question was whether the standing up of the egg was enough of an act to make it assur. This shows that he holds that a human act is needed to make it assur. **A:** The Gemara says this is no proof. It may be that they would say it is assur if he bowed down to the egg even without standing it up. The question was whether it becomes assur with the mere standing the egg up, without even bowing down to it.
  - **Q:** What view was this question asked according to? According to the view that a Yid’s avoda zara becomes assur as soon as it is prepared to be used, this egg would become assur, and according to the view that it only becomes assur once it is worshipped, it is certainly not assur!? **A:** The question was asked where the Yid stood it up to bow down to it, but never did so. Then a goy came along and bowed down to it. If this happened with a brick, **R’ Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** said the brick would be assur. The question is whether the standing up of an egg is significant (like the standing up of a brick) or not.
  - With regard to the question, the Gemara says **TEIKU**.
- **Q: Rami bar Chama** asked, if a person bowed down to a mountain, may stones from that mountain be used for the Mizbe’ach? If something that is attached to the ground is worshipped, does it become assur for purposes of hekdesch or not? If you say that it does, are the things needed for preparation of a korbon considered to be like a korbon (in that these items would also become assur to be used for them as well)? **A: Rava** said we have a kal v’chomer – if payment for a zonah, which such payment is mutar for a person to benefit from, is assur to be used for hekdesch even if it is attached to the ground, then something used for worship, which is assur for a person to benefit from, is surely assur to be used for hekdesch even when attached to the ground.
  - **Q: R’ Huna the son of R’ Yehoshua** asked **Rava**, maybe say the other way around? Maybe say that if something used for worship, which is assur for a person to benefit from only when it is detached from the ground (a mountain that is worshipped remains mutar based on the pasuk), and there is no difference in the pasuk between a regular person and hekdesch, then payment for a zonah, which is mutar for a person to benefit from when not attached to the ground, should surely be mutar for hekdesch when attached to the ground!? **A: Rava** said, my drasha leads to a chumra, and when you have a choice of how to darshen a kal v’chomer, you are supposed to choose the drasha that leads to a chumra, not to a kula.
    - **Q R’ Pappa** asked **Rava**, do we always have to choose the kal v’chomer that leads to a chumra? With regard to sprinkling the para aduma on Shabbos Erev Pesach, **R’ Eliezer** darshens a kal v’chomer to say that it is mutar, which is a chumra, because it means the person is then chayuv to bring the Korbon Pesach. **R’ Akiva** said to **R’ Eliezer**, maybe we should say the other way around – since we can’t override a Rabbinic issur like sprinkling the ashes, we should surely not be able to shecht the Pesach on Shabbos either. **R’ Akiva** proposes using a kal v’chomer that leads to a kula (the person would not bring a Korbon Pesach)!? **A:** That case is different, because **R’ Eliezer** had actually previously paskened that sprinkling the blood is assur on Shabbos, and he forgot that he paskened that way. **R’ Akiva** was trying to remind **R’ Eliezer** of his previous psak, and therefore this cannot be taken as an example of how to darshen.
- **Q: Rami bar Chama** asked, if someone bows down to wheat that is attached to the ground, can it’s flour then be used for a Korbon Mincha? Does a physical change to the worshipped item make it mutar or not? **A: Mar Zutra the son of R’ Nachman** said, a Mishna says, all animals that are assur to be brought on the Mizbe’ach, their

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

offspring is mutar to be offered. A Braisa says that **R' Eliezer** said the offspring is assur. Presumably, this refers to an animal that was a fetus at the time that the mother became assur for the Mizbe'ach, and we see that it is a machlokes whether the baby becomes mutar because of the physical change that it went through.

- **Q:** We have learned that this machlokes is even if the mother became pregnant after the act that made it assur for the Mizbe'ach, but if the mother was pregnant at the time, all would agree that the offspring is assur. The case of the wheat and the flour is more similar to the case of the mother who was pregnant when the act was done to her, and therefore the wheat should be assur!
- **Others** say that **Mar Zutra** said, the machlokes is only where the animal became pregnant after the act was done to it to make it assur, but if it was done while it was pregnant all would agree the offspring is assur, and the flour from the wheat is similar to the case of where the act was done to it while it was pregnant. To that the Gemara says, that case is very different, because the animal did not change – first it was in the mother and then it was born, but it was an animal all along. The case of the wheat is different, because it was physically changed into flour, which makes it a different object.

### -----Daf 17-----47-----

- **Reish Lakish** asked, if someone bowed down to a palm tree, can we use a branch of it for the mitzvah of lulav? Now, clearly if it was planted with intent for avoda zara it could not be used for the mitzvah, because in that case it would even be assur to benefit from. The question is only regarding a tree that was planted without such intent but was later served, and is only a question according to the **Rabanan** who say that the tree does not become assur b'hana'ah. The question is, does this tree become disgusting for purposes of using it for a mitzvah or not? **R' Dimi** said that the question was regarding an asheira tree that was assur and was then made batel. The question is, do we say that once it was rejected for a mitzvah it remains forever rejected, or not?
  - **Q:** Why can't he answer this from a Mishna that says that if blood of a shechted chaya or bird was covered over by the wind there is still a chiyuv to cover it. **Rabbah bar bar Chana in the name of R' Yochanan** said, the Mishna means that if after being covered by the wind it became uncovered, there would be a chiyuv to cover it again. The Gemara there asked, since when it was covered he was patur, why should he become chayuv again now just because it became uncovered? We should say that since the mitzvah was "rejected" it should remain so!? **R' Pappa** answered, we see from here that there is no concept of rejection with regard to mitzvos. Why didn't **Reish Lakish** have an answer from **R' Pappa**? **A:** **Reish Lakish's** question was actually on **R' Pappa's** answer. He was asking, does **R' Pappa** hold that way in all cases or only there where it leads to a chumra?
  - The Gemara leaves off with a **TEIKU**.
- **R' Pappa** asked, if someone bows down to an animal, may that animal's wool be used for techeiles?
  - **Q:** Techeiles for what purpose? If he is asking for techeiles for the Kohanim, that is essentially the same question asked by **Rami bar Chama** previously, and if he is asking regarding techeiles for tzitzis, that is essentially the question of **Reish Lakish**!? **A:** In truth he didn't have to ask this question, but it was a lead-in to some other questions – may the animal's horns be used for the trumpets in the Beis Hamikdash? May its bones be used for the flutes? May its intestines be used for musical strings? Those are the questions he wanted to ask.
    - According to the view that the main "shira" in the Beis Hamikdash is done with instruments, it is certainly assur. The question is according to the view that the main "shira" is done by singing, maybe this would be mutar, because the music is only meant to help the singing, or maybe even so it is assur. The Gemara remains with a **TEIKU**.
- **Rabbah** asked, if someone bows down to a spring of water, may water be taken from there for nesachim?
  - **Q:** What is the question? If he is unsure whether the person is only bowing to his own reflection (and the water therefore remains mutar) or whether he is bowing to the spring, he should ask whether water in a bowl that was bowed down to becomes assur even for a private individual!? **A:** He holds that the person is definitely bowing down to the water. His question is whether the person means to bow to the

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

water that is there at that time, and that water has since flowed away, or maybe he means to bow to the flowing current, which makes all flowing water assur.

- **Q: R' Yochanan in the name of R' Shimon ben Yehotzadak** said, that one cannot make public waters assur!? **A:** The case is that the water flows from the person's own property.

### MISHNA

- If someone's house shared a wall with a building of avoda zara and the wall collapsed, he is not allowed to rebuild the wall. What should he do? He should go 4 amos into his property and build the wall there. If the wall was owned half by him and half to the avoda zara (half the thickness to each), it is judged half and half (half the thickness is considered in his property and can be included in his 4 amah measurement).
  - The stones, wood, and earth from the wall give off tumah like a sheretz, based on the pasuk of "shakeitz tishaktzenu". **R' Akiva** says it gives off tumah like a niddah, as the pasuk says "tizreim kimo dava tzei tomar lo". Therefore, just as a niddah gives off tumah to the one who carries her, avoda zara does so as well.

### GEMARA

- **Q:** By bringing the wall back 4 amos into his property he is increasing the property of the avoda zara!? **A: R' Chanina** of Sura said, he makes that 4 amah area into a bathroom.
  - **Q:** One must act with tznius, so how can he use that open area as a bathroom? **A:** He only uses it at night, and since it has one wall it is ok.
    - **Q:** A Braisa says that going to the bathroom at night must be done with the same level of tznius as is done during the day!? **A:** He makes it a bathroom for children, or he fills that area with thorns.

### MISHNA

- There are 3 categories of houses of avoda zara:
  - A house that was initially built for the avoda zara – this house is assur.
  - A house that was built for another reason, but was then plastered for the sake of avoda zara and thereby added to it – for this house the person must remove what was added and it becomes mutar.
  - A house into which an avoda zara was brought in and then taken out – this house is mutar.

### GEMARA

- **Rav** said, if someone bows down to his house, he makes it assur.
  - We see that **Rav** holds that something that was detached and was then reattached to the ground, it has the status of something that is detached.
  - **Q:** Our Mishna says a house becomes assur only when it is built for the avoda zara, yet **Rav** says it becomes assur even when it is just worshipped!? **A:** Either one will make it assur – if it is built for avoda zara *or* if it is worshipped.
    - **Q:** If so, there should be a fourth category in the Mishna!? **A:** Since with regard to being mevatel such an avoda zara the case of building and worshipping are treated the same, they are not considered to be separate categories.

### MISHNA

- There are 3 categories of stones of avoda zara:
  - A stone that was hewed with the intent to be used as a pedestal for avoda zara – this is assur.
  - A stone that was not hewed with intent for avoda zara, but which was plastered and decorated for avoda zara – he must remove the plaster and decoration and it is mutar.
  - A stone onto which an avoda zara was put and then removed – this is mutar.

### GEMARA

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Ami** said, this middle category is only when he plastered and decorated the stone itself (he chiseled it into the stone).
  - **Q:** This case is similar to the second case of the last Mishna, and yet in that case it is assur even though the plaster and decoration is not into the wall itself (but rather even when applied to the outside)!? **A:** In a house the plaster gets into the spaces between the bricks, so it does go “into” the walls.
    - **Q:** Presumably, the case is even where the house was already plastered and was given another layer of plaster for the avoda zara, in which case it does not get into the spaces between the bricks!? **A:** Rather, **R' Ami** was talking in reference to being mevatel. He was saying that even if the image was chiseled into the stone and then filled with plaster, as long as the plaster is removed, it becomes mutar, and we don't view it as a stone that was hewn with intent for avoda zara.

-----Daf 72-----48-----

### MISHNA

- There are 3 categories of asheira trees:
  - A tree that was planted with intent for avoda zara – this tree is assur b'hana'ah.
  - A tree that was pruned or trimmed with intent to then use the new growths as avoda zara, and it then grew – if the growth is removed the tree is mutar.
  - A tree under which an avoda zara was put and then removed – this tree is mutar.

### GEMARA

- The yeshiva of **R' Yannai** taught, this second category is referring to where he was “mavrich” (bends the tree into the ground, from where it then takes new root and grows a new tree) or he grafted it onto another tree.
  - **Q:** The Mishna said it is even where he simply pruned or trimmed the tree!? **A:** **R' Yannai** was referring to being mevatel the avoda zara. He was saying that even if he was mavrich or grafted, if he removes what grew, it becomes mutar. We would have thought that it has the status of a newly planted tree and should remain assur. He therefore teaches that it would be mutar.
- **Shmuel** said, if one bows down to a tree, the new growth is assur.
  - **Q:** Our Mishna seems to say that it only becomes assur if the tree is pruned or trimmed, not with simple bowing to it!? **A:** **Shmuel** would say that the Mishna follows the view of the **Rabanan**, but that his statement was made according to the view of **R' Yose bar Yehuda**, who says that a tree planted without intent for avoda zara which is then worshipped, becomes assur.
    - **Q:** **R' Ashi** asked, how do we know that that **Rabanan** and **R' Yose bar Yehuda** argue with regard to new growth? Maybe they all agree that new growth is assur, and the machlokes is regarding the original part of the tree. The machlokes would be that **R' Yose** holds “va'asheireihem tisirifun ba'eish” teaches that the whole tree becomes assur and the **Rabanan** holds that “tigadeyun” teaches that only the growth becomes assur!? Although the earlier Gemara said that they each learn out from the other pasuk (not the one attributed to them here), we can say that they do use this pasuk. **A:** We can't say this, because then whose view would our Mishna be following when it says that the tree becomes assur only when it is pruned or trimmed? According to the **Rabanan** the growth would be assur even without the trimming, and according to **R' Yose** even the original part of the tree is assur.
      - The Gemara says, the Mishna could be following either view. It can be following the view of **R' Yose**, and it may be that he holds that when a tree is simply bowed down to the entire thing becomes assur, but when it is pruned, the person shows that he only has intention for the new growth and that is when only the new growth is assur. It can also be following the view of the **Rabanan**, and they are teaching that even when an act of pruning is done to the tree, it still does not make the entire tree assur, only the growth.

# Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

## MISHNA

- What is an asheira tree? It is any tree under which there is an avoda zara. **R' Shimon** says it is any tree that is worshipped as avoda zara.
  - It once happened that there was a tree that was being worshipped in Tzidon, and they found a heap under the tree. **R' Shimon** told them to investigate that heap. They did so and found an avoda zara buried in it. He told them, since they were worshipping that avoda zara, not the tree, the tree is mutar.

## GEMARA

- **Q:** The last Mishna gave the 3 categories of asheira, so why is the Mishna asking what is an asheira!? **A:** The Mishna means that of the 3 categories, two are agreed to by all, and regarding one there is a machlokes between **R' Shimon and the Rabanan**. The Mishna is asking which category is the one of machlokes? The Mishna says, it is the category of the avoda zara under the tree.
- **Q:** What tree is presumed to be an asheira? **A: Rav** said, it is any tree under which the priests sit and don't take from its fruits. **Shmuel** said, if they do use the fruit but say that it will be used for their holiday, it is also an asheira tree.
  - **Ameimar** said, the Elders of Pumbedisa told me that the halacha follows **Shmuel**.

## MISHNA

- We may not sit in the shade of an asheira, but if one does (sit in the shade, but not directly beneath the branch) he remains tahor. We may not walk beneath the tree, and if one does, he becomes tamei. If the branches hang over the reshus harabim and a person walks underneath them, he remains tahor.

## GEMARA

- **Q:** It is assur to benefit from avoda zara, so it is obvious that one can't sit in its shade!? **A: Rabbah bar bar Chana in the name of R' Yochanan** said, the Mishna is teaching that even "the shadow of its shadow" (the lighter, secondary shadow) is assur as well.
  - **Q:** This would mean that the Mishna is saying that sitting in the primary shadow would make him tamei? **A:** He would remain tahor there as well. The Mishna is teaching that one should not even sit in the secondary shadow.
  - **Others** say that the Gemara asked that it is obvious that he remains tahor since he wasn't under the branch? **Rabbah bar bar Chana** answered that the Mishna is teaching that even if he sat in the primary shade he would remain tahor. The Gemara asks, does that mean that sitting in the secondary shade would be mutar? The Gemara says that would also be assur, but the Mishna is teaching that sitting in the primary shade would still not make him tamei.

## V'LO YAAVOR TACHTEHA V'IHM AVAR TAMEI

- The reason he becomes tamei is because we are certain that there is a korbon of avoda zara buried under the tree.
  - This follows the view of **R' Yehuda ben Beseira**, who learns from a pasuk that the korbon of avoda zara gives off tumas ohel like a meis.

## HUYSA GOZELES ES HARABIM V'AVAR TACHTEHA TAHOR

- **Q:** Does the Mishna mean that b'dieved, if he passed underneath he remains tahor, or that l'chatchila he may even pass underneath? **A: R' Yitzchak ben Elazar in the name of Chizkiya** said, it means even l'chatchila. **R' Yochanan** said, it means only b'dieved.
  - The Gemara says they do not argue. **R' Yochanan** is referring to where there is an alternate route that he can take, and **R' Yitzchak** is referring to where there is no alternate.
  - **R' Sheishes** told his attendant that when they pass under an asheira that overhangs the reshus harabim, he should rush them.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** If there was no alternate route, why did he have to rush? If there was an alternate, how would rushing make it mutar? **A:** There was no alternate, but as a prestigious person he felt that he should conduct himself on a more stringent level.

### MISHNA

- We may plant vegetables under an asheira in the winter (the shade blocks the sun and is therefore detrimental to the vegetables), but not in the summer. Lettuce may not be planted there in the winter or the summer. **R' Yose** says, even vegetables may not be planted there in the winter, because the falling leaves act as fertilizer and benefit the growth of the vegetables.

### GEMARA

- **Q:** Does the Mishna mean that **R' Yose** holds that the combination of the assur item (the leaves) and the mutar item (the soil) make the vegetables assur when they both cause the growth, and the **Rabanan** hold that when an assur and a mutar thing combine the result is mutar? An earlier Mishna suggests the opposite!? The Mishna said, that **R' Yose** said a metal avoda zara may be ground into powder and thrown into the wind, and the **Rabanan** said that would act as fertilizer and would therefore be assur to do!? Now, we can say that **R' Yose** allows it there, because the avoda zara is being destroyed, and doesn't allow it here, because the tree is not being destroyed. However, how can we explain the contradicting views of the **Rabanan**? **A:** We must reverse the opinions in our Mishna – the **Rabanan** hold it is assur and **R' Yose** holds it is mutar. **A2:** We can also answer that we do not need to reverse the views. **R' Yose** can be explained as we have explained. The **Rabanan** can be explained by saying that with regard to the vegetables under the tree they hold that the benefit provided by the falling leaves is totally negated by the shade provided by the tree.

### -----Daf 49-----

- The Gemara just explained the Mishna in a way which results that **R' Yose** holds that when an assur and mutar thing combine to produce an item, the item is assur.
  - **Q:** How can this be? In a Mishna regarding Orlah **R' Yose** says that when an assur and mutar thing combine to produce a new tree it is mutar!? You can't answer that it is only regarding the stringent area of avoda zara that **R' Yose** says such an item would be assur, because with regard to a field that was fertilized with fertilizer of avoda zara or a cow that was fattened with food of avoda zara, there is one Braisa that says they are mutar and one Braisa that says they are assur. Presumably, the Braisa that says they are mutar follows **R' Yose** and the one that says they are assur follows the **Rabanan**. This means that **R' Yose** says the item is mutar even when avoda zara is one of the factors!? **A:** We can say that the Braisa that says they are assur follows **R' Eliezer** and the Braisa that says they are mutar follows the **Rabanan**, based on a machlokes in a Mishna.
    - **Q:** Where do we find these views of **R' Eliezer and the Rabanan**? It can't be from the following Mishna regarding yeast, which says that when yeast of chullin and yeast of terumah fell into a dough, each one by itself not being large enough to make the dough rise, but together making the dough rise, **R' Eliezer** says we look at whichever yeast fell in last: if the terumah fell in last, the dough becomes assur to a non-Kohen, but if the chullin fell in last it is mutar. The **Chachomim** say that the order doesn't matter, rather if there is not enough issur to cause the dough to rise, it will not become assur. **Abaye** explained that **R' Eliezer** only holds that way when the terumah yeast was removed. However, if both yeasts remain in the dough, the dough is assur because a combination of 2 things, one of which is assur, is also assur. This would seem to show that **R' Eliezer** holds that when an assur and mutar thing combine to produce an item, the item is assur! This can't be the source of his view, because maybe the reason of **R' Eliezer** is not like **Abaye** says. Maybe it is because he follows whatever fell in last, whether or not the terumah was removed! **A:** Rather, the view of **R' Eliezer** can be seen in the following Mishna. The Mishna discusses using wood of an asheirah tree (which is assur b'hana'ah). The Mishna



## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

says that if one fired up a new oven (that was never before fired up) with asheirah wood, the oven must be crushed. If it is used in an old oven, it must be left to cool down. If bread was baked in the oven (either the new oven at any time after the asheira wood was put in, or in an old oven before it was left to cool down) the bread becomes assur b'hana'ah, and if the bread becomes mixed in others, they all become assur b'hana'ah. **R' Eliezer** agrees that the oven becomes assur but says that one may "redeem" that assur benefit onto money and dispose of the money. The **Rabanan** say that one can't redeem avoda zarah. We see that **R' Eliezer** holds that when an assur and mutar thing combine to produce an item (i.e. the bread), the item is assur.

- **Q:** Where do we find the view of the **Rabanan**? It can't be the view of the **Rabanan** in the Mishna regarding the asheira wood, because they are even more machmir than **R' Eliezer**!? **A:** Rather, it must be the view of the **Rabanan** in the Mishna regarding the yeast.
  - **Q:** Maybe the **Rabanan** are only meikel in the case of yeast, but would not be likewise meikel in the case of avoda zara!? **A:** Rather, we can say that the Braisa (from the beginning of this Daf) that says that the field fertilized with avoda zara and the cow fattened with avoda zara are mutar, follows **R' Yose**, whereas the second Braisa that says they are assur follows the **Rabanan**. We will then have to explain our Mishna as **R' Yose** saying to the **Rabanan**, "According to me, I hold that when assur and mutar things combine to produce an item, the item is mutar, and therefore it is mutar to plant vegetables under an asheira tree in the winter. However, according to you, who hold that when assur and mutar things combine to produce an item, the item is assur, you must also say that it is assur to plant vegetables under an asheira tree even in the winter (because the falling leaves act as fertilizer for the vegetables)! The **Rabanan** however hold like **R' Mari the son of R' Kahana**, that the detriment of the shade cancels out the benefit of the leaves.
  - **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** paskened like **R' Yose**.
    - There was a garden that was fertilized with fertilizer of avoda zara. **R' Amram** asked **R' Yosef** whether it was mutar. He answered, that **R' Yehuda in the name of Shmuel** paskened like **R' Yose**, and therefore it is mutar.

### MISHNA

- If a person took branches from an asheira tree, they are assur b'hana'ah. If one fired up a new oven (that was never before fired up) with asheirah wood, the oven must be crushed. If it is used in an old oven, it must be left to cool down. If bread was baked in the oven (either the new oven at any time after the asheira wood was put in, or in an old oven before it was left to cool down) the bread becomes assur b'hana'ah, and if the bread becomes mixed in others, they all become assur b'hana'ah. **R' Eliezer** (agrees that the oven becomes assur but) says that one may "redeem" that assur benefit onto money and dispose of the money. The **Rabanan** said to him that one can't redeem avoda zarah.
- If a person took a splinter to use as a tool used by a weaver, the splinter is assur b'hana'ah. If a garment was woven using it, the garment becomes assur b'hana'ah. If the garment becomes mixed among others, and those others becomes mixed in others, they are all assur b'hana'ah. **R' Eliezer** says that one may "redeem" that assur benefit onto money and dispose of the money. The **Rabanan** said to him that one can't redeem avoda zarah.

### GEMARA

- Both these cases are necessary to be given. If we only had the first case we would say that only in that case **R' Eliezer** says the benefit can be "redeemed" because when the bread is completed the wood was already totally destroyed, but in the case of the woven garments, the splinter still exists throughout and therefore maybe he would say it is assur. If we only had the second case we would say that the **Rabanan** say it is assur in that case only because the splinter remains in existence throughout, but in the first case where the wood is destroyed, maybe they would agree with **R' Eliezer**.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **R' Chiya the son of Rabbah bar Nachmeini in the name of R' Chisda in the name of Ze'iri** said, that the halacha follows **R' Eliezer** (that the benefit can be "redeemed").
  - **R' Ada bar Ahava** said, this is only in the case of the bread (and the weaving, where in both cases the issur is not recognizable in the item). However, if there is a barrel of yayin nesech mixed among barrels of wine, we would not allow the owner to redeem the value of the yayin nesech. **R' Chisda** said, that even in that case we would allow him to do so. We find that **R' Chisda** actually paskened this way in practice in a case that was brought before him.

### MISHNA

- How is one mevatel an asheira tree? If he removed dry branches from it (to use as firewood) or moist branches (for his own use), or he took a stick, or a twig, or even a leaf from it, it becomes batel. If he took off even a small piece, but did so for the benefit of the tree, it remains assur. If the person did so for his own purpose, it becomes mutar.

### GEMARA

- **Q:** When a small piece is removed for the benefit of the tree itself, what is the halacha regarding the piece that was removed? **A:** There is a machlokes between **R' Huna and Chiya bar Rav** – one said it is assur and the other said it is mutar.
  - A Braisa says like the view that the piece is mutar. The 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.
- We have learned with regard to an avoda zara that broke on its own, **Rav** said he must be mevatel each and every piece. **Shmuel** said (as explained by the Gemara) that an avoda zara that broke on its own only needs to be made batel if it broke in the course of its natural growth.
  - **Q:** Maybe the machlokes between them is that **Rav** says goyim even worship the pieces of a broken avoda zara and **Shmuel** holds that they don't? **A:** It may be that all agree that they even worship the broken pieces. The machlokes here may be regarding a case where the broken pieces were further broken into smaller pieces. **Rav** says that they even worship those, and **Shmuel** says they do not. **A2:** We can say that all would agree that when broken pieces were further broken into smaller pieces they are mutar. They argue regarding an avoda zara that is made of pieces that can be put together even by one who is not an expert. In this case **Rav** says that since anyone can put it together it does not become batul, and **Shmuel** holds that since this did not come apart in its course of natural growth, it is mutar and doesn't need to be made batel.

### HADRAN ALACH PEREK KOL HATZLAMIM!!!

-----Daf 50-----

### PEREK R' YISHMAEL -- PEREK REVI'I

### MISHNA

- **R' Yishmael** says, if 3 stones are found one next to the other next to a Markulis avoda zara (Markulis is made by putting one stone on top of two other stones), they are assur. If there are only 2 next to the Markulis, they are mutar. The **Chachomim** say, the stones that seem to be with the Markulis are assur, and the ones that don't seem to be with it, are mutar.

### GEMARA

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** The view of the **Rabanan** makes sense, because they must hold that goyim worship even pieces of an avoda zara. Therefore, when stones are found that appear to be from the Markulis, we say they were part of it and fell off, and are still worshipped, and are therefore assur. If they don't appear to come from it, we say they are mutar. However, what does **R' Yishmael** hold? If he holds that they worship even broken pieces, then even if there are only two stones they should be assur, and if he holds they do not, then even three should be mutar!? **A: R' Yitzchak bar Yosef in the name of R' Yochanan** said, if the stones are known to have fallen from the Markulis, all would agree that the stones are assur, because even according to the view that the goyim do not worship broken pieces, that is only true for an avoda zara that doesn't usually fall apart, but Markulis is made from separate pieces and therefore normally falls apart and would therefore remain assur. The machlokes is regarding stones which we don't know where they came from. Even then, if they are close enough that we can say they fell from the Markulis, all would agree that they are assur. The machlokes is regarding stones that are a bit distanced from the Markulis.
  - **Q:** The Mishna says the machlokes is regarding stones that are "next to Markulis"!? **A:** The Mishna means that the stones are within 4 amos of the Markulis, but not very close. In this case, **R' Yishmael** holds that the goyim make a smaller Markulis next to a larger Markulis. Therefore, when there are three stones, which is the number needed to make a Markulis, we say they are assur, but if there are only two we say they are mutar. The **Rabanan** hold that they don't make a smaller one next to a larger one. Therefore, it doesn't make a difference how many stones are there – if they appear to be from the Markulis they are assur, and if not they are mutar.
  - **Q: R' Yochanan** said that if the stones are known to have fallen from the Markulis, all would agree that the stones are assur, because broken pieces of a Markulis are definitely assur. A Braisa says that the machlokes between **R' Yishmael and the Rabanan** is even when the stones are known to have fallen from the Markulis. This refutes **R' Yochanan**!? **A: Rava** said, amend the Braisa to say that the machlokes is when the stones are found near the Markulis.
  - **Q:** A Braisa says that **R' Yishmael** holds that even two stones are assur if they are "within the grasp of the Markulis", and three are assur even when they are further away. This refutes **R' Yochanan**!? **A: Rava** said, the Braisa is discussing where they are within "one grasp" of the Markulis (there is nothing in between the Markulis and the stones) and **R' Yochanan** is discussing where they are within "two grasps", for example, where there is a mound between the Markulis and the stones.
  - **Q:** Can it be that **R' Yishmael** holds that 3 stones lying next to each other are assur as an independent Markulis? A Braisa says that Markulis is only when the three stones are set up so that there are 2 next to each other with the third on top of them!? **A: Rava** said, that Braisa is referring to the primary Markulis (but the smaller ones that are put next to the primary don't need this configuration).
  - The house of King Yannai was destroyed and goyim came and set up a Markulis there. Other goyim who did not believe in this avoda zara came and took stones from this and used it to pave streets. Some **Rabanan** did not walk on these streets and others did. The ones who did not walk on these streets held like **R' Gidal in the name of R' Chiya bar Yosef in the name of Rav**, who darshened a pasuk to teach that the offering of avoda zara can never become batel. Therefore, since all the stones that were added to the original Markulis were added as offerings and could therefore never become batel. The ones who did walk on these street held that for an offering of avoda zara to be assur it has to be similar to the korbanos that are offered in the Beis Hamikdash, and that is why these stones are mutar.
    - **R' Yosef bar Abba** said that **Rabbah bar Yirmiya** came to our city and taught a Braisa that said, 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. **Rabbah bar Yirmiya** said, there is no one who can explain the reason for this! **R' Sheishes** said, I can explain it. You must find the Braisa difficult because of the ruling of **R' Gidal**. However, the stones are mutar, because they are not like the korbanos offered in the Beis Hamikdash.
      - **R' Yosef bar Abba** said that **Rabbah bar Yirmiya** came to our city and taught a Braisa that said, one may deworm or apply a smelly substance to a tree during shmitta, but not

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

during Chol Hamoed. One may not prune a tree during either of these times, but during both of these times one may smear oil on a branch that was pruned before these times. **Rabbah bar Yirmiya** said, there is no one who can explain the reason for this! **Ravina** said, I can explain it. What did **Rabbah** find difficult? It can't be that he didn't understand why deworming is mutar during shmitta but not on Chol Hamoed, because during shmitta it is assur to "work" the field, but there is no issue of "tircha", and deworming is only a tircha. However, on Chol Hamoed even tircha is assur. It also can't be that he didn't understand that difference between the allowance to apply a smelly substance but the issur to prune, because the reason is that applying the smelly substance only serves to preserve the tree whereas pruning serves to strengthen the tree. It also can't be based on another Braisa which says it is mutar to put on the smelly substance on a tree before Rosh Hashana of shmitta, which suggests that it would be assur to do so on shmitta itself, so how can this Braisa allow it on shmitta, because we can answer this contradiction by saying that one Braisa refers to the process done to preserve the tree and it is therefore mutar on shmitta and the other Braisa refers to when it is done to strengthen the tree and it is therefore assur on shmitta. It also can't be based on another Braisa which says it is mutar to smear oil on figs and to fatten them with oil before Rosh Hashana of shmitta, which suggests that it would be assur to do so on shmitta itself, so how can this Braisa allow it on shmitta, because we can answer this contradiction by saying that smearing a branch with oil merely preserves the tree, but fattening the fruit makes them better and is therefore assur! **R' Sama the son of R' Ashi** told **Ravina**, what **Rabbah** found difficult to understand is why it is mutar to smear a pruned branch with oil on Chol Hamoed, but it is assur to put the smelly substance on a tree on Chol Hamoed. They are both done to preserve the tree, so why is one assur and one mutar? It was for this reason that he said there is no one who can explain this.

- **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav** said, with regard to an avoda zara that is normally served by shaking a stick in front of it, if a person breaks a stick in front of it he would be chayuv, but if he threw the stick in front of it he would be patur.
  - **Q: Abaye** asked **Rava**, why is it that he is chayuv for breaking it, since it is similar to the Avodah of shechting a korbon, but he is patur for throwing it, which is similar to the Avodah of throwing the blood onto the Mizbe'ach? **A: Rava** said, in order to be chayuv the throwing must be in a way that the thrown item breaks up (like the blood when it is thrown).
    - **Q:** A Braisa says, if a person gave excrement to an avoda zara to eat (he smeared it on its face) or poured urine in front of it, he is chayuv (even if this is not the normal way to serve this avoda zara). Now, the urine breaks up when it is poured, but the excrement does not, so according to **Rava**, why is he chayuv!? **A:** The Braisa is referring to watery excrement, which breaks up when it is thrown.
  - **Q:** Maybe we can say that the halacha of **Rav** (that breaking the stick is like shechita) is actually the subject of a machlokes among Tanna'im. A Braisa says, if a person shechted a grasshopper for avoda zara, **R' Yehuda** says he is chayuv and the **Chachomim** say he is patur. Maybe we can say that **R' Yehuda** holds any act that is similar to shechting would make one chayuv and the **Chachomim** hold that it has to be more similar to an actual korbon (shechting a grasshopper is not considered shechita at all). Based on this, **Rav** would hold like **R' Yehuda**. **A:** It may be that all require a greater similarity to an actual korbon (and therefore breaking a stick would not be viewed as shechita). The machlokes here is specific to a grasshopper, because its neck is similar to the neck of an animal, and that is why **R' Yehuda** says he would be chayuv (but he would agree that he would not be chayuv for the breaking of a stick).

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

-----Daf נ"א--51-----

- **R' Nachman in the name of Rabbah bar Avuha in the name of Rav** said, with regard to an avoda zara that is worshipped with a stick, if a person breaks the stick in front of it he is chayuv and the stick becomes assur (even if this is not the normal way of serving this avoda zara). If he throws the stick in front of it he is chayuv (if this is the normal way to serve it) but the stick is not assur.
  - **Rava** asked **R' Nachman**, the reason why the stick is assur when it is broken in front of it is because it is like shechita of a korban. If so, throwing it should make it assur as well, because it is similar to the throwing of blood onto the Mizbe'ach!? **R' Nachman** said, throwing is only similar when it is done to a substance that falls apart when thrown (like blood), and that is why the stick does not become assur.
    - **Q:** If so, why do the stones used to worship the Markulis become assur? **A: R' Nachman** said, I also had this question, and ultimately it was answered by **Rav** who said that the stones thrown to Markulis are viewed as expanding the avoda zara itself, and that is why they are assur.
    - **Q:** This answer makes sense according to the view that an avoda zara of a goy becomes assur as soon as it is made, even before it is worshipped. However, according to the view that it is only assur once it is worshipped, the stones should not become assur until they are worshipped!? **A: R' Nachman** said, each stone is thrown with intent to add to the avoda zara and to act as an offering to all the stones thrown before it, so all previous stones have in fact been worshipped.
      - **Q:** The last stone to be thrown should be mutar!? **A: R' Nachman** said, if you can find the last stone to be thrown you can go and take it. **A2: R' Ashi** said that each stone thrown is meant as an offering to all previous stones and to itself. Therefore, even the last one has been worshipped.
  - **Q:** A Mishna says, if one finds garments, money, or keilim on top of a Markulis, they are mutar. If he found vines that have clusters of grapes or wreaths of grain or wine, oil, flour, or anything else of which is brought on the Mizbe'ach, they are assur. Now, with regard to wine, oil, and flour it makes sense they are assur, because they are also offered on the Mizbe'ach and they break apart when thrown. However, clusters of grapes and wreaths of grain are not offered on the Mizbe'ach and do not fall apart when thrown, so why are they assur? **A: Rava in the name of Ulla** said, the Mishna is discussing when these items were harvested with intent for avoda zara.
- **R' Avahu in the name of R' Yochanan** said, we learn that one who offers an animal with a mum to an avoda zara is patur, based on the pasuk of "zoveyach la'elohim yacharam bilti LaShem livado". This teaches that it is only assur when it is something that is done on the Mizbe'ach.
  - **Rava** queried, what kind of mum was **R' Yochanan** referring to? It can't refer to an animal with cataracts, because such an animal can be offered by a goy on his "bamah" to Hashem, so certainly they are considered offerings with regard to avoda zara!? Rather, it refers to an animal with a missing limb, as said by **R' Elazar**, who darshens the pasuk regarding the bringing of the animals into the teiva of "umikol hachai mikol basar shnayim mikol..." to teach that Bnei Noach cannot bring a korban that is missing a limb. The goyim then took this standard and used it for their avoda zara as well.
    - **Q:** That pasuk is needed to exclude the bringing of a treifa into the teiva, and is therefore not available to exclude animals that are missing a limb!? **A:** A treifa is excluded from the pasuk of "l'chayos zerah".
      - **Q:** That makes sense according to the view that a treifa cannot give birth. However, what about the view that a treifa can give birth? **A:** That view would say that a treifa is excluded by the word "itach", which teaches that the animals had to be like Noach, who was not a treifa.
        - **Q:** Maybe Noach was a treifa? **A:** The pasuk says he was "tamim" (complete).
        - **Q:** Maybe "tamim" refers to his ways? **A:** The pasuk says he was a tzaddik, so that already teaches that he was complete in his ways.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** Maybe “tamim” refers to his ways and “tzaddik” refers to his deeds? **A:** It can’t be that Noach was a treifa, because then when Hashem said to take in animals “like you” He meant that only animals that were treifos should be brought into the teiva. That does not make sense.
  - **Q:** If we exclude treifos based on “itach”, why do we need the pasuk of “l’chayos zerah”? **A:** From “itach” we would think to exclude a treifa only so that they don’t die during the year in the teiva and can provide companionship for Noach, but an old or sterile animal would be ok. The pasuk therefore says “l’chayos zerah” to teach that the animal must be able to have offspring.
- **R’ Elazar** darshens a pasuk to teach that one who shechts a korbon to Markulis will be chayuv. The pasuk says “v’lo yizbichu ohd es zivcheyhem lasi’irim”. This is not needed to teach that one is chayuv when it is the normal way of serving an avoda zara, because another pasuk says “eicha yavdu hagoyim ha’eileh es eloheyhem”, so the pasuk must be teaching about when it is not the normal way of serving that avoda zara.
  - **Q:** The pasuk is not available for that drasha, because a Braisa uses it to teach that if an animal was made kadosh before the issur of bamos was put in place it is still assur to offer it on a bamah!? **A:** **Rava** said, both drashos can be learned from the pasuk, as it can be read as saying “v’lo yizbichu” and “v’lo ohd”.

### MISHNA

- If money, clothing, or keilim were found on top of a Markulis, they are mutar. If there were vines with clusters of grapes on it, or wreaths of grain, or wine, oil, or flour, or any type of thing that is brought on the Mizbe’ach in the Beis Hamikdash, they are assur.

### GEMARA

- **Q:** How do we know that the items in the first category are mutar? **A:** **R’ Chiya bar Yosef in the name of R’ Oshaya** said, one pasuk says that the wood, stone, silver or gold that “is with them” (the avoda zara) is assur. Another pasuk says that the silver and gold that is “on them” is assur. This teaches that “with them” must be like “on them” – just like it is only assur when it is “on them” (i.e. the silver and gold) if it is there for beautification, so too is the case when it is “with them” (the wood and stone).
  - **Q:** Maybe compare in the reverse and teach that just as wood and stone is assur even when not there for beautification, the same is for silver and gold? **A:** If that is so, there would be no reason to have the pasuk of “on them”.
  - **Q:** Money (i.e. coins) are put there for beautification and yet the Mishna says it is mutar!? **A:** The Yeshiva of **R’ Yannai** said that the Mishna is discussing where the money was in a purse that was hung around the neck of the avoda zara.
  - **Q:** Clothing are put there for beautification and yet the Mishna says it is mutar!? **A:** The Yeshiva of **R’ Yannai** said that the Mishna is discussing where the clothing was folded up and out on its head.
  - **Q:** Keilim are put there for beautification and yet the Mishna says it is mutar!? **A:** **R’ Pappa** said, the Mishna is discussing where they put an upside down bowl on its head.
- **R’ Assi bar Chiya** said, anything that is found within the curtain that is put around an avoda zara, even if it is water or salt, is assur as an offering of avoda zara. If it is outside the curtain, then if it is something put there to beautify the avoda zara it is assur, if not it is mutar.
  - **R’ Yose bar Chanina** said, we have a tradition that there is no difference between within the curtain or outside the curtain with regard to Pe’or and Markulis.
    - **Q:** What does that mean? It can’t mean that even items (like water and salt) found inside the curtain are mutar, because the reason for that would be because these two avoda zaras are treated with greater respect, but that is not true, because people go to the bathroom in front of Pe’or!? **A:** Rather, it means that even items found outside the curtain are treated as if they are found inside and are assur.

## Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

### MISHNA

- With regard to an avoda zara that had a garden or a bathhouse, the halacha is that it may be used by a Yid if he doesn't have to pay for it, but he may not use it if he must pay. If the garden or bathhouse belonged to the avoda zara and some other person in partnership, a Yid may use them even if he must pay.
- The avoda zara of a goy becomes assur immediately when it is made. The avoda zara of a Yid only becomes assur from the time it is worshipped.

### GEMARA

- **Abaye** said, when the Mishna discusses monetary payment it means monetary payment to the priests of the avoda zara. The Gemara says, this comes to exclude payment to regular worshippers, which would be mutar.
  - **Some** say that **Abaye** was talking about the case of the Mishna regarding the garden and bathhouse owned in partnership. **Abaye** said that it is mutar if the payment only goes to the other partner, and not if it also goes to the priests.
  - The second version of **Abaye** would certainly agree with the first version, but the first version may disagree with the second version and may hold that since there is another partner it would even be mutar if some of the money went to the priest.

### AVODAS KOCHAVIM SHEL OVEID KOCHAVIM ASSURAH MIYAD

- The Mishna follows **R' Akiva** of a Braisa. The Braisa says, **R' Yishmael** says, the pasuk says "abeid t'abdun es kol hamikomos asher avdu sham hagoyim" – this refers to keilim that were used for avoda zara. We would think that it even includes keilim that were made but not finished, or even finished but not yet brought to the avoda zara, or even brought but not yet used in the service, that they should also be assur. The pasuk therefore says, "asher avdu sham hagoyim", which teaches that they are not assur until they are used in the service of the avoda zara. From here we learn that the avoda zara of a goy only becomes assur once it is worshipped and the avoda zara of a Yid becomes assur as soon as it is made. **R' Akiva** says the reverse is true: the avoda zara of a goy becomes assur immediately when it is made, whereas the avoda zara of a Yid only becomes assur from the time it is worshipped.
  - **Q:** The pasuk talks about "mikomos" (places), so how can this be understood to be referring to keilim!? **A:** We have learned that places don't become assur – as the pasuk teaches that the mountains do not become assur. Therefore, we must understand the issur to be referring to keilim.
  - **Q:** We said the pasuk is referring to keilim, so how does **R' Yishmael** extrapolate the halacha of an actual avoda zara? **A:** The pasuk continues and says "es eloheyhem", which creates a hekesh from the keilim to the actual avoda zara, and teaches that both only become assur once served. **R' Akiva** doesn't darshen this hekesh, because he says that the word "es" creates separation.