



Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

Maseches Avodah Zarah, Daf נב – Daf נה

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 נב---52-----

- **Q:** The Gemara taught a Braisa that brought a machlokes between **R' Yishmael** and **R' Akiva**, which was based on a drasha of the pesukim. **R' Yishmael** said that the avoda zara of a goy becomes assur only once it is worshipped, but the avoda zara of a Yid becomes assur immediately (**R' Akiva** said the opposite). Now, the halacha regarding the avoda zara of a goy was learned from a drasha in the pasuk, but how does he know the halacha regarding the avoda zara of a Yid? **A:** It is based on logic – if the avoda zara of a goy is only assur after worshipped, the avoda zara of a Yid is assur immediately when made.
 - **Q:** Maybe we should instead say that the avoda zara of a Yid does not become assur altogether? **A:** That cannot be, because we will learn soon that the avoda zara of a Yid must be buried and hidden, so it must be that it is assur.
 - **Q:** Why can't we say that the avoda zara of a Yid is not treated differently than that of a goy? **A:** The pasuk regarding the Eigel says "v'es chataschem asher asisem es ha'eigel", which shows that the sin happened even at the time it was just made.
 - **Q:** Maybe the time of making the avoda zara is when the sin is earned, but the issur b'hana'ah doesn't come until it is worshipped? **A:** The pasuk says "arur ha'ish asher yaaseh...", which shows that the curse comes at the time of its making.
 - **Q:** Maybe that is when the curse comes, but the issur b'hana'ah doesn't come until it is worshipped? **A:** The pasuk says "to'avas Hashem", which means that it is assur b'hana'ah at that time as well.
 - **R' Akiva** would say that "to'avas Hashem" just means that making the avoda zara will lead the person to worship it. It does not mean that it becomes assur b'hana'ah at that time.
- **Q:** How does **R' Akiva** know that that avoda zara of a goy becomes assur immediately when it is made? **A:** **Ulla** says, the pasuk said, "pesilei eloheyhem tisrifun ba'aish", which suggests that at the time it is formed it must already be burned, because it is assur.
 - **R' Yishmael** uses this pasuk for the drasha of **R' Yosef**, which teaches that a goy can be mevatel his avoda zara.
 - **R' Akiva** would learn this from different pesukim, like **Shmuel** does.
- **Q:** How does **R' Akiva** know that that avoda zara of a Yid only becomes assur once it is worshipped? **A:** **R' Yehuda** said, he learns from the pasuk of "v'sam basaser", that it only becomes assur when "hidden things" are done to it – i.e., when it is worshipped.
 - **R' Yishmael** uses this pasuk for the drasha of **R' Yitzchak**, which teaches that the avoda zara of a Yid must be buried and hidden.
 - **R' Akiva** learns this halacha from the drasha of **R' Chisda in the name of Rav**, on the pasuk that mentions asheira and the Mizbe'ach, which creates a hekesh to teach that just as the Mizbe'ach must be buried (if it can no longer be used), the same is for an avoda zara.
 - **R' Yishmael** uses this pasuk for the drasha of **Reish Lakish**, to teach that one who appoints an improper judge is as if he planted an asheira.
- **Q:** **R' Hamnuna** asked, what is the halacha regarding a keili that was fixed with the intent to use it for avoda zara service?
 - **Q:** What type of avoda zara? If it is of a goy, **R' Yishmael** and **R' Akiva** would agree that since this is only a keili used in the service of avoda zara of a goy, it would only become assur once it is used in the service! If it is the avoda zara of a Yid, then according to **R' Akiva** who says that even his actual avoda zara only becomes assur once worshipped, so certainly the keili will only become assur once used in

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

service!? If the question is according to **R' Yishmael**, and the question is do we learn out the keili for a Yid's avoda zara from the keili of a goy's avoda zara and it therefore only becomes assur once used in service, or do we learn out the keili from the actual avoda zara, and just like this avoda zara becomes assur even before it is worshipped the keili also becomes assur even before it is used, then why did he ask about a case where the keili was repaired? Why not ask about a case where the keili was initially made for the avoda zara of a Yid!? **A:** Rather, **R' Hamnuna** was asking with regard to a metal keili that was tamei and the keili then broke and was repaired, which a Mishna says the halacha is that the tumah returns to the keili, is that only true for D'Oraisa tumah, but not tumah D'Rabanan (like tumah given off by an avoda zara) or is it even true for tumah D'Rabanan? That is what **R' Hamnuna** meant to ask.

- **Q:** If that was his question, why did he only ask regarding tumah of avoda zara? Why not ask about other tumah D'Rabanan? **A:** He was asking a double question – one, does tumah D'Rabanan come back, and two, if you say it does not come back, is the tumah of avoda zara treated differently because of the stringent nature of avoda zara?
- The Gemara leaves the question of **R' Hamnuna** with a TEIKU.
- **Q: R' Yochanan** asked **R' Yannai**, with regard to food that was offered to an avoda zara, can bitul help to rid them of the tumah or not?
 - He did not ask regarding keilim, because since keilim could become tahor when put into a mikvah it makes sense that it can lose its tumah with bitul, but food may be different. He also did not ask regarding an avoda zara that was itself made of food, because since the issur hana'ah is removed upon bitul, the tumah would likely be removed upon bitul as well. His only question was regarding an offering of food, since an offering cannot become batel, as **R' Gidal** said earlier, the tumah also can't be removed, or maybe the issur stays, because that is D'Oraisa, but the tumah, which is only D'Rabanan, is removed? The Gemara leaves the question with a TEIKU.
- **Q: R' Yose ben Shaul** asked **Rebbi**, may the keilim used in the "House of Chonyo" (Chonyo built a temple modeled after the Beis Hamikdash and would bring korbanos there) be used in the Beis Hamikdash? [The Gemara explains, this question is being asked according to the view that this temple was not considered to be avoda zara, and a Mishna says that the Kohanim who served there may not serve in the Beis Hamikdash. The question is, maybe that is true for Kohanim, because they have free choice and are therefore penalized, but keilim are not so penalized, or maybe the same would apply to keilim and they could also not be used in the Beis Hamikdash?] **A: Rebbi** answered, "These keilim may not be used in the Beis Hamikdash, and we had a pasuk to prove this, but I have forgotten it".
 - **Q: R' Yose ben Shaul** asked that a pasuk seems to say that after Achaz used the keilim of the Beis Hamikdash for improper purposes, Chizkiyah Hamelech had them "heichanu v'hikdashnu", which seems to mean he had them toveled and anointed, which shows that keilim can be used for the Beis Hamikdash after an improper use!? **A: Rebbi** said, that is actually the pasuk that is the source for what I said! "Heichanu v'hikdashnu" actually means that they buried them and were mekadesh new ones in their place, which shows that the keilim were not allowed to be used in the Beis Hamikdash after an improper use.
 - **Q:** Maybe we can bring a proof from a Braisa that says that the Chashmona'im hid the stones of the Mizbe'ach after the Greeks defiled them. We see that they could not be used for the Beis Hamikdash once they were used improperly! **A: R' Pappa** said that is no proof. They darshened a pasuk to teach that the keilim lost all their kedusha once the goyim went into the Beis Hamikdash. Therefore, when the Greeks used them they became assur D'Oraisa as avoda zara. That is why in that case they could no longer be used for the Beis Hamikdash.

MISHNA

- A goy can be mevatal his own avoda zara and that of another goy. A Yid cannot be mevatal the avoda zara of a goy.
- One who is mevatal an avoda zara is also mevatal its accessories. If one is mevatal the accessories they become mutar, but he has not thereby been mevatal the avoda zara and it therefore remains assur.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

GEMARA

- **Rebbi** taught the Mishna to his son **R' Shimon** as we have it, that a goy can be mevatel his own avoda zara and that of another goy. **R' Shimon** asked him, “Rebbi, in your younger years you taught the Mishna that a goy can be mevatel his own avoda zara and that of a Yid!”
 - **Q:** How can that be possible, when the pasuk says that a Yid’s avoda zara must be hidden forever? **A: R' Hillel the son of R' Valus** said, the Mishna would be talking about where a Yid is a partner with a goy in the avoda zara.
 - In his younger years he held that a Yid only worships an avoda zara based on the mindset of the goy. Therefore, if the goy is mevatel it, the Yid’s piece becomes batul as well. In his later years he held that a Yid serves based on his own mindset, and therefore the bitul of the goy doesn’t help for the Yid’s piece.
 - **Others** say that **R' Hillel** spoke on the later part of the Mishna, that says that a Yid cannot be mevatel the avoda zara of a goy. This seems obvious! **R' Hillel** said, that it is referring to where the Yid and goy are partners, and is teaching that the goy still can be mevatel his piece.
 - **Others** say that **R' Hillel** spoke on a Braisa, where **R' Shimon ben Menasya** said that the avoda zara of a Yid can never be made batel. What is meant by “never”? **R' Hillel the son of R' Valus** said, it is talking about where a Yid is a partner with a goy in the avoda zara, and he is teaching that the Yid worships based on his own mindset.

-----Daf 53-----

MISHNA

- How is a goy mevatel an avoda zara? If he cuts off the tip of its ear, of its nose, or of its finger, or if he dents it without actually cutting anything off, it becomes batel. If he spit in front of it, or urinated in front of it, or dragged it through the mud, or threw excrement at it, it does not become batel. If he sold it or gave it to a creditor as a “mashkon”, **Rebbi** says it makes it batel and the **Chachomim** say it does not become batel.

GEMARA

- **Q:** In the case of denting it without cutting anything off, how has he made it batel? **A: R' Zeira** said, the Mishna is discussing where he dented its face and thereby rid it of its form.
- **Q:** How do we know that spitting, urinating, etc. don’t make it batel? **A: Chizkiya** learns from a pasuk that a goy only does this temporarily, but ultimately returns to serving his avoda zara.

MACHRA OY MASHKINA REBBI OMER BITEIL...

- **Ze’iri in the name of R' Yochanan** and **R' Yirmiya bar Abba in the name of Rav** argue – one says the machlokes in the Mishna is only when it is sold or given as a mashkon to a non-Jewish smelter, but if it was sold or given to a Jewish smelter all would agree that it becomes batel; the other holds that the machlokes is only when it is given to a Jewish smelter.
 - **Q:** According to the second opinion, does this mean that the machlokes is only when it is given to a Yid, but if given to a goy all would agree that it is not batel, or does he mean that the machlokes is whether he gives it to a Yid or to a goy? **A:** A Braisa says, that **Rebbi** said, “My view (that the avoda zara becomes batel) seems to be correct when he sold it to be destroyed and the view of my colleagues (that it is not batel) seem to be correct when he sold it to be worshipped”. Now, this can’t be understood literally, because there would be no machlokes if it was sold to actually be destroyed or to actually be worshipped. Rather, “sold to be destroyed” must refer to it being sold to a Yid, and “sold to be worshipped” must refer to when it is sold to a goy, and we see that the machlokes is in that case as well.
 - The Gemara says, this is not necessarily a proof. The Braisa could mean that **Rebbi** says that his view is accepted by the **Rabanan** when it is sold to a Yid, meaning that they only argue when it is sold to a goy.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, if a Yid bought silver scraps from a goy and then realized that among the scraps there was an avoda zara, if he had not yet given payment, he should give it back to the goy to have him make

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

it batel. If he already gave payment, he must destroy it. We see from here that selling to a Yid does not make it batel. Now, if the machlokes is even when it is sold to a Yid, the Braisa can be following the view of the **Rabanan**, but if there is no machlokes when it is sold to a Yid, who does the Braisa follow!? **A:** That case is different, because the goy sold it thinking they were all scraps. He didn't realize there was an avoda zara mixed in and therefore could not have made it batel.

- A Braisa says, if a goy gave the avoda zara as a mashkon, or a ruin fell on top of it, or it was stolen by robbers, or the goy left it and went overseas, if he intends to return and get it in the future like the war of Yehoshua, it does not become batel.
 - All these cases are necessary to be taught. If we would only say the case of the loan, we would say in that case it is not batel, because he didn't actually sell it, but when the ruin fell on it and he did not dig it out, it should surely become batel. The Braisa therefore teaches that it is not batel in that case either. If we would only say that case we would say it does not become batel, because he feels it is safely buried and can be retrieved whenever he wants, but when it is stolen, since he didn't try to get it back it should become batel. If we would only say that case we would say that the owner says to himself – if the robber was a goy he will worship it, and if he was a Jew he will sell it to someone who will worship it, and therefore the owner is not mevatel it. However, when he leaves it and goes overseas, the fact that he didn't take it with him should show that he was mevatel it. The Braisa therefore teaches that even in that case it is not batul.
 - **Q:** What is meant by “if he intends to return and get it in the future like the war of Yehoshua”? **A:** It means, if he intends to return, like the goyim of the war of Yehoshua, who thought they would win and return and therefore were not mevatel their avoda zara.
 - **Q:** Why does the Braisa use the war of Yehoshua as a point of comparison? **A:** He thereby teaches another halacha incidentally, as taught by **R' Yehuda in the name of Rav**, who says that if a Yid stands up a brick to bow down to it, and before he does so a goy comes and bows to it, the goy makes it assur even though it does not belong to him. **R' Elazar** explained, this can be learned from the pasuk that teaches that there were asheira trees in EY. Now, EY belonged to the Yidden from when it was given to Avrohom, so how could a goy make a tree assur when it did not belong to him? Rather, the reason is that by worshipping the Eigel, the Yidden showed that avoda zara was acceptable to them, and the goyim were therefore their shiluchim to worship the trees. Similarly, when a Yid stands up the brick he shows that avoda zara is acceptable to him, and the goy is therefore doing his shelichus when he bows down to the brick.
 - **Q:** Maybe the Yidden only found the worshipping of the Eigel acceptable, but not other avoda zara? **A:** The Yidden said, “eileh elohecha Yisrael” – written in the plural, showing that they desired the worship of many avoda zara.
 - **Q:** We should say that only the trees worshipped up to the time of the Eigel are assur, but those worshipped after the Yidden did teshuva should not have become assur? **A:** It is impossible to know which ones were worshipped before and which ones after. Therefore they were all assur.

MISHNA

- With regard to an avoda zara whose worshippers abandoned it, if this happened during peaceful times the avoda zara becomes mutar. If it happened during times of war, it remains assur.
- With regard to pedestals that were set up along a king's path so that he could put his avoda zara on it when he passes by, they are mutar, because the avoda zara is only put there when the kings pass by.

GEMARA

- **R' Yirmiya bar Abba in the name of Rav** said, the “House of Nimrod” (the tower that was built by the people of the “Dor Haflaga”) is treated like an avoda zara whose worshippers abandoned it in times of peace and it is

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

therefore mutar. This is so, even though when Hashem scattered them about it was like a time of war, still, since they could have returned to it and did not, it became batel.

BIMUSYA'OS SHE' MELACHIM HAREI EILU MUTAROS

- **Q:** Why are they mutar because they are only used when the king passes by? At that time they are still used for avoda zara and should therefore be assur!? **A: Rabbah bar bar Chana in the name of R' Yochanan** said, the Mishna is referring to a path that is not often taken by the king. The fact that he decides not to take that path even though these pedestals are set up there shows that they are not true avoda zara items.
- When **Ulla** came to Bavel he sat on a damaged pedestal that had been used for avoda zara. **R' Yehuda** said to him, **Rav and Shmuel** have both said that a damaged pedestal is assur, and this is even according to the view that goyim do not worship broken pieces of an avoda zara! **Ulla** said, **R' Yochanan and Reish Lakish** have both said that a damaged pedestal is mutar, and this is even according to the view that goyim do worship broken pieces of an avoda zara.
 - A Braisa says like **R' Yochanan and Reish Lakish**.

-----Daf 71-----54-----

- A Braisa says, with regard to a live animal that was worshipped, if it is the worshipper's own animal it becomes assur to be used as a korbon. If it is someone else's animal it is mutar.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, what is the case of an animal that was worshipped and becomes assur to be used as a korbon? It is any animal that is worshipped – whether b'shogeg, b'mezid, b'oneis, or b'ratzon. Now, what is the case of "oneis"? Presumably it is where a person bowed down to someone else's animal, and yet the Braisa says it may not be used for a korbon!? **A: Rami bar Chama** said, the case of oneis would be where goyim forced a person to bow down to his own animal.
 - **Q: R' Zeira** asked, if "oneis" refers to a person who was forced, the person would be patur, and if so the animal should not become passul!? **A: Rava** said, we see from the pesukim that if one is forced to worship avoda zara in public he would have to give up his life rather than worship the avoda zara. This shows that even a forced act of worship is considered to be an act of worship. That is why the animal becomes assur to be brought as a korbon, because the act of worship done to it, even if forced, makes it passul.
 - The **Rabanan** said to **Rava**, a Braisa supports what you have said. The Braisa says that the pedestals of avoda zara that were worshipped during the time of a forced decree remain assur even after the decree is no longer in effect. We see that even a forced act of worship makes the avoda zara assur. **Rava** said this is not a great proof. The reason it is assur may be that we say there may have been a Yid who was a mumar and willingly served the avoda zara. **R' Ashi** said, it is more than just that there "may be" a mumar who worshipped it willingly. Rather, there was certainly a mumar who worshipped it willingly.
 - **Chizkiya** answered the contradiction between Braisos (that was previously answered by **Rami bar Chama**) that the second Braisa is talking about where a person poured wine as nesachim onto the horns of the animal. If such an act of worship was done (not just bowing down) it can even make someone else's animal assur.
 - **Q: R' Ada bar Ahava** asked, this would be a case of an animal that is used as an accessory (a place to pour nesachim), not as an avoda zara itself, and therefore it should not become assur for the Mizbe'ach!? **A:** Rather, **R' Ada bar Ahava** said that the second Braisa is discussing the case where a person poured wine between the animal's horns, which is an act of worship, and such an act can even make someone else's animal assur.
 - We find that **Ulla in the name of R' Yochanan** made this distinction as well – that bowing down to another's animal doesn't make it assur, but doing a true act of worship does make it assur.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** How does **Chizkiya** know that a person can make someone else's animal assur? It can't be from the fact that Kohanim who are forced to serve in the House of Avoda Zara are not allowed to then serve in the Beis Hamikdash, even though they were forced to do so, because they may be assur because they have intellect and choice and yet did the aveira. It can't be from the fact that the Mizbe'ach became assur for use after the Greeks used it for their avoda zara, because the reason that became assur is based on a pasuk like **R' Pappa** said in an earlier Gemara!? **A:** Rather, he learns it from the fact that Chizkiya Hamelech did not use any of the keilim that King Achaz had put to use for avoda zara. We see from here that although the keilim did not belong to Achaz, his using them for avoda zara made them assur.
- **R' Dimi** said in the name of **R' Yochanan**, although they said that if one bows down to the soil of the earth it does not make the soil assur, if he digs a bor as worship for avoda zara, it does become assur.
 - **R' Shmuel bar Yehuda** said in the name of **R' Yochanan**, although they said that if one bows down to a live being it does not make it assur, if he barter it for an avoda zara it does become assur.
 - **Ravin** said that **R' Yishmael bar R' Yose and the Rabanan** argue. One says that the item bartered for the avoda zara becomes assur but an item bartered for the bartered item will not, the other says that even this second item will become assur as well.
 - The view that even the second item is assur is based on the pasuk of "v'hayisa cheirem kamohu" – everything generated from the avoda zara gets the issur of the avoda zara. The view that holds that it is mutar learns this from the pasuk of "ki cheirem hu", which teaches that only the first item is assur. The other view will say that "hu" comes to teach that if one sells orlah or klayim and uses the money to be mekadash a woman, it is an effective kiddushin. The view that holds that only the first item is assur will learn this halacha regarding orlah and klayim from the fact that the Torah teaches that items bartered for avoda zara and shmitta are assur, and when the Torah teaches the same halacha regarding two different things it teaches that it only applies to those two things and to nothing else. The view that holds that even the second item is assur holds that in such a situation we still can apply the halacha to other places, and therefore the pasuk of "hu" is still needed.

MISHNA

- They asked the Jewish elders in Rome, if Hashem doesn't want there to be avoda zara, why doesn't He get rid of them? The elders responded, if they worshipped things that were not needed for the world to exist, Hashem would get rid of them. However, the people worship the sun, the moon, the stars and the constellations. Should Hashem destroy the world because of these fools!? The goyim said to the elders, if so, Hashem should at least destroy the avoda zara that is not needed for the world!? The elders said, doing so would strengthen the position of those who worship the items that are needed for the world, because they will say that the fact that their avoda zara was not destroyed shows that they are truly gods.

GEMARA

- A Braisa says, the philosophers asked the Jewish elders in Rome, if Hashem doesn't want there to be avoda zara, why doesn't He get rid of them? The elders responded, if they worshipped things that were not needed for the world to exist, Hashem would get rid of them. However, the people worship the sun, the moon, the stars and the constellations. Should Hashem destroy the world because of these fools!? Rather, Hashem allows the world to function and these fools will eventually be punished. Another example is when a person steals wheat and plants it, Hashem should not allow the wheat to grow. The reason Hashem allows it is because Hashem allows the world to function and these fools will eventually be punished. Another example is when a person is mezaneh with a married woman, Hashem should not allow her to become pregnant. The reason Hashem allows it is because Hashem allows the world to function and these fools will eventually be punished.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- This is the concept taught by **Reish Lakish**, that Hashem complains that the resha'im "force" him to create people that He did not want to create (i.e. mamzeirem).
- A philosopher asked **R' Gamliel**, the pasuk says that Hashem is "jealous" and strictly punishes those who worship avoda zara. Why is it that Hashem is jealous with the worshippers instead of being jealous of the avoda zara itself? **R' Gamliel** answered with a mashal of a king with an only son who had a dog, which he nicknamed with the name of his father (the king), and whenever he would swear he would swear by the name of the dog, adding the name of his father. When the king hears this he becomes angry at his son, not at the dog! The philosopher said, you are calling the avoda zara a dog? The avoda zara is what causes the worship by displaying powers, but the dog didn't cause the son to act the way he did!? **R' Gamliel** said, where have you seen its powers? The philosopher said, there was once a fire in the city and the only remaining building was the house of the avoda zara. **R' Gamliel** said, I'll explain that with a mashal. When a king has a city that rebelled against him and he fights back, he fights against the living people, not the dead. The philosopher said, you are calling the avoda zara "dogs" and "dead". If so, let Hashem rid the world of them!? **R' Gamliel** said, if they worshipped things that were not needed for the world to exist, Hashem would get rid of them. However, the people worship the sun, the moon, the stars and the constellations, the springs and the valleys. Should Hashem destroy the world because of these fools!?
- General Agripas asked **R' Gamliel**, the pasuk says that Hashem is "jealous" of avoda zara. Now a chochom is only jealous of another chochom, and a strong person is only jealous of another strong person, and a wealthy person is only jealous of another wealthy person (doesn't this show that there are powers to the avoda zara)? **R' Gamliel** answered with a mashal. If a man takes a second wife, his first wife is only jealous if the new wife is not as good as her.

-----Daf 71-----55-----

- Zunin (who was a Yid) said to **R' Akiva**, I know and you know that there is nothing to avoda zara, but yet we see people who go into an avoda zara with broken limbs and leave healed. Why are there such miracles? **R' Akiva** said, I will answer with a mashal. There was a trusted person in a city to whom all would give items to watch, and they would give it to him without witnesses. There was one person in the city who only gave him items in front of witnesses. One time that person forgot and gave an item without witnesses. The wife of the trusted person said, we should deny ever having gotten this item. The trusted man said, should we lose our trustworthiness because of this one fool!? The same is with the situation that you asked about. When Hashem sends yisurim on a person, the yisurim take an oath that they will leave on a certain day, at a certain time, with a certain medicine given by a certain doctor. Now, if the person inflicted with yisurim happened to be at an avoda zara at the time that he was supposed to have the yissurim leave, the yissurim say – we should not leave now, however just because this person is a fool should we break our oath!?
- **Rava bar R' Yitzchak** asked **R' Yehuda**, there is a place of avoda zara in our city, that whenever there is a need for rain the avoda zara goes to its followers in a dream and tells them to offer a human sacrifice in exchange for rain, and they offer the human sacrifice and it then rains! **R' Yehuda** answered that **Rav** has darshened a pasuk to teach that Hashem allows these so called miracles to happen so that people can have free choice and be led astray to follow avoda zara. This is similar to what **Reish Lakish** darshened from a pasuk, that if a person is looking for tumah, Hashem opens the door to allow him to find it, and if he is looking for tahara, Hashem helps him to find it.

MISHNA

- We may buy the juice squeezed from a goy's stepping on the grapes, when the juice has not yet flowed out of the place where it is crushed. This is true even if the goy takes the crushed grapes from that juice and puts it on top of the pile so that they continue to drain. The juice cannot become yayin nesech until it actually flows into the bor. Once the juice flows into the bor, the juice in the bor is assur and the rest of the juice is mutar.
- One may stomp on grapes in the winepress along with a goy, but we may not harvest grapes with him.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- If a Yid processes his wine while he is tamei, we may not stomp on the grapes along with him, but we may bring barrels to the winepress with him, and we may carry barrels away from the winepress with him.
- If a person kneads his dough while tamei, we may not knead or shape the dough with him. However, we may take the finished dough to the baker with him.

GEMARA

- **R' Huna** said, once wine begins to flow freely in the vat it can become yayin nesech.
 - **Q:** Our Mishna said that we may buy the juice squeezed from a goy's stepping on the grapes, when the juice has not yet flowed out of the place where it is crushed. The Mishna said this is true even if the goy takes the crushed grapes from that juice and puts it on top of the pile so that they continue to drain. Now, at that point the wine is flowing into the vat and yet his touching it does not make it yayin nesech!? **A: R' Huna** said, the Mishna is discussing a winepress that is plugged (to prevent the wine from flowing from the place it is crushed) and full (so it cannot flow freely).
 - **Q:** The Mishna said that juice cannot become yayin nesech until it actually flows into the bor. This suggests that even if the wine flows freely it cannot become yayin nesech until it leaves the vat in which it is pressed!? **A:** Here too, the Mishna is discussing a winepress that is plugged and full (so it does not flow freely).
 - **Q:** The Mishna said that once the juice flows into the bor, the juice in the bor is assur and the rest of the juice is mutar. We see that even after the wine is flowing freely into the bor, the wine that is in the vat cannot become yayin nesech!? **A: R' Huna** said, the Mishna is the original ruling that was given, and my ruling is the way the ruling was later changed to.
 - We see this in a Braisa. The Braisa says, initially they said three rulings regarding wine production: 1) we may not harvest with goyim for making wine, because it is assur to cause even chullin to become tamei in EY; 2) we may not trample grapes with a Yid who processes his produce while tamei, because it is assur to help a sinner do an aveira; and 3) we may trample grapes with a goy, (and we are not concerned for **R' Huna's** ruling that the wine becomes yayin nesech). They later retracted these ruling and said the following three rulings: 1) we may not trample grapes with a goy (because we are concerned for the ruling of **R' Huna**); 2) we may not harvest grapes with a Yid who processes his produce while tamei, and we may certainly not trample grapes with him; and 3) we may harvest grapes with a goy for making into wine, because it is mutar to cause chullin to become tamei in EY.

-----Daf 11-----56-----

V'EINO OSEH YAYIN NESECH AHD SHEYEIREID LABOR

- **Q:** A Mishna regarding maaser says that the juice gets the status of wine from when the pits begin to float to the top. This contradicts our Mishna that says that it is wine from when it flows into the bor!? **A: Rava** said, our Mishna follows the **Rabanan** and the other Mishna follows **R' Akiva**, as we in see in a Braisa regarding maaser, where the **Rabanan** say it is wine from when it flows into the bor and **R' Akiva** says it is from when the pits begin to float.
 - **Q:** Does **R' Akiva** mean when the pits float while the juice is still in the bor, or only after the juice has been put into barrels? **A:** The Mishna just quoted says, that even when the pits float to the top, a person may still take juice from the vat (where the grapes are crushed) and from the pipe that takes the juice from the vat to the bor and drink from it without giving maaser. We see that the Mishna is referring to the pits floating in the bor. SHEMAH MINAH.
 - **Q:** **R' Zvid** taught a Braisa in the yeshiva of **R' Oshaya** that says that the **Rabanan** hold that the juice becomes chayuv in maaser from when the juice flows into the bor and the pits begin to float in it, and **R' Akiva** holds it is from when the juice is taken to be poured into barrels!? **A:** We should change the earlier Braisa to say the machlokes like this as well.

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** Then who is the Tanna of our Mishna that says that the juice can become yayin nesech once it flows into the bor (before changing the earlier Braisa we said it can follow the view of the **Rabanan** of the Braisa)? Must we say that there is a third Tanna who argues with the **Rabanan and R' Akiva**? **A:** Our Mishna follows the **Rabanan**, and they are more machmir regarding yayin nesech, and for that purpose say that it has the status of wine from an earlier point in time. According to **Rava**, who says that there is no difference between yayin nesech and maaser, we will have to say that there is another Tanna who argues with the **Rabanan and R' Akiva**.

MAH SHEBATOR ASSUR V'HASHAR MUTAR

- **R' Huna** said, the wine in the vat is only mutar if the contents of the strainer (that was placed before the bor, to catch the pits and peels before they fell into the bor from the vat) are not returned to the vat. If they were, the vat becomes yayin nesech as well.
 - **Q:** The only way that the contents of the strainer become assur is from the fact that it is connected to the bor with a stream of wine. We should therefore learn from **R' Huna** that a stream constitutes a connection? **A:** There is no proof. The case may be as **R' Chiya** taught elsewhere, that the wine in the bor rose and touched the strainer. Therefore there was a full connection.
- There was a child who had learned Mesechta Avoda Zara by the time he was six years old. They asked him, what is the halacha – is it mutar to crush the grapes along with a goy? He said, it is mutar. They asked him, the goy takes wine with his hand and pours it for avoda zara, so the wine is yayin nesech!? He said, I was referring to where the goy's hands are tied, so he cannot touch the wine. They asked him, but he touches and moves the wine with his feet!? He said, touching and moving the wine with the feet would not be considered "nesech".
 - There was once a case in Neharda'ah where a Yid and a goy whose hands were tied, together crushed grapes of a Yid, and **Shmuel** held off paskening until three Yomim Tovim had passed.
 - **Q:** Why did he delay paskening? It can't be that he was deciding whether to be machmir like **R' Nosson**, who says that if a goy simply measures the wine of a Yid it becomes assur b'hana'ah, because even **R' Nosson** says it is only assur when done using his hands, not when using his feet!? **A:** Rather, he was deciding if he could be lenient like **R' Shimon**, who says that simple touching by a goy of a Yid's wine does not make it assur unless there is intent for pouring to avoda zara.

-----Daf 57-----

- It once happened in Biram that a goy climbed a tree to take a lulav, and on the way down unintentionally touched wine with the tip of the lulav. **Rav** allowed the wine to be sold to goyim. **R' Kahana and R' Assi** asked him, you said that even a one day old goy makes wine into yayin nesech by touching it (and such a child obviously has no intent for avoda zara)!? **Rav** said, I said the child makes it assur to drink, but does not make it assur b'hana'ah.
 - **Q:** **R' Simi bar Chiya** asked **Rav**, a Braisa says that with regard to non-Jewish slaves that were purchased or that were born in the Jew's house to his unconverted non-Jewish maidservant, and these slaves were given a bris milah but had not yet toveled in a mikvah, if they are "adults", which means they understand avoda zara, the wine they touch still has the status of yayin nesech. If they are "minors", which means that they don't yet understand avoda zara, the wine they touch does not have the status of yayin nesech. We see that the wine touched by a one day old child does not have the status of yayin nesech!? **A:** The Braisa's ruling regarding yayin nesech (the Braisa discusses other things as well) only refers to the slaves that were born in the Jew's house to his maidservant. In that case we are meikel regarding the wine.
 - **Q:** The Braisa says "and also", which seems to say that the bought slaves and the ones born in his house have the same halacha!? **A:** That is regarding the other halacha of the Braisa (regarding their status as a zav).

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Q:** That only makes sense according to the version of the Braisa that says that the purchased slaves are tamei like a zav, so we need the comparison to teach that the slaves born in his house are tamei as well. However, according to the version that the bought slaves are tahor, we do not need a comparison to teach that the slaves born in his house are tahor as well (it is obvious)!? **A:** The comparison is needed to teach that just as regarding the slaves born in his house, it is only when they have not yet gone to the mikvah that they make wine into yayin nesech, but once they have gone to the mikvah there is no longer a problem of them touching the wine, the same would be true for the purchased slaves as well. This comes to exclude the view of **R' Nachman in the name of Shmuel**, who says that when slaves are purchased they continue to make yayin nesech even after they have gotten a bris milah and have gone to the mikvah, until “the mention of avoda zara disappears from their mouths”, which **R' Yehoshua ben Levi** explained to mean, until 12 months after the slave is purchased.
 - **Q:** The Braisa said, that yayin nesech is only a problem if they have not yet gone to the mikvah, but once they have gone it would no longer be a problem. This refutes the ruling of **R' Nachman**!? **A:** The Braisa's ruling was only referring to slaves born in the Yid's house.
 - **Q:** The Braisa says “and also”, which seems to say that the bought slaves and the ones born in his house have the same halacha!? **A:** That is regarding the other halacha of the Braisa (regarding their status as a zav).
 - **Q:** That only makes sense according to the version of the Braisa that says that the purchased slaves are tamei like a zav, so we need the comparison to teach that the slaves born in his house are tamei as well. However, according to the version that the bought slaves are tahor, we do not need a comparison to teach that the slaves born in his house are tahor as well (it is obvious)!? **A:** The comparison is needed to teach that purchased slaves are like slaves born to the Yid in that just as slaves born to him, only the adults make yayin nesech, the same is true for purchased slaves. This comes to exclude the ruling of **Rav**, which said that even a one day old child who touches wine makes it into yayin nesech.

-----Daf 71-----58-----

- It once happened in Mechuza that a goy walked into a Yid's store and asked to buy wine. The Yid told him that there was no wine. The goy then saw a bucket of wine. He stuck his hand into it and said, “Is this not wine!?” The Yid took the bucket of wine and threw it into a barrel of wine (as if to say “You will not drink from this wine!”). **Rava** said, it was mutar to sell the barrel of wine to a goy (even though the wine of the bucket which was touched by the goy was mixed into it, because the wine was touched without intent to pour for avoda zara). **R' Huna bar Chinina** and **R' Huna the son of R' Nachman** argued and said that the wine of the bucket would be assur b'hana'ah. Some time later on **R' Huna the son of R' Nachman** went to Mechuza (which was where **Rava** lived). **Rava** told his attendant, **R' Elyakim**, to lock the doors and not let anyone in (by this time **Rava** had retracted his psak that he paskened in the above incident, as we will see in the coming Gemara, and he therefore did not want **R' Huna** to come and badger him about his earlier view). **R' Huna** managed to get into the house and asked **Rava** what the case would be in a case like the above incident. **Rava** said, the wine would be assur b'hana'ah. **R' Huna** asked, “You said that it was mutar b'hana'ah!?” **Rava** said, “I said it was mutar to sell the barrel of wine, but the proceeds received for the wine in the bucket would be assur” (he would have to take the money received for that and destroy it).

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

- **Rava** explained (he had originally ruled that all the money would be mutar, but) that when he went to Pumbedisa he was “attacked” by **Abaye** with rulings from Amora’im and a Braisa that showed that the wine in the bucket would be assur b’hana’ah. **Abaye** said, there was such a case in Neharda’ah and **Shmuel** paskened it was assur b’hana’ah, and there was such a case in Tverya and **R’ Akiva** paskened it was assur b’hana’ah. **Rava** said, maybe they didn’t want to be meikel, because the people of Neharda’ah and Tverya were not learned, and would confuse a leniency and apply it to other places? **Abaye** said, you think those people are not learned, but the people of your city of Mechuza are!? **Abaye** then brought a Braisa that said, that if a goy tasted wine and put the rest back into the barrel, there was an actual case where this happened and they said the barrel was assur. **Rava** said, maybe they meant that it was assur to drink, but mutar to sell? **Abaye** said, if so, the Braisa would have said “it may be sold”, as it does in the next part of the Braisa. From the fact that it said the barrel is assur, it means it is assur b’hana’ah, and this refutes **Rava**, **TEYUFTA**.
- **R’ Yochanan ben Arza and R’ Yose ben Nehorai** were sitting and drinking wine. They asked the waiter to pour them some more to drink. Only after he poured did they realize that he was a goy. One of them said the wine was assur even b’hana’ah, and the other said it was mutar even to drink.
 - **R’ Yehoshua ben Levi** said, each view is based on sound reasoning. The one who said it was assur holds that this waiter would never think that such prestigious people would be drinking beer. Therefore, he knew that he was pouring wine, and thereby made it assur when he poured it. The one who said it was mutar holds that this waiter would never think that such prestigious people would ever ask a goy to pour wine for them. Therefore, he definitely thought it was beer and did not have intent to pour it to avoda zara.
 - **Q:** The waiter certainly saw it was wine!? **A:** The story happened at night, so he didn’t see anything.
 - **Q:** The waiter certainly smelled that it was wine!? **A:** The wine in the story was new wine, which has no fragrance.
 - **Q:** Even if he didn’t know it was wine, he lifted the wine in the ladle (which is the equivalent of him touching it) to give them to drink, and although unintentional, the unintentional contact by a goy makes wine assur!? **A:** The case is that he poured directly from the keili holding the wine into the cups. That is considered to be his “ko’ach” (an indirect contact), and the **Rabanan** were not goizer for such indirect contact, when unintentional.
- **R’ Assi** asked **R’ Yochanan**, what is the halacha if a goy poured water into wine to dilute it (does it make the wine into yayin nesech)? **R’ Yochanan** said it would be assur as a gezeira for a case when he actually touches the wine.
 - **R’ Yirmiya** paskened like this in an actual case where this happened.
- **Reish Lakish** went to Batzra and saw people eating produce without first taking maaser. He told them it was assur to do so (he felt that Batzra was part of EY). He also saw people drinking from public waters that goyim had bowed down to, and he told the people that it was assur to drink that water. He then told **R’ Yochanan** how he had paskened. **R’ Yochanan** told him to immediately go and retract his rulings, because Batzra was not actually part of EY (and the produce grown there was therefore not chayuv in maaser) and that the water was mutar, because public waters cannot become assur as avoda zara.
 - **R’ Yochanan** follows his view stated elsewhere where he said in the name of **R’ Shimon ben Yehotzadak** that public waters cannot be made assur as avoda zara.
 - **Q:** Why doesn’t he say that all waters cannot be made assur as avoda zara, because they are attached to the ground!? **A:** His ruling is needed for a case of a wave that was totally detached from the ground, and he teaches that if it is public waters it still cannot become assur.
 - **Q:** This should be no different than a stone that broke off a mountain on its own, where there was a machlokes whether it can become assur as avoda zara. Based on this we should say that it is **R’ Yochanan** who says it is assur!? **A:** The case of the water is where the goy hit the water causing it to become detached. Even so, he says it cannot become assur, because it is public waters. However, had the water detached on its own, it would

Daf In Review – Weekly Chazarah

be like the case of the rock from the mountain and it may be that he would hold that it could not become assur as avoda zara in that case.