

18 Adar 5778
March 5, 2018



Avodah Zarah Daf 49

Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o”h

Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o”h

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

T Jointly Produced

The *Gemora* challenges the thesis that Rabbi Yosi says that *zeh v'zeh goraim* - something jointly produced by a prohibited and permitted item is prohibited. Rabbi Yosi says that one may plant a shoot of an *orlah* tree, but not the tree's nut, as that is the prohibited fruit. However, Rabbi Yehudah quotes Rav who says that Rabbi Yosi agrees that if one did plant it (or grafted an *orlah* branch onto a non *orlah* tree), that the resulting fruit is permitted.

This is also supported by a *braisa* which makes the same statement. The fruit produced jointly by the *orlah* fruit, in conjunction with the ground (or by the *orlah* branch, in conjunction with the non *orlah* base tree) is a case of *zeh v'zeh goreim*, yet Rabbi Yosi permits it.

The *Gemora* suggests that Rabbi Yosi may still say that *zeh v'zeh goreim* is prohibited when dealing with the severe prohibition of idolatry.

The *Gemora* rejects this, since there are two *braisos* about one who fertilized a field or fattened an animal with idolatry, with one permitting the result and one prohibiting it. Since we find Rabbi Yosi permitting *zeh v'zeh goreim*, we must assume that he is the author of the permitting *braisa*, indicating that he permits it even in the case of idolatry.

The *Gemora* suggests that Rabbi Yosi may be strict in a case of idolatry, but the two *braisos* are authored by Rabbi Eliezer and the Sages.

The *Gemora* attempts to identify which dispute of Rabbi Eliezer would indicate that he prohibits *zeh v'zeh goreim*: Rabbi Eliezer and the Sages dispute the ruling in a case of two pieces of sourdough that fell into a piece of dough, and leavened it. One piece of sourdough was *terumah*, and one was standard *chulin*, and neither was able to independently leaven the dough. Rabbi Eliezer says that whichever fell last determines the status of the dough – if the *terumah* fell last, the dough is prohibited, while if the *chulin* fell last, the dough is permitted. The Sages say that it is permitted, provided the *terumah* sourdough cannot independently leaven the dough.

Abaye says that Rabbi Eliezer permits the dough when the *terumah* fell first only if the *terumah* was first removed. If it remains, Rabbi Eliezer prohibits it, as it is *zeh v'zeh goreim*. The Sages permit even this case, since they permit *zeh v'zeh goreim*.

The *Gemora* rejects this option, since the dispute may not be limited as Abaye says. Rather, Rabbi Eliezer may simply rule that whatever completed the leavening determines the status of the dough, even if both are present, with no reference to *zeh v'zeh goreim*.

The *Mishna* says that wood from an *asheirah* tree is prohibited. If it fueled a new oven, the oven itself is a benefit, as it was formed by the initial fuel, so it must be broken. If it fueled an old oven, only the heat is benefit, so nothing may be baked until it is cooled off. If one baked bread (in a new oven initially fueled by *asheirah* wood, or an old one currently fueled by *asheirah* wood), he may

not benefit from the bread. If it got mixed in other loaves, all are prohibited. Rabbi Eliezer says that one may destroy the amount of benefit by throwing it to the sea, and then benefit from the loaves, while the Sages say that one may not redeem the prohibition of idolatry. This bread is a product of a prohibited item (*the new stove/the asheirah wood*) and a permitted item (*the current fuel/the old stove*), yet it is prohibited, proving that Rabbi Eliezer prohibits *zeh v'zeh goreim*.

The *Gemora* accepts this proof to Rabbi Eliezer's position, but fails to find an opinion of the Sages which would permit *zeh v'zeh goreim* in a case of idolatry. The Sages in this case prohibit it, and the Sages in the case of the *terumah* dough may not permit it in a case of idolatry.

The *Gemora* therefore concludes that Rabbi Yosi does permit *zeh v'zeh goreim*, even in the case of idolatry. When he prohibits planting under the shade of an *asheirah* in the rainy season, due to the benefit of the falling leaves, he is simply telling the Sages that if they prohibit *zeh v'zeh goreim*, they should prohibit planting in the rainy season as well. The Sages disagree, as the *Gemora* explained, since the net effect of the tree is a loss, due to the loss of sunlight. Rav Yehudah quotes Shmuel who rules like Rabbi Yosi.

A garden was fertilized with idolatry. Rav Amram asked Rav Yosef about it, and he permitted it, based on the ruling of Rav Yehudah in the name of Shmuel. (48b – 49a)

Benefit from an Asheirah

The *Mishna* says that if one may not benefit from the wood of an *asheirah* tree by using it as fuel. If it fueled a new oven, the oven itself is a benefit, as it was formed by the initial fuel, so it must be broken. If it fueled an old oven, only the heat is benefit, so nothing may be baked until it is cooled off. If one baked bread (*in a new oven, but with new fuel, or in an old oven, with the asheirah fuel*), one may not benefit from the bread. If it fell into

other loaves, they are all prohibited. Rabbi Eliezer says that one may throw the value of the benefit of one bread into the sea, and then benefit from the mixture, but the Sages say that one may not redeem idolatry. One may not use a weaving utensil made from the *asheirah* wood. If one weaved a garment with it, he may not benefit from it. If it got mixed in with other garments, they are all prohibited. Rabbi Eliezer says that one may throw the value of the benefit of one garment into the sea, and then benefit from the mixture, but the Sages say that idolatry may not be redeemed. (49a – 49b)

What can be Redeemed?

The *Gemora* explains that the *Mishna* had to teach both cases, since the case of fuel for the oven is less severe, as the benefit occurs when the idolatry has already been destroyed. Therefore, if only that case were taught, we would have limited Rabbi Eliezer's lenient opinion to that case, while if only the second case were taught, we would have limited the Sages' strict opinion to that case.

Rav Chisda quotes Ze'iri ruling like Rabbi Eliezer. Rav Adda bar Ahavah limits this to a case of bread, since the actual prohibited item (*i.e., the asheirah wood*) is not present in it. However, in the case of a barrel of wine used for idolatrous libation, which was mixed in with other barrels, we do not rule like Rabbi Eliezer, since the prohibited item (*the barrel*) is present in the mixture. Rav Chisda rules like Rabbi Eliezer even in the case of the barrel.

A barrel of wine used for idolatrous libation was mixed in with others, and the owner asked Rav Chisda what to do. Rav Chisda told him to take four *zuz*, throw them into the sea, and then benefit from all the barrels. (49b)

Voiding Idolatry

The *Mishna* discusses how one may void an *asheirah* tree. If one took off twigs or dry branches for kindling, or a stick or leaf for his own use, it is void. If he shaved off



wood for the tree's benefit, it remains prohibited. If he did so for his benefit, it is permitted.

Rav Huna and Chiya bar Rav differ on whether one may benefit from the shavings taken off for the tree's benefit.

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa* indicating that one may benefit from the shavings. The *braisa* says that if an idolater shaved off the idolatry for his use, the shavings and the idolatry are permitted, but if he did so for the idolatry's benefit, the shavings are permitted, but the idolatry remains prohibited. If a Jew shaved the idolatry, everything is prohibited, regardless of his intent.

The *Gemora* cites a dispute about idolatry that broke. Rav says that each broken piece must be individually voided, while Shmuel says idolatry that breaks need not be explicitly voided, unless it broke in the normal course of its growth.

The *Gemora* suggests that the dispute is actually whether idolaters worship the broken pieces of idolatry, but then says that both agree that they worship the broken pieces, but are disagreeing about broken pieces that themselves broke. Rav says that idolaters even worship these broken pieces of pieces, while Shmuel says they don't. Alternatively, all agree that they do not worship broken pieces of pieces. They are disputing a case of an idolatry that is assembled of detachable pieces, which can be easily reassembled. Rav says that since they can be easily reassembled, the detached pieces are not voided, while Shmuel says that since it didn't break as part of normal growth, it is considered voided once it's disassembled. (49b)

WE SHALL RETURN TO YOU, KAL HATZELAMIM

Stones near Markulis

The *Mishna* discusses stones found near the *markulis* idolatry, which was a pile of stones worshiped by stoning.

Rabbi Yishmael says that if one found a group of three stones near it, they are prohibited, but a group of two is permitted. The Sages say that any stones near the *markulis* are prohibited, while ones further are permitted.

The *Gemora* says that we can understand the position of the Sages, as they assume that idolaters worship pieces broken off of the idolatry. Therefore, stones near the *markulis* can be assumed to be such pieces, and are prohibited, while ones further away are assumed to not be pieces, and are permitted. However, the *Gemora* does not understand where Rabbi Yishmael's distinction between two and three comes from – if they worship pieces, even two should be prohibited, and if they do not, even three should be permitted.

Rav Yitzchak bar Yosef quotes Rabbi Yochanan explaining the parameters and rationale of the dispute. He said that all agree that if a stone fell off from the *markulis* that it is prohibited. Even those who say that idolaters do not worship broken pieces agree that they do worship stones of *markulis*, since the idolatry is itself a pile of disparate stones, each one of which is worshiped. The dispute is a case where the stones were found, but we do not know if they came from the *markulis*. If they were found nearby, all agree they are prohibited, since we assume they fell from the *markulis*. The dispute is a case where they are not nearby, but within the four *amos* domain of the *markulis*, where the only concern is that an idolater made a mini-*markulis* structure. Rabbi Yishmael says that three stones are similar to a *markulis*, so we assume it was placed as a mini-*markulis*, and is prohibited. Less than three stones are not similar to *markulis*, and therefore are permitted. The Sages say that we are never concerned that someone made a mini-*markulis*, and therefore, any stones found outside of the immediate vicinity of the *markulis* are permitted, since we assume it did not fall off of the *markulis*. (49b – 50a)