

6 Nissan 5778  
March 22, 2018



Avodah Zarah Daf 66

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

### **Mixtures**

When aged (*nesech*) wine falls upon grapes, all agree that they are prohibited, if it imparts a flavor (*to the grapes*). In the case of new wine which falls upon grapes, Abaye said that they are prohibited even in minute concentration, but Rava said that it is only prohibited if it imparts a flavor.

The *Gemora* explains: Abaye said that they are prohibited even in minute concentration, for the reason that we follow the taste (*in determining if the prohibited item and the permitted food are the same type or not*), and since both the wine and the grapes have one taste, it is a case of one kind being mixed with the same kind, and in such cases, a minute concentration suffices to prohibit the entire mixture. Rava said that it is only prohibited if it imparts a flavor, for the reason that we follow the name (*in determining if the prohibited item and the permitted food are the same type or not*), and since they each have a separate name (*one being wine, and the other – grapes*), it is a case of one kind being mixed with something that is not its kind, and in such cases, the permitted food becomes prohibited only if the prohibited item imparts its flavor to the mixture.

The *Gemora* asks on Abaye from our *Mishna*: If *yayin nesech* fell on grapes etc. (*one can wash off the grapes and they are permitted. If the grapes were cracked, they are forbidden*). The *Gemora* assumes that the *Mishna* is referring to a case where it was new wine that fell on the

grapes, and is the *Mishna* not ruling that the grapes are forbidden only when the *nesech* wine imparts its flavor to the grapes?

The *Gemora* answers: No! The *Mishna* means that the grapes are forbidden even in a minute concentration (*for we follow the taste in determining if the prohibited item and the permitted food are the same type or not, and since both the wine and the grapes have one taste, it is a case of one kind being mixed with the same kind*).

The *Gemora* asks: But from the latter part of the *Mishna*, we can deduce that the *Mishna* is referring to *nesech* wine which imparts a flavor into the mixture!? For the *Mishna* states: This is the rule: Whatever the flavor (*of the prohibition*) provides benefit (*to the food*), it is forbidden. Whatever does not provide flavor that is beneficial, it is permitted.

The *Gemora* answers: Abaye will explain the *Mishna* to be referring to aged wine that fell on the grapes (*and this is regarded as a “dissimilar” mixture, for aged wine does not taste like grapes; Abaye will therefore agree that the wine prohibits the grapes only if it imparts a flavor to them*).

If wine vinegar becomes mixed with beer vinegar (*and one of them was made from nesech wine*), or wheat leaven became mixed with barley leaven (*and one of them was terumah*), Abaye said: It is only prohibited if it imparts a flavor, for the reason that we follow the taste (*in*

determining if the prohibited item and the permitted food are the same type or not), and since they each have a separate taste, it is a case of one kind being mixed with something that is not its kind, and in such cases, the permitted food becomes prohibited only if the prohibited item imparts its flavor to the mixture. Rava said that that they are prohibited even in minute concentration, for the reason that we follow the name (*in determining if the prohibited item and the permitted food are the same type or not*), and since each of them is called vinegar or leaven, it is a case of one kind being mixed with the same kind, and in such cases, a minute concentration suffices to prohibit the entire mixture.

Abaye said: How do I know that we follow the taste (*in determining if the prohibited item and the permitted food are the same type or not*)? It is from the following *Mishna*: If there is a combination of forbidden seasonings which have two or three different names (*black pepper, white pepper, and long pepper*), but which are of the same species (*pepper*), or three different species of seasonings, and they fall into a permitted food (*and season it*), they forbid the permitted food and they combine with each other (*even if each one of them could not have seasoned the food by itself*). And Chizkiyah said: We are dealing here with different kinds of sweeteners, (*and they are regarded as one kind*) because they are all appropriately used for sweetening a pot of food. Abaye says that this proves that taste is the determining factor in a mixture (*in determining if the prohibited item and the permitted food are the same type or not*), and that is why the seasonings combine. However, should you maintain that we follow the name, each of them has a separate name (*and they should not combine to forbid the pot*)!

Rava, however, could say that this *Mishna* is in accordance with Rabbi Meir, for it was taught in a *braisa*: Rabbi Yehudah said in the name of Rabbi Meir: How do we know

that all the prohibited items of the Torah may be combined together? As it is written: *You shall not eat any abominable things* — anything which I declared to be abominable for you comes within the prohibition of “You shall not eat.”

If prohibited vinegar fell into permitted wine, all agree that it is only prohibited if it imparts a flavor into the wine (*for they do not have the same taste, and they do not have the same name*). If prohibited wine fell into permitted vinegar, Abaye said that they are prohibited even in minute concentration, but Rava said that it is only prohibited if it imparts a flavor.

The *Gemora* explains: Abaye said that they are prohibited even in minute concentration, because where the smell of the wine is that of vinegar and the taste is of wine, it is regarded as vinegar (*for the smell is the dominant factor*); it is a case of one kind being mixed with the same kind, and in such cases, a minute concentration suffices to prohibit the entire mixture. Rava said that it is only prohibited if it imparts a flavor, for where the smell of the wine is that of vinegar and the taste is of wine, it is regarded as wine, it is a case of one kind being mixed with something that is not its kind, and in such cases, the permitted food becomes prohibited only if the prohibited item imparts its flavor to the mixture. (66a – 66b)

### **Aroma**

If an idolater sniffs the wine of a Jew through a “*bas tiha*” (*a hole in the stopper of the barrel*), it is fine; but regarding a Jew sniffing the wine of an idolater, Abaye declared it prohibited, whereas Rava said that it’s permitted.

The *Gemora* explains: Abaye prohibited this because he holds that the smell is something of substance (*and it is as if he would be drinking the wine*), whereas Rava maintains



that it's permitted because he holds that the smell is not something of substance.

Rava said: How do I know that the smell is not considered anything at all? It is from the following *Mishna*: If they used cumin of *terumah* as fuel for an oven and baked bread in it, the bread is permitted (*to be eaten by a non-Kohen*), because the bread did not absorb the taste of the cumin, but rather, it contains the smell of the cumin.

Abaye, however, could say that it is different in this instance, because the prohibited substance was burned (*for when the bread was placed in the oven, the cumin was already reduced to coal*).

Rav Mari said: It would seem that Abaye and Rava are arguing on an issue that was already disputed by the following *Tannaim* in a *Mishna*: If a hot loaf of bread was removed from an oven, and was then placed on top of the mouth of a barrel of *terumah* wine, Rabbi Meir says it becomes like *terumah*, whereas Rabbi Yehudah says that it does not. Rabbi Yosi says that if it is bread made from wheat, it is permitted, but if it is bread made from barley, it is forbidden, as barley draws the smell of the wine. Is it not that the point of issue between them is the following: Rabbi Meir holds that that the smell is something of substance, whereas Rabbi Yehudah maintains that it's nothing at all?

The *Gemora* answers that according to Rava, it is most definitely a *Tannaic* dispute; however, Abaye can say the following: Rabbah bar bar Chanah said in the name of Rish Lakish: They all agree that the bread is forbidden if the bread was hot and the wine barrel was opened (*for the smell is strong and hot bread absorbs more than cold bread*). They all agree that the bread is permitted if the bread was cold and the wine barrel was closed (*for the smell is weak and cold bread does not absorb so much*).

They only argue regarding a case of cold bread and an opened barrel of wine. My case (*with the "bas tiha"*) is similar to case where the bread was hot and the wine barrel was opened. (66b – 67a)

#### DAILY MASHAL

Hag'alah and Thoughts of Sin

The Rishonim (*Ba'alei HaTosfos* on the Torah, *Raaviah*, Ramban, Rabeinu Bechayei and *Chezkuni*) ask why the Jews were commanded to perform *hag'alas keilim* only after the war with Midian and not after the war with Sichon and Og. Several answers have been offered, including one in the name of the Kotzker Rebbe: Sichon and Og did not cause the Jews do have thoughts of sin whereas the Midianites defiled them with iniquitous thoughts, as we are told: "...with their trickery that they devised" (Bemidbar 25:18). The command of *hag'alas keilim* was therefore then ordered, to eliminate what is hidden inside (preface to *Hag'alas Keilim*).