

13 Nissan 5778
March 29, 2018



Avodah Zarah Daf 73

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

Mishna

Libation wine is forbidden for benefit, and it can render other wine (*in a mixture*) prohibited in a minute concentration. Wine with wine or (*nesech*) water with water - in a minute concentration. Wine with water or water with wine: If the prohibited liquid imparted a flavor, the mixture is prohibited. This is the general rule: When one prohibited kind becomes mixed with the same kind, a minute concentration suffices to prohibit the entire mixture; and when it mixes with an unlike substance, the mixture is prohibited only if it imparts flavor. (73a)

Nullifying the Wine

When Rav Dimi came from *Eretz Yisroel*, he reported that Rabbi Yochanan said: If one pours *yayin nesech* from a cask into a vat, even if he continues to pour all day long, each successive drop of wine that falls in is nullified (*for he maintains that the nesech wine can become nullified in a mixture of its own kind*).

The *Gemora* asks from our *Mishna*: Libation wine is forbidden for benefit, and it can render other wine (*in a mixture*) prohibited in a minute concentration. Are we not referring to a case when the forbidden wine fell into the permitted wine (*and nevertheless, the Mishna rules that the mixture is forbidden*)?

The *Gemora* answers: No, it is referring to a case when the permitted wine fell into the prohibited wine.

The *Gemora* asks from the next part of the *Mishna*: Wine with water or water with wine: If the prohibited liquid imparted a flavor, the mixture is prohibited. Are we not referring to a case when the forbidden wine fell into the permitted water (*and nevertheless, the Mishna rules that the mixture is forbidden*)?

The *Gemora* answers: No, it is referring to a case when the permitted wine fell into the prohibited water.

The *Gemora* asks: If, however, the first part of the *Mishna* deals with prohibited water, the latter part must likewise deal with prohibited water, but in the latter part it states: Water with wine: If the prohibited liquid imparted a flavor, the mixture is prohibited.

The *Gemora* answers: Rav Dimi can answer as follows: Throughout our *Mishna* it deals with the permitted liquid falling into the prohibited one; the first case is when permitted wine fell into prohibited water and the second case is when permitted water fell into prohibited wine.

When Rav Yitzchak bar Yosef came from *Eretz Yisroel*, he reported that Rabbi Yochanan said: If one pours *yayin nesech* from a small pitcher into a vat, even if he continues to pour all day long, each successive drop of wine that falls in is nullified. This applies only to a small pitcher whose

spout is not considerable (*and therefore we consider the forbidden liquid as entering the mixture successively*), but not to a barrel whose spout is considerable (*and therefore we consider the forbidden liquid as entering the mixture at one time*).

When Ravin came from *Eretz Yisroel*, he reported that Rabbi Yochanan said: If *yayin nesech* fell into a vat (*of permitted wine*) and a flask of water also fell into it (*but the amount of wine was too small to impart a flavor into the water*), we consider the permitted wine as if it was not there (*for if it would be here, it would become forbidden on account of the nesech wine, and the water could not nullify the entire mixture*), and as for the remainder, the water overpowers it and nullifies it.

When Rav Shmuel bar Yehudah came from *Eretz Yisroel*, he reported that Rabbi Yochanan said: This teaching only applies when the flask of water fell in (*to the permitted wine*) first (*and then, when subsequently, the nesech wine fell in, the water nullified it immediately*), but if it did not fall in first (*for the nesech wine fell into the permitted wine first, and then the water fell in*), that kind (*the nesech wine*) has met with its own kind (*the permitted wine*) and is energized (*for the permitted wine becomes forbidden on account of the nesech wine, and the water could not nullify the entire mixture*).

There are those who connect Rav Shmuel bar Yehudah's statement with our *Mishna*: Wine with wine - in a minute concentration. Rav Shmuel bar Yehudah said in the name of Rabbi Yochanan: This teaching only applies when a flask of water did not also fall in, but if a flask of water fell in as well, we consider the permitted wine as if it was not there (*for if it would be here, it would become forbidden on account of the nesech wine, and the water could not nullify the entire mixture*), and as for the remainder, the water overpowers it and nullifies it.

The *Gemora* explains the difference between the two versions: He who connects it with our *Mishna* does not require the flask of water to fall in first (*and even if the nesech wine fell in first, the water, which came afterwards, can still overwhelm the nesech wine and nullify it*), but he who connects it with Ravin's statement requires the water (*in order to nullify the nesech wine*) to fall in first.

It was stated: If *nesech* wine fell into a vat (*of permitted wine*), and a flask of water (*in an amount larger than the nesech wine, but less than the permitted wine*) fell in as well, Chizkiyah said: If they (*the permitted wine and water*) increased because of the prohibited wine (*i.e., the water and the permitted wine formed a mixture, and then the yayin nesech fell into it*), it is forbidden (*for the nesech wine combines with its kind and forbids it, and the water is not large enough to nullify the wine; this halachah would certainly be true if the water fell in last, for the nesech wine already prohibited the permitted wine*). However, if they (*the prohibited wine and water*) increased because of the permitted wine (*i.e., the water and the nesech wine formed a mixture, and then the permitted wine fell into it*), it is permitted (*for the yayin nesech already was nullified in the water, and when the permitted wine falls in, it does not revitalize the nesech wine*). And Rabbi Yochanan says: Even if they (*the permitted wine and water*) increased because of the prohibited wine (*i.e., the water and the permitted wine formed a mixture, and then the yayin nesech fell into it*), it is permitted (*for since the water fell in before the nesech wine, we do not say that that kind has met with its own kind, and it emerges that the water overwhelms the nesech wine and nullifies it*).

Rabbi Yirmiyah (*who did not understand the dispute in the manner explained above*) said to Rabbi Zeira: Let us say that Chizkiyah and Rabbi Yochanan differ over the same issue as Rabbi Eliezer and the Sages, for we have learned

in a *Mishna*: 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.

The *Gemora* asks: But how can you understand the dispute in this way, for behold Abaye explained: 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*. Now, then, with whom does Chizkiyah agree? Rather, here the point of difference is whether we consider the permitted wine as if it is non-existent. Chizkiyah holds that we do not, and Rabbi Yochanan maintains that we do.

The *Mishna* had stated: This is the general rule: When one prohibited kind becomes mixed with the same kind, a minute concentration suffices to prohibit the entire mixture; and when it mixes with an unlike substance, the mixture is prohibited only if it imparts flavor.

Rav and Shmuel both say: With all the prohibited things of the Torah, if it mixes with the same kind, a minute concentration suffices to prohibit the entire mixture; and when it mixes with an unlike substance, the mixture is prohibited only if it imparts flavor. And when the *Mishna* stated, “This is the general rule,” it was including all the prohibited things of the Torah (*besides for yayin nesech*).

Rabbi Yochanan and Rish Lakish both say (*in disagreement with Rav and Shmuel*): With all the prohibited things of the Torah, whether it mixes with the same kind or when it

mixes with an unlike substance, the mixture is prohibited only if it imparts flavor, with the exception of *tevel* (*untithed produce*) and *yayin nesech*, where the rule is that if they mix with the same kind, a minute concentration suffices to prohibit the entire mixture; and when they mix with an unlike substance, the mixture is prohibited only if the prohibited element imparts flavor. And when the *Mishna* stated, “This is the general rule,” it was including *tevel* (*besides for yayin nesech*).

The *Gemora* cites a *braisa* which is in accordance with Rav and Shmuel, and the *Gemora* also cites a *braisa* which is in accordance with Rabbi Yochanan and Rish Lakish.

The *Gemora* explains that we deal strictly with *yayin nesech* because of the severity of idol worship. And the reason that *tevel* is treated stringently is because we say, “Like its permissibility, so is its prohibition.” For Shmuel said: One grain of wheat can exempt an entire pile (*and there would be no need to separate any more terumah*). (73a – 73b)