

## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) Clarifying the positions of R' Yosi and Rabanan (cont.)

The Gemara concludes its challenge to R' Yosi's position that זה וזה גורם is prohibited.

The response to the challenge is that the cited sources represent the dispute between R' Eliezer and Rabanan rather than R' Yosi and Rabanan.

The Gemara searches, unsuccessfully, for the related dispute between R' Eliezer and Rabanan.

The Gemara returns to the assumption that the cited sources reflect the opinions of R' Yosi and Rabanan and resolves the contradiction between R' Yosi's two rulings.

R' Yehudah in the name of Shmuel rules like R' Yosi that זה וזה גורם is permitted.

A related incident is recounted.

**2) MISHNAH:** The Mishnah discusses different benefits that one may have from a branch or piece of wood from an asheirah tree and whether those benefits are permitted.

### 3) Clarifying the Mishnah

The Gemara explains why it was necessary for the Mishnah to address two cases.

Two different lists of Amoraim rule in accordance with R' Eliezer's position.

R' Ada bar Ahava and R' Chisda disagree about how far R' Eliezer's leniency could be extended.

A related incident is recorded.

**4) MISHNAH:** The Mishnah discusses different methods of nullifying an asheira tree, some of which are effective and some of which are not.

### 5) Chips from an asheirah tree

R' Huna and R' Chiya bar Rav disagree whether chips of an asheirah tree are permitted for use.

A Baraisa is cited in support of the opinion that maintains that the chips are permitted.

(Continued on page 2)

## REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the point of dispute between R' Eliezer and Rabanan concerning שאור?

2. What is the halacha regarding זה וזה גורם?

3. Why does the Mishnah present two similar cases?

4. What is the point of dispute between Rav and Shmuel?

## Distinctive INSIGHT

The view of R' Eliezer regarding the case of זה וזה גורם

אפה בו הפת וכו'

The Gemara declares that R' Eliezer and Chachamim disagree regarding the law of זה וזה גורם. This means that when a product is formed by something from which benefit is prohibited together with something from which benefit is permitted, there is a question whether this product is prohibited from benefit. An example of this is the case in the Mishnah (48b) where R' Eliezer prohibits planting vegetables under the shade of an asheira tree even during the rainy season. Even though the shade of the tree is harmful in that it blocks out the sunlight which is essential for the vegetable's growth, the plants grow due to the rain and the falling leaves of the prohibited tree, which contribute a fertilizing effect. Tanna Kamma allows this due to זה וזה גורם, while R' Eliezer does not consider this to be a leniency to allow even the partial benefit of the asheira.

On our daf, the Gemara attempts to identify that R' Eliezer is the one who holds that זה וזה גורם is prohibited. The Mishnah from the top of עמוד ב' is cited. The case is where branches from an asheira are taken and they are used to fire up an oven. The Mishnah rules that if it is a new oven, the heat of the avodah zarah has been absorbed and has caused the bricks to harden. The oven is forever prohibited to be used, and it must be dismantled. If the prohibited branches were used to heat up an old, established oven, it must be cooled down. Tanna Kamma says that bread baked in the heat generated by these branches is prohibited, while R' Eliezer allows the bread through redemption, taking the value of the loaf and throwing it into the Dead Sea.

The Rishonim discuss a new oven which was hardened with the heat of asheira branches. After it has cooled, and regular branches are now used to heat the oven, would a loaf baked in this heat be a problem of זה וזה גורם? Rashi says that this loaf would be prohibited, because the oven itself was originally hardened with prohibited branches. Yet, we also now have the heat from branches which are permitted. Rashi therefore understands that the ruling of R' Eliezer which prohibits the loaf demonstrates his strict view regarding זה וזה גורם both in the case of the new oven which was originally heated with asheira branches, as well as in the case of an old oven.

Tosafos Ri"ד explains that a new oven which was originally heated with asheira branches but was cooled and is now heated with permitted branches is a case of only היתר, which all opinions agree is permitted. He explains that the proof of the Gemara regarding the view of R' Eliezer was from the case of a new oven, which when heated with asheira branches must be dismantled. The bricks are of permitted material, and the heat was from asheira branches, a זה וזה גורם combination. ■

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated  
 Mr. and Mrs. Avi Goldfeder  
 In loving memory of their father  
 ר' ירוחם פישל בן ר' משה אברהם הכהן, ז"ל

# HALACHAH Highlight

## Drinking milk on Pesach from a cow that was fed chometz

פרה שנתפטמה בכרשיני עבודת כוכבים

A cow that was fed vetch of idolatry

The Gemara presents a debate regarding seeds that were planted beneath an asheirah tree. During the summer time the shade of the asheira tree provides benefit for the seeds. What emerges is that on the one hand the shade of the tree contributes a prohibited benefit towards the growth of the tree and on the other hand, the ground contributes a permitted benefit towards the growth of the tree. This phenomenon is called **זה וזה גורם**—“This and that are the cause.” Tannaim debate whether the product of such a circumstance is permitted or prohibited. A similar dispute applies regarding an animal that was fattened with food that has been used for idolatry. One opinion permits the slaughter of the animal immediately whereas the other opinion maintains that the animal should be left to lose the fat that was generated by the forbidden food. Rambam<sup>1</sup> rules that **זה וזה גורם** is permitted and the seeds may be consumed and the animal may be slaughtered and eaten immediately.

Later authorities discuss the case of drinking milk of a cow on Pesach that belongs to a non-Jew who fed the cow chometz. Some authorities<sup>2</sup> prohibit drinking the milk of an animal that ate chometz in the past twenty-four hours. Their rationale is that chometz on Pesach is prohibited from benefit even in the slightest amount and any time food will not be nullified **זה וזה גורם** is prohibited. Avnei Miluim<sup>3</sup> permits the consumption of the milk and offers the following rationale. **זה וזה גורם** is only

(Overview...continued from page 1)

Rav and Shmuel disagree about the status of an idol that broke on its own.

Shmuel's position is clarified.

The exact point of dispute between Rav and Shmuel is discussed and clarified.

### הדרן עלך כל הצלמים

6) **MISHNAH:** The Mishnah discusses the status of stones found in the vicinity of a markulis idol.

### 7) Clarifying the dispute in the Mishnah

The Gemara explains the rationale behind Rabanan's position and then questions R' Yishmael's position.

R' Yitzchok bar Yosef in the name of R' Yochanan begins to explain the exact point of dispute between R' Yishmael and Rabanan. ■

Rabbinically prohibited and the stringency that chometz is prohibited even in the slightest amount does not apply to food that is Rabbinically prohibited. As a result one could be lenient concerning milk from a cow that ate chometz. Mishnah Berurah<sup>4</sup> records the following dispute. Pri Megadim permits drinking milk from a cow only if twenty-four hours passed since it ate chometz whereas other opinions are more lenient and allow the milk to be consumed as long as the cow ate non-chometz food in the morning and evening. ■

1. רמב"ם פ"ז מהל' ע"ז הי"ד
2. ישועות יעקב או"ח ס"ס תמ"ח
3. אבני מילואים שו"ת סי' ז'
4. מ"ב סי' תמ"ח ס"ק ל"ג ■

# STORIES Off the Daf

## The Smallest Measurable Quantity

יוליך הנאה לים המלח

Today's daf discusses the parameters of issurei hana'ah. The most prevalent issur hana'ah that we deal with is chometz on Pesach which cannot be nullified. A very famous question is how one can drink from a water source where someone may have thrown chometz somewhere in the vast expanse of the body of water. Of course, this question is only relevant if the source of water is a place where people go to visit. But in many places in the world, this is a very practical question. Some people even prepare water before the holiday for the entire chag as a result of this prob-

lem.

When someone asked Rav Shlomo Zalman Auerbach, zt"l, about this he explained that initially, he too had been careful. “But then I understood that although even a **משהו** (a “something”) of chometz is prohibited, a **משהו** is also a measurable quantity. Such an infinitesimal amount as what we get after a bit of bread soaks in the Kinneret for twenty-four hours is definitely less than even a **משהו**. Although this seems clear and is certainly true, I would be happier if I could find it in an earlier source, but unfortunately I have not yet succeeded.”

Interestingly, the Orchos Halachah brings this down and points out that the Rosh L'Reuveini cites the same reasoning from Rav Menasheh, one of the students of the Vilna Gaon, zt"l.<sup>1</sup>

When someone asked Rav Nissim Karelitz, shlit"a, this question he brought a brilliant proof from a clear Mishnah in Pesachim. “The Chazon Ish, zt"l, permitted this, explaining that, ‘A **משהו** is also a measurable quantity.’ A **משהו** must still have some kind of influence, but it is not that it is nothing, as a “nothing” cannot prohibit. I believe this is clear from the Mishnah in Pesachim that says that according to the opinion of the sages one gets rid of his chometz by throwing it into the river even after the time when chometz is prohibited. Clearly, putting chometz into rivers will not prohibit drinking the water or this would have been forbidden!”<sup>2</sup> ■

1. הליכות שלמה פסח פרק ד' ס' ה' ואות 20
2. חוט שני פסח פ"ז אות ב' ושער ציון אות נ"א