

26.3.6

(לא צריכא דקא נבעי מארעא) 47a → (איתמר אבני הר שנדלדלו) 46a

1. ולא תביא תועבה אל ביתך והיית חרם כמהו שקץ תשקצנו ותעב תתעבנו כי חרם הוא: דברים ז, כו
 2. לא תביא אתנן זונה ומחיר כלב בית ה' אלהיך לכל נדר כי תועבת ה' אלהיך גם שניהם: דברים כג, יט
 3. אבד תאבדון את כל המקמות אשר עבדו שם הגוים אשר אתם ירשים אתם את אלהיהם, על ההרים הרמים ועל הגבעות ותחת כל עץ רענן: דברים יב, ב

- I בני ר'חייא (חזקיה) ר' יוחנן dispute – מחובר לקרקע ע"ז which is tangential discussion about status of ע"ז
- a Question: rocks which got dislodged from the mountain (and then were worshipped) – what is their status?
- i Argument for היתר as per הר
- 1 Counter: a mountain is set in place, unlike this dislodged rock
 - 2 Save: animals (which cannot become objects of ע"ז while alive)
 - (a) Counter: animals are alive
 - (b) Save: mountains
 - 3 מותר → תפיסת ידי אדם no הצד השווה
 - 4 Applicat: dislodged rock has no תפיסת ידי אדם
 - (a) Challenge: the common denominator is also unchanged, unlike dislodged rock
 - (b) Modification: צד השווה is either בנהמה בעלת מום +mountain OR from בנהמה+dried up tree
- ii Argument for איסור: that's the purpose of v. 1- to anticipate the argument and ban nonetheless
- b Suggestion: חזקיה is the lenient one, as per his question about erecting an egg – whether it is אסור ipso facto
- i Assumption: he then worshipped it and his question – is erecting it a מעשה → without erecting, מותר
- 1 Explanation: this is parallel to a dislodged rock
 - 2 Rejection: חזקיה may indeed be the stringent one, here the case is that it wasn't yet worshipped
 - (a) Challenge: if not yet worshipped:
 - (i) If: we accept the principle that ע"ז של ישראל is prohibited upon designation – obviously אסור
 - (ii) And if: we accept the principle that ע"ז של ישראל is only prohibited at worship – obviously מותר
 - (b) Rather: case is that the ישראל set it up and an עכ"ם came along and worshipped
 - (i) His question: is this similar to a brick (in which case – אסור); or is the זקיפת ביצה not as obvious (תיקו)
- II Two essential questions about using מחובר לקרקע which has been worshipped for sanctified needs
- a דמי בר חמא can the rocks of a worshipped mountain be used for מזבח? (use for גבוה)
- i Even if: we argue that גבוה אצל לקרקע במחובר לקרקע – יש נעבד במחובר לקרקע אצל גבוה – the מזבח is only a קרבן לקרבן, not a קרבן itself
- ii Answer (רבא): ק"ו from אתנן (v. 2)
- 1 If: אתנן, which is permissible, even when תלוש, to הדיוט, but is אסור לגבוה even if לקרקע even if מחובר לקרקע
 - 2 Then: certainly ע"ז, which is prohibited when תלוש to a citizen, is אסור לגבוה even if מחובר לקרקע
 - (a) Challenge (ר' הונא בריה דר'י): perhaps ק"ו is the opposite, proving that אתנן is not אסור לגבוה if מחובר (v. 3)!
 - (b) Defense (רבא): if we can argue equally forcefully with lenient or stringent results – פרכינן לחומרא
 - (i) (challenge: from ר"א/ר"ע in ב: פסחים ו: ב; answer – ר"ע was just reminding ר"א of his own argument)
- b דמי בר חמא if someone bows to a stalk of wheat, can it be used for מנחות? (2nd question about use for גבוה)
- i Argument: perhaps the change (wheat to flour) makes it a new item → מותר
- ii Answer (מר זוטרא בריה דר'נ): ruling that offspring of מזבח פסולי are permitted
- 1 And: ר"א invalidates
 - 2 And: ר"נ ruled that dispute is only if they were נפסל & then became pregnant; if pregnant first, all agree לאיסור
 - (a) And: our case is akin to being pregnant first (wheat was already in ground)
 - (b) Rejection: animal is the same inside and ex utero; unlike wheat which is now flour
- c ד"ל if someone bowed to a palm, is the לולב usable for מצוה? (question about use for מצוה)
- i Note: must be that it was planted first, then worshipped – and according to those who oppose בר יהודה
- ii Question: is it "rejected" for use for ה'?
- 1 Modification (ר' דימי): case is an אשרה that was subsequently nullified/rejected (by עכ"ם)
 - (a) Question: is there דחוי אצל מצוות (meaning – once an item has been rejected for use for מצוה, is that rejection permanent or can it be "rehabilitated")?

- 2 *Suggestion: solve from וד: re: חולין*: כסוי הדם:
- (a) *If*: he covered it and it became uncovered, he is no longer liable
 - (b) *But if*: the wind covered it – he is liable
 - (i) ד' יוחנן: this is only if it subsequently became uncovered; otherwise, he is exempt
 - (ii) אין דחוי אצל מצוות ד' פ: infers from here that אין דחוי אצל מצוות
 - 1. *Reasoning*: since the דם was exempt when the wind covered it – but then when it became uncovered, the obligation was regenerated → אין דחוי אצל מצוות
 - (c) *Response*: ר"ל's question was how to understand ר"פ
 - (i) *Was he*: sure that אין דחוי → לולב may be used OR
 - (ii) *Was he*: unsure and ruled לחומרא (re-cover blood) but wouldn't apply it לקולא, allowing לולב – תיקו
- d ד' פ: if someone bows to an animal, what is the status of its wool for תכלת?
- i *Question*: which תכלת?
 - 1 *If*: for בגדי כהונה, this is the same as רב"ח's question (לגבוה)
 - 2 *If*: for ציצית – this is the same as ר"ל's question (למצווה)
 - ii *Answer*: that's correct – but he asked due to his subsequent questions – about using the animal parts for musical instruments – and
 - iii *His essential question*: (if the significant component of שירה is instruments → אסור)
 - 1 *but*: if the significant component is singing,
 - (a) *do we consider*: the instruments to be simply accompaniment → אסור
 - (b) *or do we consider them*: non essential and מותר – תיקו
- e דבא: if someone bows to a spring – may the waters be used for נסוך המים?
- i *If*: he is asking if we understand the person to be bowing to the water or to his reflection-
 - 1 *Then*: let him ask about using a cup of water even for non-גבוה purposes
 - ii *Rather*: we assume him to be bowing to the water
 - 1 *And*: his question is if he is bowing to the water before him (which is quickly gone)
 - (a) *Or*: is he bowing to the source?
 - 2 *Challenge*: how could these waters become אסור – we assume them to be in the public domain
 - (a) *Answer*: could be a spring in his own property, which he has the purview to affect