

26.4.4; 52b → 53b (מסנה 27)

1. ארור האיש אשר יעשה פסל ומסכה תועבת ה' מעשה ידי חרש ונשם בפתר ויגנו כל העם ואמרו אמן: דברים כז:טו
2. ועבר בה נקשה ורעב והיה כי ירעב והתקצף וקלל במלכו ובאלהיו ופנה למעלה: ואל ארץ גיט והנה צרה וחשכה מעוף צוקה ואפלה מנדח: ישעיהו ח:כא-כב
3. ונתצתם את מזבחתם ושיברתם את מצבתם ואשריהם תשרפון באש ופסילי אלהיהם תגדעון ואבדתם את שמם מן המקום ההוא: דברים יג:ג
4. ויקח מינדם ויצר אתו בחרט ויעשו עגל מסכה ויאמרו אלה אלהינו וישרא אלהינו אשר העלינו מארץ מצרים: שמות לב:ד

I ביטול ע"ז and purview of משנה 27

- a עכו"ם: a non-Jew has the purview to negate his own – or another עכו"ם's ע"ז; a ישראל cannot be מבטל an ע"ז of an עכו"ם
- b משמרים: if he is מבטל the ע"ז, its משמים are cancelled *ipso facto*; if he is מבטל the משמים – only they are cancelled (not ע"ז)
- i ר"ש (son to his father): challenged father teaching as per 1st clause;
 - 1 He had taught: עכו"ם may also cancel של ישראל
 - 2 block: v. 1 blocks possibility of ביטול
 - 3 rather (מנחם ב"ר וולס): case is where ע"ז is coowned by ישראל and עכו"ם
 - (a) Originally: thought that ישראל worships per interest of עכו"ם → if עכו"ם is מבטל, so goes ישראל
 - (b) Later: realized that ישראל's worship is of his own interest
 - (i) Note: some read וולס ב"ר וולס's comment n 2nd clause (ישראל cannot negate), to challenge of פשיטא, he posited case as one of coownership
 - (ii) And: others read it as comment on ברייתא ר"ש – a ישראל has no "עולמית" ביטול
 1. Extra word: even if he is a partner with עכו"ם

II method of ביטול of an idol משנה ה'

- a If he: cut off the tip of its ear, nose or finger; if he mashed it, even without diminishing mass – בטל (if he mashed its face)
- b But if: he spat at it, urinated at it, dragged it or threw feces at it – no ביטול – per v. 2
- c If he: sold it or used it as a pledge
 - i בטל דבי
 - ii ביטול חכמים
 - 1 Analysis of dispute: dispute ר' יוחנן/רב about parameters of dispute
 - (a) One: dispute if buyer (smith) is a non-Jew; all agree if he is ישראל
 - (b) Other: dispute if buyer is ישראל
 - (i) Unclear: if he understands that dispute also includes a non-Jewish smith or all agree no ביטול
 - (c) Attempted resolution: רבי suggested that his opinion should be accepted when it is sold for destruction; and accept חכמים' position if sold for worship
 - (i) Cannot mean: literal destruction and worship – those are obvious
 - (ii) Must mean: destruction – sold to ישראל (smith); worship – sold to עכו"ם (smith)
 - (iii) Implying: dispute is in both cases (and רבי concedes one point, suggests they concede the other)
 - (d) Rejection: meaning of רבי's statement – חכמים concede to him in case of sale to ישראל
 - 2 Challenge: if he buys coins and finds ע"ז among them, not בטל (must return or destroy)
 - (a) If: dispute is צורף ישראל – this is חכמים' position
 - (b) But if: dispute is צורף עכו"ם and all agree that צורף ישראל, then who's opinion is this?
 - (i) Defense: disanalogous – עכו"ם sold coins w/o intending ביטול (didn't know ע"ז was there)
- d ברייתא: if he used it as a pledge, it was buried under a cave-in (and he didn't dig it up); armed thugs stole it or owners abandoned it and went abroad – if they plan to return (as in מלחמת יהושע) – not בטל; else – בטל
 - i Justification: if only taught עליה סד"א – ליה עליה since he didn't sell it – no ביטול;
 - 1 But: buried – since he didn't dig after it → ביטול
 - 2 And if: only taught מפולת סד"א – מופולת he can retrieve it at any time, unlike ליסטים
 - (a) And if: only taught ליסטים, it'll eventually end up with pagan who will worship, unlike מדה"י צריכה
 - ii Revisiting מלחמת יהושע means – if they plan to return, it is considered like מלחמת יהושע
 - 1 Reason for invoking יהושע: per ruling of רב – if a ישראל sets up a brick and עכו"ם comes along and worships – אסור
 - (a) Reason: per v. 3; since א"י already belongs to ישראל (via אבות); how can they prohibit it?
 - (i) Answer: since we worshipped עגל → ישראל approve of ע"ז and their worship is שליחות for ישראל
 - (ii) Therefore: when ישראל sets up brick, they are performing שליחות for ישראל by worshipping
 1. Challenge: perhaps ישראל only desired עגל, not others
 2. Answer: v. 4 implies that ישראל desired many gods
 - a. Challenge: perhaps ישראל only desired things that were with עגל?
 - b. Answer: that cannot be proven → all אסור