

26.3.6

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

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 הקרים הרמים ועל הגבעות ותחת כל עץ ורענן: דברים יב, ג

- I בני ר'חייא (חזקיהו/ר' יוחנן) dispute – מחובר לקרקע ע"ז which is dislodged – what is their status?
- a *Question*: rocks which got dislodged from the mountain (and then were worshipped) – what is their status?
- i *Argument for הייתר* 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 → מותר
 - (a) *Challenge*: the common denominator is also unchanged, unlike dislodged rock
 - (b) *Modification*: צד השווה is either מוס +בהמה בעלת מוס OR from תמה +בהמה+dried up tree
- ii *Argument for איסור*: that's the purpose of v. 1- to anticipate the argument and ban nonetheless
- b *Suggestion*: חזקיהו 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*: חזקיהו 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 גבוה)
- i *Even if*: we argue that במחובר לקרקע אצל גבוה יש נעבד – the מזבח is only a קרבן לקרבן, not a קרבן itself
- ii *Answer* (ר'בא): אתנן ק"ו (v. 2)
- 1 *If*: אתנן, which is permissible, even when תלוש, to הדייט, but is אסור לגבוה even if לקרקע even if מחובר
 - 2 *Then*: certainly ע"ז, which is prohibited when תלוש to a citizen, is אסור לגבוה even if מחובר
 - (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* (ר'בא): if we can argue equally forcefully with lenient or stringent results – פרכינן לחומרא
 - (i) (*challenge*: from ר"א/ר"ע in ו:ב; פסחים; 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"ג): ruling that offspring of מזבח פסולי are permitted
- 1 *And*: ר"א invalidates
 - 2 *And*: ר"ג 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 מצוה 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:רחולין הדם: 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) 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 ר"ב'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 ד'בה: 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