

26.4.1

49b (משנה א) → 50b (לית נגר ולא בר נגר דיפרקינה)

1. ויצמדו לבעל פֶּעוֹר וַיֹּאכְלוּ זִבְחֵי מִתִּים: תהלים קו:כח

- I 'א משנה: identifying the location of a Mercury-stele
- a מרקוליס: three rocks placed next to Mercury are themselves מרקוליס; if there are only 2 – not מרקוליס
- b מותרות: if the rocks appear to be associated with the central statue – אסורות; if not – מותרות
- i Analysis: רבנן's position is clear – עכו"ם do not worship shards (→ separate piles of rocks, assumed to have broken off of מרקוליס, are ignored); but ר"י's position is unclear –
- 1 If: he holds that they worship shards – why not identify 2 (or 1?) as מרקוליס?
 - 2 And if: he holds that they don't, even three shouldn't be reckoned
- ii Proposal (ר' יוחנן): all agree that if we know that the rocks fell from the idol, they are אסור
- 1 Even: the מ"ד that עכו"ם don't worship shards will agree that in the case of Mercury, they do (אורחיה)
 - 2 Dispute: plain rocks (that didn't fall from idol)
 - (a) Even then: if they are close to the idol, they agree that they are אסורות – (offered to idol)
 - (b) Dispute: if they are far away (in spite of wording "בצד מרקוליס" – means within ד"א)
 - (i) ר"י: their custom is to make a small מרקוליס next to the big one; it is made of 3 rocks → אסור
 - (ii) חכמים: they don't make a small מרקוליס there → if they're not obviously attached to idol – מותר
- iii Revisiting ר' יוחנן: rocks that fell from מרקוליס are אסור
- 1 Challenge: ברייתא – rocks that fell from מרקוליס are only אסור if they appear to be connected to it
 - (a) Dissent: ישמעאל – only if there are three; two are not אסורות
 - (b) Defense (רבא): don't read "that fell (שנשרו)", rather "that were found (שנמצאו)"
 - (i) Challenge: ישמעאל doesn't permit 2; he rules that 2 which are בתפיסה are אסור; 3, even if distant
 - (ii) Answer: if they abut the idol, even 2 are אסור; if a bit away – only 3 אסור
 1. Meaning; if there is some barrier between them
 2. Question: is this how they make מרקוליס? ברייתא rules that בית קוליס is 2 rocks and one on top
 3. Answer: that is in re: base idol
- iv Realted story: בי ינאי was destroyed, מרקוליס was set up there; non-מרקוליס worshippers took stones to pave road
- 1 Ruling: some חכמים walked there; others didn't
 - (a) ר' יוחנן: even קדושים בנן של קדושים (ר' מנחם בר סימאי) who wouldn't look at images on coins) would walk there
 - 2 Rationale: for prohibiting – per v.1; just as מת is never בטל, so תקרובת ע"ז (the rock) is never בטל
 - 3 Rationale: for permitting (ר' גידל בשם רב) – תקרובת must be similar to עבודת פנים (e.g. שחיטה)
- II Two indecipherable ברייתות, each brought by בר ירמיה and reported by יוסף ר'
- a If: a non-Jew brings מרקוליס-rocks and paves a road – מותר if א ישראל does so – אסורות
- i Solution (ר' ששת): as per ר' גידל above – תקרובת is only אסור if done פנים
- b Care for trees: we may deworm and "heal" trees (by putting fertilizer on "wound") during שמיטה, but not on חוה"מ;
- i But: in neither case may we prune
- ii However: in both cases we may apply a balm to the pruned section
- 1 Question (רבינא): what was indecipherable?
 - 2 If: the distinction between חוה"מ and שמיטה –
 - (a) Resolution: שמיטה is an מלאכה – no איסור מלאכה involved; חוה"מ is a problem of טירחא
 - 3 If: the distinction between healing and pruning (on שמיטה)
 - (a) No question: healing maintains the tree; pruning helps the tree grow further
 - 4 If: "healing" vs. ברייתא which only permits it during תוספת שביעית (until ר"ה)
 - (a) Answer: follows distinction between two kinds of healing; one which promotes growth is אסור
 - 5 If: applying balm vs. ברייתא which only allows applying oil to small fruit during תוספת שביעית
 - (a) Answer: in that case, it's fattening the fruit; in our case, it's maintaining it
 - 6 Answer (ר' סמא בריה דר' אשי לרבינא): he was bothered by the contradiction between "healing" and "applying the balm" on חוה"מ – since both are there just to maintain tree, why is one (applying balm) מותר and the other אסור?
 - (a) No answer: that's why it was considered indecipherable