

26.4.4; 52b (משנה 27) → 53b (מאן מוכח)

1. ארור האיש אשר יעשה פסל ומסכה תועבת ה' מעשה ידי הרש ושם בַּסֵּתֶר וְעָנּוּ כָל הָעַם וְאָמְרוּ אָמֵן: דברים כז:טו  
 2. וְעָבַר בָּהּ נִקְשָׁה וְרָעַב וְהָיָה כִּי יִרְעַב וְהִתְקַצַּף וְקָלַל בְּמַלְכוֹ וּבְאֱלֹהָיו וּפְנָה לְמַעְלָה: וְאָל אֶרֶץ יִבְיִט וְהָיָה צָרָה וְחִשְׁבָה מְעוֹף צוּקָה וְאִפְלָה מִנְדָּח: ישעיהו ח:כא-כב  
 3. וְנִתְצַתֶּם אֶת מִזְבְּחֵיכֶם וְשִׁבְרֵתֶם אֶת מִצְבְּתֵיכֶם וְאֲשַׁרְיֵתֶם תְּשַׁדְּפוּן בָּאֵשׁ וּפְסִילֵי אֱלֹהֵיכֶם תִּגְדְּעוּן וְאִבְדַּתֶּם אֶת שְׁמֵיכֶם מִן הַמָּקוֹם הַזֶּה: דברים יב:ג  
 4. וַיִּקַּח מִקֶּדֶם וַיִּצַר אֶתוֹ בַּחֲרִט וַיַּעֲשֶׂהוּ עֵגֶל מִסֵּכָה וַיֹּאמְרוּ אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר הָעֵלּוּךְ מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם: שמות לב:ז

## I ביטול ע"ז and משנה 27

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

## II 'ה משנה: method of ביטול of an idol

- 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 דב"י**  
 ii **ביטול חכמים**  
 1 **Analysis of dispute**: dispute 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 עכ"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 צרוף ישראל – this is חכמים' position  
 (b) **But if**: dispute is צרוף עכ"ם and all agree that צרוף ישראל, then who's opinion is this?  
 (i) **Defense**: disanalogous – עכ"ם sold coins w/o intending ביטול (didn't know ע"ז was there)  
 d **בריתא**: 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 ליה 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 – מפולת 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 צריכא – מדה"י  
 ii **Revisiting יהושע מלחמת יהושע**: means – if they plan to return, it is considered like מלחמת יהושע and no ביטול  
 1 **Reason for invoking יהושע**: per ruling of רב – if a ישראל sets up a brick and עכ"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