

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Clarifying the Mishnah (cont.)

The Gemara completes its record of the exchange between R' Yosi bar Yehudah and Rabanan.

2) Worshipping objects attached to the ground

A Baraisa is cited that R' Sheishes explains follows the position of R' Yosi bar Yehudah.

The interpretation of R' Sheishes is unsuccessfully challenged.

3) Stones that become dislodged

The sons of R' Chiya and R' Yochanan debate whether stones that are dislodged from a mountain and then worshipped are prohibited.

The rationale behind the lenient position is explained.

This explanation is successfully challenged and subsequently modified.

The response of the stringent opinion is recorded.

The Gemara attempts to prove that it is the sons of R' Chiya who subscribe to the lenient position based on an inquiry of Chizkiya, one of R' Chiya's sons.

This suggestion is rejected in favor of an alternative understanding of Chizkiya's inquiry.

Rami bar Chama inquires whether one may use stones from a mountain that was worshipped to build an altar.

The Gemara explains the two parts of this inquiry.

Rava answers both parts of the inquiry.

R' Huna the son of R' Yehoshua challenges Rava's reasoning.

Rava defends his position.

R' Pappa unsuccessfully challenges Rava's approach.

(Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. What are examples of how we assign derogatory nicknames to an idol?

2. What is the point of dispute between R' Chiya and Chizkiya?

3. Explain מכשירי קרבן כקרבן.

4. Explain יש שינוי בנעבד.

Distinctive INSIGHT

Special sensitivity for items to be used for offerings

יש נעבד במחובר אצל גבוה או אין נעבד במחובר אצל גבוה

We learned earlier that if a mountain is worshiped as an idol, the mountain does not become prohibited from benefit. The idolaters do not have the ability to cause something connected to the ground to become prohibited. Rami bar Chamma asks, however, whether a mountain that is worshiped is permitted to be used in the construction of the Beis HaMikdash and its furnishings. He asks, "Are the stones of a mountain that is worshiped for idolatry allowed to be used for the construction of the altar?" Is the leniency of the Torah only applied to civilian use of the mountain and its materials, or is the rule that the idol worship does not affect the mountain a leniency that applies to holy purposes as well? Rami b. Chamma then proposes a second question, and that is whether these same objects which were worshipped may be used for an accessory for an offering, such as for construction material for the altar.

Rashi and Tosafos, as well as other Rishonim, understand that Rami b. Chamma is actually asking two questions. The first question is whether it is permitted to take something connected to the ground which was worshiped for idolatry, and use it for the service in the Beis HaMikdash. And, if this would be prohibited, the next question is whether these objects which were worshipped may be used for accessories for an offering (מכשירי קרבן), such as to be used to construct the altar. Does an accessory for an offering have the same halachah as the actual item used for the offering itself, or not?

Ramban learns that Rami bar Chamma had no doubt regarding the second issue, as he holds that accessories for an offering have the same law as the offering itself. Therefore, his only one question is if something was connected to the ground and worshipped, may it be used as an offering, and may it be used to fashion accessories for an offering (e.g. to build an altar)?

Ramban also brings other opinions that explain that Rami b. Chamma held as a certainty that an offering may not be brought from something that was worshiped, even while connected to the ground. This can be determined from the halachah of an animal, which is not subject to תפיסת יד of man, and which becomes prohibited for an offering when it is worshiped. So, too, anything connected to the ground and does not have תפיסת יד of man, also becomes disqualified for an offering. Accordingly, his question was whether this level of sensitivity applies to מכשירי קרבן as well. Ramban questions this approach, though, because the words of the Gemara throughout this inquiry are whether these items are permitted לגבוה, for service of the holy, which implies that the question was regarding using these items for an offering itself. ■

HALACHAH Highlight

Stones the become dislodged from a mountain

אבני הר שנדלדלו

Stones of a mountain that were dislodged

The Gemara does not arrive at a definitive conclusion regarding the status of stones that became dislodged from a mountain that were then worshipped. Rambam¹ adopts the lenient position and rules that the stones are permitted. Ran² disagrees and rules stringently since the question relates to a Biblical prohibition and when a Biblical prohibition is in doubt the stringent position should be followed (ספק (דאורייתא לחומרא). Ran also questions Rambam's position. Why did Rambam adopt a lenient position when the question relates to a possible Biblical prohibition?

Bach³ suggests that Rambam maintains that a stone that becomes dislodged from a mountain that was then worshipped is Biblically permitted and the dispute in the Gemara related to whether there is a Rabbinic prohibition against using dislodged stones. Since the debate revolved around a Rabbinic injunction, Rambam adopted a lenient approach. Shach⁴ suggests another explanation. Our Gemara is uncertain whether R' Yochanan is the author of the lenient position or whether it is the sons of R' Chiya who maintain the lenient position. In the Yerushalmi (3:5), however, there is a similar debate and in that debate it is clear that Chizkiyah, one of the sons of R' Chiya, maintains the lenient position whereas R'

(Overview...continued from page 1)

4) Wheat that was worshipped

Rami bar Chama inquires whether wheat that was worshipped may be used for a Korban Mincha.

Mar Zutra the son of R' Nachman cites a Mishnah and Baraisa that indicates that the matter is subject to a debate between Tannaim.

The Gemara begins to reject the proof. ■

Yochanan holds the stringent position. When we apply their respective positions to our Gemara it would emerge that Chizkiyah holds that rocks that become dislodged are permitted and it is R' Yochanan who maintains that they are prohibited. Accordingly, Rambam ruled in accordance with the lenient position since the halacha will follow Chizkiyah's position over R' Yochanan's since he was R' Yochanan's rebbi.

Pri Ha'aretz⁴ asserts that the debate in the Gemara relates to whether a stone that becomes completely dislodged is prohibited. Rambam's lenient ruling related to a stone that became loosened from the mountain but not dislodged completely. Being that the stone is not completely dislodged it is still considered a part of the mountain and therefore is permitted the same as a mountain that remains permitted even if it is worshiped. ■

1. רמב"ם פ"ח מה"ל עכו"ם ה"ב.

2. ר"ן ד"ה וגרסינן.

3. בי"ח יו"ד סי' קמ"ה ד"ה ומ"ש ואפילו.

4. פרי הארץ על הרמב"ם הני"ל. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

The Precedence of Shabbos

"אין הזאה דוחה שבת..."

The Shem MiShmuel, ז"ל, explains a very inspiring lesson based on a statement on today's daf. "Our sages teach that just as water flows from a high place to a low place, so too Torah only enters the understanding of one who is humble and lowly in his own eyes.

"It is possible to explain that this is the purification of the מי חטאת, which must be made with running water. Running water represents one's constant inner motion of yearning for Hashem. But this must also be mixed with the ashes of the red cow. We can understand this in terms

of the words of the Kotzker Rebbe, ז"ל, who once revealed that it is easier to fast and inflict upon himself the harshest self-mortification in the world than to truly accept upon oneself the yoke of heaven.

"This is the symbolism of the ash of the red cow: that one has completely nullified his ego by accepting the yoke of heaven, since the more one accepts this yoke like an ox who bears a burden, the more he pushes away all impurity.

"Through the above it is possible to explain why a parah adumah is disqualified if she bore a yoke or burden. On the surface this requirement appears difficult. Why should a parah admumah be different than sacrifices which are not disqualified if they have borne a yoke? But if we say that the parah's ashes represent accepting the yoke of heaven we

understand very well why any other yoke disqualifies it. As the Zohar writes, one cannot truly take on the yoke of heaven if he feels any other yoke.¹

"And this is also why we find in Avodah Zarah 46 that the sprinkling of the mei chatas does not override Shabbos. As we find in the Zohar, on Shabbos we are not obligated in tefillin since this represents accepting the yoke of the kingdom of heaven. My father explained that on Shabbos our avodah is from love and desire, which cannot be called a yoke. Therefore, the mei chatas which is the aspect of truly accepting the yoke of heaven does not override Shabbos, which is the arousal of a burning love for Hashem!"² ■

1. זוהר, ריש פרשת בהר

2. שם משמואל, צו תרע"ט, ע"י פ"ט ■