



A publication of the Rabbinical College of Australia & New Zealand
www.rabbinicalcollege.edu.au/Shiurim shiurim@rabbinicalcollege.edu.au

פסחים דף נ"ג עמוד ב' מה ראו חמ"ו שמסרו עצמן

גמרא Our

The ספר of דניאל tells of נבוכדנצר's construction of a gigantic golden statue, and his command that all nations bow to it. When חנניה מישאל ועזריה (henceforth referred to as: חמ"ו) refused to prostrate themselves before it, נבוכדנצר commanded that they be cast into a fiery furnace. Miraculously, they were seen walking amid the raging flames, and they eventually emerged completely unharmed.

תודוס expounded: Why did חמ"ו deliver themselves into the fiery furnace and sanctify the Name of ה'? They determined that if the frogs jumped into the burning ovens – despite not being commanded with the מצוה of קידוש השם, how much more so that they should do so – being that they were obligated with the מצוה of קידוש השם!

This raises the obvious question: How could תודוס suggest that חמ"ו would not have sacrificed their lives were it not for the precedent set by the frogs? After all, חמ"ו were צדיקים of the highest caliber, and they certainly would have sacrificed their lives in order to fulfil the מצוה of קידוש השם!

רש"י The opinion of

רש"י writes that איד is allowed to transgress an איסור to save his life, as derived from the פסוק of "וּשְׁמַרְתֶּם אֶת חֻקֵי וְאֶת מִשְׁפָּטַי ... וְחַי בָּהֶם" – "You shall guard My decrees and My laws ... and live by them". Being that the מצות are "to live by", they may be transgressed in order to save one's life, and חמ"ו would have done so were it not for the precedent set by the frogs.

ראשונים and many other ראשונים vigorously object to רש"י's explanation, on two counts:

1. The סנהדרין in גמ' states that the היתר of "וְחַי בָּהֶם" does not apply if the transgression will occur in the presence of ten אידן! In fact, the גמרא in סנהדרין states that in the presence of ten אידן, one must sacrifice his life even for something as "trivial" as shoelaces. [The ראשונים explain that in the times of the גמרא, the אידן were particular about tying their shoelaces in a manner different to that of the נכרים. Alternatively, the אידן were particular about using shoelaces which were coloured differently than those of the נכרים.]
2. According to הלכה, the היתר of "וְחַי בָּהֶם" does not apply to the severe transgression of ע"ז! [This question is asked by only some ראשונים; see below for a possible reason as to why many ראשונים – including תוספות – do not ask this question.]

The מהרש"א addresses these challenges as follows:

1. נבוכדנצר's golden image was erected in a remote valley, and ten אידן were not present when חמ"ו were instructed to bow to it. Therefore, the היתר of "וְחַי בָּהֶם" was indeed applicable.

It should be noted that the מהרש"א's explanation is the subject of a debate in מדרש שירי, השירים רבה, which states:

According to רבנן, the Jewish nation served idols. How is this? When נבוכדנצר erected the image, he selected twenty-three men from each nation, and twenty-three Jewish men (who all bowed down, with the exception of חמ"ו). According to רשב"י, the Jewish nation did not serve idols. How is this? When נבוכדנצר erected the image, he selected three men from each nation, and three Jewish men; namely חמ"ו. They stood firm, objected, and did not serve the idol¹.

The רשב"י's explanation is compatible with the opinion of רבנן, but not with the opinion of רשב"י. The רבנן's explanation is also incompatible with the גמרא in סנהדרין (on דף צ"ג) which indicates that many other אידן were present, as in the following example:

"When חמ"ו emerged unscathed from the fiery furnace, all the nations of the world came and struck the other אידן [who had bowed to the image] across their faces, and said to them, 'You have such a great G-d, yet you worshipped an image!' Immediately they [the אידן] opened their mouths and confessed..."

Another example from the גמרא in סנהדרין:

"Where did חמ"ו go? [I.e. what occurred to them after they were saved from the fiery furnace?] ... שמואל said: They drowned in the spittle." I.e. the nations spat at the אידן who had bowed to the image, until enough spittle collected that it drowned חמ"ו.

The רשב"י's explanation is also incompatible with the following גמ' in מגילה (on דף י"ב ע"א):

The students of רבי שמעון בר יוחאי asked him: "Why were the אידן (in the generation of פורים) deserving of extermination?" ... He said to them, "Because they bowed to the image of נבוכדנצר"².

2. רבי יהושע and רבי אליעזר argue about the parameters of the היתר of "נְחִי בָהֶם". The הלכה accords with רבי אליעזר who holds that the היתר of "נְחִי בָהֶם" does not apply to עבודה-זרה. However, it is quite possible that רבי יהושע agrees with רומי, who holds that the היתר of "נְחִי בָהֶם" applies even to עבודה-זרה. This is the opinion of רש"י, and this is also why many ראשונים do not question רש"י on this count, as noted above.

⌘ The opinion of רבינו תם (cited in הוספות)

According to רבינו תם, the golden statue was not an idol, but rather, a monument erected for the king's glory. Bowing to it did not constitute עבודה זרה, and therefore, the מצוה of קידוש השם did not require one to sacrifice his life – even in public. [To put this into proper perspective, ר"ת holds that bowing down to the golden image was less of a problem than transgressing the above-mentioned shoelaces custom.] Nevertheless, חמ"ו were concerned that bowing down to the image would create the appearance of serving יע"ז. Alternatively, חמ"ו were concerned that bowing down to the image of

¹ According to this quote, רשב"י maintains that the other אידן did not bow to the image. This is at odds with the רשב"י opinion as cited in מסכת מגילה, as noted in footnote 2.

² According to this quote, רשב"י maintains that the other אידן bowed to the golden statue. This is at odds with the opinion of רשב"י as cited in מדרש שיר השירים רבה, as noted in footnote 1.

³ This is the opinion of the רמב"ן ורשב"א ורא"ה. Conversely, רש"י (ב"ה עמוד ב') holds that one must sacrifice his life even in order to prevent creating the appearance of idol-worship.

an earthly king would diminish the glory of the Heavenly King⁴. Therefore, חמ"ו deliberated whether it was worthwhile to sacrifice their lives, and they ultimately did so, purely on account of the precedent set by the frogs.

How does חמ"ו explain the קל והומר? After all, the frogs displayed self-sacrifice **in order to fulfill ה' instructions**, whereas חמ"ו had **not** been instructed to sacrifice their lives! The ר"ן and רבינו דוד explain the ק"ו as follows: If the frogs were willing to jump into the burning ovens – despite not being commanded with the מצוה of קידוש השם – **in order to increase the glory of ה'**, then חמ"ו – who were commanded with the מצוה of קידוש השם – should certainly be willing to do so **in order to increase the glory of ה'!**

תוס' (both here and in עמוד א' ג' עמוד זרה דף ג' עמוד א') cites several sources which indicate that the golden image was not an actual idol:

1. The פסוק quotes חמ"ו as saying: "לא אלהך לא איתנא פלחין ולצלם דהבא די הקימת לא נסגיד" – "To your god we will not worship, and to the golden image that you erected we will not bow." The switch from "god" to "image" implies that the statue itself was not worshipped as a "god", and it was nothing more than an "image" erected for the king's glory.
[Interestingly, the רשב"א and רמב"ן draw the opposite conclusion; the fact that the פסוק mentions both "god" and "image" implies that the image itself was worshipped as a god. In explanation of חמ"ו's opinion, these ראשונים maintain that חמ"ו referred to the "image" as a "god" because נבוכדנצר considered the image as important as a god.]
2. The רשב"א (דף ג' עמוד א' on עבודה זרה in גמ') states:
"יבא נמרוד ויעיד באברהם שלא עבד עבודת כוכבים ... יבא נבוכדנצר ויעיד בחמ"ו שלא השתחוו לצלם"
"Let נמרוד come and testify that אברהם did not serve idols ... let נבוכדנצר come and testify that חמ"ו did not bow to the image."
Here too, the switch from "god" to "image" implies that נבוכדנצר's statue was not actually worshipped as a "god", and it was nothing more than an "image" erected for the king's glory.
3. The רשב"א (דף י"ב עמוד א' on מגילה in גמרא) recounts the following discussion between רשב"א and his students:

The students of רבי שמעון בר יוחאי asked him: "Why were the אידן (in the generation of פורים) deserving of extermination?" ... He said to them, "Because they bowed to the image of נבוכדנצר"¹. His students replied, "If so, why was favoritism shown"; i.e. why were they forgiven? He answered, "They acted only outwardly, and ה' also dealt with them outwardly," i.e. since they acted out of duress and not out of conviction, therefore, ה' also frightened them – but only outwardly.

This גמרא indicates that serving נבוכדנצר's image "outwardly" was "excusable", which could only be because the golden image was not really ע"ז. [This requires explanation: If the golden image was not really עבודה זרה, in which case the אידן were not required to sacrifice their lives, then why did ה' even frighten them outwardly?]

4. The רשב"א (דף ל"ג עמוד ב' on כתובות in גמרא) cites רב, who states that חמ"ו would have yielded and bowed to the golden statue had they been threatened with torture, as opposed to death. This raises the obvious question: How could רב suggest that חמ"ו would yield to torture? After all, חמ"ו were צדיקים of the highest order, and they certainly would have endured any form of torture in order to fulfil the מצוה of קידוש השם!

⁴ This is the opinion of the תוספות הרשב"א, the ר"ן and רבינו דוד.

ה"ר אליעזר (cited in שיטה מקובצת כתובות) answers that the פסוק of "בכל מאדך" requires one to sacrifice his **life** for the sake of קידוש השם, but not to endure **torture** which is worse than death. Thus, חמ"ו would have bowed to the statue had they been threatened with torture. However, תוס' maintain that one must even endure torture for the sake of קידוש השם, and they cite two cases in point: רבי עקיבא suffered excruciating agony when he was combed to death with iron combs, and רבי חנניא בן תרדיון's suffering was prolonged when moist sponges were placed over his heart whilst he was burning at the stake. ה"ר אליעזר deflects these proofs of תוספות by distinguishing between torturous death and indefinite torture. In other words, ה"ר אליעזר holds that one must submit to a **torturous death** for the sake of קידוש השם, but one is not obligated to endure **indefinite torture**.

It thus emerges that תוספות and ה"ר אליעזר debate whether one must endure indefinite torture in order to create a קידוש השם. According to תוספות, the original question remains: Since the מצוה of קידוש השם requires one to endure even indefinite torture, how could רב suggest that חמ"ו would have yielded to prolonged torture? After all, חמ"ו were צדיקים of the highest order, and they certainly would have suffered any form of torture had it been necessary! It could only be because the golden image was not really עבודה זרה, and the מצוה of קידוש השם did not require them to sacrifice their lives.

Ultimately, תוס' notes that the wording of רב's statement "אלמלא נגדוה לחמ"ו פלחו לצלמא" ("had they whipped חמ"ו they would have **worshipped** the statue") indicates that bowing to the statue did constitute עבודה זרה, unlike the opinion of רבינו תם.

⌘ The opinion of the ר"י (cited in תוספות)

The ר"י maintains that the golden image was in fact ע"ז, and bowing to it was forbidden even in the face of death. However, תודוס איש רומי had a different question entirely: The גמרא in סנהדרין (on דף ר"א) describes דניאל's escape. Why didn't חמ"ו flee beforehand as well? תודוס answered that חמ"ו would have indeed fled were it not for the precedent set by the frogs.

The מהרש"א is puzzled, because the גמרא that the ר"י cites in his support actually seems to contradict him, for it implies that only דניאל was able to flee, and not חמ"ו:

Three were involved in that scheme [allowing דניאל to be absent]:
הקב"ה said: "Let דניאל depart, lest it be said that חמ"ו were saved in his merit".
דניאל said, "Let me go from here, in order that I not be a fulfillment of the פסוק which states 'the engraved images of their gods shall be burned with fire.'" [דניאל worshipped נבוכדנצר]
דניאל was worried that he would be completely burned if he was cast into the flames, and that people would say that he was punished because he was worshipped.]
נבוכדנצר said: "Let דניאל depart, lest people say that he (i.e. נבוכדנצר) burnt his god in fire."

⁵ Aside from the various answers presented further on, the ראשונים present two arguably "strained" solutions to this difficulty:

1. The רשב"א writes that רש"י (absent from our editions of רש"י) interprets רב's statement as a **rhetorical question**: "Would חמ"ו have bowed to the statue had they been tortured?" Accordingly, רב accepts that חמ"ו would **not** have bowed even had they been tortured. Nonetheless, the גמרא proves from the wording of this rhetorical question that torture is indeed worse than death.
2. The רמב"ן explains (in one approach) that רב did not really mean that חמ"ו would have yielded to torture and worshipped ע"ז. Rather, רב **exaggerated**, in order to emphasize that torture can be worse than death. [The ר"א rejects this approach, for why would רב needlessly exaggerate; he could have easily pointed out that torture can be worse than death, without hyperbole.]

This **סוגיא** clearly indicates that **דניאל** was unable to **leave the king's court** without his consent. The same would presumably be true of **חמ"ו**. If so, why does the **ר"י** cite this **גמ'** to prove that **חמ"ו** could have escaped? [A suggested answer: It is clear from the **פסוקים** that **דניאל** was much more prominent in the king's court than **חמ"ו**. As such, **דניאל's** absence would be immediately noticed, whereas **חמ"ו's** absence might have gone unnoticed. Thus, the **ר"י's** point is that if **דניאל** was able to escape – with the king's consent, then **חמ"ו** should have been able to escape – even without the king's consent.]

In any case, the **מדרש שיר השירים רבה** cited by many **ראשונים** supports the approach of the **ר"י**:

חמ"ו came before **יחזקאל** and asked ... "Shall we prostrate ourselves, or not." **יחזקאל** responded, "I have received a teaching regarding this from my teacher **ישעיה**, who said 'Hide but for a moment, until the anger passes,'" i.e. absent yourselves from the ceremony.

They responded, "Do you desire that it be said that every nation – even the **אידן** – bowed to the statue?" **יחזקאל** responded, "And what do you suggest?" They responded, "We desire to tarnish the image; we wish to be present and not bow, in order that it be said that every nation bowed to the statue – besides for the **אידן**!" **יחזקאל** responded, "If this is your intention, wait and I will consult with the Almighty".

יחזקאל said before **הקב"ה**, "Creator of the world, **חמ"ו** seek to give up their lives to sanctify your Name! Will you stand by them, or not?" He responded, "I will not stand by them..."

At that moment, **יחזקאל** began crying and lamenting. He said, "Woe to the **אידן**, the remnant of **יהודה** is lost! **חמ"ו** are all that remain of **יהודה**, and this is the response they are given?" ... When **חמ"ו** heard the response they said, "Whether He stands by us or not, we will give up our lives in sanctification of His Name."

After **חמ"ו** left **יחזקאל's** presence, **ה'** revealed Himself to **יחזקאל** and said, "What did you think? That I will not save **חמ"ו**? I will most certainly stand by them... However, leave them be, and do not tell them anything. I wish them to act innocently (i.e. sincerely)."

⌘ An opinion cited by the מהר"ם חלאווה and רבינו דוד

There is an opinion that allows one to take his own life in order to avoid a situation of **מסירת נפש**. Thus, **חמ"ו** considered taking their own lives in order to avoid the test of **מסירת נפש**, but the precedent set by the frogs ultimately convinced them to face the test of **מסירת נפש**. However, had **חמ"ו** been threatened with prolonged torture, they would have taken their own lives beforehand.

This opinion recalls the tragic words of the **אורחות חיים** (cited by **סי' קנ"ז**):

The **בראשית רבה** expounds that ... at a time of persecution, one may take his life if he fears himself unable to withstand the test. In fact, one may even take his life if he fears torture, as **שאל המלך** did ... It is from here that those who slaughter the young during a time of persecution bring proof. However, there are those who forbid it.

... There is a story regarding a certain **רב** who slaughtered many youngsters during a time of persecution, for he was worried that they would otherwise transgress their religion. Another **רב** was furious and labelled him a murderer, but the first **רב** ignored him. The objecting **רב** cursed him, "If it is as my words, you should be punished with an unusual death." And so it was. The **נכרים** seized the **רב** who had killed the youngsters and skinned him alive, stuffing the space between his skin and his flesh with sand. Afterwards, the decree of persecution was revoked, and it emerged that had the youngsters not been slaughtered, they could have been saved.

מהר"ם שי"ף The opinion of the

The פסוק (in דניאל ג:יט) relates that נבוכדנצר was so furious with חמ"ו that he instructed his executioners to heat the furnace sevenfold. The furnace was so hot that it killed the officers as they attempted to cast חמ"ו inside. The מהר"ם שי"ף asks: If the officers died before they could fulfil their mission, how did חמ"ו end up in the furnace? The מהר"ם שי"ף answers that חמ"ו willingly cast themselves into the furnace, in order to sanctify the Name of ה'!

In light of this, it is easy to understand the question of תודוס איש רומי: Why did חמ"ו cast themselves to the flames, instead of simply walking away? תודוס איש רומי answers that חמ"ו would indeed have walked away were it not for the precedent set by the frogs. [This might also be the intent of the above-mentioned גמרא in כתובות: Although חמ"ו willingly risked death by hurling themselves into the flames, they would not necessarily have willingly inflicted themselves with torture.]

The explanation of the מהר"ם שי"ף might also explain another point: The פסוק (in דניאל ג:כו) relates that חמ"ו walked around the fiery furnace unharmed, but did not exit it until נבוכדנצר instructed them to. The מפרשים wonder why חמ"ו waited for נבוכדנצר to give them instructions to leave, and they provide various answers. According to the מהר"ם שי"ף, we might answer that חמ"ו simply desired to stay in the fire as long as possible, in order to glorify the Name of ה' for as long as possible.

שיטה מקובצת in שיטה ישנה The opinion of the

The פסוק relates that when חמ"ו were initially brought before the king, they spoke to him forcefully and brazenly, which only served to increase נבוכדנצר's fury.

נבוכדנצר, in wrath and anger, ordered חמ"ו before him. נבוכדנצר said to them, "Is my decree meaningless, חמ"ו, that you do not worship my god and that you do not prostrate yourselves to the golden image that I have set up? Now behold ... fall and prostrate yourselves to the image that I made, and if you do not prostrate yourselves, you shall be cast into a burning, fiery furnace, and which god who will save you from my hand?" חמ"ו answered and said to the king, "נבוכדנצר, we do not care to answer you about this matter.

Behold there is our God whom we worship; He can save us from the fiery furnace, and from your hands He will save us.

And even if He does not save us, let it be known to you that we will not worship your god, nor shall we prostrate ourselves to the golden image that you have set up."

Then, נבוכדנצר was filled with wrath, and the features of his face changed against חמ"ו ...

In light of this, the question of תודוס איש רומי can be explained as follows: Why did חמ"ו answer the king so insolently, knowing full well that this would increase the risk of being thrown into the furnace? Why did they not respond meekly and submissively, in an effort to try and placate the king's anger? תודוס איש רומי answers that חמ"ו would indeed have done so were it not for the precedent set by the frogs.

הלכה when not required by מסירת נפש

☞ Were חמ"ו required to have מסירת נפש?

There is a famous מחלוקת regarding whether one may sacrifice his life when הלכה does not require it. The רמב"ם (in הלכות יסודי התורה פ"ה ה"ד) rules that this is forbidden, and that one who does so is guilty of taking his own life. Conversely, תוס' (in ע"ז כ"ז ע"ב ד"ה יכול) rules that it is permissible – and righteous – to do so, if one thereby avoids transgressing a מצוה⁶. The כסף משנה notes that this is also the overwhelming consensus of the ראשונים.

Now, our גמרא indicates that חמ"ו were not **required** to sacrifice their lives to the extent which they did. How is this compatible with the opinion of the רמב"ם?

Furthermore, our גמרא seems difficult even according to תוס' (in ע"ז), for their words indicate that one may voluntarily sacrifice his life **only** if the transgression is otherwise unavoidable. Many of the above-mentioned opinions hold that this was not the case with חמ"ו, for –

According to רבינו תם: Bowing down to the golden image did not constitute a transgression.

According to ר"י: חמ"ו could have escaped beforehand!

According to מהרמ"ש: חמ"ו did not have to cast themselves into the fiery furnace!

According to שיטה ישנה: חמ"ו did not have to speak so insolently to נבוכדנצר!

According to all of these opinions, why did חמ"ו sacrifice their lives in the manner that they did?

☞ The יוסף הצדיק of מסירת נפש

The תורה relates (in פרשת וישב) that the sons of יעקב were tending to the flocks in שכם, and their father commanded יוסף to seek out their welfare and relay it back to him. According to the מדרש, the מלאך גבריאל informed יוסף that his brothers were plotting to kill him, and that he should stay away. However, יוסף disregarded his advice, which culminated in יוסף almost losing his life.

The רמב"ן holds that מלאך גבריאל delivered his message obscurely, and יוסף did not properly comprehend his words. Otherwise, contends the רמב"ן, why would יוסף have sought out his brothers if he knew that they were plotting to kill him?

In לקוטי שיחות (in חלק ל"ה וישב-חנוכה), the Rebbe proves that רש"י argues and holds that מלאך גבריאל presented his message clearly and explicitly. As for the רמב"ן's question, רש"י would simply answer that this highlights the greatness of יוסף; he strived to fulfill his father's instructions despite his knowledge of the great danger that he faced. In fact, upon failing to find his brothers in שכם (who had already moved on to a place known as דותן), יוסף would have had the perfect excuse to return home, since his father had instructed him to seek out his brothers in שכם. Nevertheless, יוסף remained loyal to his mission even though his life was at risk.

The Rebbe goes on to analyze the basis in הלכה for יוסף's actions. **First, the Rebbe links this with the** above-mentioned debate regarding whether one may voluntarily sacrifice his life for the sake of a מצוה, when הלכה does not require him to do so. However, the Rebbe rejects this approach, on account of a profoundly simple question: It is all very well that יוסף was willing to risk his life in

⁶ Even amongst those who permit this "optional" form of מסירת נפש, there is much debate regarding the extent to which this is permitted:

- a) Some hold that "optional" מסירת נפש is permitted only when the נכרי's agenda is על דת – to cause the איד to transgress his religion.
- b) Some hold that "optional" מסירת נפש is permitted even when the נכרי's agenda is merely להנאת עצמו – to derive personal gratification, but only if the act will occur in public.
- c) Some hold that "optional" מסירת נפש is permitted when the נכרי's agenda is merely להנאת עצמו, even if the act will occur in private.

See שו"ע יר"ד סי' קנ"ז for further details.

order to fulfill the מצוה of **כיבוד אב ואם**, but **יעקב** clearly requested that **יוסף** **return** with news of his brothers' welfare. In other words, the core of **יעקב's** request was **not that יוסף** should visit his brothers, but rather, that he should return. Thus, in risking his own life, **יוסף** was also jeopardizing the entire mission! If so, why did he risk his life, when he was thereby not even fulfilling a מצוה?

The Rebbe explains that **יוסף's** actions are to be understood in light of the **יוסף**'s words (in **סנהדרין**): **"When a** great man who is pious and God-fearing sees that his generation is corrupt in a certain aspect, he may sanctify the Name of **ה'** and give up his life even over a small מצוה, in order that the people see and learn from him".

In his brief analysis of the **יוסף's** remarks, the Rebbe implies that this type of **מסירת נפש** is of a totally different sort than the typical act of **מסירת נפש**. The typical act of **מסירת נפש** serves to highlight the tremendous importance of the particular מצוה that the **נפש** upheld. Conversely, the act of **מסירת נפש** described by the **יוסף** accomplishes a lot more; it serves to sanctify the Name of **ה'** by making (or attempting to make) an impact powerful enough to reverse the corrupt trend of the generation.

[This might explain why this form of **מסירת נפש** is sanctioned only when two factors are present; that the **נפש** is "a great man who is pious and God-fearing", and that "his generation is corrupt in a certain aspect". Since the point of such **מסירת נפש** is to powerfully impact the generation, it is permitted only when the **נפש** is great enough to achieve the desired impact, and only when the corruption of the generation calls for it.]

In the case of **יוסף**, the Rebbe explains that **יוסף** thought his brothers were "corrupt" with regards to the מצוה of **כיבוד אב ואם**. In his eyes, they had been constantly disrespectful to their father; **שמעון** and **לוי** massacred the people of **שכם** against **יעקב's** wishes; **ראובן** moved his father's bed in an act of rebellion; and their hatred of **יוסף** was itself an act of disrespect to **יעקב**, whose choice it was to favour **יוסף**. Therefore, **יוסף** deemed it appropriate to risk his life for the sake of **כיבוד אב ואם**, "in order that the people see and learn from him".

☞ Applying this explanation to our סוגיא

Accordingly, we can understand why **חמ"ו** sacrificed their lives, even though the typical rules of **מסירת נפש** did not call for it, nor allow it. This was because the **מסירת נפש** of **חמ"ו** was not merely for the sake of upholding the **איסור** of **עבודה זרה**. Rather, their **מסירת נפש** was aimed at powerfully impacting their generation, in order to reverse the idolatrous trend amongst them. Therefore, the normal rules of **מסירת נפש** did not apply.