



Produced by Rabbi Avrohom Adler, Kollel Boker Beachwood

Daf Notes is currently being dedicated to the neshamot of

**Moshe Raphael ben Yehoshua (Morris Stadtmauer) o"h**

**Tzvi Gershon ben Yoel (Harvey Felsen) o"h**

May the studying of the Daf Notes be a zechus for their neshamot and may their souls find peace in Gan Eden and be bound up in the Bond of life

**L'chatchilah and b'Dieved**

Ravina says: This is not difficult. One (the Mishnah that says we do not give an animal to an idolater shepherd) is lechatchilah (initially), and one (the Baraisa) is b'dieved (after the fact).

The Gemara asks: How do we know that we indeed differentiate (regarding a valid suspicion) between lechatchilah and b'dieved?

The Gemara answers: There is a Mishnah that says that a woman should not be secluded with a gentile, as they are suspected of promiscuity. However, there is another Mishnah that states that if a woman is captured by gentiles in order to get a ransom, she remains permitted to her husband. If it was to kill her, she is forbidden. This teaches that although we say that she should not be secluded lechatchilah, we do not say that anything necessarily happened post facto.

The Gemara asks: How do we know this? Perhaps the only reason he does not defile her when he wants to get a ransom is because he thinks the husband will not pay if he does so! The Mishnah itself implies this, as it says that if she was kidnapped in order to kill her, she is forbidden to her husband.

Rabbi Pedas says: This is not difficult. The Mishnah and Baraisa are by two different authors. One is Rabbi Eliezer, and one is the Rabbis. The Mishnah states regarding a red heifer that Rabbi Eliezer held it could not be bought from a gentile, while the Chachamim hold it is permitted. It must be that Rabbi Eliezer holds we suspect gentiles of having relations with their animals, while the Chachamim say we do not have this suspicion.

The Gemara asks: How do we know this? Perhaps everybody holds that we do not actually suspect they have relations with their animals. Perhaps Rabbi Eliezer merely holds like Rav Yehudah's statement in the name of Rav. He says that if someone put a bunch of bags onto a red heifer, he has made it invalid for use as a red heifer. If it was a calf, it cannot be used as an eglah arufah if it walked with these bags (as opposed to the heifer which is made invalid by the placing alone). It may be that Rabbi Eliezer holds we suspect this happened to the red heifer in the gentile's possession, and the Rabbis say we do not suspect this happened. (However, they possibly both hold that this has nothing to do with suspecting them of having relations with the animal!)

The Gemara answers: It is not logical to assume that Rabbi Eliezer suspects that the gentile will lose so much money (paid for a rare red heifer) in order to



gain a small benefit (placing bags on his red heifer).

The Gemara asks: If this is so, why don't we say that the shepherd will also refrain from having relations with the animal in order to keep his job?

The Gemara answers: This is different, as his desires make him override his financial concerns.

The Gemara asks: How do we know this? Perhaps everybody holds that we do not actually suspect they have relations with their animals. Perhaps Rabbi Eliezer's reasoning is as stated by Shilo's study house. Shilo's study house taught: What is Rabbi Eliezer's reasoning? The verse states: Speak to Bnei Yisroel and they will take (a red heifer). This implies that Jews should take their own red heifer, and not buy one from a gentile.

The Gemara answers: Do not think this is correct, as the end of the Baraisa states that Rabbi Eliezer used to say that all korbanos cannot be brought from animals acquired from gentiles. If Shilo was right, this would only be correct regarding a red heifer due to the verse above. Why should Rabbi Eliezer hold this way regarding all korbanos?

The Gemara asks: Perhaps the Rabbis only argue on Rabbi Eliezer regarding a red heifer, as it is very expensive (and he will therefore not have relations with it or do work with it as the risk to lose a large amount of money is great). However, regarding other korbanos, perhaps they agree with Rabbi Eliezer!

Additionally, the Baraisa explicitly says: What did Rabbi Eliezer's friends ask him about this statement?

The verse says, All the sheep of Yishmael will be gathered in to you, they will go up on My altar. (This clearly implies that their animals can be used as korbanos.) (23a1 – 23b1)

#### Unfit for a Korban

[The Gemara starts a new discussion.] They only argue regarding a suspicion of bestiality. However, everyone agrees that if the animal was sodomized, it cannot be brought as a red heifer. This implies that a red heifer is considered a korban, akin to those that go on the altar. If it was just monetary hekdesch, does monetary hekdesch become invalid because of relations?

The Gemara answers: A red heifer is different, as the Torah calls it a chatas (the name of a korban).

The Gemara asks: If so, it should be invalid if born through a caesarian! If you will say that it is invalid, why does the Baraisa state that if someone dedicated his red heifer born through caesarian, that the Rabbis say it is invalid, but Rabbi Shimon says it is valid? If you will say that this is merely Rabbi Shimon's minority opinion, as he says in general that a caesarian is equivalent to a regular birth, didn't Rabbi Yochanan say that Rabbi Shimon admits it cannot be dedicated as a korban (other than a red heifer)?

Rather, the Gemara answers: A red heifer is different. Being that it is invalid if it has a blemish, if it is involved in relations or served as an idol it will also be invalid. This is as the verse says: For their destruction is within them, they have a blemish. Rabbi Yishmael's house taught: Whenever the verse says, "destruction" it refers to illicit relations and idolatry. It indicates illicit

relations, as the verse regarding the generation of the flood says: For all flesh has destroyed its way on the land. It refers to idolatry, as the verse says: Lest you destroy, and you will make an image for yourself etc. Therefore, we will say that just as a blemish makes a red heifer invalid, so too illicit relations and idolatry make it invalid (based on the verse: For their destruction is within them, they have a blemish, that puts these topics together). (23b1 – 23b3)

The Gemara discusses the statement of Shilo's study house: What is Rabbi Eliezer's reasoning? The verse states: Speak to Bnei Yisroel and they will take (a red heifer). This implies that Jews should take their own red heifer, and not buy one from a gentile.

The Gemara asks: If this teaching is correct, we should similarly say that the verse: Speak to Bnei Yisroel and they should take for me a donation also implies that only Bnei Yisroel may sell to the Temple officers, but the idolaters may not sell these items! And if you will say this is so, but Rav Yehudah said in the name of Shmuel: They asked Rabbi Eliezer how far one must go when honoring his parents. He answered: See what this idolater did in Ashkelon. His name was Dama ben Nesinah. Once, the *Chachamim* proposed to buy stones for the *eifod* (article of clothing worn by the *kohen gadol*), in a deal which would have given him a profit of six hundred thousand gold *dinars*. Rav Kahana taught it was eight hundred thousand. However, the key to the goods was under his father's pillow, and his father was sleeping, so he did not pain his father. (23b1 – 24a1)

## DAILY MASHAL

### The Radiant Point in Each Person

HaRav Chaim Shmulevitz *zt'l*, the Rosh Yeshiva of Mir in Yerushalayim, wondered how a Jew could carry out the mitzvah of honoring one's father properly. The Torah compares parents' honor to that of Hashem! How can a son honor his father in such a sublime way? Aren't there sons have find it difficult to properly honor fathers whose conduct is unbecoming? R. Chaim replied: Every Jew has a shining inner point in his *neshamah* that is unique to him. With a bit of reflection, a son will find his father's unique shining point, and then it will be easy for the son to accord him his due honor.