

## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) Stabbling animals (cont.)

Ravina offers another resolution to the earlier contradiction whether idolaters are suspected of bestiality.

The source for Ravina's distinction between an initial concern and a concern after the fact is cited.

This source is rejected.

R' Pedas resolves this contradiction by distinguishing between the positions of R' Eliezer and Rabanan concerning a parah adumah.

R' Pedas's understanding of the dispute between R' Eliezer and Rabanan is unsuccessfully challenged.

### 2) Parah adumah

The Gemara infers from the discussion between R' Eliezer and Rabanan that the parah adumah is consecrated for the altar rather than for the upkeep of the Beis HaMikdash.

Different reasons are suggested to explain why the parah adumah may not have been sodomized even though it is only sanctified for upkeep of the Beis HaMikdash.

A Baraisa cites Shila as giving the rationale behind R' Eliezer's position that an animal purchased from an idolater may not be used as the parah adumah.

This exposition is challenged. ■

## REVIEW and Remember

1. If a married woman is kidnapped does she become prohibited to her husband?  
 -----
2. What is Shila's exposition related to the purchase of a parah adumah?  
 -----
3. Is the parah adumah consecrated for a korban or for the upkeep of the Beis HaMikdash?  
 -----
4. What does the term השחתה convey?  
 -----

## Distinctive INSIGHT

### A parah adumah and its category of holiness

שאני פרה דחטאת קרייה רחמנא

The Gemara presented a disagreement between R' Eliezer and Chachamim in the Mishnah (Parah 2:1) whether it is permitted to purchase a para adumah from an idolater. Their point of dispute is whether we suspect that the animal had been sodomized by its owner. R' Eliezer does not allow a parah adumah to be purchased from an idolater, while Chachamim allow it. The Gemara concludes that this disagreement is not only in reference to buying an animal for a parah adumah, but also regarding buying an animal for any offering. R' Eliezer is generally concerned that the idolater used the animal for immoral purposes, which disqualifies the animal from being used in our service, while Chachamim do not suspect that the animal was sodomized, and they are therefore not wary about this issue.

The Gemara notes that the disagreement between R' Eliezer and Chachamim is where we do not know for certain that this cow was used for immoral purposes, and whether we speculate that this was the case. However, if we knew for sure that the animal was used in this manner, even Chachamim would disqualify the animal from being a parah adumah.

The Gemara now discusses the parah adumah and the nature of its being holy. The Gemara notes that there are two categories of consecration. One is where a animal is designated as holy to be used as an offering. This is called קדשי מוזהב, as the animal or other item is consecrated to be used directly as part of the service in the Beis HaMikdash. An item in this category may not be redeemed for cash, unless it is blemished or otherwise no longer eligible for use on the altar. The other category is called קדשי בדק הבית. Here, an item is donated for the general fund of the Beis HaMikdash for any of its needs. Anything may be donated, not only items which are directly used in the service, and the treasurer of the Beis HaMikdash generally sells the item or allows it to be redeemed for cash.

The Gemara notes that if a parah adumah would be in the category of kodshei bedek habayis, we would not expect it to become disqualified just because it was used for immoral purposes. After all, any item in any condition should be acceptable to be consecrated, and the treasurer may either sell it or use it in some manner. If a parah adu-

# HALACHAH Highlight

## Waking one's father for davening

דמא בן נתינה שמו פעם אחת בקשו ממנו אבנים לאפוד

*Dama ben Nesina was his name. One time they requested from him stones for the ephod*

The Gemara relates that the Sages wished to purchase precious stones for the ephod from Dama ben Nesina. They offered a very generous sum of money for those stones but he refused to wake his father to get the key to be able to sell them the stone. Rav Moshe Feinstein<sup>1</sup> questions why Dama ben Nesina was correct in his decision to not wake his father. Most fathers derive pleasure when their children are financially successful and would be greatly disappointed to hear that their children did not earn a potentially large profit. Accordingly, it should have been considered obligatory for Dama ben Nesina to wake his father to give him that good feeling. It must be, concludes Rav Feinstein, that Nesina was insane and not capable of appreciating his son's profit and thus Dama decided that he could not disturb his father's sleep for his own personal gain. Along the same lines, Taz<sup>2</sup> writes that Nesina for whatever reason did not want his son to profit and consequently it was prohibited for Dama ben Nesina to wake his father since it would only anger him.

Sefer Chassidim<sup>3</sup> writes that if it was a case in which the father would have profited rather than the son it would be a mitzvah for the son to wake his father to earn that profit. Sim-

*(Insight...continued from page 1)*

mah is in the category of kodshei mitzbe'ach, we could understand why it is disqualified if it was used for immoral purposes. Nevertheless, the Gemara explains that a parah adumah is referred to as a chattas (Bemidbar 19:9), thus indicating that it has some aspect of being an actual offering, even if it would be in the category of kodshei bedek habayis.

Gri"z HaLevi explains that a parah adumah is in the category of bedek habayis until it is slaughtered, at which time it assumes halachos of a chattas. Chazon Ish writes that it has chattas aspects from the moment it is consecrated. ■

ilarly, it is obligatory for one to wake his father for shul or to perform some other mitzvah. This ruling is cited by Chaye Adam<sup>4</sup>. Aruch Hashulchan<sup>5</sup> adds that permission to wake one's father for davening applies only when the time for davening is close to passing, but if there is plenty of time for one's father to wake up later and daven within the correct timeframe it is prohibited for a son to wake his father. He also writes that even in those circumstances in which a son is allowed to wake his father it is preferable for the son to ask another person to wake his father for him. ■

1. דברות משה קדושין ל"א. סי' נ' העי' י"ז.
2. ט"ז יו"ד סי' ר"מ סק"י.
3. ספר חסידים סי' של"ז.
4. חיי אדם ח"א כלל ס"ז סעי' י"א.
5. ערוה"ש יו"ד סי' ר"מ סעי' מ'. ■

# STORIES Off the Daf

## His Loss, Our Gain

"אלה אותו ממון שהפסדת..."

Rav Yitzchak of Vorki, zt"l, explained a fundamental difference between a Jew and an idol-worshipper from our daf. "On Avodah Zara 23 we find that when the sages visited Dama ben Nesinah to purchase stones for the Ephod for a fortune of money, he refused to wake his father who was sleeping on the key. When the next year he had a parah adumah born among his cattle, he only requested the money he would have made from the sale of the precious stones for the Ephod.

"From here we see the difference

between a Jew and an idol-worshipper. A Jew serves Hashem from love and is therefore pleased when he sacrifices for a mitzvah. An idol-worshipper is not pleased at all. On the contrary, like Dama ben Nesinah, he tends to dwell on the unpleasant circumstances that led to his sacrifice. This is because idol-worshippers honor their parents because they realize intellectually that this is only right. But, of course, he also knows intellectually that his father did not have to be sleeping precisely when the sages came to buy his valuable stone. He therefore lost a profit because of his misfortune.

"On the other hand, a Jew does mitzvos as a chok, which we cannot understand, and so we are pleased when we sacrifice for mitzvos. This is the lesson of his having a parah adumah the next year.

This shows that we must do all the mitzvos like a chukah which we do to serve the King even though we don't understand it intellectually."<sup>1</sup>

Rav Shmuel Alexander Undsdorfer, zt"l, would say a similar thing, proving it from Dama ben Nesinah's own words. "When he himself asked for the money for the parah adumah, he asked for the money he had lost for having been forced to honor his father. Just imagine if a Jew paid a large sum of money for an esrog and then complained of his great loss. Obviously, he would be considered a fool. But even idol-worshippers willing to sacrifice to do a good deed often complain of the money it cost them, since they feel such losses keenly."<sup>2</sup> ■

1. גדולת הצדיקים, ע' ס"ז
2. כרם חמד, ח"א, ע' ר"א ■