



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

Our Rabbis taught in a Baraisa: A Sage must change his father's name and his teacher's name, but the interpreter does not change his father's name and his teacher's name. Whose father? Shall we say, the father of the interpreter? — Is then the interpreter not obligated [to honor his parents]? — But, said Rava, [it means] the name of the Sage's father or the name of the Sage's teacher. As when Mar, son of Rav Ashi, lectured at the college sessions; he said [to the interpreter]: My father, my teacher [said thus], whereas his interpreter said: Thus did Rav Ashi say.

Our Rabbis taught in a Baraisa: What is 'fear' and what is 'honor'? 'Fear' means that he [the son] must neither stand in his [the father's] place nor sit in his place, nor contradict his words, nor tip the scales against him. 'Honor' means that he must give him food and drink, clothe and cover him, lead him in and out. (31b2 – 31b3)

Whose Money?

The Gemora inquires: From whose money are the needs of the parents provided for? [*Do the children pay with their own money, or are they just responsible to ensure that their parents are taken care of?*]

Rav Yehudah says: The son must pay for it. Rav Nosson bar Oshaya says: The father must pay for it.

The Rabbis rendered a ruling to Rav Yirmiyah, and some say that it was to the son of Rav Yirmiyah that the father must pay for it.

The Gemora asks on this ruling from a Baraisa: It is written: *Honor your father and your mother*, and it is written: *Honor*

Hashem from your fortune. Just as honoring Hashem involves a loss of money, so too, honoring one's parents involve a loss of money. But if you say that it is the father's money that is used, what loss of money is there?

The Gemora answers: It is referring to the loss of work.

The Gemora cites a Baraisa: Two brothers, two partners, a father and a son, a teacher and his student can redeem the *ma'aser sheini* for each other (*without adding the fifth, which would be required if the owner himself redeems it*) and they can give each other *ma'aser ani* (*even though, if they wouldn't have the ma'aser ani, they would find something else to give them*). If you would say that the son must honor his father with his own money, it will emerge that he is paying his debt with money belonging to the poor!?! [*This Baraisa would prove that he uses the father's money.*]

The Gemora rejects the proof: He may use the *ma'aser ani* to pay for the father's extra needs.

The Gemora asks: If so, what is the explanation for the following statement, which was made in reference to the Baraisa? Rabbi Yehudah said: There should be a curse to the person who uses *ma'aser ani* to feed his father! If we are dealing with his extra needs, what is wrong with what the son did?

The Gemora answers: It is, nevertheless, a shameful thing to do.

The Gemora cites another Baraisa: They asked Rabbi Eliezer: How far must one go to honor his father and his mother? He answered them: If the father would take a wallet and throw

it into the sea in front of the son, and the son would not embarrass him. Now, if you say that the son uses the father's money to honor him, what difference does it make to the son if the father throws his own wallet into the sea? [This *Baraisa* would prove that he uses his own money.]

The *Gemora* rejects the proof: We are dealing with a case that the son is the one who would inherit him (and the *Baraisa* is teaching us that even so, the son may not embarrass the father).

This is similar to that which happened to Rabbah bar Rav Huna. For Rav Huna tore some silks in front of Rabbah his son. He wanted to see if Rabbah would get angry or not.

The *Gemora* asks: But if he would have gotten angry, would Rav Huna have not violated the prohibition of "placing a stumbling block in front of a blind man" (causing someone to sin, for he might have said something to his father that he was not allowed to)?

The *Gemora* answers: Rav Huna waived his personal honor.

The *Gemora* asks: But he has violated the prohibition of destroying useful things?

The *Gemora* answers: He tore the silks along the seams.

The *Gemora* asks: Maybe that was the reason that Rabbah did not become angry!?

The *Gemora* answers: He did it when Rabbah was angry for another reason (and therefore he wouldn't realize that they were being ripped by the seams). (31b3 – 32a2)

Honoring a Father

Rav Yechezkel taught his son the following *Mishnah*: If a few people that were condemned to be burned became mixed up with many people that were condemned to stoning, Rabbi Shimon says that we punish them with stoning, for

burning is a more severe of a punishment (and the *halachah* is that we always give them the lighter punishment).

Rav Yehudah (his other son) said to him: Father, do not learn the *Mishnah* like that! For if so (that the majority of those people were condemned to stoning), why did Rabbi Shimon have to say that the reason is because burning is more stringent? He should have said (that they are stoned) because the majority of them deserved to be stoned!?

Rather (Rav Yehudah said), this is how the *Mishnah* should be taught: If a few people that were condemned to be stoned became mixed up with many people that were condemned to be burned (Rabbi Shimon says that we punish them with stoning, for burning is a more severe of a punishment).

Rav Yechezkel asked him: If so, let us analyze the end of the *Mishnah*: The *Chachamim* say: We punish them with burning, for stoning is a more severe of a punishment Why did they have to say that the reason is because stoning is more stringent? They should have said (that they are burned) because the majority of them deserved to be burned!?

Rav Yehudah answered: There it was the *Chachamim* who were responding to Rabbi Shimon, who said that burning is more severe; they disagreed and hold that stoning is more severe.

Shmuel said to Rav Yehudah: sharp one! Do not talk to your father like that, for we learned in a *Baraisa*: If one's father was transgressing something from the Torah, he should not tell him, "Father, you have violated something from the Torah." Rather, he should say, "Father, the following verse is written in the Torah" (and the father will realize by himself that he went against the Torah).

Elazar the son of Masya said: If my father said to me, "Give me a drink of water," and at the same time, there is a *mitzvah* (such as burying the dead) for me to do, I leave the

obligation of honoring my father and perform the *mitzvah*, for I and my father are both obligated in the *mitzvah*. Issi the son of Yehudah said: If the *mitzvah* can be performed by others, he should let the others do the *mitzvah* and he should go and honor his father.

Rav Masnah ruled: the *halachah* is according to Issi the son of Yehudah. (32a2 – 32a3)

Renouncing his Honor

Rav Yitzchak bar Shila said in the name of Rav Masnah, who said in the name of Rav Chisda: If a father waives the obligation on his son to honor him, his honor is waived (*and the son is not obligated to honor him*). If a teacher waives the obligation on his student to honor him, his honor is not waived. Rav Yosef said: Even if a teacher waives the honor due to him, his honor is waived, as it is written: *Hashem went before them by day (showing that even Hashem waived the honor due Him)*.

Rava disagrees with the proof: Now, there, where we are talking about the Holy One, Blessed be He, since the world is his, and the Torah is his, He can waive His honor; however, here (*by the teacher*), is the Torah his that he can waive the honor due him (*because of the Torah*)?

Rava then retracted and said that yes, it is his Torah, as it is written: *In his Torah he ponders day and night*.

The *Gemora* asks: Does Rava indeed hold that a teacher who waives the honor due him, it is in fact waived? But it happened that Rava was serving the drinks at his son's wedding feast, and when he poured a cup for Rav Pappa and Rav Huna the son of Rabbi Yehoshua, they stood up for him. But when he poured a cup for Rav Mari and Rav Pinchas the son of Rav Chisda, they did not stand for him, and Rava became upset and exclaimed, "These Rabbis (*those who stood up*) are Rabbis, but these Rabbis are not!" [*Evidently, they were still required to honor Rava, even though he waived his honor, by serving them drinks!?*]

A similar incident is recorded with Rav Pappa, who was serving the drinks at his son's wedding feast, and when he poured a cup for Rav Yitzchak the son of Rav Yehudah, he did not stand up for him, and Rav Pappa became upset!?

The *Gemora* answers: Although Rava waived the honor due him, they should have lifted themselves off their seat (*as a sign of respect – as if they were planning on standing up completely*).

Rav Ashi says that even according to the opinion that a teacher may forgo his honor; a *Nasi* may not forgo his honor.

The *Gemora* asks on this from a *Baraisa*: There was an incident with Rabbi Eliezer, Rabbi Yehoshua and Rabbi Tzadok, who were reclining at the wedding feast for Rabban Gamliel's son. Rabban Gamliel was serving the drinks. He offered Rabbi Eliezer a cup, but he refused to accept it. He offered it to Rabbi Yehoshua, and he did accept it. Rabbi Eliezer said to Rabbi Yehoshua, "Yehoshua, what is this? Is it proper for us to sit and Rabban Gamliel should serve us?" Rabbi Yehoshua said back to them, "We find in the Torah someone even greater than him, who served others. For Avraham was the great man of his generation, and it is written regarding him: *And he stood over them (the three guests) while they ate*. And perhaps you will want to answer that Avraham only did so because they were ministering angels. That cannot be the case, for they appeared to him as Arabs. So therefore, it is quite proper for Rabban Gamliel to stand over us and give us to drink. Rabbi Tzadok said to them, "why are you ignoring the honor of the Omnipresent, and you are dealing only with the honor of mere mortals? The Holy One, Blessed be He causes the winds to blow, the rain to fall, the ground to sprout and He sets the table in front of every single person (*by preparing them food*). And (*if He waives His honor*) shouldn't we allow Rabban Gamliel to stand over us and give us to drink? [*Evidently, even a Nasi can forgo the honor due him!?*]

Rather, if it was stated, this is what Rav Ashi said: Rav Ashi said: Even according to the opinion that a *Nasi* may forgo his honor; a king may not forgo his honor. This is because it is written: *You must put a king over you*. From the double expression (*som tasim – you must put*) we derive that the awe of a king must be on you. (32a4 – 32b2)

Rising for a Sage

The *Gemora* cites a *Baraisa*: It is written: *You shall rise before an old man*. One could think that this *halachah* would apply to a wicked man as well; by the fact that the Torah wrote *zakein*, this indicates that we are referring to a sage. This can be proven from the following verse: *Gather to me seventy men from the (ziknei) sages of Israel*.

Rabbi Yosi HaGellili says: The word “*zakein*” can only mean “one who has acquired wisdom.” [*The word “zakein” is being used like an acronym – zeh, this one - shekanah, that he acquired.*] As it is written: Hashem acquired m3 at the outset of his journey.

I might think that one might stand up before him [even] at a great distance: therefore, it is written: you shall rise up, and you shall honor, [implying], I ordered one to rise up only where it confers honor.

I might think that one must honor him with money, therefore it is written: ‘you shall rise up and you shall honor’: just as rising up involves no monetary loss, so does honoring also mean without monetary loss.

I might think that one must rise up before him out of a lavatory or a bathhouse, therefore it is written ‘you shall rise up and you shall honor’, [implying] I ordered to rise up only in a place where it confers honor.

I might think that one may shut his eyes as though he has not seen him: therefore, it is taught, . . . you shall rise up, and you shall fear your God: of what is known to the heart only it is said, and you shall fear your God. [*Even though*

people might think that you did not see the sage, Hashem is well aware of the truth.]

Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar said: How do we know that the Sage must not trouble [the people]? From the verse, . . . old man and you shall fear. [By the fact that the Torah juxtaposes the word *zakein* and *you shall fear*, this teaches us that the sage should not trouble people to stand before him (*if he can go a different way*).]

Issi ben Yehudah said: You shall rise up before an old man implies even any old man. But isn’t Rabbi Yosi HaGellili identical with the first Tanna? — They differ in respect to a young sage: the first Tanna holds that a young sage is not [included in the mitzvah], whereas Rabbi Yosi HaGellili holds that he is.

What is Rabbi Yosi HaGellili’s reason? — He can tell you: should you think as the first Tanna asserts, if so, the Merciful One should have written: ‘You shall rise up before an old *zakein* and honor [him]’; why did the Merciful One divide them? To teach that the one [old man] is not identical with the other [*zakein*], and vice versa. This proves that even a young sage [is included]. - And the first Tanna? — That is because it is desired to place ‘old man’ in proximity to ‘and you shall fear’. - Now, what is the first Tanna’s reason? — Should you think as Rabbi Yosi HaGellili maintains, if so, the Merciful One should have written: ‘You shall rise up before and honor an old man; you shall rise up before and honor a sage. And since It is not written thus, it follows that they are identical. (32b2 – 33a1)

INSIGHTS TO THE DAF

Honoring Parents; Bein Adam l’Makom, or Bein Adam l’Chaveiro?

The *Gemora* inquires: From whose money are the needs of the parents provided for? [*Do the children pay with their own money, or are they just responsible to ensure that their parents are taken care of?*]



Rav Yehudah says: The son must pay for it. Rav Nosson bar Oshaya says: The father must pay for it.

Reb Zeidel Epstein in the sefer *Afikei Ayil* writes that their argument is based upon the following question: Is the *mitzvah* of honoring one's father and mother a *mitzvah* which is between man and Hashem, and therefore the son would be obligated to use his own money just like any other *mitzvah*? Or perhaps the *mitzvah* is one that is between man and his fellow, and therefore one would not be required to use his own money.

The Dvar Yaakov asks: If it is a *mitzvah* that is between man and his fellow, the son would not be required to disrupt his work in order to honor his father!?

Rather, he explains: Everyone agrees that it is in the category of a *mitzvah* which is between one man and another, but Reb Boruch Ber explains that even in those *mitzvos* one would be required to spend money, provided that the money being spent is a part of the *mitzvah*, such as the *mitzvah* of giving charity. The dispute in the *Gemora* is regarding this point. Is the money being spent to honor one's father a part of this *mitzvah*, or not?

The *Minchas Chinuch* writes that if honoring one's parents is included in the category of *mitzvos* that are between people, *Yom Kippur* would not atone for these transgressions unless one would appease his father and mother beforehand.

The Ramban writes that the Ten Commandments were written on two tablets. This illustrates to us that the first five are different than the second five. The purpose of the first five is to honor Hashem. Honoring your parents is included in this category because when one honors his parents he is in fact honoring Hashem, for the parents were Hashem's partners in the child's creation.

DAILY MASHAL

Renouncing his Honor

Rav Ashi said that even according to the opinion that a prince may forgo his honor; a king may not forgo his honor! This is indicated by the verse that states "put for yourself a king," implying that his awe should (*always*) be placed upon you.

It is noteworthy that a Torah scholar can renounce his honor. What is the difference between the two?

Reb Chaim Brisker explains: A king has a higher status than an ordinary person because the people appointed him as a king. In truth, everyone is fit to become a king. Once he is appointed king, everyone is obligated to honor him. If the king renounces his honor, it is as if he is reverting to being an ordinary constituent, for there is no tangible difference between them except the honor accorded to him.

This is not the case with respect to a Torah scholar. Everyone is required to honor him because of his inherent status. Even if he chooses to renounce his honor, his higher level remains the same. This is why he is permitted to renounce his honor.