

## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) Honoring parents (cont.)

The Gemara asks who pays for the needs of a parent.

R' Yehudah maintains that the son must pay whereas R' Nosson bar Oshiya holds that the father must pay.

Support for the position that the father must pay is cited.

Different unsuccessful attempts are made to prove one of the positions correct.

A related incident is cited.

### 2) Correcting a parent

A conversation between R' Yechezkel, his son Rami and his son R' Yehudah is presented because it provides parameters for how a child is to correct a parent.

### 3) Prioritizing the mitzvah of honoring a parent

A disagreement is presented whether one should put aside honoring a parent to perform another mitzvah or whether it depends on whether the mitzvah could be performed by others.

R' Masna rules that it depend on whether the mitzvah could be performed by others.

### 4) Waiving one's honor

R' Chisda is cited as ruling that a parent can waive his honor but a rebbi may not whereas R' Yosef maintains that even a rebbi can waive his honor.

Rava initially argued that a rebbi could not waive his honor but subsequently changed his position.

Rava's revised position is unsuccessfully challenged from Rava's own behavior.

R' Ashi asserts that even the opinion who maintains that a rebbi can waive his honor would agree that a nasi can not waive his honor.

This assertion is successfully challenged and the Gemara is forced to say that R' Ashi maintained that a nasi can waive his honor but a king may not waive his honor.

### 5) Rising for the elderly

A Beraisa is cited that discusses the obligation to rise when an old person or sage approaches.

The Gemara identifies the difference between the position of Tanna Kamma and R' Yosi HaGalili and the basis for their respective positions. ■

## Gemara GEM

### *A Torah scholar may waive his honor*

ורב יוסף אמר אפי' הרב שמחל על כבודו, כבודו מחול

**O**ur Gemara concludes by saying that the law is that if a Torah scholar wishes to waive the honor which is due to him, he may do so.

The Gemara (Kesubos 17a) teaches that if a king chooses to forgo his honor, he may not do so. The verse states, "You must set the king upon yourself." (Devarim 17:15) From this we learn that he must remain as an authority figure, and his position must not be compromised.

What is the reason for the discrepancy between the position of a king, which cannot be compromised, and that of a Torah scholar, which may be willfully excused?

Rabbi Chaim MiVolozhin explains that if a king allows himself to forgo his honor, he is no longer a king over his subjects at that moment. The position of king is one which anyone may fill, and it is only through a consensus of peers that a particular person should be promoted and given the privileges of royalty which then result in this one person being the king. When he allows his position to be cheapened, he is, in effect, resigning the monarchy, and this is not allowed. After all, the Torah demands that we continually appoint him above us. A Torah scholar, however, earns the respect of the nation due to his amassed knowledge. If he allows others to deal with him simply, his prominence and distinction are still valid, and, consequently, his honor is still intact. His consenting to be treated plainly does not affect his position, and nothing is lost. ■

## REVIEW and Remember

1. Why did R' Huna tear silk garments in his son's presence?  
.....
2. Is a teacher permitted to waive the honor that is due to him?  
.....
3. What was the Gemara's proof that a nasi is permitted to waive the honor that is due to him?  
.....
4. Is one obligated to stand before a young Torah scholar?  
.....

## HALACHAH Highlight

### Causing another person to become angry

דלמא רתח וקעבר אלפני עור לא תתן מכשול

But perhaps he would become angry and thus violate the prohibition of, "Do not place a stumbling block in front of a blind man."

Reuven once had to have a conversation with Shimon which would inevitably cause Shimon to become angry. When the conversation took place Shimon became so angry that he broke a utensil. For his part Reuven did not want to anger Shimon; rather it was a conversation which was necessary, he just knew that it would cause Shimon to become irate. Reuven wondered whether he violated the prohibition against putting a stumbling block before the blind (לפני עור). He was concerned because becoming angry is a very severe transgression as noted in many places in Shas and the Zohar and especially when anger causes someone to break something it is extremely severe. Additionally, if one was to accept the premise that causing someone to become angry constitutes a transgression it would make relationships very challenging since it is so common for people to say or do things that anger others and who could be so cautious so as not to anger anyone.

Reuven decided that he would consult with Rav Yosef Chaim of Baghdad, the Ben Ish Chai, for some insight into this important matter.

Ben Ish Chai<sup>1</sup> responded that one could infer from our Gemara that there is no violation of לפני עור if one causes another person to become angry. Our Gemara relates that R' Huna ripped some garments in the presence of his son Rabbah because he wanted to see if Rabbah would become angry. The Gemara wondered about the permissibility of this act since R' Huna ran the risk of violating the prohibition of לפני עור. If Rabbah were to speak disrespectfully towards his father he would violate the mitzvah of honoring his father. The Gemara answers that R' Huna waived his honor before testing him so that even if Rabbah became angry with him he would not transgress that mitzvah. The very fact, deduces Ben Ish Chai, that the Gemara did not mention concern that R' Huna would violate לפני עור by causing Rabbah to become angry is itself a proof that causing another to become angry is not a transgression of לפני עור. R' Yisroel Salanter is also cited<sup>2</sup> as inferring from our Gemara that the prohibition against לפני עור does not apply to matters related to character traits. ■

1. שו"ת תורה לשמה סי' ש"ע.

2. ספר דרך שיחה עמ' שס"ט. ■

## STORIES Off the Daf

### The Clock Tower

"רבי יוסי הגלילי סבר אפילו יניק וחכים..."

On today's daf we find that Rabbi Yosi HaGalili obligates one to rise out of respect even for a young scholar. The halachah follows Rabbi Yosi HaGalili. Rav Shlomo Zalman Auerbach, zt"l, said that one must honor any of one's rebbis—even an average magid shiur who is not his rebbi muvhak—more than a regular chacham with whom he doesn't have rebbi-talmid relationship.<sup>1</sup>

Rabbi Yitzchok Hutner, zt"l once told a story in order to illustrate the

need to place one's rebbi or Rav up on a pedestal—that the position of the Rav of a community should be distinct, and that people shouldn't relate to him just like anyone else:

"Every town in Europe used to have a town clock set up in a high tower, so that anyone who wanted to reach it would have to use a ladder. Clever townspeople used to say that the reason for doing so was so that anyone could see the time from far off. But the real reason was that its purpose was to provide an absolute standard, so that everyone in the town should set their watches by its time. If the clock had been located lower down, closer to the people, anyone would just walk over to it and re-set the town clock by his own watch,

completely eliminating its very purpose! Placing it so high up put it out of the reach of the average person, saved it from being tampered with, and so as a matter of course, everyone in town would continue to keep time according to its standard."

Rav Hutner continued, "Due to our many sins, we unfortunately find many communities that do not understand the need to stand their local rabbi on a high pedestal. Because of this, anyone can approach him and adjust him to his own personal opinion—and this destroys the entire purpose of having a Rav!"<sup>2</sup> ■

1. הליכות שלמה, ניסן-אב, עמוד רל"ג,

ארחות הלכה #126

2. פחד יצחק, אגרות #132