



OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Clarifying the dispute between Beis Shammai and Beis Hillel (cont.)

Rava suggests an alternative explanation for the dispute between Beis Shammai and Beis Hillel.

R' Pappa challenges this explanation. In the course of his challenge he explains why his challenge is directed at Rava but is not directed at Rabbah.

Rava demonstrates that this challenge could also be directed towards Rabbah. He then proceeds to explain the Mishnah cited by R' Pappa.

R' Ada bar Ahavah presents another unsuccessful challenge to Rava's explanation.

Ravina begins another challenge to Rava's explanation of the dispute between Beis Shammai and Beis Hillel. ■

HALACHAH Highlight

Referring to a rebbi by his name

תפוס לשון ראשון... בגמר דבריו אדם נתפס

Take hold of the first words ... it is the end of a person's words that should be held

The Gemara Sanhedrin (100a) rules that it is prohibited for a student to refer to his rebbi by his first name. The Gemara challenges this ruling from the fact that Dovid Hamelech referred to his teacher Mefiboshes by his first name when he would ask, "Mefiboshes, my rebbi, did I judge correctly?" The Gemara answers that Mefiboshes was a title rather than a first name and therefore it was permitted. Sefer Parshas Derachim¹ notes that the Poskim explain that the prohibition against referring to a rebbi by his name applies only when he is referred to only by his name but if one adds a title to his rebbi's name, e.g. Rabbi Ploni, there is no prohibition. Thus, for example, Kesef Mishnah² notes that Yehoshua said to Moshe Rabbeinu, "My master Moshe destroy them." Since he included an honorific title it is permitted. Accordingly, he questions why the Gemara was troubled by Dovid Hamelech refer-

(Continued on page 2)

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
 לזכות ולרפואה שלמה
 לקירה אריאל בת רבקה רחל
 and for all חולי ישראל.
 Rebecca and Jeremy Amster and Family

Distinctive INSIGHT

What constitutes a dependent clause between the subjects?

כגון שתלאן זה בזה, ואמר פלוני כפלוני ופלוני כפלוני

Rambam rules according to the simple reading of this Mishnah, as he writes (Hilchos Nedarim 4:11): "If someone takes an oath or a vow, saying 'I will not benefit from any of you,' and he asks for and is granted a release from any one of them, the neder regarding all of them is automatically suspended. When part of an oath is released, the entire oath is completely dismissed. If the original oath was worded 'I will not benefit from the first person, and the second person shall be as the first (זה ולזה וכו'), the third person as the second, etc.' the law is different. Here, if the vow for the first person is released, all are permitted. If the last person's restriction is released, only he is permitted, but the rest are still prohibited."

Lechem Mishnah notes that the wording of the ruling of Rambam does not conform with the conclusion of our sugya. We learn that the only situation where there is a dependence of one person's restriction upon others is if the expression used is "פלוני כפלוני וכו'", and not where the speaker said 'זה ולזה וכו'. In fact, if he used the expression 'זה ולזה וכו' we use the rule that when anyone is released, all are released, regardless of whether it is the first or last who is released.

Lechem Mishnah answers that Rambam had a reading in his text of the Gemara according to the text of the Rosh, "The first case of the Mishnah is where the speaker connected the people to each other by saying, פלוני ופלוני ופלוני. In other words, Rambam holds that it is not the specific words that make the difference to cause dependence, but rather whether the references to the various people were connected throughout with the letter ו' (the conjunction 'and'). This is the case where a release for the first person results in everyone else being permitted, but not where the last one was released.

In his Halachos (66a) Ramban explains this opinion to mean that the person did not actually say that he was connecting the people in a dependent line, but it is rather we who interpret his expression and usage of the connecting letters ו' to mean exactly that. ■

Today's Daf Digest is dedicated
 By Mr. and Mrs. Boruch Rivkin
 in loving memory of their mother and grandmother
 מרת קרניידל בת ר' לייבל, ע"ה

(Highlight...Continued from page 1)

ring to Mefiboshes by name when he included a title, "Mefiboshes my rebbi."

To resolve this inquiry Parshas Derachim asserts that it is only permitted to refer to one's rebbi by name with a title if the title precedes his name, e.g. Rabbi Ploni, but it is not permitted to put the name before the title, e.g. Ploni, my rebbi. Thus since Dovid Hamelech said, "Mefiboshes, my rebbi," the Gemara wondered why it was permitted since Dovid Hamelech mentioned his name before his title. Later authorities³ cite the comments of Rabbeinu Nissim⁴ to our Gemara where he discusses the issue of whether it is the beginning of a person's statement that is most significant or is it the latter part of his statement that is most significant.

Other Poskim⁵ reject this distinction and note many occasions when Amoraim would mention the name of their father followed by the honorific "Abba." The Sefer Shem Mishimon⁶ notes that the way in which we refer to Moshe Rabbeinu clearly indicates that it is permitted to mention the name before the title. Gaon Chida⁷, in fact, concludes that it does not make a difference whether one mentions the name of his rebbi and then his title or whether one mentions his title and then his name. ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. How does Rava explain the dispute between Beis Hillel and Beis Shammai
2. Explain נדר שהותר מקצתו הותר כולו.
3. What type of onion is good for the heart?
4. How does Rava respond to R' Ada bar Ahava's challenge?

1. ספר פרשת דרכים דרוש חמשה עשר
2. כסף משנה פ"ה מהל' ת"ת
3. ע' פניני הלכה למתיבתא מס' נדרימ כו ד"ה אמנם כתב
4. ר"ן ד"ה לא נחלקו
5. ע' ברכ"י יו"ד סי' רמ"ב ס"ק י"ח
6. שם משמעון (פאלאק) יו"ד סי' כ"ב
7. יוסף אומץ סי' פ"ז ■

STORIES Off the Daf

A philosophical question

שהבצל רע ללב

Many years ago, in the Provencal city of Montpellier, the community was violently split over the issue of their children's education. One group held that the best thing they could do was to teach their children classical studies like Greek philosophy and the natural sciences in addition to Torah. The second group noticed that, in far too many cases, students who began the path of secular studies were drawn further away from Judaism in the long run. This group felt that not only was it inappropriate to teach such potentially dangerous material to children, they felt that it should be forbidden to anyone under the age of twenty-five.

There was a lot of heated debate

about the two approaches, but both groups remained intractable. The anti-philosophy group eventually decided to devolve on themselves and their descendants a cherem if any one of them would pursue secular studies prior to the minimum age. The pro-philosophy group tried to circumvent the force of this declaration by declaring the first group in cherem if they were to follow through with their ban. In return, the anti-philosophy faction declared this tactic non-halachic and considering putting their opponents into cherem for their audacity! Fortunately, both groups eventually agreed to place their controversy before the Rashbah, zt"l.

He responded, "This question could be compared to the group that decided to issue a cherem on another group to force them to refrain from eating onions because the food can be detrimental to the heart, as we see in Nedarim 26. Since there is no halachic

prohibition against eating onions, such a cherem will certainly not take effect. All the more so in our case, where one group wishes to issue a ban against what they perceive to be a spiritual threat and their opponents wish to obstruct them.

The Rashba concluded, "Do you think that if someone wished to refrain from wine and used the force of a formal ban on himself to assist him in his effort, the community could stop him by issuing a cherem against him? On the contrary, the Torah calls this man holy! All the more so does the cherem of the proponents of secular studies not take effect against a group who feels that they are simply trying to save their spiritual lives. They are merely trying to do what they can to prevent this chochmah that has been responsible for causing so many to fall from spreading in their community!" ■