

## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) The language of the berachah for havdalah (cont.)

Rava concludes his explanation of the text he used when making havdalah.

### 2) The number of separations mentioned in havdalah

R' Elazar in the name of R' Oshaya states that when making havdalah one should not recite fewer than three separations (הבדלות) or more than seven.

This ruling is challenged from a Baraisa that permits the recitation of one separation.

The Gemara explains that there is a dispute between Tannaim regarding this matter but concludes that the halachah does not follow the opinion that recites only one separation.

R' Yehoshua ben Levi states: The separations one mentions in havdalah must be traced to the separations mentioned in the Torah.

The Gemara unsuccessfully challenges this Baraisa.

### 3) Concluding havdalah

Rav and Shmuel disagree how to properly conclude havdalah. According to Rav it is with the words, **מקדש ישראל** and according to Shmuel it is with the words **המבדיל בין קודש לחול**.

Abaye disapproved of the way Rav concluded the berachah. In the name of R' Yehoshua ben Chananya it was taught to combine the two phrases but the Gemara declares that the halachah does not follow that opinion.

The Gemara relates an incident in which it was noted that Ulla did not conclude his havdalah with a berachah.

The Gemara challenges Ulla's practice from a Baraisa that indicates that havdalah should conclude with a berachah that begins and ends with Baruch Atah... ■

## REVIEW and Remember

1. What is the basis for the dispute regarding the recitation of the words **בין קדושת שבת לקדושת יר"ט הבדלת**?
2. How does one acquire the nickname "Son of holy ones"?
3. What was the cause of R' Yehudah's anger towards his son R' Yitzchok?
4. What is the baseline structure of a berachah (does it end with baruch or not)?

## Distinctive INSIGHT

*Rav Yitzchok did not go, he sent Abaye...*

לא אזל שדר ליה לאביי

The precise wording of the havdalah formula is the subject of the discussion in our Gemara. Ulla once came to Pumbedisa, and Rav Yehuda, the head of the Academy, saw it as a golden opportunity to observe how this great Torah sage recited havdalah. He sent his son, Rav Yitzchok, with a gift basket to greet Ulla and experience this great moment. Instead, however, Rav Yitzchok did not go, but he sent Abaye in his place. When Rav Yehuda heard that his son had not gone in person, he was very disappointed. He criticized him for being haughty and too interested in dominating over Abaye.

Two questions arise. Being that the testimony regarding Ulla's conduct was successfully recorded, why did Rav Yehuda get angry? The mission was completed! Furthermore, if he demanded that his son personally listen to his command, and not delegate the matter, why then did Rav Yitzchok not fulfill the great mitzvah of honoring one's parents?

Sefer **אור הישר** explains that there was indeed a misunderstanding. Rav Yitzchok thought that his father simply wanted Ulla to receive the gift, and that the information about havdalah be noted. Rav Yehuda, however, felt that his son could benefit from observing Ulla, for we know that gazing upon the holy countenance of a tzaddik is a fulfillment of the dictum (Yeshayahu 30:20), "Let your eyes behold your teacher."

Reb Reuven Benges uses this story to support the opinion of Rashba (Yevamos 6a) who says that normally, honoring one's parent is personally incumbent upon a child, and is a mitzvah that cannot be delegated. However, the mitzvah itself applies only in cases where there is a direct benefit for the parent. Simply obeying the wishes of a parent is not the mitzvah of honoring a parent, unless it is performing an act of benefit for the parent. Therefore, in our case, the wishes of Rav Yehuda to determine the halachos of havdalah were not in the realm of **כיבוד אב ואם** and Rav Yitzchok was technically allowed to delegate the mission to Abaye. ■

## HALACHAH Highlight

*Is it a problem of avodah zara to look at a coin with a human face on it?*

מאן ניהו בנן של קדושים רבי מנחם בר סימאי ואמאי קרו ליה בן של קדושים דלא אסתכל בצורת אדווא

Who is the "son of the holy one?" Rabbi Menacham the son of Simai. And why is he called "son of the holy one?" Because he never stared at the image on a coin.

The Rishonim point out an apparent contradiction between our Gemara and a Gemara in Shabbos. From our Gemara it seems that only R. Menacham conducted himself in this special way, and it also seems that his practice stemmed from a special holiness and devoutness. However, the Gemara<sup>1</sup> in Shabbos says that it is forbidden for anyone to stare at the image of a human, for the pasuk says "do not turn to foreign gods." The Rishonim offer two ways to reconcile this question. Tosafos<sup>2</sup> in Shabbos answers that it is forbidden to stare at the image of avodah zara, whereas the practices of R. Menacham only applied to the beautification of the avodah zara. Tosafos in Avodah Zara<sup>3</sup> however says that in regards to the images on a coin, which one is accustomed to seeing, the issur of "turning to foreign gods" would not apply. Nonetheless, the "Son of the holy one" had the practice not to stare at it. Images which one is not accustomed to seeing would be forbidden to stare at (according to this Tosafos) even if they are just made for

beautification purposes. The Poskim dispute the practical application<sup>4</sup> of this law. (And there are those who say<sup>5</sup> that people are generally lenient in this law.) Nonetheless, all are in agreement that the issur only applies to staring<sup>6</sup>, or to intently concentrating upon it. But to simply look at it would be permitted. It would also be permitted to look at coins with which one is familiar<sup>7</sup>. Based on this law, this would also impact staring<sup>8</sup> at dolls. Therefore, people are generally lenient and stare at them. ■

1. בשבת דף קמ"ט
2. תוס' בשבת שם
3. בע"ז דף נ' ע"א
4. שהחכמת אדם בכלל פ"ה ס"ט, אסר מלהסתכל בכל דמות צלם אדם אא"כ בצורה שע"ג מטבע. ומאידך המגן אברהם בסימן ש"ז ס"ק כ"ג וערוך השולחן שם בס"ח כתבו שנהגו להקל. ובביאור הלכה שם סט"ז בד"ה ועובר, הביא מחלוקת התוס' בזה ולא הכריע
5. במ"א ועה"ש הנ"ל
6. במ"א ועה"ש הנ"ל [ומצאתי מחלוקת אג"מ ועור מקודש אם ההבדל הוא בכך שהסתכלות פירושו שמכיון משא"כ בראיה, או שהחילוק הוא בין אם מתבונן בפרטיו, ובב"ח באו"ח סימן ע"ה משמע שהכל גדר אחד הוא. ומ"מ עי' בששה"ל קצ"ה שקשה להבדיל בין ראייה והסתכלות, וע"ע בה"ל סוף רכ"ה ואכמ"ל
7. כנ"ל מתוס' בע"ז וכו' בחכמ"א הנ"ל
8. והאם מותר להחזיק בובות או שצריך לפוגם עי' בשו"ת שה"ל ח"ז סימן קל"ד אות א' שהחמיר. ומאידך בחכמ"א כלל פ"ה ס"ו הקיל. [ומשמע מלשונו שמ"מ עדיף לפגמו.] וכמה צריך לפגום בה עי' בבית לחם יהודה ביור"ד סוף סימן קמ"א וביד אפרים שם ס"ו ובשו"ת מנחת יצחק ח"ב סימן ר"ט. ומאידך עי' דרכי תשובה סימן קמ"ו ס"ק כ"א בשם החת"ס. ואכמ"ל ■

## STORIES Off the Daf

### Seven Havdalos

בנן של קדושים אומר אחת ונהגו העם לומר שלש

The Mei HaShiloach, zt"l, explains that havdalah, or distinguishing between the holy and the profane, is contingent on the level of one's intelligence and awareness. Some people needed as many as seven havdalos, the general custom is three, but Menachem ben Sim'ai, the "Son of kedoshim" only needed one. He was so elevated, a single statement or glance provided all the information

he needed to distinguish between the holy and the profane.

A meshulach once arrived in Volozhin and went from house to house collecting money for tzedakah. When he reached the home of the illustrious Rav Chaim of Volozhin, zt"l, he was turned aside without a penny. The town wondered what the fellow had done to deserve such mistreatment, but no one had the nerve to ask the gaon about his behavior. Some time later, it became known to all that the meshulach was actually a missionary in disguise, and all those who had contributed to his cause had inadvertently supported sinful activities.

Members of the community approached Rav Chaim, zt"l, with a complaint: "Now we see that the gaon had ruach hakodesh—but why weren't we told before? Why were we allowed to give to his cause?"

Rav Chaim, zt"l, laughed. "You accuse me of something that I don't have! I didn't know anything about him at all. All I knew was that when he came to my door, I immediately wanted to give him money. There was no internal resistance at all. Right away I understood that it is impossible that there is any mitzvah involved—if there had been, my yetzer harah would have put up a fight..." ■

