



Today's Daf In Review is being sent l'zecher nishmas Habachur Yechezkel Shraga A"H ben R' Avrohom Yehuda

Kiddushin Daf Lamed Beis

- A Braisa asks, what is the obligation to fear one's parents and what is the obligation to honor one's parents? Fearing them is not to sit or stand in their place, and not to contradict what they say or give an opinion if his father has a machlokes in halacha with someone else. Honoring them is to give them to eat and drink, to dress and cover them, and to bring them in and to take them out.
 - **Q:** Whose money does he use to honor his parents? **A: R' Yehuda** says it must come from the son's money, and **R' Nosson bar Oshaya** says it may come from the father's money. The **Rabanan** paskened to **R' Yirmiya** (or to his son) that it may come from the father's money.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says, one pasuk says "kaved es avicha v'es imecha" and another pasuk says "kaved es Hashem meihonecha", and we learn that just as honoring Hashem may sometimes cost a person money, the same is true for the obligation of honoring parents. This must mean that the money for kibud av v'eim must come from the son!? **A:** The Braisa may mean that the son has to give up work to do the mitzvah, but not that he has to spend money to do so.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that a son may feed his father with maaser ani. Now, if the son has the obligation to spend money, how can he use maaser ani to fulfil his obligation!? **A:** The Braisa is referring to money used for excess needs.
 - **Q:** If that is true, why did **R' Yehuda** say on the Braisa that one who feeds his father with maaser ani should be cursed? It is only being used for the excess, not the basic needs!? **A:** Still, using maaser ani for a father is considered to be a disgrace.
 - **Q: R' Eliezer** says in a Braisa, that the extent of kibud av v'eim is for a parent to take a wallet full of money, to throw it into the sea, and for the son not to get upset. This must refer to the son's money, or else why would he get upset? **A:** It is the parents' money, and the son would get upset because he stands to inherit the money. As we find that **R' Huna** once tore fancy clothing in front of his son **Rabbah**, to see if he would get angry.
 - **Q:** If he would have gotten angry at his father, **R' Huna** would have been oiver on the lav of "lifnei iver lo sitein michshol"!? **A: R' Huna** was mochel for the honor that was due him.
 - **Q:** He was oiver "baal tashchis" by ripping the clothing!? **A:** He ripped it on the seam, but he did so when **Rabbah** was angry so he would not notice that it was being ripped on the seam.
- After hearing **R' Yehuda** correct his father **R' Yechezkel** by telling him that he had the wrong version of a Braisa, **Shmuel** said to him, you are not supposed to correct a father like that. As a Braisa says, if a person sees his father being oiver on something in the Torah, he should mention the pasuk that teaches the issur, and should not correct him directly.
- **Elazar ben Masya** said, if my father asks me for water and I have another mitzvah to do, I will do the other mitzvah first, because both me and my father are obligated to do the mitzvah. **Isi ben Yehuda** says, if there is someone else to do the other mitzvah, he should have the other person do it, and he should go and serve his father.
 - **R' Masna** paskened like **Isi ben Yehuda**.
- **R' Yitzchak bar Shila in the name of R' Masna in the name of R' Chisda** said, if a father is mochel on the honor due to him, it is an effective mechila. However, if a rebbi is mochel on his honor, it is not effective. **R' Yosef** says that even a rebbi's mechila is effective, as we see that

Hashem went in front of the Yidden. **Rava** said, Hashem is different – it is His world, His Torah, and therefore He can be mochel on His honor. However, the Torah is not the rebbi's, and therefore he cannot be mochel. **Rava** later said, the Torah does belong to the rebbi, as the pasuk says “uvisoraso yehigeh yomam v'luyla”.

- **Q:** We find that when **Rava** was serving drinks at his son's wedding (and in that way was mochel on his honor) he was upset when some of the **Rabanan** did not stand up for him (we see that he holds that his mechila was not effective)!? A similar story took place with **R' Pappa** when he was serving drinks!? **A:** Although the mechila was effective, they still felt that honor should have been given to them anyway.
- **R' Ashi** said, even according to the view that a rebbi could be mochel on his honor, a nasi could not effectively be mochel his honor.
 - **Q:** A Braisa says that **R' Gamliel** (who was the nasi) served drinks at his son's wedding (so we see that a nasi could be mochel on his honor)!? **A:** It must be that this is what **R' Ashi** said – even according to the view that a nasi who is mochel on his honor can do so effectively, a king who is mochel on his honor could not do so effectively, because of the pasuk of “som tasim alecha melech”, which teaches that the king's fear must be on you always.
- A Braisa says, the pasuk says “mipnei seiva takum”. We would think this includes an old man who is a rasha as well. The pasuk therefore says “zakein”, which refers to a talmid chachom, as the pasuk says “esfah li shivim ish miziknei Yisrael”. **R' Yose Haglili** says, the word “zaken” is a contraction of “zeh kanah chachma” and refers to a talmid chochom. We would think that we must stand up for this “zakein” even when he is far away. The pasuk therefore says “takum v'hadarta”, to teach that one only need to stand up if it will bring honor to the zakein (if he is nearby). We would think the obligation is to honor him with money, the pasuk therefore teaches “takum v'hadarta”, that just as standing up doesn't cost money, so too the entire obligation need not cost money. We would think one must even stand up for him in a bathroom or bathhouse. The pasuk therefore teaches “takum v'hadarta”, that one only need to stand up in a place where doing so will bring him honor. We would think you can make believe that you don't see the zakein. The pasuk therefore teaches “takum...v'yareisa”, to teach that Hashem knows what you saw and what is in your heart. **R' Shimon ben Elazar** says, the pasuk of “zakein v'yareisa” teaches that the zakein should not trouble people to stand for him (he should take a route that won't cause people to have to stand for him). **Isi ben Yehuda** says, “mipnei seiva takum” teaches to include every type of old person.
 - **Q:** **R' Yose Haglili** is saying the same thing as the **T”K**? **A:** The difference would be if one must stand for a young chochom. The **T”K** would say he does not need to stand for such a chochom, and **R' Yose Haglili** says that he does need to do so. **R' Yose Haglili** says, if the **T”K** was right, the pasuk should have said “mipnei seiva zakein takum”. Instead the Torah separates “seiva” and “zakein” to teach that one must stand for an elder even if not a chochom, and for a chochom even if not an elder. The **T”K** says the reason zakein was written later in the pasuk is so that it should be closer to the word “v'yareisa” (for the drasha taught later in the Braisa). The **T”K** says, if **R' Yose Haglili** is right, the pasuk should write the words “takum v'hadarta” for an elder and then again for the chochom. Since it combines this by writing it once, it teaches that the person must be an elder and a chochom.