

■ Overview of the Daf

1. Rav Zeira teaches that both Moshe Rabbeinu and Dovid HaMelech knew the time of חצות and explains why the indications otherwise are not true.
2. We discuss what made Dovid HaMelech declare that he was a chosid and why he feared he would not merit עולם הבא.
3. The opinion of the חכמים, who say the latest time for חצות is קריאת שמע, is explained according to the opinion of רבן גמליאל and the חכמים incorporate an extra precaution to prevent a person from forgetting to say קריאת שמע.
4. The disagreement between ר' יהושע בן לוי and ר' יוחנן regarding whether to say שמונה עשרה and then השכיבו is discussed and we clarify why קריאת שמע and ה' שפתי תפתח are not an interruption between תפילה and גאולה.
5. We have a discussion of the greatness of אשרי and that one who recites אשרי three times a day merits עולם הבא.
6. A discussion regarding קריאת שמע על המטה begins. ■

■ Distinctive Insight

שמה יגרום החטא

The Merits May Be Diminished

Dovid HaMelech refers to himself as a "chossid", but he nevertheless expresses doubt about his ultimate worthiness. The Gemara explains that he was concerned perhaps, due to sin, his merits would diminish—שמה יגרום החטא.

The Gemara then brings a statement of R' Yaakov bar Iddi to illustrate that even Yaakov Avinu was concerned about whether sin would interfere with the merit he had accrued. Yaakov was assured by Hashem that he would return safely to Eretz Yisroel. Yet, upon his return, Yaakov wondered if he would survive his encounter with Eisav. Why was Hashem's promise not adequate? The Gemara explains that Yaakov knew that Hashem's guarantee might only be valid if he had not sinned. This episode with Yaakov therefore illustrates the concept of שמה יגרום החטא.

Interestingly enough, the Gemara continues to bring a ברייתא where we see this idea a third time. When the Jews returned to Eretz Yisroel with Ezra, the people should have merited to enjoy a grandiose entry into the land. Instead, the few who accompanied Ezra had to rely upon the approval of Koresh. The reason is that due to sin, the merits of the people was actually diminished—גרום החטא.

We can ask, what do we see from this ברייתא that was not already shown in the case of Dovid HaMelech and Yaakov Avinu?

Perhaps we can say that this ברייתא adds a significant lesson. Not only was the concern of Dovid HaMelech and Yaakov Avinu theoretical, but, in fact, there was a case where this actually happened. A real illustration is therefore brought. Not only might sin have caused harm, but it in fact actually ruined things. ■

■ Halacha Highlights

כך אמר דוד לפני הקדוש ברוך הוא: רבונו של עולם, לא חסיד אני? ... כל מה שאני עושה אני נמלך במפיבשת רבי, ואומר לו: מפבישת רבי! יפה דנת, יפה חיבתני! יפה זכיתני! יפה טהרתני! יפה טמאתני! ולא בושת!

Calling One's Rebbe By His Name

So says David ... Master of the Universe: Am I not Spious? Whatever decisions I render I take counsel with Mipiboshet my master. I say to him: Mipiboshes my master, Did I correctly adjudicate? Did I correctly find liable? Did I correctly exonerate? Did I correctly rule pure? Did I correctly rule impure? And I was not ashamed.'

The Poskim question how David would address his master by his first name, since it is prohibited¹ for a student to do so. Several options are presented to resolve this difficulty.

The Rema² holds that one is permitted to say: "My Rebbi My Master So-and-so", attaching a title to the teacher's name. However, the Shach³ disagrees with the Rema. He opines that this is only permitted when not in the presence of the teacher, however in the teacher's presence one may only address him as Rebbi. According to the Shach this is not an option⁴.

The Mishneh LaMelech in his Parashas Derachim⁵ offers that the prohibition is only when the student uses the teacher's actual name. Therefore, since Mipiboshet was only an honorific appellation that David used for his teacher there would be no prohibition.

The Tzlach⁶ proposes that the prohibition is limited to one's Rebbi Muvhak (eminent Rebbi). Therefore, since we know that Mipiboshes was not David's Rebbi Muvhak, there existed no prohibition for David to address him by his name. ■

1 סנהדרין ק. ונפק בשו"ע יו"ד סי' רמב סט"ו 2 יו"ד סי' רמב סט"ו ע"פ רש"י בסנהדרין שם ע"י כס"מ (פ"ה מהל' ת"ת הי"ה)
3 שם ס"ק כד 4 ע"י בפת"ש שם (ס"ק ז) שיש חולקים וכן ראה בברכ"י שם (אות ז) ע"י בעינים למשפט שיש להקשות מכאן על הש"ך 5 דרוש טו בשם רבותיו. וע"י בעינים למשפט. 6 כאן. וראה בשדי חמד (כללים מע"י כ"י כלל קד"ה ובעיקר) ובמאור ישראל כאן ע"פ תוסי' (יבמות ז:)

■ Gemara Gem

כל האומר תהלה לדוד בכל יום שלש פעמים מובטח לו שהוא בן העולם הבא

The Power of Ashrei

Rashi summarizes and says that the great benefit of Tehillim 145 (commonly referred to as Ashrei), is that it is written using a format following the entire alef-bais, and that it features a statement of Hashem providing sustenance for all living creatures (verse 16 - פותח את ידך וגו' .).

The Gr"א points out that the reason why this chapter is specifically chosen, and not Mizmor 111, which also contains both of these features, is that in 111:5, the verse simply says that Hashem provides food for all that fear Him (טרף נתן ליראי). In Ashrei, however, the verse indicates that *all* creatures receive their sustenance, unconditionally. The verse does not limit this aspect of Hashem's benevolence to only those who fear Him. This distinction also provides an explanation why Tehillim 34 (לדוד בשנתו) is not said daily, although it is also structured according to the alef-bais, and it also features a verse referring to food (כי אין מחסור ליראיו...ודרשי ה' לא יחסרו כל טוב). Again, the emphasis there is that Hashem guides those who fear Him with an added measure of care, while in Ashrei the focus is on Hashem's overall supervision of all His creatures.

This, accounts for why within Ashrei itself the verse of פותח את ידך וגו' (v.15), and not the previous verse (v.14) of עיני כל אליך ישברו. In this

■ Stories off the Daf

למד לשונך לומר איני יודע

Know when to say, "I don't know."

Someone once asked the Chazon Ish how we are to understand this Gemara. After all, if a person knows the answer to a question, or if he is aware of the details of a situation, and he tells others who ask him that he does not know anything about it, this is an outright lie. The Gemara surely is not advocating that one lie. On the other hand, perhaps the Gemara is

discussing a person who does not know about the information being asked, and he truthfully states outright that he does not know about it. Yet, in this case, it hardly seems insightful for the Gemara to tell us that a person should admit that he is not familiar with something, rather than to offer advice or information which is wrong or unreliable.

The Chazon Ish explained that, in fact, we are talking about someone who really does not know the answer to what is being asked. However, it is

common in such cases for people to offer their impressions and their general feelings about the information being asked. It is in this case that the Gemara teaches that it is better to be clear and truthful and to say, "I do not know", rather than to give personal opinions instead of fact. It is not proper when the speaker leads the questioner to believe that the information may be factual, when it is indeed only an assumption on the behalf of the speaker. ■

■ Review and Remember

- 1. What are the reasons Moshe Rabbeinu used the term כחצות ?
_____.
- 2. What activities was Dovid HaMelech involved in that made him a חסיד ?
_____.
- 3. Why in reference to קריאת שמע של ערבית did Chazal say that one who violates a דרבנן is liable to death?
_____.
- 4. Why is אשרי considered to be such a valuable perek of Tehillim?
_____.

earlier verse, the promise of sustenance is targeted and specifically aimed *only* at "all who look to You with hope."

The unique feature which we wish to highlight in Ashrei is Hashem's unlimited and complete supervision and care for *all* creatures. This is the theme found in verse 15, and this is why the halacha requires that one concentrate fully as it is recited. ■