For the master said, there is nothing, etc. – דאמר מר אין לך דבר כולי

OVERVIEW

מרבא asked that we cannot fault the עדים for signing falsely under duress (of the loss of life) for יוחנן states that only in three instances must one forfeit his life to avoid transgressing an עבירה. It would seem that רבא agrees to this ruling. points out that it is not necessarily so¹.

- פירוש 2 אפילו למאן דמחמיר לא מחמיר אלא בהנך

The explanation in citing this ruling is to be understood as follows; even according to the more stringent view in these matters, he is not stringent concerning all commandments (that one must give up his life so as not to transgress any commandment), but rather only in these commandments of ע"ז ג"ע is one obligated to be מוסר נפש be ושפ"ד.

תוספות explains why we must interpret the citation in this manner, and not simply that רבא is citing a ruling (להלכה):

רבא גופיה קסבר דאפילו בהני אינו חייב למסור עצמו בצינעא - דרבא גופיה קסבר דאפילו בהני אינו חייב למסור עצמו בצינעא, one is not obligated to give up his life if it is done privately as רבא states it –

- במסכת עבודה זרה בפרק רבי ישמעאל (דף נד, א ושם) ואין חילוק בין הנך לשאר there is no difference between in במסכת נפש and according to רבא there is no difference between these three to the rest of the nixn; in private there is never an obligation for מסירת נפש –

ובפרהסיא⁴ בכולהו יהרג ולא יעבור:

And in public, by all מצות one should rather allow himself to be killed and not transgress any מצוה. Therefore when רבא is citing this statement it cannot be להלכה; but rather he is saying even the strictest opinion does not require יהרג ואל יעבר for signing falsely on a שטר.

 $^{^{1}}$ See, however, תוספות ע"ז נד,א ד"ה הא.

² The term 'פירוש' (or רש"י (or רש"י (or רש"י) [usually] denotes a departing from the simple understanding of the text; namely that רבא agrees to this ruling.

³ From the simple reading of חוספות it appears that according to דבא the rule is שפיכת דמים (even) by שפיכת דמים. However, elsewhere (פסחים כה,ב) we find that רבא rules regarding שפיכת דמים that יעבר, giving the reason of מאי חזית דדמא דידך סומק טפי, which would seem to apply to a case of נצ"ב. פרהסיא as well as צ"ב. פרהסיא.

 $^{^4}$ תוספות is explaining that we cannot say that אין לך דבר וכו' אלא ע"ז וכו' אמר מר states this אין לך דבר וכו' אלא ע"ז וכו' אמר מר מר states this אמר מר המיא he is discussing a case of פרהסיא for then the ruling is that יהרג ואל יעבור by all the מצות not only these three. See 'Thinking it over'.

SUMMARY

There is a dispute whether the three עבירות are singled out for יהרג ואל יעבר פעפח (ר"י), or whether all עבירות are the same; there is no יהרג ואל יעבר בצנעא only if it is בפרהסיא (רבא).

THINKING IT OVER

If רבא maintains that בפרהסיא, the rule is יהרג ואל יעבר by all עבירות, 5 then what is his question; perhaps they were forced to sign the שטר בפרהסיא?

_

⁵ See footnote # 4.

⁶ See מהרש"א.