

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) R' Elazar ben Parta and R' Chanina ben Teradyon (cont.)

The Gemara explains why R' Chanina ben Teradyon, his wife and daughter were deserving of their respective punishment.

The reactions of R' Chanina ben Teradyon and his family as they were being taken for execution are recorded.

An elaborate description of R' Chanina ben Teradyon's execution is presented.

The story of R' Meir's plan to save R' Chanina ben Teradyon's daughter is retold.

2) Stadiums

A Baraisa teaches that one should not even visit a stadium since it is a gathering of scoffers.

Another Baraisa teaches that it is permitted.

The Gemara answers that the issue is indeed subject to a dispute between Tannaim.

A Baraisa presents two opinions regarding the permissibility of going to theaters and circuses.

R' Chanina of Sura identifies the difference between these two positions.

3) Scoffers

R' Shimon ben Pazi expounds the first couple of pesukim in Tehillim as it relates to scoffers.

Consequences of scoffing are presented.

Additional expositions that relate to arrogance, scoffing and attending entertainment venues of pagans are recorded. ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. Why was the daughter of R' Chanina ben Teradyon sentenced to dwell in a house of prostitutes?

2. Who was Beruria's father?

3. What is the prohibition against going to stadiums?

4. What are the consequences for scoffing?

Distinctive INSIGHT

Joining the wicked, standing with sinners, and sitting with scoffers

וכי מאחר שלא הלך היכן עמד וכו'

The Gemara cited the verse in Tehillim (1:1-2) which lauds a man "who does not go in the counsel of the wicked," and, instead, "whose desire is in the Torah of Hashem."

The Gemara now refers to a comment of R' Shimon b. Pazi who analyzed this verse and presented a powerful lesson. The verse praises a person who first of all does not go to a group of the wicked. Furthermore, the verse lauds this person for not standing with sinners, and he does not sit with scoffers. Maharsha explains that the question of R' Shimon b. Pazi is that if this person cares and does not even go to where the wicked are found, how can the verse continue to speak of his not standing or sitting with them? There does not seem to be any additional praise due to one who will avoid sin and not develop cynicism if he astutely remains distant from these influences in the first place. What, then, he asks, is the way to understand this verse?

R' Shimon explains that, in fact, the verse is not adding extra praise to this person, but it is informing us that had this person simply gone to join with the wicked, even to briefly be with them, the nature of the situation is that he would have ultimately stood with them, and he would have then sat with them. The wisdom of the Torah informs us that even minimal exposure to such influences invariably leads to dangerous and devastating results.

The ר"א, in his commentary to Ein Yaakov, explains that the verse deals with three distinct groups - the wicked, sinners, and scoffers. The question of the Gemara must be understood, because the verse is not necessarily speaking about staying away from one group in successive terms. The verse may be praising who does not go to the wicked, one who also does not stand with sinners and he additionally does not sit with scoffers. Alternatively, the verse may be addressing three different people. One is praised for not joining the wicked, another for not standing with sinners, and a third for not sitting with scoffers. Either way, there is not necessarily any repetition or redundancy here.

He answers that if the verse was speaking to one person, it would have been worded differently and used the word "ואשר" in introducing each phrase. Furthermore, the verse joins the descriptions of the wicked and sinners, and it can be read in one grouping, saying, "Fortunate is the person who does not go to the wicked and with the sinners." Therefore, the question and the comment of R' Shimon b. Pazi is

HALACHAH Highlight

Women and the principle of arvus

ועל אשתו להריגה דלא מיחה ביה

And his wife was sentenced to death because she did not protest against him

Mahari Algazi¹ questions how R' Chanina ben Teradyon's wife could be held accountable for not protesting her husband's behavior. Rosh² writes that women are not included in the principle of ערבות – communal responsibility for men. The obligation to protest someone else's behavior stems from the principle of ערבות. Therefore, if women are not included in the principle of ערבות, R' Chanina ben Teradyon's wife should not have been held accountable for not protesting her husband's behavior. He answers that even though women are not included in the principle of ערבות they are nevertheless Rabbinically obligated to protest. The basis of this obligation is the Gemara in Berachos (31b) that teaches that one who witnesses his friend behaving in an improper manner (דבר שאינו הגון) is obligated to rebuke that person. Tosafos³ explains that although behaving in an improper manner does not constitute a Biblical prohibition, nevertheless, there is an obligation to protest. Similarly, R' Chanina ben Teradyon's wife was punished for not protesting since even women must protest when they see a דבר שאינו הגון. Another resolution to this question is based on Teshuvos R' Akiva Eiger⁴. R' Akiva Eiger maintains that women are in-

(Insight...continued from page 1)

well founded based upon a careful analysis of the verse itself.

The extension of the verse teaches that if someone tosses caution to the wind and joins these groups, this in and of itself demonstrates that his desire is not with the Torah of Hashem. ■

cluded in the principle of ערבות for those mitzvos they are obligated to observe. As such since women are also prohibited from uttering the name of Hashem in public she was obligated to protest her husband's behavior.

Chasam Sofer also asks, how it is possible for R' Chanina ben Teradyon's wife to be held accountable for her husband's behavior. First of all did she have the wherewithal to protest? Furthermore, even if she did argue with him concerning the permissibility of uttering Hashem's Name for the purpose of studying, who says that he would be expected to listen to her? He therefore suggests that R' Chanina ben Teradyon's wife was held accountable for her daughter's improper behavior. Accordingly, it is understandable why R' Chanina ben Teradyon's wife was punished since she does bear the burden of ערבות for her daughter, a fellow woman. ■

1. ספר שמע יעקב פ' ויצא ומובא דבריו בשערים מצויינים בהלכה לסוגיין.
2. רא"ש ברכות פ"ג ס"י י"ג.
3. תוס' ברכות ל"א: ד"ה דבר שאינו הגון.
4. שו"ת רעק"א ס"ז ז'.
5. דרשות חת"ס ח"ב דף שפ"א. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

The Inevitable Decline

"ואם עמד סופו לישב..."

Rav Shalom Shwadron, zt"l, once offered a very vivid explanation of a statement on today's daf. "The verse states: 'אשרי האיש אשר לא הלך בעצת רשעים ובדרך חטאים' — 'Fortunate is he who did not walk in the council of the wicked, who did not stand in the way of sinners, and did not sit in a convocation of scoffers.' Our sages explain that the three words used in the verse הלך, עמד, and ישב, teach that one who goes in negative paths will eventually stand in them, and one who stands will eventually settle in them.

"This verse is not talking about wicked people who act out every bad impulse that they feel in their hearts. It discusses a potentially wicked person. These people ob-

serve Torah and mitzvos but do nothing to change the bad character traits that are part of the natural human condition. Since they have not made efforts to eradicate the bad, they will slowly but surely be drawn to evil until they become wicked in action too. The verse exhorts us not to be like these people. It is incumbent on us not to go in their ways."

He continued, "For example, one who feels great internal resistance to giving charity will set up a gemach to assuage his guilty conscience. Or he will be careful to attend funerals and comfort mourners. He will invest time and energy in every mitzvah project, as long as it is not that which is hardest for him.

"Or in the case of a glutton who knows that it is wrong to overeat; this person will suddenly become a huge machmir regarding oneg Shabbos. He will eat every delicacy supposedly for the honor of Shabbos, but this is really just a way to start

going on the path of the wicked man who always indulges himself. His inconsistency regarding other mitzvos makes his weakness obvious, since he spends as little as he can get away with on anything unrelated to appeasing his own appetites.

"Take another case: when I told a certain person that he really should check his very old tefillin, he was puzzled and said, 'I cannot understand what the rav wants from me. After all, these were my grandfather's tefillin.'

"I responded immediately and explained the foolishness of this assertion. 'Would you then wear your grandfather's worn-out shoes too?' Anyone who follows such paths will be inexorably drawn further and further along, until he too will sit in a, 'convocation of scoffers.' He will sit with one leg draped over the other and laugh at Torah scholars who seem unnecessarily strict in his eyes..."¹ ■

1. לב שלום, ח"א, ע"י ל"ח. ■