



OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Reward for mitzvos (cont.)

A verse is cited which Chazal state refers to R' Tzadok and his friends. The story of R' Tzadok is presented.

Another related story is recorded.

Rava formulates a challenge against the first Mishnah in Peah to R' Nachman.

After the Gemara unsuccessfully attempts to answer the question Rava resolves the contradiction.

A Baraisa is cited that discusses reward for performing mitzvos and the consequences for good or bad thoughts.

The assertion that one is not punished for thinking about a sin is challenged and the Gemara answers that it is only for the sin of idolatry that one is punished for the thought of the sin.

Another exposition for one of the pesukin cited earlier is presented.

2) Sin

R' Avahu in the name of R' Chanina discusses sins that are committed in private.

R' Ilai the Elder offers advice for one who feels that he cannot overcome his evil inclination.

This teaching is unsuccessfully challenged.

The severity of the sin of desecrating Hashem's name is discussed.

Two more related Beraisos are presented.

3) MISHNAH: The Mishnah addresses the value of living a life that includes Torah study and ethical behavior, and the evil of one who does not possess these traits.

4) The righteous and the wicked

A Baraisa is cited that presents parables to describe the righteous and the wicked.

The Gemara records a discussion amongst Tannaim whether learning is greater or the performance of mitzvos.

A Baraisa stresses the importance of Torah study.

A detail in that Baraisa is clarified.

The Gemara continues to cite and comment about this Baraisa.

5) One who does not study or practice ethical behavior

R' Yochanan asserts that one who does not study or practice ethical behavior is disqualified from giving testimony.

A Baraisa discusses eating in the street.

R' Idi bar Avin rules like the opinion who disqualifies a person who eats in the market from testifying in court. ■

Gemara GEM

Planning to do a mitzvah

מחשבה טובה הקב"ה מצרפה לטובה וכו' אפילו חשב אדם לעשות מצוה ונאנס ולא עשה

R' Meir Simcha of Dvinsk writes in Meshech Chochmah (Shemos 12:13) that our Gemara cannot be telling us that if a person merely thinks about doing a mitzvah, but he never actually does it, that he gets full credit as if he had succeeded in performing the mitzvah. It is simply not reasonable that the Gemara is declaring that thinking is as good as doing. Rather, the Gemara is telling us that once a person not only plans, but also follows through and succeeds in fulfilling a mitzvah, that Hashem will reward the person for his efforts and planning as well as for his actions. It is as if the person then receives reward for having done the mitzvah twice. This is what the Gemara means by saying that the reward for the planning stage is added on and attached (מצרפה) to the reward of actually doing the mitzvah.

Meshech Chochmah adds that it seems from the comment of Rashi to our Gemara that a person receives reward even if he did not actually do the mitzvah. Yet, Meshech Chochmah (and עין יעקב in עץ יוסף) explains that this must mean that when a person decides definitely to do the mitzvah, and he had resolved how it will be done, but then circumstances cause him to fail to complete his mission, in this case the person is credited for his efforts, even though they fell short of success. The person had all the thoughts and made all the efforts he could possibly have extended. In this case he is given credit for doing all that he could have done. This is what is meant in the Gemara when it says that the person receives reward when he is compelled (נאנס ולא עשה) and is not able to finish the job.

(Continued on page 2)

REVIEW and Remember

1. How did R' Kahana successfully negotiate for a chest full of money from Eliyahu Hanavi?
2. Explain מחשבה טובה מצרפה למעשה.
3. What causes a person to lose the reward he deserved for his performance of mitzvos?
4. Why is Torah study considered more valuable than the performance of mitzvos?

HALACHAH Highlight

Eating in the marketplace

האוכל בשוק הרי זה דומה לכלב ויש אומרים פסול לעדות

One who eats in the marketplace is like a dog and some say he becomes disqualified from giving testimony

Tosafos¹ maintains that only a person who eats bread in the marketplace is compared to a dog and disqualified from testifying, but a person who eats fruit does not fall into the category discussed in the Gemara. Other Rishonim disagree and maintain that even a person who eats fruit in the marketplace is disqualified from testifying. Kesef Mishnah² writes that Rambam's opinion on the matter is not conclusive but it is certain that it is not praiseworthy (אינו שבח) for a Torah scholar to eat even fruit in the marketplace.

Teshuvos Siach Yitzchok³ expresses uncertainty whether Shulchan Aruch's ruling that someone who eats in the marketplace is disqualified to testify applies to drinking since we find many instances where drinking is considered the same as eating. After suggesting and rejecting one possible proof that drinking in the marketplace does not disqualify a person from testifying, he notes that according to Tosafos who maintains that one is disqualified from testifying only if he eats bread it is clear that one who drinks (with the possible exception of wine) in the marketplace will not become disqualified.

A related question raised by Teshuvos Siach Yitzchok is whether a person who eats in the marketplace at night when others

(Insight. Continued from page 1)

Ben Yehoyada goes a step further. The Gemara says that Hashem considers a person worthy of reward even when he thinks about doing a mitzvah (חשב אדם לעשות מצוה). This means that once a person's mind set is determined to do a mitzvah, it is as if he has taken an oath to commit himself, he is seen as having fulfilled his goal, even if he is forced to fall short of success. This suggests that the person is already credited for the mitzvah even if he had not yet come up with a practical approach of how to implement his objective, and this is unlike the opinion of ר' יוסף who explained that a person's intent is only seen as worthy of reward once he not only thinks about what to do, but he must also have a practical plan regarding how to actually perform the mitzvah. ■

ers will not be able to see him becomes disqualified from testifying. Is the disqualification related to others' being able to see him eat and thus at night it would not be an issue or perhaps the act of eating in the marketplace, in and of itself, disqualifies a person from testifying regardless of whether others could see him. A practical example would be a person who, on the night of Bedikas Chometz, wants to eat outside near the street to avoid the possibility of dropping crumbs in his house. Another related question is mentioned in Sefer Derech Sichah⁴. He cites Rav Chaim Kanievsky's uncertainty whether eating on a public bus is considered the same as eating in the marketplace. ■

1. תוס' ד"ה ויש אומרים.
2. כסף משנה פי"א מהל' עדות ה"ה.
3. שו"ת שיח יצחק סי' תע"ט.
4. ספר דרך שיחה עמ' תקכ"ז. ■

STORIES Off the Daf

"A person planned to do a Mitzvah..."

"חשב אדם לעשות מצוה ונאנס..."

A certain man had good cause to rejoice: his wife had given birth to a baby boy. He arranged everything for the bris which would take place on the eighth day and even traveled to nearby Lublin to invite the Chozeh of Lublin, ז"ל, to be the sandek. The Chozeh graciously agreed, and everything was set.

On the day of the bris which was called for early afternoon, the family and friends slowly gathered in the appointed place to wait for the great event. Unfortunately, when the time came, the Chozeh had not yet arrived. Since the father really yearned for the Chozeh to be the sandek, he decided to wait.

When, after an hour, there was still no sign of the Chozeh, the family began to get worried. It was a winter day and the sun would set early. After another short while of anxious waiting, they finally decided to do the bris without the Chozeh.

Just as they were about to wash for the seudah a little over a quarter of an hour before sunset, the Chozeh finally arrived. The family requested his presence at the seudah and sat him at the head of the table. During the seudah, they noticed something very strange. It seemed that the Chozeh was much more joyous than he appeared during a bris when he had actually been the sandek. This infectious happiness lifted up the mood of the all of the attendees, and they expressed their happiness with enthusiastic singing and Torah.

After the bris, someone asked the Chozeh why he was so joyous—he had not even attended the actual bris.

He answered, "I am so happy because, in a way, not having made it to be the sandek is better than being sandek. Since the custom is to only choose a truly great person to be sandek, one who is blessed with this distinction must fight thoughts of arrogance which can impinge his joy. However, if one planned to do a mitzvah and was prevented against his will, Hashem views this as if he had done the mitzvah anyway.

The Chozeh concluded, "Surely no hubris can be felt by someone who missed doing the mitzvah! Yet Hashem views it as if it was done. This means Hashem views it as if he had done it with perfect connection and focus. It is as if I have merited to do a mitzvah with completion and humility—shouldn't I be filled with ecstasy and joy?"¹ ■

1. נפלאות הרבי, עמוד מ'