

OVERVIEW of the Daf

1) Koresh (cont.)

R' Kahana unsuccessfully challenges R' Yitzchok's assertion that Koresh became debauched.

At the conclusion of the above challenge the Gemara states that a Jew earns reward if he donates to charity even if he does so with ulterior motives, but a non-Jew does not.

Three more proofs are proffered that Koresh eventually became evil. Each proof is unsuccessfully challenged.

2) The New Year for the festivals

R' Chisda explains how the language of the Mishnah is consistent with the fact that the New Year for festivals actually begins on the fifteenth of Nisan.

The significance of this New Year is for determining when one is in violation of delaying a vow to bring a voluntary offering, according to R' Shimon's opinion.

3) בל תאחר

A Beraisa records five different opinions concerning the time frame of when a person is in violation of delaying a vow to bring a voluntary offering—בל תאחר.

The rationale behind each opinion is explained

The Gemara explains how the different Tannaim explain the different verses cited by the other opinions.

As a side note to the above discussion, the Gemara cites the teaching of R' Elazar in the name of R' Oshaya, that one who did not bring a Korban Chagigah on Shavuos has an additional six days in which to offer the Korban.

The Gemara explains how we derive this halachah from the juxtaposition of Shavuos to Pesach, and proceeds to explain what is derived from the juxtaposition between

Distinctive INSIGHT

The time frame for paying tzedakah pledges

תנו רבנן... צדקות... כיון שעברו עליהן שלשה רגלים עובר בבל תאחר

Tosafos (ד"ה צדקות ומעשרות) contrasts the words of the Baraisa with a statement of Rava, which appear later (6a). The Baraisa here states that a person is not liable for delaying paying his pledge to tzedakah until the passage of three festivals. Rava offers his comment in reference to the Beraisa which teaches that the word בפיך refers to a pledge of צדקה which must be redeemed. Rava declares that the time frame to pay one's pledge to tzedakah and to distribute the money or supplies to the poor is לאתרו—immediately. How can these statements be reconciled? Tosafos explains that Rava teaches us that if the poor person is standing and waiting for the tzedakah which was promised, the giver is obligated to give the money to him immediately. The Mishnah, however, rules that if the poor or needy individual is not present, the person who committed himself to give tzedakah is not held liable for neglecting to give his money to a worthy cause until three festivals have passed. As the deadline approaches, the giver would actually have to seek out a poor person in order to fulfill his pledge.

Rashba proposes a different approach to resolve these two differing guidelines regarding tzedakah. The Baraisa is defining the parameters of לא תעשה of בל תאחר. This negative commandment is violated when a pledge is not redeemed once three festivals have transpired. The statement of Rava, however, is speaking about the positive commandment of מוצא שפתיך תשמור ועשית, which teaches that a person must heed his words and bring them to fruition. This mitzvah is in effect with the arrival of the first festival which occurs, as a person is expected to expedite and complete his mission to offer any offering or promise which he pronounces. Nonetheless, the negative commandment is not in effect until after three festivals. (This suggestion is mentioned by Tosafos, who rejects it, but Rashba deals with the objections raised by Tosafos.) ■

REVIEW and Remember

1. Does a non-Jew receive credit for charity given with ulterior motives?

2. Does the New Year for festivals begin on the first of Nisan?

3. What are the five opinions as to when בל תאחר is violated?

4. How do we know that there are seven days to offer the Korban Chagigah on Shavuos rather than eight?

*Today's Daf Digest is dedicated in memory of
 Rabbi Sholom Sklar ז"ר
 A founding member of our
 Beis Medrash on the west side*

HALACHAH Highlight

Accepting tzedakah from non-Jews

ומאן דעבד הכי לאו מעליותא היא והתניא האומר סלע זו לצדקה בשביל שיחיו בני...הרי זה צדיק גמור? לא קשיא כאן בישראל כאן בעובדי כוכבים

And doesn't one who acts in this [self-serving fashion] do something praiseworthy? Doesn't the Beraisa teach: One who declares, "This sela is for tzedakah so that my son should live"... He is completely righteous? There is no difficulty, there we are dealing with a Jew and here we are dealing with a non-Jew.

Shulchan Aruch¹ prohibits one from accepting tzedakah from a non-Jew. According to some opinions² this restriction applies only when receiving the money in public (פרהסיא), but in private it would be permitted. According to others³ it is prohibited to accept tzedakah from non-Jews even in private. The reason for the dispute relates to the rationale behind the prohibition. According to one approach the concern is causing a chillul Hashem – a desecration of Hashem's name. It is considered disgraceful if a Jew is forced to accept charity from a non-Jew. In private, however,

there is no public disgrace and thus it is permitted. According to the second position the concern is that accepting tzedakah from non-Jews generates for them more merit and their reign over us will only be broken once their merit has been exhausted. Therefore, it is prohibited to accept tzedakah even in private because it will still generate for them the same merit.

Teshuvos Chessed L'Avrohom⁴ writes that the interdiction against accepting tzedakah from non-Jews applies only when it is given without self-serving motivation, but if the tzedakah is given out of self-serving motivation, e.g. so that his son will live. In this case it is permitted to accept a tzedakah donation from a non-Jew. The reason for this distinction is the statement of our Gemara that tzedakah given out of self-serving motivation generates merit only for Jews and not for non-Jews. Rav Shmuel HaLevi Vosner⁵, the Shevet HaLevi, strongly disagrees with this assertion and maintains that even when the tzedakah is given out of self-serving motivation it is still prohibited. ■

1. שו"ע יו"ד סי' רנ"ד סי' א'
2. ע' ט"ז וש"ך שם סק"א
3. ע' ספר צדקה ומשפט מה"ר יעקב ישעיה בלויא פ"א הע' ס"ז
4. שו"ת חסד לאברהם תנינא יו"ד ע' נ"ח ומובא דבריו בשו"ת שבט הלוי המובא לקמן
5. שו"ת שבט הלוי ח"ה סי' קמ"א אות ב' ■

STORIES Off the Daf

Completely righteous

האומר סלע זו לצדקה בשביל שיחיו בני...הרי זה צדיק גמור

Rav Yaakov, the Novominsker Rebbe, zt"l, was on very good terms with all of the gedolim of his time, both Chassidische and Litvishe. Once, Rav Yosef Dov Soleveitchik, zt"l, the famous Beis HaLevi, spent a summer in Novominsk. When he met the Rebbe, he posed the following question:

"The Beraisa states that one who says gives a sela (a certain weight in gold) to charity on condition that his children live long lives is a complete

tzaddik. Why should we consider one who gives money in this way to be absolutely righteous? One would think that a really righteous person would give charity for the sake of the mitzvah alone, or perhaps as a means of overcoming his natural tendency to cruel indifference. Why, then, is one who acts with ulterior motives considered completely righteous?"

The Rebbe replied, "The first thing on one's mind when giving charity is to atone for one's sins. We see this from the verse, 'Redeem your sin with charity.' (Daniel 4:24) One who has a child whose life is threatened will naturally try to use the merit of the mitzvah to clear up his sins as well as heal his son, especially since his sins are very likely the

cause of his child's illness. It is only the person who knows for certain that he has already fully repented and has a perfectly clean slate who will 'assign' the merit of his charity in this world purely for his child's speedy recovery. This is the type of person that the Gemara calls a complete tzaddik."

When the Gaon of Vilna, zt"l, was asked this question, however, he explained that the printer had simply made a technical error. The original manuscript had appeared with an abbreviation of צ"ג. The printer mistakenly thought that this should be rendered as צדיק גמור. The Gaon maintained that the abbreviation should have been rendered as צדקה גמורה instead! ■