

INTERNET PARSHA SHEET
ON BEREISHIS - 5759

B'S'D'

Compiled by Rabbi Yaakov Asher Sinclair General Editor: Rabbi Moshe Newman Production
Design: Eli Ballon Prepared by the Jewish Learning Exchange of Ohr Somayach International 22
Shimon Hatzadik Street, POB 18103 Jerusalem 91180, Israel Tel: 972-2-581-0315 Fax:
972-2-581-2890 E-Mail: info@ohr.org.il Home Page: http://www.ohr.org.il
parasha-qa@virtual.co.il Parsha Q&A www.ohr.org.il/qa

To receive these Parsha sheets by e-mail, contact crshulman@aol.com and cshulman@cahill.com
To subscribe to individual lists see http://www - torah.org virtual.co.il shamash.org
shemayisrael.co.il jewishamerica.com ou.org/lists youngisrael.org & 613.org

Recommended Reading List Ramban 1:1 The Need for
Bereishis 1:14 The Sun and the Moon 1:26 Man 1:29 Vegetarianism
2:3 Shabbos 2:20 Names 3:16 Punishment of Chava 5:4 Length of
Life Sforno 2:3 The Blessing of Shabbos 2:25 Naked and
Unashamed 3:17 The Curse of Work 4:26 Calling Out in Hashem's Name
5:1 The Image of Hashem 6:8 Noah Rashbam 1:27 What's
Missing? 2:23 The Birth of Chava ... Written and Compiled by Rabbi Reuven
Subar Prepared by the Jewish Learning Exchange of Ohr Somayach

ohr-weekly@virtual.co.il Torah Weekly - Bereishis
http://www.ohr.org.il/tw/5759/Bereishi/Bereishi.htm

On And On "In the beginning..." (1:1) Life is like a film. When we watch a film, we're not watching a homogeneous whole, we're watching hundreds of individual pictures. The "magic" of the cinema is based on a peculiarity of the human brain. When presented with separate images in rapid succession, the brain ceases to discern them as separate images, rather it links them all together. This is called the persistence of vision. The result is the illusion of movement -- motion pictures. Our eyes and brain retain a visual impression for about 1/30th of a second (the exact time depends on the brightness of the image.) Persistence of vision accounts for our failure to notice that a motion picture screen is dark about half the time, and that a television image is just one bright, fast, little dot sweeping the screen. Motion pictures show one new frame every 1/24th of a second. Each frame is shown three times during this period. The eye retains the image of each frame long enough to give us the illusion of smooth motion. Someone once said that "life is a movie." I doubt they realized the truth of their words. Life is like a movie because, like a movie, life is an illusion of continuity. G-d didn't just create the world once. He re-creates it every split second. That's what our Sages mean when they say that G-d "renews the creation every day." Every second is a separate and distinct creation. It just looks like a continuous whole. When a craftsman makes an artifact, from the moment of its completion that artifact becomes independent of its creator. Not so the Creation. Even though G-d finished the Creation in seven days, it still needs His support. If for one second G-d would remove his attention from Creation, it would return to nothingness. From the beginning of the world to this very day, G-d's statement "In the beginning" goes on and on, re-created over and over again.

Credit Where It's Due "Yet your longing will be for your husband, and he shall rule over you" (3:16) There once was a thief who stole a credit card from a wealthy woman. The card actually belonged to her husband. After a few days, the thief was surprised to find that no one had put a stop on the card. The months came and went and he was able to run up extremely large sums. Eventually he was caught on another offense and when he was searched the stolen credit card was found. The credit card company obviously wanted to know why no one had reported the theft of the card. They contacted the husband and asked him why he had not reported its theft to the police. "I decided not to report it" said the husband "when I saw that the thief was spending less than my wife." The Talmud (Bava Metzia 59a) tells us that when a husband honors his wife, it bodes well for the state of his bank account -- he will become rich. If you think about it, the reverse should be true. Honoring one's spouse with one's credit card is unlikely to be a harbinger of wealth to come. G-d, however, always rewards us measure for measure. When a husband honors his wife, he lightens the curse that was decreed on her at the time of the sin of Adam and Chava "he shall rule over you." The Torah views man's domination of woman as a curse, something to be avoided. Just as no one walks barefoot in the forest in order to help the snake fulfill its curse of "you will bite his heel," so must a husband strive to avoid being the cause of the curse "he shall rule over you." So, when a husband lightens his wife's curse by not behaving like a despot, Hashem also lightens his punishment -- "by the sweat of your brow, you shall eat bread." Instead of having to work hard for a living, Hashem sends him riches, lightening the amount of sweat it takes to put bread on the table...and his credit card remains without a dent.

Sources: On And On - Mayana shel Torah Credit Where It's Due -
Rabbi Mordechai Druck, heard from Rabbi Calev Gestetner Written and

ravfrand@torah.org "RavFrاند" List - Rabbi Frاند on Parshas Bereishis
These divrei Torah were adapted from the hashkafa portion of Rabbi Yissocher Frاند's Commuter
Chavrusah Tapes on the weekly portion: Tape # 164, Weddings In Shuls? Is this a Problem? Good
Shabbos!

When Do We Say 'It Was Good' About Division? The Medrash points out that on the second day of Creation, the Torah does not use the expression "Ki Tov" (It was good). On all the other days of Creation, the Torah says that "G-d saw that it was good". However, the Torah does not use this expression on the second day of Creation. The Medrash explains that on the second day, G-d made the firmament (rakiah) which divided between the waters above and the water below. This was the day when G-d introduced division (machlokes) into the world. Therefore, G-d did not want to use the expression "It was good" regarding machlokes.

The Medrash continues, "If a machlokes which is for the establishment of the world is not 'good', certainly a machlokes which is not for such a lofty purpose, but rather is just to create disunity and arguments, is not good".

There seems to be one obvious problem with this Medrash. This was neither the only nor the first division during Creation. Another division was created on the first day of creation. "And G-d divided between the Light and the Dark" [Bereishis 1:4]. So G-d made machlokes on the first day as well. He separated between light and darkness. And despite the division, it does say "And G-d saw that it was good (ki tov)".

Rav Shlomo Breur, zt"l, explains that this Medrash is telling us an important and recurring concept. The prophet says, "And Truth and Peace You shall love" [Zecharia 8:19]. We must love, cherish, and pursue two different principles. We must pursue Peace, but we must also pursue Truth. And, Truth is not secondary -- "Truth and Peace You shall love" -- Truth precedes Peace. We want Peace at almost any cost. But there is a price we are not willing to pay. We can never compromise the Truth. When Peace and Truth come into conflict with each other, our Sages tell us to pick Truth, because the Peace of a perverted Truth is not a Peace that we want.

The last Mishna in the Talmud [Uktzin 3:12] says that "G-d did not find a receptacle as appropriate for holding blessing as the receptacle of Peace". Rav Breur points out that Peace is referred to as a receptacle (keli). If one does not have a receptacle to hold his blessing, he is left with nothing. But one must realize that Peace is a vessel to hold something. That which we are left holding must be worthwhile. "Truth and Peace You Shall Love." Peace -- Yes; but only together with Truth. On the second day, G-d divided the upper and the lower waters. This was not a case of good water and bad water; of True water and False water. This was a case of making a division between two equally valid components. Regarding such division we do not say, "It was good". This was an unfortunate division. A division was necessary, but there is no 'ki tov' on that day because conceptually there is no reason to have machlokes between 'water' and 'water'. But the first day was different. On the first day, the division was between Light and Dark (Or v'Choshech). By analogy, this represents separation between Truth and Falsehood, between the forces of Good and the forces of Evil. There we must divide. We must delineate. We must say this is Light and this is Dark; This is True and this is False. This is a machlokes, but it is a machlokes that warrants a 'Ki Tov'. It is a necessary machlokes -- a division that must be made. Sometimes we question, why would it not be better to have

peace? Is it not much better to have unity? Why do we sometimes need to create what seems to be machlokes? The answer is "Truth and Peace You shall love". Love and pursue peace, but make sure that truth is maintained together with the peace.

Why Do We Not Find 'It was Good' by Creation of Man? Later, concerning the creation of all the species, the Torah writes "And G-d saw that it was good". However when G-d creates Man we do not find this expression. There is no 'Ki Tov' by the creation of Adam. The insect gets a 'Ki Tov'. The elephant gets a 'Ki Tov'. Every creature gets 'Ki Tov'. But Man himself, formed in G-d's Own Image, the top of the pyramid, does not merit a 'Ki Tov'! The Sefer Halkrim by Rav Yosef Albo discusses this matter: When an insect is created, it is possible to say 'It is good'. When an apple tree is created, it is possible to say 'It is good'. Concerning every creation in the world it is possible to say 'It is good'. The reason why that when an elephant is created it has reached perfection. We do not expect anything more from that elephant. When an apple tree is created, it is perfect. We do not expect anything more from the apples. Everything is 'Good' as created, except for Man. However, regarding Man, it is not merely sufficient that he was created. That is only the beginning. He is far from perfect. We expect more from Man. We wait a lifetime for Man, because a Man has to grow. He has to reach his potential. The apple tree, the bird, and the insect have all reached their potential on day one. But Man is a vast bundle of potential that is waiting to grow, that is waiting to happen, that is waiting to blossom. We can not say 'Ki Tov' yet. Maybe we can say 'Ki Tov' after 120 years, when that potential is finally reached, but not on the day of Creation. The Talmud says [Berachos 17a] When the Rabbis used to take leave of each other, they gave themselves a blessing: "You should see your world in your lifetime" (Olamecha tireh b'chayecha). What do these words mean? What kind of blessing is this? I once heard a beautiful thought regarding this from Rav Shimon Schwab zt"l. Rav Schwab said the word 'Olamecha' ("your world") comes from the root he'elem (that which is hidden). He'elem is the word for potential. The blessing of "Olamecha tireh b'chayecha" was that they should be able to see their own potential in their lifetime. The blessing was "Let us be able to say on you a 'ki tov', to see in you the potential that every human being has". But this potential is never visible on day one. I once heard a similar thought in the name of Rav Shraga Feivel Mendlowitz, zt"l. When Adam ate from the Tree of Knowledge, G-d gave everyone a curse. G-d cursed the snake. G-d cursed Chava. But G-d said to Adam, "Because you listened to the voice of your wife and ate from the tree that I forbade you to eat from, the earth will be cursed because of you; with pain you will eat from it, all the days of your life." Rav Shraga Feivel asks, the curse seems to be directed to man -- that he would have to work hard to take food out from the earth. Why then does the Torah say that the earth will be cursed? Rav Shraga Feivel answers that the earth received the worst curse of all. If it is hard to take the fruits out from the land, the earth cannot see its potential. That is the worst curse. "I cannot give forth my fruits." To be unable to meet its potential, to have the potential but have it suppressed and inaccessible is an awesome curse. Inability to see one's potential is a curse for mankind as well. The blessing that we should hope for ourselves and for our children and grandchildren is "Olamecha tireh b'chayecha" -- we should see our potential in our own lifetime.

Sources and Personalities Rav Shlomo Breur -- (1850-1926) son-in-law of Rav Samson Raphael Hirsch and his successor in Frankfurt. Rav Yosef Albo -- 15th century, Spain. Author of Sefer Halkrim, [Book of Principles (of Faith)]. Rav Shimon Schwab -- (1908-1995) Rav of the 'Breur Kehilla' in Washington Heights, and previously the Rav of Shearith Israel Congregation, Baltimore, MD. Rav Shraga Feivel Mendlowitz -- (1886-1948); Influential Torah educator; Mesivta Torah Vodaath; New York. Transcribed by David Twersky; Seattle, Washington twerskyd@aol.com Technical Assistance by Dovid Hoffman; Yerushalayim dhoffman@torah.org Tapes or a complete catalogue can be ordered from the Yad Yechiel Institute, PO Box 511, Owings Mills MD 21117-0511. Call (410) 358-0416 for further information. Rabbi Yissocher Frand: In Print is available through the Project Genesis On-Line Bookstore: <http://books.torah.org/> RavFrand, Copyright (c) 1998 by Rabbi Y. Frand and Project Genesis, Inc. Project Genesis: Torah on the Information Superhighway learn@torah.org 6810 Park Heights Ave. <http://www.torah.org/> Baltimore, MD 21215

From: Rabbi Jonathan Schwartz jschwartz@ymail.yu.edu
Re: Young Israel of Jamaica Estates Internet Chabura -- Parshas Berashis(fwd)

Prologue: Rashi, (2:4 D'h Bhibaram) notes that the creation of the world was done with the letter heh. The miforshei Rashi ask what lesson is to be learned from the midrash? Maran Hagaon Harav Aaron Halevi Soloveitchik shlita (Warmth and the Light) notes that the lesson of Rashi is that man's nature is to search for ways to achieve personal fame. The identity of man is filled with his desire to show the world that he has impacted it and expanded it. This is symbolized by the Heh Hayediya (The letter Heh that serves as a noun marker in the hebrew language to denote importance). Thus, the creation of the world is never fully complete - Hamichadesh b'tuvo b'chol yom tamid maaseh berashis. Maran Hagaon Harav Hershel Schachter (Shiurei Chumash Berashis 5759) shlita expanded upon this point by noting the requirement of man to continually strive to improve the world by working the land, as per the commentary of the Ibn Ezra (2:3). Rav schachter cited the Chasam Sofer who noted that this obligation is not only limited to the physical expansion of the world, through limited toil, but through the labor of Torah as well. An individual has the obligation to be michadesh chiddushim but by building upon a solid knowledge of the Torah that exists before him (for a further expansion upon this theme see introduction to "B'ikvei Hatzooan"). With that in mind, we turn to this week's chaburah entitled: Shabbos: Is it the ultimate saver? The gemara in Shabbos (118a) quotes Rav Chiya Bar Abba who stated that anyone who keeps shabbos as per its halachos, will be forgiven for any transgressed sin. The magnitude of this saving includes one who was a worshipper of idols as evil as those living in the days of Enosh. The source for this statement is the possuk, "Ashrei enosh Ya'aseh Zos, Shomer Shabbos Mi'challilo - al tikra Michallilo ela Mochel lo (Don't read the possuk as "from transgressing shabbos" Rather "shabbos causes him to be forgiven"). The question arises: Hashem is not a simple plea bargainer. How could he accept performance of one mitzva in the place of punishment or teshuva for transgressing another? (See sifrei to Parshas V'zos Haberacha) Additionally, the wording of the gemara of "as per its halachos" appears unnecessary? Also, why can we simply change the reading of the possuk that serves as the proof to this statement? The Taz (Orach Chaim 242) notes that the Tur quoted this gemara. He asks that if one does not do teshuva for his sins, he certainly cannot be forgiven for them. The intent of this memra is to tell us that teshuva does not help for certain transgressions (until death) but if one keeps shabbos k'hilchaso, forgiveness can come before death is needed to complete the atonement process. Based upon the Taz, we can postulate that when the gemara says that when one keeps shabbos he is forgiven, that only means with teshuva. Teshuva alone does not always help however. Sometimes death serves as the ultimate decider of complete teshuva. Keeping Shabbos with all of its tiny halachos allows one to be forgiven without death. (See Shut Radvaz Vol. 2, 796 who offers a similar peshat). The decision of the gemara to note this memra based upon the principle of "al Tikri" stems from the fact that alone, the word Michalilo is redundant one who keeps shabbos is not violating it. This can explain a strange midrash in sefer berashis as well. The Midrash (Berashis Rabba 22:28) notes that when Kayin was punished, he met Adam who asked him what had happened with his trial with Hashem. Kayin noted that he had done teshuva. Adam replied that he had not known that this was the power of teshuva, had he known of it, he would have employed it as well. Immediately, he began to recite Mizmor Shir L'yom Hashabbos. Now, why would he have selected that chapter of tehillim to recite? Based upon the Taz cited above, we can suggest that Adam too, sought to complete the teshuva process by keeping a shabbos with all of its dinim in order to achieve complete atonement which would have been impossible other wise without death due to his status as a ben noach whose punishments are harsher. With Shmiras shabbos, he was able to achieve teshuva gemura and mechila before his death.

chayn "in the eyes of Hashem," because eyes can also reflect back-in reverse-what is looking into them. Hence, the posuk can be explained to mean: When Noach looked in the eyes of G-d, he found chayn, i.e., a reverse image of himself. "Eyes" represent a person's vision, or outlook-hashkafa. As Rashi points out, Noach learned Torah (7:2), and Torah is G-d's vision of creation and all that is supposed to transpire. As it says, "When G-d decided to make creation, He looked into the Torah as if it were a blueprint" (Bereishis Rabbah 1:1). Hence, when Noach looked into Torah-G-d's eyes-he found chayn-a reflection of himself, that is, his inner essence ... his godliness. In fact, the question is raised: Why did the waters of the Flood rise above the highest mountains 15 cubits (Bereishis 7:20)? The answer is, because, by not acting in the image of G-d, the Generation of the Flood defiled the yud-heh (equal to 15) of Elokim, leaving behind the letters, aleph, lamed, mem, which spell the world e-leim-a deaf and dumb person-the spiritual status of a person who does not live in the image of G-d. Noach, however, acted differently, and this is what saved him, and this is what saves any person from Divine justice. While Society looked at itself and saw a reflection of a physical body with physical potential, it designed a physical lifestyle to accommodate this reality of man. However, when Noach, with the help of Torah, saw past his body and into his inner being-his soul, the true source of chayn-he understood his true essence, and lived his life accordingly. Since this will, b"H, arrive in advance of Shemini Atzeres and Simchas Torah, I wish the joy of G-d's Holy Light and Torah. May it touch you, and elevate you, and cause to be revealed to you the depth and beauty of Divine wisdom--especially during the hakafos (seven circuits around the bimah with the Sefer Torah), when we draw down the Infinite Light of G-d upon us.

Have a good Shabbos, Pinchas Winston Perceptions, Copyright (c) 1998
 Rabbi Pinchas Winston and Project Genesis, Inc. Rabbi Winston teaches at both Neve Yerushalym (Jerusalem) - <http://www.torah.org/neve/> and Neveh Tzion (Telzstone) - <http://www.neveh.org/>
 Project Genesis: Torah on the Information Superhighway learn@torah.org 6810 Park Heights Ave.
<http://www.torah.org/> Baltimore, MD 21215 (410) 358-9800

parsha-insights@torah.org Parsha-Insights - Parshas Breishis
 - <http://www.torah.org/learning/parsha-insights/5759/breishis.html> -

This week we once again begin the yearly cycle of Torah-reading with parshas Breishis. "In the beginning"... Starting again... We've gone through intense introspection during the days of Rosh Hashana and Yom Kippur -- sorting out who we really are and what role we must play in Hashem's master-plan. Almost immediately afterwards we spent seven days enveloped in the loving embrace of the succah -- forsaking the comforts of our permanent homes and moving into temporary ones. Focusing on what is really permanent and what is really temporary, what is truly important and where our priorities must lie. Hashem seems to be laying out the groundwork for us, preparing us with the prerequisites needed to start again... With that we begin the Torah: "Berishis barah Elokim... {In the beginning of Hashem's creation...}[1:1]." Hashem created a perfect world, day by day, until He reached the pinnacle of His creations -- "Na'aseh Adom b'tzalmenu kidmusenu {Let us make man in the form of the angels (Rashbam), similar to us that he'll make free-will decisions based on his knowledge and understanding (Sforno).}[1:26]." The holiness of Adom Harishon is totally beyond our grasp. The angels wanted to sing praises to him as they do to Hashem. The Ramban reveals to us the nature of Adom Harishon before his sin. He did all that he was supposed to do as part of his innate character, just as the heavens and its hosts do the will of Hashem without any deviation. He was given one commandment -- not to eat from the Etz Ha'da'as Tov V'ra {the Tree of Desiring Good and Evil}. The fruit of this tree would put into a person the desire to choose tov {good} or ra {evil}.

We stated above that Adom Harishon was intrinsically a free-will being. How was there free-will before the knowledge of and desire for ra? Rav Chaim Volozhiner explains in his classic Nefesh HaChaim that Adom Harishon before the sin did have the ability of choosing tov or ra. However, he was the embodiment of unsullied purity and holiness without any internal leaning toward ra. Any desire toward ra came from an external source (the

nachash {primordial snake}), as an outsider might try to convince a person to jump into a fire. By eating from the Etz Ha'da'as, man's desire to do ra entered the person himself to the point that it appears that he really wants to do it! Rav Dessler explains this further. In our present state of 'after the sin' we hear our desires for ra in first person. "I really want to do that... I really want to go there..." The desires for tov then speak up in second person. "You know that you really shouldn't... You know it's wrong..." The "I" is the want to do ra. The mutiny has been so complete that we totally identify with the ra. That was not the case with Adom Harishon. As the Ramban wrote, his "I" only wanted to do what was tov. An internal desire to go against the will of Hashem was incomprehensible to Adom Harishon. It was like wanting to jump into a fire. How could "I" want to do ra? How could "I" want to cause myself destruction?

The Ramban writes that before the sin, Adom Harishon had no concept of tov and ra. Rather, his decision making process decided between sheker {falsehood} and emes {truth}. Meaning, when one sees with perfect clarity the goodness of good and the evil of evil, the decision is one of truth or falsehood. Only good, the will of Hashem, is true and enduring. Evil, going against the will of Hashem and thinking something could be gained by that is the most ridiculous falsehood imaginable. However, as we move further and further from that clarity, our decision begins to take the shape of good and evil, right and wrong, proper and improper. Ra becomes a possibility... I can gain plenty by choosing and doing ra but I shouldn't do it... It's wrong... We've lost sight of the intrinsic truth and falsehood of the decision. The Etz Ha'da'as Tov V'ra {the Tree of Desiring Good and Evil} confused the decision of truth and falsehood into one good and evil. If Adom Harishon had that absolute clarity, how could he have gone ahead and eaten from the tree that Hashem had commanded him not to?

Again, Rav Dessler explains. The decision to sin could only have come from a misunderstanding. From mistakenly thinking that true tov would result from his actions. Adom Harishon felt that in his present state he could only produce a minimal kiddush Hashem {sanctification of Hashem's name}. He and the world were in such a pure state. The decision to choose truth/good was such a simple one. If, however, both he and the world were to be lowered a bit, to move a bit closer to ra, and if in that state he would still recognize ra as being the sheker that it is, then the kiddush Hashem {sanctification of Hashem's name} that he would bring about would be that much greater. The external seduction spoke to him in second person. "You are obligated to do that! Truth and love of Hashem demand it of you! To not do it and thereby not bring about your maximum kiddush Hashem, that will be your sin!" That was the test that Adom Harishon was faced with. A harrowing decision of which course of action was true emes/tov.

Rav Dessler writes that Chaza"l, in their crypt manner, allude to this. The nachash said that by eating, "you'll become like Elokim, knowers of good and evil [3:5]." Rashi explains this in a baffling manner. You'll become like Elokim -- you'll create olamos {worlds}. We've mentioned many times before that Hashem hid Himself in this world in order to allow us free-will. The Hebrew word for world is 'olam' which means hidden. The world is defined as the place wherein Hashem hides Himself. Our choosing of tov would 'earn' us the ultimate tov -- connecting to the Source of and epitome of Tov -- connecting to Hashem Himself. What results is that the creation of the world was a creation of seeming evil for the purpose of bringing about ultimate good. Adom Harishon was told by the nachash that he too would create olamos. He too would be a partner in this creation. By eating from the Etz Ha'da'as he too would create seeming evil for the purpose of bringing about ultimate good. It was his lofty madregah {spiritual level} which led to his mistake. With the clarity he had, he couldn't imagine the darkness and confusion of ra. He couldn't imagine just how difficult things could and would become. He thought the tests would be easy to pass and one would have to be crazy to succumb to ra. He decided to create evil to bring about good. He ate from the Etz Ha'da'as.

What was at the core of Adom Harishon's mistake? The thought that something could be gained by going against the Will of Hashem. What is at the core of every aveira {sin} that we, the descendants of Adom Harishon, commit? The thought that something can be gained by going against the will

of Hashem. That clear decision of emes {truth} and sheker {falsehood} that has become clouded into one of tov {good} and ra {evil}. This week we once again begin the yearly cycle of Torah-reading. "In the beginning"... Starting again... A new year... Perhaps that is the most important point to gird ourselves with as we begin again. That absolute truth and absolute falsehood. The realization that absolutely nothing can be gained by going against the Will of Hashem. Good Shabbos, Yisroel Ciner
Parsha-Insights, Copyright (c) 1998 by Rabbi Yisroel Ciner and Project Genesis, Inc. Rabbi Yisroel Ciner is a Rebbe [teacher] at Neveh Zion, <http://www.neveh.org/> Project Genesis: Torah on the Information Superhighway learn@torah.org 6810 Park Heights Ave. <http://www.torah.org/> Baltimore, MD 21215 (410) 358-9800

mj-ravtorah@shamash.org breishis.98 Shiur Harav Soloveichik ZT"L on Parshas Breishis (Shiur date: 10/26/76) "And Elokim called the light day and the darkness He called night, and it was evening, and it was morning, day one (Yom Echad)". The Midrash Rabbah comments that the term Yom Echad refers to Yom Kippur. What is the connection between Yom Echad and Yom Kippur? The Rav explained that in Hebrew, the word Echad has 2 meanings: the number one; and unique (singular or different). For example, Shema Yisrael Hashem Elokeynu Hashem Echad means that He is the one God as well as He is unique and beyond comparison with His creation. Similarly, Yom Kippur is one day yet it is a singular and unique day, different from all other days in the year. The Ramban (1:5) quotes the Ibn Ezra that the beginning of the night is called Erev because all forms are mixed up and confused. Morning is called Boker because in daylight man can distinguish and discriminate between those same forms. Erev means confusion, an indistinguishable mixture that prevents me from discriminating between good and bad, Issur Vheter (as in Hilchos Taaruvos). Likewise, in the evening man has difficulty distinguishing between objects, as their shapes and identifying characteristics tend to blur. The morning, Boker, is when man uses his talents to discriminate and distinguish between similar objects, when he realizes that Ata Chonen L'adam Daas (Hashem graces man with intelligence, as we recite in our daily prayers). Why did Hashem divide time into day and night? Why not leave man in a constant state of Boker, clarity? The Rav answered that if man would remain in a constant state of clarity, Teshuva would be impossible. The basis of Teshuva is that man acts in a state of confusion, it is this confused state that explains why he acted as he did. Hirhur Teshuva, the contemplation of Teshuva, is the beginning of the long process towards becoming a Baal Teshuva. It represents man's confusion, the shame and pain of the sin, the weight of his actions on his mind, as signified by Erev. The Gemara (Kiddushin 49b) says that one who betrothes a woman on condition that he is a righteous person creates a valid Kiddushin (betrothal) even if he was a wicked person all his life, perhaps he contemplated Teshuva. This initial stirring to repent is the first and most necessary step. At this point, he recognizes that there is a mixing of thought processes between good and sin that he is not yet able to fully sort out, but he knows that he must attempt to make sense of it. Boker represents the rest of the Teshuva process, of Viduy (admission of the sin) and the disassociation from the act of sin in the future. On Yom Kippur, man experiences both of these aspects. On the night of Yom Kippur, he acts out of the confusion brought about by the mass of conflicting thoughts and emotions he feels when contemplating his actions. He undergoes Hirhurei Teshuva. With the clarity that comes with the arrival of the morning of Yom Kippur, the Boker, man can truly distinguish between good and evil, he can now embark on fulfilling the course of Teshuva. These unique aspects of Yom Kippur and their relationship to Teshuva are why Yom Kippur is referred to as Yom Echad.

This summary is Copyright 1998 by Dr. Israel Rivkin and Josh Rapps, Edison

drasha@torah.org DRASHA - Parshas Braishis - Dealing with the Enemy

There are few descriptive verses in the Torah that defines the evil-inclination. Many of them appear in Sefer Braishis. After all, if Hashem

created man with a Yetzer Horah (evil-inclination) then man ought to have the formula to defeat it. In fact, after Kayin fails by offering an inferior sacrifice, Hashem guides him by revealing something about the enemy - the Yetzer Horah. "Surely, if you improve you can carry him (the Yetzer Horah), and if you do not improve, he crouches at your door and his desire is toward you. But you can rule over him!" (Genesis 4:7)

The two sides seem to lack a study in contrast. If you improve you will carry him, but if not he will wait for you, he will desire to get you -but you will rule over him! It seems that the Yetzer Horah is defeated both ways. Even if you are not able to carry him and he crouches in ambush, you still can overrule him. Shouldn't the negative have stated, "and if you do not improve, he crouches at your door, his desire is toward you and he will rule over you"? In a recent volume about the life of Rabbi Ahron Moshe Stern, the Mashgiach of the Kaminetz (not related to Kamenetzky) Yeshiva in Jerusalem, I saw an amazing story about Reb Naftali Trop, the Rosh Yeshiva of the Chofetz Chaim's Yeshiva in Radin.

There was an itinerant Jew who had visited Radin and had earned a reputation as a thief. This particular individual had stolen from the very people who had invited him in as a guest in their homes. Word got out that he had stolen, and the next time he came to Radin, no one invited him into their homes - except Reb Naftali Trop. Upon hearing of the offer of hospitality, some of the prominent members of the community approached Reb Naftali. "The man you invited is a thief! Last time he was here he walked off with some of his hosts valuables. You mustn't have him sleep in your home!" Reb Naftali did not react. "The Torah tells us that a thief must pay a fine for his actions. It does not tell us that a thief should not be invited to eat or sleep. I have a responsibility to invite guests. If I am afraid that they may steal, well, that's my problem. I guess I must arrange to make sure that all my valuables are guarded. However, my fears can in no way relieve me of my responsibility to shelter my fellow Jew."

The Torah's message to Kayin is twofold. You can get the Yetzer Horah out of your way completely. You can carry him. You can place him out of your path and lift him out of sight. But that may not work for all of us. Those who cannot rise to that level and have the Yetzer Horah in our doorways constantly still may not give up hope. He may be lying in ambush but we can not ignore him. We must deal with him. If it means channeling your anger against evil - so be it. If it means steering an improper stinginess, channel that attribute to those times when splurging unnecessarily is uncalled for. The Torah is telling us that when the Yetzer Horah is part of our lives we must deal with him. We never have an excuse by saying that the desires were too great and insurmountable. If we let him in the door we have to make sure that we are able to fulfill the mitzvos in spite of his presence. The mussar luminaries used to comment: The Talmud tells us that our matriarch Rachel warned Yaakov about the deceptive shenanigans that her father Lavan was wont to perform. Yaakov responded by saying, "I am his equal in the ability to deceive." The question that was raised is simple. "Where did Yaakov learn to be so crafty?" The answer that they gave was that when dealing with a Yetzer Horah, one must be wily too. Yaakov learned from the trials of life how to deal with the most clever and cunning of men. If you tame the beast correctly, he may crouch and wait for you. But you will rule over him. And you will learn to use his resources for your gain. Good Shabbos Rabbi Mordechai Kamenetzky Drasha, Copyright (c) 1998 by Rabbi M. Kamenetzky and Project Genesis, Inc. Rabbi Mordechai Kamenetzky is the Rosh Mesivta at Mesivta Ateres Yaakov, the High School Division of Yeshiva of South Shore, <http://www.yoss.org/> Project Genesis: Torah on the Information Superhighway learn@torah.org 6810 Park Heights Ave. <http://www.torah.org/> Baltimore, MD 21215

olas-shabbos@torah.org Olas-Shabbos Bereishis: Getting to Know the Yetzer Hara Rabbi Eliyahu Hoffmann <Hoffmann@torah.org> Eitz haDa'as - Getting to Know the Yetzer Hara And Hashem G-d commanded the man, saying, "Of every tree of the garden you may eat, but from the Eitz haDa'as Tov ve-Ra (Tree of Knowledge of Good and Bad) you must not eat, for on the day you eat from it, you shall surely die." Now the serpent was more cunning than any creature. And the serpent said to the woman, "You

will not die, for G-d knows that on the day you eat of it your eyes will be opened and you will be like G-d, knowing good and bad." (2:16-17; 3:1, 4-5)

The intriguing Tree of Knowledge of Good and Bad is shrouded in mystery. What was it, and what evil powers did it possess? What does it mean to know (da'as) good and bad? Certainly good and bad existed even before partaking of the Fruits of the Tree, as witnessed by the evil serpent. Certainly, too, Adam and Chava (Eve) were able to choose and discern between good and bad before eating from the Tree; if not, the test would have been unfair. So how were they changed by eating from the Tree - "knowing good and bad?" Rashi (to 2:25) writes, "Even though [Adam] was endowed with wisdom [which was used] to give names [to the animals], the yetzer hara (evil disposition or inclination) did not enter him until he ate from the Tree, upon which the yetzer hara entered him... ." What does it mean when we say that the yetzer hara entered him? If he wasn't there until then, how did he come to sin?

Let us first address this mysterious yetzer hara fellow. He seems to come under a fair amount of discussion, yet he is poorly understood. Perhaps, at some simplistic level, we still believe the yetzer hara to be some (red? pitchforked?) man who whispers evil thoughts in our ears, persuading us to sin. But if so, where is he? How do we hear him? Obviously, we admit, this vision is too shallow. It is in truth too shallow for us, explains Rabbi Chaim Velozhiner (Nefesh haChaim 1:6), but once upon a time, this is exactly what the yetzer hara was. He was a serpent, an evil cunning creature, who came and whispered persuasive, sinful thoughts to Adam and Chava. Left to their own, it would never have occurred to them to partake of the Tree which Hashem had forbidden. As it is written (Koheles/ Ecclesiastes 7:9), "G-d created man yashar (straight/virtuous)." They could, however, be corrupted by an external force, which is exactly what happened. Once

corrupted, the yetzer hara, as Rashi says, entered them. A metamorphosis took place. The yetzer hara was no longer an *external* force of evil trying to exert itself against inherent good. Good and evil joined; they became mixed and blended - *within* man. Rabbi Eliyahu Dessler (Michtav me-Eliyahu volume 2, p. 138) explains it thus: Before eating the Fruit, "you" (you = the yetzer hara) tried to get me to sin. After eating the fruit, it is "I" who wants to sin. This concept is in fact alluded to by the Ramban, who writes (2:9), "Adam would naturally do that which is proper and useful to do [without deviation], just as do the heavens and the constellations. The Fruit of the Tree is what instilled within him the idea of *wanting* and *desiring* - that is to choose good or bad [based upon what he wants]." Indeed, R' Chaim Velozhiner explains that the meaning of the word da'as in Eitz haDa'as/The Tree of Da'as is to mix or to merge (this is an alternate meaning of the word, see for instance Ralbag to Mishlei 7:1 who demonstrates such a usage) - it was the Tree which Merged Good and Bad, which had until then been separate, within the heart of man. This is unquestionably a deeper, more thorough understanding of the Eitz haDa'as Tov ve-Ra, and of the yetzer hara. What practical application can this bring to our service of Hashem?

The pasuk says (Devarim 21:10), "When you will go out to war against your enemies, and Hashem, your G-d, will deliver them into your hands." Mefarshim (commentators) explain that the "enemy" refers not only to our physical enemies, but also to our inner enemy - the yetzer hara. If, they explain, you desire victory, you must treat this battle as you would any war. When one goes to war, he must be intimately familiar with his enemy. Many a battle has been lost due to inadequate reconnaissance and lack of familiarity with the enemy's power and capacity to attack. If we want to stand a chance in our battle with the yetzer hara, it is crucial that we first understand who and what it is, and how it goes about attacking us and convincing us to sin. Now we have begun to perceive that the "yetzer hara" is not some external enemy. Following the sin of the Eitz haDa'as, it "entered" man and became one with him. Battling "it" is actually battling with ourselves; struggling to come to terms with our own inner feelings and desires, without trespassing the boundaries set out for us by Hashem. Recognizing this is half the battle. Good Shabbos. This week's publication is sponsored by Mr. Yochanan Buksbaum, in honour of the Yohrtzeit of his father, Moshe ben Nasan Mordechai a"h, 28 Tishrei. ***** Olas Shabbos, Copyright (c) 1998 by Rabbi

Eliyahu Hoffmann and Project Genesis, Inc. The author is a Maggid Shiur (teacher) and Menahel (principal) in Mesivta Chassidei Bobov of Toronto. Project Genesis: Torah on the Information Superhighway learn@torah.org 6810 Park Heights Ave. http://www.torah.org/ Baltimore, MD 21215

daf-insights@shemayisrael.com Insights to the Daf: Pesachim 46-58

INSIGHTS INTO THE DAILY DAF brought to you by Kollel Iyun Hadaf of Yerushalayim Rosh Kollel: Rabbi Mordecai Kornfeld Daf@shemayisrael.co.il

Pesachim 47 "YOM TOV SHENI SHEL GALUYOS" IN YERUSHALAYIM QUESTION: The Gemara cites a Mishnah which states that when the two days of Rosh Hashanah fall immediately prior to Shabbos (that is, on Thursday and Friday), the Lechem ha'Panim is eaten in the Mikdash on the eleventh day after being baked. (That is, from when it was baked -- Wednesday, the day before Rosh Hashanah, until the Shabbos of the following week, when it is eaten, is eleven days). RASHI (DH Sh'nei Yamim Shel Rosh Hashanah), at the end of his comments, asks why does the Beraisa say two days of Rosh Hashanah, and not two days of any Yom Tov (that is, "Yom Tov Sheni Shel Galuyos")? Rashi answers that "at the time of the Lechem ha'Panim, there was no second day of Yom Tov." What is Rashi talking about? Our discussion involves the Lechem ha'Panim in the Beis ha'Mikdash! There are *never* two days of Yom Tov in the Beis ha'Mikdash other than on Rosh Hashanah -- even today only one day of Yom Tov is observed in Yerushalayim! What does Rashi mean by saying that "in the *times of the Lechem ha'Panim* they did not have two days of Yom Tov in the Beis ha'Mikdash?" (TZELACH) ANSWERS: (a) The CHASAM SOFER writes that when in his youth he brazenly suggested an answer to the TZELACH, who nodded his head in affirmation. He answered that it could be construed that there sometimes were two days of Yom Tov even in Yerushalayim. During the time that the leading Torah sages were outside of Israel, the sages of Chutz l'Aretz would accept the testimony of witnesses who saw the new moon to establish the new month (Berachos end of 63a). Since it took time for the messengers of Beis Din to bring news of the new month to Yerushalayim, the people of Yerushalayim would have to keep two days of Yom Tov, out of doubt (just as cities outside of Israel kept two days of Yom Tov when the Beis Din in Yerushalayim established the new month)!

Why then *weren't* there two days of Yom Tov in Yerushalayim in the "times of the Lechem ha'Panim"? Perhaps, suggests the Chasam Sofer, the verse "v'Alisa El ha'Makom" comprises a requirement that as long as there is a Beis ha'Mikdash, the Sages of Eretz Yisrael must establish the beginning of the new month, no matter who lives in Chutz l'Aretz. b) RAV YOSEF SHAUL NATANSOHN notes (in a comment on the famous Teshuvah of the CHACHAM ZVI #167 -- who reaches the opposite Halachic conclusion), suggests that we see from here that two days of Yom Tov were always kept by the people of Yerushalayim! Tosfos (Pesachim 14a DH Shteit) explains that since people from many different locales would gather in Yerushalayim, the city would always keep the most stringent customs that were common. If so, an argument could be made that they kept two days of Yom Tov in Yerushalayim, following the more stringent custom of Chutz l'Aretz, since people from Chutz l'Aretz were constantly there. Rashi had to explain that at that time of Lechem ha'Panim, there was not yet a rabbinical enactment to keep two days of Yom Tov outside of Israel (Beitzah 5b), rather two days were kept in outside of Israel out of doubt. Since there was not yet a "Minhag" to keep two days of Yom Tov in Chutz l'Aretz, Yerushalayim kept only one day. (The comments of Rav Y.S. Natansohn can be found at the end of most prints of the Chacham Zvi.)

(c) Perhaps when Rashi says that "there were not two days of Yom Tov *in the time* of the Lechem ha'Panim," he does not mean that in the historical era of the Beis ha'Mikdash there were not two days of Yom Tov. Rather, Rashi means to say that when discussing *the duration of time* from when the Lechem ha'Panim was baked until it was eaten, *it is not relevant* to discuss two days of any Yom Tov other than Rosh Hashanah, for the very reason we mentioned in our question -- because such a thing does not exist in Yerushalayim. (That is, Rashi is to be read as follows: "When discussing the duration of time of the Lechem ha'Panim, there is no [pertinence to] two days of Yom Tov.") Why did Rashi find it necessary to point this out if it is obvious? Rashi wants to explain why *other* Mishnayos do not discuss "Yom Tov Sheni Shel Galuyos" but refer to two days of Rosh Hashanah instead. For instance, the Mishnah in Shabbos (137a) tells us that Milah is sometimes performed 12 days after a birth when two days of Yom Tov of "Rosh Hashanah" intervene between the birth and the Bris. Does this law apply to when two days of any other Yom Tov intervene as well, or do we just go ahead and circumcise the baby on the second day of Yom Tov, on every other Yom Tov besides Rosh Hashanah? This is actually the subject of a debate among the Rishonim. Most rule that there is no difference between Rosh Hashanah and any other Yom Tov. The TASHBETZ (3:284, cited by TSHUVOS CHASAM SOFER, YD 250) infers this to be the opinion of Rashi, as well, since Rashi here implies that had another Yom Tov intervened between the baking and eating of the Lechem ha'Panim, it would have had to have been baked *before* that Yom Tov. The Rambam (Hilchos Milah 1:15), on the other hand, differentiates between Rosh Hashanah and other Yomim Tovim, based on the wording of the Mishnah in Shabbos.

Rashi in our Sugya is attempting to rebut the Rambam's proof from the wording of the Mishnah that discusses Milah. He points out that there is a specific reason why *this* Mishnah does not mention Yom Tov Sheni of Galuyos. Since this Mishnah had to two days of "Rosh Hashanah," the other Mishnayos that discuss something (Milah) that is delayed due to two days of Yom Tov it also mentions Rosh Hashanah, even though the Halachos of Milah apply equally to Yom Tov Sheni Shel Galuyos. (M. Kornfeld)

49b "IT IS PERMITTED TO KILL AN AM HA'ARETZ EVEN ON YOM KIPPUR..." OPINIONS: The Gemara says that it is permitted to kill an Am ha'Aretz by Nechirah (stabbing him in the neck) even on Yom Kippur that falls on Shabbos. What did the Am ha'Aretz do to deserve such treatment?

(a) TOSFOS says that the Gemara is referring to an Am ha'Aretz who is a known killer. Since it is a matter of Piku'ach Nefesh, it is permitted to dispose of him even if he is not presently involved in a murder. (b) The RAN and RABEINU DAVID, quoting RAV SHERIRAH GA'ON and the RIF say that if the Am ha'Aretz is pursuing a betrothed woman (Rodef Achar ha'Ervah), it is permitted to kill him, even on Yom Kippur, even if he can only be stopped by stabbing him (i.e. an ugly death, Misah Menuveles). The Rishonim ask that if this is the case that the Gemara is referring to when it says that one may kill an Am ha'Aretz, then why is the

Gemara talking about an Am ha'Aretz? It is permitted to kill anyone, even a Talmid Chacham, if he is Rodef Achar ha'Ervah! The answer is that granted, it would be permitted to kill anyone who is Rodef Achar ha'Ervah, but only someone who is an Am ha'Aretz would be ignorant enough to do so. An Am ha'Aretz does not think about the consequences of his actions and goes ahead and pursues the woman where people can see him, and thus he is killed in any manner during his act of being Rodef. As an Am ha'Aretz, he does not even know how to sin. (c) The RAN and MAHARSHA explain that the Gemara is speaking in metaphoric terms. Since the Amei ha'Aretz hate the Talmidei Chachamim so much, the Gemara uses exaggerated statements about them. The Maharsha adds that the Metaphor for killing is that one is permitted to embarrass the Am ha'Aretz in public, even on Yom Kippur (embarrassing a person is akin to killing him -- Bava Metziah 58b).

Pesachim 50 THE WAY HASHEM'S NAME IS WRITTEN AND THE WAY IT IS PRONOUNCED The Gemara here tells us of two differences between the world as it is now and as it will be in the future. First, the Gemara cites the verse, "On that day, Hashem will be One and His name will be One," and asks that is He not One even in this world? The Gemara answers that the World to Come is not like this world. In this world, we recite the blessing "ha'Tov v'ha'Meitiv" when we hear good tidings and "Dayan ha'Emes" when we hear bad tidings. In the World to Come, we will only recite the blessing "ha'Tov v'ha'Meitiv" (i.e., there will be no bad tidings -- Rashi). Second, the Gemara continues and asks that the verse says, "And His name will be One" -- is His name not One even in this world? The Gemara answers that the World to Come is not like this world. In this world, Hashem's name is written one way, but it is pronounced another way. In the World to Come, the Name will be pronounced the way that it is written. Another difference between this world and the next is expressed by RASHI. Rashi, on the verse "Shema Yisrael Hashem Elokeinu Hashem Echad" (Devarim 6:4) explains, based on the Sifri, that "Hashem Elokeinu" means that the G-d Who is *presently* our G-d, and not that the other nations, will *in the future* be "Hashem Echad," one G-d over all of the nations, as the verse says, "At that time I shall cause all of the nations to call out in the name of Hashem" (Tzefanya 3:9). Likewise, it states, "On that day Hashem will be One, and His name will be One" (Zecharya 14:9). The Shulchan Aruch (Orach Chaim 5) tells us that when uttering Hashem's Name, both meanings -- the meaning of the Name as it is pronounced (that Hashem is the "Master of the world") and the meaning of the Name as it is written (that He has always existed and is above time) -- should be borne in mind. But the Vilna Gaon (ad loc.) dissents. Based on numerous sources, he contends that it is only necessary to bear in mind the meaning of the Name as it is pronounced, "Master of the world." The Gaon adds, however, that the verse "Shema Yisrael" is an exception, and when one utters the Name in Shema Yisrael, he should bear in mind *both* meanings of the Name. What is it that makes this verse different from all others? Rav Yitzchak Hutner (Pachad Yitzchak on Yom Kippur Ch. 5; Pesach Ch. 60; Shavuos 25:9, see also notes on Pesach 5:2) offers an insightful explanation based on our Gemara and the words of Rashi.

He explains that the three differences between this world and the next as described in our Gemara and in Rashi in Devarim are clearly related. Since we do not perceive things the way they really are in this world, Hashem's presence is clouded over, and not clearly recognized by all. If we would always see Hashem's good and perfection, it would be clear to all that Hashem is One. In the World to Come, since it will be apparent to all that everything is good, the nations of the world will inevitably proclaim Hashem's Oneness along with us. This is also what is meant by the difference between the spelling and the pronunciation of Hashem's name. The pronunciation that we use today suggests a Creator that is partially hidden from the world. He is like a master who lets his slave work and supervises from his distant corner. In the World to Come, we will pronounce Hashem's name as it is written, suggesting that He is inseparable from all of existence, and that His presence is evident to all (see Ramban, beginning of Parshas Va'era, and Meshech Chochmah, beginning of Parshas Bechukosai). Thus, all three "Onenesses" stem from one root; the clarity of Hashem's presence in the World to Come. Actually, even in this world it is possible, to a certain extent, to disperse the clouds, and feel the omnipresence of the Divine Will. After all, no true "bad" or "injustice" is ever done in this world. Everything that transpires is of Divine design and is ultimately meant to be for our own good (see Berachos 60b). Although that end is often hidden from our perception, it is there nonetheless. We can strive to recognize it and accept it, thereby getting a "glimpse" of our Creator. There is no time when it is more imperative for us to feel that lucid presence of Hashem than when reciting the verse "Shema Yisrael" and proclaiming the Oneness of Hashem. As Rashi says, we are longing, with this exclamation, for the world in which Hashem's presence will be fully revealed and He will "truly" be One. When reciting this verse, we attempt to gain clarity of Hashem's Oneness in this world of inclarity, and we do that by trying to find that hidden good that exists in everything in this world. If so, it is certainly appropriate that in this verse we should preserve the meaning of Hashem's name as it is written, and not just as it is pronounced.

Pesachim 52 HALACHAH: A PERSON WHO COMES FROM ISRAEL KEEPING TWO DAYS OF YOM TOV OUTSIDE OF ISRAEL OPINIONS: The Gemara establishes that one who normally observes only one day of Yom Tov (such as a resident of Eretz Yisrael) must refrain from doing Melachah for two days of Yom Tov when he finds himself outside of Israel in a Jewish community that observes two days of Yom Tov. Why must one conduct himself like the residents of the place he is in, and to what extent does this Halachah apply? (a) The RAMBAM (Hilchos Yom Tov 8:20) does not distinguish between the Minhag of refraining from Melachah on the second day of Yom Tov outside of Israel and observing any other Minhag. He simply writes, with regard to all Minhagim, that if a person has intention to return to his original place then he may conduct himself according to the Minhag of his original place, however, he should not do Melachah where others will see him doing it in order to avoid Machlokes, as our Mishnah (50a-b) says. Presumably, according to the Rambam one who comes from Eretz Yisrael is permitted to do Melachah on Yom Tov Sheni in Chutz La'aretz in private. This is indeed the conclusion of a number of authorities (TAZ, citing MAHARSHAL, in OC 496:2; Harav Ovadyah Yosef in YECHAVEH DA'AS 3: 35.) (b) TOSFOS (52a, DH b'Yishuv, see also RAN) writes that the Minhag of refraining from Melachah on Yom Tov Sheni is more stringent than other Minhagim, because it is not possible to do Melachah in private without it becoming known that Melachah was done. (Even though there are some Melachos that can be done quietly without anyone knowing about them, the Rabanan did not differentiate and they forbid all Melachos in private, -Machtzis ha'Shekel OC 496:4.) Therefore, wherever Melachah is forbidden, it is forbidden even in private. However, it is not clear exactly in which cases Melachah is

normally forbidden in private. TOSFOS (51a, DH Iy Ata) points out an apparent contradiction. The Mishnah states unequivocally that one must conduct himself according to the Chumra of the place at which he has arrived, because he must avoid causing Machlokes. However, the Gemara says that the reason one must conduct himself according to the Chumra of the place is because of the Kusim in that place, who will misunderstand one's practice to be lenient and they will permit other things which really are forbidden. The Gemara seems to be saying a different reason than the Mishnah!

Tosfos cites the RI who explains that the Mishnah is talking about a "Minhag Chashuv," that is, a Minhag with a strong basis. One may not be lenient with regard to such a Minhag even in front of Talmidei Chachamim who understand one's reason for being lenient even if he does not plan on returning his original residence. On the other hand, one *may* be lenient and permit a Minhag which does not have a strong basis but is based on a mistake or on a practice that evolved without the consent of the Chachamim. However, even such a Minhag may not be permitted in front of Kusim.

Next, citing the RASHBA (RABEINU SHIMSHON M'SHANTZ), Tosfos says that the Mishnah is talking about when the person does *not* have intention to return to his original place ("Ein Da'ato Lachzor"), in which case he takes on the Minhag of the place at which he has arrived whether its populace is learned or ignorant, since it is as if he has already become a member of that community. When he has intention to return, though, he does not take on the Minhag of the new place unless there are Kusim there. (This also appears to be the ruling of the RAMBAN in Milchamos Hashem.) The Minhag of Yom Tov Sheni fits the criteria of being a Minhag with a strong basis (see Beitza 4b). Therefore, according to the RI, one who comes from Eretz Yisrael to Chutz la'Aretz would have to take on that Minhag in order to avoid Machlokes, even if one intends to return to Eretz Yisrael. The RASHBA, though, is more lenient. According to the RASHBA, only if one does not intend to return to Eretz Yisrael does he have to observe the second day of Yom Tov in Chutz la'Aretz. If he intends to return to Eretz Yisrael, then he may do Melachah on the second day of Yom Tov as long as there are no Kusim in the place, but only Talmidei Chachamim.

As mentioned above, Tosfos holds that with regard to the second day of Yom Tov, wherever Melachah is forbidden, it is forbidden even in private. Consequently, one may not do Melachah even in private at all according to the RI -- even when there are no Kusim around -- and according to the RASHBA he may not do Melachah in private in a place where there are Kusim. (c) The BA'AL HA'ME'OR explains that when the Mishnah says that one must be stringent and follow the Minhag of the place in order to avoid causing Machlokes, it really means that one must be stringent *only* in a place where there are Kusim*. Accordingly, it should be permitted to do Melachah on Yom Tov Sheni in a place in which only Talmidei Chachamim reside. However, the Ba'al ha'Me'or explains that the Minhag of refraining from Melachah on Yom Tov Sheni is a stronger Minhag than any other, and therefore one must be stringent and refrain from Melachah even in a place where there are only Talmidei Chachamim. (The Acharonim understand this to mean that even in private one may not do Melachah.) If so, not only is Melachah prohibited on private on Yom Tov Sheni, but in all aspects Yom Tov Sheni must be kept when in Chutz la'Aretz, even in private. (d) The RA'AVAD on the RIF writes that when a resident of Eretz Yisrael travels to Chutz la'Aretz, there is no question of which one of the two Minhagim should one choose -- to do Melachah on Yom Tov Sheni or not to do Melachah on Yom Tov Sheni. There is no such thing as a Minhag for a resident of Eretz Yisrael to do Melachah in Chutz la'Aretz on Yom Tov Sheni. That is, even someone from Eretz Yisrael has a Minhag to keep Yom Tov Sheni *when in Chutz la'Aretz*. The Ra'avad apparently learns our Gemara like TOSFOS in Sukah (43a; see Insights to 51b) that even people from Eretz Yisrael have a Minhag to keep two days of Yom Tov when they are in a place where the messengers of Beis Din cannot reach. In other words, their Minhag is that *when they go to Chutz la'Aretz*, they keep two days of Yom Tov.

HALACHAH: THE SHULCHAN ARUCH (OC 468:4) rules like TOSFOS, that one must be stringent even in front of Talmidei Chachamim (like the RI) and in private as well (Mishnah Berurah 468:14). If one is in an area outside the Techum of the nearest Jewish community ("Midbar"), then he is permitted to do Melachah. This is assuming that he has intention to return to his original place. If he does not intend to return, then he keeps the Minhagim of Chutz la'Aretz right away, even in a Midbar before reaching the Jewish community. (See also SHULCHAN ARUCH 496:3.)

Pesachim 56 KING CHIZKIYAH AND "SEFER REFU'OS" (THE BOOK OF CURES) OPINIONS: The Gemara says that King Chizkiyah was praised by the Rabanan for hiding away the Sefer Refu'os (the Book of Cures). What was the Sefer Refu'os, and why did Chizkiyah hide it?

(a) RASHI (DH v'Ganaz Sefer Refu'os) says the Sefer Refu'os was a book that listed the remedies for all illnesses. By hiding it, Chizkiyah was effectively forcing the Jews to rely on Hashem for their healing and to pray for mercy from Him, instead of relying on the Sefer Refu'os. (b) The RAMBAM (Perush ha'Mishnayos) takes extremely strong opposition to Rashi's explanation. His position is that using natural means of healing does not in any way detract from one's reliance on the Almighty. He compares it to taking away food from a starving man so that he will pray to G-d for food. A person will still rely on G-d's mercy for his health when using natural remedies because it is G-d Who makes those remedies work. Instead, the Rambam explains that the Sefer Refu'os was a collection of astrological formulae for healing, accomplished by placing certain forms in certain places at certain hours. It is permitted to learn from such a book, but not to use it in practice, because of Avodah Zarah. When Chizkiyah saw that people were using it in practice, he hid it away. (The Rambam refers to this type of healing by its Greek name, "Talisman"). King Shlomo wrote the Book of Cures in order to show the wonders that exist in the natural world, but he did not intend that it should actually be used. (c) The RAMBAM (loc. cit.) gives another explanation and says that the Book of Cures listed poisons and the antidotes to those poisons. The purpose of the book was to supply antidotes for the various poisons. When people began using the book in order to know what poisons to use upon their enemies, Chizkiyah hid it away. How does Rashi answer the Rambam's question on his explanation? Why did Chizkiyah hide away the book but still permit people to go to doctors? Either way, one might lose his trust in Hashem and place his trust in the other sources of healing! Rashi here emphasizes that when the Sefer Refu'os was being used, people were not humbling themselves as a result of their illness, which is what Hashem intended when He brought the illnesses upon the people in the first place. As long as a person was able to heal himself, he would not become humbled. But if he had to go to a doctor and rely on someone else, he would be humbled. Alternatively, we might suggest that Rashi agrees that there is nothing wrong with using natural remedies. The Sefer Refu'os, however, may have recorded cures based on alternative medicines which appeared to the layman to be related to

witchcraft, or it recorded cures actually based on supernatural means. Those who used the book, Chizkiyah feared, would come to believe that they can circumvent nature and rely on magical cures, without Hashem's assistance, and their reliance on Hashem would be diminished. Even though "anything which is used for medicinal purposes is not considered to be the way of the gentiles" (Shabbos 77a), nevertheless when Chizkiyah saw that people tended to attribute power to forces other than Hashem, he hid the book. (M. Kornfeld)

SAYING "BARUCH SHEM KEVOD" QUIETLY QUESTION: The Gemara gives a metaphor to explain why we say the verse "Baruch Shem Kevod..." in the Shema quietly. It is comparable to a princess who smelled delicious food. On the one hand, she will suffer from her urge for the food if she does not have it. On the other hand, it is embarrassing for her to ask for it outwardly. Therefore, it is brought to her quietly without announcement. This metaphor implies that "Baruch Shem" is, for some reason, somewhat embarrassing to express, and that is why we say it quietly. Indeed, the NEFESH HA'CHAIM (3:6) and the Mekubalim explain that it is a lower level of declaring the Yichud of the name of Hashem. However, other sources indicate that "Baruch Shem" is a "higher" form of Yichud ha'Shem, and not a lower form as our Gemara implies.

First, the TUR (OC 61) cites the Midrash that says that Moshe Rabeinu heard the Malachim declaring "Baruch Shem Kevod..." and he wanted to incorporate it into the prayers of the Jewish people. However, he could only institute that it be said quietly, because it is an "otherworldly" praise which is too lofty to be recited in this world. It is not said aloud lest it appear that we are stealing it from the Malachim. Second, we find that only in the Beis ha'Mikdash, the Jewish people used to respond "Baruch Shem Kevod..." instead of "Amen" after hearing the blessings of the Kohen Gadol (Berachos 63a, Ta'anis 16b), because "Baruch Shem" is a loftier expression which can only be said in the holiest place. Third, the MAHARAL (Nesiv ha'Avodah, ch. 7) writes that the reason we say "Baruch Shem" aloud on Yom Kippur is because on that day we are elevated to a higher realm of existence. That is also the reason Yakov Avinu said it -- because he was on a higher level of existence.

These sources seem to contradict the theme of our Gemara that implies that "Baruch Shem" is embarrassing in some sense. **ANSWER:** RAV YITZCHAK HUTNER zt'l (Yom Kippur 5:2:15) explains that both implications are true and the two views do not conflict with each other. They reflect different aspects of "Baruch Shem." In one sense "Baruch Shem" is a lower, embarrassing form of praise, and in other sense, it is a loftier, more holy form of praise. "Baruch Shem Kevod..." means that the Name of Hashem is eternal and will remain forever. The Name of Hashem, however, is comprised of two different elements (50a) -- there is the name as it is written, which emphasizes the eternalness of Hashem, and there is the name as it is pronounced (the Shem of "Adnus"), which expresses that Hashem is the Master of the world. The Shem of "Adnus" will only be used in this world; it has no place in the World to Come, when the Name will be pronounced the same way that it is written, as the Gemara earlier states. It is inappropriate to say "Baruch Shem Kevod... le'Olam Va'ed" in reference to the Shem of "Adnus", because since Name is only used in this world, praising it with "Baruch Shem" is only a praise that it will always be used in this world. This Shem of "Adnus" is a lower level of Yichud ha'Shem; it is a Yichud for this world, expressing the limited extent to which we are able to perceive Hashem. It does not express the way that Hashem will be perceived in the next world. However, when we use "Baruch Shem" in reference to the Shem of "Yud... Hei," then it means that the Name will be blessed in this world and in the next.

The first praise (when we use "Baruch Shem" in reference to the Shem of "Adnus") is a lesser form of Yichud because it applies only to this world. The second praise (when we use "Baruch Shem" in reference to the Name as it is written) is a much higher form of Yichud. The Malachim experience and perceive Hashem in the ultimate way, the way that His Name is written. When they say "Baruch Shem," they are only praising that Name. So, too, in the Beis ha'Mikdash, the people declare "Baruch Shem" in response to the Kohen Gadol pronouncing the Name as it is written. There is no lower level Name being used, so then "Baruch Shem" can be said aloud. That was the level of Yakov Avinu as well. For us, though, in this world, since the Shem is actually comprised of two Names, when we say "Baruch Shem" it is actually two different blessings, and one of them is indeed a lesser praise. (See Insights to Pesachim 50a.) Therefore we say it quietly, like a person who has a message that can be understood in two ways -- one way that is very lofty, and one way which sounds ridiculous. He whispers it so that the wise people who understand the lofty meanings will understand it, and they will know that he is whispering it in order not to reveal the lofty wisdom behind it. The unlearned people will think that he is whispering it because it is a ridiculous statement and he is embarrassed to say it aloud. Therefore, both our Gemara, which implies that "Baruch Shem" is a lower praise, and the other source which imply that it is a greater praise, are both correct, since both meanings are contained in "Baruch Shem."

Pesachim 59 THE MITZVAS ASEH OF THE KORBAN PESACH OVERRIDES THE MITZVAS ASEH OF "HASHLAMAH" QUESTION: The Gemara says that the Mitzvah to bring the Korban Pesach -- which is punishable with Kares if not done -- overrides the Mitzvas Aseh of "Hashlamah" (making sure that the afternoon Korban Tamid is the last Korban that is offered upon the Mizbe'ach). Since bringing the Korban Pesach overrides the Mitzvas Aseh of "Hashlamah," one who is Mechusar Kipurim -- who needs to bring a Korban Kaparah in order to become Tahor so that he may eat from the Korban Pesach -- may bring his Korban after the Korban Tamid. This Gemara is difficult to understand. Why should one's personal Korban override the Mitzvah of "Hashlamah?" Even though it will enable him to partake of the Korban Pesach, that Mitzvah will not be done until later. We know that in order for one Mitzvah to be Docheh another one, they must be done at the same time! Since he will not be doing the Mitzvah of eating the Korban Pesach until after nightfall, why should he be allowed to forego the Mitzvah of "Hashlamah" and bring his private Korban for Kaparah after the Korban Tamid? **ANSWERS:** (a) TOSFOS (DH Asi) answers in the name of the RIVA that the Gemara is talking about a case when the person who is Mechusar Kipurim already brought the Korban Pesach before he brought his Korban for Kaparah. Since he is not fit to eat the Korban Pesach in his present state, it is not considered as though he brought it. At the very moment that he slaughters his own Korban he becomes fit to eat the Korban Pesach and he fulfills the Mitzvah of bringing the Korban Pesach. That is, at the moment he becomes fit to eat the Pesach, he is Yotzei the Mitzvah of offering up the Korban. As the Gemara says later (90a), he is exempt from bringing a Korban on Pesach Sheni as long as he was fit to eat the Korban Pesach on Pesach Rishon. Even though he is not actually fulfilling the Mitzvah of *eating* the Pesach (which is the Mitzvah which is punishable with Kares), nevertheless the

Mitzvah of *bringing* the Korban Pesach is considered to be a weightier Mitzvah than the Mitzvas Aseh of "Hashlamah," since it is associated with the Mitzvah of eating the Pesach which does have Kares.

(b) The RI cited by Tosfos answers that in order for one Mitzvah Aseh to override a weaker Mitzvas Aseh, the two acts do not have to be done at the same time. Only when one wants to be Docheh a Lo Ta'aseh -- which is a stronger Aveirah -- with an Aseh do they then have to be done at the same time. **RAV YISRAEL ZEV GUSTMAN, zt'l**, used to explain that the underpinnings of this question may be based on a broader question. Why is an Aseh able to be Docheh a Lo Ta'aseh? After all, a Lo Ta'aseh -- an Isur -- is more severe than an Aseh (Ye'vamos 8a). There are two approaches to this question in the Rishonim. **RABEINU NISIM GAON** in Shabbos (133a, see Insights there) explains that the Aseh is not really "Docheh" the Lo Ta'aseh. The Aseh does not push away or override the Lo Ta'aseh. Rather, in situations where the Lo Ta'aseh comes in conflict with an Aseh, the Lo Ta'aseh was never commanded in the first place! That is, the Torah did not give the commandment to observe the Lo Ta'aseh when it is in conflict with an Aseh. The Lo Ta'aseh is in force contingent upon there being no Aseh opposing it. If there is an Aseh opposing it, then the prohibition of the Lo Ta'aseh was never said in the first place. If so, the condition that the Aseh and Lo Ta'aseh have to be done at the same time in order for the Aseh to be "Docheh" the Lo Ta'aseh is actually describing the condition under which the Lo Ta'aseh was commanded. That is, when did the Torah not command the Lo Ta'aseh when it clashes with an Aseh -- only when the Lo Ta'aseh is in opposition to an Aseh at the very same time that the Aseh is being performed. But when they are not being done at the same time, the Lo Ta'aseh *does* take effect and it remains in force because it is stronger than the Aseh which cannot override it.

This is the opinion of the RI here. The RI explains, and that is why he explains that a strong aseh being docheh a lo taaseh, logically one is stronger than the other, and therefore you don't need this clause that when they come into opposition the torah never gave one. It is mdechiyah and not midin hutrah. Therefore even not idnei it can be docheh. The RIVA, on the other hand, learns that every case of "Aseh Docheh Lo Ta'aseh" works by pushing aside the Lo Ta'aseh ("Dechiyah"), and not the way Rabeinu Nisim Gaon explains ("Hutrah"). He learns that an Aseh is stronger than a Lo Ta'aseh (see Ramban to Shemos 20:8), as the MAHARIK (Shores 139) writes. The rule that the Aseh must be done at the same time as the Lo Ta'aseh is merely in order to ensure that the person not do the Aveirah first and then forget about doing the Mitzvas Aseh. This will apply equally when one Aseh is Docheh a weaker Aseh. The Riva seems to be consistent with his opinion elsewhere (Tosfos, Chulin 141a), where he writes that when an Aseh is opposed by another Aseh and a Lo Ta'aseh, one is not permitted to perform the Aseh by transgressing the other Aseh and the Lo Ta'aseh. However, if one, b'Dieved, transgressed and performed the Aseh, he does not get Malkus for transgressing the Lo Ta'aseh, because the fulfillment of the Aseh is Docheh the Malkus (see Insights, Pesachim 47b). This makes sense according to the Riva's opinion that the Aseh is stronger than the Lo Ta'aseh and therefore it is Docheh it, as the Maharik (ibid.) points out.

According to Rabeinu Nisim Gaon, on the other hand, the Torah *did* command the Lo Ta'aseh in such a situation, so it will not be pushed aside at all and one will receive Malkus. **Mordecai Kornfeld** [Email: kornfeld@virtual.co.il/TI/Fx(02)6522633/612 Katzenelbogen St. | kornfeld@netvision.net.il/US:(718)520-0210 Har Nof, Jerusalem,ISRAEL] kornfeld@shemayisrael.co.il/POB:43087, Jrslm

dafyomi@virtual.co.il The Weekly Daf #243 <http://www.ohr.org.il/yomi/yomi243.htm>

Silent Praise After we loudly proclaim our classical "pledge of allegiance" to our Divine King with the passage "Shema Yisrael," we silently add the words "Baruch shem kevod malchuso le'olam va'ed." The gemara explains that "Shema Yisrael" was first said by the sons of Yaakov when they reassured him ("Hear, our father Yisrael...") that they were as loyal as he in their monotheistic belief. The response of Yaakov-Yisrael was the praise of "Baruch shem kevod..."

What should we do? asked the Sages. Shall we say "Baruch shem" as Yaakov did? But Moshe did not record that praise in the Torah! Shall we then omit it? But Yaakov did say it! The solution they arrived at was to say it, but silently. Rabbi Avahu notes, however, that in places where heretics were prevalent, the rabbis decreed that this praise be said aloud so that they would not be able to claim that we were silently making some sort of disclaimer of our faith. In Nahardea, where there was no such danger, they continued to say it silently and this is the custom everywhere today.

An apparent contradiction to this conclusion is posed by the commentaries from a gemara (Berachos 12a) which tells us that the Sage Ameimar wanted to institute in Nahardea the daily recital of the Ten Commandments along with the shema. He abandoned the plan for fear that heretics would claim that this was the only part of the Torah which is true because we heard it directly from Hashem. If no exception was made for Nahardea in regard to the danger of heretics, despite the lack of heretics in that Torah-true community, why was an exception made in regard to the silent saying of "Baruch shem..."? The difference, explains Rabbi Shmuel Shtrassen of Vilna in his footnotes in the back of the Vilna Shas, lies in the degree of danger involved. The damage to the truth of Torah in its entirety which could arise from singling out the Ten Commandments was considered so grave that it was outlawed in every place. But the suspicion that the silent praise following the shema be construed as disclaimer was so remote that it was given consideration only where heresy was rampant, not in Nahardea then, or anywhere today. * Pesachim 46a

Written and Compiled by Rabbi Mendel Weinbach General Editor: Rabbi Moshe Newman
Production Design: Eli Ballon Prepared by the Jewish Learning Exchange of Ohr Somayach International 22 Shimon Hatzadik Street, POB 18103 Jerusalem 91180, Israel