

INTERNET PARSHA SHEET  
ON VAYEISHEV - 5759

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>  
[www-shemayisrael.co.il-jewishamerica.com-ou.org/lists-youngisrael.org-613.org](http://www-shemayisrael.co.il-jewishamerica.com-ou.org/lists-youngisrael.org-613.org)  
Thank you to M. Fiskus for distributing in YIJE and to S. Gunsburg for distributing in KBY

\* TORAH WEEKLY \* Highlights of the Weekly Torah Portion Parshas Vayeshev <http://www.ohr.org.il/tw/5759/Bereishi/vayeshev.htm>

\_\_\_\_\_The Play's The Thing\_\_\_\_\_ "And Yaakov sat...." (37:1) Once there was a woman sipping coffee in the lobby of a theater long after the movie had started. The usher was curious why she hadn't taken her seat, and asked if she knew that the movie had already started. "Oh yes," she replied, "I know, but I don't want to go in there now. It's much too crowded and noisy. Once they all come out, that's when I go in. Then I can have all the seats to myself!"

We tend to think that the purpose of life is those endless, sunny, summer days; days when you can't see a cloud and everything seems perfect. And when the rain falls into our lives -- as it does to us all -- well, that's something to be endured until the clouds clear. We put up with hardship, thinking that it's just a painful intermission, and when it ends we will get back to the "real purpose of life." The reverse is really the case. Life is all about the rain and the storms and our striving to overcome them. For in this way, we elevate ourselves spiritually and fulfill the purpose for which we were sent down here. Those sunny days are so we can gather our strength, and thus derive the maximum benefit from facing life's challenges.

Yaakov wanted to live in peace and tranquillity. Hashem not enough for the righteous that they have their reward in the World to Come? They also want to live in this world in serenity?" Even though Yaakov desired serenity to devote himself to spiritual pursuits, nevertheless it was considered improper for him to place his focus on serenity. For in life "the play's the thing," not the intermission.

\_\_\_\_\_The Good, The Bad, And The Holy\_\_\_\_\_ "His brothers saw that it was he whom their father loved the most... so they hated him." (37:4) One of the more satisfying aspects of early cowboy-films is that you can always tell the goodies from the baddies. As every schoolboy knows, the goodies wear white hats and the baddies wear black hats. This is an immutable law of cowboy-film reality, no less than water always flowing downhill and the sun always rising in the east. Life, however, is usually stranger than fiction, and always more complex. In life, it's not always so simple to work out who are the goodies and who are the baddies.

Around two hundred years ago, the great Yeshiva of Volozhin was embroiled in a dispute between two giants of the Torah, the Netziv and the Beis Halevi. On Shabbat morning of Parshat Vayeshev, the Maggid of Vilna arose to address the Yeshiva. The Maggid pointed out that from the beginning of the Torah until this week's Parsha, good and evil are as clearly defined as black and white. Adam and Chava are good, the serpent is evil. Hevel is good, Cain is evil. Sarah is good, Hagar is evil. Yitzchak is good, Yishmael is evil, etc. However, in this week's Parsha, for the first time in the Torah's narrative, it's not so simple to discern who is good and who is evil.

On the one hand, Yosef behaved immaturely, dressing his hair and adorning his eyes to make himself look beautiful. He held himself aloof from Leah's sons, preferring to associate with the children of Bilha and Zilpa, the handmaidens. Yosef "informed" on his brothers to his father. He judged them harshly, failing to give them the benefit of the doubt. In a sense, the brothers could be forgiven for thinking that Yosef was evil. For in the previous two generations, there had been a son who had turned to an evil usurper (Yishmael and Esav), so they understood that one of their number might also turn aside and become evil. When Yosef started telling them his dreams, they understandably thought that Yosef was setting the stage to grab the mantle of kingship for himself. And thus they tried him and sentenced him to death.

On the other hand, the brothers did not act out of total altruism. They were jealous of Yosef. He was the favorite of their father Yaakov. They resented the embroidered tunic of fine colored woolen stripes

that Yaakov had given Yosef. Sometimes in life it's not so clear who's the goodie and who's the baddie. Sometimes it's the goodies who wear the black hats.

Sources: \* The Good, The Bad, and the Holy - Rabbi Berel Wein, as heard from Rabbi C.Z. Senter \* The Play's The Thing - Rabbi Yerucham Levovitz

Written and 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 <http://www.ohr.org.il>

"RavFrاند" List - Rabbi Frاند on Parshas Vayeshev Parshas Vayeshev

Rashi's Comment Contained Within the Verse Itself Yosef dreamt that the sun, moon, and eleven stars all bowed down to him. The symbolism of this dream was obvious to Yaakov -- the sun and moon were Yosef's father and mother, and the eleven stars were his brothers. Yaakov chastised Yosef, saying, "What is this dream that you dreamt (mah haChalom hazeh ASHER CHALAMTA) -- will I and your mother and your eleven brothers come and bow down to you to the ground?" [Bereishis 37:10]. Rash"i explains that Yaakov was not criticizing the entire dream. Rather, he was pointing out that the dream could not possibly come true, because in fact Yosef's mother was no longer alive. Rash"i's comment can be derived from the words ASHER CHALAMTA (that you dreamt). If we look carefully at those two words (and reposition the space that separates them) we will find the words RACHEL MEISa (Rachel, Yosef's mother, died).

Reuven, Aharon, and Boaz All Had Their Doubts Reuven intervened to save Yosef. He did not want to participate in the killing of his brother. According to the brothers' judgement, Yosef was a Pursuer, one who "runs after" someone with intent to kill him. They believed that Yosef was attempting to cut them out of the Jewish people. Yet even though Chaza"l tell us that the brothers judged Yosef as a Pursuer, deserving of death, Reuven did not want to have any part of that. Reuven devised a plan and told the brothers to throw Yosef into a pit (rather than kill him). Reuven hoped to eventually come back and rescue Yosef from the pit. The Medrash in Ruth says that had Reuven known that G-d would eventually write that 'Reuven went and saved his brother', Reuven would have unashamedly carried Yosef on his shoulders all the way back to his father. Since he did not realize that this narration would appear in the Torah, he devised a clandestine plan which was not completely successful. The Medrash also says there that had Aharon known that his greeting to Moshe upon Moshe's return from Midian would be recorded in the Torah, then he would have gone out to greet Moshe with musical instruments and dancing. Finally, the Medrash says that had Boaz realized that G-d would publicize his generosity to Ruth, he would have provided her with a fully catered meal, rather than feeding her a few kernels of grain! This Medrash always bothered me. It seems to be saying that Reuven, Aharon and Boaz were publicity hounds. Had they known that "The Press" was going to be there, then they would have done a better job. But since they did not think it would make the front page, they did less than they could have. The Medrash obviously wants to praise these individuals -- they were all doing good things. So what is the meaning of that statement that "Had they known... they would have done it on a grander scale"? The interpretation of the Medrash is as follows. They were not interested in publicity. They were not interested in the front pages. However, each of these individuals had a lot of doubt whether what he was doing was correct. They did not know -- in each case -- whether they were doing the proper thing at all. Reuven was going up against his brothers -- a Beis Din of the Tribes of Israel. Ten brothers paskened, ruled, that Yosef was a Pursuer who was guilty of the death penalty. Reuven was in the minority. Maybe the brothers were correct, and Yosef deserved to die. For this reason, Reuven was hesitant. Had he known that G-d appreciated and agreed with what he did, Reuven would have 'gone all out'. When Aharon went to greet Moshe Rabbeinu, he also had his doubts. "People will say I am crazy. I am the older brother. The younger brother should pay respect to the older brother; not vice

versa." Had Aharon known that G-d would look favorably upon this act, he would have gone without any embarrassment and without any hesitation. When Boaz gave the food to the young maiden Ruth, he was afraid that perhaps people would raise their eyebrows and snicker and say "Hey, what's going on over there with Boaz and Ruth?" He was therefore concerned about what people would say. Had he known that G-d in fact would agree with him, he too would have 'gone all out'. The Medrash continues, "In days gone by a person would do a mitzvah and the prophet would record it. Nowadays when a person does a mitzvah, and people scorn, who writes down who was right?" The Medrash answers its own question "Eliyahu will write it down and the Messianic King and G-d Himself will sign it in affirmation. Concerning this it is written [Malachi 3:16] "Then the G-d fearing men spoke to one another and the L-rd listened and heard it. And a book of remembrance was written before Him for those who feared the L-rd and for those who valued His Name highly." The prophet Malachi is speaking of a period -- just prior to the coming of the Messiah -- when everyone would laugh at those who observed the Mitzvos. Everyone will say "these guys are behind the times; they are not modern; they are not 'with it'". It will appear that the other forces are the ones that are prevailing. Perhaps in those times, people will also be reticent and hesitate to take a stand. People will again think "we are in the minority; maybe they are right and we are wrong." Malachi talks about a time when people will perhaps be ashamed to do what they think is right, like Reuven and Aharon and Boaz. So G-d testifies that at the end of the days, before Moshiach, "You do what you know is right. Keep the Torah; keep the faith; keep the flame burning. I and Eliyahu the prophet and the Moshiach himself are going to write about you that you were right all along."

Transcribed by David Twersky; Seattle, Washington twerskyd@aol.com  
 Technical Assistance by Dovid Hoffman; Yerushalayim  
 dhoffman@torah.org Project Genesis: Torah on the Information  
 Superhighway learn@torah.org 6810 Park Heights http://www.torah.org/  
 Baltimore, MD 21215

#### Hamaayan / The Torah Spring Edited by Shlomo Katz

The midrash introduces this parashah, in which we read that Yosef's brothers hated him and sold him as a slave, with a verse from Iyov (3:25), "Never did I feel secure, never quiet, never at peace; and now, torment." The midrash expounds: "Never did I feel secure - because of Esav; never quiet - because of Lavan; never at peace - because of Dinah; and now, torment - because of Yosef." R' Aharon Lewin z"l (1879-1941; the "Reisha Rav") explains: There is nothing as painful to a father as a fight between his children, for children represent a father's hope for the future. A parent's greatest desire is to see his children happy, to see them growing without obstacles or frustrations; therefore, if the children are at odds with each other, the parent's heart is broken within him and all of life's troubles pale in comparison. The verse quoted by the midrash summarizes Yaakov's life. Yaakov faced many trials and tribulations in his lifetime, but none of these dampened his spirits or depressed him - that is, until the enmity between Yosef and his brothers broke out. Experience shows that there is no war as bad as a civil war. Throughout history, powerful nations have dominated their neighbors and sown fear and dread into the hearts of smaller nations. Yet, when these powerful empires have experienced internal dissension, they have disappeared almost overnight. [Ed. note: In our own time, the breakup of the Soviet Union is an example of this phenomenon.] Yaakov knew how to deal with an attack by Esav, by Lavan, or by Dinah's kidnappers. Nevertheless, he was at a loss when it came to dealing with the battle that raged in his own home. (Ha'drash V'ha'iyun)

"Reuven heard, and he rescued him [Yosef] from their hand..." (37:20) Did Reuven really save Yosef? He proposed throwing Yosef into a pit full of snakes and scorpions! Also, the gemara (Sanhedrin 6a) says that one is prohibited from praising Yehuda for saving Yosef from the pit. Why? Wasn't Yehuda's act greater than Reuven's? R' Y. Stern z"l of Paris explains: True, Reuven's act might have led to Yosef's death, but only his

physical death. In contrast, by proposing that Yosef be sold to Egypt as a slave, Yehuda condemned Yosef to a spiritual death (i.e., a lesser person than Yosef would have been swept up by the idolatry and immorality of Egypt). (Iturei Torah)

... Hamaayan, Copyright (c) 1998 by Shlomo Katz and Project Genesis, Inc. Posted by Alan Broder, ajb@torah.org  
<http://www.torah.org/learning/hamaayan/>  
<http://www.acoast.com/~sehch/hamaayan/> . Project Genesis: Torah on the Information Superhighway learn@torah.org

\* PARSHA Q&A \* In-Depth Questions on the Parsha and Rashi's commentary. Parshas Vayeshev <http://www.ohr.org.il/qa/5759/bereshi/vayeshev.htm> ...

Recommended Reading List Ramban 37:2 The Evil Report 37:10 The Moon 38:24 Tamar's Punishment Sforno 37:2 The Evil Report 37:3 Yosef's Coat 37:18 The Brothers' Concern 38:1 Yehuda's Punishment 39:19 Why Yosef was Imprisoned

This Week's Questions All references are to the verses and Rashi's commentary, unless otherwise stated

1. "These are the offspring of Yaakov: Yosef...." Give three reasons why Yosef is considered Yaakov's main offspring. 37:2 - (a) Yosef was the son of Rachel, Yaakov's primary wife. (b) Yosef looked like Yaakov. (c) All that befell Yaakov befell Yosef. 2. What was praiseworthy about the fact that Yosef's brothers did not speak to him in a friendly manner? 37:4 - They did not act hypocritically. 3. How do we see from Yosef's dream about the sun, moon and stars that all dreams contain some untrue element? 37:10 - The moon represented Rachel. Since she had already died, it was impossible for that element of the dream to come true. 4. Who brought Yosef down to Egypt? 37:28 - A caravan of Midianites. 5. Where was Reuven when Yosef was sold? 37:29 - He was attending to Yaakov. 6. In addition to the brothers, who else knew that Yosef was alive? 37:33 - Yitzchak. 7. Why didn't Hashem reveal prophetically to Yaakov that Yosef was alive? 37:33 - Because the brothers had issued a ban against revealing the truth to Yaakov, and Hashem, so to speak, abided by their ban. 8. For how long did Yaakov mourn the loss of Yosef? 37:34 - Twenty-two years. 9. Verse 37:35 states "his father wept." To whom does this refer? 37:35 - Yitzchak, who wept because of Yaakov's suffering. 10. Who was Tamar's father? 38:24 - Shem. 11. In what merit did Tamar deserve to have kings as her descendants? 38:26 - In the merit of her modesty. 12. Why is the word "hand" mentioned four times in connection to the birth of Zerach? 38:30 - To allude to his descendent, Achan, who sinned with his hand by taking four things from the spoils of Jericho. 13. Why does the Torah relate the incident with Potiphar's wife immediately after the incident of Yehuda and Tamar? 39:1 - To teach us that just as Tamar acted with pure motives, so did Potiphar's wife. 14. How did Potiphar "see" that Hashem was with Yosef? 39:3 - Yosef mentioned Hashem's name frequently in his speech. 15. Who in this week's Parsha pretended to be sick? 39:11 - Potiphar's wife. 16. Why were the butler and the baker imprisoned? 40:1 - The butler was imprisoned because a fly was found in the king's goblet, and the baker was imprisoned because a pebble was found in the king's bread. 17. For how long were the butler and the baker in prison? 40:4 - Twelve months. 18. How did the baker know that Yosef had correctly interpreted the butler's dream? 40:5 - The baker dreamed the interpretation of the butler's dream. 19. What promoted the butler and baker to tell Yosef their dreams? 40:6 - Yosef asked them why they looked troubled. 20. How was Yosef punished for asking the butler for help? 40:23 - He remained in prison an additional two years.

Written and Compiled by Rabbi Reuven Subar General Editor: Rabbi Moshe Newman Production Design: Eli Ballon (C) 1998 Ohr Somayach International

Yated - Peninim Ahl HaTorah Parshas Vayeishev by Rabbi A. Leib

Scheinbaum Hebrew Academy of Cleveland

"And Yaakov settled in the land of his father's sojournings." (37:1) The text begins with the word, *Vayeshev*, settle, and ends with *migurei*, sojourn. Chazal infer from this seeming ambiguity that Yaakov finally sought to settle down, to rest from the tzaros, afflictions, that were an integral part of his life. He was not, however, destined to rest. The righteous enjoy no rest in this world. Their ultimate rest and reward await them in the World to Come. Chazal do not mean that Yaakov is about to retire, to cease his work in this world. They simply teach us that the tzaddik's work is never completed. Yaakov thought that he had fulfilled his mission, raised a Torah family, blazed the trail for the creation of Klal Yisrael; he now merited to sit and learn Torah uninterrupted. This was not destined to be. He was thrown into a major crisis in which his beloved family was torn with strife and his dear Yosef was taken from him. In his old age he was relegated to mourn a son in whom he had placed so much hope. No, Yaakov's mission was far from complete.

What lesson can we derive for ourselves? In his inimitable manner, Horav Moshe Swift, zl, poses the question; Can a Jew ever take it easy? He has built his home and involved himself in the community. He has a wonderful marriage in which he has raised a lovely Torah family. Can he breathe a sigh of relief, now that all his trials and tribulations are behind him? Is that not precisely what Yaakov was attempting? Eisav was behind him. Lavan no longer had a strangle-hold over him. Dinah had become an episode in the past. His family seemed to be in order. The Torah's message is clear: We can never sit back and rest upon our past laurels. A Jew can never be *vayeshev*, never settle himself. New crises continue to confront us. We have new challenges to surmount and new obstacles to overcome. We must build for our children, so that they will preserve the ideals that we bequeath them. What was sufficient for us is not necessarily adequate for our children. They are confronted with new and stronger challenges than those which we have faced. Only if we build for them will they know to build for their children. The Jew's mission in life is to keep moving forward. The unfortunate alternative is that he will fall backwards.

"And his brothers were jealous of him." (37:1) Meilitz Yosher infers a striking lesson from this pasuk. One can have an abundance of heterim, reasons for eating a certain food that is not kosher. He can find a number of reasons to justify his actions. Yet, when all is said and done, his action is simply not justifiable. This is similar to the lazy person who comes up with a multitude of excuses for not participating in a given endeavor. Indeed, all of the stated reasons may be true, but the main reason that he is not involved in this endeavor is his indolence! The Torah tells us that in the final analysis, the brothers were nothing more than jealous. They had rendered a halachic decision; they had discussed every reason pro and con for finding clemency for Yosef; but in the end, they were simply jealous. The Torah's insight pierces through the facade that veils the real reason for selling Yosef jealousy! A person can shout that he is acting *lshem Shomayim*, for the sake of Heaven, but in reality he is responding to his own misguided passion. He may claim that he is zealous but in reality he is nothing more than jealous!

Shabbat-B'Shabbato - Parshat Vayeishev SHABBAT-ZOMET is an extract from SHABBAT-B'SHABBATO, a weekly bulletin distributed free of charge in hundreds of synagogues in Israel. It is published by the Zomet Institute of Alon Shevut, Israel, Translated by: Moshe Goldberg

SOMETIMES IT MAY BE NECESSARY TO TAKE SIDES by Rabbi David Lau, Chief Rabbi of Modi'in None of the participants in the story of the sale of Yosef is free of blame. This was true of Yaakov, who openly favored Yosef, and also of Yosef himself, who contributed to his brothers' hate by bringing gossip to his father, and of course of the brothers, who almost translated their hate into murder. Two of the brothers, Reuven and Yehuda, stand out as being different, in that they wanted to save Yosef. Reuven tried to save him but didn't finish the job. Yehuda saved him from death but left him to be sold as a slave to Egypt. There is a wide difference in the attitude towards these two brothers. Reuven is praised, and the Torah

bears witness that he wanted "to rescue him from their hands, in order to return him to his father" [Bereishit 37:22]. As a reward for his efforts, Reuven had the privilege of being the first one to have a sanctuary city in his territory. Yehuda, on the other hand, was punished, starting from his fall from favor with his brothers and eventually having his wife and sons die (see Bereishit Rabba 85:3). The sages even go so far as to write that anybody who praises Yehuda for saving Yosef from death is disparaging G-d (Sandhedrin 6b). Why are these two brothers different? After all, didn't Yehuda manage to save Yosef from the mortal danger of serpents and scorpions? Why should he be punished? It would seem that the criticism of Yehuda is that he did not take a firm stand. The sages describe a halachic discussion between the brothers whether Yosef should be put to death or not. Shimon and Levi led the accusers, while most of the other brothers felt that Yosef should be set free. They all turned to Yehuda for his opinion. If he felt that Yosef was guilty, he should have objected to Reuven's proposal to throw him into the pit, and if he felt that Yosef was innocent, he should have argued against Shimon and Levi and helped bring Yosef back home. But Yehuda's suggestion, to sell him to a passing caravan, is "neither here nor there." It is a proposal which satisfies neither side and seems to be an attempt not to make any decision. It is this refusal to take a stand which is so strongly punished. This is similar to what was written by my late grandfather, Rabbi Y. Frankel, Chief Rabbi of Tel Aviv, in order to explain the criticism of Rabbi Zecharia ben Avkulous, who is accused of causing the destruction of the Temple (Gittin 57a). Even though he was head of the Sanhedrin, he refused to give an opinion on the right way to act. He noted that both sides of the controversy should be heard, but he would not say what he thought. Such modesty was out of place; a rabbi and a leader must be willing to clearly state his opinion when it is called for. In contrast to these examples are Matiyahu and his sons, who did not try to accommodate both the Torah and the Hellenists. They saw that passive standing on the sidelines had the effect of giving a victory to those who wanted to abandon Judaism. This would have led to increased influence by the Greeks, so they rose up with the call: "Whoever is on the side of G-d, come to me!" In the end, they were privileged not to have to look for compromises and use impure oil for the dedication of the Temple but were able to light pure olive oil.

---

WEEKLY-HALACHA FOR 5759 SELECTED HALACHOS RELATING TO PARSHAS VAYEISHEV By Rabbi Doniel Neustadt A discussion of Halachic topics related to the Parsha of the week. For final rulings, consult your Rav.

"NO MAN OF THE HOUSEHOLD STAFF WAS THERE IN THE HOUSE" (39:11)

BABY-SITTING: HOW TO AVOID YICHUD Yichud, the prohibition against a man being alone in a secluded place with a woman, is Biblically forbidden(1). It is for this reason that Yosef ha-Tzaddik, who as a son of Yaakov Avinu kept the mitzvos of the Torah, refused to be alone with his master's wife in their home(2). Indeed, on that fateful day, when he unexpectedly found himself alone with her in the house, he was almost tempted to sin. What follows are some guidelines concerning yichud in everyday situations.

ARE RELATIVES INCLUDED IN THE PROHIBITION OF YICHUD? Yichud is permitted with linear descendants, such as parents with their children(3) or grandchildren(4). Yichud is also permitted between a brother and a sister(5) and a nephew with his father's or mother's sister(6), but only on a temporary basis(7). They may not live together in the same house for a period of time which exceeds the normal stay of a house guest(8).

Yichud with all other relatives, such as uncles, aunts [through marriage], cousins, brothers-in-law, parents-in-law, etc., is strictly prohibited(9).

AT WHAT AGE DOES THE PROHIBITION OF YICHUD BEGIN? A boy under the age of bar mitzvah is permitted to be alone with a girl under the age of bas mitzvah(10). Since there is no mitzvah of chinuch in the prohibition of yichud(11) and both parties are minors(12), yichud is permitted. When one of the parties, however, is bar/bas mitzvah, then he or she may not be alone with a member of the opposite gender. We must clarify, therefore, the minimum age requirements of the other party - the one who is under bar/bas mitzvah. According to the Rambam, Shulchan Aruch and all the earlier poskim [including the Mishnah Berurah(13)], once a girl turns three years old she is considered an *ervah* in regard to yichud and all halachos of the Torah - she must dress properly, physical contact and yichud with her are prohibited, etc. Indeed, in many communities these halachos are strictly observed from the age of three. The Chazon Ish(14), however, when discussing the halachos of reciting Kerias Shema in the presence of an *ervah*, disputes this cut-off age. In his opinion, a little girl is not considered an *ervah* because people do not view her as such until she matures. There is no exact age that determines *ervah* since the maturation rate of each individual girl differs. It is generally assumed, though, that any girl up to the age of six or seven is not considered an *ervah*(15). In the view of some contemporary poskim(16), the Chazon Ish's leniency applies only to hilchos Kerias Shema; it does not apply to hilchos yichud. Concerning hilchos yichud, age three remains the age from when yichud is prohibited. Other poskim(17), however, hold that the Chazon Ish's leniency applies to hilchos yichud(18) as well. In their opinion,

yichud is permitted with a girl until the age of five or six. Harav M. Feinstein(19) deals with this issue from a different angle. In his opinion, yichud may be permitted with a girl over three since a girl that age will surely report any illicit behavior to her parents or teachers. The fear of being found out is enough of a deterrent to permit yichud with a girl that young. In his final evaluation, however, Harav Feinstein hesitates to expressly permit yichud with a girl over three, although he does not object to those who are lenient. In an oral ruling(20), Harav Feinstein allows yichud - when necessary - with a girl till age seven. The age of yichud for a boy begins at age nine(21).

QUESTION: Are there any permissible ways in which a girl over twelve may baby-sit for a boy over nine? DISCUSSION: There are several permissible ways. The halachic definition of yichud is: Seclusion with little or no chance of intrusion from the outside. The halachah states, therefore, that if there is a pesach pasuach (open door) to a reshus ha-rabim (public domain), then yichud does not apply, since there is a constant possibility of public access. Thus, for yichud to be permitted, both of the above factors - pesach pasuach and reshus ha-rabim - must be present. What constitutes pesach pasuach is a subject of debate among the poskim. Similarly, there is no exact, undisputed definition of reshus ha-rabim. In the following situations, however, there is general agreement among the poskim that yichud is permitted(22): If the front door is left completely or partially open(23). After 10 p.m.(24) the house must also be well lit(25); If the front door is closed, but unlocked, and people regularly walk into the house without knocking(26). After 10 p.m. one should not rely on the door being locked, but the parents or other members of the household are in possession of a key and could come into the house at any time(28); If the door is locked, but there is an unimpeded view from the street or from a facing window directly into the room where the yichud is taking place(29). The home must be well lit. After 10 p.m. it is better not to rely on this solution(30); If another child, male(31) or female(32), is in the house. There are various opinions concerning the required age of the other child - ranging from a minimum age of five to a maximum of thirteen for a male and twelve for a female(33). This leniency is only applicable during normal waking hours(34). To extend this leniency to normal nighttime sleeping hours, there have to be two children present besides the one who is being cared for(35).

Often, none of the above solutions are practical. A baby-sitter may not want to leave the door open or unlocked. Sometimes the parents may be out of town or unavailable to check on their children. Thus, the preferred method when hiring a baby-sitter is to give a set of keys to a married couple that lives nearby(36), with instructions that the husband and wife should come into the house several times throughout the day and night. The baby-sitter must be told of these instructions. The neighbor must actually go into the house several times for this leniency to be valid(37).

#### FOOTNOTES:

1 View of the vast majority of the Rishonim. In certain situations, such as when one man is alone with two women, yichud is Biblically permitted but prohibited by the Rabbis. 2 See Ibn Ezra, Rashbam and Seferon on Bereishis 39:10. 3 E.H. 22:1. See Igros Moshe E.H. 2:15; E.H. 4:65-8 who rules that it is permitted for a man to be alone with another woman other than his wife in the presence of his daughter, mother or sister. 4 Pischei Teshuvah E.H. 22:2 quoting the Bach. 5 Beis Shmuel and Chelkas Mechokek E.H. 22:1. 6 Igros Moshe E.H. 4:63; 64-1, since a nephew and his aunts have the same relationship as a brother and a sister, based on Shulchan Aruch E.H. 21:7. See Hebrew Notes, pg. 236, for an elaboration. 7 Beis Shmuel and Chelkas Mechokek E.H. 22:1. 8 Igros Moshe E.H. 4:64-3;65-11, who adds that a sister who is visiting from a distant city may stay longer than a sister visiting from a nearby area, just as a guest from afar stays longer than a guest from nearby. 9 E.H. 22:1; Igros Moshe E.H. 4:63; 64-1. See Hebrew Notes, pg. 237, for elaboration. 10 Bach and Yam Shel Shelomo in the name of the Semag, quoted in Devar Halachah 2:8. 11 Shevet ha-Levi 5:204 wonders why the process of chinuch does not pertain to this prohibition. See Divrei Sofrim, pg. 137 for a possible answer. 12 Or one minor and one non-Jew - oral ruling from Harav S.Y. Elyashiv (Kuntres Toras ha-Yichud). 13 Beur Halachah 75:1 - concerning the definition of an ervah for hilchos Kerias Shema. 14 O.C. 16:8. See also Maharam Brisk 2:70 who concurs with this ruling. Harav M. Feinstein is also quoted (Children in Halachah pg. 30) as concurring with this ruling. 15 Halichos Bas Yisrael 4:3; Ohr ITziyon 6:12. Harav Y. Kamenetsky (oral ruling quoted in Ko Somar I/Beis Yaakov pg. 139) ruled that until age five is clearly permitted, while from age five and above depends on the individual girl. 16 Harav S.Y. Elyashiv (quoted in Nishmas Avraham vol. 5, pg. 135). 17 Harav S.Z. Auerbach and Harav Y.Y. Neuwirth (quoted in Nishmas Avraham vol. 5, pg. 135). For an explanation of this dispute, see Hebrew Notes, pg. 237. 18 Hugging and kissing, however, is prohibited from age three and on - ibid. 19 Igros Moshe E.H. 4:65-12. 20 Quoted in Children in Halachah pg. 40. 21 This is the ruling of the Shulchan Aruch E.H. 22:11 and all the poskim. See, however Kuntres Toras ha-Yichud who quotes an oral ruling from Harav S.Y. Elyashiv that nowadays we can be lenient and allow yichud with a boy till age eleven. No other poskim, however, mention this leniency. 22 There is a disagreement among the poskim if the leniency of pesach pasuch may be relied upon when the baby-sitter and the child share a close, personal relationship which could be described as libo ga bah. One should be stringent - Igros Moshe E.H. 4:60; 65-9. 23 E.H. 22:9. 24 The 10 p.m. deadline was given by the Chazon Ish (Devar Halachah 3:14) as the time that is considered as "late night hours" in the city of Bnei Brak during the 1950s. Each location, depending on its population and lifestyle, must determine its own "late" hours. 25 The poskim rule that during the late night hours, when people are not on the streets, the leniency of an open door does not apply - see Be'er Heitev and Pischei Teshuvah E.H. 22:9, and Igros Moshe E.H. 4:65-5. When the house is lit, however, there are poskim who are lenient - see Devar Halachah 3:15. 26 Ruling of Harav S.Y. Elyashiv and Harav C.P. Scheinberg (Kuntres Yichud pg. 25) as a compromise between those who require the door to be completely open and those who allow yichud as long as the door is not locked. See Igros Moshe E.H. 4:65-4, who is lenient even when the door is locked, as long as there is a possibility that someone would come knocking on the door and would need to be let in. Most other poskim do not agree with this leniency. 27 Since even a completely open door should not be relied upon late at night. Even lighting the house would possibly not be sufficient in this case - see Devar Halachah 3:15. 28 Devar Halachah 3:3 quoting the Chazon Ish and Dovev Meisharim. 29 Noda B'yehudah E.H. 1:77; Igros Moshe E.H. 4: 65-2; Devar Halachah 3:10. 30 See note 27. 31 Beis Shmuel E.H. 22:9; Chochmas Adam 126:5-9. 32 E.H. 22:10. 33 See Devar Halachah 4:2-3 for all the various views. A sister of any age over five serves as a guardian - see note 3. 34 Rama E.H. 22:5; Chasam Sofer E.H. 2:96. Even if the child is presently up, once it is past his normal bedtime we are concerned that he may fall asleep at any time and will no longer serve as a guardian. The same halachah applies during the day if the guardian is actually sleeping. 35

Chazon Ish Kiddushin 45; Devar Halachah 4:9. 36 A married couple is preferable since they can come together to check on the house, thus avoiding a possible yichud problem between the baby-sitter and the neighbor. Even in a situation where a yichud problem does not exist, two neighbors should be asked to check the house, since we are fearful that one can forget or fall asleep. 37 Devar Halachah pg. 188-189. See further clarification in Avnei Yashfei 2:185.

Mazel Tov! Mazel Tov! This issue of Weekly-Halacha is sponsored in honor of the birth of a baby boy to Ari and Dina Lundner by the proud grandparents, Jeffrey and Barbara Gross.

THE COMPLETE SET IS NOW AVAILABLE! The Weekly Halachah Discussion Volume 2 on Vayikra, Bamidbar and Devarim is published and on sale in your local bookstore! Weekly-Halacha, Copyright (c) 1998 by Rabbi Neustadt, Dr. Jeffrey Gross and Project Genesis, Inc. The author, Rabbi Neustadt, is the principal of Yavne Teachers' College in Cleveland, Ohio. He is also the Magid Shiur of a daily Mishna Berurah class at Congregation Shomre Shabbos. The Weekly-Halacha Series is distributed L'zchus Doniel Meir ben Hinda. Weekly sponsorships are available - please mail to jgross@torah.org . Project Genesis: Torah on the Information Superhighway learn@torah.org 6810 Park Heights Ave. http://www.torah.org/ Baltimore, MD 21215

From: Jonathan Schwartz[SMTP:jschwartz@ymail.yu.edu] Subject: Internet ChaburaH--Parshas VaYeshev Prologue: Whether we like it or not, there is an impression that one gets of a person by studying his appearance. Parshas VaYeshev accents this lesson through the dressing style of Tamar which led to Yehuda's evaluation of her profession and through Yaakov's decision to give the special coat to Yosef. Knowing the ire that would be evoked in the brothers through the elevation of their younger brother's status, how could Yaakov give Yosef the coat? R. Lavi Greenspan offered an interesting interpretation. According to the gameplan, Reuven was to be the one who was to receive the extra gifts of Kehuna, Malchus and the extra portion. This was a result of his status as the Bechor. When he sinned, Yaakov removed the bechora from him and gave it to Yosef. This was not haphazard. Rather Yaakov chose the next bechor and selected him to receive the gifts of the bechora. It was the right of the bechor to have them. And, as we see in the gemara in Nedarim, the actions of avoda, the right of a bechor/Kohen, requires one to be in special garb. Hence Moshe who was not a Kohen still had to wear something special when he performed the avoda in the mishkan during the Shivat Yimei Hamiluyim. Yosef's chulak for this purpose was the special coat his father gave him.

What Clothes Can Make a Man? The Michaber notes that (Orach Chaim 8:11) the main part of wearing a tallis kotton is for an individual to see the tzitzis all the time and recall the mitzvos.

The Mishna Berurah (8:25-26) cites the Mogen Avraham who notes that the minimum obligation is for one to at least wear the strings (as opposed to the entire begged) out of his clothes unlike those who place the strings in their clothes or in the corners of their begadim. Those who do so are not only ignoring the mitzva of seeing the tzitzis, they are also creating a chilul Hashem as they show they do not care for the word of Hashem in this matter. The Mogen Avraham continues with a harsh tone to tell the reader that those who engage in this practice are going to pay for it one day. He compares the situation to one who would get dressed up to see a secular king but will not dress up for the king of kings. The Aruch Hashulchan joins the Mogen Avraham's cause (8:17) noting that in the end of days Jews will be experts in this area. It appears that the makor for the words of the Mogen Avraham are in the Baal Hattur (Hil. Tzitzis End of 213) who quotes the teshuva of Rabbi Yitzchak Ben Maron who quotes the possuk "al Arba Kanfot Kesuscha" that the tzitzis must be literally on top of the begadim. Thus to fully be yetzei according to this opinion, one must wear the entire tzitzis garment on top of his clothes.

The Baal Hattur himself challenges this opinion. He cites the possuk "Uri'isem oso" to say that one does not have to look at the tzitzis all the time, just that the purpose of looking is U'zichartem es kol mitzvos Hashem. As one wears them, he should, at some point look at them so that he can remember the mitzvos (Thus, Uri'isem is a process to the performance of the mitzva, not a component of the mitzva itself according to the Baal Hattur). Rabbi Chaim Vital (Kavvanos HaAri 7b) notes that the custom of the Ari not to wear the Tzitzis on top of one's clothes. The Ari notes that those who do are acting haughtily (YooHara) and it is a mistake built on the reverse of truth. This serves as the basis for the machlokes that exists today among contemporary sages. According to the non-Kabbalists, one should wear his tzitzis out, while Kabbalists say he mustn't. Our Mesora teaches that when one has a difference of opinion between Torah and Kabbala, we follow Torah (Mishna Berurah 25:42). Hence, The Mishna Berurah holds one must wear his tzitzis out.

Sephardim tend to follow Kabbala in these matters. Hence, the Sdei Chemed, Birkei Yosef, Chida and Shut Rav Poalim all tell us to follow the kabbala teaching and keep tzitzis in, under one's clothes. The Rav Poalim (Orach Chaim II, 12) carefully reminds the reader that there is no Haughtiness in the opposing position (non-kabbala) (For a single opposing view on this matter, see Sichas Rabbi Dr. Norman Lamm, 5757) Rav Ovadiah Yosef cautions his charges not to follow minhag ashkenaz here because they follow the michaber even when he opposes Kabbala teachings. The Tzitz Eliezer (8:3) and the Az Nidbiru (3:43) both note that a position held by many rabbis to be a part of the main mitzva of tzitzis cannot be considered to be haughtiness if one were to keep it. Certainly this is the case with those who follow the Michaber here and wear their tzitzis on top of their begadim. There can be no yooHara in that.

L'Halacha, many rely on the opinion of the Shelah (Chullin, U'maiAchar) who notes that he wore the begged under his clothes because of the detractors. Still, he took the tzitzis from the front two sets of strings and wrapped them around his belt to be yetzei all the opinions, those of the promoters and the detractors. L'halacha this is the recommendation of the MiYam HaHalacha (I:8).

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

Pesachim 114 DIPPING THE KARPAS INTO CHAROSSES OPINIONS: The Mishnah says that during the Seder, Chazeres (Maror) is brought to the table before the Matzah. The Gemara explains that this refers to the Karpas which is eaten before the meal in order to arouse the curiosity of the children so that they will ask about this and other practices of the Seder. The Gemara explains that one is not required to eat Chazeres for Karpas; any vegetable will suffice. The Mishnah mentions Chazeres to teach that even when the only vegetable that one has is Maror, he should still

use it for Karpas in order to arouse the curiosity of the children. Does this first vegetable, whether it be Charoses or another vegetable, have to be dipped into Charoses or not? ....

**HALACHAH:** The DARCHI MOSHE quotes the AGUR who says that the author of the AGUDAH would put a little Charoses into the vinegar and dip the Charoses in that to satisfy all the above-mentioned opinions. The BEIS YOSEF, though, writes that the question is only whether one is \*allowed\* to use Charoses; everyone agrees that one is not \*required\* to use Charoses when using other vegetables. Therefore, he writes that it is best to avoid the issue and dip the vegetable into vinegar. The SHULCHAN ARUCH (OC 273:6) rules, therefore, that one should dip Karpas into vinegar, and the MISHNAH BERURAH adds that one may also use salt water, which is our practice today.

**115b REMOVING THE SEDER PLATE FROM THE TABLE OPINIONS:** The Gemara says that the custom was to remove the tables from before all of the people at the Seder (like the opinion of Rav Huna). The RASHBAM explains that nowadays, there is no custom to remove the table because we eat at one large table, whereas in the time of the Gemara they used to eat at small, individual tables. Rather, it suffices to move the Seder plate to the other end of the table. What is the practice today? (a) The SHULCHAN ARUCH (OC 473:4) rules like the Gemara's conclusion according to the Rashbam, that the Seder plate should be moved across the table before reciting Mah Nishtanah so that the children will be aroused to ask questions. (b) However, the MAGEN AVRAHAM (OC 473:25) writes that it is not necessary to do this nowadays. The purpose of removing the plate is to get the children curious by moving away the Seder plate before the meal, and this will not be accomplished today, because everyone knows that the Seder plate does not contain the food that will be eaten during the meal, but rather its contents are merely symbolic. Moving it will not arouse their curiosity. Even though the ELIYAH RABAH points out that some of the things on the Seder plate \*are\* eaten, such as the Matzos, and thus when the children see them being removed they will ask why, nevertheless many of the Poskim make no mention of moving the Seder plate because of the Magen Avraham's contention. Even though the MISHNAH BERURAH (Sha'ar haTzitzon 473:78) writes that the VILNA GA'ON and PRI MEGADIM did not rule like the Magen Avraham, (and therefore the Chafetz Chaim does not mention the opinion of the Magen Avraham in the Mishnah Berurah), nevertheless the grandson of the Chafetz Chaim, Rav Hillel Zaks, affirmed that the Chafetz Chaim himself did not move away the Seder plate. This is the practice in many households today. (c) The practice of the Yemenite Jewish community is to cover the entire table and everything on it with a tablecloth, a practice which is certain to arouse the curiosity of the children.

109 Dear Rabbi Kornfeld, I heard that Rav Soloveitchik, when asked about the doubling of Shiurim, replied that elephants don't lay eggs. Harvey Sukenic Brookline, MA The Kollel replies: Thanks for bringing that to our attention, Harvey! I suppose that the Rav, then, did not use "Brisker" Shiurim. On the other hand, I understand that at times he quipped about something, but in practice took it into consideration. Do we have any readers who can confirm what his practice was in this matter? Thanks, Mordecai

**PESACHIM 120-121 (25-26 Kislev) -** the Daf study material for the first day of Chanukah has been dedicated to the memory of Hagoan Rav Yisrael Zev Gutmman ZaTZal (author of "Kuntresei Shiurim"), whose Shiurim lit the eyes of many, by his students.

"Meet" the members of the Kollel at <http://www.dafyomi.co.il/kollel/kollel.htm> ! The Kollel employs a full-time staff to produce its study material; your support is urgently needed. Write to [donations@dafyomi.co.il](mailto:donations@dafyomi.co.il) for more info.

**Pesachim 116 A SON WHO IS NOT ABLE TO ASK THE FOUR QUESTIONS QUESTION:** The Mishnah states that the son should ask the four questions of the Mah Nishtanah. If the son is not wise enough yet, says the Mishnah, "the father should teach him" how to ask the four questions. The Gemara cites a Beraisa which says that the son should ask, and if he is not yet capable, then the wife should ask, and if one is not married, then he should ask the four questions himself. The Mishnah and Beraisa seem to contradict each other. The Mishnah says that if the son is not yet capable of asking, then the father should teach him. The Beraisa, though, says that if the son is unable to ask, then the wife or the father himself asks! Why does the Beraisa not say that the father should try to teach his son how to ask, as the Mishnah says? (SEFER BERACH MOSHE quoted by the HAGAHOS MAHARSHAM) ANSWER: The HAGAHOS MAHARSHAM says that when the Mishnah says "his father should teach him" ("Aviv Melamdo"), it does not mean that the father should teach the son how to ask the four questions. Rather, it means that the father should teach the son the \*answers\*, and that the father himself should ask the questions. Since the child is too young to understand the questions, it is pointless for the father to teach him how to ask. The whole point is for the father to tell the son about Yetzi'as Mitzrayim. (b) The SHULCHAN ARUCH (OC 473:7) records both the Mishnah and the Beraisa. The Shulchan Aruch writes that "if the child is not yet wise, the father should teach him \*to ask\*, and if he \*does not have a son\*, then the wife should ask, and if he does not have a wife, then he should ask." Apparently, the Shulchan Aruch had a slightly different Girsas in his Gemara, the Girsas of the Rosh and other Rishonim. The text of their Gemara read, "The son should ask, and \*if not\* (instead of "if \*the son is not able\*"), the wife should ask," meaning that only if there is no son, then the wife should ask. But if he does have a son, he should try to teach him how to ask the four questions.

**116b THE LOGIC BEHIND THE ORDER OF THE HAGADAH QUESTIONS:** The Mishnah discusses the order of the Seder and the Hagadah. It quotes Raban Gamliel who said that one who does not explicitly state the reasons that the Torah gives for the Mitzvos of Korban Pesach, Matzah, and Maror does not fulfill his obligation. We recite this part of the Mishnah in the Hagadah in order to fulfill Raban Gamliel's dictum. (a) What is Raban Gamliel's source for his rule? (TOSFOS, DH v'Amartem, says that the source is from the verse dealing with the Korban Pesach, which says, "You shall say, 'This is the Pesach offering...'" (Shemos 12:27). This answer needs elucidation, because (1) that verse is a response to a child's question, and mentions no obligation to say anything if a child does not ask, as Raban Gamliel requires. (2) That verse is not the source for the obligation to relate the story of Yetzi'as Mitzrayim on Pesach night. Rather, the source is Shemos 13:8, but in that verse there is no command to recite the phrases about Pesach, Matzah, and Maror. (3) Even if Raban Gamliel does derive his principle from the verse "v'Amartem," it would suffice to recite "the Matzah which we eat is because..." without the specific word "\*this\* Matzah". Why does Raban Gamliel require us to say "this" in each of the three phrases of Pesach, Matzah, and Maror. (4) If there is a Hekesh from Pesach to Matzah and Maror, Raban Gamliel's rule should only be an

obligation when the Pesach offering is brought. But at a time when there is no Pesach offering, there should also be no obligation to recite these statements regarding Matzah and Maror either.) (b) In the Hagadah, this paragraph seems to be placed in the wrong place. Why did the compiler of the Hagadah place the paragraph "Raban Gamliel Hayah Omer" between the paragraphs "Kamah Ma'alos Tovos" and "b'Chol Dor va'Dor"? The statement of Raban Gamliel, that one must recite specific statements about the Korban Pesach, Matzah, and Maror, has nothing to do with either the preceding or following paragraphs! It should have been placed after the paragraph "Yachol m'Rosh Chodesh", which concludes with the words, "...at such a time when the Matzah and the Maror are in front of you," for these are two of the three features which Raban Gamliel instructs us to discuss! (c) The Mishnah, after discussing the dictum of Raban Gamliel, introduces another obligation and says that "in every generation, a person is obligated to view himself as if he personally left Egypt. The Hagadah, too, places this obligation ("b'Chol Dor va'Dor") right after the paragraph of "Raban Gamliel." Why? One paragraph has no connection with the other! The compiler of the Hagadah should have placed "b'Chol Dor va'Dor" \*before\* "Raban Gamliel Hayah Omer," because the paragraphs which precede "Raban Gamliel Hayah Omer" list the abundant acts of kindness Hashem performed for the Jewish people ("Dayeinu"), and they mention the obligation to praise and thank Hashem for His benevolence. Therefore, it would have been appropriate to place "b'Chol Dor va'Dor" -- which discusses the obligation for every person to view himself as if he personally received Hashem's acts of kindness -- immediately after the list of those acts! (d) The next obligation mentioned in our Mishnah is the obligation to recite praises of Hashem, "Therefore we are obligated to give thanks and to praise... the One who did for our fathers and for us these miracles...." What is the logical progression from the passage of "b'Chol Dor va'Dor" to the recitation of the Hallel? ANSWER: The author of the MALBIM HAGADAH (apparently Rav Naftali Maskil l'Eisan) proposes a brilliant approach to answer all of these questions, as well as many others involving the order and content of the Hagadah. He suggests that the order and content of the Hagadah were based on the verse which is the source for the Mitzvah of recounting Yetzi'as Mitzrayim: "v'Higadeta l'Vincha ba'Yom ha'Hu Leimor, ba'Avur Zeh Asah Hashem Li b'Tzeisi m'Mitzrayim" -- "And you shall relate to your child on that day, saying: It is because of this that Hashem acted for me when I came forth out of Egypt" (Shemos 13:8). Although there are other verses in the Torah which command us to recount Yetzi'as Mitzrayim, this is the only verse which requires us to tell the story regardless of whether or not our children ask us about it. Since the commandment of this verse applies whether or not a child asks, it serves as the source for the Mitzvah of Pesach night for every Jew to tell the story of Yetzi'as Mitzrayim. This verse has six parts: (1) And you shall relate to your child (2) On that day (3) Saying (4) It is because of this (5) Hashem acted for me (6) When I came forth out of Egypt. The central section of the Hagadah (called "Magid"), too, is divided into six sections, corresponding to these six phrases. As such, this verse serves as the basis for the content and order of the Hagadah! (1) The first eight paragraphs, beginning with "Avadim Hayinu" and concluding with "The son who does not know how to ask," were placed at the beginning of the Hagadah to correspond with "v'Higadeta l'Vincha -- And you shall relate to your child," the first phrase. (See Malbim Hagadah for details.) (2) The second section of the Hagadah discusses \*when\* to fulfill the Mitzvah of recounting the story of Yetzi'as Mitzrayim and says, "Yachol m'Rosh Chodesh." This section corresponds to the second phrase of the verse "v'Higadeta," which says, "ba'Yom ha'Hu -- on that day," teaching \*which\* day this Mitzvah is supposed to be performed! The Hagadah derives from the words "ba'Yom ha'Hu" that the obligation of telling about the Exodus must be fulfilled "on that day" -- the day "when Matzah and Maror are in front of you" -- i.e. the Fifteenth of Nisan. (3) The third section of the Hagadah corresponds to the third phrase in Shemos 13:8, "Leimor" -- "saying." This phrase is the actual commandment to talk about Yetzi'as Mitzrayim, and thus the compiler of the Hagadah places the actual fulfillment of the Mitzvah of discussing Yetzi'as Mitzrayim at this point in the Hagadah! Not only was the compiler of the Hagadah consistent with the order of words in the verse which is the source for the Mitzvah, but he also achieved a logical progression by first introducing the obligation to recount the Exodus ("v'Higadeta l'Vincha"), then instructing when to fulfill this obligation ("ba'Yom ha'Hu"), and then including the actual fulfillment of the obligation ("Leimor"). This section begins with "Mit'chilah Ovdei Avodah Zarah" and concludes with "Al Achas Kamah v'Kamah," and contains the actual telling of the story of the Exodus. It appropriately corresponds to the third phrase of verse upon which the Hagadah is based, the phrase "Leimor" -- "saying." (4) The fourth section of the Hagadah corresponds to the fourth phrase, "Ba'avur Zeh" -- "it is because of this," in the verse "v'Higadeta." With this assumption, we can answer question (b) above. Raban Gamliel's rule that one must explain the Pesach, Matzah, and Maror corresponds to the phrase "Ba'avur Zeh," which is why the compiler of the Hagadah placed the paragraph of Raban Gamliel at this point in the Hagadah. What is the source for this rule? His source is none other than the phrase to which this section of the Hagadah corresponds -- "Ba'avur Zeh!" How does Raban Gamliel derive from these words the obligation to recite the explanation of the Pesach, Matzah, and Maror? Raban Gamliel reads the verse "v'Higadeta" differently from the common reading. The common translation of the verse is, "And you shall relate to your child on that day, saying: It is because of this that Hashem acted for me when I came forth out of Egypt." Raban Gamliel, however, translates the verse as follows: "And you shall relate to your child on that day, saying: \*This is because\* of what Hashem acted for me when I came forth out of Egypt." Raban Gamliel translates "Ba'avur Zeh" as "this is because," meaning, "the reason for this is," which is indeed an accurate, simple translation of the Hebrew phrase "Ba'avur Zeh". (The difference between the common way of reading the verse and Raban Gamliel's way is whether the word "Zeh" ("this") is the subject or the object of the subordinate clause. Raban Gamliel learns that it is the subject ("\*this thing\* is because") and not the object ("because of \*this thing\*"). To illustrate, it is as if the phrase reads "Zeh Ba'avur" instead of "Ba'avur Zeh", and as if the verse reads, "And you shall relate to your child on that day, saying: This is because of what Hashem did for me when I came forth out of Egypt." What does "this" refer to? "This" is the object on the table to which one can point and say, "\*This\* is because...", referring to the Korban Pesach, Matzah, and Maror! To summarize, Raban Gamliel's rule is clearly written in the verse itself. In order to fulfill the obligation of relating the story of Yetzi'as Mitzrayim to one's child, one must also relate the reason for the Korban Pesach ("Because the Holy One, blessed be He, passed over the houses of our fathers in Egypt"), the reason for the Matzah ("Because the dough of our fathers did not have time to become leavened"), and the reason for the Maror ("Because the Egyptians embittered the lives of our fathers in Egypt"). This obligation is part and parcel of the

obligation to recount the Exodus, as is evident by its presence in the verse commanding us to recount the Exodus! This answers question (a). This also explains why we must say "this\* Matzah" and "this\* Maror", for "this" is the language of the verse, "Ba'avur Zeh -- this is because". (5) The fifth section of the Hagadah corresponds to the next phrase in Shemos 13:8, "Asah Hashem Li." These words are the source for the obligation for each person to consider himself as if he personally had been redeemed from Mitzrayim. Therefore, the compiler of the Hagadah placed the paragraph "b'Chol Dor va'Dor," which discusses this obligation, at this point in the Hagadah following the order of the verse. This answers question (c). (6) The sixth section of the Hagadah begins with the paragraph "l'Fichach" -- "Therefore we are obligated to give thanks," which is the introduction to the recitation of Hallel. The recitation of Hallel was placed at the end of the Hagadah because it corresponds to the phrase "b'Tzeisi mi'Mitzrayim -- when I came forth out of Egypt," the sixth and final phrase of Shemos 13:8! The Hallel of the Seder commemorates the miracles of the redemption from Egypt and gratefully declares, "b'Tzeisi Yisrael mi'Mitzrayim" -- "When Yisrael went forth from Egypt," echoing the words upon which its inclusion in the Hagadah is based, "b'Tzeisi mi'Mitzrayim". This answers question (d). The author of the Malbim Hagadah adds that this is also the reason why the Hagadah is called "Hagadah," when perhaps a more appropriate word would have been "Sipur," as it says in a number of places, "In order that you relate (l'Saper) in the ears of your children" (Shemos 10:2), as well as in the Hagadah itself, "We would nevertheless be obligated to recount (l'Saper)..." and, "They were relating (Mesaprim) the story of Yetzi'as Mitzrayim..." Since the book's foundation from beginning to end is based on the words of the verse "v'Higadeta l'Vincha," the most fitting title for this book comes from the first word of that verse, "Hagadah". With a single, clear, simple answer, we have discovered an overwhelmingly logical and organized order in the Hagadah. The order of the Hagadah is the order of words in the verse which stands as the source for the Mitzvah of relating the story of Yetzi'as Mitzrayim, "(1) And you shall relate to your child (2) on that day, (3) saying: (4) It is because of this (5) that Hashem acted for me (6) when I came forth out of Egypt." (From the "Ma'amar Yesod Mosad," printed in the MALBIM HAGADAH, 1894 Vilna edition, and translated by J. Taub and Y. Shaw, Targum Press, 1993.)

Pesachim 117 THE ESSENCE OF "HALLEL" QUESTION: The Gemara says that the Nevi'im, the prophets, instituted that the Jewish people recite Hallel for each "Perek" ("time period" at which we were saved) and for each "Tzarah" ("trouble" from which we were saved). What is the difference between a "Perek" and a "Tzarah"? We always say Hallel to thank Hashem for saving us. What is the difference, then, between the Hallel of a "Perek" and the Hallel of a "Tzarah"? ANSWERS: (a) The RASHBAM (116b, DH Al Kol Perek) explains that "Perek" refers to the times that are set in the Jewish calendar by the Torah; in particular, this refers to the three Regalim -- Sukos, Pesach, and Shavuos. "Tzarah" refers to times not established by the Torah, but that were added later in history after a miraculous salvation occurred, such as Chanukah. Regarding the Hallel said for a "Tzarah," the Rashbam does not distinguish between the Hallel said at the actual moment of the miraculous salvation and the Hallel said each subsequent year in commemoration of the salvation. Apparently, both of those forms of Hallel are the same; it is just that when it is a highly significant miracle, we commemorate it and thank Hashem for it every year, and when it is a less significant miracle, we thank Hashem for it only the year that it occurred. They are both the same type of Hallel, though. (b) The BRISKER RAV (Hilchos Chanukah 3) cites RABEINU YERUCHAM who explains our Gemara differently. "Perek" refers to all set times during the year, including \*both\* the three Regalim and Chanukah, when there is a special enactment to recite Hallel. "Tzarah" means that at the time of a salvation, the Jewish people sing Hallel to thank Hashem, even without a special enactment. Where do we find that the Jewish people may sing Hallel spontaneously at the occurrence of a miracle? The BEHAG writes that whenever the Jewish people are gathered together and are all saved, they may say Hallel to thank Hashem; this form of Hallel was part of the decree of the Nevi'im. The Brisker Rav points out that these two types of Hallel not only apply at different times, but they are different in their essence in a number of ways. (1) The Hallel of established days on the calendar is \*obligatory\*, while the Hallel that is said spontaneously by all of the Jewish people together is optional; they are \*allowed\* and not \*obligated\* to say Hallel with a Berachah. (2) RABEINU YONAH in Berachos says that it is not necessary to recite the entire Hallel when the Jewish people are singing it in response to a miraculous salvation. They may say a few passages from it, and they may interrupt in the middle, even when they said a Berachah for it. In contrast, the Hallel of the Regalim must be recited in its entirety, and a Berachah may be said only when the entire Hallel is recited. The Brisker Rav explains that the reason for these differences is based on a difference in the essence of each Hallel. The Hallel of the Regalim and the set days is a Hallel recited as an obligation to "read the Hallel"; an obligation in "Keri'ah" (through reading the Hallel, we arouse our love for Hashem for the miracle which He did for us). The other Hallel, said by the Jewish people at the occurrence of a miraculous salvation, is said not as an obligation of \*reading Hallel\* per se, but as a form of praise to Hashem, or "Shirah" (our love for Hashem for the miracle that He did for us arouses us to say the Hallel). We may add that this explanation of the Brisker Rav will answer the Rashbam's question on Rashi in our Sugya. The Beraisa says that according to one opinion, Hallel was said by Moshe and Yisrael at the sea. Another opinion says that it was said by Yehoshua and Yisrael when they conquered Eretz Yisrael. A number of other opinions are given. At the end, the Beraisa quotes the opinion of the Chachamim who say that Hallel was instituted by the Nevi'im to read at each "Perek" and each "Tzarah" from which we were saved. Rashi explains that all of the opinions until the Chachamim are just adding to each other, and they are saying that Hallel was \*also\* (and not \*only\*) said at those times. The Rashbam asks that the wording of the Beraisa clearly implies that the Chachamim are arguing, and if the previous opinions agree that they said Hallel whenever they were saved, then they are saying the same thing as the Chachamim and they are not arguing! The answer might be that Rashi holds that according to the first opinions, there is no general institution to say Hallel after being saved. Only when the Navi \*tells\* us to say Hallel, after a miracle occurs, may we then say Hallel (with a Berachah). The Chachamim hold that there is a general institution to recite Hallel (as the BEHAG says); the Nevi'im instituted that whenever the Jewish people are gathered together and are saved by a miracle they may say Hallel, without needing a \*specific\* dispensation from the Nevi'im to do so.

117b HALACHAH: RECITING BIRKAS HA'MAZON OVER A CUP OF WINE OPINIONS: The Mishnah says that we recite Birkas ha'Mazon over a cup of wine on Pesach night. The Gemara, though, says that it cannot be proven from here that Birkas ha'Mazon always needs a cup of wine.

Since the Rabanan enacted that we drink four cups of wine on Pesach night, they said that each cup should be used for a Mitzvah. On any other day, though, there is no obligation to recite Birkas ha'Mazon over a cup of wine. What is the Halachah? Does Birkas ha'Mazon need to be recited over a cup of wine or not? (a) TOSFOS (105b, DH Shema Minah Berachah) cites RABEINU YECHIEL who says that even an individual needs a cup when reciting Birkas ha'Mazon, as the Mishnah implies when it says, "They poured \*for him\* a third cup" ("Mazgu \*Lo\* Kos Shelishi"). This is also the opinion of the ROSH (Pesachim 10:14 and Berachos 9:2). The Rosh points out that the Gemara says "Birkas ha'Mazon needs a cup," and not "Birkas \*ha'Zimun\*," which implies that using a cup of wine is an obligation in reciting Birkas ha'Mazon, and not just an obligation in Zimun. (b) However, TOSFOS (loc. cit.) mentions a dissenting opinion that says that perhaps Birkas ha'Mazon only needs a cup when three people are eating together. Our Gemara thought that since, throughout the year, Birkas ha'Mazon needs a cup when three people eat together, then the Rabanan would have enacted that on Pesach night, even an individual needs to recite Birkas ha'Mazon with a cup of wine. The Rabanan would not have enacted reciting Birkas ha'Mazon on a cup of wine on Pesach night if, during the rest of the year, Birkas ha'Mazon never needs a cup. (c) The RAMBAM (Hilchos Berachos 7:15) rules like our Gemara, which appears to conclude that Birkas ha'Mazon does not need a cup. Even though the Beraisa earlier (105b) said that Birkas ha'Mazon does need a cup of wine, that Beraisa is according to Beis Shamai as the Gemara there states, and the Halachah does not follow Beis Shamai. HALACHAH: The SHULCHAN ARUCH (OC 182:1) records all three opinions. The REMA adds that although they argue whether there is an obligation or not, everyone agrees that it is a meritorious act, a Mitzvah Min ha'Muvchar, to use a cup of wine for Birkas ha'Mazon. The MISHNAH BERURAH says that regarding the obligation, it is best to be stringent to use a cup of wine when reciting Birkas ha'Mazon with three people (a Zimun), but that the common practice is not to be stringent even then, unless one happens to have wine readily available in his home. As for an individual, the SHA'AR HATZIYON writes -- based on the writings of the ARIZAL -- that one may be lenient and he need not recite Birkas ha'Mazon with a cup of wine when alone.

ARCHIVES: <http://www.shemayisrael.co.il/dafyomi2> | Mordecai Kornfeld | Email: kornfeld@virtual.co.il | TL/Fx(02)6522633 6/12 Katzenelbogen St. | kornfeld@netvision.net.il | US:(718)520-0210 Har Nof, Jerusalem, ISRAEL | kornfeld@shemayisrael.co.il | POB:43087, Jrslm

The Weekly Daf #252 Pesachim 114 - 121 Parshas Vayeshev <http://www.ohr.org.il/yomi/yomi252.htm>

The Fast Bake "Why do we eat this matza?" This is the rhetorical question we ask at the Pesach Seder while saying the Haggadah. We answer by recalling the hurried departure of our ancestors from Egypt: "They baked the dough which they took out of Egypt into matzos, for it did not leaven into chametz, since they were driven out of Egypt and could not tarry." (Shmos 12:39) What would our ancestors have done had they been given more time? There are two radically different approaches to this question.

Rabbeinu Nissim (RaN) writes in his commentary on our gemara that they would have allowed it to become chametz and would have baked it into bread. Although at Sinai we were forbidden to eat or own chametz the entire seven days of Pesach, this first Pesach took place before receiving the Torah at Sinai and had different rules. The ban on eating chametz was limited to the first day alone, and there was no ban on possessing chametz even on that day. Had time allowed, they would have baked their dough into loaves of bread which they could begin eating the day after their Exodus. Rabbi Moshe ben Nachman (Ramban), in his commentary on Chumash, dismisses such an approach, because he contends that even on that first Pesach it was forbidden for Jews to have chametz in their possession. Had they been given more time, he concludes, they would have baked matzos in the comfort of their homes, and transported the finished product, rather than be compelled to carry out dough which they could only bake in an improvised manner at their first stop. This approach raises the question of how they were able to avoid the dough automatically becoming chametz when left unattended for so long. Natural and miraculous explanations can be found in the Midrash, the Targum of Yonasan ben Uziel and the commentaries of Ohr Hachayim and Malbim. \* Pesachim 116b

A Reward for the Reward "Give thanks to Hashem for He is good, for His loving-kindness is forever." (Tehillim 136:1) This is probably the most familiar passage of the Hallel, which we say at the Seder table and throughout Pesach and other Festivals. Rabbi Chisda offers a fascinating perspective of Hashem's extraordinary graciousness based on this passage. When a Jew is loyal to Hashem, he is promised Divine protection for his possessions. As the Torah says "No one will covet your property when you go up to be seen before Hashem your G-d three times a year (Shmos 34:24)." The Sage Issi ben Yehuda explains this to mean that even though you are not at home, your cow will safely graze with no wild beast attacking it, and your chicken will rummage for its food with no cat threatening it. (Pesachim 8b) But when a Jew abandons his responsibility to observe the Torah and has to be reminded of his duty, Hashem does not immediately strike at his body or life. He sends his warning instead in the form of withdrawing those material blessings which He has granted. The rich man loses his ox, the poor man his sheep, the orphan his egg and the widow her chicken. It is with the good that He has given man that He enables man to achieve atonement for his sins, and this is indeed an expression of magnificent lovingkindness. Since it is obvious that it is Hashem's preference to bless man with prosperity, we may gain a new insight, as Tiferes Yisrael suggests, into the statement of the Sage Shimon ben Azai that "the reward for a mitzvah is a mitzvah" (Avos 4:2). Since it is the Divine will to increase human prosperity as a reward for obedience, the one who fulfills a mitzvah gets credit not only for obedience but also for generating prosperity. The converse is true of the sinner. "Retribution for a sin is a sin" means that the sinner is held responsible for the destruction of possessions necessitated by his sinful ways. In this sense, the sinners are called "destroyers of the world" (Avos 5:1) while the righteous are called "preservers of the world" (Ibid). \* Pesachim 118a

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 E-Mail: [info@ohr.org.il](mailto:info@ohr.org.il) Home Page: <http://www.ohr.org.il>

---