

that Bnei Yisrael were commanded to prepare a lamb for the sacrifice, and even though they explained that they were planning on slaughtering the Egyptian gods, the Egyptians were afraid and did not do them any harm. This is indeed a great miracle! And this is the explanation for the name, Shabbat Hagadol. However, the Beit Yosef asks: Why is only a single day commemorated? Weren't all the days from 10 Nissan until Pesach great in the same way? His answer is that "the main miracle was on the first day ... After the first day, they became used to the situation." The miracle is that the Egyptians didn't react immediately. Once the principle had been established, there is nothing startling about the fact that they remained silent. Thus, the words of the Tur lead to the conclusion that this special Shabbat was established in memory of the great miracle, that the Egyptians were afraid to react to what Bnei Yisrael did. This can also be viewed from a different angle: perhaps the fear of the Egyptians was only a reaction, and the great miracle was that Bnei Yisrael had the courage to act! They were willing to take Egypt's idol, tie it to their beds, and declare that they were about to slaughter it, as commanded by G-d. They did not fear the Egyptians. This is the greatest of miracles. This itself was the cause of the Egyptian fear. And this point of view offers a new insight into the words of the Beit Yosef. Since the main aspect of the miracle was the audacity of Bnei Yisrael in capturing the lambs and tying them up, the first day was indeed the most important. This is therefore commemorated in the name, Shabbat Hagadol. In order to leave bondage, the concept of freedom must burn within us. In contrast to all the other miracles which G-d performed in Egypt, this one was unique in that we acted, showing a spark of freedom within us. It was this initial spark which transformed the Exodus from Egypt into a memorable event. After our action, the way was open to become truly free.

<http://www.torahweb.org/>
 Rabbi Yaakov Neuberger
 [From last week] Sefer Vayikra:
 A Halachic Stream of Consciousness



Sefer Vayikra begins with the Mishkan service, whose details will comprise most of the book. Though its devotion to this theme clearly distinguishes Sefer Vayikra from the other books of the Torah, it also links it to Sefer Shemot, which culminated in the Mishkan's construction and establishment as the place of God's residence amongst the Jewish people. In

fact, on a deeper level, the Ramban points out that Sefer Vayikra really protects the accomplishments made in Sefer Shemot, in which the Jews were redeemed from Egyptian slavery and were promised that God would dwell amongst them. By providing the rules of the Mishkan service, Sefer Vayikra sought to ensure that God's presence would not be driven away by the sins of the Jews, which could now be atoned for by offering sacrifices.

But Sefer Vayikra is much more than a detailed description of the laws of sacrifices and taharot. The text will take us far afield, teaching us the laws of kashrut, the prohibitions on cheilev and blood, and the laws of incest and adultery. We will also learn many of the laws of tithing in Sefer Vayikra, as well as the laws of sh'mitah and charity. The Ramban explains that Sefer Vayikra included these laws because of its kind of "stream of consciousness" style, which leads to the study of issues that are tangential to the main themes of the book.

Nevertheless, the chosen style is troubling. Surely there is a more efficient format in which to communicate laws; the Rambam's Mishneh Torah, the Shulchan Aruch, and a host of other texts that have shaped our mesorah throughout history have all been carefully structured and organized. Why was Sefer Vayikra not written in the same way?

Rav Nisan Alpert zt"l suggested that by using this style the Torah teaches us several insights. In his sefer, Limudei Nisan, he speculates that by making us learn scores of halachot from the book of the chumash that is otherwise

dedicated to the rules and regulations of the Mishkan service, the Torah underscores the connection between the Mishkan and talmud Torah. We are being reminded that just as the Mishkan service assures our connection with God, so too does the mitzvah of talmud Torah.

Additionally, Rav Alpert suggests that Sefer Vayikra--called "Torat Kohanim" by Chazal--includes many different halachot among the laws of the Mishkan to stress that the role of the kohanim is also to teach Torah. In the words of the prophet (Malachi 2:7), "Ki siftei kohanim yishmeru da'at" ("The lips of the kohanim will protect our wisdom"); for kohanim, the physical duties performed in the Mishkan are only one facet of a lifestyle dedicated to teaching the Jewish people and tending their spiritual needs and growth.

Finally and most importantly, Rav Alpert saw in the structure of Sefer Vayikra the model for the style that we now view as characteristic of the mishnah and, even more so, the gemara. The free style of discussion which moves easily from one topic to another and often follows tangential connections suggests that students of Torah should be familiar with the wide range of subjects it contains. Not only are rabbinic laws modeled after Torah-laws, but we can now appreciate that the very style of the Torah she-Ba'al Peh is rooted in the style of the Torah she-bi-K'tav. The entire Talmud was composed in the style of the book of Vayikra, the only book of Torah she-bi-K'tav dedicated almost entirely to halachah.

Moreover, through this style of halachic composition the Torah informs us that no parshah (section) of Torah should be studied or practiced in a vacuum. No halachah can be fully appreciated without seeing it as part of a complete regimen of practices and behaviors. Any single halacha can have its intended impact on our spirits only when observed in concert with all of Torah. The mitzvah of se'udat yom tov, for example, must be considered alongside the prohibition against bal tash'chit; the permissibility of shechitah comes together with the prohibition of tza'ar ba'alei chayim and the mitzvah of shilu'ach ha-kan. The same legal system that demands the destruction of Amaleik or an ir ha-nidachat also appreciates the plight of the stranger, orphan, or widow. We believe in shabbat and in Torah-study, but we also have a work ethic. Any attempt to view parts of Torah in a vacuum, however efficient they may be, can lead to a distorted understanding of Torah. A ben- or bat-Torah should be raised from his or her earliest years to know that shabbat, kashrut, lashon ha-ra and geneivat da'at are all threads of a single beautiful tapestry which can tear and unravel if pulled in different directions.

Rav Alpert saw the same notion in Parshat Mishpatim. Immediately following the story of matan Torah in Parshat Yitro, the chumash there confronts us with the laws pertaining to such varied subjects as altar-construction, slavery, property rights, torts, theft, and idolatry, to name but a few. Its goal is to introduce us right after Sinai to the warp and woof of Torah Law, a massive legal body that God devised to address and shape different kinds of people in all walks of life, to enhance everyone's spirituality and consciousness of the divine.

Haaros - Parshas Tzav - Shabbos Hagadol

Dedicated in loving memory of Chana Michal bat Shmuel Mordechai v'Rashka, Alisa Flatow, hy"d, by her family. Please learn and daven in her memory.

In the last issue, we discussed the central role that meals play in regard to the holidays. Food touches upon another subject: The Korbonos (the Sacrifices). Many of the Korbonos are eaten, at least in part, by the Kohanim. Certain Korbonos are eaten by the owners, as well. One example: the Todah (thanks-giving offering). Its meat, as well as its forty loaves, are mostly consumed by the owner's party. The Matza at the Pesach Seder represents the Todah. This idea is found in the early commentaries (Rush, Mordechai, Hagos Maimonides), and eventually, in the Shulchan Aruch (code of law) Simon 475. The Amount of Flour in the Matzos The poskim debated whether there should be two or three matzos on the Seder Plate. The Rush agreed that there should be three, and went on: The Todah offering had forty loaves. Ten were leavened, thirty were unleavened, i.e.,

Matza. These thirty unleavened loaves comprised three types, ten of each type. A measure of three "isaronim" was used for each type; since there were ten loaves for each type, every loaf was made from 1/3 "isaron;" every three came from one "isaron" of flour. The Number of Matzos Therefore, the Matza of the seder should have three loaves of 1/3 "isaron" each. The Korban Nesanel explained: Even though the Todah had forty loaves -- thirty of Matza -- nonetheless, one could make do with four, one of each of the four types, or three of Matza. Each person needed to bring the Todah for his own salvation, because one who is freed from a prison needs to offer the Todah. At Pesach, each of us were delivered from the imprisonment of Egypt. Why is wheat the preferable grain for the matzos? The "Minhag Yisrael Torah" cites an explanation. The Menachos (the offerings of flour-products) were always wheat. Since the Matza of the Seder corresponds to the Matza of the Todah offering, it is proper that wheat should be chosen. The Charoses As we know, the Seder involves the eating of Matza (unleavened bread), Moror (bitter herb), Korech (a combination of the Matza and the Moror), and, at the end of the meal, another piece of Matza. Although the Matza is an independent obligation, the Moror was actually dependent on the Pesach Lamb offering. Since we don't have any sacrifices today, the mitzva of Moror disappeared. The Rabbis obligated us to eat Maror today, in order to recall the Moror eaten with the Pesach Lamb. The Moror comes in contact with the Charoses, a mixture of fruits, nuts and wine. Since Charoses represents the mortar with which the slaves worked, the Moror -- the food of bitterness -- should contact the mortar -- the source of bitterness. (Maharal) The Rambam, however, adds that the Matza should touch the Charoses, as well. The commentaries express puzzlement -- the Matza reminds us of freedom, the Charoses -- slavery. Why put the two together?

The Mikraei Kodesh quotes the Aderet. Rambam and Ra'avad disagreed as to why the Egyptians were punished. Even though the slavery was predetermined by Divine Decree, each individual Egyptian had the choice whether he would be one of the perpetrators or not. Therefore, those who chose to enslave and mistreat the victims, were choosing on their own to do so, and needed to be punished. So explained the Rambam. Ra'avad, however, disagreed. The Egyptians were punished because they acted with greater viciousness than necessitated by the decree. Why did Rambam not explain as Ra'avad did? It must be that the severity of the slavery was for the ultimate good of the Jews -- the situation was so dire, that they had to be saved immediately, before their time had arrived. (The Ra'avad, though, must have another reason as to why they were saved early.) Similarly, the Rambam and Ra'avad argue regarding the Matza and Charoses. Ra'avad cannot agree that they should be eaten together -- the Matza represents the freedom, while the Moror represents the slavery. To the Rambam, though, there is no contradiction. The severity of the pain caused a speedy redemption. (Aderet, cited in Mikraei Kodesh, Pesach, vol. 2, page 172) We have discussed previously how the wine represents the wine of the nesachim (pourings on the altar); meat -- the sacrifices; the songs -- the singing of the Levi'im. In general, we say that our tables represent the sacrificial altar. Ha'admor Mizedichov, shlita, has often said that the similarity of the table to the mizbe'ach (altar) is not that we fill our stomachs, but that we offer food to guests and the needy. Here you have sacrifices -- sharing one's food with others -- taking time from our indulgent eating to contemplate profound ideas of past and future -- singing with enthusiasm and spirit. Imagine the meal that followed the thanks-giving offering -- the Todah had forty loaves... There still exists a concept of a "seudas hoda'ah" -- a meal of thanks. We must share our good fortune with friends, family, those in need. First, though, we have to recognize our good fortune. The severe pain, too, may all be part and parcel of the redemption -- and, if so, we need to give thanks for it as well!

Rabbi Yaakov Bernstein yaakovb@torah.org Beis Medrash Yeshivas Chafetz Chayim Kiryas Radin 11 Kiryas Radin Dr., Spring Valley, NY 10977 Ph. (914) 362-5156 Project Genesis: Torah on the Information Superhighway learn@torah.org 6810 Park Heights Ave http://www.torah.org/ Baltimore, MD 21215 (410) 358-9800 FAX:

From: owner-hamaayan[SMTP:owner-hamaayan@torah.org] Hamaayan / The Torah Spring Edited by Shlomo Katz Contributing Editor: Daniel Dadusc

Pesach Thoughts The day before Pesach (this coming Wednesday) is Ta'anit Bechorim/the Fast of the Firstborn. The usual explanation for this fast is that it commemorates the fact that Hashem killed the firstborn of Egypt but spared the firstborn of Bnei Yisrael. However, observes R' Shlomo Zalman Auerbach z"l (1910-1995; one of the foremost halachic authorities of the second half of this century), there are several serious objections to this explanation. These are: (1) If the fast commemorates the plague of the firstborn, why is it observed on the day before that plague occurred and not on the day of the plague itself? (2) Erev Pesach is itself a yom tov (equivalent to Chol Ha'moed). Why was it made into a fast day? (3) The plague of the firstborn struck both males and females, and it struck both the firstborn of the mother and the firstborn of the father. Why, then, are only the male firstborn of their father required to observe Ta'anit Bechorim? (4) Notwithstanding its popular name, the plague of the firstborn struck not only firstborn children, but also the oldest child in each household. Why, then, are only the firstborn required to observe the fast? (5) If the fast is a way of thanking Hashem for the fact that the Jewish firstborn were saved in Egypt, why do present-day firstborn fast? The fast should rather be observed by descendants of those firstborn who participated in the Exodus! (6) Why has it become customary to excuse the firstborn from fasting if they participate in a mitzvah-meal such as a siyum/completion of a Talmudic tractate? In answer to all of these questions, R' Auerbach explains that the common understanding of the fast of the firstborn is incorrect. Before the sin of the golden calf, the firstborn, not the family of Aharon, served as kohanim to Bnei Yisrael. The firstborn attained this status because Hashem so-to-speak acquired them as His own when He spared them from the plague of the firstborn. (This priestly status was reserved, however, for the male firstborn of their fathers.) How great then is the embarrassment of the firstborn every Erev Pesach, when each Jew brings his Korban Pesach and the firstborn can only watch as the kohanim, who are descendants of Aharon, perform the service that once was reserved for the firstborn themselves! (Their embarrassment is particularly acute on Erev Pesach because it was in connection with the Korban Pesach, whose blood was placed on the doorposts to identify Jewish homes, that the firstborn were originally sanctified as priests.) This explains the custom that the firstborn eat at a siyum instead of fasting, for what the firstborn are doing is drowning their sorrows in Torah study. (Quoted in Haggadah Shel Pesach Arzei Ha'levanon, Vol. II, p.8)

We read in the Pesach Haggadah, "I might think that one should start recounting the story of the Exodus from Rosh Chodesh . . . Therefore it says (Shmot 13:8), 'Because of this' - only at a time when matzah and marror are before you." R' Menachem Mendel Schneerson z"l (the "Lubavitcher Rebbe"; died 1994) asks: The very source for the mitzvah of retelling the story of the Exodus is the above verse, "You shall tell your son on that day, saying, 'Because of this Hashem acted on my behalf when I left Egypt'." And, as the above passage indicates, the word "this" in the verse refers to the matzah and the marror. Since the mitzvah of Haggadah is thus connected with the matzah and the marror (whose time is Pesach night), how could the author of the Haggadah entertain the possibility that the mitzvah of telling about the Exodus begins on Rosh Chodesh, fifteen days before Pesach? He explains: We are taught that the Patriarchs observed the Torah before it was given. However, there is a difference between their Torah observance and ours. For us, there are such things as holy objects (for example, tefilin) and unholy objects (for example, a non-kosher animal). However, to the Patriarchs, such concepts did not exist. Although they could observe the laws of tefilin and the laws of kashrut, the objects themselves were not yet invested with sanctity or impurity (as the case may be) because the Torah did not yet exist in the physical world. (This, says R' Schneerson, is why Avraham did not circumcise himself before Hashem commanded him to do

so. Before the mitzvah of milah was given, there was no impurity to the foreskin.) The mitzvot of matzah and maror were first given to Moshe on Rosh Chodesh Nissan, two weeks before Pesach. It was on that day that the idea of matzah and maror as mitzvah-objects first came into being, and the author of the Haggadah thought that perhaps that was sufficient basis to begin retelling the story of the Exodus. No, the Haggadah concludes, the matzah and maror are not invested with their full holiness until it comes time to eat them, and that is when there is a mitzvah to retell the story of the Exodus. (Haggadah Shel Pesach: Admor Mi'Lubavitch)

R' Levi Yitzchak of Berditchev z"l (early chassidic rebbe; died 1809) asks: How did the Patriarchs know what was in the Torah before it was given? He answers: Chazal teach that the number of positive and negative commandments in the Torah correspond respectively to the number of bones and sinews in the human body. Each mitzvah protects one bone or sinew, and just as a person knows instinctively how to protect himself from physical harm, so a person who reaches a sufficiently lofty spiritual level knows instinctively how to protect his body from spiritual harm. This is how the Patriarchs knew the Torah. This, R' Levi Yitzchak continues, is the meaning of the statement in the Haggadah: "If He had brought us to Har Sinai and not given us the Torah, that would have been sufficient." What would have been the purpose of bringing us to Har Sinai and not giving us the Torah? Because when our ancestors stood at Har Sinai (before the sin of the golden calf), they had reached the level where they could know the Torah instinctively. (Kedushat Levi: Kedushah Rishonah)

"The more that one tells about the story of the Exodus, the more praiseworthy he is." (From the Haggadah) Why is it necessary for the Haggadah to tell us this? Would we have thought otherwise? R' Avraham Shmuel Binyamin Sofer z"l (the "Ketav Sofer"; 19th century Hungary) explains as follows: The gemara (Shabbat 118b) teaches: "One who recites Hallel every day is a blasphemer." Why? R' Sofer explains that Hallel praises Hashem for the supernatural miracles of the Exodus. However, one who focuses too much on G-d's supernatural miracles doesn't notice His everyday wonders. Man is obligated to see Hashem as much in his daily life and in nature as in His supernatural acts, and therefore man is forbidden to recite Hallel every day. R' Sofer adds: This is the meaning of the verse (Mishlei 3:6), "In all your ways know Him and He will smooth your paths." In all of your ways, in whatever you do on a day-to-day basis, know Him. Know that He is the source of your day-to-day success, and then He will indeed smooth the path before you. In light of the above, one might think that he should downplay the story of the Exodus. No, the Haggadah tells us, on the Seder night one should elaborate as much as possible on the Exodus. (Haggadah Shel Pesach Ketav Sofer-Shir Ma'on, p.10b)

Exactly what is the extent of one's obligation to retell the story of the Exodus? R' Shimon Sofer z"l (1850-1944; son of the Ketav Sofer) answers: The Haggadah relates that Rabbi Eliezer, Rabbi Yehoshua, Rabbi Elazar ben Azaryah, Rabbi Akiva and Rabbi Tarfon (all sages of the Mishnah) sat together during the entire night and discussed the Exodus. In apparent contrast to this, the Shulchan Aruch (481:2) states: "One is obligated to busy himself with the laws of Pesach and [the story of] the Exodus and to relate the miracles and the wonders that G-d did for our ancestors until he is overpowered by sleep." In reality, there is no contradiction, R' Sofer explains. One is, in fact, obligated to discuss the Exodus (and/or the laws of Pesach) all night. However, the Shulchan Aruch recognizes that most people cannot accomplish this, and it therefore states that one's obligation continues until he falls asleep. This means, however, R' Sofer writes, that one may not do things that will cause him to fall asleep sooner. For example, one may not drink any wine after the fourth cup and one should not overeat at the Seder meal. In addition, if one does fall asleep and he happens to awaken before dawn, he is obligated to resume his discussion of the Exodus until morning. (Ibid p.2b)

This coming week marks the shloshim of R' David Povarsky z"l, one of the Roshei Yeshiva of the Ponovezh Yeshiva in Bnei Brak. R' Povarsky passed away on the 6th of Adar at the age of 97 after almost 55 years of teaching at Ponovezh. R' Povarsky was born in White Russia and was a

leading student of R' Yerucham Levovitz z"l, the famed Mashgiach of Mir. [A yeshiva's mashgiach is the faculty member charged with molding the students' characters.] The following is from a lecture delivered by R' Povarsky on 23 Adar 5739 (March 22, 1979). Chazal have instructed us, "Every single day, a person must see himself as if he participated in the Exodus." How is this possible? There are certain facts and concepts upon which a Jew is expected to reflect until they become ingrained in him, until they become "real". One of these is the Exodus. Why does Hashem care whether a Jew possesses a tiny morsel of chametz on Pesach? The Mashgiach of Mir explained that laws such as this are intended to awaken a person and cause him to reflect upon the Exodus. We are taught, "Who is wise? One who can see the consequences of his actions." Chazal carefully chose the word "see" to indicate that the consequences of good deeds and bad deeds must be so real to a person that he can "see" them. The fact that the mitzvot must be ingrained in a person is reflected in the gemara (Sukkah 52a) which teaches: "In the future, Hashem will slaughter the yetzer hara and bring it before the righteous and the wicked. To the righteous, the yetzer hara will appear as a mountain and they will say, 'How did we conquer that great mountain?' To the wicked, the yetzer hara will appear as a hair and they will say, 'How did we fail to conquer that hair?'" The righteous will be surprised by the size of the yetzer hara because they have trained themselves to the point that even hard mitzvot are easy. The wicked will be surprised because they have lowered themselves to the point where even easy mitzvot are hard. Pesach illustrates that a mitzvah can become ingrained in a person. To see this, one need only look at the number of people who make no effort to keep kosher but who would never knowingly introduce chametz into their homes during Pesach. (Mussar Va'da'at III p. 294)

Hamaayan, Copyright (c) 1999 by Shlomo Katz and Project Genesis, Inc. Posted by Alan Broder, ajb@torah.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 FAX: 358-9801

<http://yu1.yu.edu/riets/torah/>

Pesach Toafos Harim - Mesores Avos Lechag Hapesach
Rabbi Dr. Yechiel Michael Kossowsky

Selections translated from the Pesach chapter of Sefer Toafos Harim

Vehaya ki yomru alechem beneychem, ma haavodah hazos lachem - The Mechilta states: "Evil tidings were given to the people of Israel at that moment, and some say good tidings were given to them, that they were destined to give birth to children and children's children". People ask: If the children and children's children are wicked, how can this be good news? The answer is: One of the main reasons for the wicked son's rebellion is the notion entertained by each and every generation's rebels that they know more than their parents. In their opinion the deeds of the parents are not good or right. They "know better". That is why he forsakes the way and the teachings of his parents and seeks a new path in life. That is the bad news.

However, when his son after him asks his own father the same question, and decides that his father's wicked ways are wrong, and he rebels against them, saying, Ma haavoda hazos lachem, then he is often actually returning to the ways of grandparents, and that is good news. So both are true; the question can bring us bad news and good news at the same time...

Vayehi bihiyos Yehoshua Biyericho.... ata basi: Haftorah; See Rashi and Malbim who explain that Joshua knew that this was a prophetic vision, and his question was, "What is the meaning of this vision?" Halanu, "Did you come to help us or Letzarenu, did you come to help our enemies?" And the angel answered, Ata basi, I have come about the issue of "Now" (Tal. Megila 3). I am not speaking of the future, of the outcome of the struggle, but about your own conduct at this very moment. "Last night you overlooked the regular daily evening offering and today you have overlooked the study of Torah". The importance of the prophecy was that at a time of war and siege it might seem there are more important concerns that the study of Torah and the daily service. So the angel appeared to warn Joshua that

Torah and Tefila are the primary concern of every Jew no matter what the circumstances and time. So important to the Jewish people and its survival are the Beth Midrash and the Synagogue.

Atzamos yeveshos: In the prophecy of Yehezkel's "dry bones" we perceive three categories: first, bones sere and dry with no moisture whatsoever; then bodies with flesh and sinews, but not living; and finally a living camp. Those who say avda tikvasenu... reflect those Jews who have lost all hope of Jewish survival and have despaired about the future of the people and the land of Israel. Higher than them are those who have made aliya to Israel, who build and defend it. Yet they lack a spiritual essence; they are bodies, flesh and sinews, but they do not have the spirit of life - of eternal life. The House of Israel cannot look to them for its survival into the far future. The house of Israel will ultimately be built from the great and vital living camp that has the spirit of God calling from its voice, and glories in the name of God....

Shehora ani venava... shehora ani bemaasay venava bemaase avosay (Midrash Rabbah). The song of Songs, a dialogue between Israel and their beloved in Heaven, here speaks of a generation which has strayed and which regrets its transgressions, remembering with longing the deeds of their parents who taught and trained them to walk in the way of truth. Despite their sins, the teaching of their parents struck deep roots and many beautiful flowers still blossom because of it. Keahaley Kedar... which are ugly and dark outside, but inside are full of treasures, so that previous generation which had a traditional upbringing in a warm Jewish atmosphere still retain some fine Jewish traits because of it. The generation that is missing and is intermarrying at such a catastrophic rate did not have such an influence. Restoring that missing inner spirit in the hearts of the next generation will only happen through chinuch, not only in the school, but through the creation of a spiritually rich, warm Jewish environment....

(Transcribed in the Pesach section) Velo yeraeh es penei HaShem reykam, ish kemaatnas yado ... (Torah reading for the last day of Pesach). The Mechilta comments on the passage, velo yerau es panay reykam Ma simcha haamura leadam berauy lo, af reiyah haamura lagavoha barauy lo (according to the version of the text as amended by the Gaon of Vilna). A man comes before God on this holiday in the wrong mood. We come with our hands open to receive. We want God to bless us with all manner of blessing, joy, success, health, etc. We want a great deal. What are we ready to give in return? Lo yaraeh es panay reykam! Do not come with empty hands! What kind of gifts can we give the Almighty? A thought about Teshuva... a resolve to live a life where there is more Torah and sincerity in fulfilling mitzvos.... If you want God to grant you gifts barauy lecha, suitable for you, then you must give Him barauy lo, as far as you are able to do so. There are no free gifts here! The Almighty doesn't require a complete personality revolution, but a movement, a new step in His direction. Shuva eylay vaashuva aleychem (Malachi 3). Ish kemaatnas yado, and according to the value of your gift shall the blessing come from the Almighty, Kebirchas hashem elokecha asher nasan lach. As we leave the presence of the holy forbears we have joined at Yizkor, we must see that we are worthy of taking something with us, and not to go out of God's presence Reykam.

The Author: Rabbi Dr. Yechiel Michael Kossowsky of blessed memory was Rav of the Beth Midrash Hagadol in Johannesburg until his death in 1965. His daughter, Mrs. Rywka Shulman teaches Tanach in Stern College and his son-in-law, Rabbi Dr. Nisson Shulman, is Director of the Gertrude and Morris Bienenfeld Department of Rabbinic Services of MSDCS, RIETS. His son is Rabbi Zalman Kossowsky (AA) of Zurich. The above Passover thought capsules are translated from his book, Toafos Harim, published posthumously by his widow, Rebbetzin Chienna Kossowsky, Aleha HaShalom.

From: yated-usa@mailserver.ttec.com Halacha Discussion by Rabbi Doniel Neustadt

Matzah-How Much Need We Eat? Question: How much Matzah must one eat on Seder night? Discussion: There is a Biblical commandment to eat matzah on the first night(1) of Pesach. The Talmud explains that "eat", by definition, means to eat at least an amount equivalent to the size of an olive, a k'zayis. Men and women equally are obligated to perform this mitzvah. Boys and girls, too, once they are old enough to understand what the Seder is all about, should be taught to eat a portion of matzah lishmah, "for the sake of the mitzvah", as the Torah requires. In the opinion of many authorities, the proper, l'chatchillah manner of eating the k'zayis of matzah is to chew the matzah thoroughly and swallow it entirely in one swallow(2). If it is difficult to do so(3),

however, one may take up to three(4) minutes(5) to eat the k'zayis. [An elderly person who is only able to chew slowly, children under the age of bar/bat mitzvah(6), or anyone with a medical condition, can rely on the lenient views which allow for a time-span of up to nine minutes.] It follows, therefore, that anyone who eats one k'zayis of matzah within the prescribed time satisfies his basic obligation. But while the basic mitzvah is easy to understand and fulfill, there is much discussion among the poskim concerning several technical details of how best to perform this important mitzvah: Some of the issues debated are: -Should the k'zayis of matzah be broken off from the upper, whole matzah, or from the middle, broken matzah? -Can two blessings-ha-motzi and al achilas matzah-be recited over one matzah(7), or must we recite one blessing over one matzah and the other blessing over the other? -If, indeed, the two blessings must be recited over two separate matzot, which blessing is said over which matzah? In response to these and other concerns and in order to fulfill the mitzvah in the most l'chatchillah manner(8), Shulchan Aruch advises that one eat two k'zayis portions, one from each matzah. But since we are unsure which is the "real" k'zayis, nor are we sure which blessing corresponds to which matzah, we recite both blessings over both pieces of matzah (the top and the middle one(9)), break them off together(10), and eat a k'zayis from each one of them together(11). ["Together" means inserting both k'zayis portions into one's mouth and chewing them, and then swallowing one k'zayis at a time, if possible. If it is difficult to insert both k'zayis portions into the mouth at one time, one can take up to three minutes to swallow both portions(12).] Thus one is actually eating two k'zayisim.

But it is essential to understand that eating a second k'zayis is not nearly as important as eating a first one. Clearly and unequivocally, one fulfills his basic obligation by eating any k'zayis of any matzah, regardless of which matzah or combination of matzot is taken from. Bearing this in mind, the following points need to be clarified: -There are poskim who question this entire stringency(13) and require only one k'zayis to be eaten(14). -Even among the poskim who recommend that two portions be eaten, there are several who hold that only the person conducting the Seder [or anyone breaking the matzot and reciting the blessings over them] must eat two portions. The other participants need to eat only one portion(15). -While many poskim seem to hold that everyone should eat two k'zayisim(16), it is, according to all views, a stringency and a hiddur mitzvah, not a basic halachic obligation. Thus elderly or weak people, people who can only stomach a small amount of matzah, small children, and anyone else who finds eating matzah difficult, need not force themselves to eat more than one k'zayis of matzah. [The k'zayis should be a combination of the top and middle matzot.] -One who is able to eat two portions, but cannot eat them together or even within three minutes, should eat them separately, each one within three minutes. He should first eat the k'zayis which comes from the upper, whole matzah, and then the k'zayis which is taken from the middle matzah(17). How much is a k'zayis? The amount of a k'zayis as it pertains to matzah has been extensively debated among the classic poskim and contemporary authorities. We will list briefly the points debated: -Is a k'zayis the equivalent of half an egg, like the Rosh writes, or a third of an egg, like the view of the Rambam? -Are the eggs today the same size they were during the days of the Talmud or are they smaller, as some evidence seems to indicate? -Is the k'zayis measured by weight or by volume? (In other words, do we include air holes when measuring the k'zayis or not?) -When measuring an egg, what size egg is used? Is the shell included when measuring the egg? There are no clear-cut, definitive answers to these questions. While several poskim allow for the lesser amount, the view of the Mishnah Berurah is that when it comes to matters of Biblical law, such as the mitzvah of eating matzah, we ought to be stringent, following the principle of safek deorayisa lchumrah(18). Thus it is proper to follow the more stringent measurements for the k'zayis. [Sick and elderly people may rely on the lenient size of a k'zayis, which is about half of the standard amount.] But as explained earlier, the Biblical obligation is to eat only one k'zayis. That one k'zayis should be reckoned according to the maximum standard, as it is a Biblical requirement. But the second k'zayis, the one that is eaten to satisfy the concern of the poskim regarding the technical details of the mitzvah, is not Biblically mandated. For that second k'zayis we can surely rely upon the smaller, more lenient size. Indeed, some poskim(19) maintain that one need eat only one large k'zayis to meet all requirements: The Biblical obligation will be met with the large k'zayis; the technical details obligation will also be satisfied with the one large k'zayis, since a large k'zayis can contain two small portions of k'zayis.

There are several methods for estimating the size of one large k'zayis: About 2/3 of a standard machine matzah; about 24 grams (0.8 oz.) of hand matzah(20); about the space of a loosely-extended palm (including the thumb) of an average person(21). Note: Matzah that remains on the gums is counted towards the k'zayis, but whatever gets stuck between the teeth does not. Burned matzah, or matzah that is not actually ingested because it has fallen out of one's mouth while eating, do not count towards the k'zayis either. The above discussion applies to the matzah eaten at the end of the meal, the afikoman, as well. There, too, one k'zayis is required(22) while the second k'zayis is only recommended(23) and anyone who finds it difficult to eat two portions should eat only one(24). By eating one large k'zayis, one will surely meet all of his requirements.

1 Outside of Eretz Yisroel, there is a Rabbinic obligation on the second night as well. 2 Mishnah Berurah 475:9 and 41, based on Magen Avraham and Shulchan Aruch Harav. But other poskim rule that this is not required; see Eliyah Rabbah 475:2 and 12; Aruch ha-Shulchan 4, Dinim v'Hanagos 17:34 quoting her custom of the Chazon Ish; Yecheveh Da'as 1:17. 3 Most people find this difficult to do - Moadim u'Zmanim 3:259, especially if they use a large piece for a k'zayis. 4

Igros Moshe O.C. 4:41. Some poskim allow only two minutes while others allow up to four minutes. [If, mistakenly, one took longer than four minutes to eat his portion, he should eat another k'zayis, but without reciting the blessings.] 5 The time begins from the beginning of the swallowing, not from the beginning of the chewing; Kol Dodi 14:7. 6 Harav S.Z. Auerbach (Shemiras Shabbos K'hilchasah 54, note 130). 7 Based on the rule of ayn osin mitzvos chavilos chavilos. 8 As the Chasam Sofer writes: This mitzvah (eating matzah on Pesach) is the only Biblical mitzvah of "eating" that has remained for us to fulfill in these times when the bais ha-mikdash is not standing... it is proper to fulfill it in a manner which satisfies all opinions l'chatchillah... (Teshuvos, C.M. 195). 9 When the first blessing - ha-motzi - is recited, all three matzot should be held so that lechem mishneh can be fulfilled. 10 Mishnah Berurah 475:3. Other poskim do not insist that they be broken together; see Shulchan Aruch ha-rav 475:5. 11 The two portions cannot be eaten separately, since we are unsure which is the "correct" one. Eating one before the other could create questions of hefsek between the "correct" blessing and the "correct"

k'zayis. 12 See Orchos Rabbeinu 2:66 that this was the custom of the Chazon Ish and Harav Y.Y. Kanievsky. This is also the common practice. 13 See Beir Halachah who questions the basis for this practice and its authenticity. 14 Chazon Ish is quoted by several sources as ruling that there is no need to eat more than one k'zayis, and this was the custom of the Chazon Ish himself; see Orchos Rabbeinu 2:70. 15 Harav S.Y. Elyashiv (quoted in Seder ha -Haruch 79:4); Hagadas Moadim u'Zmanim, pg. 97; Kol Dodi 14:3. See also Shemiras Shabbos K'hilchasah 55 note 15 quoting Harav S.Z. Auerbach. [Igros Moshe O.C. 5:16 recommends that each male household member have in front of him three matzos, so that each one should have enough matzah for two portions of k'zayis.] 16 Kitzur Shulchan Aruch 119:5; Minhagei Chasam Sofer 10:17. 17 O.C. 475:1 and Mishnah Berurah 10. He should recline when eating both portions. 18 Mishnah Berurah 486:1. 19 Seder Pesach K'hilchaso 8:4, quoting Harav S.Y. Elyashiv and Harav N. Karelitz. 20 It is difficult to estimate the size of a k'zayis of a hand matzah, since the matzos vary in size and in thickness. Generally, a little more than a quarter of an average matzah is a large k'zayis; Piskei Teshuvos 486:1. 21 Halaylah ha-Zach, pg. 19. Chazon Ish and Harav Y.Y. Kanievsky measured the large k'zayis as the space of their loosley-extended palm without the thumb; Orchos Rabbeinu 2:66. 22 According to most opinions, the obligation is Rabbinical in nature. 23 Mishnah Berurah 477:1 24 Shulchan Aruch Harav 477:3. Some poskim maintain that women and children are only obligated to eat one k'zayis for afikoman; see Seder ha -Haruch 97:8.

Kortz U Sharf-Short and Sweet Pesach Vertlach by Shaya Gottlieb

Why is there no fifth question about the four cups of wine that are drunk all evening? The wine in itself is not a strange sight for the child. However, the other simonim -eating matza, maror, reclining and dipping-send mixed messages, confusing his young mind. Is it a celebration for freedom or slavery? Or both? The answer to his questions is "Avodi m Hoyinu"-we were slaves to Pharaoh, and so the reason for the dual simonim of slavery and freedom. -Yaavezt

Why is the miracle of the splitting of the Red Sea emphasized while the splitting of the Yarden is not mentioned with as much elaboration? One reason -the main attraction and novelty of Krias Yam Suf was that the miracle occurred before Matan Torah, and the Yarden was split after the giving of the Torah. Once the Bnei Yisroel had the 'koach haTorah' miracles did not evoke so much wonder and awe. -Alshich

"Kol Yemei Chayechu L'hovi Limos HaMoshiach" -all the days of your life, this alludes to the days of Moshiach. (Haggada, Omar Ben Zoma) All the days of your life, your goals should be, 'Thovi limos haMoshiach'-to bring the geula closer. "V'es Amoleinu Elu Habonim" -and our burden: this refers to the children Children are called burdens because it is their parents' responsibility to care for them and raise them. -Ritva

"K'neged Arboah Bonim" -the Torah speaks of four sons. Since Pharaoh strove to eradicate Jewish children by throwing them into the Nile, our answer to him is a devotion to the needs of these children, to pass on our legacy to the future generation. -Rav Shamshon Refael Hirsch

One can only be successful in raising children if each child is brought up according to their own way, working with their innate characteristics. Even a child who lacks the understanding to inquire and ask questions must be prompted. -Malbim

From: Jonathan Schwartz[SMTP:jschwartz@yml.yu.edu] Subject:Internet chaburah-- Shabbat hagadol Prologue: The commentaries discuss the basis of the minhag we call shabbos Hagadol. According to the most prominent (Shibolei Haleket, Magen Avraham among others) the nature of Shabbos Hagadol commemorates the nes of the non-resistance of the Egyptian oppressors to the taking of the Korban Pesach on the tenth of the month--which happened to be shabbos-- by the Jews. Acting based upon faith, the Jews merited a miracle and there was no Egyptian rioting in response to this gesture. Pesach is fraught with many historical lessons. The goals of the seder include the recognition of these miracles and the personalization and internalization of these miracles as we transmit them to our children. In that effort to create that internalization, we are warned to transmit the lessons in the style of the particular child. Hence, at the seder, we retell the story of Yitzias Mitzrayim to 4 sons with 4 different styles. This seems to be based upon the ideal that true internalization of the nes (Kilu Hu Yatza Mitzrayim) is achieved by the child only when he can relate to the story in the manner to which he relates to most things -- Chacham, Rasha, Tam and Sheino Yodaya Lshoel each in their own relating style. HaGaon HaRav Aharon Lichtenstein shlita added that the lessons of Pesach are not only related to the past but to the future as well. Rav Lichtenstein noted that the essence of the story of the 4 sons is based on being prepared for mochor for tomorrow. The lessons of the past are there to be guides for the future. Only the foolish one is unprepared to answer in the mochor. The Jews too, voiced their faith in the Mochor on the Shabbos HaGadol. They prepared to leave mitzrayim and follow their word of Hashem in the midbar. They prepared for the challenges of becoming a nation under one Hashem. The first step was the shaking of the immediate gratification of needs which is the trademark of a slave personality. Instead, they challenged their masters with the beliefs in a Mochor -- a better tomorrow under one true Hashem. With this in mind, they were prepared to engage in civil disobedience against the Egyptians which brings us to this weeks chaburah entitled:

Keeping the law or keeping the sheep? It is clear that any obedience to authority that may be required of halacha assumes that the government requesting the obedience is a legitimate one. When power is usurped, no allegiance is due that government. This is clearly stated in the gemara (Yevamos 22b) where the gemara determines that the rule of the possuk "V'nassi B'amcha Lo saor" refers to leadership that is to the benefit of the nation. The Rambam explains (Gezaila 5:18) that these rules apply only when the citizens accept the individual leader as their master and they accept their role as his subjects. Without this acceptance, the "leader" is no more than a gazlan who imposes his will on the weaker population to which rebellion is not considered to be more b'malchus. The question of defying unconscionable orders arises when the authority is legitimate and where compliance to the law is halachically applicable. David Hamelech ordered his general Yoav to cause the death of Uriah HaChitite. Yoav complies as if his command from the king were to be unquestioned. Later, Yoav brings out the death of Amasa for a similar violation of the words of Dovid. It is interesting that the second death was censured by Shlomo Hamelech (Kings I 2:32) despite Yoav's apparent following of orders. The gemara (Sanhedrin 49a) explains that Shlomo

told Yoav that there are times when even the king's command is to be questioned. When action called for by the king runs counter to the command of the Torah, it is the obligation of Jews to respond with civil disobedience. This lesson was exemplified by Amasa and Avner who were both killed by Yoav for not keeping that halacha. The Rambam (Melachim 3:9) includes this issue under the principle of "Divrei Harav V'Divrei Hatalmid divrei Me shomin". Yet, elsewhere, the Rambam (Yesodei Hatorah 5:4) notes that one who is forced to desecrate the Torah because of royal decree is not chiyav. Still, if he does not seek to end living in tyranny, he is like a dog returning to his vomit who is held o be chiyav. This issue of disobedience has serious ramifications in the arena of shaliach l'davar aveira. There is a machlokes if the the shaliach is unaware that his action is halachically unallowed, if he can be held accountable. Rashi (Bava Kamma 79a) and the Maharit (I:116) maintain that divrei Harav applies only when the shaliach can determine what the divrei Harav are. If he does not have that knowledge, he cannot be held accountable. Ritva (kiddushin 42b) and the Nimukei Yosef (Bava Kamma 79a) hold that shlichus is batel the moment that an illegal act is done regardless of the reason. Hence, they hold the shaliach would be chiyav. The Nimukei Yosef shows that Dovid is never punished (Kiddushin 43a) for his part in the murder plot while Yoav is given mussar. Maharit counters that Yoav was not acting to kill Uriah, rather he merely caused the latter's death to come about. Additionally, the death is never chastized by Shlomo as the deaths of Amasa and Avner are. Redak (Shmuel II 12:19) supports this view of the Maharit. According to the Redak, David is punished for ordering the death of Uriah and Yoav is no t. Redak clearly states that the reason why is that Yoav was acting as a shaliach who could not have known that his act was assur. This is because the king has the right to order one's death purely for Takkamat HaOlam, for the betterment of the greater society. Not even Yoav could have the insight into that command. Thus, coming from a different approach, Redak learns that the shaliach is patur and his sender is chiyav, lik the Maharit. To summarize, when a shaliach knows his act runs counter to halacha he is chiyav. When this is not clear, there is a machlokes as to whether the halacha exonerates him or not. Thus, in issues of morality, when the moral decision is clear, "Divrei Harav V'divrei Hatalmid, Divrei Me Shomin?" applies.

Battala News Mazal Tov to Kalman Schoor upon his engagement to Jordana Kofman Late breaking Mazel Tov to Menachem and Leah Gelbtuch on the birth of a beautiful (obviously he looks like his mother) baby boy.

From: owner-daf-insights[SMTP:owner-daf-insights@shemaisrael.com]

Subject: Insights to the Daf: Yoma 76-80

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

YOMA 59-88 have been dedicated to the memory of the late Dr. Simcha Bekelelnitzky (Simcha Gedalya ben Shraga Feibush) of Queens N.Y. by his wife and daughters. Well known in the community for his Chesed and Tzedakah, he will long be remembered. Kollel Iyun Hadaf employs a full-time staff; your support is urgently needed. Write to donations@dafyomi.co.il for details.

YOSEF DA'AS NOW ONLINE! <http://www.dafyomi.co.il/ivrit2.htm> Dear fellow Dafyomi students, I would like to express the Kollel's profuse thanks to the many of you who so warmly responded to our call with generous donations to D.A.F. We are proud to publicly thank those who donated \$1000 or more, \$100 or more, and \$36 or more, in our Friends, Sponsors, and Patrons lists on our Website (<http://www.dafyomi.co.il/sponsors.htm>, or the Sponsors button on our homepage, www.dafyomi.co.il/index.htm); which will be updated to include the new donations shortly. For those who have not yet responded, please remember that it is only through your generosity that we can continue. With your help, our meticulously researched resources will be used by many thousands of Jews learning Gemara for many years to come. Help us keep it up. Send your U.S. tax-deductible donation to the following address, or write to donations@dafyomi.co.il for more information: D.A.F. 140-32 69 Ave. Flushing NY 11367 ... Our donors website, <http://www.dafyomi.co.il/sponsors.htm>, offers six different donation options. We share with you our very best wishes for a Pesach Kasher v'Same'ach, as well as the hope that we will be able to continue learning together for many years to come! --Rabbi Mordecai Kornfeld Rosh Kollel, Kollel Iyun Hadaf Kollel Iyun Hadaf [Email: kornfeld@dafyomi.co.il] Tel : (02)6522633 P.O.B. 43087 | donations@dafyomi.co.il | Fax: 9722-6522633 Har Nof, Jerusalem, ISRAEL |

daf@writeme.com US: (718)520-0210 *D.A.F. has the written and/or verbal approbation of the Gedolei ha'Dor (Hagaon Rav Yosef Shalom Elyashiv, Hagaon Rav Shlomo Wolbe, Hagaon Rav Moshe Shapiro, Hagaon Rav Aharon Feldman, Hagaon Rav Nachman Bulman.)

Yoma 78b AN ADULT ASSISTING A CHILD TO SMEAR OR WASH HIMSELF ON YOM KIPUR QUESTIONS: The Gemara says that children are not required to observe any of the Isurim of Yom Kipur except for Ne'ilas ha'Sandal, wearing shoes. As Rashi explains, the Gemara initially suggests that the reason children must observe the Isur of Ne'ilas ha'Sandal is because if they were permitted to wear shoes, people would see the child wearing shoes and think that his parent put them on him, which is prohibited because of the Derasha of "Lo Sachilum" (from Vayikra 11:42; Yevamos 114a), which teaches that an adult may not give an Isur to a child. The Gemara rejects this reason, because if it is true, then Rechitzah and Sichah should also be forbidden for a child for the same reason. The Gemara responds that when people see that a child is washed or smeared with oil, they will think that it was done to the child the day before, whereas when it comes to wearing shoes, everyone knows that shoes are only donned on that day and no one wears shoes overnight, and thus they will think that the child's parent put the shoes on him on Yom Kipur. The Gemara says that this reason is still not correct, because the Beraisa which says, "Children are permitted in all of the Isurim except Ne'ilas ha'Sandal," implies that it is permitted l'Chatchilah for an adult to do the Isur for the child (to wash the child and to smear oil on him). Rashi explains that since it is permitted l'Chatchilah, when the father asks the Beis Din whether he may feed or wash his son, the Beis Din will tell him to feed and wash him, and the father will thus know for sure that the child was fed and washed on Yom Kipur. The Gemara is making a point that we see that there is no concern that people will think that an adult did it for the child on Yom Kipur. There are a number of problems with Rashi's comments. (a) Why does Rashi add that the father asks if he is allowed to *feed* the child? There never was a question whether the father may feed the child! Feeding a child is certainly permitted on Yom Kipur, because it is dangerous for the child not to eat. (b) Why does Rashi say that if Beis Din tells him that he is allowed to wash the child, we should because the father knows

that he did it on Yom Kipur, and people will suspect that something prohibited was done by giving a child an Isur? Rashi should say that there is a much more obvious problem, besides people's *suspicion* that an adult gave a child an Isur -- the father *did*, and was permitted by Beis Din to, give the child an Isur! We see, then, that there is no Isur of "Lo Sachilum," and if so, there should be no concern that people will suspect him of transgressing that Isur, because it is not Asur!

ANSWERS: (a) The ST'ACH YITZCHAK answers that Rashi is explaining how the Gemara knows that it is permitted to wash a child l'Chatchilah on Yom Kipur. From the Heter to feed a child, it can be inferred that one may also wash a child. There is no doubt that it is permitted to feed a child l'Chatchilah, since it is dangerous if he does not eat. Since the Beraisa groups together all of the Inuyim except for Ne'ilas ha'Sandal, it implies that they are all similar to Achilah and are permitted l'Chatchilah. That is why Rashi adds that the father asked if he could *feed* the child and wash him -- to show how the Gemara knows that washing the child is permitted l'Chatchilah. (b) The RAN at the beginning of the Perek asks that according to Rashi, the Rambam, and the others who hold that the other Inuyim are Asur mid'Oraisa, how is it permitted to do those things to a child on Yom Kipur? Anything which is Asur mid'Oraisa for an adult to do, is also Asur for an adult to do on behalf of a child because of the Derasha of "Lo Sachilum." It should be prohibited to help a child perform any of the Inuyim because of "Lo Sachilum," just like Rashi says here with regard to Ne'ilas ha'Sandal! Actually, the Tosefta (4:1) says that Ne'ilas ha'Sandal for a child is Asur only because of Mar's ha'AYin (and not because of "Lo Sachilum"). What is the Mar's ha'AYin here? RABEINU ELYAKIM explains what the Mar's ha'AYin is: Although the Isur of Lo Sachilum does not actually apply here, people will *think* that it applies to smearing, washing, or shoeing a child on Yom Kipur. If they see others doing such acts (or if they see Beis Din permitting such acts), they will think that the Torah did not prohibit any Inuyim other than eating and drinking, and that smearing, washing and wearing shoes are permitted! For this reason, the Rabanan prohibited putting shoes on children on Yom Kipur. They permitted smearing and washing the child only because of "Hainu Ravisai'hu," it is needed for the normal development of the child. Why does Lo Sachilum actually *not* apply? Either because the Inuyim are prohibited mid'Rabanan, and not mid'Oraisa (and the Rabanan do not apply Lo Sachilum to their own prohibitions), as many Rishonim say, or, even if they are d'Oraisa (as Rashi seems to say, see Insights to 74:1), the Torah may not have prohibited the other Inuyim when the primary Isur of fasting does not apply (as we wrote there). This may be Rashi's intention in our Sugya as well. Rashi does not mean to say that the Gemara originally prohibited putting shoes on a child because of Lo Sachilum. Rather, it prohibited the act lest people *think* that Lo Sachilum is being transgressed, and come to permit wearing shoes on Yom Kipur. Similarly, Rashi tells us that if Beis Din permit a person to wash or smear his child l'Chatchilah, the person may think that those acts are not prohibited at all on Yom Kipur, for otherwise it should not have been permitted to do this to his child because of Lo Sachilum

Yoma 80 HOW MANY EGGS CAN A PERSON HOLD IN HIS MOUTH AT ONCE

QUESTIONS: The Acharonim ask a number of questions on the famous opinion of the Noda b'Yehudah regarding the size of a Beitzah from this Daf. The NODA B'YEHUDAH (d. 5553/1793), in the middle of the eighteenth century, used his thumbs to determine the volume of an egg, using the figure that Chazal gave for the size of an egg in terms of thumb-breadths (Etzba'os): A Revi's, which is the size of 1.5 eggs, equals 10.8 cubic Etzba'os. Then, he took an egg and measured its actual volume. He found that the actual volume of an egg was only about *half* of the figure that he calculated using thumb-breadths! How could the Gemara equate 10.8 thumb-breadths to one egg, he asked. He concluded (TZELACH, Pesachim 116b) that modern day eggs must be only about half as large as ancient ones. As a result, when it comes to any Mitzvah which involves the Shi'ur of a Beitzah (or a Revi's), one should use *twice* the amount of eggs that the Gemara requires. (For example, if the Gemara says that in order to be Mekabel Tum'as Ochlin a food must be the size of a Beitzah, then it must be the size of two modern day Beitzim, in order to compensate for the decrease in size of eggs.) This opinion is cited as the Halachah by the CHASAM SOFER (Teshuvos OC 127), the VILNA GA'ON (Ma'aseh Rav #105), and the CHAZON ISH (Kuntrus ha'Shi'urim, Chazon Ish OC 39). (a) The MINCHAS BARUCH challenges the Noda b'Yehudah's opinion based on our Gemara's statement "the opening to one's esophagus (Beis ha'Bli'ah) cannot hold *more* than one Beitzah." This statement implies that it *could* hold exactly one Beitzah. Yet it is clearly impossible to fit *two* modern day eggs at once into the Beis ha'Beli'ah, the opening of the esophagus (b) Second, when discussing the Shi'ur of "Melo Lugma," our Gemara clearly implies that the average person can hold more than a Revi's (which is 1.5 eggs) in both of his cheeks at one time. The Gemara says that if Beis Hillel, when he says "Melo Lugmav," means "k'Melo Lugmav" (one cheekfull), then the Shi'ur that he is giving is *less* than the Shi'ur given by Beis Shamai, which is a Revi's, and if so, Beis Hillel is being more stringent than Beis Shamai. But if Beis Hillel means literally a "Melo Lugmav," then he is saying two cheekfulls, which is more than a Revi's, and he is being more lenient than Beis Shamai. The Gemara, therefore, clearly implies that a person's two cheeks can hold more than a Revi's. The MISHNAH BERURAH (OC 271:13, Bi'ur Halachah) points out that according to the Noda b'Yehudah, who says that a Revi's contains *twice* the amount of eggs than it did in the time of the Gemara, a person should be able to hold at least *three* modern eggs in his mouth at once -- yet after much experimentation, he found that no average-sized person can hold more than two eggs, at most, in his cheeks! (The TOSFOS RID, in fact, preceded the Mishnah Berurah with this observation. He adds that even 1.5 eggs cannot be held in the cheeks at once unless a person holds his head downwards, in an unnatural position, in order to prevent himself from swallowing the liquid in his cheeks. Because of this he suggests to delete from the Gemara the words "Im Ken" ("if so"). According to this Girsah, the Gemara is saying that not just "Melo Lugma," but even "Melo *Lugmav*" is less than a Revi's -- in which case there is no question on the Noda b'Yehudah either.) ANSWERS: The CHAZON ISH (Kuntrus ha'Shi'urim OC 39) addresses both questions. (a) Regarding the first question, he answers (ibid. 39:10) that "Beis ha'Beli'ah" refers to the area of the throat which holds all the chewed up food which can be swallowed in a *protracted* act of swallowing, not just what fits into the entrance to the esophagus. (b) Regarding the second question, the CHAZON ISH (Kuntrus ha'Shi'urim OC 39:16) says that perhaps the Mishnah Berurah did not measure accurately. It could be that the people whom the Mishnah Berurah asked to fill their cheeks did not stuff them to their absolute capacity. The Chazon Ish cites the RAN who implies that the amount which the average person can hold in his cheeks cannot be measured by experimentation. It must be that either that the amount that it takes to fully stuff a mouth is not measurable, or that the definition of an average-sized person is not clear. (RAV

YOSEF BEN-ARZA, shlit'a, points out that the Chazon Ish's proof from the Ran that the amount held in the mouth is not measurable is not an accurate proof, because the Ran is referring to the *minimum* amount for which one is Chayav on Yom Kipur. The Ran says that the exact amount is not measurable because perhaps it might actually be *less* than the experimentation shows. However, the Shi'ur which the Chazon Ish says is not measurable is the *maximum* amount the cheeks can hold.)

Mordecai Kornfeld kornfeld@dafyomi.co.il |Tel: (02)6522633 P.O.B. 43087 kornfeld@netvision.net.il |Fax:9722-6522633 Har Nof, Jerusalem, ISRAEL|kornfeld@shemayisrael.co.il