



קהל לב אבות

LEV AVOS

ספר

והשיב לב אבות

כרך ב • פסח-שבועות תשע"ז • קהל לב אבות

ספר

והשיב לב אבות

כרך ב • פסח-שבועות תשע"ז • קהל לב אבות

Sefer Ve'heishiv Lev Avos

*Khal Lev Avos
500 Hungry Harbor Road
North Woodmere, NY 11581*

Volume 2 • Nissan 5777

Editorial Team

*Moshe Buchbinder, General Editor
Yoni Kirschner, General Editor
Tani Sussman, Publication Lead*

Rob Shur, Design and Layout
www.rbscreative.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Sefer Dedication

.....	p. 5
<i>הכרת הטוב to Avi and Penina Sipzner</i>	p. 7
<i>עץ חיים היא</i>	p. 9

פסח

The P'sul of Hesach HaDaas in the Korban Pesach and Avodas Hashem

RABBI DONIEL BAK

.....	p. 13
-------	-------

Why was Slavery Part of Hashem's Plan?

AVI LANGER

.....	p. 21
-------	-------

Making Matza Soft Again: Thick Matzos on Pesach

GEDALIAH WIELGUS

.....	p. 31
-------	-------

Pesach or Chag HaMatzos: Which is the Real Name?

YOSEF MOSKOWITZ

.....	p. 41
-------	-------

Ohr Lyud Daled- Short or Sweet?

ARI SZAFRANSKI

.....	p. 45
-------	-------

The Purpose of Galus Mitzrayim

MOSHE BUCHBINDER

.....	p. 51
-------	-------

הגדה של פסח

The Four Sons and the Four Shomrim

ELIMELECH BLUMSTEIN

.....	p. 81
-------	-------

הרי זה משובח

YONI KIRSCHNER

.....	p. 87
-------	-------

The Mitzva of Heseiba and Daled Kosos

RABBI YOSEF FRIEDLER

..... p. 89

Chinuch Lessons from the Four Sons

RABBI YOSEF FRIEDLER

..... p. 92

Heseiba: When We Don't Lean Left

RABBI AVI WEBER

..... p. 97

Maaseh B'Rebbi Eliezer

CHAIM STERN

..... p. 101

שבועות

Shavuos: The Prerequisites to Kaballas HaTorah

MOSHE BOLLAG

..... p. 107

Eating Meat on Yom Tov

YEHOShUA ALLSWANG

..... p. 113

The Heavenly Captive

RABBI YOSSE SCHWARTZ

..... p. 119

Does One's Son or Grandson Have Priority for Mitzvas Talmud Torah?

ARIEL JEIDEL

..... p. 127

דברי תורה בעברית

מה נשתנה

שלום בלובשטיין

א

בגדר ד' כוסות

יונתן זאב קירשנער

ג

SEFER DEDICATION

We would like to dedicate this D'var Torah publication in honor of the many generous supporters who donated to our recent (and ongoing) capital campaign. B"H, thanks to your sponsorship, we have recently purchased a beautiful Shul building, situated in an ideal location at 500 Hungry Harbor Road. Construction is already underway and we hope to celebrate our *Chanukas HaBayis* in the coming months. We genuinely appreciate your support and hope that you will join us to see the *Kiddush Hashem* that you have facilitated at Khal Lev Avos!

In particular, we would like to acknowledge and express our profound appreciation to Mr. Gavriel and Mrs. Vardi Jeidel for their magnanimous contribution to the Shul, as well as to their *machatenister* Mrs. Vera Solomon for her exceptionally generous donation made *l'iluy nishmas* her loving husband Mr. Yechezkel Solomon, Yechezkel Ben Yisrael Shalom z"l, a man who was known as the "king of *chessed*" and whose love and care for a fellow Jew knew no bounds. May his *neshama* have an *aliya* from the *zechus* of their generosity, as well as from the abundance of Torah and *tefillos* emanating from our Shul.

We would also like to acknowledge and thank their children, our very own Ariel and Esther Malka Jeidel (nee Solomon) for their tremendous level of personal involvement in advancing the Shul's physical and spiritual development. Ariel, through his role on the Executive Board of the Shul, has been a driving force behind much of the development and planning for our *Kehilla* over the past year. Between board meetings, we also cherish the fountain of *ruach* and contagious love for the Shul that he brings to the atmosphere each Shabbos. Esther Malka is a member of the Presidium of the Shul's *N'shei* (sisterhood) and has been the driving force behind much of the programming and *Chessed* initiatives for women and children within the community. We are extremely lucky to have such dedicated leaders within our community and wish them and their parents much continued *nachas* and *bracha* from all of their *Avodas HaKodesh*.

אין אנחנו מספיקים להודות לך

We have now crossed the one year milestone since Avi and Penina Sipzner have welcomed the Shul into their home. While many people would get fatigued from such an overwhelming, constant responsibility, we are all amazed as to the unwavering good nature and warmth which they exude in hosting the Shul, week in and week out.

We once again just wanted to take this opportunity to thank you and your children for opening your doors and giving Khal Lev Avos an amazing “starter home.” We look forward to vacating the premises and restoring your living room to its rightful state in the coming months!

עץ חיים היא למחזיקים בה

It is our hope that you, the reader, do not just enjoy the Torah that is written inside, but are also uplifted through this Sefer to higher levels of Torah, *Avoda* and *Yiras Shamayim*. If you would like to help in our endeavor to build our *Mikdash Me'at* and continue to publish such works of Torah, please do not hesitate to reach out.

Khal Lev Avos
500 Hungry Harbor Rd.
North Woodmere, NY 11581
koltt567@gmail.com.

Tax deductible contributions can be made via Chase QuickPay, PayPal or Venmo using koltt567@gmail.com.

Tizku L'Mitzvos!

פסח

The *P'sul* of *Hesach HaDaas* in the *Korban Pesach* and *Avodas Hashem*

Rabbi Doniel Bak

In the times when we were זוכה to the בית המקדש, one of the many highlights of חג הפסח was the שחיטת קרבן פסח. Unfortunately, we currently do not have the opportunity to bring the actual *korban*. In lieu of an actual *korban*, I hope this דבר תורה can help us fulfill פסח כאילו הקריב פסח.

PART I - חלק הפשט

The process of bringing the קרבן פסח

The Rambam in the first *perek* of *Hilchos Korban Pesach* list the steps required for the *Korban Pesach* after שפיכת הדם:

דם הפסח, טעון שפיכה כנגד היסוד. ואחר ששופכין דמו, מפשיטין אותו; וקורעין את בטנו ומוציאין את אימוריו, ומקטירין אותן חלבי כל זבח וזבח לבדם. ובעל הזבח נוטל פסחו עם העור שלו, ויוצא לביתו לירושלים; וצולהו, ואוכלו לערב

The Korban Pesach requires that the blood is spilled on the yesod (the base of the outer alter). After the blood is spilt, they skin the animal, they then cut open the belly of the animal and take out the sacrificial parts and fats. They place those parts on the mizbayach, each animal alone. The owner then takes the skinned animal and the hide of the animal, he then goes to his home in Yerushalayim. He roasts it and eats the Korban Pesach in the evening.

The source for this Rambam is the *mishnayos* in *perek* נשחט. However, the *gemara* records an additional step which the Rambam omits:

תנא, כל אחד ואחד נותן פסחו בעורו ומפשיל לאחוריו. אמר רב עיליש – טייעות.

Every person puts the Korban Pesach in its own hide and tosses the bag behind his back. Rav Illish explains, like an Arab merchant.

The omission of this *gemara's* statement from the Rambam raises a few questions:

1. Why did the Rambam omit that the owner places the *Korban Pesach* in the hide?

2. What was the function of placing the *Korban Pesach* specifically in a hide? Why not just carry it in any sort of bag?

3. Lastly the commentators are troubled why the *gemara* adds the statement of Rav Illish that the act of carrying was like an Arab merchant, which seemingly is an unimportant historical fact. This does not seem to bear on the *halachic* requirements of a פסח, קרבן פסח, so what precisely does the statement contribute?

Rav Meir Simcha of D'vinsk, the author of the *אור שמח* on the Rambam and the *משך חכמה* on *Chumash*, provides an insightful *halachic* analysis to answer these three questions in a single elegant approach. However, in order to follow the logic of the *אור שמח*, three introductions to קדשים are needed.

Introduction #1 - קדשים by פסול as a היסח הדעת

The first introduction relates to the פסול of היסח הדעת by קדשים. The Torah requires that תרומה be supervised at all times, and if at any point the supervisor becomes distracted from the supervision of תרומה it becomes disqualified. The source for this הלכה is a פסוק in קרח פרשת which states: את משמרת תרומתי. Rashi there explains: עביד ליה שימור ולא תסיח דעתך - Supervise the תרומה and do not become distracted.

Although this disqualification seems to be limited to תרומה, there are opinions that קדשים has the same disqualification. The משנה in שקלים states:

בשר שנמצא בעזרה, אברין – עולות, וחתיכות - חטאות. בירושלים - זבחי שלמים. וזה וזה תעבר צורתו ויצא לבית השריפה. (שקלים זג)

Meat found in the Azara: Whole limbs - we assume that it is a Korban Olah. Dissected limbs -we assume it is a Korban Chatas. If it was found in Yerushalayim - we assume it is a Korban Shelamim. Regardless of where it was found, we allow the form to change (i.e. we wait for the meat to spoil) and then we burn it.

The ברטנורא explains this משנה as follows: If a person finds limbs of an animal in the עזרה or ירושלים, one (even a kohen) may not eat these limbs (even if the limbs were dissected in a way of a קרבן חטאת) because the limbs of קדשים became disqualified through היסח הדעת.¹ Thus was see that the disqualification of היסח הדעת does not just apply to תרומה, but to קרבן פסח like the קרבן פסח as well.

¹ See רמב"ם הל' פסולי המוקדשים יט:ד to מרכבת מהשנה and משנה למלך who note that the Rambam omits the היסח הדעת בקדשים פסול. However, the *אור שמח* proves that the Rambam agrees with the ברטנורא.

Introduction # 2 – The reason that היסח הדעת is a פסול

The gemara in Pesachim 34a records a לקיש רבי יוחנן וריש לקיש regarding why there should be a disqualification of היסח הדעת altogether:

איתמר, היסח הדעת, רבי יוחנן אמר פסול טומאה הוי, ורבי שמעון בן לקיש אמר פסול הגוף הוי. רבי יוחנן אמר פסול טומאה הוי שאם יבא אליהו ויטהרנה שומעין לו. רבי שמעון בן לקיש אומר פסול הגוף הוי שאם יבא אליהו ויטהרנה אין שומעין לו.

It was taught regarding why hesech hada'as is a psul by teruma: Rabbi Yochanon said that it is a psul tumah i.e., there is a concern that when the person became distracted the teruma became defiled and he didn't realize it. Rabbi Shimon Ben Lakish said it is a psul haguf, i.e., there is an independent disqualification called hesech hadaas even if we know for sure the teruma did not become defiled. According to Rabbi Yochanon if Eliyahu HaNavi would tell us that the teruma never became defiled then it would be permitted. But according to Reish Lakish, even if Eliyahu HaNavi would tell us that the teruma never became defiled it is still disqualified.

Introduction # 3 - היסח הדעת בפרה אדומה

פרה אדומה - והיתה לעדת בני ישראל למשמרת למי נדה: פרשת חקת (יט:ט) The Torah states in משניות in פרק ז teach us that the water used for פרה אדומה also become disqualified with היסח הדעת. The משנה states:

נותן את שלו לאחוריו ואת של חטאת לפניו. ואם נתן את של חטאת לאחוריו פסול.
One who fills water for his own use and at the same time fills water for chatas (i.e., the para aduma water) may carry his water on his back, but the para aduma water must stay in front of him at all times.

The Rambam in his commentary to the משניות explains:

ואמר יתברך למשמרת למי נדה, בזמן שהן שמורין הן מי נדה, ולכן ישימם נכחו עד שיהיו שמורים נוכח עיניו.

The Torah tells us that the para aduma water should be kept safe. They only remain qualified para aduma waters as long as they are kept safe. Putting them behind one's back is not considered a safekeeping, and thereby disqualify them.

In other words when a person places the מי חטאת on his back the water becomes disqualified because of היסח הדעת – a deficiency in awareness that compromises their safety.

The תירוץ of the אור שמח

Based on these introductions, the אור שמח addresses each of the aforementioned questions. He asks, why did the ברייתא say that each one takes their קרבן פסח and swings it onto his back. If the הלכה is that בהיסח הדעת the הלכה is that קדשים נפסלין בהיסח הדעת, and we see from פרה that placing קדשים onto the back is a violation of היסח הדעת, when the owner would place his קרבן on his back he disqualified his קרבן! The אור שמח answers that since we hold like Rabbi Yochanon, that היסח הדעת distraction is not an intrinsic disqualification, but rather just a concern that perhaps when he was distracted the קדשים became defiled, the solution would be to wrap the animal in its hide. The rule is that unfinished hide is not מקבל טומאה.² So if the owner would take the hide and wrap his קרבן פסח in it, it would remain permissible to swing the קרבן behind his back since it is protected and impervious to טומאה. There would therefore be no violation of היסח הדעת.

The אור שמח adds that the *gemara* holds that there is no requirement to swing the קרבן פסח behind the back. That was done as a show of beautification, i.e., it was vogue to march home with the קרבן on the back the way the Arab merchants would parade around with wares on their backs.

Rav Illish was therefore clarifying the ברייתא by stating that the קרבן only needs to be wrapped in its hide if a person intends on swinging the קרבן behind his back in a show of beautification like an Arab merchant, in order to prevent the disqualification of היסח הדעת. However, if a person carries home the קרבן in a regular manner in which he would be aware of the קרבן at all times, which is perfectly permissible, then there is no need to wrap the קרבן in his hide.

This also explains why the Rambam omitted this *gemara* from the הלכות. The Rambam in הלכות קרבן פסח is only teaching us the requirements for קרבן פסח, and carrying it behind one's back is not a requirement. But, אין הכי נמי, if one decides to carry the קרבן on his back then he would need to consult the general laws of היסח הדעת and of course would need to wrap the קרבן in the hide to avert a disqualification of היסח הדעת.

PART II - חלק הדרוש

עבודת השם in פסול היסח הדעת

The Torah in פרשת יתרו states:

ועתה אם שמוע תשמעו בקלי ושמרתם את בריתי והייתם לי סגלה מכל העמים כי לי כל הארץ.
(שמות יג:ה)

² See הלכות כלים פרק ב ומשנה למלך שם and רמב"ם הלכות מעשה הקרבנות פרק ח 2

And now if you listen to my voice and guard my covenant, you will be the most treasured people to me of all the nations, because the land is mine.

On this פסוק, the בית ה' writes the following:

ושמרתם את בריתי. הנה בכמה מקומות מצינו דנאמר אצל התורה לשון שמירה. כאן נאמר ושמרתם את בריתי, וכן כתיב שמר לך את הדברים האלה, בא הכתוב לומר דדברי תורה צריכין שימורה וכמו דמצינו דחולין אינן נפסלין רק אם ידוע שנשמאו וכל זמן דלא ידוע בהם שנשמאו הרי הם בחזקת טהרה דאין צריכין שימור בטהרה. משא"כ תרומה וקודש נפסלין בהסח הדעת ואע"פ שאין יודע להם שום טומאה מ"מ כיון דלא שמרם והסיח דעתו משמירתם נפסלין בהסח הדעת ונפקא לן מקרא דכתיב משמרת תרומותי דלענין קדושת תרומה צריך שיהיה משומר דוקא ולא מהני מה דאינו יודע בהם קלקול רק צריך שיהיה יודע שהם טהורים. וכן בתורה מוכרח האדם לשומרם בטהרה ומיד שיסיח דעתו מעבודתו ומשמירתו נפסל ואע"ג שאינו יודע בעצמו שום קלקול כל שלא נזהר להשמר בטהרה וקדושה נפסל.

The בית ה' teaches that in many places we find the Torah employing the language of שמירה. The point is that the Torah itself needs safeguarding. Although we find that חולין (non-תרומה produce) does not become disqualified unless we know for a fact that it became defiled, the rule is that חולין does not require a special שמירה. However, objects of holiness like תרומה and קדשים do become disqualified if one becomes distracted from שמירה. This is derived from the verse תרומותי משמרת תרומה and קדשים require to be specifically watched and it is not acceptable just to assume that the produce or קדשים did not become defiled. The same is true for Torah study if a person is distracted for his study or from his service of Hashem, the Torah is disqualified.

In other words, the בית ה' is saying that just like there is a פסול הסח הדעת for תרומה and קדשים, the same goes for לימוד התורה. But how can we explain the opinion of רבי יוחנן that לימוד התורה is אפסול טומאה? It is easy to understand how something that can potentially be מקבל טומאה requires safeguarding, but that seems to be a physical, technical requirement. How exactly does that carry over onto לימוד תורה?

There is a famous piece by אור החיים הקדוש in פרשת חקת that explains why the הלכה of טומאת אהל (the ability of a corpse to transmit טומאה throughout a house) relates exclusively to the body of a Jew, while a gentile does not generate טומאת אהל. The אור החיים הקדוש writes:

וכבר המשלתי במקום אחר ענין זה לשני כלים שהיו אצל בעל הבית אחת מלאה דבש ואחת מלאה זבל. ופינה אתם והוציאם לחוץ מהחדר, אותה שהיתה מלאה דבש מתקבצים

לה כל הזבובים והרמשים. ואתה שהיתה מלאה זבל הגם שיכנסו לה קצת המרמשים לא ישרה לשל דבש. כמו כן אדם מישראל שמת להיותו מלא קדושה מהתוקה והעריבה בצאת הנפש ונתרון הגוף יתקבצו הקליפות לאין קץ שהם כוחות הטומאה התאבים תמיד להדבק בקדושה ליהנות מהערב, ולזה יטמא באהל. וכ' משא"כ אשר לא מזרע ישראל להיותו מושלל מהקדושה אין כל כך התקבצות הטומאה אלא חלק הממית הנדבק בגוף ואשר וסובב הכל היא תורה. (במדבר יג:ב)

I have given a parable on this topic elsewhere. A man had two vessels. One contained honey and the other contained household waste. The man decides to take the vessels and empty them in his yard. The vessels that contained the honey now is empty but has residue of honey inside it. The same is for the container that contained waste. When the man comes back later he will find that the container that contained the honey will be swarmed with flies, bees and other insects. The empty refuse container will be generally bug free. The same is true when a Jewish person dies. His body was filled with spirituality. When his souls leaves the evil forces in the world (who are sustained by holiness) come into the body and generate impurities. The cause of all of this is the Torah a man learnt.³

To summarize, the אור החיים הקדוש is teaching an important principle. That which once contained תורה and has since רחמנא ליצלן lost it is now in a lower state than one which never had תורה at all.

This teaching is consistent with the *gemara* in Pesachim 49b which states: תנא, One who learned Torah and then departed from its ways hates Torah scholars more than anyone else. Rabbi Chaim Shmuelevitz explains why these two ideas are comparable:

וטעם חומר "שנה ופירש" הוא משום שכל מקום שהיה קדוש ונסתלקה משם הקדושה הטומאה מתדבקת לשם יותר מאשר למקום שלא היה קדוש מתחילה. כמו כתב האוה"ח הק' בטעם הדבר שישראל מקבל טומאה ואין עכו"ם מקבל טומאה וכן כתב גם בטעם הדבר שישראל מטמא באוהל ואין העכו"ם מטמא באהל וכ' זהו חומרו של שנה ופירש שמכיון שאדם זה היה מקודם מקום קדושה הרי כשפירש הוא גרוע יותר ממי שלא למד בתחילה. (שיחת מוסר מאמר ל"ח)

³ The אור החיים uses this principle to answer a question in regarding the קרבן פסח which the Jews brought in Mitzrayim. There are specific laws regarding טומאת מת and the קרבן פסח. Why weren't these laws taught to the Jews in Mitzrayim if they needed to know them? (These laws seem to be only taught first regarding פסח דורות.) The אור החיים answers that before we received the תורה the Jews themselves did not generate אהל טומאה. The אור החיים there gives a few applications where we see the concept. See also יערות דבש דרוש ד who uses this principle to explain why there are evil forces on the Temple Mount.

The explanation for "shana v'peresh" is that anytime there was holiness in a place and the holiness departed the forces of evil cling in its stead (more than if there never was holiness there in the first place) as the Ohr Hachaim explains why only Jews have the laws of contracting tumah and the laws of generating tumas ohel. The same is true in regards to a man who studies Torah and then departed from its ways, where the evil forces cling to him and make him an inferior person.⁴

We can now explain the הלוי בית regarding why the Torah requires constant safeguarding. When one is distracted from התורה לימוד, leaving a void in his connectivity to Torah, he becomes more susceptible for the כוחות הטומאה to cling to him just like the person who on a more severe scale is שנה ופירש and abandons Torah altogether. Even the temporary absence of Torah creates a magnetic effect for the attack of the כוחות הטומאה. Therefore, just like Rabbi Yochanon holds that היסח הדעת is a פסול טומאה by וקדשים תרומה to prevent the attack of טומאה, similarly we hold that היסח הדעת is a פסול טומאה regarding לימוד התורה since any failure to safeguard the Torah generates a comparable attack by טומאה.

The solution for היסח הדעת

The solution for היסח הדעת in Torah can be found in the aforementioned הלוי בית:

שמח זבולון בצאתך וישכר באהלך (דברים לג), והוא דלכאורה היאך אפשר להאדם לבל יסיח דעתו מתורתו והרי מוכרח ליצא לשוק ולעסוק בפרנסה וכמו שאמרו במס' ברכות (דף לה) הנהג בהם מנהג דרך ארץ. רק דאיתא בפסחים בני חבורה שהיו מסובין לשתות ויצאו לקראת חתן כשהם חוזרים טעונים ברכה. דהיציאה חשיבא הסיח הדעת בד"א שלא הניחו שם מקצת חברים אבל הניחו מקצת חברים כשהם חוזרים אין טעונים ברכה. דכיון מקצתן נשאר במקומן גם לגבי היוצא לא מקרי הסח הדעת. דלקביעא קמא הדר. וכן הוא בעסק התורה אם עוסקים בכנופיא ובקיבוץ אז גם כמקצתן יוצאין לפרנסתן הרי הניח מקצת חברים בבית המדרש ובפרט אם העוסק הוא מהמחזיקין ידי העוסקים בתורה כמו זבולון וישכר גם לגבי היוצאין לא מקרי יציאתן היסח הדעת. וזהו שאמר הכתוב שמח זבולו בצאתך אחרי שישכר באוהלך כיון דהוא נשאר בעבודותו בבית המדרש.

"Rejoice Zevulun in your excursions and Yisachar in your tents." At first glance one might ask how is it possible not to be distracted from

4 See from the author of פרק הספינה ד"ה אמר רבה בר בר חנה לדידי חזי הורמין אמת ליעקב 4 נראה לי ונקדים בזה דברי המקובלים שאמרו שלפעמים אפילו רשע נגמור חזר בתשובה שלימה: who writes: נתיבות המשפט ואמר כך חזר לסורו הטעם מפני שכוחות הטומאה רואין שכבר כלה ממנו כל הקדושות מביאין אותו לשוב בכדי שידבק בו כוחות קדושות ואחר כך מטמאין אותו.

Torah study, since a person needs to leave the study hall to pursue a livelihood etc. The gemara in Pesachim states: If a group of diners are drinking together and leave the meal to join a bride or groom, when they resume eating they need to make a new beracha. The gemara qualifies this by adding that if they left their meal to join a bride and groom but some of the members of the meal stayed behind, when the ones who left rejoin the group do not need to make a new beracha. We see that since they left their friends at the meal their minds never left the meal and there was never a hesech hada'as. The same is true regarding Torah. If a person is part of a group of people that are devoted to Torah, then even if he needs to pursue a livelihood there never is hesech hada'as - especially if he goes to work with the intention of financially supporting the Torah scholars (like Yisachar and Zevulun). That is the intention of the verse "Let Zevulun rejoice in his excursions" - there is never hesech hada'as because "Yisachar in in his tent studying Torah."

Tying this back to the *gemara* quoted and explained earlier which states that the פסח was thrown behind one's back, and therefore required the protection of the hide, we can understand a פסוק in מלכים in which the נביא rebukes בן נבט and says: - "ואותי השלכת אחרי גוך - "And you threw me behind your back."⁵ What the נביא was saying to Yerovom was, "Yerovom... you were מסיח דעת from תורה ועבודה!"

May our learning about the focus required for דברים שבקדושה be a זכות for us to be focused on our תורה and עבודה and fulfill the mandate of לנגדי תמיד.

יהי רצון שיבנה בית המקדש ושם נאכל מן הפסחים ומן הזבחים במהרה בימינו אמן.

מלכים א יד:ג 5

Why was Slavery Part of Hashem's Plan?¹

Avi Langer

The Haggadah's Lullaby

As Rabbi Fohrman is fond of pointing out, we sometimes forget to ask questions about stories and events we are so familiar with from our childhood. One of those events is the סדר, and the הגדה that serves as its guide. As we sit and discuss סיפור יציאת מצרים with our children, I would venture to say that many people would answer the following question incorrectly.

Where can we find the פסוקים in the Torah that discuss יציאת מצרים? On first thought, one would be compelled to say that it is derived from the פסוקים in ספר שמות that describe the שעבוד. After all, we have at least four פרשיות almost completely dedicated to that topic. Interestingly, however, the backbone for the story and the main source of סיפור יציאת מצרים in the הגדה comes forty years after the actual enslavement from a few seemingly minor פסוקים in תבוא כי תבוא:

והיה כי תבוא אל הארץ אשר ה' אלהיך נתן לך נחלה וירשתה וישבת בה. ולקחת מראשית כל פרי האדמה אשר תביא מארצך אשר ה' אלהיך נתן לך ושמת בטנא והלכת אל המקום אשר יבחר ה' אלהיך לשכון שמו שם. ובאת אל הכהן אשר יהיה בימים ההם ואמרת אליו הגדתי היום לה' אלהיך כי באתי אל הארץ אשר נשבע ה' לאבותינו לתת לנו. ולקח הכהן הטנא מידך והניחו לפני מזבח ה' אלהיך. וענית ואמרת לפני ה' אלהיך ארמי אבד אבי וירד מצרימה ויגר שם במתי מעט ויהי שם לגוי גדול עצום ורב. וירעו אתנו המצרים ויעוננו ויתנו עלינו עבדה קשה. ונצעק אל ה' אלהי אבותינו וישמע ה' את קלנו וירא את ענינו ואת עמלנו ואת לחצנו. ויוצאנו ה' ממצרים ביד חזקה ובזרע נטויה ובמרא גדל ובאתות ובמפתים. ויבאנו אל המקום הזה ויתן לנו את הארץ הזאת ארץ זבת חלב ודבש. (דברים כו:א-ט)

When the farmer brings the season's first fruits to ירושלים, as part of his declaration he highlights the years of slavery in מצרים where we were forged into a nation, and thanks Hashem for giving us His special land. These are the main פסוקים that formulate what we say on the סדר night. Although there is a brief reference to what happened in מצרים, why does the הגדה בעל הגדה choose to expand on what the

¹ Based on a series of shiurim given by Rabbi David Fohrman.

farmer recites when bringing בִּיכּוּרִים and not the actual פסוקים in שמות that describe in great length the שעבוד and ultimate גאולה from מצרים?

One might suggest that the הגדה בעל הגדה is trying to provide some perspective. Instead of describing what happened, it would give more meaning to tell it from the perspective of the farmer because he is the fulfillment of Hashem's promise. The farmer says that way back in מצרים, Hashem made a promise that He would not only take us out of Egypt, He would also bring us into ארץ ישראל where we would prosper. So the farmer says that he is living proof of the fulfillment of that promise. And we, the descendants of that farmer, read the הגדה and this recitation of the farmer because we, too, are living proof of that promise. As we impart this message to our children, we lead from מגיד directly into הלל because we recognize the fulfillment of Hashem's promise and we offer our thanks and praise to Him for it.

However, the promise wasn't really made to us or to our ancestors in מצרים. It was made generations earlier to our forefather Avraham. ברוך שומר הבטחתו לישראל was the promise to Avraham by the בתרים בין הבתרים.

ויאמר לאברם ידע תדע כי גר יהיה זרעך בארץ לא להם ועבדום וענו אתם ארבע מאות שנה. וגם את הגוי אשר יעבדו דן אנכי ואחרי כן יצאו ברכש גדול. ואתה תבוא אל אבתך בשלום תקבר בשיבה טובה. ודור רביעי ישובו הנה כי לא שלם עון האמרי עד הנה. (בראשית טו:יג-טז)

Hashem informed Avraham that his descendants would be exiled to a strange land where they would suffer in servitude for many years. But Hashem placated Avraham with a pledge that, after their enslavement, they would leave with great wealth and would eventually return to ארץ ישראל.

Now, what should have been Avraham's response to this ברית, to this covenant? "Thank you?" Does he even need to say "thank you" for taking them out? Earlier, (טו:א) Hashem told Avraham מאד שכרך הרבה; if his reward was indeed so great, how could it be that his children would need to be exiled? It would have been better for Hashem not to place Avraham's children in גלות and then there would have been no need to free them. If Hashem put them in גלות, why do we need to give שבה for taking them out? And why would it help that they would leave with immense treasure? It's a nice thing to have riches but an even nicer thing is retaining your freedom.

To answer these questions, we must answer some other questions first. As we mentioned when we started, there are stories in תנ"ך that we take for granted, mainly because it is how we were taught in yeshiva as children. We know that the fulfillment of Hashem's promise occurred when בני ישראל were enslaved and eventually freed from מצרים. But might there be another place in the Torah where this sequence of events played out?

Goats and Coats

After working for his father-in-law Lavan for twenty years, Yaakov decided that it was time to return home upon the birth of his son, Yosef. What was unique about the birth of Yosef in particular that served as the catalyst for Yaakov's decision to leave?² R' Yosef Dov Soloveitchik זצ"ל posits that all of the אבות knew about the נבואה that Avraham received but they did not know when it would occur. Upon the birth of Yosef, perhaps Yaakov saw an interpretation that rang true for him. Let's try to compare the language of אברהם in נבואת אברהם with some of Yaakov's experiences.

1. גר יהיה זרעך: Yaakov became a גר when he left his parent's home to escape Eisav.

2. ועבדום: Yaakov worked for twenty years for Lavan.

3. וענו אותם: Yaakov was a victim of injustice on account of Lavan (both in terms of his marriage partners and his business dealings).

4. ארבע מאות שנה: Yaakov calculated that maybe this time frame just referred to an extended period of time but did not mean a full four hundred years.³

5. יצאו ברכוש גדול: Yaakov amassed a tremendous amount of cattle and became wealthy.⁴

6. ודור רביעי ישובו הנה: 1) Avraham, 2) Yitzchok, 3) Yaakov, 4) Yosef; although Lavan tricked Yaakov into marrying Leah from whom he had a number of children, Rachel was really Yaakov's wife and Yosef, her בכור, represented the fourth generation from Avraham.

On account of these messages, right after Yosef was born, Yaakov demanded that Lavan send him on his way – שלחני ואלכה – let me go! (ויצא לכה) Not very different than Moshe's request of Pharaoh to "Let my people go!" So Yaakov thought that he was experiencing the fulfillment of that נבואה – did he make a mistake?

Let's continue to examine the פסוקים by the story of Yaakov and Lavan and see if we can draw additional parallels to the story of the actual Exodus.

2 Other than the more esoteric פשט that Rashi mentions at the beginning of פרשת וישב where he explains, based on a פסוק in עובדיה that while Yaakov represented fire, Yosef represented the flame or spark that would burn up the straw that was Eisav.

3 This suggestion isn't as far-fetched as it may seem. Even with the actual קיום of the נבואה, the בני ישראל didn't actually serve for four hundred years in מצרים and the מפרשים come up with answers to explain this number (e.g., it starts from the birth of Yitzchak etc.).

4 ויפרץ האיש מאד מאד ויהי לו צאן רבות ושפחות ועבדים וגמלים וחמרים - בראשית ל:מג

יעקב – לבן (ויצא לא:כב-כה) בני ישראל – פרעה (בשלח יד:ה-ט)

ויגד ללבן ביום השלישי כי ברח יעקב ויגד למלך מצרים כי ברח העם

These are the only two instances in the Torah where it says that X was told that Y ran away.

ויקח את אחיו עמו ויאסר את רכבו ואת עמו לקח עמו

וירדף אחריו דרך שבעת ימים ויחזק ה' את לב פרעה מלך מצרים וירדף אחריו בני ישראל

וישג לבן את יעקב וירדפו מצרים אחריהם וישיגו אותם

Not only are the words identical, even the order is consistent! ויגד, ויקח, וירדף, וישג. Furthermore, Yaakov served Lavan for twenty years and left in the twenty-first. Was it a coincidence that the בני ישראל left in the 210th year? It's almost as if what happened to Yaakov was a microcosm of what happened to כלל ישראל on a macrocosmic scale.

The בראשית רבה in (פדא) tells us בקש יעקב לישב בשלוה – Yaakov wanted to settle down in the land in which his forefathers were just גרים, as it says בארץ מגורי אביו בארץ גרים, כנען קפץ עליו רוגזו של יוסף, but Yaakov could have been the fulfillment of the promise to Avraham, but the sale of Yosef is what started the process anew.⁵ There is an apparent connection between what caused Yaakov to be in גלות and what caused us as a nation to be in גלות. What other connections between the stories of Yaakov's various ordeals and the בני ישראל's time in מצרים can we find to draw that קשר even closer?

One of the ways that demonstrated to the brothers that Yaakov treated Yosef as his בכור was that he gave Yosef the פסים כתנת פסים. And what did the brothers do with it? They sheched a goat, dipped it into the goat's blood and brought that very same כתונה in order to deceive their father regarding the son who he thought was his בכור (we will refer to this episode as "Goats and Coats II"). This mirrors the story with Yaakov that caused him to have to flee his parents' home – he tricked his father into thinking that he was the בכור by bringing him the meat of a goat while clothed in a goat's skin and wearing the coat of his brother Eisav. (we will refer to this episode as "Goats and Coats I"). That which the children of Yaakov do to him, Yaakov himself had done to his own father!⁶ We see that the first step in both the גלות of Yaakov and what was to be the seeds for the גלות in מצרים all started with tricking a father regarding the son who he thought was, and treated like, his בכור.

If the way Yaakov got to his "mini-slavery" in Lavan's house was on account

עיין רמב"ן וספורנו (בראשית לז:א) 5

6 Perhaps the reason why the ten multiplier was used in the שיעבוד of the בני ישראל was because the ten brothers who sold Yosef and deceived their father required ten times (two hundred and ten years) the amount of תשובה (through the entire nation of ישראל) than just Yaakov (twenty one years) who deceived his father.

of Goats and Coats I, and the way we went into slavery in מצרים as a nation was on account of Goats and Coats II, wouldn't there have to be some mention of other elements of Goats and Coats when we left מצרים? In other words, if our time in מצרים was to serve as a כפרה of sorts for the events in Coats and Goats I, there would have to be some reference as to how that כפרה was realized. We can't just escape our past mistakes without a stark reminder of how we got into that mess in the first place. Understanding what put us into slavery would seem to be an essential component in ensuring that mistakes that were made wouldn't be made again. Yet, at first glance, after the עשר מכות, בני ישראל miraculously left מצרים and there doesn't seem to be any references to Goats and Coats. Or maybe there is....

Goats and Coats Replay

After the final encounter between Moshe and Pharaoh, Moshe left the palace and Hashem informed him of one more מכה – "עוד נגע אחד אביא על מצרים" – Based on the sequence of events, the next פסוקים in the תורה should seemingly discuss מכות בכורות and how it would relate to the מצריים and בני ישראל. The Torah, however, deviates from this discussion and instead moves to various הלכות regarding the קרבן פסח.

If you would try to find a common theme in the setup of the first few ספרים of the Torah, it might look something like this:

ספר בראשית = stories

ספר שמות: First half = stories

Second half = הלכות

ספר ויקרא = הלכות

Why then does the Torah break into the stories of the first half of ספר שמות by introducing קרבן פסח? And if it were necessary to the narrative to mention the קרבן פסח, the Torah could have accomplished this with one פסוק by saying that you must shecht the קרבן and place its blood on the doorpost. Instead, the Torah lists all of the הלכות related to the קרבן פסח (שחיטה, משקוף, דם, צלי, ז' ימים, מצות, וכו') (שחיטה, משקוף, דם, צלי, ז' ימים, מצות, וכו').

It must be that these הלכות are not a digression from, but rather an essential part of, the story itself. Let's see how the Torah drops hints of Goats and Coats into the הלכות of the קרבן פסח.

1. One הלכה of the קרבן פסח is that every family needs to take a ששה.⁷ If the family, however, is too small on their own to finish the ששה, they may invite another family to join them.⁸ The Torah in שמות יב:ד says "במכסת נפשות איש לפי אכלו תכסו על" – *Every participant in a given group's offering (lit. counting of the souls),*

⁷ ויקחו להם איש ששה לבית אבת ששה לבית - בא יב:ג

⁸ ואם ימעט הבית משה ולקח הוא ושכנו הקרב אל ביתו... - בא יב:ד

each person according to what he can eat, תכסו – count himself in the group. Besides for the meaning ascribed to it here in the simple explanation of the פסוק (i.e., counting), the word תכסו is also related to the word כסה – cover. The תורה tells us that "דם הוא הנפש" – so the phrase במכסת נפשות can be translated as "covering of souls." And we find a "covering of souls" in Goats and Coats I by the sale of Yosef – Yehuda says "מה בצע כי נהרג את אחינו וכסינו את דמו" (וישב לזכו).

2. "שה תמים זכר בן שנה יהיה לכם מן הכבשים ומן העזים תקחו" – the פרשה starts off talking about a שה, a sheep, but continues to explain that the word שה means either a כבש (lamb, which is a baby sheep, the conventional word for שה) or an עז. It's almost as if the עז can pretend to be a שה. The brothers sheched a גדי and placed its blood on the כהונה of Yosef to pretend as if it were the blood of a person. Therefore, now too by the קרבן פסח, we need the goat to pretend as if it were something else.

3. By the קרבן פסח, we are very careful in how the it should be prepared. The שה must be roasted and water must not touch it.¹⁰ Why can't it be cooked in water? If Yosef is the שה of the Goats and Coats narrative, we find that Yosef also did not come in contact with water – והבור רק אין בו מים – (לז:כד).

4. The פסוק in יב:ח says שמות יב:ח – ואכלו את הבשר בלילה הזה צלי אש ומצות על מררים יאכלהו – the Pesach "bread" must be eaten together with bitter herbs. Where is there a "bitterness" mentioned in relation to bread in Goats and Coats? In Goats and Coats I, Yaakov served bread with the meal for his father and, after Yaakov received the ברכות, Eisav cried out upon realizing he had been deceived – ויצעק צעקה גדלה ומרה – (תולדות כז:לד). Similarly, in Goats and Coats II, the brothers sat down to eat bread in a family group after selling Yosef – וישבו לאכל לחם – (וישב לז:כה). So we must also sit down in a family group and eat bread – על מררים –. And that exact word refers to Yosef. Later on in the blessings that Yaakov gives to him, Yaakov acknowledges that the brothers hated Yosef – וימררהו ורבו וישטמהו – (ויחי מט:כג).

5. In describing how the קרבן פסח should be eaten, the Torah interestingly uses the word "נא" instead of a more traditional word like גלם. The word "נא" is more commonly translated to mean "please" – why does the Torah choose a word that can mean "please" when instructing that the קרבן פסח must not be eaten raw? In both Goats and Coats stories we find numerous examples of the word "נא" – in Goats and Coats I, Yitzchok tells Eisav שא נא כליך (תולדות כז:ג), Yaakov tells his father גשה נא ואמשך בני (פסוק יט) and Yitzchok says to Yaakov קום נא שבה ואכלה מציד (פסוק כא) גשה נא ואמשך בני (פסוק כו) גשה נא ושקה לי בני... When the brothers bring the coat to Yaakov in Goats

אך בשר בנפשו דמו (נח ט:ד), כי נפש הבשר בדם הוא (אחרי מות יז:יא), כי הדם הוא הנפש (ראה יב:כג) 9
ואכלו את הבשר בלילה הזה צלי אש ומצות על מררים יאכלהו. אל תאכלו ממנו נא ובשל מבשל במים כי אם צלי אש ראשו על 10
כרעיו ועל קרבו - בא יב:ח-ט

and Coats II they say (וישב לז:לב) הכר נא הכתנת בנך הוא אם לא Everything was done so politely in both Goats and Coats episodes, but now, by the פסח קרבן, the Torah says let's replay the whole thing but without the "please" this time – אל תאכלו ממנו נא.¹¹

6. By the פסח קרבן it says (בא יב:י) ולא תותירו ממנו עד בקר – there should be no leftovers. What is that reminiscent of in Goats and Coats? By the sale of Yosef, Reuven returns to the pit only to discover that Yosef is no longer there (וישב לז:כט). Just as the "sheep" vanished from the pit, we are instructed to make sure nothing of the פסח קרבן is leftover by morning – as if there had been no sheep there at all.

7. Further, by the פסח קרבן it says how the בני ישראל should eat the *korban* – וככה – (בא יב:יא) תאכלו אתו מתניכם חגרים נעליכם ברגליכם ומקלכם בידכם ואכלתם אתו בחפזון – your belt must be tied, your shoes must be on your feet, your stick must be in your hand and you must eat it in haste. Why must they be prepared to leave? Returning to Goats and Coats we find that they are always ready to leave – after Goats and Coats I, Yaakov runs from Eisav upon Rivka's instruction – וקום ברח לך אל לבן אחי חרנה – (תולדות כז:מג), and after Goats and Coats II the family rushed down to מצרים after discovering that Yosef was still alive.

8. When Moshe called the elders of the בני ישראל, he told them (בא יב:כא) למשפחתים – pull for yourselves and take a sheep for each of your families. Why did משה have to add the word "משכו" – he should have just said "take a sheep for your family" – who cares about pulling the sheep? The Torah only uses the word משכו one other time: when they drew Yosef from the pit the פסוק says וימשכו (וישב לז:כח) ויעלו את יוסף מן הבור. The Torah is telling us that the first time you pulled the "sheep" and then sold it, but now you mustn't sell it, you must pull it and then take it – קחו לכם. To where should you take him? The פסוק continues: למשפחתים. Take him into your family.¹²

9. The final stage in the offering of the פסח קרבן is (בא יב:כא) ושחטו הפסח. Is there any slaughtering in Goats and Coats?¹³ In Goats and Coats II, the Torah says that the brothers took the cloak of Yosef (וישב לז:לא) וישחטו שעיר עזים ויטבלו את הכתנת בדם – they sheched a goat and dipped the cloak in its blood. Similarly, by the פסח קרבן the Torah continues in the next פסוק (בראשית כז:ט) ולקחתם אגדת אוזב וטבלתם בדם אשר בסף והגעתם אל: – they took the אגדת אוזב and dipped it in blood.

11 If פסח מצרים was indeed just a replay to fix earlier events, that could explain why the נמרא lists differences between פסח מצרים and פסח לדורות, one of them being that פסח לדורות may be eaten raw. Once פסח מצרים repaired earlier events, there was no longer a need to continue with the mandated remedies.

12 מכאן שחייב אדם לקרב קרוביו כדי שישמחו עמהם בימים טובים here says רבינו בחיי.

13 In Coats and Goats I, Rashi (בראשית כז:ט) notes from פרקי דרבי אליעזר that it was פסח, but there isn't a specific reference to slaughtering in the text. Some cite this taking of the ברכות במרמה as the source for stealing the אפיקומן.

And where did they need to place it? It wasn't enough to place it on the top – אל המשקוף and the two sides – אל שתי המזוחות, they also needed to place it בסף – on the threshold.¹⁴ The word “סף” is an interesting word – who else is “סף”? of course! The brothers dipped the coat of Yosef in “his blood” – so by the קרבן פסח we need to dip a second time in fake Yosef blood. If you want your בכור to live on the night that בכורים are dying, you need to mend what you broke.¹⁵ The brothers fought amongst themselves regarding who had the זכות for the בכורה. But this time you must take the “שה” Yosef – your brother – into your family. Only when you're together in unity will you be ready to leave מצרים.

Becoming G-d's Firstborn

Based on all this we can say that Hashem didn't put כלל ישראל into גלות. We did it to ourselves. Isn't that what the farmer declares when he brings the בכורים: “ארמי: ביכורים” – my father (Yaakov, as some מפרשים explain) was a wandering Aramean. Hashem didn't put Yaakov into the house of Lavan. “וירד מצרימה” – and he went down to מצרים, “וירעו אתנו המצרים” – and the מצרים oppressed us – there's still no mention of Hashem in this declaration. Only by the גאולה do we first mention Hashem: “ויוצאנו ה' משם” – Hashem took us out from there – when we brought ourselves into trouble, Hashem was there to bail us out. So the prophecy to Avraham wasn't to tell Avraham what Hashem would do to them. It was only a glimpse into the future of what his children would do to themselves. They will be a גר in a strange land but, with all that, I will still be with them.

The night of the סדר isn't just a night to give gratitude on the fulfillment of the prophecy and His promise to always be there for us – it's a night of thanks for the ability to fix the mistakes we have made. We drink four cups of wine because there were four verbs that Hashem used to express His commitment to deliver us from מצרים, I will take you out from מצרים, I will save you from your terrible labors, I will redeem you and I will bring you to Me as a people by taking you into ישראל ארץ. All of them seem to make sense except for גאולתי – what does this add that isn't already captured by the other three? What does it mean to be redeemed? When someone experiences trauma, it is not enough to be

¹⁴ See אבן עזרא here. Also see the גמרא quoting the העמק דבר in נצי"ב that פסח מצרים was offered on three מזבחות: the משקוף and two מזוחות. But the מכילתא concludes (also quoted in the ירושלמי in פסחים ט:ה) that R' Shimon is לשיטתו when he argues that there were four מזבחות: the three listed above plus the סף, because he holds that the word סף means the אסקופה – the threshold. Some מפרשים explain (see, e.g., תרגום אונקלוס, רש"י) that in this context the word בסף refers to some כלי, a basin of sorts that contained the blood.

¹⁵ As noted in footnote 10, the על המשקוף ועל שתי המזוחות and על המשקוף ועל המזבחות is also listed in the משנה in פסח מצרים as a requirement that was limited to מצרים.

saved from the trauma; a trauma leaves its mark, especially when it's self-inflicted. To truly recover from trauma, a person needs to be redeemed, and sometimes to go through the same experience that brought about the trauma in the first place. Perhaps we can suggest that Hashem gave us the power that night with the קרבן פסח to also rectify our errors – to fix the horrors of the sale of Yosef. By going through that traumatic experience we emerged “clean” once again.

And Hashem did it in a way that we not only replayed the stories that occurred but also the causes behind those stories. In the two Goats and Coats stories, we fought with and rebelled against our brother, and deceived our father, all because we desperately wanted to be the “בכור” of our father. And we now need to turn this flaw into a strength. Hashem tells us on the night of מציאת מצרים that if you want to be a בכור – you can be My בכור – בני בכורי ישראל. But you need to do so without any rebelliousness or trickery. You must shecht the god of the מצריים and place it on your doorposts – and you will do so in front of them – בעצם היום הזה.¹⁶

A בכור serves as a bridge between generations so that the children born after him can learn and understand. By proclaiming our faith to Hashem and declaring Him our Father, we are saying that we are brothers and we take the role of the בכור seriously (the position of the בכור only exists if you are willing to acknowledge that there are other children also). So on the סדר night, when we recognize the fact that we became the בכור of Hashem, we must also recognize the fact that we are brothers, too. That is why there is also a need to invite everyone – כל דכפין ייתי ויכול – we are all brothers.

Haggadah: Epilogue

The name “פסח” is unique. It is derived from ופסחתי עליכם (בא יב:יג) – Hashem “passed over” you. This is a new word in the Torah – why does the Torah use a brand new word when it could have easily used “קפץ/jump” or “דלג/skip?” By the קרבן פסח the Torah says that it needs to be roasted ועל קרבו ועל כרעיו ועל קרבו – in the fetal position. You must also eat the entire thing, nothing must be left over. We are then commanded to hurry out through a doorway that is completely surrounded by blood. This sounds very much like a description of childbirth – the moment of the national birth of ישראל כלל. At a time when they are being formed as a nation for the first time and leaving the רחם. And just as this happens, Hashem skips over us. פסח is the same lashon as “פס” – as in stripes, as in “פסים,” as in the פסים. The stripes from Yosef’s cloak. Yaakov demonstrated his affinity to Yosef by giving

כי בעצם היום הזה הוצאתי את צבאותיכם מארץ מצרים (בא יב:יז), בעצם היום הזה יצאנו... (בא יב:מז), בעצם היום הזה 16 הוציא ה' את בני ישראל מארץ מצרים (בא יב:נא)

him “stripes”¹⁷ – when we were born that night, Hashem demonstrated that same affinity to us – by giving us our stripes, not with a cloak, but by jumping over us and sparing His special nation. His “בכור.” בני בכורי ישראל.

This also explains the strange introduction to the laws of the פסח. The פרשה begins (בא יא:ב) החדש הזה לכם ראש חדשים ראשון הוא לכם לחדשי השנה – begin counting your months from now. ניסן is the first month to you. Even though to the whole world it is not the first month, for you, however, time starts now. Why is that? The answer is that ניסן is your birthday – when you became Hashem’s בכור.

¹⁷ Though the origin of the phrase “earning your stripes” is typically explained to be derived from soldiers who achieve a particular rank or position (designated by a stripe) based on certain skills or achievements, perhaps this is an earlier source as the brothers felt that Yosef did nothing to “earn his stripes” – (וישב לג:) – וישראל אהב את יוסף מכל בניו כי בן זקנים הוא לו ועשה לו כתונת פסים (וישב לג:) – it sounds like Yosef received his striped coat simply because he was born when Yaakov was older, not because he did anything in particular to deserve it.

Making Matza Soft Again: Thick Matzos On פסח

Gedaliah Wielgus

An annual debate occurs in nearly every Jewish household as the holiday of Pesach nears. Which matza should we buy this year? This one is crunchier, while that one is tastier. This one cracks too easily, while that one tastes like cardboard. This one is better in the soup (for those that do such things), while this one makes a great matza-pizza. There is one thing, however, that all our matzos have in common: they are all crispy and paper-thin.

Sometime over Pesach, there is bound to be one person in each Ashkenazi home who remarks, “Did you know Sephardim eat *laffas* on Pesach? Why can’t we do that? You think Hillel’s כורך sandwich consisted of some barely held together crackers and lettuce spilling off the sides?! He had a *shawarma* in a *laffa*!” Is there any merit to this argument? Do our matzos have to be paper-thin? Can Ashkenazim partake in this alleged Sephardi-matza?

This article will attempt to resolve all of these questions. But first, a disclaimer: the desire to eat soft matzos is probably a result of ימים גנובים ימתקו. I was able to track down thick “*laffa*” matzos, and it was no contest. The standard thin matzos that most of us are accustomed to eat are far superior in taste. This was not merely the opinion of your humble author, but the unanimous opinion of the approximately ten individuals who partook in the thick matzos together with me. Much to our disappointment, the thick matzos we had did not taste anything like a *laffa* one can buy at a local Israeli eatery. Considering the requirement of שמחת יו"ט, this article is strictly להגדיל תורה ולהאדירה and one should certainly eat the better-tasting matza.¹

Does the גמרא Address the Permissibility of Eating Thick Matzos?

ת"ר אין אופין פת עבה בפסח דברי בית שמאי ובית הלל מתירין. (פסחים לו; ביצה כב:)

The גמרא in both פסחים and ביצה cites the dispute between בית שמאי and בית הלל as to whether one may bake thick bread on פסח. The assumption of the גמרא is that the

¹ This article uses the term soft matza and thick matza interchangeably. While neither hard matza and thick matza nor soft matza and thin matza are necessarily mutually exclusive, modern commercial soft matza is clearly thicker than modern hard matza, and this article will operate on that premise.

dispute between בית שמאי and בית הלל was focused on how thick we can allow matza to be before there is a concern that the matza will become חמץ.

The גמרא then asks, וכמה פת עבה, what size qualifies as thick bread? As רש"י points out, the גמרא wants to determine how thick of a bread בית הלל is willing to tolerate.² לחם הפנים רב הונא answers that בית הלל would allow up to a טפח because that is the size of the לחם הפנים. לחם הפנים was not allowed to become חמץ and yet it was a טפח thick. This indicates that one can bake bread at least up to a טפח thick without concern that the bread may become חמץ.³

The גמרא is bothered by the comparison of matza to the לחם הפנים. How can one compare לחם הפנים, which was handled by expert כהנים, to matza, which was handled by laymen? In addition, how can one compare the לחם הפנים, which was well-kneaded, to matza which is not? Furthermore, dry wood was used for the לחם הפנים, while moist wood is used for matza. Finally, the ovens for the לחם הפנים were hot and made of metal, while the ovens for matza are cold and are made of pottery.

On the basis of all these questions, the גמרא reverses its understanding of the dispute between בית שמאי and בית הלל. The dispute is not related to any matza or פסח-specific issue. Rather, בית שמאי and בית הלל were simply discussing whether or not there is an issue of unnecessary work to bake a large amount of bread on יר"ט. The reference to פסח in the dispute was simply incidental and the same argument would apply to any יר"ט.

Left unclear from this גמרא is the status of thick matza. The גמרא established that בית שמאי and בית הלל did not address the issue of thick matza at all. Does that mean there is no maximum as to how thick one's matza may be, or does the גמרא's initial comparison to לחם הפנים, and subsequent rejection of the comparison in the להלכה, play some sort of role הוה אמינא?

The Various Approaches in the פוסקים

Omission by the פוסקים, the Question of the בית יוסף and the Ruling of the שלחן ערוך

The רמב"ם and the ר"ף cite the argument between בית שמאי and בית הלל as a dispute regarding baking a large amount of bread on any יר"ט and make no mention of any restriction with respect to thick matzos.⁴ The רמב"ם as well does not address the issue of baking thick matzos. The טור in תוס' סו"ט explicitly rules that one may bake thick bread on any יר"ט, including פסח, and makes no mention of a maximum shiur.

It seems evident that the רמב"ם, ר"ף, רא"ש, and טור are all of the opinion that

² רש"י פסחים לו. ד"ה וכמה

³ שם ד"ה שכן

⁴ ר"ף ביצה יא: מדה"ר; רא"ש פסחים ב:טו

one may bake and eat thick matzos for פסח, without any maximum size. One would expect the ערוך to rule accordingly, in line with his usual הפסק.⁵ Surprisingly, however, the ערוך in שלחן ערוך rules, פסח א"יח תסה: *the maximum shiur for matza is less than a טפה*. In fact, in the בית יוסף, he remarks that it is a bewilderment that the טור would not reference the prohibition of having matza as large as a טפה. The בית יוסף quotes רי"ח as a source for the prohibition, but strikingly makes no mention of its omission by the רמב"ם and רי"ף, רמב"ם and ר"ש.

The ערוך's logic appears to be that in the הוה אמינא the גמרא attempted to say one can have matza as large as a טפה just as the לחם הפנים had the thickness of a טפה. In the מסקנא, the גמרא rejects the comparison because the לחם הפנים has characteristics that matza does not have which allowed it to avoid becoming חמץ even when it is as thick as a טפה. By virtue of the fact that the גמרא refuted the logic behind allowing טפה-thick matza, the clear implication is that matza cannot be a טפה thick. The גמרא, however, offers no clue as to how thick matza can in fact be; all we know is that it cannot be a טפה. The ערוך's view appears to be that we can only prohibit that which the גמרא explicitly prohibits and that is why he permits making matza up to, but not including, a טפה.

Two Approaches to Resolve the בית יוסף Question

How would the טור and ר"ש, רי"ף, רמב"ם respond to this argument? The מגן אברהם's approach is that because ultimately the גמרא understands the dispute between בית שמאי and בית הלל to have no bearing on the thick matza question, it is as if the גמרא said nothing about it.⁶ In the הוה אמינא we understood there to be a prohibition, but למסקנא, there is no prohibition.

The מגן אברהם, however, is not satisfied with the approach of the אברהם.⁷ The הלכה argues that it is clear from the גמרא's conclusion that matza cannot be a טפה thick. On the contrary, from the fact that the גמרא says we cannot compare matza to לחם הפנים, it must be that even less than a טפה is prohibited! In addition, when the גמרא reverses its understanding and says that the מחלוקת between בית שמאי and בית הלל is regarding baking a large amount of bread, רש"י remarks, "ובחררין דקים", clearly understanding the גמרא as maintaining its position that there is a prohibition to make thick matzos.⁸

5 עיין הקדמה לבית יוסף שכתב וז"ל שלשת עמודי ההוראה אשר הבית בית ישראל נשען עליהם בהוראותיהם הלא המה הרי"ף והרמב"ם והרא"ש ז"ל אמרתי אל ליבי שבמקום ששנים מהם מסכימים לדעה אחת נפסוק הלכה כמותם אם לא במקצת מקומות שכל חכמי ישראל או רובם חולקין על הדעת ההוא ולכן פשט המנהג בהיפך עב"ל ולכאורה כ"ש כאן שכולם מסכימים לדבר אחד. ואולי סובר הבי"י שזה נכלל במה שכתב בסמוך באופן ש-"אחד מן הנזכרים לא גילה דעתו." וזה דוחק, וצ"ע.

6 מג"א א"ח תס:ד

7 ביאור הלכה שם ד"ה פת עבה טפה

8 רש"י פסחים לו. ד"ה פת מרובה

Perhaps an alternative approach to explain the omission of the aforementioned פוסקים would be to read the גמרא in an entirely different fashion. Let's return to the original words of the גמרא:

אין אופין פת עבה בפסח דברי בית שמאי ובית הלל מתירין וכמה פת עבה א"ר הונא
טפח שכן מצינו בלחם הפנים טפח.

The assumption we have been operating on is that the גמרא's question of כמה וכמה פת is how far בית הלל is willing to take their היתר. This is clearly how רש"י read the גמרא. However, it would seem that there would be a more literal way to read the גמרא. בית הלל is of the opinion that one cannot bake פת עבה, and בית שמאי permits it. When the גמרא then wonders what the shiur is for פת עבה, wouldn't it make sense to say that we want to understand what exactly is the פת עבה that בית שמאי prohibits? If that's the case, then even in the הוזה אמינא the גמרא never prohibited טפח-matza because that was the opinion of בית שמאי and we rule in accordance with the opinion of בית הלל! Although the ביאור הלכה is correct that the words of רש"י clearly indicate the גמרא held of a prohibition of thick matza in the מסקנא, the טור and רא"ש, רי"ף, רמב"ם are not necessarily bound to רש"י's position. It seems quite possible that they read the גמרא in an entirely different fashion.

Taking the Restriction Further Than a טפח

So far, we have discussed the view of those פוסקים that hold there is no restriction of פת עבה at all, as well as the view of the שלחן ערוך that one can make bake matza so long as it is not a טפח thick. The שלחן ערוך is not alone in his view. The מאירי, רשב"ץ, and מהר"ם חלואה all take the same approach and rule that one is restricted from baking matza that is a טפח thick.⁹ There are also those ראשונים who take the restriction even further and say, either explicitly or implicitly, that one cannot bake thick matza, even if it less than a טפח.

As mentioned above, רש"י uses the term "חררין דקים" in the מסקנא of the גמרא and does not simply say the matza is less than a טפח. The clear implication from רש"י is that once the גמרא rejects the comparison to לחם הפנים, even less than a טפח would be prohibited and matza must be "thin."

Similarly, the רשב"א entertains the possibility that even less than a טפח is prohibited, and concludes, "ולא אתפרש בגמ' עד כמה שרי וכל דעביד להו ריקין שפיר דמי"¹⁰ Because the גמרא leaves it unclear as to how thick one's matza may be, one should only make ריקין. The ריטב"א quotes the רא"ה as adopting the same approach.¹¹ In the

בית הבחירה ביצה כב; שיטת הרשב"ץ והמהר"ם חלואה מובא בביאור הלכה סימן תס ד"ה פת עבה טפח 9

רישב"א ביצה כב 10

ריטב"א פסחים לו 11

same vein, the אור זרוע writes, “אמרנו בלחם הפנים בפת”¹² These ראשונים are all echoing the same idea: by rejecting the comparison to לחם הפנים, the conclusion of the גמרא is that one cannot make thick matza, even if it less than a טפח.

The View of the רמ"א

The רמ"א's view on this matter is a source of dispute among the אחרונים. The רמ"א writes “ויש לעשות המצות ריקין ולא פת עבה כשאר לחם כי אין הרקיקין ממהרים להחמיץ”¹³ *one should make matzos as ריקין and not thick like other bread, because ריקין do not quickly become חמץ*.¹³ At first glance, it appears as if the רמ"א is arguing with the שלחן ערוך who rules one may make matza up to a טפח, and instead holds like those ראשונים that one cannot even make thick matza that is less than a טפח. The רמ"א's emphasis on specifically requiring one to bake ריקין seems to be the exact approach the רשב"א took.

The difficulty with the רמ"א, however, is the placement of this הלכה. The שלחן ערוך rules in סעיף ה that one cannot bake matza that is a טפח thick. If the רמ"א was simply disagreeing with the שלחן ערוך's permitted size, one would expect the רמ"א to raise his objection there in סעיף ה. Yet, the רמ"א actually makes his ruling in the prior סעיף ד. In סעיף ד the שלחן ערוך rules that one cannot use molds to make creative designs with matzos, but one can use a comb to prevent the matzos from swelling, even though the comb may create shapes in the matzos. The שלחן ערוך notes that when using a comb, it is better to make the matzos fast. It is on this הלכה that the רמ"א writes that one should bake ריקין.

The ביאור הלכה notes this difficulty, but nonetheless concludes that the רמ"א is in fact arguing on the שלחן ערוך and his comment on סעיף ד is meant to address what the שלחן ערוך writes in סעיף ה.¹⁴ The ביאור הלכה argues that the words of the רמ"א in the משה דרכי make clear that this is the רמ"א's intent. The משה דרכי quotes the אבודרהם in the name of the ראב"ד that one must make matzos as ריקין and not large and thick because that is not עוני לחם.¹⁵ He then cites the מהר"י וויל who provides a different reason to avoid large matzos, which is that thick matzos take longer to become חמץ, which is the approach the רמ"א ultimately takes in his comments on the שלחן ערוך. The אבודרהם and the מהר"י וויל, as cited by the רמ"א, give no hint that their remarks have anything to do with the הלכה of using molds to bake matzos, but rather all indications are that it is a general rule when baking matzos.

12 מובא בביאור הלכה סימן תס ד"ה פת עבה טפח

13 רמ"א שם סעיף ד

14 ביאור הלכה סימן תס ד"ה פת עבה טפח

15 דרכי משה שם ס"ק ג

It should be noted, however, that even in the דרכי משה, the רמ"א writes his comments on the בית יוסף's discussion of shaped matzos, and not on the בית יוסף's discussion of thick matzos generally. While the words of the אבודרהם and the מהר"י clearly seem to apply to all matzos, it would seem highly unlikely that the רמ"א would place his comments in the discussion of shaped matzos both in the טור and in the שלחן ערוך for no apparent reason.

The simpler way to read the רמ"א would be the approach the ביאור הלכה originally suggested, before he rejected it in favor of the aforementioned approach that the רמ"א's comments are really meant to apply to the ruling of the שלחן ערוך in סעיף ה. The ביאור הלכה suggested that the רמ"א's comment is meant to address the *psak* of the שלחן ערוך said that when using a comb one should make sure to bake the matzos quickly. The רמ"א is providing an alternative suggestion which is to simply make the matzos thin, and avoid any concern of the matzos becoming חמץ. If that were the רמ"א's intention, then the רמ"א has not made any comment on the baking of matzos generally and by his omission he presumably agrees with the שלחן ערוך that one can bake matzos up to a טפח thick.

The גר"א cryptically remarks on this ruling of the רמ"א that "כמש עושין סריקין כמין" ¹⁶ The גר"א is referring to the גמרא which quotes the opinion of רבי יוסי that one can make shaped matzos so long as the matzos are ריקין. What the גר"א appears to be saying is that the רמ"א is ruling like רבי יוסי that one can make סריקין so long as the matzos are thin. The רמ"א is not alone in ruling like רבי יוסי. The בית יוסף cites the הגהות who quotes the ריצב"א as ruling accordingly.¹⁷ Indeed, the ט"ז explicitly says that the רמ"א is in fact following the opinion of the ריצב"א that the הלכה is like רבי יוסי.¹⁸

The problem with this approach is that the רמ"א merely remarks that one should make matzos thin. He does not give any indication that he is in fact arguing on the entire premise of the שלחן ערוך who clearly does not rule like רבי יוסי. Perhaps one can suggest that the גר"א is not actually saying that the רמ"א holds like רבי יוסי. Rather, he is using the words of רבי יוסי to show a Talmudic source for the idea that baking thin matzos slows down the חמץ process and can serve as a proper alternative to the שלחן ערוך's caution to make the matzos quickly when using a comb; the original approach of the ביאור הלכה.

However one chooses to understand the גר"א, it is certainly clear from both the גר"א and the ט"ז that they are understanding the רמ"א's words to be specifically addressed on the words of the שלחן ערוך in ד, סעיף ה, not like the conclusion of the ביאור

¹⁶ ביאורי הגר"א שם ד"ה ויש

¹⁷ ב"י שם

¹⁸ ט"ז שם ס"ק ה

הלכה. This is also appears to be the understanding of the חק יעקב who uses this רמ"א as a justification for the custom to make shapes out of matzos.¹⁹

בדיעבד or לכתחילה

In addition to the dispute as to the thickness of one's matza, the פוסקים are also in disagreement as to whether the aforementioned sizes are simply restrictions לכתחילה when baking matzos or if one may not eat thick matzos even בדיעבד, once the matzos have been baked.

The מאירי writes that it is only a restriction לכתחילה. The שלחן ערוך's language of "אין עושין בפסח" also implies that it is only a restriction לכתחילה. The same for the רמ"א (assuming he is addressing baking thick matzos) who writes "ויש לעשות המצות." The רמ"א also rules that בדיעבד one may eat thick matzos. The מהר"ם חלואה, however, rules that one may not partake in טפח-thick matzos, even בדיעבד.

There are other ראשונים who are ambiguous or unclear on this point.²⁰ There are also those who distinguish between טפח-wide matzos, which cannot be eaten בדיעבד, and thick matzos that are less than a טפח, which may be eaten בדיעבד.²¹

The Conclusion of the פוסקים

In sum, there are various opinions among the פוסקים. Some hold there are no restrictions whatsoever on baking thick matzos. Others cap matzos at a טפח-thickness, while others restrict baking thick matzos, even if less than a טפח. Of those פוסקים, some specifically recommend baking ריקין. The פוסקים also disagree as to whether this is a din בדיעבד or just לכתחילה. How do we rule להלכה?

The מגן אברהם and the חק יעקב seem to rule that the הלכה is like the שלחן ערוך that one cannot bake matzos that are a טפח thick, but one may bake matzos up to a טפח.²² In addition, even matzos that are a טפח thick may be eaten בדיעבד considering the fact that many of the פוסקים completely omitted this הלכה. The פרי חדש, on the other hand, argues that one cannot eat טפח-matza, even בדיעבד.²³ Even the פרי חדש, however, concedes to the מגן אברהם that matza can לכתחילה be made thick so long as it is less than a טפח.

The הלכה ביאור takes strong issue with the פרי חדש and the חק יעקב who allow one to bake thick matzos less than a טפח. He argues that had those פוסקים seen the words of the רשב"א, the רא"ה, the אור זרוע and others restricting even less than a

19 חק יעקב שם ס"ק יא

20 עיין ביאור הלכה שם ד"ה פת עבה טפח

21 עיין מ"ב שם ס"ק ז'

22 מג"א שם ס"ק ד; חק יעקב שם ס"ק יב

23 פ"ח שם

they would retract their פסק and defer to those ראשונים. It would seem, however, that one could make the case that the פרי חדש and חק יעקב would still believe there was no issue with matza less than a טפה, notwithstanding the views of the other ראשונים. As mentioned above, רש"י already mentioned that matzos are "חררין דקין," which the פרי חדש and חק יעקב were certainly aware of, and they nonetheless rejected this view. It is important to keep in mind that the רמב"ם, ר"ף, רמ"ש, ר"ף, רמב"ם and טור did not believe there was any issue with creating thick matzos, a point the ביאור הלכה does not raise. Perhaps the ביאור הלכה and חק יעקב only felt it necessary to be stringent like the שלחן ערוך and restrict making matzos a full טפה thick, but they did not believe one was required to take that even further and restrict making matzos less than a טפה. The משנה ברורה himself rules that one may eat thick matzos בדיעבד if they are less than a טפה, but not if they are more than a טפה.

In addition to the restriction of baking פת עבה, the רמ"א does make reference to the idea that one should specifically bake רקיקין. As mentioned above, many פוסקים do not view this רמ"א as having any relevance to the issue of פת עבה, but the ביאור הלכה disagrees and rules that not only should one avoid baking פת עבה, but they should ideally be baked דקין רקיקין.

The שלחן ערוך rules like the אברהם מגן אברהם that the restriction of פת עבה is only for matzos that are a טפה thick and that the restriction is only לכתחילה.²⁴ However, he adds ומכל מקום אנחנו נוהגים לעשות המצות רקיקים דקים, ולא פת עבה כשאר לחם, דהרקיקין "אין ממהרין להחמיץ." Unlike the ביאור הלכה, he does not cite the רמ"א as a source, but it seems as if he ultimately comes to the same conclusion that although thick matza is permitted, it is better to make רקיקין דקין. The שלחן ערוך הרב adopts the same approach.²⁵

What are רקיקין?

The רשב"א was the first to mention that one should bake their matzos as רקיקין. The רמ"א may or may not have urged a similar practice, but the ביאור הלכה, the שלחן ערוך and the הרב all recommend following this practice. רקיקין is commonly translated as "crackers," but that does not appear to be a precise translation.

The משנה in ע"ב כ"א rules רקיקין אלא גריצין אלא רקיקין ביצה כ"א ע"ב in משנה *we do not make thick, coarse bread [on טוב] rather we bake רקיקין*. A simple reading of the משנה indicates that the משנה is presenting a binary choice. Bread can be either גריצין or it can be רקיקין. As the פירוש המשניות in רמב"ם spells out, "רקיקין, גריצין ככרות לחם גדולות. ורקיקין, ככרות דקות."²⁶ If bread is not large, then it qualifies as רקיקין.

²⁴ עה"ש שם סעיף ז

²⁵ שלחן ערוך הרב שם סעיף י

²⁶ פירוש המשניות להרמב"ם ביצה ב"ו

There is room for debate as to when bread leaves the category of גריצין and becomes ריקין, and the implication from many of the aforementioned אחרונים is that bread less than a טפח may still not qualify as ריקין. However, there is no indication anywhere that ריקין means that matzos must be paper-thin and hard. ריקין clearly does not mean “crackers,” but means bread that would not qualify, as the רמב”ם puts it, as ככרות לחם גדולות. The רמב”ם himself, in describing the Seder-process, remarks, “ולוקח שני ריקין וחולק אחד מהן.”²⁷ There is no indication anywhere else in the רמב”ם that one should eat thin matzos. As mentioned above, the רמב”ם was actually of the opinion that there is no maximum שיעור at all with respect to the thickness of one’s matza. It is unclear as to what exactly the רמב”ם would say qualifies as ריקין, but he certainly does not understand ריקין to mean hard crackers.

The באר היטב cites the observation of the הלל בית המנהג is to make matzos that are as thick as an אצבע.²⁸ The באר היטב cites this view on the רמ”א’s ruling that one should bake ריקין. He does not provide any indication that the הלל בית המנהג is arguing on the רמ”א’s opinion. It would seem that the באר היטב is understanding this מנהג to be fully compatible with the view of the רמ”א. The באר היטב must have also been of the belief that ריקין does not translate as crackers.

Conclusion

The opinion of many of the major ראשונים is that one may bake matza as thick as one desires. Others, including the ערוך שלחן, and arguably the רמ”א, prohibit baking matza the size of a טפח. If the matza has already been baked, the מגן אברהם and ערוך משנה ברורה, among other אחרונים, rule that one may eat the matza, while some אחרונים, including the משנה ברורה, disagree.

Some ראשונים are of the opinion that one is prohibited from baking thick matza even if less than a טפח, but the consensus of most of the אחרונים is that one may eat such thick matzos once they are baked. These ראשונים do not provide a clear שיעור, but some of them, as well as some אחרונים, advocate baking “ריקין” or “ריקין דקים.” The באר היטב cites a custom that matzos were baked as thick as an אצבע, indicating that the term “ריקין” includes matzos as large as an אצבע.

Estimates for the size of a טפח range from approximately 3.15 inches to 4 inches.²⁹ Estimates for the size of an אצבע range from approximately .79 inches to 1 inch.³⁰ Modern commercial soft matzos are about .3 to .5 inches thick.³¹ Even if

27 רמב”ם הל’ חמץ ומצה ח:ו

28 באר היטב א”ח תס:ח

29 עיין ספר שעויר תורה ג:כה; שו”ת אגרות משה א”ח א:קלו; ספר שעורין של תורה עמוד ג בשם החזון איש

30 עיין שם

31 <http://softmatza.com/index.php/about-soft-matza>

we were to reject the view of the רמב"ם, רי"ף, רא"ש, and טור that there is no restriction on baking thick matzos, and we reject the view of the שלחן ערוך (and seemingly the רמ"א) that one may bake matzos up to a טפח, and we reject the view of the מגן אברהם that it is permitted בדיעבד, and we accept the opinion that matzos should ideally be ריקקין, it would seem that today's soft matzos would certainly qualify as ריקקין as they are far thinner than the aforementioned matzos of the בית הלל, as reported by the באר היטב. Considering that today's soft matzos are about half the size of what the באר היטב considered ריקקין, a strong case could be made that such matzos would qualify as ריקקין דקין as well. An even stronger argument could be made that one could partake in such matzos if they are not being used as מצת מצוה, as some of the פוסקים imply that the issue of פת עבה only applies to מצת מצוה.³²

Nevertheless, Rav Shlomo Zalman Auerbach is reported to have strongly objected to Ashkenazim eating anything other than the thin, hard matza we are accustomed to eat.³³ Similarly, Rav Asher Weiss argues that eating soft matza may be a violation of אמך תיטוש תורתך.³⁴ Considering that the באר היטב mentions the מנהג to have matzos as thick as an אצבע, it seems difficult to accept that resorting back to that מנהג would violate תיטוש תורתך any more than our ancestors switching from soft matza to hard matza. Of course, as with all *halachic* questions, one should consult a competent *halachic* authority before partaking in soft matzos on Pesach. It is also important to note that this article assumes the soft matzos were baked in a *halachically* proper manner. Baking soft matzos in a proper way can be more challenging than baking hard matzos and one may obviously only eat soft matzos that were baked by those with the appropriate expertise.

32 עיין ביאור הלכה סימן תס ד"ה פת עבה טפח

33 מ"ב ביצחק יקרא שם ד"ה בפחות מטפח

34 הגדת מנחת אשר סימן טו

Pesach or *Chag HaMatzos*: Which is the Real Name?

Yosef Moskowitz

Rabbi Levi Yitzchak of Berditchev famously explained that the two names for the יום טוב of Pesach, פסח and חג המצות, relate to two partners, Hashem and Bnei Yisrael, who each wanted to show their love for the other and therefore called the יום טוב by the name that praises their partner. As Shlomo Hamelech said (*Shir HaShirim* 6:3), אני לדודי ודודי לי – “*I am my beloved’s and my beloved is mine.*” Hashem praises his beloved Bnei Yisrael for the faith in which they went into the desert prepared to eat matza instead of bread (the זהר הקדוש actually calls matza “the food of faith”), and so the Torah refers to the holiday as חג המצות – the יום טוב that Klal Yisrael showed love to Him through מצות. Reciprocally, Bnei Yisrael refer to the יום טוב colloquially as חג הפסח, praising Hashem for passing over their homes when He struck the Egyptians with מכת בכורות.

Yet somewhat surprisingly, in עשרה יעלה ויבא of שמונה עשרה and bentching, as well as in קידוש, we refer to the holiday as חג המצות, which is the name that Hashem uses for it. If we are attempting to praise Hashem for the miracles of יציאת מצרים that we celebrate on Pesach, would it not be more apropos to refer to it as חג הפסח and explicitly acknowledge the great miracle in which Hashem skipped over only the house of the *Yidden*? Why do we deviate from our standard terminology of פסח and flip to the name that Hashem uses?

Another way to think of this question is to step back and contemplate whether the fact that in *davening* we refer to it as חג המצות actually signifies a more fundamental conclusion – that חג המצות is the “real” name, while פסח is something that Klal Yisrael uses less formally. Should we draw such a conclusion?

Before answering these two questions, perhaps one can suggest that the question is actually one layer deeper. It appears from the פסוקים that both חג המצות and פסח are fully authentic names for the holiday. In (23:6) פרשת אמר the פסוק states: ובחמשה עשר יום לחדש הזה חג המצות. But also, in פרשת בא, both the word פסח and מצות are used in the description of the קרבן פסח offering. The Torah commands that on יום ערב טוב, the fourteenth of ניסן, Bnei Yisrael were required to prepare and slaughter the קרבן פסח and spread the blood on the doorposts and mantel of their homes so that

Hashem would skip over their house at מכת בכורות, as the *pasuk* (Bo 12:13) states: וראיתי את הדם ופסחתי עלכם. Then, after nightfall on the fifteenth of ניסן, the requirement was to eat the קרבן פסח along with matza and marror, as the *pasuk* (Bo 12:8) states: ואכלו את הבשר בלילה הזה צלי אש ומצות על מררים יאכלה. While the rationale for why we ate the קרבן פסח (remember מכת בכורות), matza (remember the haste with which we left Mitzrayim) and marror (recall the bitterness of the slavery) differ, there is a moment in time on the night of the fifteenth of ניסן where the three overlap. In essence, this symbolizes that all three מצוות are somehow intertwined, making the term פסח and מצות fundamentally connected and perhaps even interchangeable.

In answering this question, I would like to suggest that the key difference between the names of פסח and חג המצות is that the name “פסח” is associated with the הקרבה of the קרבן פסח in the בית המקדש while מצות are subject to no such limitation. When the בית המקדש was destroyed, we lost the ability to serve Hashem by being מקריב קרבנות. No longer could we receive כפרה for our sins through קרבנות. No longer could we thank Hashem through קרבנות. And no longer could we rejoice with Hashem through קרבנות. However, while the קרבן פסח can no longer be offered, the name פסח was still retained as a זכר to the ideal form of our יום טוב, infused by this connection to the בית המקדש. While our focus now has shifted to the matza, we continue to call the holiday “פסח” to represent the fact that we are mourning the loss of the בית המקדש and yearn for its return. Indeed, we make the זכר למקדש and perform כורח as an annual reminder that we must not forget the בית המקדש. Likewise, we conclude מגיד with the ברכה that highlights אחרים וְלִרְגָלִים אַחֲרֵימֵינוּ – our forward looking aspiration to returning to serve Hashem in the בית המקדש.

Additionally, as far as the colloquial nomenclature goes, by calling the Yom Tov “פסח” we create a constant reminder of the missing בית המקדש, which allows us to keep our mindset in the proper perspective.

However, always focusing on what we lack is not healthy for our psychology and emotional wellbeing. And that is why *Chazal* decided that when it came to *kiddush*, *benching* and *davening*, since מצוות must always be done with שמחה, we need to depart from our colloquial norm and refer to the holiday as חג המצות. This is the uplifting name of the יום טוב since we still have the מצוה of matza through which we proudly recall the מסירת נפש of our ancestors who left Mitzrayim without the time to even let their bread rise. All they needed was the simple אמונה in Hashem that He would provide for their needs in the desert. Referring to חג המצות during *davening* enables us to simultaneously feel חירות and שמחה as well as cherish the מצוות that we do have today.

This idea of balancing the yearning and lacking of פסח with the excitement and eagerness of מצות מצה is eternalized in the famous story of Reb Simcha Bunim of P'shischa. It was said that he carried two slips of paper, one in each pocket. On one he wrote: בשבילי נברא העולם — “for my sake the world was created,” as a reminder that he was inherently an important creation. On the other paper he wrote: ואנכי עפר - “And I am but dirt and ashes,” a humbling reminder of his lowly mortality. Reb Simcha Bunim would take out and refer to each slip of paper as necessary; the first to remind him of his value when he felt down, and the second as a reminder of his inherent worthlessness when he felt lacking in sufficient humility. Similarly, Shlomo Hamelech teaches us balance, stating עת ספוד ועת לרקוד – *there is a time for mourning and a time to dance* (Koheles 3:4). The Rambam championed the phrase of the הזהב - the golden path which shunned extremism. And the Baal Shem Tov explained that שויה' לנגדי תמיד means I am even-keeled in my emotions (שוה) because Hashem is always in front of me. Thus, a life of Torah and מצוות prizes balance. The time of פסח and nomenclature that we use to describe the happiness of our present day מצוות and the sadness for lacking the בית המקדש is therefore appropriate.

While it is easy to say simply that balance is important, *Chazal* have worked hard to identify exactly what constitutes balance and what is too far to one extreme. In the context of פסח, perhaps one can suggest that this is the deeper מחלוקת between Rav and Shmuel found in the *gemara* in *Pesachim* 116a, which states:

מתחיל בגנות ומסיים בשבח: מאי בגנות רב אמר מתחלה עובדי עבודה גלולים היו אבותינו, [ושמואל] אמר עבדים היינו.

The *mishna* teaches that we begin the סיפור יציאת מצרים with a recollection of an element of our denigration and we conclude it with praise. Rav suggests that the denigration that we start with is a reference to the fact that Avraham Avinu came from a family of עבודה זרה, while Shmuel says it refers to the fact that Klal Yisrael were initially slaves to Pharaoh. What is really the המחלוקת?

Perhaps the answer is that Rav and Shmuel both recognized the need to incorporate the גנות into the סדר but they disagreed as to the degree to which it should be incorporated. Rav thought that telling the story in its entirety dating back to the origins of Avraham Avinu was important, and from that very low point, we would appreciate the loftiness of our ascent. By contrast, Shmuel felt that starting from such a terrible frame of reference was just too much to strike a balance at the סדר. Thus, he shortened the story line and started it only from the עבודה in Mitzrayim. Furthermore, Rav was willing to incorporate six words of disparagement, מתחלה עובדי עבודה זרה היו אבותינו, while Shmuel insisted that we keep it

short, down to four words, עבדים היינו לפרעה במצרים. Thus they argue in two capacities regarding how much is too much and how to strike the optimal balance.

In conclusion, may we be זוכה to spend the upcoming יום טוב focusing on the dual messages of the פסח and matza, and through their mindful yet uplifting reminders may we reach further heights in our Torah, עבודה and חסד.

Ohr Lyud Daled- Short or Sweet?

Ari Szafranski

Masechta *Pesachim* begins with the *perek* entitled “*Ohr Lyud Daled*,” which primarily deals with one’s obligation to check for *chametz*, when and where it applies and how it should be done. As the name would not suggest, the time that one is normally required to check for *chametz* is the night of the fourteenth of Nisan. Why then would the first word in the *masechta* be “*ohr*” instead of the word “*lail*”, which means nighttime? After about a *blatt* of debating the issue, the *gemara* concludes that the *mishna* chose to use the word “*ohr*” because it is considered a “*lishna ma’alya*,” which the *gemara* and Rashi seem to translate as a “*lashon n’kiya*”, or a “clean” terminology. The *gemara* goes on to bring a number of examples where the Torah uses a *lashon n’kiya* instead of using the more natural mode of speaking which could be considered a “*davar meguna*.” The *gemara* then questions this principle that there are many times the Torah does not use a *lashon n’kiya* but instead chooses a more concise terminology (*lashon ketzara*). The *gemara* concludes that in truth, one should choose the shortest way to communicate something – but if there are two equally concise ways to communicate something, one should choose the *lashon n’kiya*.¹

What is the rationale for this guiding principle that using a concise form is preferred to using a *lashon n’kiya*? Perhaps we can explain based on Rashi’s explanation of these principles. When it comes to using a *lashon n’kiya*, Rashi explains (3a, d”h *mai taima*) that it is the way of the “*nekyei hada’as*” (loosely translated as pious people) to use a *lashon n’kiya*. When it comes to using a *lashon ketzara*, Rashi explains (3b, d”h *v’chol heicha*) that one should communicate to his students in short form so that they will be able to more easily retain the content; ie, it is easier for them to retain the *rebbe*’s teachings when all they have to remember is a short form which contains the same principle vs using a longer form. Thus, we can explain that, while it is certainly admirable to reach high levels of self-perfection by using a *lashon n’kiya*, this should not be done at the expense of

¹ Even though the previous examples brought from the Torah seem to choose a *lashon n’kiya* despite the fact that it was longer, Rashi and Tosfos explain that the exception to the rules were made so that we would learn the principle of using a *lashon n’kiya* in the first place – but in reality, one should use the most concise version.

ensuring that one's students can retain as much as possible. Therefore, a *lashon ketzara* is preferable to a *lashon n'kiya*.

It is interesting that the Rif (1a-1b) does not quote what is seemingly the *maskana* of this *gemara* and only quotes the examples of speaking in a *lashon n'kiya*.

Further, after the *gemara* states the principle that we first look to find a *lashon ketzara*, and only then also look for a *lashon n'kiya*, the *gemara* brings many stories accentuating the importance of using a *lashon n'kiya* and not a *lashon meguna*. One such story is as follows:

Two *talmidim* were once sitting before Rebbi, one of which was R' Yochanan (the first *girsā* of the *gemara* replaces Rebbi with Hillel and replaces R' Yochanan (the *amora*) with R' Yochanan ben Zakai (the *tanna*)). One of the two *talmidim* posed the following question: Why is the *halacha* that one must harvest grapes using pure vessels but when harvesting olives, one need not use pure vessels. The other *talmid* posed the same conceptual question in a slightly different way; why is the *halacha* that one must harvest grapes using pure vessels but when harvesting olives, one may use impure vessels. After these questions were posed, it is not clear that Rebbi answered either of his *talmidim* (if he did, his answer is not recorded here in the *gemara*); rather, Rebbi responded as follows: “*muvtach ani bazeh shemorah hora'ah b'Yisrael*”, which can be translated as “I am sure that this individual will give *halachic* rulings in Klal Yisrael”. The *gemara* testifies that within a few days this *havgacha* of Rebbi came true.

The Ran points out that this story is seemingly contradictory to the conclusion of the *gemara*, that one should choose a *lashon ketzara* over a *lashon n'kiya*. R' Yochanan in fact had to use one extra word in order to say his question using a *lashon n'kiya*. Why is he then praised over the other *talmid* who used the more concise *lashon ketzara*? The Ran answers that the *talmid* who used a *lashon ketzara* was actually inaccurate, since his specific verbiage could imply that one must use (and not that one merely may use) impure vessels for harvesting olives, which is not true.

Perhaps one can ask on the Ran that if this is indeed the case, then what was so special about the *talmid* who used a *lashon n'kiya* which warranted this *havgacha* from Rebbi? In other words, using a *lashon n'kiya* is only something to marvel at when one could have just as well used a *lashon meguna* to get the same point across, but still chose to use the *lashon n'kiya*. But, if there is only one accurate way to get the point across in the first place which also happens to be a *lashon n'kiya*, then one should not be praised for choosing a *lashon n'kiya*, since what other choice did he have in order to communicate his message accurately?

Shitas Ha'Rif

It is very interesting to note that the Rif, who often does not quote stories, quotes this one. We can perhaps suggest for the Rif that he held that the *gemara* in fact backtracked on its earlier position that a *lashon ketzara* takes precedence over a *lashon n'kiya*, as is evident in the story of Rebbi and R' Yochanan. Thus, the Rif only brings this story (while still leaving out the other stories which do not add any new *halachic* dimensions to the prior discussion) and also leaves out the “interim” position of the *gemara* that a *lashon ketzara* takes precedence of a *lashon n'kiya*.

What are we to do about the above explanation for why *lashon ketzara* is more important than a *lashon n'kiya* (based on Rashi above)? How could we explain the opposite position? In terms of the *ma'ala* of using a *lashon n'kiya*, we can perhaps suggest that this is not merely a personal praiseworthy attribute for “*nekkiyei hadaas*” as Rashi suggests – rather, it is a key ingredient in being *manhig* Klal Yisrael and passing on the *mesora*. The best proof to this is that when Rebbi saw this quality in R' Yochanan, the only thing that came to mind is that he would be a *moreh hora'ah* in Klal Yisrael. Rebbi did not merely compliment R' Yochanan's *tzidkus* or say how lucky we are to have one of the *n'kiyei hadaas* in our midst who will *daven* for us etc... - rather, Rebbi was sure that this is the quality that is necessary to become a *moreh hora'ah*. Apparently this too is an essential ingredient for teaching Klal Yisrael, perhaps because many will learn from him how to act and speak themselves. In terms of the *ma'ala* of using a *lashon ketzara*, there is an alternate explanation used by the Rambam (*Hil Deyos*, 2:4). The Rambam quotes our *gemara* “*l'olam yishaneh adam l'talmidav derech ketzarah*” within the context of explaining how it's preferable not to talk at all except when necessary, as one who speaks too much will bring himself to sin. And even in *divrei Torah*, continues the Rambam, one should limit speech as much as possible, as our *gemara* suggests. Perhaps this too was the position of the Rif, which would translate into the reverse *cheshbon* of Rashi. The Rif in fact holds that, when one must choose, it is more important to speak with a *lashon n'kiya*, which will ultimately have an impact on others, as opposed to speaking with a *lashon ketzara*, which is only for one's own personal growth.

Shitas Ba'al Hama'or

There is in fact a third *shita* in the *rishonim* which is somewhere in between that of the Rif and the simple reading of the *gemara*. This is the *shitah* of the *Ba'al Hama'or* (1a in the *dapei haRif*) and is expounded upon by the Rabbeinu Yonah in *Shaarei Teshuva* (3:230), who pick up on some of the seemingly interchangeable types of

speech used in our *gemara*. They explain that, in general, it is preferable to use a *lashon ketzara* instead of a *lashon "kavod."* A *lashon kavod* is a *ma'ala* used by the *n'kiyei hada'as* of Yerushalayim, but its advantages do not outweigh *lashon ketzara*, as we explained earlier based on Rashi. However, if the *lashon ketzara* is a *lashon meguna*, he should not speak in the *lashon ketzara*, as this could lead to other *aveiros* like *lashon harah*. This is similar to the Rambam quoted earlier.

There is a difficulty in this position that the *Ba'al Hama'or* addresses. That is, when describing the non-kosher animals who entered the *teiva* in *Parshas No'ach*, the *pasuk* describes them as "*beheima asher enenu tehora*" which means an animal which is not pure, or non-kosher. However, in *Sefer Vayikra*, when describing the laws of kosher and non-kosher animals, the *pasuk* refers to these same animals as "*tamei.*" *Mima nafshach* – if calling an animal *tamei* is a *lashon meguna*, then why does the *pasuk* in *sefer Vayikra* use this word? And if *tamei* is not considered a *lashon meguna*, then why does the *pasuk* in *Parshas Noach* not use it, as it is the shorter way to describe these animals. The *Ba'al Hama'or* explains that the word *tamei* is generally considered a *lashon megunah*. However, when used within the context of warning Klal Yisrael not to eat *tamei animals*, it is not considered a *lashon meguna*.

Message for Us

Perhaps we can explain this idea based on the Dubno Maggid, who addresses this very question with a *mashal*. There was once two rich men in a town with the same name (let's call them Moishele) – however, one was a *talmid chacham* while the other was quite unlearned. Once a poor man mistakenly came to Moishele the *talmid chacham's* house but was actually looking for the other Moishele. The servant scolded the man "how could you confuse my master with Moishele the boor (unlearned)". After hearing this, Moishele the *talmid chacham* rebuked his servant for calling the other Moishele a boor. The very next day a *shadchan* came to Moishele the *talmid chacham* to suggest a girl for Moishele's son. Who did she suggest – none other than the daughter of the unlearned Moishele. Moishele the *talmid chacham* was taken aback and said "how could you suggest this *shidduch*? That Moishele is a boor and is not fitting for my son!" After hearing this, the servant questioned his master on how he could be so hypocritical. "Just yesterday you told me not to call the other Moishele a boor, but now you do the same?" Moishele explained that when the poor man was looking for the other Moishele, all he needed was someone to point him in the other direction. Moishele's character was irrelevant at that time. But today, the *shadchan* thought that she came up with a

good *shidduch*, and he needed to emphasize to her that the other Moishele is a complete boor and is therefore not a good fit at all for his son. So too, the Dubno maggid explains, when the Torah is describing the non-kosher animals entering the *teiva* in *Parshas Noach*, there is nothing to be gained by calling them *tamei*, and so the words *einenu tehorah* are more appropriate. However, when the Torah is describing the non-kosher animals that we are not permitted to eat in *Sefer Vayikra*, it is important for the Torah to describe them bluntly as they are – *tamei* – to reinforce to us that this is something to stay far away from.

In conclusion, it is interesting to note that, of all *sugyos* to discuss in *masechta Pesachim*, this is the very first *sugya*, and is rather lengthy. Perhaps this is the message of the *ba'alei hagemara* - despite the great focus of what goes into our mouth on Pesach, we must first have a prerequisite of analyzing what comes out of our mouth. I recall that about eighteen years ago or so, Rav Pam gave this type of introduction to the Tisha B'av video – more than we need to be careful of what goes into our mouth, we must be careful of what comes out of our mouth.

The Purpose of *Galus Mitzrayim*

Moshe Buchbinder

The painful experience of *Galus Mitzrayim* was one of the most critical developmental stages in the development of Jewish history. Yet, the Torah does not provide a single crystal clear articulation for why Klal Yisrael needed this particularly dark era. So Chazal approach the issue in many different ways and numerous *shitos* emerge. This *D'var Torah* will attempt to organize the *sugya* and first briefly address three of the *mehalchim*, each containing its own variations, proofs and challenges:

1. *Galus Mitzrayim* was a punishment for an *aveira* committed by Avraham Avinu. Exactly what that *aveira* was is debated.
2. It was a punishment for the sin of *Mechiras Yosef*.
3. The *שעבוד*, while painful, actually served a good, constructive purpose. Several variations exist on the precise benefit that it provided.

Then, much of this *D'var Torah* will be dedicated to a fourth approach, the *דברים נפלאים* of the Arizal:

4. The Arizal explains that *Galus Mitzrayim* was a *תיקון* for the *חטא עץ הדעת*. This ties into the topic of the *ניצוצות הקדושה*, sparks of holiness that were gathered during the period of *Galus Mitzrayim* and that we continue to gather today. The discussion from the Arizal has been written to raise awareness of this very important *shita* and *mehalech* in *Limud Torah*. The complexity of the Kabbalah components are not incorporated herein. This piece can be learned independently from the other three.

May our learning about the *Galus Mitzrayim* provide a *zechus* for our final *Geula* *בימינו*.

Approach I: *Galus Mitzrayim* as a Punishment for Avraham Avinu

Three variations on the sin of Avraham Avinu

The *gemara* records a three-way *machlokes* regarding the precise reason for *Galus Mitzrayim*. However, fundamentally, all *Amoraim* in the *gemara* agree that it was a punishment for an *aveira* committed by Avraham Avinu. The *gemara* states:

אמר רבי אבהו אמר רבי אלעזר מפני מה נענש אברהם אבינו ונשתעבדו בניו למצרים מאתים ועשר שנים? מפני שעשה אנגריא בתלמידי חכמים, שנאמר וירק את חניכיו ילידי

ביתו. ושמואל אמר מפני שהפריז על מדותיו של הקב"ה, שנאמר במה אדע כי אירשנה. ורבי יוחנן אמר מפני שהפריש בני אדם מלהכנס תחת כנפי השכינה, שנאמר תן לי הנפש והרכוש קח לך (גמרא נדרים ל"ב ע"א)

Rebbi Abahu said in the name of Rebbi Elazar: Why was Avraham Avinu punished and his descendants forced into slavery in Mitzrayim for 210 years? Because he used Talmidei Chachamim to fight a war.¹ Shmuel says it was because Avraham Avinu questioned Hashem's ways by saying 'How do I know that my descendants will inherit Eretz Yisrael?'² Rebbi Yochanan says it is because he failed to bring the people of Sedom into Yahadus.³

At first glance, it may appear that these three suggestions are independent of one another, each identifying a different *aveira* by Avraham Avinu. However, the Maharal explains that these three explanations are actually thematically aligned:

הרי ג' דעות בענין החטא של אברהם, כי מן השורש והעיקר נמשך הכל, שממנו נמשך החסרון אל הנמשכים ממנו... ותוכל לומר שדעת רז"ל כי השי"ת הביא את זרע אברהם בגלות, מפני שאברהם לא היה מתחזק כל כך באמונה, וכדי שיקנה זרעו האמונה וידעו כח מעשיו שעושה לאוהביו ולאויביו, וזה שאמר ר' אבהו על שעשה אנגריא בתלמידי חכמים ולקחם למלחמה מיראתו. ואילו לקח הראוין אין בזה חטא, כי אין סומכין על הנס, אבל לא לקחת תלמידי חכמים שאין ראוי לקחתם, אלא לבטח בו יתברך. ושמואל סובר שחס ושלוש לומר שאין אברהם בוטח בהקב"ה שהוא מציל את אוהביו, אבל החטא במה שאמר במה אדע, שהוא מיעוט בטחון שמא לא יזכה לדבר זה, ולפיכך היה זרעו בגלות וקנו האמונה השלמה. ור' יוחנן סבר שגם זה לא יתכן בראש המאמינים, רק שלא הכניס גרים תחת כנפי השכינה, שזה כבוד ה', וזהו כמתעצל שיקנו הבריות אמונה בו יתברך, ולפיכך נשתעבדו בניו ויצאו בנסים ונפלאות עד שגרים הרבה באים להתגייר ולהאמין בו יתברך (גבורות ה' פרק י')

1 records that when the four kings defeated the five kings, which included Sedom, the people of Sedom were captured. At the time, Avraham's nephew Lot was living in Sedom and he was taken captive. Avraham then took three hundred and eighteen men to war against the four kings to save him. Amongst those warriors were *Talmidei Chachamim*. Rebbi Abahu says that while Avraham Avinu was entitled to go to war, he should not have been מבטל תורה of the חכמים and should have just taken other individuals to war.

2 In Hashem promises Avraham Avinu that he will inherit Eretz Yisrael. Avraham questions Hashem's statement saying במה אדע כי אירשנה. Hashem initiates the ברית בין הבתרים and tells Avraham Avinu to bring several קרבנות. Then, Avraham Avinu falls into a deep sleep and Hashem tells him that his descendants will be wanderers and slaves for four hundred years.

3 After Avraham defeated the four kings and emancipated the people of Sedom, the king of Sedom suggested that as Avraham Avinu's spoils he should keep all of the possessions, but let the people of Sedom revert back to him. Avraham Avinu declined to take even the possessions. Rebbi Yochanan states that he should have taken the people that he liberated and converted them to *Yahadus*. For failure to do so, he was punished.

The three answers are actually all rooted in a single “failure” by Avraham Avinu, which was exhibiting a lack of *emuna* in Hashem. Rabbi Abahu says Avraham Avinu should have believed that if Hashem wanted him to win the war, he could have done so without being מבטל תורה of the תלמידי חכמים of his house, and therefore he should have limited the recruiting of his “army” to the general population.

Shmuel doesn't view that decision as an exhibition of a lack of *emuna* because Avraham Avinu knew that Hashem would save his nephew, and as such the decision to take the תלמידי חכמים was strategically thought through by Avraham Avinu, not a mistake. Shmuel says the real lack of *emuna* was demonstrated by his stating במה אדע, implying that he doubted his own worthiness⁴ and thereby questioning whether in fact Hashem would follow through on His word. Therefore, his descendants needed to go into *galus* in order to acquire the appropriate level of *emuna*.

Finally, Rabbi Yochanan rejects במה אדע as the trigger sin; it is a given that Avraham Avinu had tremendous *emuna*. (While we may see במה אדע as doubt in Hashem's word on our superficial level, Rabbi Yochanan concludes that attributing a sin of such magnitude to Avraham Avinu is unthinkable.) Therefore, Rabbi Yochanan suggests the failure of *emuna* was not properly capitalizing on the opportunity for כבוד שמים by converting the refugees of Sedom to יהדות when Avraham Avinu had the opportunity. The purpose of *galus* and *Yetzias Mitzrayim* was therefore to rectify this mistake and provide a platform for Hashem to perform miracles which would draw in many converts to יהדות.

But why punish his descendants?

One obvious question arises. According to this *mehalech*, that the entire reason for *Galus Mitzrayim* was punishment for Avraham Avinu's lack of *emuna*, why was the punishment meted out on his descendants rather than on him personally?⁵ The Abarbanel formulates the question as follows:

והנה הדעות האלה כלם מלבד מה שיש בהם מהחולשה כבר יכללם ספק עצום והוא שאברהם שחטא לא נענש כלל כמ"ש ואתה תבא אל אבותיו בשלום תקבר בשיבה טובה ונענש עליו הדור השלישי והד' מיוצאי חלציו על לא חמס בכפיו, ועל כיוצא בזה נאמר אבות יאכלו בוסר ושיני בנים תקהינה. ואמנם מה שאמרה תורה פוקד עון אבות על בנים הוא לבד בחטא ע"ג וכשאוחזים מעשה אבותיהם בידיהם לא ע"צ העונש שיענשו בנים בעון אביהם שלא נכשלו הם בו (אברבנאל, וישב ט"ו:א)

⁴ Or perhaps the worthiness of his descendants. See Seforno and Radak on the *pasuk*.

⁵ See *Gemara Sanhedrin* 27b.

The Abarbanel puts a pin in the question: We have a general principle throughout the Torah that each person suffers the consequences of their own sins (subject to one limitation where sons follow in the footsteps of their fathers and perform *avoda zara*). As such, why should the children of Avraham Avinu experience *galus* while he did not receive any punishment at all!? In fact, the *pasuk* tells us that Hashem assured Avraham Avinu that he would die in peace at a ripe old age. Doesn't that violate the principle? The strength of this question leads the Abarbanel to seek an alternative explanation (to be discussed).

But the Maharal does provide an answer:

ודע שהיה ראוי שיהיה עונש נמשך לזרע אברהם בשביל אברהם, כי חסרון השורש
 יתגלה ויראה בענפים ביותר. ואין החטאים שוים, כי החטא שהוא במקרה לאדם אינו
 חטא שהוא בעצם לאדם, והחטא בשורש הוא חטא עצמי בשורש שהוא אברהם

The Maharal makes two points. First, fundamentally, when there is a flaw in the root, the rest of the tree exhibits that deficiency in an even more stark and recognizable way. Since Avraham Avinu was the root of all of Klal Yisrael, his flaw in *emuna* posed a threat of being exhibited more strongly throughout all future generations. Second, not all sins are of equal magnitude, and the gravity of this one was particularly worrisome. The Maharal notes that a low level sin would be something accidental that in no way speaks to the essence of a person's character. A higher level sin is one which expresses one's core identity and behavior. But the highest level of sin is one which stems from the very root of an individual's existence. Putting these two notions together, the Maharal explains that Avraham Avinu's exhibition of a lack in *Emuna* was a threat at the root which had potential to be amplified in the branches of his tree, and seriously infect future generations in Klal Yisrael. Once the flaw surfaced in Avraham Avinu, it instantly flowed into the essence of Klal Yisrael. Therefore, his repairing the problem alone would not have been sufficient to eliminate the deficiency from the rest of the tree. It was necessary for the subsequent generations to experience the תיקון in order to expunge this flaw from their very essence and fully cleanse Klal Yisrael.

The clock begins from לידת יצחק

ידע תדע כי גר יהיה זרעך בארץ זרה, בריית בין הבתרים, Hashem said to Avraham Avinu בארץ זרה, בריית בין הבתרים, Hashem said to Avraham Avinu – *You should know that your children will be strangers in a land that is not their own, and they will serve them and be oppressed by them for four hundred years.* Rashi there comments (consistent with *Pirkei D'Rabbi Eliezer*, Perek 48) that the four hundred years began from the birth of Yitzchak Avinu, who was the beginning of the זרע of Avraham, i.e., to whom the *pasuk* was

referring when it states גר יהיה זרעך.

Based upon this explanation of the Maharal, we now understand why the four hundred years of punishment began from the birth of Yitzchak (who, while never enslaved, was forced to wander) rather than the actual period of slavery in Mitzrayim. The whole point of the punishment was to rectify the חסרון באמונה in the subsequent generations. It was therefore wholly appropriate the תיקון should begin immediately from the first generation of *Yahadus* after Avraham Avinu, which was Yitzchak Avinu.

Additional explanation of the Ramban and the קשיא of the Maharal

While the *gemara* provides three very clear alternatives for the sin of Avraham Avinu which triggered the *Galus Mitzrayim*, the Ramban seemingly suggests an additional/alternative explanation:

ודע כי אברהם אבינו חטא חטא גדול בשגגה שהביא אשתו הצדקת במכשול עוון מפני פחדו פן יהרגוהו, והיה לו לבטוח בה' שיציל אותו ואת אשתו ואת כל אשר לו, כי יש באלקים כח לעזור ולהציל. גם יציאתו מן הארץ, שנצטווה עליה בתחילה, מפני הרעב, עוון אשר חטא, כי האלקים ברעב יפדנו ממות. ועל המעשה הזה נגזר על זרעו הגלות בארץ מצרים ביד פרעה. במקום המשפט שמה הרשע והחטא (רמב"ן עה"ת, לך לך, יב:)

The Torah records that due to a famine in Eretz Kenaan, Avraham Avinu traveled with Sarah Imeinu down to Mitzrayim. Avraham instructed Sarah to tell the Mitzriyim that she was his sister so that they would not kill him in order to take her as a wife. Sarah was then taken to Pharaoh's house, and the Mitzriyim gave Avraham many gifts. Hashem intervened to protect Sarah, striking the entire house of Pharaoh with a plague, which Pharaoh understood was a punishment for taking Sarah. Avraham Avinu then confessed that she was in fact his wife.

The Ramban notes that in this story, Avraham Avinu (at his tremendous level of *emuna*) committed two sins. First, he put his wife in danger of being defiled in order to protect his own life. He should have trusted that Hashem would protect them without a need to resort to a potentially dangerous scheme which put her in more immediate danger. Second, Hashem never told Avraham Avinu to leave Eretz Yisrael to seek food during the famine. His doing so on his own initiative was also a mistake. The Ramban concludes that *Galus Mitzrayim* was a punishment for these sins.

However, the Maharal (*ibid.*) vehemently rejects the explanation of the Ramban and writes:

הרמב"ן ז"ל נתן טעם לדבר, מפני שאברהם הביא את אשתו בנסיון גדול, וכבר הקשו עליו קושיות עד שנעקר פירושו מכל, שהרי אחר כך הלך עוד לגרר ואמר על שרה אחותי היא, ואיך יתכן שיחזור לחטא אחרי העונש הגדול?

The Maharal reminds us that even after this episode and the edict of *Galus Mitzrayim*, Avraham Avinu used the exact same plot of *היא אחותי* when he and Sarah later went to גרר (Avimelech) and she was in comparable danger. Had the poor judgment in using the plot of *היא אחותי* been the reason for the punishment of *Galus Mitzrayim*, obviously Avraham Avinu would not have used the ploy again (note Avraham had been subsequently notified at the *הבתרים* בין *הבתרים*, so the possibility he didn't know that he sinned by Pharaoh is off the table). This question presents an acute problem to the *mehalech* of the Ramban.⁶

חטא מכירת יוסף תיקון for Galus Mitzrayim as a Approach II

The *Yalkut Chadash* (*Galus*, 12) and the *Medrash Talpiyos* (*Os* 10, *Anaf Yosef*) quote from the *Zohar Chadash* (which is not found in our text) as follows:

גלות מצרים היה בחטא מכירת יוסף, שלא ראה פני אביו כ"ב שנה, וגרמו לכל שבט כ"ב שנה להיות בגלות, הרי עשרה פעמים כ"ב הוא ר"ך שנה, אלא משום שעשרה שבטים הקדושים מתו בארץ הטמאה והיה להם צער גדול, לכן נגרעו עשרה שנים ונשתעבדו רד"ו שנה.

The *Zohar HaKadosh* explains that *Galus Mitzrayim* was caused by the sin of the brothers selling Yosef. As a result of the sale, there were twenty-two years in which Yosef did not see his father, Yaakov Avinu. Each of the ten brothers (including Reuven, who was not at the sale but shared the responsibility) was therefore punished with twenty-two years of *Galus*, for a sum total of two hundred and twenty years of *Galus*. However, since all ten of the brothers died in *Mitzrayim*, an extremely painful experience for them, Hashem deducted one year from each of their twenty-two year sentences.⁷ As a result, the *Galus* was prescribed for two

6 See also Ran there who presents similar challenges to the approach of the Ramban. In defense of the Ramban, perhaps one can suggest that the Ramban was not rejecting the three reasons offered in the *gemara* and suggesting an alternative. Rather the Ramban was trying to explain why specifically the punishment involved the land of *Mitzrayim*, when none of Avraham Avinu's sins three sins enumerated by the *gemara* transpired there. This even works well with the *mehalech* of the Maharal because the fact that Avraham Avinu left Eretz Kenaan and endangered his wife illustrates a lack of *emuna*, thematically consistent with how the Maharal explained the *gemara*. Thus, while perhaps it was not the core cause of the *Galus*, it was an additional factor that was appended to it since it exhibited a comparable flaw. This explanation of the Ramban fits nicely into his *לשון*, which highlights that the two *aveiros* were בשוגג, and therefore not likely a core cause of the *Galus*. So the Ramban was probably trying to communicate something else, i.e., the explanation for *Galus* in *Mitzrayim*. Also, the ending he states במקום המשפט שמה הרשע which suggests that truly the focus of the Ramban was on explaining the location of the *Galus*, not its cause. To deal with the Maharal's question, one must then say that the *היא אחותי* of *Mitzrayim* was qualitatively different than by Avimelech, perhaps because Gerar (while lacking in *יראת אלקים* as the *pasuk* states) was not שטופי זמה to the level of *Mitzrayim*, therefore making the plot less dangerous.

7 While the *midrash* states that the bones of the other *Shevatim* were also reinterred in Eretz Yisrael, the *pashut pshat* on the *Pasuk* עמו יוסף יוסף is that only Yosef's bones were taken

hundred and ten years, as it materialized.

This *shita* resonates in the words of the *Medrash Shocher Tov* (*Tehillim*, 10) which states: "אמר ר' חנין, אמר הקב"ה לשבטים, אתם מכרתם אותו לעבד שנאמר (קה, יז) לעבד נמכר." *Rebbi Chanin stated, Hashem said to the Shevatim, you sold him as a slave, I swear that every year you will read (in the Hagada) the phrase "עבדים היינו פרעה במצרים."* Clearly, the *midrash* links the sale of Yosef to the slavery in *Mitzrayim*, suggesting that the sale was the proximate cause for the *Galus*.

The Abarbanel also arrived at the conclusion that *Galus Mitzrayim* was due to the sin of יוסף מכירת (and the wording in his text implies that he had not seen the aforementioned, earlier sources). The Abarbanel writes:

הנני מבאר פה מה שדעתי נוטה בכל אחד מדרכי הדעות האלה, מסתלק מהספקות אשר קדמו בשאלה ואומר שאם נודה שהיה גלות מצרים על חטא ועון קודם, אין ראוי שנחשבהו בחק אברהם אבינו, חלילה לו מעון, ושיותר ראוי שנחסחו לשבטי בני יעקב, כי הנה התורה העידה שהם חטאו חטאה גדולה בשנאת חנם את יוסף אחיהם ובמה שהתנכלו אותו להמיתו כשהלך לדרוש שלומם וטובתם ובהשליכם אותו אל הבור ובמה שמכרו אותו למצרים. ועם היות שראובן לא היה במכירה הנה הוא היה בשנאה והוא היה יועץ בדבר וכמ"ש אבל אשמים אנחנו על אחינו אשר ראנו בצרת נפשו בהתחננו אלינו ולא שמענו על כן באה אלינו הצרה הזאת. ולפי שהם חטאו, היה משורת הדין שיקבלו ענשם, ולפי שבמצרים חטאו שמכרוהו להיות עבד שם, היה ראוי שילקו במצרים והיו עבדים שמה הם ובניהם וזרעם שנים רבות כמו שגלה שם יוסף אחיהם ובניו וזרעו. ולפי שהשליכו את יוסף אל הבור היה מענשם שכל הבן הילוד היאורה תשליכוהו (אברבנאל, וישב ט:ו: א' עמ' ריב).

The Abarbanel rejects the notion that *Galus Mitzrayim* was due to Avraham Avinu's sin, and ascribes it to *Mechiras Yosef* based upon the fact that they hated him. He then goes on to corroborate this conclusion with an insightful reading of the *pesukim*. The Torah (*Parshas Mikeitz, Perek 42*) recounts that Yosef, who was still incognito, told his brothers who had just come down to *Mitzrayim* seeking food (the first time) that he will give them food but will hold Shimon captive until they bring down Binyamin to corroborate their story and prove they are not spies. The brothers then state amongst themselves: אבל אשמים אנחנו על אחינו אשר ראנו בצרת – *Certainly,⁸ we are guilty for what we did to our brother (Yosef) in that we saw the distress of his soul, when he besought us, and we would not hear; therefore this pain has befallen upon us.*

ואת עצמות יוסף אשר העלו בני ישראל (Perek 24) the *Navi* records which again implies that only the bones of Yosef were buried in Shechem. The bones of the brothers are never mentioned.

8 The *Targum* translates אבל as בקושטא – in truth, i.e., certainly.

At a *pashut* level, these *pesukim* are simply stating that the brothers were attributing the cause of their immediate, localized problem of having to go back to fetch Binyamin against their father's wishes in order to free Shimon to their sin of *Mechiras Yosef*. They made the automatic association because they knew that they sold Yosef down to Mitzrayim and then as soon as they got to Mitzrayim, this trouble arose. It seemed like an obvious מדה כנגד מדה. However, on a deeper level, the Abarbanel suggests that this episode was signaling the beginning of *Galus Mitzrayim*.

The Abarbanel lists numerous parallels between the episode of *Mechiras Yosef* and *Galus Mitzrayim* which further demonstrates the connectivity and supports the causality: (1) they both involved Mitzrayim, (ii) Yosef was made a slave, so the *Yidden* were made slaves, (iii) Yosef's children were subject to a long period of exile by virtue of Yosef's, so the children of the *Shevatim* were also subject to *Galus* even after the *Shevatim* themselves had died, (iv), Yosef was thrown into a pit, so the Jewish boys were thrown into the Nile, (v) they sent Yosef down to Mitzrayim so he drew them down to Mitzrayim, (vi) Yosef had gone to check on the sheep when the מכירה took place, so the *Shevatim* went down to Mitzrayim seeking food for their sheep (לגור בארץ באנו כי אין מרעה לצאן אשר לעבדיך, מזוד). With that, the Abarbanel concludes הגנה נתתי בזה סבת גלות מצרים יותר ישרה מכל הסבות ששערו – *I have presented to you a rationale for Galus Mitzrayim which is more straightforward than all of the reasons provided by our earlier Rabbanim.*

The beginning of the *Galus*

The beginning of *Parshas Vayeishev* recounts the story of *Mechiras Yosef*. There (37:14), Yaakov Avinu tells Yosef: 'דבר וישלחהו מעמק חברון ויבא שכמ (Yaakov) said to him (Yosef), please go see the wellbeing of your brothers and the wellbeing of the sheep and report back to me; and he sent him from the valley of Chevron and he came to Shechem.

Targum Yonason adds a dimension and explains the *Pasuk* as follows: ואמר ליה איזל כדון חמי ית שלם אחר וית שלם ענא ואתיבני פתגמא ושדריה על עיטא עמיקתא דאתמלל אם אברהם - *Targum Yonason* starts the clock of *Galus Mitzrayim* ticking from the moment of *Mechiras Yosef*. Notwithstanding the fact that מכירת יוסף was twenty-two years before the two hundred and ten years of *Galus*, thereby requiring some work to understand how/why the Torah ultimately counts only the two hundred and ten and not two hundred and thirty two years, it is clear that *Targum Yonason* also views *Mechiras Yosef* as the trigger for the *Galus*.

Challenges with the approach

The Maharal (ibid.) objects to the notion that *Mechiras Yosef* was the cause of the *Galus* and states:

ויש אומרים שהגלות היתה בחטא השבטים במכירת יוסף, ואף יוסף חטא בהבאת דבה וכו',
זוה היפך משמעות הכתוב, שהקב"ה אמר לאברהם קודם לידת השבטים "גר יהיה זרעך" וגו',
וכל מי שיש לו עינים יראה שסבת המכירה כדי שירדו למצרים, ולא המכירה סבה לשעבוד.

The Maharal's core contention is that Hashem had already told Avraham Avinu at the בתרים בין הבתרים, many years before *Mechiras Yosef*, that his children would be strangers in a foreign land. Thus it is hard to conclude that the causal event only took place later. The Maharal therefore concludes that *Mechiras Yosef* was merely the means through which the *Galus* was effectuated, but not the actual catalyst.

This is consistent with a statement in the *Zohar HaKadosh* (*Vayeishev* 184A) which states definitively that *Mechiras Yosef* was not the cause of *Galus Mitzrayim*:

ויאמר ישראל אל יוסף הלוא אחיך רעים בשכם לכה ואשלחך אליהם, וכי יעקב שלימא
דהוה רחים ליה ליוסף מכל בנוי, והוה ידע דכל אחוי הוו שנאין ליה, אמאי שדר ליה
לגביהו? אלא איהו לא חשיד עלייהו, דהוה ידע דכלהו הוו זכאין, ולא חשיד לון, אלא
גרים קדשא בריך הוא כל דא, בגין לקיימא גזרה דגזר בין הבתרים.

The *Zohar HaKadosh* asks, given that Yaakov Avinu loved Yosef and knew that the brothers hated him, why did he send him to check on them and thereby put him in harm's way? The answer is that Yaakov Avinu knew that the brothers were צדיקים and would not do anything inappropriate. The *Zohar HaKadosh* then concludes, "Rather, Hashem caused all of this in order to fulfill the edict at the בתרים בין הבתרים."

Approach III – *Galus Mitzrayim* as a Constructive Process

To recap, the *gemara* and Ramban explicitly stated that *Galus Mitzrayim* was a punishment for an *aveira* committed by Avraham Avinu. Some Tanaic sources suggest that it was a punishment for *Mechiras Yosef*. Both of these share the common denominator that the painful experience of *Galus Mitzrayim* was a manifestation of retribution. Intuitively, this makes sense. However, Chazal also look at *Galus Mitzrayim* as a constructive step in preparing Klal Yisrael for קבלת התורה and hone in on various nuances of the preparation.

The purity of the nation

The *Zohar HaKadosh* (*Shemos* 14b) records the following explanation from Rebbi Elazar, the son of Rabbi Shimon Bar Yochai:

ומדאיתלידו ליעקב תריסר שבטין אשתכלל כלא כגוונא דלעילא, כד חמא קודשא בריך הוא חדוותא סגיאה דהאי עלמא תתאה דאשתכלל כגוונא דלעילא, אמר דילמא ח"ו יתערבון בשאר עממין וישתאר פגימותא בכלהו עלמין, מה עבד קודשא בריך הוא טלטל לכלהו מהכא להכא עד דנחתו למצרים למידר דיוריהון בעם קשי קדל דמבזין נמוסיהון ומבזין להון לאתחנתא בהו ולא תערבא בהדייהו וחשיבו להון עבדין, גוברין געלן בהון, נוקבתא געלן בהון, עד דאשתכלל כלא בזרעא קדישא ובין כך ובין כך שלים חובא דשאר עמין דכתיב (בראשית טו) כי לא שלם עון האמורי עד הנה, וכד נפקו נפקו זכאין קדישין דכתיב (תהלים קכב) שבטי יה עדות לישראל, אתא ר' שמעון ונשקיה ברישיה א"ל קאים ברי בקיומך דשעתא קיימא לך (שמות, יב ע"ב)

Reb Elazar B'Rebbi Shimon explains that the children of Yaakov Avinu were spiritually perfect and Hashem was concerned that any intermingling with other nations would ruin the purity of Klal Yisrael. Therefore, Hashem sent Klal Yisrael to *Galus* in order to isolate all of Klal Yisrael in one spot. Furthermore, He made the *Yidden* repulsive to the *Mitzrim*, who considered them lowly slaves, so as to prevent intermarrying or any other meaningful connections between them. Thus, the *Zohar HaKadosh* suggests that the purpose of *Galus Mitzrayim* was to facilitate the purity of Klal Yisrael as a nation.

Create awareness of Hashem

Second, the *Sifrei* focuses on the fact that the purpose of *Galus Mitzrayim* was to facilitate the miracles of *Yetzias Mitzrayim* and thereby increase awareness of Hashem.

ומנין אתה אומר שלא ירדו אבותינו למצרים אלא כדי שיעשה להם הקדוש ברוך הוא נסים וגבורות (ו) בשביל לקדש את שמו הגדול בעולם שנאמר (שמות ב:כג-כד) ויהי בימים הרבים ההם וימת מלך מצרים, ואומר, וישמע אלקים את נאקתם ויזכור אלקים את בריתו, ואומר, כי שם ה' אקרא ה' ג' לאלקינו (ספרי, דברים י"א).

Similarly, the *Shelah HaKadosh* focuses on the emergence of three אמונה עיקרי:

אמיתת ענין גלות מצרים אי אפשר לומר שהיה מצד עונש, שהרי כרת ה' אז ברית עם אברהם והיה עמו באהבה רבה, על כן מוכרחין אנו לומר שאף על פי שהנגלה הוא רע ומה, מכל מקום תוכיות הענין היה לתכלית הטוב האמיתי... הענין במצרים נתגלו כל השלשה עקרים, נודע ונתפרסם חידוש העולם, ושיש לו מחדש, ומציאות השי"ת, ולו הכח והיכולת, והוא משגיח לתת לאיש כדרכיו, ונתאמת נבואת משה רבינו ע"ה. והכל בשביל "בהוציאך את העם ממצרים תעבדון את האלקים", והיינו תורה משמים (מסכת פסחים, דרוש ג')

The *Shelah HaKadosh* suggests that it is impossible to suggest that *Galus Mitzrayim* was a punishment to Avraham Avinu because he was so beloved by Hashem. Therefore, we must conclude that while the גילוי came through painful

means, it was inherently for a constructive purpose of facilitating a much higher form of good - לתכלית הטוב האמיתי. This greater good was the revelation of three key principles of our faith: (i) Hashem created the world, (ii) Hashem continues to operate the world and employs a system of שכר ועונש, and (iii) Moshe Rabbeinu's נבואה is an absolute Truth and that תורה משמים, the Torah is of a Divine nature. In summary, the *Shelah HaKadosh* views the benefit of *Galus Mitzrayim* not as a benefit for Klal Yisrael per se, but serving a more global purpose of גילוי of Hashem. It should be noted that this approach focuses primarily on the purpose of the grandeur of *Yetzias Mitzrayim*, but does not directly address the long duration or harshness of the שעבוד in *Galus* itself.

A practical approach

Rav Yosef Gikatilla (the author of the venerated *kabbala sefer, Shaarei Orah*) suggests that the true benefit was actually practical in nature:

ואמנם יש לנו לחקור הנה חקירה נכונה, והיא כי כוונת הגלות אשר במצרים הוא ליסוד גדול וזה כי מאחר שהשי"ת בחר בזרע אברהם, אילו לא יתנם בגלות אי אפשר להם לקבל התורה, כי אילו הרבה אותם והפרם והשפיעם בלי גלות, והיו מתאחזים בארץ ומצליחים עליה והם בלי תורה מקובלת מפי הגבורה, היאך היו מכריחים להוציאם למדבר ולאסור עליהם כמה דברים שהיו רגילים בהם בין במאכלות בין בעריות בין בשאר מצוות (הגדה לר' יוסף גיקטיליא, ברוך שומר הבטחתו)

Rav Yosef Gikatilla explains that had we not been placed into *Galus*, and had we instead prospered and multiplied in a peaceful habitat, it would have been impossible for us to be מקבל the Torah with all of its many restrictions of physical matters which appeal to our *Yeitzer Hara*. Therefore, the purpose of the *Galus* was to set a terrible status quo and a context which we could comfortably leave behind. It provided a path for Klal Yisrael to leave behind the pain of *Mitzrayim* and “trade up” to a better life, allowing us to embrace the Torah properly, notwithstanding its many restrictions.

Like Rav Yosef Gikatilla, the *Shelah HaKadosh* also views the period of *Galus Mitzrayim* as a practical preparation, but focuses more on the עבודת component:

והנה בשבעים נפש ירדו אבותינו למצרים ונזדככו שם ועבדים היו במצרים ולקחם הקב"ה מעבדות לחרות להיות לו ית' לעבדים כמ"ש כי עבדי הם וגו'. וכוונת הענין הוא רצה הקב"ה להטביע בלבם ענין העבודת להרגילם בעבודת כדי שיהיה בהם נקל אחר כך לעבודת הבורא יתברך ולקיים התורה לעבדה ולשמרה (של"ה הקדוש עה"ת, פרשת לך לך)

The *Shelah HaKadosh* explains that the purpose of the slavery in *Mitzrayim* was to teach and train the *yidden* how to be devoted slaves, so that when Hashem

would take us out, we would already have the proper mindset and skills to be devoted עבדים to Hashem.

The *Sefas Emes* echoes this explanation and adds a surprising requirement - to have *simcha* over the *Galus*!

בוודאי עלינו לשבח על הגלות גם כן, דאם לא כן, מה השבח על הגאולה אם היינו יכולין להתקרב להשי"י בלי זה – אם כן לא הן ולא שכרן, אלא וודאי הגלות היתה עצה שנוכל להתקרב להשי"ת... כי היה זה להיות שפלים ונכנעים להשי"ת, כי בלא זה לא היינו יכולין להנצל מגיאאות, וזה לחם עוני להיות שפל ונכנע, כי באמת אחר יציאת מצרים הלכנו למדריגות גבוהים ביותר לקבל התורה כו', כסדר המעלות טובות שלמקום עלינו כו', אבל אנו שמחים בהתחלה זו שהוא קבלת העול מלכות שמים, שזה הביאנו לכל המעלות אחר כך (שפת אמת, פסח תרל"ג).

The *Sefas Emes* explains that it was impossible for Klal Yisrael to be worthy of receiving the Torah without the suffering of *Galus Mitzrayim*, because had that been the case, Hashem would have skipped it altogether. The very existence of the *Galus* demonstrates that the experience of suffering was critical to humble Klal Yisrael and allow for Klal Yisrael to become closer to Hashem with *Kaballas HaTorah* and added levels of *Kedusha*. Therefore, we should experience *simcha* even for the *galus* itself because it was the first step on this upward journey.

The *Sefas Emes* adds that the device we use to memorialize this experience, *matza*, which is called *lechem oni*, “poor man’s bread,” therefore doesn’t refer simply to the fact that the poor/downtrodden *Yidden* who left *Mitzrayim* ate poor man’s bread. Rather, it is a reminder of the humility that is necessary to achieve great heights.

Why Avraham Avinu did not *Daven* to prevent *Galus Mitzrayim*

The *Tzror HaMor* uses the notion that *Galus Mitzrayim* was constructive in order to answer a somewhat glaring question:

והנה יש לתמוה מאברהם שהיה אב רחמן על כל העולם ובקש רחמים על אנשי סדום ולא בקש רחמים לבניו. וכן ה' בשכר כל עבודתו שעבדו נתן לו בשורה כזו מגלות בניו בלי סבה. ולפי שבשר לו בשלום שתק ולא התפלל כמו שעשה נח שאמר לו עשה לך תיבת עצי גופר ושתק. אבל הכוונה בכל זה ידועה כי השם בשכר צדקתו בישר לו בשורה טובה של גלות מצרים. כי מכאן זכו בניו למעלת התורה והכהונה והמלכות. ואם לא ירדו למצרים שנתנסו שם בכור הברזל לא היו ראויים לכל אלו המעלות. כאומרם ז"ל שלשה מתנות טובות נתן הקדוש ברוך הוא לישראל וכלם לא נתנם להם אלא על ידי יסורין תורה וארץ ישראל ועולם הבא. ולכן שתק אברהם וקבל הבשורה (ט"ו:ט').

The *Tzror HaMor* asks as follows: We know that Avraham Avinu was a

tremendous בעל חסד. He even went out of his way to *Daven* that Sedom should be saved. Yet, after Hashem told him at the ברית בין הבתרים that his children will be strangers and slaves for four hundred years, Avraham did not *Daven* for forgiveness and mitigation of the sentence. Why didn't he? The *Tzror HaMor* concludes, it is because Avraham Avinu knew that *Galus Mitzrayim* was going to serve the constructive purpose of the כור הברזל which would facilitate *Kaballas HaTorah* and serve as a springboard for Klal Yisrael to achieve higher levels of *kedusha* via the Torah, *Kehuna* and *Malchus*.

The challenge of the Maharal

Here too, the Maharal addresses this rationale for the *Galus* as a spiritual preparation for *Kaballas HaTorah* and rejects it. The Maharal (*ibid.*) writes:

ויש אומרים שהיו יסורים של אהבה לנקות את ישראל ולזכותם, אך אין זה נראה,
שהשיעבוד לא היה לדור אחד בלבד, ואיך תאמר שהיו יסורים כדי לרוממם ולזכותם אם
מתו בגלות ובצרתם

The Maharal asks, if the purpose was to “cleanse” Klal Yisrael, how was that achieved through killing out multiple generations during the slavery? It seemingly had a larger goal than just purifying and preparing the group of individuals who would stand at Har Sinai.

Similarly, perhaps we can ask why such a long and arduous *Galus* was necessary to facilitate the isolation of Klal Yisrael and provide the platform for a grand *Yetzias Mitzrayim*? Hashem certainly could have accomplished those objectives in less painful and shorter ways.

Conclusion to approaches 1 - 3

Thus far we have seen three approaches, none of which have escaped the scrutiny of the Maharal and Abarbanel, amongst others. To summarize, the first approach espoused by the *gemara* and supported by the Maharal explained that the *Galus Mitzrayim* was triggered by a lack of *emuna* by Avraham Avinu. However, this is rejected by the Abarbanel and *Shelah HaKadosh* on the grounds that Hashem loved Avraham deeply, and said as much at the ברית בין הבתרים. Also, it is peculiar that the punishment was meted out against his descendants rather than him.

The second approach, suggested by the *Zohar Chadash* and supported by *Targum Yonason*, was that *Galus Mitzrayim* was a punishment for *Mechiras Yosef*. However, the *Zohar HaKadosh* and Maharal point out that the ברית בין הבתרים, at which point Hashem declared that Klal Yisrael would experience four hundred years of *Galus*, happened years before *Mechiras Yosef*. So it is unlikely *Mechiras Yosef* was

the cause of the *Galus*, but rather appears to be merely the mechanism by which the family of Yaakov Avinu was moved to Mitzrayim allowing the sentence to play out.

The third approach was that *Galus Mitzrayim* served a variety of constructive functions including isolating, cleansing, and preparing Klal Yisrael's mind frame for *Kaballas HaTorah*. However, while those may have transpired during the *Galus*, the Maharal questions whether it made sense to kill multiple generations in slavery in order to prepare just the last group for *Kaballas HaTorah* (and achieve the other goals).

Thus, not one of these three explanations offered by *Chazal* for the purpose of *Galus Mitzrayim* has emerged unscathed under the דרישה וחקירה by חכמינו וזכרונם לברכה. With that, we will now turn to the דברים נפלאים of the Arizal.

Approach IV – Galus Mitzrayim as a תיקון for חטא אדה"ר

The fourth approach to the purpose of *Galus Mitzrayim* is that taught by the Arizal. This *mehalech* provides a long and profound backstory to *Galus Mitzrayim*. But before we see the words of the Arizal, it is helpful to first see two other important pieces of background information.

The כור הברזל

In *Parshas VaEschanan*, Moshe Rabbeinu is giving his final “*mussar schmooze*” and instructions to Klal Yisrael before his death. There (4:20) he reminds the *Yidden*: ואתכם לקח ה' ויוצא אתכם מכור הברזל ממצרים – *But Hashem has taken you and withdrawn you from the iron furnace, from Mitzrayim*. This reference to the “כור הברזל” is somewhat enigmatic. Why is Mitzrayim referred to as an iron furnace, i.e., a place where raw metal ore is repeatedly purified and banged into shape under intense heat?

A *pashut* explanation would be in lines with what we saw above - that Klal Yisrael needed to either experience a *kaparah* for an *aveirah* (be it by Avraham Avinu or for *Mechiras Yosef*), or alternatively, a tough environment to prepare the *Yidden* for *Matan Torah*. The iron furnace would simply be symbolic of an intense, “heated” environment in which the uncultivated form of Klal Yisrael was rendered into a functional state. While undoubtedly this is true on a simple level, the Arizal adds a profound dimension to the meaning and experience of the כור הברזל. But one more bit of background information is necessary before we see the words of the Arizal.

ק"ל שנה and חטא עץ הדעת

The Torah tells us in *Parshas Bereishis*, after Adam ate from the עץ הדעת, he and Chava were expelled from Gan Eden. The *pesukim* then go on to record that Chava gave

birth to Kayin and Hevel. Then Kayin killed Hevel, Kayin started a family, and then Adam and Chava had a third child named Sheis. Regarding the birth of Sheis, the *pasuk* (5:3) states: *And Adam lived 130 years and he begot in his image and likeness, and he called his name Sheis.*

Note that the Torah fast forwards through one hundred and thirty years of history in that one *pasuk*. The *gemara* explains what transpired during the years before Sheis was born:

ואמר ר' ירמיה בן אלעזר, כל אותן השנים שהיה אדם הראשון בנידוי הוליד רוחין ושידין ולילין, שנאמר ויחי אדם שלשים ומאת שנה ויולד בדמותו כצלמו, מכלל, דעד האידינא לאו כצלמו אוליה. מיתבי, היה ר' מאיר אומר, אדם הראשון חסיד גדול היה, כיון שראה שנקנסה מיתה על ידו, ישב בתענית מאה ושלשים שנה, ופירש מן האשה מאה ושלשים שנה, והעלה רזי תאנים על בשרו מאה ושלשים שנה? כי קאמרינן ההוא בשכבת זרע דחזא לאונסיה (גמ' עירובין י"ח ע"ב)

Rebbi Yirmiah Ben Elazar records that after the *de'eta*, Adam separated from his wife Chava and fasted and afflicted himself for one hundred and thirty years. During this time period, he experienced accidental *zure* לבטלה, seminal emissions. From that *zure*, three different forms of negative spiritual beings called *רוחין שדין* were formed.⁹ At the end, he reunited with Chava and they bore a son called Sheis who the *pasuk* tells us was a spitting image of his father, Adam.

The Arizal was מגלה how this formative stage of the world caused *Galus Mitzrayim*:

הנה נודע מ"ש ז"ל כי אותם הדורות הראשונות דור אנוש, דור הפלגה, סילקו את השכינה למעלה ברקיע ז',¹⁰ מחמת עונותם ודע, כי ישראל שהיו באותו הדור של שעבוד מצרים היו בחי' אותם הנצוצות של קרי, שהוציא אדה"ר באותם ק"ל שנים, עד שלא נולד שם כמ"ש ז"ל. ואח"כ באו בגלגול בדור המבול ולכן היו גם הם משחיתים זרעם על הארץ, כעין השורש אשר משם נצרו וחוצבו, עד שנימוחו. וזה מש"ה, וירא ה' כי רבה רעת האדם בארץ (בראשית ו:ה), ונודע כי הקרי נקרא רע, והמוציאו נקרא רע, כמש"ה

9 Rav Tzadok HaKohen (*Kuntras Sichas Sheidim, Os 1*) explains exactly what these three forms of *רוחין שדין* represent within the *קליפה* and why specifically they are formed via *zure* לבטלה.

10 The *midrash* explains that due to the evil deeds of seven of the early generations of the world, the *shechina* receded back through the seven levels of the *רקיע* until Hashem's presence was removed as far as possible (so to speak) from this world. Then, through the seven generations from Avraham Avinu through Moshe Rabbeinu, It descended until It was fully reinstated in this world. The *midrash (Bamidbar Rabba 13:2)* records as follows:

כיון שחטא אדם, נסתלקה השכינה לרקיע הראשון. חטא קין, נסתלקה לרקיע שני. חטאו דור אנוש, נסתלקה לרקיע השלישי. חטאו דור המבול, נסתלקה לרקיע הרביעי. חטאו דור הפלגה, נסתלקה לרקיע החמישי. חטאו הסדומיים, נסתלקה לרקיע הששי. חטאו המצריים [בימי אברהם – (ב"ר י"ט:ז)], נסתלקה לרקיע השביעי. וכנגדן עמדו שבעה צדיקים, והורידו את השכינה מן העליונים לתחתונים. ואלו הן: אברהם, הורידה מן השביעי לששי. יצחק, הורידה מן הששי לחמישי. יעקב הורידה מן החמישי לרביעי. לוי, הורידה מן הרביעי לשלישי. קהת, הורידה מן השלישי לשני. עמרם, הורידה מן השני לראשון. משה, הורידה מעליונים לתחתונים.

ויהי ער בכור יהודה רע בעיני ה' (וישב לח:ז)... ונמצא, כי הדור ההוא, היו ממש רעת אדם הידוע, הוא אדם הראשון. וזה מש"ה אמחה את האדם אשר בראתי (בראשית ו:ז), הוא אדה"ר עצמו, שנברא על ידי השי"ת עצמו, ואלו ניצוצותיו, ורצה למחותם. ואח"כ הם עצמם חזרו, ונתגלגלו בדור הפלגה, ועליהם כתיב וירד ה' לראות את העיר ואת המגדל אשר בנו בני האדם (נח יא:ה), בנוי דאדם קדמאה, והבן זה... וצריך שתדע, כי ענין הנשמות, הם כענין הזהב, הנוצר בבטן האדמה, וכשמוציאין אותו, הוא מלא טינוף וסיגים, דבר אשר לא ישועה, ולא תואר זהב לו, עד יתחכם הצורף, להגות סיגים מכסף, פעם אחר פעם, זיכוך אחר זיכוך, לא ראי זה כראי זה, ובכל זיכוך מזדכך לאט לאט, עד אשר כל הסיגים נפרדים מן הזהב, ואחר כך ניכר היותו זהב. וכן הענין בנשמות, כי בחטאו של אדה"ה, נתערב טוב ברע, ובפרט בניצוצות האלו של קרי שהוליד בק"ל שנה... ועד"ז, היו אלו הניצוצות הולכות ונתקנות לאט לאט, עד אשר התחילו להתקן, ולהראות בח' הזהב שבהם, וזה היה בדור מצרים. ובזה תבין טעם נכון, למה נגזר עליהם אותו השעבוד הקשה שאין כמותו. כי כנגד מה שחטאו בדור המבול, להשחית את זרעם, נגזר עליהם כל הבן הילוד היאורה תשליכוהו, דוגמת עונש המבול עצמו. וכנגד מה שחטאו בדור הפלגה, הבה נלבנה לבנים כו', נאמר וימררו את חייהם בחומר ובלבנים.

The Arizal explains that the זרע, potential for human life, that Adam HaRishon was מוציא during the one hundred and thirty years experienced numerous גלגולים, reincarnations. First, these souls came back during the דור המבול, and just like Adam HaRishon, the people of that generation were נכשל in לבטלה, as the *pasuk* states: *And Hashem saw that the wickedness of אדם was great on the earth.* The word רע there refers to קרי (as it does in the context of the Er, the son of Yehuda, who was also זרע) and the reference to אדם in this *pasuk* is specifically to Adam HaRishon, meaning the actual "children"/ טיפות from Adam HaRishon were wicked. So Hashem then says *I will destroy the אדם which I created.* This אדם here too is דוקא, a reference to the fact that Hashem would destroy any trace of Adam HaRishon from the world. Hashem brought a מבול of water to destroy these souls for the first time.

Then, the souls experienced a second reincarnation and came back as the דור הפלגה, the generation which built the tower of bricks to rebel against Hashem. The *pasuk* states: *And Hashem came down to see the city and tower that the בני האדם built.* Once again, the Torah refers to them as the בני האדם, a לשון that דוקא associates these souls to Adam HaRishon.

The Arizal, as recorded by Rav Chaim Vital, then pauses in the story and provides an important explanation for how *neshamos* work, and in the process elucidates the deeper significance of the analog of the כור הברזל which the Torah utilizes to describe the period of *Galus Mitzrayim*. The Arizal explains that *neshamos* are like raw, unprocessed gold in its natural state of ore, which contains

many other impurities. It is not yet the precious metal “gold” as we know it. Only through many successive rounds of refining in a hot furnace does it slowly, bit by bit, shed the impurities and emerge to a pristine precious metal.

In order to continue and complete the rectification of the זרע of Adam HaRishon, Hashem brought back the souls another¹¹ time in the generation of *Galus Mitzrayim* as the ערב רב.¹² The כור הברזל of Mitzrayim was therefore not just purifying from the *aveiros* of Avraham Avinu or *Mechiras Yosef*, but rather, actually providing a purification for specific sins that these *neshamos* themselves had committed, מדה כנגד מדה. The *neshamos* originally committed the הוצאת איסור of הוצאת זרע were drowned by water at the מבול. In parallel, in Mitzrayim they needed to be purified through an affliction of water, and they were therefore subject to the evil decree that all the baby boys should be thrown into the Nile – כל הבן הילוד היאורה – תשליחוהו. Then, in their second reincarnation, the *neshamos* sinned with bricks (הבה נלבנה לבינים), building a tower toward the sky to rebel against Hashem. To atone for this *aveira* committed with bricks, it was decreed that the *Yidden* would need to perform the backbreaking physical labor of bricklaying for Pharaoh, as the *pasuk* (*Shemos* 1:14) states: וימררו את חייהם בעבודה קשה בחמר ובלבנים.

The Connection between the חטא of the עץ הדעת and the זרע of the ק"ל שנה

One important detail here is that the good and evil became entwined as a function of the עץ הדעת which transpired before the ק"ל שנה and the need for the תיקון of those *neshamos*. However, these two episodes were really connected. Rav Chaim Friedlander (*MiMishnas Shel Ramchal*, page 153) quotes from the לשם that the reason Adam HaRishon separated from Chava was in order to expunge this זרע which contained the evil in it. In other words, the זרע was the product of the חטא of the עץ הדעת and the separation was the very first step of תשובה in order to purify himself and bring about Sheis, בדמותו כצלמו. While this worked, there was still a tinge of the זוהמא of the Nachash attached to Adam and Chava themselves which was transmitted to Sheis and to all generations thereafter.

Purification of the 600,000

The Ramak explains another component of the כור הברזל, which was the proper reconstitution and redistribution of all of the *kedusha* across the generations. The Ramak writes:

11 Rav Chaim Vital records elsewhere in *Shaar HaPesukim, Parshas Shemos* on the *pasuk* ויקם מלך חדש that there was actually a third גלגול of these *neshamos* in Sedom, which can be seen from the *pasuk* – ואנשי סדם רעים וחטאים לה' מאד – The fourth גלגול was then in Mitzrayim.

12 See *Shaar HaPesukim, Parshas Bo* on קדש לי כל בכור.

כי עדין סיגים מעורבים בכסף, וכסף מעורב בסיגים, שבין האומות היו נשמות קדושות, ובין הקדושה היתה עדיין זוהמא. והנה בראשונה נתחכם הבורא לטהר הקדושים, ויצא מאברהם ישמעאל ומיצחק עשו ויעקב מטתו שלמה טהורה ונקיה. אח"כ רצה לטהר ולקבץ ניצוצות נדחות כי רצונו לבלתי ידח ממנו נדח, והכניס הכסף הנקי בתוך הכור הברזל, עבודת מצרים, בתוקף הקליפה ושם נתקבצו כל הניצוצים אל רוב הכסף הנקי, ולכן שם נתגלגלו כל הדורות דור המבול שעליהם נאמר כל הבן הילוד היאור' תשליכוהו, דור הפלגה עליהם נאמר נלבנה לבנים, וכן במצרים נאמר ותוכן לבנים תתנו, עד שיצא הכסף צרוף נקי מנוקה מכל סיג, שש מאות אלף... עכ"ז נכנסו בתוך הקליפה וירדו פלאים והסיגים והעופרת שלט עליהם עד שנכנסו בשער מ"ט פנים טמא... והנה כצאת ישראל ממצרי' עדיין לא היו נקיים. (פרדס רמונים, שער השערים, פרק ג')

The Ramak explains that we need to step back further and look at the purification process from the very beginning. When Adam HaRishon sinned, all of the good and evil became intertwined in the world.¹³ Every person had some good and bad within himself. This was not a suitable context in which the world could receive the Torah. There were therefore two components to the purification process. The first was the emission of the bad particles from the purest existent form in the world at the time, which was Avraham Avinu. Avraham therefore bore Yishmael, an expulsion of one layer of the evil, before he bore Yitzchak, a more spiritually clean model than Avraham Avinu himself. Yitzchak then bore Eisav before Yaakov so that a second layer would be purified. Yaakov Avinu was perfect and his children were therefore all צדיקים גמורים.¹⁴ Thus, the good side of the equation had been purified to perfection.

However, the second track of purification was the reverse case, which was the aggregation of all of the good particles which existed within the העולם prior to Avraham Avinu. In other words, even the דור המבול and the דור הפלגה had some good in it, and this goodness needed to be reattached to the pure form of Klal Yisrael.¹⁵ To make this happen, Hashem brought back the *neshamos* of those generations and provided them with the purification in *Galus Mitzrayim*.

When *Galus Mitzrayim* was done, there were 600,000 purified *neshamos* within Klal Yisrael. However, even though those *neshamos* had achieved this very important dimension of purification, they still had been entirely enveloped by the טומאה of Mitzrayim, and stooped all the way down to the 49th level of טומאה.

13 It should be noted that the חשבון of Adam and Chava to separate in order to expunge the זוהמא is a חשבון far beyond our level of comprehension and has no bearing on the זרע לבטלה that is operative today.

14 See detailed discussion by the *Alshich HaKadosh*, *Toldos* 25:19.

15 For further discussion of the two tracks of purification (by birth and by pain) see *Ohr HaChaim HaKadosh*, *Toldos* 28:5 and earlier references discussed there.

Thus, the major objective of the cleansing and aggregation of קדושה had been accomplished, but there was still a local purification that this קהל needed ahead of מתן תורה. This process took place during the forty nine days leading up to מתן תורה.

ניצוצות הקדושה

With this background from the Arizal and Ramak, we can now understand a major focus of the ספרי חסידות in describing the process of *Galus Mitzrayim*. The ספרים (some of which will be discussed in the coming paragraphs) refer to the בירור of the ניצוצות הקדושה which took place in Mitzrayim. Without getting into too much of the *Kabbalah*, when Hashem created the world, two hundred and eighty eight sparks of קדושה called the ניצוצות רפ"ח were created and after the עץ הדעת they were distributed across the world.¹⁶ Klal Yisrael's עבודה is to "collect" these spiritual sparks by learning Torah and performing mitzvos.¹⁷

Conversely, the קליפות, forces of evil, try to hold these sparks captive and use them as a "source-power" to provide them with sustenance, since no pure evil could survive in this world without an underlying value, or component of *kedusha*.¹⁸ The time period of *Galus Mitzrayim* during which Klal Yisrael was experiencing the לגולים of the prior generations and the purification of the כור הברזל, as well as preparing for the arrival of Moshe Rabbeinu and Matan Torah, was the key point in history when much of the battle for the ניצוצות transpired.

The Two Hundred and Two ניצוצות in Mitzrayim

The *Megaleh Amukos* (*Va'Eschanan, Ofen* 58) quotes from the Rama MiPano (*Kanfei Yona* 3:56) that from the two hundred and eighty eight ניצוצות were located in Mitzrayim. Moshe Rabbeinu liberated two hundred and two of them when we left Mitzrayim, leaving a total of eighty six remaining.¹⁹ The *Megaleh Amukos* brings examples in the pesukim that allude to this:

The *pasuk* (*Mikeitz* 42:3) states: וירדו אחי יוסף לשבר ב"ר ממצרים – *And the brothers of Yosef went down to procure ב"ר – grain, from Mitzrayim* (during the famine).

¹⁶ See *Sifsei Chein Hakdama* 3, and *Daas Elokim* page 57 for summary discussions of the רפ"ח (as discussed by the Arizal and Rav Chaim Vital in *Otzros Chaim* and *Mevo Shearim*). See also *Bnei Yisaschar Chodesh Nissan Maamar* 4 *Drush* 6 who writes: הנה התחלת ענין נפילת הניצוצות היה: בחטא אדה"ר.

¹⁷ See *Shomer Emunim HaKadmon* (R' Yosef Ergas) *Vikuach Sheini, Os* 79. See also *Hakdama* of the *Baal Hatania*.

¹⁸ This notion that the כוחות הטומאה require a source power of קדושה is called "נהירו דקיק" by the זהר הקדש. See ע"ע ע"ע.

¹⁹ Regarding where exactly these eighty six ניצוצות remained, whether in Mitzrayim or elsewhere, the *Megaleh Amukos* states: אבל פ"ו לתשלום רפ"ח לא היה יכולת. למשה להוציא מכור הברזל. Nowadays the ניצוצות are found wherever Klal Yisrael is in *Galus*.

The *gematria* of ב"ר is two hundred and two; a code that they went down with the purpose of gathering those ניצוצין from Mitzrayim. Similarly, the *pasuk* (41:49) states ב"ר ויצבר יוסף ב"ר, Yosef was gathering the ניצוצות.

Later, Yaakov Avinu learns ר"ב עוד יוסף בני חי – *How great! My son Yosef is still alive*. Here, Yaakov was signaling that he understood that Yosef, who was still a *frum Yid*, was gathering the two hundred and two ניצוצין in Mitzrayim.

After Yaakov Avinu died and the brothers were worried that Yosef would take revenge against them for selling him to Mitzrayim, he tells them not to worry because even though they thought to do bad to him, אלקים חשבה לטובה למען עשה כיום, – *Hashem designed it for a good purpose – to sustain the vast people* (Vayechi 50:20). Here too, the term ר"ב is a hidden allusion to the fact that Yosef understood that Hashem sent him down to be מברר the ניצוצין.²⁰

In the beginning of *Shemos*, Pharaoh warns the Mitzriyim – בני ישראל ר"ב – *the Bnei Yisrael have captured two hundred and two of the ניצוצין from us*. Therefore, ל"ו – *we must outsmart them*. If one expands the word ל"ו to reveal its hidden letters – ל"ו ד"ו – the *gematria* is eighty six. This was a warning from Pharaoh to his people that they must fight to preserve their remaining ניצוצין and enslave the Bnei Yisrael.

Then, during the exodus, the *pasuk* (Bo 12:38) states וגם ערב ר"ב עלה אתם – *the Eirev Rav* ascended out of Mitzrayim with Klal Yisrael. The *gematria* of ר"ב is two hundred and two. Conversely, the *pasuk* (Yisro 19:3) tells us that at *Matan Torah* – ומשה עלה אל האלקים – *Moshe Rabbeinu went up to אלקי"ם*, which in *Gematria* equals eighty six.

Forty years later, in *Parshas VaEschanan* (3:26) Moshe Rabbeinu davens to be allowed to cross into Eretz Yisrael and Hashem responds ר"ב לך אל תוסף דבר אלי – *Hashem tells Moshe you have already liberated ר"ב – two hundred and two of the ניצוצין*. That's enough for you. You cannot gather all of the ר"ב עו"ד בדב"ר הזה which is the *gematria* of two hundred and eighty eight.

Having now identified many examples where the Torah alludes to the gathering of the ניצוצות, let us delve one layer deeper and see exactly how this gathering was achieved and what transpired as they were gathered.

The ניצוצות and the symbolism of the הסהר²¹

The Torah alludes to the fact that this בירור was not a passive maturation process, but rather an active spiritual endeavor. The *pesukim* (Vayeishev, Perek 39) describe

²⁰ This piece is quoted from the *Bnei Yisaschar, Igra D'Kala, Noach, D"R LeHachayos*.

²¹ See *Shvilei Pinchas, Parshas Vayeishev* 5776.

the jail that Yosef was thrown into by Potifar and his experience there:

ויקח אדני יוסף אתו ויתנהו אל בית הסהר מקום אשר אסירי המלך אסורים... ויתן חנו בעיניו שר בית הסהר... ויתן שר בית הסהר ביד יוסף את כל האסירים אשר בבית הסהר
And the masters of Yosef took him and put him in the prison where the prisoners of the king were incarcerated... And Hashem put [Yosef's] favor in the eyes of the warden... And the warden entrusted all of the prisoners of the jail into the hands of Yosef.

On a *pashut* level, this means that Yosef became a trusted assistant to the warden, a symbol of success and stature in the prison.

However, the *Arvei Nachal* explains the deeper symbolism. The “אסירי המלך” which literally means the prisoners of the king, actually refer to the ניצוצות הקדושה, and the King actually refers to Hashem. The warden refers to the שר של מצרים, guardian angel of Mitzrayim, who then entrusted all of the ניצוצות into the hands of Yosef. In other words, the episode in which Yosef suffered in jail was Divinely engineered to allow him to gather together into one spot all of the ניצוצות הקדושה!

Rav Pinchas Friedman *shlit"a* (*Shvilei Pinchas, Vayeishev 5776*) asks the obvious question: why would the angel of Mitzrayim do such a thing and just hand over the ניצוצות הקדושה to Yosef HaTzadik when we know that the קליפות fight viciously to prevent Klal Yisrael from gathering the ניצוצות? He answers that it was because Yosef's צדקות was not recognized by the שר של מצרים. Looking at the facts, perhaps it was not so obvious who Yosef was. *Chazal* (see Rashi 37:2) tell us that he was fond of curling his hair, which is hardly the behavior one would suspect from a person of spiritual stature. Furthermore, he had just been accused of attempted adultery by the wife of Potifar. Thus, he didn't seem at all like a religious person. In fact, the *pasuk* tells us עשה היה עשה – *while Yosef was in jail, he did everything just like the other Mitzri prisoners*. He appeared to be a regular Egyptian. The שר never saw the threat coming.

Rav Friedman takes it one step further with a חידוש and states we now understand why Yosef HaTzadik did unbecoming things like curl his hair and why Yaakov Avinu never objected to such behavior. It was so that Yosef could “get into disguise” in order to achieve the grand mission of being מברר the ניצוצות without the detection of the שר של מצרים.

The increasing intensity of the שעבוד

In the beginning of *Parshas Shemos*, the Torah states that the period of slavery began after the old king of Mitzrayim died and a new king came to power. Then, after Moshe Rabbeinu came to Pharaoh and demanded that he let Klal Yisrael

go, Pharaoh intensified the workload on Klal Yisrael and required them to gather their own straw for bricks without diminishing their production quota. The *Sefas Emes* explains that the reason for the sequential intensification was rooted in the diminution of the *ניצוצות הקדושה* providing source-power to the evil of Mitzrayim:

בענין תוקף השיעבוד שהוסיף פרעה לבנ"י אחר משה ואהרן באו אליו בשליחות הקב"ה. כי כל הגלות הוא להוציא הניצוצות קדושות שנמצא בהם.. ולכן אחר שמוציאן מהם בח"י הני"ק נעשים רעים לגמרי. ואז הוא זמן מפלה שלהם. לכן כ' ג"כ וימת מלך מצרים, הוא הסתלקות כח ני"ק שהי' בו. ולכן הרע לבנ"י ביותה. (שפת אמת, שמות, תרנ"ג)

The *Sefas Emes* explains that when the Torah says that the king of Mitzrayim died it was alluding to the fact that the *ניצוצות הקדושה* that were sustaining the king of Mitzrayim had been effectively gathered, leaving him without a “good” source power and rendering the king pure evil. He therefore initiated the slavery. Then, Moshe Rabbeinu’s demand that he send the *Yidden* free escalated the threat of their demise and he therefore intensified the slavery. In other words, the “badness” of the *קליפות* tracks inversely to the presence of the *ניצוצות הקדושה* that sustains them.

The population explosion of Klal Yisrael

The *Shem Mishmuel* explains what exactly happened to these *ניצוצות הקדושה* that were taken from Mitzrayim:

וכאשר יענו אותו כן ירבה וכן יפרוץ... ונראה עפ"י"מ דאיתא בספרים דהא דפרו ורבו ככ"ה' מפאת ריבוי חלקי הטוב שהיו מתבררים מהמצרים ונתוספו על חלקי קדושת ישראל. (שם משמואל, שמות תרע"ב)

The Torah says וכן יפרוץ – וכאשר יענו אותו כן ירבה וכן יפרוץ – The population of Klal Yisrael grew commensurately with the level of pain that the Mitzriyim afflicted upon them. The *Shem Mishmuel* explains based upon the *ספרים הקדושים* that the reason for this correlation was that as the *ניצוצות הקדושה* were extracted from Mitzrayim, they did not simply disappear. Rather, their power was reallocated to the side of *kedusha* and provided propulsion for the growth of Klal Yisrael.²²

The *כסף* and the *ניצוצות*

One of the recurring motifs that the Torah uses throughout the period of *Galus Mitzrayim* is the collection of gold and/or silver. *Chazal* explain that this “money” also provided deeper symbolism to the *ניצוצות*.

When Yosef was appointed viceroy of Mitzrayim, he stored the food during

²² See *Ohr HaChaim HaKadosh (Shemos 1:12)* that quotes the *Zohar HaKadosh* and explains this point in more detail.

the seven years of plenty and then sold it during the seven years of famine until he amassed all of the wealth from the citizens of Mitzrayim and Eretz Kenaan. The *pasuk* (Mikeitz 47:14) records: – *And Yosef gathered all of the money found in Mitzrayim and Eretz Kenaan.*

The *Megaleh Amukos* (Va'Eschanan, 176, see *Hagaa*) writes: *This matter of "collecting the money" actually refers to the collection of the money which came from Adam HaRishon from the עץ הדעת of both עץ and עץ are both one hundred and sixty, which illustrates the symbolic connection.*

Never return to Mitzrayim – לא תוסיפון לשוב בדרך הזה עוד

The *pasuk* (*Shoftim* 17:16) states that there is an איסור for Klal Yisrael to return to dwell in Mitzrayim. Putting aside the *halachic* parameters of the איסור, and notwithstanding the fact that Mitzrayim was a terrible place in Klal Yisrael's history, the question is why does such an איסור exist?

לא תוסיפו לשוב בדרך הזה עוד, ולמה נאסר דירת מצרים מכל שאר ארצות, רק סוד הדברה כי הלא גם זה לעומת זה עשה אלהים, וכאשר חטא אדה"ר פגם בכל העולמות, וא"כ היה מוכרח שנפלו ממנו ניצוצי הקדושים ונתערבו בכל ד' רוחות העולם ובכל ע' אומות, כל א' נטל את חלקו, והנה אותן הניצוצין, אין בהם כח לצאת משם, רק ע"י ישראל העושין מצות ותפלות, וע"י תפלותיהן מעלין אותן בסוד מ"נ כנודע ליודעי חן, ומתבררין אז כולן... כי שולטין באומות בישראל להוציא מידם אותן הניצוצות, ואותן הניצוצין הם המחיים את הקליפות, כי הקליפות הם מתים כי הרשעים אפילו בחייהם קרויים מתים, כי אין בהם נשמת קדושה מן היסוד הנקרא אל חי, רק מן הקליפות הנק' מות וצלמות, וע"י אותן הניצוצין הם חיים, וזהו סבת חפץ ורצון הקליפות לאחוז נשמות ישראל להחטיאן, כי אין להם חיות לולא ע"י... אמנם ישראל, צריכין להגלות עם השכינה בכל ע' לשון, אשר שם ניצוצי הקדושה ללקטן משם... והנה בכל הגאולות לא היו שלימות, כי עדיין נשארו איזו ניצוצין קטנים אשר גברה יד הקליפה בהם מאוה, ולא יכלו להתברר כ"א באריכות הזמן, ולכן לא הוצרכו ישראל להתאחר שם ויצאו מן הגלות ההוא, ואמנם לטעם זה לא אסרה תורה חזרה למקום ההוא, כי עדיין צריך שיגלו לשם אותו אדם הבא משרש אותן ניצוצין שנשארו שם, כדי להוציאם משם, אך במצרים לא נשאר בה שום שורש ועיקר כלל, וא"כ מה צריך לחזור שם. (פרי עץ חיים, הקריאת שמע, פרק ג')

The Arizal explains that the role of Klal Yisrael in *Galus* is to be מברר the ניצוצות הקדושה. But when we left Mitzrayim, there were no ניצוצות הקדושה left there at all for us to ever be מברר again. As such, we have no function for the land, and the Torah therefore makes it אסור for us to return there.²³

²³ In this discussion, Rav Chaim Vital seemingly discounts the eighty six ניצוצות that remained in Mitzrayim after Moshe Rabbeinu. See footnote #19. וצריך עיון קצת.

The One Hundred and Thirty Years

Moving on to the next topic, the Arizal also explains the deeper significance of the one hundred and thirty years in which Adam separated from Chava, and how these years were later duplicated in Mitzrayim:

והנה זמן גלות מצרים, משנכנסו לה בני ישראל, היו רד"ו שנים. ובק"ל שנים הראשונים, התחילו הענפים להתגלגל בבני ישראל ובערב רב כנזכר, והיו נצרפים ומתלבנים ומתבררים הטוב מן הרע, ולא נגמר בירורם עד תשלום ק"ל שנים ההם, כדוגמת ק"ל שנים שפירש אדם והולידם כנזכר. ואחר שנשלם גלגולם וביורום, אז נולד מרע"ה, כנודע כי משה היה בן פ' שנה בצאתם ממצרים, והנה ק"ל ושמונים, הם רד"ו, כי משה שהוא עצמו הדעת הטובה, לא יכול לבוא, עד שיתבררו ניצוצותיו הטוב מן הרע, ולכן כשנשלם בירורם, נולד הוא. וזהו טעם מ"ש רז"ל כי בו ביום שהושלך משה, נתבטלה גזרת השלכת הזכרים ליאורה, לפי שכבר נשלמו כולם לבוא כנזכר. וזהו טעם נכון, בענין עמרם שפירש מיוכבד עד היותה בת ק"ל שנים, ואז הוליד את משה, ע"ד שפירש אדם מחוה, עד שיתבררו ממנו כל אותם הסיגים של השחתת זרע בק"ל שנה. ואח"כ הוליד את שת, בהיותה חוה בת ק"ל שנה. (שער הפסוקים, שמות)

The Arizal explains that the years during which Adam had separated from Chava and was required the atonement. This atonement took place during the first one hundred and thirty years in Mitzrayim and ended with the birth of Moshe Rabbeinu, which was eighty years before Yetzias Mitzrayim.

During those first years, the *ניצוצות הקדושה* of the *בירור* took place and only after that *בירור* was complete could Moshe Rabbeinu, who was completely good, be born. *Chazal* explain that the *גזרה* that all of the Jewish boys should be thrown into the Nile ended on the day that Moshe Rabbeinu was born. But that was not because the *בירור* של ישראל was born and the *גזרה* no longer served a function, but rather because all of the *בירור* was complete and therefore the *כפרה* had been achieved. The birth of Moshe Rabbeinu was therefore an output of the completion of the *בירור* and the end of the *גזרה*, not the underlying rationale for its ending.

Looking another layer deeper into the one hundred and thirty years, we see there are several other parallels between the story of Adam HaRishon and that of *Galus Mitzrayim*. First, Moshe Rabbeinu's father Amram separated from Yocheved until she was one hundred and thirty years old, just like Adam HaRishon separated from Chava for one hundred and thirty years.²⁴ In fact, the *Megaleh Amukos* (*Shemos*) quotes that Amram was a *גלגול* of Adam HaRishon and Yocheved was a *גלגול* of Chava.²⁵ Elsewhere, the Arizal teaches that Moshe Rabbeinu was a *גלגול* of

²⁴ In this *drush*, the Arizal does not explain the prior birth of Aharon and Miriam, Moshe Rabbeinu's older siblings, in light of the one hundred and thirty year separation.

²⁵ See also this discussion in *Chessed LeAvraham* (the father of the Chida) *Maayan* 4, *Nahar* 54.

נשמות (and הבל).²⁶ In other words, the people themselves were of the same שח

Second, in both instances, the birth at the end of the בירור was perfect. Adam HaRishon birthed Sheis, who the *pasuk* tells us was בדמותו כצלמו, a replica of Adam HaRishon, the perfect מעשה ידיים of Hashem. Likewise, after the years of בירור, Moshe Rabbeinu, who was also completely good, was born.

Third, both Chava and Yocheved were one hundred and thirty years old at the time of the respective perfect births.

Finally, the Arizal (*Shaar HaPesukim, Vayigash, Siman 47*) states that when Yaakov Avinu arrived in Mitzrayim, he met with Pharaoh, who asked him כמה ימי שני חיך – how old are you? Yaakov Avinu responded: ומאת שנה מעט – *The days of the years of my wanderings have been one hundred and thirty years, [they have been] few and bad.* The Arizal states that the first one hundred and thirty years of Yaakov Avinu's life had been filled with suffering as a תיקון for the השחתת זרע of Adam HaRishon. At the end of those years, once his portion of the תיקון had been complete, the *neshama* of Adam HaRishon entered Yaakov Avinu. The Torah communicates this at the beginning of *Parshas Vayechi* by saying ויחי שנה – *and Yaakov lived in the land of Mitzrayim for 17 years.* These 17 years were truly living, in a spiritual sense, because he was infused with the very lofty *neshama* of Adam HaRishon.

More allusions during the youth of Moshe Rabbeinu

The Rama MiPano (*Maamar Chikur HaDin, 3:21-22*) adds several other parallels between דור המבול \ דור הפלגה and the end of *Galus Mitzrayim* characterized by the arrival of Moshe Rabbeinu:

כי הדורות הראשונים גרמו לנו גזירת היאורה תשליכוהו שנתקיימה במשה כל הבן הילוד שהוא שקול ככל ישראל... ותחמרה אמו בחמר ובזפת לטהר את החומר שהיה להם לחומר לבוני המגדל, והזפת מבעיר כבשונות לשרפת הלבנה לאבן, ותחת בלבול לשונם הוצרך מרע"ה להיות כבד פה וכבד לשון.

The Rama MiPano explains that Moshe Rabbeinu, who was equivalent to all of Klal Yisrael, was placed in his basket into the waters of the Nile, it served as the final aspect of the גזרת היאורה תשליכוהו which provided the atonement for the דור המבול. Also, when Yocheved built the basket into which she would put her baby Moshe Rabbeinu, she coated it in חמר וזפת, clay and pitch. The חמר was symbolic of the pitch used by the דור הפלגה used to build the tower. Later, Moshe Rabbeinu was afflicted with a speech difficulty, paralleling the fact that Hashem created a mass confusion of world languages in the aftermath of the מגדל. Thus, the arrival of

²⁶ *Hakdama to Eitz Chaim, Shaar Haklalim, Perek 10.*

Conclusion

May our increased understanding of the purpose of *Galus Mitzrayim* provide us with a *zechus* to see the final גאולה speedily in our days.

הגדה

של

פסח

The Four Sons and the Four *Shomrim*

Elimelech Blumstein

The number four is the star of the Seder in numerous obvious ways, such as the four sons and four questions. But it also conveys numerous deep messages, including some ways that perhaps you may never have even imagined.

The *Mechilta* (*Shemos, Perek 12*) states:

ושמרתם את המצות (שמות יב:יז) - אל תקרי "מצות" אלא "מצוות", אם תבוא מצוה לידך, אל תחמיצנה, אלא עשה אותה מיד.

The פסוק says there is a הלכה that we must guard the *matzos* (with one *vuv*), but this פסוק should also be alternately interpreted to read guard the mitzvos (with two *vuv*s), and if a מצוה presents itself, we should not let it get stale, but rather jump on it. Putting aside the *halachic* impact of this דין, we learn from the *Mechilta* that there is a fundamental commonality between *matzos* and mitzvos – the need for guarding. It is this need for guarding that resonates in the הגדה and will be the topic of this דבר תורה.

שימור and the Seder

The הקדוש של"ה (*Pesachim, Matza Ashira, D'rush 1, 285-290*) develops a deep connection between שימור and Pesach generally, and the four sons of the הגדה specifically.

Generally, the הקדוש של"ה quotes that the evening of the Seder exhibits three elements of שימור. First, the matza requires שימור, i.e., שמורה מצה. Second, the ד' כוסות provide a רמז to the המשומר יין made from the grapes of בראשית that nobody has ever seen and which will be used by דוד המלך to lead the bentching at one of the סעודות. Third, the Seder night is referred to as the ליל שימורים. All of these שימורים just beg the question, why is there such a focus on guarding at the Seder?

The הקדוש של"ה answers as follows. Really, the whole purpose of Klal Yisrael is to serve הקב"ה, just as Adam HaRishon was initially instructed that his job in גן עדן (before the חטא) was לעבדה ולשמרה, to work it and guard it (*Bereishis 2:15*). Comparably, when Klal Yisrael was first initiated into a formal relationship with

Hashem in Mitzrayim, He instructed Klal Yisrael in the laws of פסח and *matza*. It was in this very first moment of the relationship that Hashem laid down the ground rules and expectations for how we should serve Him – we should zealously guard our *matzos* and by extension all mitzvos – ושמרתם את המצות. In other words, the notion of zealously approaching mitzvos was first taught to Klal Yisrael in the context of the mitzva of *matza* and the Seder evening. Therefore we celebrate this approach to our עבודת ה' at the Seder.

The Four שומרים, Four Historical Models of עבודת ה', and Four Sons

and מסכת בבא מציעא discuss the הלכות pertaining to the four categories of שומרים, people who are in a position to guard the object of another.

The first is a שומר חנם, who is basically doing his friend a favor and guarding his friend's object without being paid for his work. The של"ה הקדוש explains that the שומר חנם is clearly a “good guy.” The second is a שומר שכר, who also watches his friend's object, but he is a paid custodian. This arrangement can be categorized as “fair.” The third is a שוכר, one who rents an object from his friend. This arrangement, like the שומר שכר, can also be categorized as fair, trading money for utility. Finally, there is the שואל, one who borrows from another without paying for the privilege. The של"ה הקדוש states that in this arrangement we see taking without giving, which is a bad מדה.

The של"ה הקדוש goes on to explain a second group of four; the four historical figures that each demonstrated one of four primary approaches to עבודת ה'. Those four figures were (i) Adam HaRishon, (ii) the wicked inhabitants of the ten generation between Adam HaRishon and Noach who brought about the מבול as well as the דור הפלגה that built the tower to rebel against Hashem, (iii) Noach, and (iv) Avraham Avinu. The של"ה הקדוש then lines up the four שומרים, the four sons – the חכם, רשע, תם, and שאינו יודע לשאול, and the four historical figures as follows.

Avraham Avinu was the חכם. He actively discovered Hashem, davened for others (even אנשי סדם) and generally was took an active approach to עבודת ה'. (Indeed Avraham Avinu is considered the paradigm of חסד.) He is like the שומר חנם, always giving. Hashem states regarding Avraham Avinu, ותורתו, וישמור משמרתו מצותי חקותי ותורתו, – he was the quintessential guardian of Torah and mitzvos.

The ten generations from Adam HaRishon until Avraham Avinu and the ten from Avraham Avinu to Noach represent the approach of the רשע who has no interest in עבודת ה' at all. They purely take from הזה, עולם הזה, just like the שואל who takes without giving anything in return. Parenthetically, the המשפט explains that the reason that a שואל is חייב to pay for an object that is damaged wholly accidentally

(אונס) is that he truly views himself as the owner. That is the character of the שואל – the narcissist who views the world as here to serve him, not him to serve Hashem.

The תם is the innocent son, as Rashi writes regarding Yaakov Avinu who the Torah refers to as an איש תם: מי שאינו חריף לרמות קרוי תם: איש תם – one who is not sharp (elbowed) to deceive is called a תם. Similarly, Adam HaRishon at the beginning of creation before the חטא עץ הדעת was comparably innocent. He was not looking to deceive at all. Rather he was the victim of deceit by the נחש, analogous to how Yaakov Avinu was deceived by לבן, (which we read in the הגדה – ארמי אבד אבי – Adam HaRishon and the תם are therefore comparable to the שומר שכר who approaches life fairly but seeking reward. Adam HaRishon demonstrated that he was happy לטעמה ולשמרה, but at the same time, once the נחש suggested that Chava and he could eat from the עץ הדעת and then experience עניינם והייתם כאלקים, Chava and by extension Adam HaRishon sought the to take the deal. So this מדרגה of שומר שכר is not necessarily a failure in עבודת ה' (as we know it is מותר to be מקבל פרס) but it is certainly less than the ideal of the altruistic חכם who serves Hashem על מנת שלא על פרס לקבל פרס.

Finally, there is Noach. The Torah refers to Noach as תמים היה בדרותיו – he was simple in his generation of sinners, but as Rashi comments (in one view on the matter), he would not have been a standout in the more spiritually elevated generation of Avraham Avinu.¹ Noach's approach to עבודת ה' was totally passive. Unlike Avraham Avinu, who sought out Hashem, when it came time for Hashem to destroy the world, Hashem had to initiate the dialogue with Noach – ויאמר ה' אל נח קץ כל בשר בא לפני - While Avraham Avinu *davened* for Sedom, Noach did not *daven* for his generation to be spared. Thus, Noach represents the שאינו יודע לשאול, the one who cannot ask, and thus must be instructed precisely what to do. And once he is instructed, he follows those instructions precisely. Therefore even Noach can be called a צדיק. This is parallel to the שוכר, the one who rents for payment fairly. He wants to work and be productive but needs another to facilitate his progress. Hence Noach is also referred to as the איש האדמה, the one who constructively revived the earth after the מבול.

Clearly, the הגדה is trying to communicate to us that there is a lesson in understanding our history, the four sons, and analogously the four שומרים. We must constantly approach guarding מצוות as zealously as Avraham Avinu (who also taught us the practice of מקדימין למצוות). We must be passionate and excited about our עבודת ה' and always seek to contribute to *Yiddishkeit* as much as possible, שלא על מנת לקבל פרס.

¹ Note that the הקדוש של"ה does not discuss the fact that the word תמימות used by Noach is similar to the word תם used by Yaakov Avinu.

A reverse perspective – The שואל as the highest form of עבודת ה'

Outside of the הגדה context, Rav Chaim Cohen *shlit"א*, the *Chalban* (*Parshas Mishpatim*, pp. 238) takes a totally opposite approach to the four שומרים and looks at each through the lens, not in terms of what value they personally extract from עוה"ז, but how they feel about דביקות בה'. This leads to a very different set of conclusions regarding how the שומרים stack up conceptually from the most praiseworthy to the least.

Viewed through this lens, one who approaches עבודת ה' as a שומר חנם moves through life without any enjoyment of תורה ומצוות. He is חנם in his approach to guarding the Torah – totally lacking in any meaningful דביקות בה'. This is not admirable, but quite unfortunate. פיקודי ה' ישרים משמחי לב – we are supposed to enjoy our relationship with Hashem, and conversely we are told that if Klal Yisrael does not serve Hashem happily, we are subject ר"ל to the punishments outline in the תוחכה as the פסוק states: תחת אשר לא עבדת את ה' אלקיך בשמחה ובטוב ללב (Ki Seitzei 28:47). One who moves through the motions unenthusiastically remains far removed from Hashem. He is on the lowest מדרגה.

The שומר ש"ח illustrates a person who learns Torah, but not לשמה. He wants personal benefit from the לימוד תורה such as כבוד. So while technically he approaches עבודת ה' happily and gets some enjoyment from it, which is more than the שומר חנם, because this individual is motivated by the wrong factors, he is clearly far from ideal.

The שוכר is already on a lofty level. He “uses” the חפץ of the Torah properly; in other words, he embraces Torah happily (and even sacrifices for it). While this is a lofty level, it is impaired slightly by the fact that this individual benefits from the fact that he knows he gets a *geshmak* in learning, which is objectively a good thing, but remains one hair-breadth removed from being purely לשמה.

Finally, there is the שואל. To review, in the presentation of the הקדוש ש"ה, the שואל was the רשע who just wanted to extract הנאה from עוה"ז. By contrast, the *Chalban* explains, that viewed from the lens of דביקות בה', the שואל is on the loftiest level. The function of the שואל is to stand in the place of the בעלים (owner) and use each object of עוה"ז, not for his own utility, but rather for the service of Hashem. Yes, he gets enjoyment, but that enjoyment is entirely ancillary to the fact that he is using the object, learning the Torah, purely לשמה.

The *Chalban* records a story of a rebbe on a journey who stopped by an apple tree, made a ברכה and ate an apple. He then told the *chassid* accompanying him that some people make a ברכה so that they may be permitted to eat an apple, while he eats the apple only so that he may bless Hashem. This type of selfless individual

achieves the highest levels of קדושה and is worthy of praise, as the *gemara* in *Pesachim* 119b records that at the *seuda* of Mashiach where the המשומר is served, after the *Avos*, Moshe Rabbeinu and Yehoshua have turned down the opportunity to lead the *bentching*, Dovid HaMelech takes the cup and says כוס ישועות אשא אני - אברך ואני נאה לברך, I will lift the cup and lead the *bentching*, and it is fitting for me to do so. Dovid HaMelech was not being haughty in this statement. Rather, he is reflecting on the fact that his entire life was characterized as total התבטלות to the רצון ה', and such an individual is viewed as praiseworthy in the eyes of Hashem.

Furthermore, along these lines the *Chalban* explains that, while generally a שואל uses an object for his benefit like its owner and is therefore responsible for all damages, there is one situation where even the שואל is פטור from paying the owner, and that is the פטור of עמלו עמו, when the owner was with the שומר at the time the object was damaged. What is the underlying rationale for this פטור? The *Chalban* quotes from the אור החיים הקדוש who explains a similar דין. If someone borrows an animal from הקדש (the המקדש) and the animal gets damaged, the הלכה there too is that he is פטור from paying, and the reason is בעליו עמו, Hashem (the "owner" of the object of הקדש) is Omnipresent, and therefore the פטור of עמלו עמו applies. The *Chalban* refers to this case as שואל בקדושה and explains that when a שואל is truly using the object in a context that suits the owner, he is never held accountable for faulty but purely motivated actions. Similarly, when one approaches ה' עבודה with purity and שמחה, he is surrounded by a halo of קדושה from Hashem and is afforded His protection. Only when one seeks to use the objects of עוה"ז for his own personal benefit can he be held accountable.

May we all be זוכה to approach המצות שמירת שמצוות and שמירת with the utmost zeal, and achieve the altruistic עבודה ה' of the חנם שומר as expressed by the הקדוש של"ה and the pristine דביקות בה' of the שואל as explained by the *Chalban*. And in this זכות, may we be זוכה to attend the סעודת יין המשומר upon the arrival of the גואל צדק, ביאת גואל צדק!
במהרה בימינו!

הרי זה משובח

Yoni Kirschner

Rav Yonasan Sacks, the Rosh Yeshiva of Lander's College for Men, brings down a “famous” question which I thought was כדאי to bring up again and perhaps offer a new answer or two.

During היינו עבדים we quote the interesting הלכה of “וכל המרבה הרי זה משובח”¹. This is very unique. If the point of the quote is to tell us that we should discuss יציאת מצרים until the end of the זמן of מצרים, that's not משובח - that is the עיקר ההלכה! And if the purpose is to tell us that we should go beyond the זמן, why is that משובח? After all, the זמן is over!

The גמרא records that it is אסור to expound on the adjectives describing the attributes of הקב"ה in עשרה שמונה. The גמרא compares one who adds praise towards Hashem to one who offers a tribute of silver to a king who has an endless storehouse of gold. The ריטב"א explains that any additional praise detracts from the overall praise. It limits the praise to words and feelings only mortals comprehend, which Hashem is of course greater than. So why are we allowed to expound at the Seder night but not during תפילה?

The טור answers these questions by explaining that it is אסור to increase the praise of Hashem with adjectives. However, to discuss and reflect on the miracles performed by Hashem - that is משובח. Thus, the הרי זה משובח is not going on the time of the מצוה of מצרים but the aspect of how to appropriately praise Hashem.

The נצי"ב gives a different approach to answer our original question. In fact the praise is that you extend the סיפור beyond the זמן of the חיוב, and this is not בל תוסף because the extra סיפור will attach to the daily חיוב of מצרים. While we normally say one fulfills this חיוב with the recitation of שמע קריאת שמע, one can always do more. It appears the נצי"ב is making a distinction between שבת, like שבת שמנה, where you can't go above and beyond, and שבת about מצרים, which, when latched onto מצרים, allows one to increase the praise.

It is also interesting to note that the next phrase of the הגדה discusses five תנאים who stayed up discussing מצרים until השחר. Of course, this makes sense

¹ It should be noted that the Rambam has a slightly different wording of this phrase. In הל' חמץ ומצה the Rambam states that משובח הרי זה משובח ביציאת מצרים. Although the language is slightly different, the general point and question still remains.

according to Rebbi Akiva, because he held that the זמן of סיפור (along with the זמן of eating the קרבן פסח / אפיקומן) extends until עלות. However, both Rebbi Eliezer and Rebbi Elazar Ben Azarya hold that the זמן ends at חצות. So why did they continue until עלות?

According to the נצי"ב it makes sense, for while the חיוב of מצרים יציאת מצרים expires at midnight, one can always latch onto the מצוה of מצרים יציאת מצרים. But according to the טור, if the whole idea of being מרבה is a דין in the type of praise one gives and there is no requirement or praiseworthy ideal to extend the סיפור beyond the mandated time, why did Rebbi Eliezer and Rebbi Elazar Ben Azarya continue until עלות?

The הגדה goes out of its way to tell us this Seder of the five תנאים occurred in בני ברק. Why would the בעל ההגדה, גמרא, include this detail?

The Steipler Gaon on ברכות answers that בני ברק was the home town of Rebbi Akiva and thus the other rabbis took on his חומרא of the מצוה of מצרים יציאת מצרים lasting until עלות.

The Seder is a time when many family members with different backgrounds join together. We should all be זוכה to a Seder in which everyone appreciates the חומרה and outlook of everyone else, and this mutual respect and appreciation should help us in rebuilding the בית המקדש and bringing the ultimate גאולה במהרה בימינו.

The Mitzva of *Heseiba* and *Daled Kosos*

Rabbi Yosef Friedler

There are two famous חקירות regarding the סדר פסח סדר that are discussed by the ד' בריסקר רב and seemingly present a contradiction.¹

#1 חסיבה - חקירה

The first חקירה regards the מצוה of חסיבה. The ד' בריסקר רב presents the following two possible understandings of how the mechanics of the מצוה work. One way to understand the מצוה of חסיבה is that just as the רבנן were מתקן many מצוות for the סדר that are meant to help us feel like בני חורין, so too they were מתקן a separate מצוה to lean during the סדר and act like בני חורין. Now, חז"ל clarified that since the point of leaning is to show חירות, the ideal time to do this מצוה is while you eat the מצה and while you drink כוסות ד', since these מצוות represent חירות. However, חסיבה is really a completely separate מצוה, not part of the מצוה of מצה and כוסות ד'.

The second understanding is that חסיבה is not a separate מצוה unto itself, but rather it is a חלק of the מצוה of מצה and a חלק of the מצוה of כוסות ד'. Just like there are many הלכות dictating how one eats מצה, such as what grain it must come from and how much one must eat to be יוצא, so too there is a הלכה that one must lean while eating מצה. And the same goes for the מצוה of כוסות ד'. The same way there are הלכות about how one drinks the wine and the amount of wine that needs to be drunk, so too, there is a הלכה that one must lean while drinking כוסות ד'.

The ד' בריסקר רב explains that the רמב"ם who says that if one leans during שולחן ערוך, it is משובח, הרי זה משובח, must hold that חסיבה is a separate מצוה. This is because if leaning is a הלכה in how one must eat his מצה and how one must drink his כוסות ד', why is it praiseworthy for him to lean by שולחן ערוך? What does leaning have to do with שולחן ערוך, if it's a condition how the רבנן felt we should perform the מצוה of מצה and כוסות ד'? It must be that חסיבה is a מצוה by itself. Ideally the time to do that is by מצה and כוסות ד', but the more one leans the more he is involving himself in this מצוה of חסיבה to show חירות. Therefore, it's praiseworthy to lean by שולחן ערוך as well.

However תוספות and the רא"ש seem to hold the opposite and say that חסיבה is a

¹ See stencil from the Griz, quoted in the הגדה מבית לוי.

of how one eats מצה and drinks ד' כוסות. These ראשונים say that if one forgot to lean while eating מצה and drinking ד' כוסות, you may have to go back and perform the מצוה again while leaning. If leaning was a מצוה by itself, what would be the point of eating another מצוה of כזית מצה when one forgot to lean, if the מצוה of מצה was completely fulfilled? Only if you hold that תנאי is a הסיבה in the מצוה of מצה would it make sense to say that this condition is מעכב in the מצוה and when one forgets to fulfill the condition, he was not יוצא the מצוה properly and therefore must redo the מצוה.

שתיית ד' כוסות – חקירה # 2

Now let us move on to the second חקירה. The בריסקר רב also explains two understandings in the מצוה of ד' כוסות. The first way to understand this מצוה of ד' כוסות is simply that there is a מצוה to **drink** four cups of wine as a sign of חירות. This approach can be seen in the לשון of the רמב"ם of ד' כוסות - *a person is obligated to 'drink' four cups of wine*. The act of drinking is the key.

This is in contrast to the second approach illustrated by the מצוה of קידוש on רב חיים and יום טוב, where the מצוה is **not** to 'drink' a cup of wine, but rather as רב חיים שבת מקדש the מצוה is to make the ברכה on a כוס. The מצוה is to be מקדש the שבת with דיבור. As a matter of fact, according to most ראשונים the מצוה דאורייתא is merely to say the words and there is no requirement to have a cup of wine. The רבנן were מתקן that this קידוש should be said on a כוס של יין. The reason we drink the wine after is because of a צריך שיטעום of דין, the המברך צריך שיטעום, one who makes a ברכה on a cup of wine must drink the wine. מסכת עירובין in רש"י goes so far as to say that the reason for this הלכה is because it's a בזיון to the כוס that a ברכה was made on it and it should be left undrunk. Clearly this indicates that the essence of the מצוה is not to drink the cup of wine, but rather to make the ברכה and be מקדש את השבת over a cup of wine.

There would be a huge נפקא מינה between ד' כוסות and שבת on קידוש. By שבת on קידוש clearly one could be מוציא others in the מצוה, as we all do. This works because of שומע כעונה. Since the מצוה is the words, through שומע כעונה one can be יוצא as though he said the קידוש. However, when it comes to ד' כוסות, since the מצוה is to drink the wine, one would not be able to מוציא others in this מצוה, just as one cannot be מוציא others in eating מצה or מרור.

Since תוספות and the רא"ש consider the option of the בעל הבית being מוציא his family in ד' כוסות, and compare it to קידוש, it would be clear, says the בריסקר רב, that they hold that the מצוה of ד' כוסות is indeed like קידוש where the essence of the מצוה is make the ברכות on כוס של יין. The fact that we drink the wine is only an after effect because of the הלכה of צריך שיטעום.

The apparent סתירה

Now if we were to take a step back and look at these explanations of these two מצוות, namely הסיבה and ד' כוסות, we would see a סתירה in the understanding of תוספות. If the מצוה of ד' כוסות is only to make a ברכה, how can there be a תנאי לעיכובא that the wine must be drunk בהסיבה? The drinking of the wine is not even really part of the מצוה! It would make sense if you said that הסיבה is a completely separate מצוה. Therefore one can understand that חז"ל made a מצוה to lean throughout the סדר to show חירות, and since we are going to drink wine anyway, that is an ideal time to lean, as drinking wine while leaning certainly shows חירות. However, to say that it's a תנאי in how to perform the מצוה of ד' כוסות, and the whole מצוה is to make the ברכה over a cup of wine, with the drinking only a side point because of שיטעום, and yet at the same time there is a תנאי that the wine must be drunk בהסיבה as a sign of חרות, seems very difficult to comprehend!

Chinuch Lessons from the Four Sons

Rabbi Yosef Friedler

The פסוק in בא פרשת says לכם מה העבודה הזאת לכם (when you enter ארץ ישראל, and begin to do the פסח), *when your son will say to you ‘What is this service to you?’*

רש"י tells us that this is the question of the רשע who asks in a disrespectful way, and excludes himself from the “service” that he talks about. We all know that the הגדה tells us to respond to the רשע by ‘knocking out his teeth’ and telling him that if he were there in מצרים he would not be redeemed.

This is very difficult to understand, as the כלי יקר asks, the תורה does not give this answer. The תורה says: ...ואמרתם זבח פסח הוא לה' אשר פסח... And you will say (to your son who asked the question) that it's a קרבן פסח for Hashem, and the פסוק goes on to explain the reason why we bring the פסח. Seemingly the תורה tells us to answer with patience and explain to the child nicely. Why then, does the הגדה tell us to react very harshly?

Perhaps we can answer this question with a *mashal*. A *rebbe* is teaching the *gemara* to the class, and hands out a worksheet that goes through the steps of the *gemara* in detail. A boy receives the sheet, and diligently takes out a pencil, begins to read each question carefully and tries to answer the questions. He begins to look in the *gemara* for the answer, and then back at the sheet to reread the question. He sighs heavily and goes to the next question. Once again, he looks at the *gemara* for the answer and sighs heavily. In frustration, he picks up the worksheet, tears it to shreds and says “Why do we have to do this ridiculous sheet!?” There is silence in the room. How should the *rebbe* react? Can he allow such disrespect to take place in his classroom? A good *rebbe*, will see that the boy is clearly frustrated and overwhelmed, and does not mean to be *chutzpadik*. Of course, later, when the boy is calm, he'll explain why that's wrong and that even out of frustration, one cannot speak that way. But for now, he'll put his arm around him and say “Come, let me explain this *gemara* to you. Let's see where you're having difficulty.”

However, let's say for example, another boy comes into class late, without a *gemara*, plops down in his seat, and sees the worksheet. Without a moment's glance at the contents of the sheet, he tears it up and says “Why do we have to

do this ridiculous sheet!?” How does the *rebbe* react to this boy? He is clearly not overwhelmed. Here, there seems to be a serious lack of respect for the *rebbe*, for the class, and for the *gemara* too!

The Torah is speaking about when you come to ארץ ישראל and bring a קרבן פסח. Imagine the scene. Thousands and thousands of people are coming with their קרבנות. The משנה tells us about the rivers of blood and the hundreds of כהנים that were doing the עבודה. It was probably a very overwhelming scene. A child, out of frustration and confusion, says “What’s this עבודה to you?” Yes, he calls it “עבודה” and yes, he says *to you*. Perhaps there is a tone of disrespect too. But the Torah sees that it’s out of frustration and confusion, not out of disrespect. For this child the Torah says to answer patiently and say 'זבח פסח הוא לה' - explain exactly what we’re doing and why we’re doing it.

However, the הגדה, written generations after the בית המקדש is destroyed, is describing the various questions the sons ask by the סדר. While we’re talking about יציאת מצרים and how the *Yiddin* brought the קרבן פסח, one child, sitting in his comfortable chair, says “what’s this עבודה to you?” Perhaps he highlights the word עבודה, and certainly stresses the word לכם, excluding himself from the ציבור. This child is not overwhelmed or confused. He’s angry. Angry at Hashem. Angry at His Torah. And angry at his מצוות. For this child, the הגדה tells us to knock out his teeth and deal with him harshly.

With this we can answer another very famous question on the הגדה. Why do we chastise the רשע for saying the word לכם, while the חכם also says the word “אתכם” which also seems to be excluding himself? Perhaps the answer to this is also that it all depends on the context in which the question is asked. The חכם’s question is found in פרשת ואתחנן, as opposed to all the other three sons, whose questions are found in פרשת בא. Their questions are an emotional response to the מצוה, whereas the חכם’s question is a question in learning. The פסוקים over there are talking about various מצוה that will take place when we come to ארץ ישראל. There, the Torah tells us that your child will ask you “מה העדות והחוקים והמשפטים.” He wants to understand the details of the מצוה. He wants to understand all the intricacies, just like all the new מצוות he now begins to do in ארץ ישראל. Yes, he says the word אתכם, but we can clearly tell that he does not mean to exclude himself.

Perhaps with this we can also understand the choice of location the Torah uses to ask the question of the תם. His question is at the end of פרשת בא, right after the Torah tells us about the מצוה of פטר חמור and פדיון הבן. The תם is not overwhelmed by the קרבן פסח, nor is he asking about all the details and הלכות. He is bothered by the idea of the first born having a special קדושה. He is a simple son. He has a

difficult time understanding the idea that something has קדושה, a level of holiness. His question too is answered by looking with the proper perspective.

This idea of having the proper perspective when it comes to *chinuch* is so important. Often we compare one child to another or one situation to another, without taking the full picture into account.

There is a story told of a boy who was walking out to recess after all the boys left the room, and he saw a beautiful watch on another boy's desk. He had a real urge to have that watch, and he took the watch for himself. After recess the owner of the watch realized that his watch was missing, and told the *rebbe* that someone stole his watch. The *rebbe* wanted to get the watch back for the boy, but didn't want to embarrass the boy who took it either. The *rebbe* asked the boys to line up against the wall, to face the wall with their hands up. He went to each boy and checked their pockets. After all the pockets were checked, all the boys sat down, and the *rebbe* took out the watch and returned it to the proper owner. He did not mention who took it, nor did he approach that boy, as not to embarrass him. Many years later, the boy who took the watch told over this story. He said "I was so embarrassed that I stole, and was petrified that the *rebbe* would catch me. I was sure that I would be caught red-handed, and forever be hated by my classmates. To my utter surprise, my *rebbe* said nothing. I saw how much he cared about me and how he made sure that I would not get embarrassed. From that point on, I decided that I wanted to be like that *rebbe*!"

While this is an inspiring story, and there is certainly what to learn from it, it cannot be applied to every situation. There was once a boy who stole, and based on many details, he was told that he needs a different program, because the yeshiva couldn't help him with his personal challenges. The parents were obviously infuriated, claiming "How can a yeshiva throw a boy out to the streets like that?" Other *mechanchim* as well, only hearing this one detail that a boy stole and was being thrown out of yeshiva, were surprised and upset. However, if the proper perspective would have been taken, seeing all the details of the situation, they would have understood. Unfortunately, the boy did not get the help he needed and the issues came out in a much more pronounced way later on.

There is a famous *mechanech* that spoke by a convention and claimed "What right does a *rebbe* have to give a child a "-" on a report card? He is handing him a death sentence! He's telling him he's a failure!" Again, while his point is well taken, and there certainly is truth to the fact that a *rebbe* has tremendous power when he marks a report card, and sometimes giving a boy the confidence and the extra boost is what's needed to get him through a difficult period so that he can go on to

shteig afterwards. But there often is so much more to it.

There was once a boy in a *rebbe's* class who was failing at everything. He really was not doing well, and lacked the skills to succeed in a mainstream classroom. The yeshiva had a meeting with his parents and told them that perhaps the boy should find a program that can help him on his level. The parents refused to put him in a special program. When it came to marking report cards, he earned a "ד" in almost every single area. It was so difficult to give ד after ד and crush the kid and his parents. So he called his *menahel* and said that he simply didn't have the heart to grade the report card honestly. The *menahel* responded "at the very least call the parents and tell them that the grades are not really accurate." So the *rebbe* called the mother and said "You know, we had a meeting about your son, and he really didn't accomplish much in class, so I'm not going to give the real grades because I feel it'll crush him, and it's not his fault. He really can't do much better. I'll only give the poor grade in an area that I feel he can really do better like *tefilla*." The mother responded "Okay, but my husband might really think that he's not doing so poorly..." The *rebbe* hung up the phone and decided that he must give honest grades, one ד after another. The next day, the husband called the yeshiva and said that he did not realize how bad the situation was, and he and his wife are strongly considering putting him in a program that will help him on his level. The next year he went to a more suitable program. Did the ד give him death sentence? Or did it prevent a boy from sitting in a classroom year after year not understanding one word and feeling like a total failure, which usually turns into frustration then resentment?

Chinuch is a complete picture as it says in the פסוק - פסוק דרכו - פסוק דרכו.

Heseiba: When We Don't Lean Left

Rabbi Avi Weber

From the moment we clean off our Purim *seudos*, we immediately begin anticipating the exciting, yet overwhelming *chag* of Pesach. After weeks of preparation, we begin this *Yuntif* almost identically to any other *Yuntif* throughout the year, with kiddush. Yet instantly, we are struck with one of the numerous distinctions found between Pesach and other Yomim Tovim, specifically, הסיבה, the requirement of leaning, throughout the Seder night. The *gemara* in Pesachim 108a states the following:

איתמר מצה צריך הסיבה מרור אין צריך הסיבה יין, איתמר משמיה דרב נחמן צריך הסיבה, ואיתמר משמיה דרב נחמן אין צריך הסיבה, ולא פליגי, הא בתרתי כסי קמאי הא בתרתי כסי בתראי. אמרי לה להאי גיסא, ואמרי לה להאי גיסא, תרי כסי קמאי בעו הסיבה דהשתא הוא דקא מתחלא לה חירות, תרי כסי בתראי לא בעו הסיבה מאי דהוה הוה. ואמרי לה להאי גיסא, אדרבה תרי כסי בתראי בעו הסיבה ההיא שעתא דקא הויה חירות, תרי כסי קמאי לא בעו הסיבה דאכתי עבדים היינו קאמה השתא דאיתמר הכי ואיתמר הכי אידי ואידי בעו הסיבה.

When it comes to leaning by the כוסות ד', there is a debate regarding which cups require one to lean. Both opinions are brought down in the name of R' Nachman. According to the first approach, we are only required to lean by the first two cups since it is at this point we begin the "freedom process." By the last two cups, however, leaning is no longer necessary since we are already free people and what occurred is already a thing of the past. According to the second approach, it is only when we get to the last two cups does one have a requirement to lean. The reason is that only at this point of the Seder are we actually free. Prior to this point we are still considered slaves and leaning during these cups would be meaningless. The *gemara* concludes that both approaches contain valid arguments and therefore we are required to lean by all four cups.

The Ran¹ is bothered by the conclusion of the *gemara* regarding our common practice of leaning by all four cups. Why, specifically here, in a case of a ספק דרבנן do we rule strictly and require everyone to lean by all four cups? In general, we

1 כג. בדפי הר"ף ד"ה "והשתא"

follow the famous rule of *לְקוּלָא דְרַבְנָא*, when in doubt of a law of rabbinic nature, we rule leniently. It is critical for us to understand why this law does not take precedence in this case as well.

The Ran provides two possible approaches in understanding this dilemma. He brings down an idea based on Chazal that since there is no real added trouble in requiring one to lean by two extra cups, we may as well require it (רווחא מלחא). Meaning, given the fact there are two compelling reasons for each approach, we may as well incorporate both into our requirements on Seder night. The Ran himself reasons that if we were to go with the classic ruling of *לְקוּלָא* here, the result would be to uproot the concept of leaning altogether. We would, in essence, rule leniently by each approach which would in turn, cause us to not lean by either cup. That, says the Ran, is not a viable option which forces us to go with the alternative which is to lean by all four.

The *Shiltei Giborim*² asserts that when there is a debate between two Tanaaim, we are able to say *לְקוּלָא דְרַבְנָא*. However, if the debate is merely based on recalling what one person actually said, we cannot apply *לְקוּלָא דְרַבְנָא*. In such a case, we must be stringent with both possibilities even if the law is rabbinic in nature. Hence, in our case, where the debate is focused on what R' Nachman himself said, we must be stringent and do not apply *לְקוּלָא דְרַבְנָא*.

Rav Yonason Sacks in his *הגדה של פסח*³ cites the opinion of Rav Ovadia Yosef זצ"ל who takes a separate approach. Rav Ovadia brings a proof from *Birchos HaTorah* that there are times when we incorporate multiple opinions into common practice, not as a result of *לְקוּלָא דְרַבְנָא*, but rather as definitive rulings (מתורת ודאי). For instance, the *gemara* in *Brachos 11a* brings down a variety of opinions as to which bracha one is required to make for *Birchos HaTorah*. The *gemara* concludes, "Therefore, one should say all of them." Why do we not follow a similar rule of *לְקוּלָא דְרַבְנָא*? Rather, says Rav Sacks, if we say that the *gemara's* conclusion is a result of definitive rulings, meaning, that we include multiple opinions because these are definitive, not because we are in a state of doubt, everything makes sense. Therefore, when it comes to *הסיבה* as well, if we say that our *gemara* in *Pesachim* is a result of a *ודאי* and not a *ספק*, we do not encounter the difficulty of *לְקוּלָא דְרַבְנָא*.

Finally, the *Beis HaLevi* argues that in a case of a *ספק*, if both possibilities contain within it both a *חומרא* and a *קולא*, we do not apply *לְקוּלָא דְרַבְנָא*. Therefore, in regards to *הסיבה*, since both possible approaches of R' Nachman's opinion contain within it both a stringency as well as a leniency, in such a case we would follow

2 על המרדכי ע"ז ד:י

3 דף פד

the more strict option of each approach. Therefore, we lean by the first two cups because of the first approach and the last two cups because of the second.

The Ramban⁴ discusses why the very first of the *Aseres HaDibros* begins with “I am Hashem your G-d that took you out of Egypt from the house of slavery...” For what purpose does G-d need to mention in His introduction to His people that He was the one Who took us out of Egypt? Were His direct words not enough of a reason to convince His people to believe in Him? The Ramban explains that first we needed to accept G-d’s dominion before we can even begin to accept His decrees. Once we have solidified G-d as our ruler, only then can we accept upon ourselves His mitzvos. The reason, says the Ramban, why we accept G-d as our King is because He took us out of slavery in Egypt. This “acceptance,” which is a product of our appreciation to G-d for what He did for us, becomes the basis for all future fulfillment of mitzvos that will soon be decreed. What evolves from this idea is that the basis for all six hundred and thirteen mitzvos is יציאת מצרים and the entire episode of יציאת מצרים was orchestrated simply to convey to us the concept of *Hakaras HaTov*.⁵ *Hakaras HaTov* becomes the very essence of all קבלת עול תורה ומצוות.

The inherent difficulty that many of us face is obvious. How is it possible for us to acquire sincere appreciation for what G-d did for the Jews in Egypt? How can this possibly be the basis of my belief if I was not even physically present? The answer, of course, is the Seder. It is through the Seder that we not only retell but re-live the story of יציאת מצרים. It is through the Seder and all of its nuances that we are able to experience יציאת מצרים on a psychological, emotional and spiritual level, “כאילו הוא יצא ממצרים.” All of the unique *halachos* and *minhagim* that we observe over the course of Seder night are intended to achieve one common goal; to re-live יציאת מצרים.⁶

If we understand the critical role יציאת מצרים plays in our core beliefs and overall adherence to *halacha*, we can begin to appreciate the emphasis placed on internalizing the concept of *Hakaras HaTov*. If Seder night is the tool used to acquire *Hakaras HaTov*, it is quite understandable why we do not rely on any leniencies. We are never *meikel* when it comes to *Hakaras HaTov*; hence, ספיקא לקולא is not applicable. Even in a case of potential doubt, when one could theoretically rationalize why *Hakaras Hatov* is not a requirement per se, we err

4 שמות כ:ב

5 שפתי חיים חלק ב' דפ רעד

6 שם רפה

on the side of caution and exhibit *Hakaras HaTov* to the fullest extent. Regardless of which answer best satisfies the question of the Ran, we lean by all four cups to deepen our appreciation for what Hashem did for us during *יציאת מצרים*. We hold ourselves to a higher standard of *Hakaras HaTov* on this night and hope that it will continue to spill over into all areas of our *Avodas Hashem*.

Maaseh B'Rebbi Eliezer

Chaim Stern

In the פסח של הגדה it says the following:

מעשה בר"א ור"י ורבי אליעזר בן עזריה ורבי טרפון ורבי עקיבא שהיו מסובין בבני ברק והיו מספרים ביציאת מצרים כל אותו הלילה עד שבאו תלמידים...

There was a story with all of the above mentioned, they were sitting in ב"ב relating the story of מצרים throughout the night until their students came and told them that it is the time to recite the morning שמע. The הגדה then continues and quotes the *mishna* in ברכות:

אמר רבי אלעזר בן עזריה: הרי אני כבן שבעים שנה, ולא זכיתי שתיאמר יציאת מצרים בלילות, עד שדרשה בן זומא...

The opinion of ר"א is that there is a מצוה to mention the third פרשה of שמע every night of the year, while the חכמים disagree. ר"א said, "I did not win the debate of whether one should mention nightly the third פרשה of שמע until זומא בן זומא came and taught it through חי"ך, ימי חי"ך, ימי חי"ך. כל ימי חי"ך הלילות.

I would like to pose 3 questions on the הגדה:

1) This last paragraph is a discussion that relates to every night of the year, not limited to ליל הסדר, so why did the author of the פסח find it necessary to include it ליל הסדר? It's clearly not something that took place specifically on פסח?

2) Why did ר"א argue with the חכמים without having any source?

3) In general, is there a connection to these two paragraphs? One being the story that happened in בני ברק and two being the הלכה of שמע at night?

Besides for the הלכה that we mention יציאת מצרים every night of the year (like ר"א), there is an additional הלכה that at מעריב we are לתפלה, which means we say שמע with the ברכות of ק"ש - גאולה and immediately following without any interruption we תפילה עשרה - דאבנ.

The גמ' says that ר' יוחנן holds that מעריב requires לתפלה because there was a גאולה at night. In order to explain what the גמ' means, רעקיא, in his glosses, references a מחלוקת תנאים in the גמ' in דף ט' about the deadline of eating the פסח. The פסוק says ואכלתם בידכם ומקלכם בידכם ואכלתם פסוק. The פסח קרבן פסח. אותו תאכלו אותו מתנינים חגרים ונעליכם ברגליכם ומקלכם בידכם ואכלתם פסוק. The פסח קרבן פסח. אותו תאכלו אותו מתנינים חגרים ונעליכם ברגליכם ומקלכם בידכם ואכלתם פסוק. Chazal understood this to mean to require eating the פסח קרבן פסח in a haste. ר"א says this means the פסח קרבן פסח must be eaten by midnight because

One possible answer is that although we only worked for two hundred and ten years, we satisfied the debt of four hundred by working extra hard with pain. Another possible answer is given by מקובלים that we actually are to pay off the years left in מצרים גאולה. The symbolism of leaving at night is that although we left, there is still darkness, the remaining years of our גלות.

This ties back to what we had said earlier with עקיבא ר' ע"ר. According to ר' עקיבא, who holds the עיקור גאולה was at night (midnight), this would be consistent with the מקובלים that said we are still in גלות and we are making up the one hundred and ninety years, and according to ר' עקיבא, who holds the עיקור גאולה was by day, it would be consistent with the מדרש that גאולה מצרים was complete because of the hard labor.

In מדרש רבה שמות it says the following:

בעולם הזה עושה לו ניסים בלילה על שם שהו עובר אבל בעולם הבא עושה להם ניסים ביום על שם שהוא נס קיים.

שבועות

Shavuos: The Prerequisites to Kaballas HaTorah

Moshe Bollag

The night of Shavuos is the most elevated and exalted of all nights of the year. The *Pri Etz Chaim* of the Arizal tells us that a person's entire direction in life is tied to this evening. As all things in Torah are eternal, the giving of the Torah is a permanent fixture on the calendar. Each and every year we, both as a *klal* and individually, receive the Torah on the sixth day of Sivan. Therefore, as we prepare to celebrate *Z'man Matan Toraseinu*, it is apropos to focus on some of the prerequisites to *Kaballas Hatorah*.

*Hakaras Hatov*¹

In describing the scene between Moshe and the *malachim* at the time Moshe ascended to the heavens to receive the Torah, the *midrash* (*Shemos Rabba* 28:1) explains that the *malachim* wanted to prevent the giving of the Torah to Moshe. In order to stop the *malachim* and allow the Torah to be given to *Klal Yisrael*, Hashem changed Moshe's countenance to that of Avraham's. Hashem then said to the *malachim* "Aren't you embarrassed? Isn't his [Avraham's] home the one you went down to and ate in?" The *midrash* concludes by stating that Hashem told Moshe that the Torah was only given in the *z'chus* of Avraham Avinu.

Rav Eliyahu Dessler asks why the *malachim* had a problem with Moshe receiving the Torah, and answers that *malachim* have no *bechira*, and therefore the idea of not fulfilling Hashem's will is completely anathema to them. They could not comprehend that man has an ability to overcome his *yetzer horah* and grow. All the *malachim* saw was the possibility of *chillul Hashem* and therefore they felt they needed to prevent Moshe from receiving the Torah.

This begs the obvious question of what exactly was Hashem doing by changing Moshe's appearance, and more pointedly, why specifically to Avraham Avinu? Looking back at the *midrash*, we see that Hashem was telling the *malachim* that since they ate in Avraham's house, they now owed him some level of *hakaras hatov*. However, in explaining the *maase* in the beginning of *Parshas Vayeira*, when Avraham greeted the *malachim*, the *midrash* (*Bereishis Rabba* 48:14) states

¹ Adopted from a *shiur* given by Josh Brody.

that the *malachim* only appeared as if they were eating. *Malachim*, being purely spiritual, are incapable of having any enjoyment from the physical and therefore the concept of actually eating is foreign to them. If so, Avraham didn't actually even do anything for the *malachim*, so why then did they owe him *hakaras hatov* at all?

Rabbi Chaim Friedlander, in his sefer *Sifsei Chaim*, explains the *midrash* as follows. Before Avraham fulfilled the mitzva of *hachnosas orchim*, the *malachim* were on a higher *madreiga* than humans, but afterwards Avraham was higher. At the moment when Avraham fulfilled this mitzva two things occurred. Firstly, the *malachim* saw the *mesiras nefesh* that Avraham put into the mitzva of *hachnasas orchim*. Even though he had just had the *bris mila*, and he had plenty of servants who could have performed the physical aspects of the mitzva, he performed it himself. After witnessing this the *malachim* understood the idea that man could elevate himself to a level higher than a *malach*. Secondly, they also realized that when Avraham utilized them in the performance of this mitzva, the spiritual greatness of the *malachim* themselves was automatically increased.

The *gemara* in *Chullin* 91b explains that *malachim* are only able to sing *shira* to Hashem in the *z'chus* of *Klal Yisrael*. Furthermore, the *midrash* (*Bereishis Rabba* 68:12) states an opinion that when relaying the instance of the ladder in Yaakov's dream the *malachim* were only going up and down in relation to Yaakov's *madreiga*. When you combine these concepts, it is clear that a *malach's* spiritual level is tied to *Klal Yisrael's* Torah observance. Fundamentally, since man is the focal point of creation, the sole purpose of a *malach* (which is derived from the same root as the word *shaliach*) is to aid man in his service of Hashem. If utilized properly, the *malachim* themselves also have a spiritual *aliya*.

Now we understand why the *malachim* owed Avraham *hakaras hatov* - not for the actual food that was served, but rather, for elevating their spiritual status. On their own, *malachim* are static and unchanging in their level of *ruchniyus*, but by utilizing them as a tool in his *avodas Hashem*, Avraham was the causative factor in them having an *aliya*. Therefore, even though they may have had valid reasons as to why the Torah should not be given to Moshe, Hashem reminded them that due to their *hakaras hatov* they should have for man, the *malachim* don't even have the ability to make an argument to prevent the giving of the Torah. Hashem changed Moshe's face to look like Avraham not to fool the *malachim*, but to enlighten them to man's ability to grow in his own *ruchniyus* and raise others in the process, thereby revealing to them the *hakaras hatov* that is owed to mankind.

The concept that the Torah was given through *hakaras hatov* is quite profound.

Hashem specifically wanted to show Moshe that the entirety of *Kaballas HaTorah* is wrapped up in *hakaras hatov* and without it, one cannot be *mekabel* the Torah.

There is a famous question asked with regard to the first of the *Aseres Hadisbros*; why does the first *dibra* mention *Yetzias Mitrayim* and not the creation of the world? There are myriad reasons given, but I'd like to suggest, based on the previously mentioned *pshat*, the reason is to highlight the *hakaras hatov* that we need to have to Hashem for taking us out of *Mitzrayim*, and that without *hakaras hatov* we would be unable to accept Hashem's kingship over us.

Rabbi Noach Weinberg in his book '*What the Angels Taught You*' expands on this idea and explains that Hashem does not need anything from us. There is no way for human beings to possibly repay Hashem for anything he has given us, the only thing we can do is be *makir tov*. The entire purpose of creation was to instill in humans the concept of *hakaras hatov*. The basic understanding of *hakaras hatov* is if someone does something for you, you should be thankful. However, the concept is actually so much greater! When we show gratitude it actually makes us better by shifting our focus from what we don't have to what we do.

This concept of *hakaras hatov* manifests itself on the Yom Tov of Shavuos, with the obligation to bring *bikkurim* during the times of the *Beis Hamikdash*. The mitzva of *bikkurim* does not just consist of bringing the first fruits to the *kohen*. There is also a specific *tefilla* that must be said, in which the farmer recites a portion of Jewish history and ends with praise to Hashem for taking us out of *Mitzrayim*. The *Alshich HaKadosh* notes on the *midrash* which interprets the opening words of the Torah "*Bereishis barah*" as meaning homiletically "the world was created for those things which are called *reishis*". The *midrash* goes on to show that Israel, Torah, and *bikkurim* are all called *reishis*, and therefore it may be said that the entire world was created for the sake of Israel, Torah, and *bikkurim*. The *Alshich* expands on this and states that at the time of harvest we need to be grateful, and recognizing the need to express gratitude is fundamental to being a decent human being. At a time where we reflect on all we have, we say thank you and, with true *simcha*, we bring the *bikkurim* to the *Beis Hamikdash*.

Shavuos, the time when we re-receive the Torah each year, is the time for us to stop, reflect and be *makir* to Hashem all that we are grateful for.

Chessed

The *gemara* in *Shabbos* 88b describes in greater detail the *malachim's* complaints and Moshe's responses. The *malachim* asked how Hashem could possibly give the gift that existed 974 generations prior to the creation of the world to a *basar v'dam*,

and Moshe responded by pointedly asking regarding what was contained in the Torah and whether specific examples related to the *malachim*.

Rabbi Chaim Friedlander elucidates on this and explains that the *malachim* were primarily stating, “Since Torah is *ruchnius* and not *gashmiyus*, it belongs in the heavens and not on earth. If man wants Torah, Hashem should not send Torah down to man but rather man must raise himself up.” In fact, that is exactly what the *Avos* did. *Bereishis Rabba* states that Avraham worked on himself to such a great degree that his own physical body embodied the Torah and he became completely *ruchani*. That is why the Torah states that when performing the *Akeida* Avraham had to “send his hand”, as his hand was incapable of doing anything that is anti the will of Hashem.

However, a Torah in the heavens is not what Hashem wants. Hashem’s desire is to place the Torah into the hands of man, the world of physicality, thereby allowing a person to do *mitzvos* which would help man grow in *ruchniyus*. Hashem’s desire is for one to utilize the Torah and the *mitzvos* in order to raise oneself up and be *davuk* to the *Shechina*. This is why the Torah must be readily accessible to man in *Olam HaZeh*.

Yet, there is a catch. Torah and *mitzvos* will only help us grow if our observance is *lshma*. If it is not *lshma* then we cannot achieve the highest level of *ruchniyus*. The *gemara* in *Pesachim* 50b tells us that only when a *ma’asa mitzva* is done for the sake of giving *nachas* to Hashem can you reach the level of *me’al hashamayim*. Without it, we only get *ad lshamayim*, meaning your growth is limited on some level to that of a physical nature and never reaches complete spirituality. The *malachim* questioned how it is possible for a human being, with all of his physicality and desires, living in a physical world, to observe the *Torah lshma*. Hashem’s response was that the Torah was only given in the *z’chus* of Avraham, as Avraham was the manifestation of being *oved Hashem lshma*.

Avraham is referred to in the Torah as both an *adam*, the root of which is *adama*, and an *anak*, a giant. We know that Adam Harishon had a unique ability to look at any creation and understand its essence and purpose in the world and utilized his gift to name every creation. Yet we see that he named himself “*Adam*” which represents the lowest and most physical aspect of man. One would think that basing his name on the lowest aspect of man would be a mistake, and rather he should have focused on the *neshama*, the loftiest part of man. Why did he do this? Rabbi Chaim Friedlander explains that Adam recognized the true purpose of man, to use his physicality and all the *gashmiyus* in the world and elevate them to *ruchniyus*! This is why man, in some respects, is in fact greater than a *malach*; only man has the ability to turn *gashmiyus* into *ruchniyus*.

The *Avos* mastered this as they purified their actions, making themselves into vessels capable of embodying the *Shechina*. Avraham accomplished this by using his *midas hachessed*. He showed the world, for the first time, how to take physicality and turn it into spirituality. This explains why Avraham is called both *adam* and an *anak*. When feeding the *malachim*, he took the physical and through *chessed* elevated it to the spiritual.

This clarifies Hashem's answer to the *malachim's* question of how man, in a world of *gashmiyus*, can reach a level of *ruchniyus*; how can a physical being do things *l'shma*? Hashem responded, "look at Avraham. By utilizing *chessed*, using *gashmiyus* not for yourself, but for others, you pull yourself out of the *gashmiyus* and actually transform it into *ruchniyus*." Once one is able to remove the selfish motivations, one is able to act purely *l'shma*.

Thus, man's ability to elevate *gashmiyus* to *ruchniyus* through the *midda* of *chessed* is one of the causative factors in man's worthiness to receive the Torah.

*Bitul*²

There's a basic tenet that *yetzias Mizrayim* took place through an *isarusa de-le'ela*. All of its elements were accomplished completely by Hashem. Even the spiritual elevation which *Klal Yisrael* needed in order to leave *Mizrayim* was engineered solely by Hashem. However, being *mekabel* the Torah required an *isarusa de-lesasa*, some level of *z'chus/effort* by *Klal Yisrael* themselves. What could this have been? What did *Klal Yisrael* need to do to prepare themselves to accept the Torah and to become *Am Yisrael*, the Jewish nation?

Every Pesach we sing *Dayeinu* in which we declare that there would be grounds to thank Hashem had He only brought us to *Har Sinai*, even had He not followed by giving *Klal Yisrael* the Torah. By way of explanation, we learn that Adam's first sin introduced an essential corruption of the human spirit, and that *Klal Yisrael's* gathering at *Har Sinai* rectified it. Therefore, had we not received the Torah, merely the retroactive removal of this corruption would have been sufficient cause for *Klal Yisrael* to thank Hashem for bringing them to *Har Sinai*. Our question is deepened. What exactly did *Klal Yisrael* do at *Har Sinai* that they succeeded in ridding themselves of this corruption?

The *gemara* in *Shabbos* 88a explains that when *Klal Yisrael* pledged "*Na'ase V'Nishma*," six hundred thousand *malachim* descended, and placed two crowns on each Jew's head, one for each of the two phrases. *Chazal* also report that a heavenly voice called out, "Who revealed this great secret to my children, a secret ordinarily used by the *malachim* themselves!"

² Adopted from a *shiur* by R' Yitzchak Adlerstein on the *Nesivos Shalom*.

The preceding of “we will do” to “we will listen” was in and of itself the necessary preparation and precursor for *Kaballas HaTorah*. The mindset behind this declaration was *hisbatlus*-negating the sense of self in the presence of Hashem. For *Klal Yisrael* to speak it with conviction required complete self-negation to the presence of Hashem. Each Jew who answered in this way, promised to perform Hashem’s will without any precondition. No one predicated his acceptance upon finding Torah reasonable or emotionally and spiritually fulfilling. They would all perform, simply because Hashem asked them to.

This is no small achievement. In fact, it is the highest form of serving Him. At *Har Sinai*, *Klal Yisrael* was able to feel a sense of relative nothingness in the presence of Hashem. By becoming nothing they could attach themselves fully to Hashem. In *hilchos tumah v'tahara*, something which is fully attached to the *tahor* will becomes *tahor*. Therefore, by attaching themselves to Hashem, *Klal Yisrael* was able to rid themselves of the spiritual corruption that occurred at the time of the initial *chet*.

Ordinarily, other than *malachim* for whom yielding completely to Hashem is the defining element of their existence, we are unaware of active, intelligent forms yielding perfectly to Hashem’s will. There is no room within a *malach* to assert a sense of self. *Klal Yisrael* at *Har Sinai* rose to this level; in this way, they partook of the “secret” of the *malachim*. In so doing, they earned the *z'chus* of being able to be *mekabel* the Torah. Through *bitul* they were able to raise their entire being to complete *ruchniyus*.

How are we, today, able to replicate this *bitul*? Let us look back at *Kaballas HaTorah*. The crucial preparation for receiving the Torah through *bitul* was, “And Yisrael encamped there, opposite the mountain.” The *pasuk* uses the singular form for the verb “encamped.” *Chazal* comment that *Klal Yisrael* succeeded in functioning as, and becoming, a single entity, with one heart and purpose, joined together as if in a single person. *Bitul* is not within reach of most individuals. However, banding together as a *tzibbur* places it within our grasp.

Conclusion

The prerequisites to *Kaballas HaTorah* that were just elaborated on: *hakaras hatov*, *chessed* and *bitul*, all pertain to removing ones sense of self and focusing on relationships - whether it be through recognizing what one does have and receives from others, through *chessed* done for others, or through being *mevatel* oneself completely to Hashem. During this time, as we prepare ourselves for Shavuot, it is incumbent upon each and every one of us to focus on these three aspects so that we can all be prepared to accept the Torah once again.

Eating Meat on Yom Tov

Yehoshua Allswang

מצות שמחה בבשר ויין

The Gemara in מסכת פסחים discusses the performance of שמחה on Yom Tov:

תנו רבנן חייב אדם לשמח בניו ובני ביתו ברגל, שנאמר 'ושמחת בחגך' במה משמחם? בין, ר' יהודה אומר 'אנשים בראוי להם ונשים בראוי להם' (מסביר הגמרא) אנשים בראוי להם - בין, ונשים במאי? תני ר' יוסף 'בבבל בבגדי צבעונין בארץ ישראל בבגדי פשתן מוגהצים', תניא ר' יהודה בן בתירא אומר 'בזמן שבית המקדש קיים אין שמחה אלא בבשר, שנאמר 'חבחת שלמים ואכלת שם ושמחת לפני ה' אלקיך' ועכשיו שאין בית המקדש קיים אין שמחה אלא בין, שנאמר 'ויין ישמח לבב אנוש'. (פסחים קט)

The *gemara* clearly states that the way that men fulfill the מצוה of שמחה on יו"ט today is through drinking wine. However, the רמב"ם in ויזו writes "that every person, even בזמן הזה, is obligated מן התורה to have שמחה on יום טוב. How is this accomplished? For children, we give toasted kernels and nuts. For women, we buy them nice clothing. And men must eat meat and drink wine because there is only שמחה if there is meat and there is only שמחה if there is wine."

The רמב"ם in טור *paskens* like the רמב"ם there, however, is very bothered by this רמב"ם, because the גמרא in פסחים quoted above seems to say very clearly that the מצוה of יו"ט is accomplished only by drinking wine, and not through eating meat, so why does the רמב"ם write that one should eat meat? Because of this question, the שולחן ערוך ס' תקכט in בית יוסף does not mention anything at all about eating meat on יו"ט. The מגן אברהם there, however, does quote the רמב"ם (and *paskens* like him) that it's a מצוה to eat meat on יום טוב.

The ב"ח attempts to answer up the question of the בית יוסף, that during the times of the בית המקדש eating meat created שמחה for two reasons, firstly because of the שמחה of partaking in a קרבן שלמים, and second because there is an inherent שמחה which comes about when one eats meat. Eating meat nowadays does not possess the first reason of שמחה, but it does have the second. And for that reason the רמב"ם says one should eat meat on יו"ט even nowadays, and even though the ברייתא said אין שמחה אלא בין, that only means that the שמחה nowadays is through wine. However, even though meat is not the שמחה עיקר anymore, it nevertheless, provides a certain degree of שמחה.

There is another possible way to answer up the question on the רמב"ם. The ברייתא of R' Yehuda argues on the second רמב"ם understands that the first ברייתא

of R' Yehuda Ben Besera. R' Yehuda Ben Besera held that the only way one can fulfill his obligation of *שמחה בחג* is by eating or drinking something which the Torah explicitly defines as creating *שמחה*. Therefore, when we had the *בית המקדש* we fulfilled the obligation through eating *קרבן שלמים*, but nowadays that we don't have a *קרבן שלמים*, we can only fulfill our obligation by drinking wine, because wine also has an explicit *פסוק* of *אנוש לבב ישמח* ויין *שמחה* which states that it creates *שמחה* (but there is no *פסוק* which states that *בשר של חולין* creates *שמחה*).

The first *ברייתא* by R' Yehuda, however, disagrees with this entirely. He holds that any type of food or object for which we can find a source in *חז"ל* that it creates *שמחה* can be used to fulfill our obligation for *שמחה יו"ט*. And that is why the *גמרא* said that according to R' Yehuda, women fulfill their obligation by receiving new or pressed clothing, because we see from the *הלכות* of *באב תשעה* that clean clothing can create *שמחה*, and that is why it is forbidden during those days of mourning. Likewise, the *רמב"ם* said that one fulfills his obligation to children by giving them toasted kernels and nuts because we see from a different place that these types of foods give children *שמחה*.

Based on this we can also understand why the *רמב"ם* says one fulfills his obligation of *שמחה* by eating meat, because since we know from the *הלכות* of *תשעה באב* that meat is forbidden for the *מפסקת* because it creates *שמחה*, therefore, using this same logic but flipping it around, we can learn from here that one would fulfill his obligation of *שמחה יו"ט* by eating meat. The *מגן אברהם* in *מגן אברהם* points out that the *גמרא* in *סנהדרין* says explicitly that meat (even when it's not a *קרבן*) creates *שמחה* (the *גמרא* there is explaining why we can't eat meat for the *מפסקת*). A further possible proof to this way in understanding the *גמרא* is because the *רי"ף* only mentions the first *ברייתא* of R' Yehuda, but he does not bring down the *ברייתא* of R' Yehuda Ben Besera, and based on what was just explained above, this way of understanding the *גמרא* is in line with the *רמב"ם*, because the *רמב"ם* also *paskens* like the first *ברייתא* and not like the second.

שאר מיני שמחות

The *מועד קטן* יד ע"ב writes that albeit *תוספות* writes in *סימן סה* that the *mitzva* of *שמחה* on *Yom Tov* is only *בזמן הזה* (because we don't have the *קרבן*), nevertheless, most of the *ראשונים* disagree with *תוספות*, and hold that even nowadays it is *דאורייתא*. Furthermore, he brings from the *ר"ן* in *פרק ד* of *סוכה*, that even *בבשר* *אלא* *בבשר* *אין* *שמחה* only means if one wishes to fulfill the *מבחר* *המובחר*. However, one can still fulfill the basic obligation of *שמחה* even by eating meat of *חולין* or *שמחות* even during the times of the *בית המקדש*, and *כל שכן* nowadays.

The פסחים פ ע"א in גמרא brings a proof to the opinion of the ר"ן from a גמרא which discusses what to do in a situation that half of Klal Yisrael is טמא and half are טהור. (We need a majority of טמאים in Klal Yisrael in order to use the principal of קרבן פסח in its proper time) which would then allow even the טמאים to bring the קרבן פסח in its proper time). The גמרא brings the opinion of עולא who says that they should send one of the טהורים far away (דרך רחוקה). The גמרא then asks why עולא doesn't just say they should make one of them טמא by touching a corpse, and answers because then that person will not be able to bring his קרבן חגיגה (because having a majority of טמאים only allows for everyone to bring the קרבן פסח, but it doesn't help for the קרבן חגיגה). The גמרא then asks that if we send him to דרך רחוקה then he will not be able to do a קרבן פסח, (as oppose if we make him טמא, then he can bring it). The גמרא answers that he can bring it on שני פסח. Then the גמרא asks that even if we make the person טמא he can still bring the קרבן חגיגה on the last day of פסח, because by then he will be טהור, and answers that עולא is of the opinion that if one was not allowed to bring the קרבן חגיגה on the first day, then he is not allowed to bring it any other day, even if the underlying reason has been resolved by then (כולהו תשלומין דראשון). (נינהו). So the שאגת אריה says that if the opinion of תוספות is correct, that one can only fulfill one's obligation of יו"ט through a שמחה, then the גמרא should have said that the reason עולא does not want to make a person טמא is because then the person won't be able to bring a שמחה and thereby will not fulfill his obligation of יו"ט. Therefore, says the שאגת אריה, from the fact that the גמרא doesn't say it, is a clear proof to the opinion of the ר"ן, that one can fulfill the obligation of שמחה יו"ט through any method of having שמחה. Based on this proof, the שאגת אריה says:

שמע מינה דכל אדם מצות שמחה מוטלת עליו בראוי לו ובמה שנהנה ממנו, והיינו דאמרין בגמרא הרבה פעמים 'דילמא אתי לאמנועי משמחת יום טוב', הרי נתברר דמצות שמחה נוהג מן התורה בזמן הזה בכל מיני שמחות.

The שאגת אריה disagrees with the proof of the שאגת אריה, because the entire proof of the שאגת אריה is built on the premise that the obligation of שמחה applies to each and every day of Yom Tov individually, meaning, that even if someone had שמחה on the first day of Yom Tov, there would still be an obligation to have שמחה on other days. The מנחת ברוך argues that there is one mitzva of שמחה for all seven days, and if one has שמחה on the last day of Pesach, even if he didn't have שמחה on the other days, he has still fulfilled his obligation of having שמחה on Yom Tov.

The שפת אמת has a third way in understanding one's requirement of שמחה יו"ט. He agrees with the שאגת אריה that there is an independent חיוב each and every day, but the חיוב is just to have שמחה at one point in the day. Therefore, even if we were to accept the opinion of the רמב"ם, that one must have meat and wine in

order to fulfill one's obligation of שמחה, nevertheless, as long as one has meat and wine at either the night meal or the day meal, that would suffice.

Children and שמחה

The אחרונים ask another question on the רמב"ם related to מיני שמחות. The רמב"ם writes that children fulfill יו"ט שמחה by receiving toasted kernels and nuts, but the גמרא does not say that anywhere. The only time this idea is mentioned is the גמרא on that same דף that says that one should give toasted kernels and nuts to children on the first night of פסח in order to keep them awake during the סדר. So where did the רמב"ם derive this שיטה?

The ב"ח answers that the רמב"ם understands that toasted kernels and nuts keep children awake because they make children happy. And since we see it makes them happy, one can also fulfill one's obligation of יום טוב שמחה for children through them as well.

Fresh meat

The בעל הגהות of the שאגת אריה brings up another element which must be discussed in the שיטת הרמב"ם. The גמרא in סנהדרין ע says that meat only creates שמחה if it is eaten within two days and one night from when it was slaughtered. Once, however, the meat has aged three days, then it is not משמח anymore. The רמב"ם paskens like this in הלכות תעניות ה:ז. Therefore, says the בעל הגהות, the only way that one can fulfill one's obligation of having שמחה on Yom Tov by eating meat would be if the meat has not aged three days yet (which is almost impossible nowadays).

One could argue that with the advent of modern refrigeration, this entire halacha of meat not creating שמחה after three days of slaughter doesn't apply anymore. The reason the גמרא gives is that this type of meat would have to be בשר מליה (because otherwise it would spoil) and as רש"י there explains "once two days have passed, the meat is salted, and thereby the taste of the meat is now gone, and is replaced with a very salty taste," but nowadays, through modern refrigeration, the meat does not need to be salted in order for it to retain its original taste, and therefore it should provide שמחה even many days after slaughter.

The Minhag of Milchigs on Shavuos

The דרכי תשובה in דרכי תשובה יו"ד פט:יט says that there are many who have the מנהג on Shavuos to eat a milchig meal (the רמ"א quotes this minhag in אור"ח תצד). The דרכי תשובה writes that to only eat milchigs during the day and to not eat meat at all would be improper. Even though the שאגת אריה writes that מיני שמחות works as well

to fulfill one's obligation, and therefore, it would seem to imply, that if someone enjoys a milchig meal more than a fleishig meal, it would be preferable to eat a milchig meal, nevertheless there are many פוסקים who explicitly disagree with the שאגת אריה. The ים של שלמה in the second פרק of ביצה writes:

דהא שמחת יו"ט הוא הסעודה, ולא נקרא סעודה להיות בו לב טוב ושמח בלי אכילת בשר.

Furthermore, writes the דרכי תשובה, מגן אברהם, and תורת חיים, and דאפרים all hold that there is a mitzva to specifically eat meat on Yom Tov. Eating meat at night and milchigs during the day is also not proper, says the דרכי תשובה, because any time there is a חיוב סעודה on Yom Tov there must be meat served. Therefore, he says the best thing to do on שבועות, is to eat milchigs, wait an hour, and then have the fleishig meal.

שמחת יו"ט – הלכה למעשה

As mentioned earlier, the ט' תקסט in שולחן ערוך does not make any mention that one should eat meat on Yom Tov, based on his understanding of the גמרא פסחים that only through drinking wine does one fulfill his obligation of שמחה. The מגן אברהם, however, brings the שיטת הרמב"ם that it is a mitzva to eat meat on Yom Tov. The ביאור הלכה and משנה ברורה like the מגן אברהם, and he elaborates in the הלכה and says that nowadays there is a חיוב to drink wine for שמחת יו"ט (since we have a pasuk of משנה ברורה) and there is a mitzva (but not a חיוב) to eat meat.¹ The משנה ברורה, however, does not bring down the שיטה of the שאגת אריה that even with מיני שאר שמחות one fulfills his obligation.

In summation, the opinion of the ר"ן and the שאגת אריה is that one does not need to specifically eat meat on Yom Tov in order to fulfill one's obligation of שמחת יו"ט, rather the חיוב is subjective to every person individually. The opinion of the שולחן ערוך is that only through drinking wine does one fulfill his obligation. The opinion of the מגן אברהם and משנה ברורה is that wine is a חיוב and meat is a מצוה. The opinion of the דרכי תשובה (based on the ים של שלמה and תורת חיים and others) is that there is a חיוב to have meat at every סעודה חיובית. The opinion of the מנחת ברוך is that there is a חיוב to have meat and wine at least one time during the course of the entire Yom Tov. The opinion of the שפת אמת is that one must eat meat and drink wine at least for one meal every day of Yom Tov.

The רמב"ם in קונטרס אחרון writes that even according to the opinions who hold that the only way to fulfill the mitzvah of שמחה is through eating meat and drinking wine, nevertheless, there is a מצוה מדרבנן to have שמחה

¹ The משנה ברורה is forced to explain the מגן אברהם like that, because otherwise the מגן אברהם would be contradicting himself based on what he wrote in תרצה:טו (the ד"ד פ"ט:ט says this explicitly).

through other means as well, as long as the שמחה is an עבודת היוצר and not of הוללות and וסכלות. Based on this we can understand that which the גמרא says many times "דילמא" אתי לאמנועי משמחת יו"ט.

חול המועד on שמחה

The paskens (based on a רמב"ם) that the mitzvah of שמחה applies to חול המועד as well. Hence, a מקור for taking children on day trips during חול המועד, could be derived from the שיטה of the שאגת אריה.

The הולכי דרכים ביום פטורים מן הסוכה ביום או"ח תרמ"ז in שולחן ערוך. The ר' שלמה זלמן אורבויך of R' Nebenzal records that which contains the הגהות of R' Nebenzal records that ר' שלמה זלמן אורבויך held that people who go on day trips during חול המועד are not exempt from the סוכה, and this הלכה of the שולחן ערוך does not apply to such a situation. Many years ago, I told over this חידוש of ר' שלמה זלמן to an אדם גדול, named R' Yackov Stefansky. I remember that he disagreed with the דין of ר' שלמה זלמן but I don't remember exactly why. Based on what we just previously mentioned, that according to the שאגת אריה one is potentially being מקיים a מצוות עשה דאורייתא by going on a field trip, one could possibly say that the דין of הולכי דרכים does apply because it is a הילוך של מצוה.²

² See also the ר"ן on ר"ב ביצה י"ב.

The Heavenly Captive¹

Rabbi Yossi Schwartz

Heavenly Fight

The *gemara* in *Shabbos* 88b gives a behind the scenes glimpse of what was going on upstairs when Moshe went up to get the Torah:

ואריב"ל בשעה שעלה משה למרום אמרו מלאכי השרת לפני הקב"ה רבש"ע מה לילוד אשה בינינו? אמר להן לקבל תורה בא. אמרו לפניו חמודה גנוזה שגנוזה לך תשע מאות ושבעים וארבעה דורות קודם שנברא העולם אתה מבקש ליתנה לבשר ודם? (תהלים ה, ה) מה אנוש כי תזכרנו ובן אדם כי תפקדנו. ה' אדונינו מה אדיר שמך בכל הארץ אשר תנה הודך על השמים. אמר לו הקב"ה למשה החזיר להן תשובה... אמר לפניו רבונו של עולם תורה שאתה נותן לי מה כתיב בה: (שמות כ, ב) אנכי ה' אלהיך אשר הוצאתיך מארץ מצרים. אמר להן למצרים ירדתם? לפרעה השתעבדתם? תורה למה תהא לכם... מיד הודו לו להקב"ה שנאמר (תהלים ח, י) ה' אדונינו מה אדיר שמך וגו' ואילו תנה הודך על השמים לא כתיב. מיד כל אחד ואחד נעשה לו אוהב ומסר לו דבר שנאמר (תהלים סח, יט) עלית למרום שבית שבי לקחת מתנות באדם.

The *gemara* describes the argument between Moshe Rabbeinu and the *malachim* whether or not Klal Yisrael should receive the Torah. The obvious question is what were the מלאכים thinking? What was their *אמינא* to keep the Torah up in Heaven when it is clearly written for humans? The Maharsha on the *gemara* explains that indeed the *malachim* had no issue with the revealed part of the Torah being given to us. What the *malachim* were protesting was the giving of the סודות התורה to the Jewish people. It is this area of Torah that they felt was more suitable for them than for the denizens of earth.

The *pasuk* in *Tehillim* quoted by the *gemara* that records their argument to keep the Torah in שמים says “תנה הודך על השמים” - “Keep your glory (הוד) in Heaven.” Why did the *malachim* refer to the Torah in this context as הוד? There are two similar words that are used to describe beauty or glory - הוד and הדר. The Malbim explains that the difference between הוד and הדר is that הדר signifies an external, visible beauty. For example, an *esrog* is called a עץ הדר, פרי עץ הדר, from which חז"ל learn that it needs to be externally beautiful. Another example is the phrase ברב עם הדרת מלך - the more people there are the more the glory of the king is externally manifest. הוד on the other hand connotes an inner beauty; an inner glow that is not necessarily perceived externally.

¹ Many of the ideas are taken from the amazing *sefer* שמעון רבי הוא כדאי by R' Pinchos Friedman *shlit"l*.

For instance, Hashem tells Moshe עליו - *Bestow from your glory (הוד) on him (Yehoshua)*. Hashem was telling Moshe to give over from his inner beauty - from his חכמה, to Yehoshua. פנימיות התורה is the inner beauty of the Torah that the *malachim* were referring to when they said על השמים הודך - keep your הוד up here in heaven.

Rays of Light

The *pasuk* describes Moshe upon his descent from Heaven with the לוחות:

ויהי ברדת משה מהר סיני ושני לחת העדת ביד־משה ברדתו מן־ההר ומשה לא־ידע כי
קרן עור פניו בדברו אתו. (שמות לד:כט)

The *Medrash Tanchuma (Shemos 37)*, quoted by Rashi, defines the rays of light coming out of Moshe's face as קרני הוד.² Based on what we have seen, that Moshe Rabbeinu's struggle with the *malachim* was over the סודות התורה, we can understand why he had קרני הוד. Moshe had successfully argued with the *malachim* and brought down the inner secrets of the Torah to this world, allowing this hidden light to be revealed outwardly into this world, and therefore he had an inner light radiating outward from within the skin of his face.

This fits beautifully with the different explanations given by חז"ל for the source of Moshe's קרני הוד. One opinion in the *midrash* says that Moshe got them from the ink that was left over in the quill after he finished writing the Torah. What is the *midrash* trying to tell us with this enigmatic statement? And why was there leftover ink - why didn't Hashem give Moshe the exact amount necessary for the writing of the Torah?

The *Ksav Sofer (Parshas Ki Sisa)* explains that this is a reference to the סודות התורה that Moshe brought down. Hashem taught Moshe these סודות התורה which weren't written in the Torah explicitly, and this is what the *midrash* means when it says there was "leftover ink." Although Moshe didn't write these secrets explicitly, he did cloak them in the words of the Torah. It was the bringing down of these secrets that gave him the קרני הוד.

תוספות on *Shabbos* 88b says that Moshe got the קרני הוד from the crowns that Bnei Yisrael received after saying ונשמע, which were subsequently taken away after the העגל.³ As the *gemara* there says explicitly, these crowns were given to

2 The Rashbam (34:29) says anyone who thinks that the word קרן in this context means a horn is a fool, because קרן has two separate definitions, and here it means rays. In truth, the reason a horn is called a קרן is because a horn is the inside of the animal's head protruding outwards just like a ray of light is a radiation extending outwards from within a source of light. See R' Nosson in *Likkutei Halachos, Simanei Beheima Vechay* 1 who writes: ויעל כן ניכר הסימן שבין בהמה וחיה בהקרניים, כי הקרניים הם מותרים המוחין שבולטים ויוצאין; ובבהמה נעשה קרניים ונעשה מהם קרניים בחינת קרני הוד, קרון עור הפנים שיש באדם שהוא בליסט המוחין לחוץ. ובבהמה נעשה קרניים

3 Rashi on the *gemara (Shabbos 88)* says the same thing. The *gemara* says that Moshe took the crowns as the *pasuk* says - ומשה יקח את האהל, referring to the crowns. אהל also means light as in בהלו בו, and Rashi says that this was the קרון עור פניו - קרני הוד.

Moshe when he came down with the second לוחות. According to תוספות, the קרני הוד/crowns also represent סודות התורה. The reason they are called crowns is that our heads contains our intellect, our ability to mentally grasp ideas. A crown represents something that is above our head, and the סודות התורה cannot be grasped the same way the rest of the Torah is understood.⁴ They are not called סודות, secrets, because people happen to not know them being that they are transmitted secretly. Rather they deal with the inner functioning of all the spiritual worlds, something beyond the ability of human intellect to understand. At the giving of the first לוחות, all of Klal Yisrael became so spiritual that they attained an understanding of סודות התורה. However, they lost these levels because of the חטא העגל. It was these secrets that Moshe once again brought down that gave him קרני הוד.

Based on this, it would seem that the argument between Moshe and the *malachim* took place only when Moshe went up to receive the second לוחות. Moshe was fighting with them over the סודות התורה, but by the first לוחות all of Klal Yisrael had the crowns/קרני הוד, an understanding of סודות התורה. It was only after the חטא העגל that כלל ישראל were no longer worthy to receive these secrets and Moshe had to fight to bring them down to a nation that was seemingly unworthy of these levels of understanding.⁵

Rashi (לד:כט), quoting the *Medrash Tanchuma*, says:

ומהיכן זכה משה לקרני הוד, רבותינו אמרו, מן המערה שנתן הקב"ה ידו על פניו, שנאמר
ושכתי כפי.

The שפתי חכמים explains that Rashi was bothered by why Moshe only received the קרני הוד after the second לוחות and not by the first, to which Rashi answers that he received it in the מערה. Moshe davened to Hashem to forgive them for the חטא העגל, and it was then that Hashem placed him in the מערה. From Rashi as well we see that the argument with the *malachim* was only after the חטא העגל. It was there that Moshe received the סודות התורה that gave him the קרני הוד.

Light Skin

The פירוש קדשים in זהר הקדוש says that it was only after the עץ הדעת that Adam

4 The *gemara* in *Brachos* 17 says that when Moshiach comes the צדיקים will sit בראשיהם - and their crowns will be in their heads. Why doesn't the *gemara* says that their crowns will be on their heads rather than in them? Rebbe Nachman (Torah 21:4) explains that the secrets of the Torah in this world are so deep that they cannot be fully grasped in our minds in this world. The crowns of the צדיקים refer to these secrets. However, when Moshiach comes, we will be able to understand it and therefore the crowns - levels that are usually beyond our heads - will be in our heads, symbolizing that we will be able to fully grasp these sublime secrets.

5 Indeed, *Pirkei D'Rebbe Elazar* (46) based on the רד"ל - (*Kedai R*"S page 355, 436) says explicitly that the argument was only by the second לוחות.

needed a physical body made of flesh and skin as the פסוק says להם כתנות "ויעש להם כתנות עור". This is not simply referring to the animal skin clothing that Hashem made for them, but rather in a deeper sense it is referring to the fact now they needed physical bodies. Before the חטא their bodies were almost completely spiritual, it was only after the העגל חטא that the body became a "garment" to the soul, cloaking its light rather than revealing it.⁶

The זרה הקדוש says that originally they had כתנות אור, garments of light, with an א rather than עור with an ע. The difference between א and ע is very small. The letter א when pronounced has no sound. It is a letter that symbolizes that which is beyond the physical world.⁷ The letter ע, on the other hand, although subtle, does have a sound.⁸ It symbolizes something spiritual that has crystallized into physicality. This is why אור with and א means light, while עור with an ע means skin. In English, another word for skin is hide,⁹ for this is exactly what our skin does: it hides our true essence - the light of our נשמה. When vowelized as עֶרָר (*ever*) it means blind - the exact opposite of light which enables sight.

This is the difference between כתנות אור and כתנות עור. Originally Adam was created with כתנות אור, a garment for their soul that projected its light rather than blocking it. After the חטא, the א turned into an ע. Their bodies became a physical garment that hides the נשמה rather than revealing it.¹⁰

The שלי"ה הקדוש¹¹ says that the crowns/קרני הוד that all of Klal Yisrael received before the חטא העגל were precisely the כתנות אור that Adam had originally had. When Adam had כתנות אור he was almost completely spiritual which enabled him to have an understanding of all the secrets of the world and the Torah. This is exactly the level that Klal Yisrael was on at the giving of the first לוחות. Both Adam and Klal Yisrael lost this level after their חטא. The שלי"ה says that had

6 Perhaps this is the meaning of *Chazal* that Adam's body was covered by nails. Our nails are the only parts of our physical body that are translucent. Adam's entire body was translucent, meaning that it revealed his נשמה rather than blocking it.

7 פלאי is the same letters as אלהי - wondrous, something supernatural which goes beyond the confines of this world. An אלוף, a champion or general, is someone who rises above the average person.

8 The *gemara* in *Megilla* 24b says that a certain family of *Kohanim* were not allowed to *duchen* because they couldn't differentiate between the sound of א and ע.

9 This is a rare instance of the English language getting the deeper meaning of a word right.

10 Rashi on the *gemara* in *Shabbos* says that אהל is a reference to light as in עלי ראשי. An אהל as well is meant to shield and block and yet here it means a source of light.

11 משה רבינו ע"ה היה עניו מכל האדם, הוא אדם קדמאה, על כן זכה משה רבינו ע"ה לקרן אור שהוא סוד כתנות אור, שהופשט מאדם ונתן למשה.

Adam not sinned he would have had קרן אור פניו - with an א, because he would have remained cloaked in אור, light, rather than עור, skin. If not for the חסא העגל, Moshe, as well as all of Klal Yisrael, would have had קירון אור פנים rather than קירון עור פנים.

Heavenly Captives

The Arizal says an incredible *remez* on the *pasuk* from *Tehillim* quoted in the *gemara* earlier that refers to Moshe successfully bringing down the סודות התורה: The *pasuk* says עלית למרום, שביט שבי, לקחת מתנות באדם - *You went up to the exalted (heavens), you captured a captive, you took gifts for man.*¹² The word שבי, says the Arizal, contains a hint/*remez* to the person most responsible for revealing סודות התורה to mankind - שמעון בר יוחאי - ש.ב.י. The Arizal says that Moshe Rabbeinu was feuding with the *melachim* over the נשמה of רבי שמעון בר יוחאי and he is the captive that Moshe captured from up on high and brought down with him. Rashbi is the one who generations later revealed the same סודות התורה that only Moshe was able to understand. He is the one who brings back the inner secrets of the Torah - the הוד of the Torah - to all of Klal Yisrael.

Another incredible רמז is that שבי also stands for the names of the two other most responsible for revealing the סודות התורה to the world: (i) the Arizal - יצחק בן שלמה, and (ii) the *Baal Shem Tov* - ישראל בן שרה (or ישראל בעל שם). Similarly, the *Bnei Yissoschor* in his *sefer* אגרא דכלה says that the word בראשית stands for: אור תורת רבי שמעון בר יוחאי, אור תורת רבי יצחק בן שלמה, אור תורת רבי ישראל בן שרה.¹³

Return to 50

There is a known יסוד (principle) in פנימיות התורה which states that the higher the level that something is rooted in, the lower it is able to go.¹⁴ For instance, the *gemara* famously states: במקום שעלי תשובה עומדים צדיקים גמורים אינם יכולים לעמוד. The reason for this is that in order for a נשמה to have the ability to descend to a low level and then come back it must be from a very high level. Imagine if you needed to explain Einstein's theory of relativity to a ten year old child. The only one who would have the ability to do that would probably be Einstein himself - someone who fully understood the theory.¹⁵ The clearer someone understands something, the lower the level to which he is able to bring it down.

¹² Quoted in the Chida's *Sheim HaGedolim* 332 in the name of the Arizal

¹³ צירופי בראשית אות נה

¹⁴ סידור בעל התניא, דף עא

¹⁵ Albert Einstein is quoted as saying: "If you can't explain it to a six year old, you don't understand it yourself."

The *gemara* says that Hashem created fifty levels of בינה (understanding), and only forty-nine of them were given to Moshe. R' Tzaddok writes that the fiftieth level of בינה is an understanding of סודות התורה only attainable by a בעל תשובה.¹⁶ Moshe is the quintessential צדיק and therefore was unable to comprehend the fiftieth level of בינה. The *midrash* (*Bamidbar Rabba* 19:6) says: דברים שלא נגלו למשה נגלו לר' עקיבא: וחיבריו, וכל יקר ראתה עינו זה ר' עקיבא וחיבריו. R' Shmuel Vital (*Shaar Maamarei Razal, Shabbos, Ois 3*) writes that although Moshe didn't attain the fiftieth level of בינה, R' Akiva - the ultimate בעל תשובה, did, and he taught it to רבי שמעון בר יוחאי his תלמיד.¹⁷ The Arizal says that Moshe Rabbeinu did attain the fiftieth level at מתן תורה.¹⁸

Now we can understand what Moshe answered the *melachim* when he said did you go down to מצרים, etc. The *melachim* knew this but they were arguing that סודות התורה are meant for someone completely pure, the צדיק who is like a מלאך אלקים. Moshe revealed that סודות התורה are the Torah of the בעל תשובה, someone who has been in the lowest of places and returned, and therefore the fact that Klal Yisrael had sinned with the עגל did not negate their ability to understand these secrets. On the contrary, they were now בעלי תשובה and were uniquely qualified to understand these secrets. תשובה is something that is only possible for a human whose נשמה comes from a higher place than the *melachim*.

The word הוד which means glory, is also the root of the word הודאה - to admit. This is the מידה of the בעל תשובה, for what greater glory is there than when even those who are seemingly distant from Hashem admit that he was right all along?¹⁹ The זוהר הקדוש and the סודות התורה in general have the same ability - to show that nothing is truly distant from Hashem, and that everything in the Torah and even in the world that seemed coincidental really has a much deeper meaning.²⁰

Caves of Light

Rebbe Ahron MiKarlin writes in his *sefer* בית אהרן²¹ that the *pasuk* in איכה יט:כו that the *pasuk* in "מבשרי אחזה אלוק" is referring to רבי שמעון בר יוחאי, as the word מבשרי can be read as an acronym for מתורת ר' שמעון בר יוחאי. It is he who revealed G-dly secrets to the world.

16 *Pri Tzaddik, Devarim* 10

17 When we discuss the levels of צדיק and בעל תשובה we are not necessarily referring to what we mean when we say those terms. Rather we are referring to types of נשמות. See תניא פרק א'.

18 לקוטי תורה פר' ואתחנן ד"ה ויתעבר

19 See 2:186 זוהר הקדוש quoted in *Pri Tzaddik, Bereishis* 142, *Chanukah Ois* 2 stating that הדר refers to a צדיק and הוד to a בעל תשובה. Aharon HaKohen is also associated with the מדה of הוד and indeed we find that on some level he was involved with the העגל. חסא העגל בעל תשובה himself he is the one who is מקרב others to the Torah

20 See Ramchal's הקדמה to הויכוח ספר

21 ל"ג בעומר דף קז

Perhaps we can add that it is specifically the word *בשרי*, flesh, that hints at *רשב"י* because it is only a human made of lowly flesh and blood who can potentially fall and then do *תשובה* that has the ability to reach an understanding of *סודות התורה*. This was Moshe's winning argument against the *melachim*.

By revealing the *סודות התורה* to the world, *רשב"י* gave us the ability to turn our *כתנות עור*, our garment of flesh, into *כתנות אור*; to turn the *ע* into an *א*. Moshe Rabbeinu, on the other hand, represents the *צדיק*, perfection, and all of Klal Yisrael were on that level at the giving of the first *לוחות*. After the *חטא העגל* it was necessary for Moshe to reveal that it is *דוקא* the *בעל תשובה* who can reach the highest of levels.

Moshe teaches the Torah and translates it into seventy languages - *הואיל משה* - *באר את התורה*. He takes the *א* and translates it into *ע*. He translates the unity of Hashem and the Torah into the language of this world. He teaches how to live a physical life with the spirituality of the Torah. *רשב"י*, however, is the one who takes the *ע* and turns it *א*. He shows how the physicality and darkness of this world comes from an incredibly high level. He uses this world to understand the secrets of the upper world.

According to this, perhaps we can say that this is the meaning of a statement that *רשב"י* makes in the *Zohar HaKadosh*:

מעיד אני עלי שמים וארץ עליונים שבעליונים שהנני רואה כעת מה שלא ראה אדם מיום שעלה משה שנית להר סיני...ועוד שאני יודע שפני מאירין ומשה לא ידע ולא הסתכל, זהו שאמר הכתוב ומשה לא ידע כי קרן עור פניו. (נשא קלב)

What did *רשב"י* mean by, "Moshe doesn't know (that *קרן עור פניו*), but I do know?" Moshe turned the *א* into *ע*, but being a *צדיק* he could not use the physical to understand the spiritual. It was only *רשב"י* who showed how even the lowliest things in this world can be used to reach the highest of levels. An incredible *רמז* to this is that the *gematria* of *קרן עור פניו* (with an *א*) is exactly the same as *שמעון בר יוחאי*.

Rashi (quoted earlier) says that the source of Moshe's *הוד קרני* was the *מערה*. Similarly, *רשב"י* hid in a *מערה* for thirteen years and it was there that he learned the *סודות התורה* as we say in the song - *במערות צורים שעמדת שם קנית הודך והדרך* - *מערה* is a place that hides, and its *שורש* is *עור*, skin/hide. *רשב"י* as well goes into a *מערה*, but he turns it into a *מארה* - a luminary, a source of light, just like he turns the *כתנות עור* into *כתנות אור*.

Reveal the Light

ל"ג בעומר is not just the day that *רשב"י* passed away, but it is also the day on which he taught the deepest secrets of the *זהר*. It is the day of *הוד שבהוד* - the deepest inner beauty of the Torah was revealed. This is the meaning of the *pasuk* *גל עיני ואביטה*

ג- נ- פלאות - on the day of בעומר ל"ג - גל - our eyes were opened and the פלאות of the fiftieth level, were revealed to the world. Based on this we can understand the deeper meaning of the *pasuk* that we say every day in הדר: אשרי ודברי נ-פלאתיך, reveal openly the beauty of the hidden secrets of the Torah, כבוד הודך - אשיחה - and thereby we will be able to openly converse in the wondrous fiftieth level (of בינה).²² The *gematria* of the words נפלאתיך אשיחה are exactly the same as רבי שמעון בר יוחאי - they both equal 915.

May we be זוכה to the days in which the secrets of the Torah will no longer be hidden, ומלאה הארץ דעה את ה' כמים לים מכסים.

²² The term שיח is specifically associated with the revelations of ימות המשיח - as hinted at in the name מ-שיח, ואכמ"ל.

Does One's Son or Grandson Have Priority for Mitzvas Talmud Torah?

Ariel Jeidel

The *gemara* in *Kiddushin* (30a) states:

אמר ריב"ל, כל המלמד את בן בנו תורה מעלה עליו הכתוב כאילו קבלה מהר סיני, שנאמר והודעתם לבניך ולבני בניך, וסמיק ליה יום אשר עמדת לפני ה' אלהיך בחורב (דברים ד, י).

Rebbi Yehoshua ben Levi stated, one who teaches his grandson Torah is as if he accepted the Torah on Har Sinai, since the pasuk by Mattan Torah is next to the one about the responsibility for transmitting the Torah to one's grandson.

The fact that Rebbi Yehoshua ben Levi makes this statement only regarding a grandson and not a son (who is also included in the *pasuk*) seemingly implies that teaching Torah to a grandson is more important and takes precedence over teaching one's son Torah.

In light of this reading of the *gemara*, the Rambam writes something somewhat surprising in *Hilchos Talmud Torah* (1:2):

כשם שחייב אדם ללמד את בנו כך הוא חייב ללמד את בן בנו שנאמר והודעתם לבניך ולבני בניך... אם כן למה נצטוו על בנו ועל בן בנו להקדים בנו לבן ובן לבן חבירו.

The Rambam clearly *paskens* that teaching Torah to a child takes precedence over teaching Torah to a grandchild. Along the same lines, the *Kesef Mishna* is uncertain if the חיוב to hire a *rebbe* for his son (when he himself cannot teach his son) applies also to a grandson. By virtue of asking this question, we see that the *Kesef Mishna* also assumes that teaching a son Torah is more important than to a grandson.

The *Harerei Kedem* (*chelek 2, siman 122*) quotes the Ramban (mitzva 2 in מנין 2) to answer this question. The Ramban explains that when learning Torah with one's offspring, one accomplishes two mitzvos:

A) The mitzva of teaching your children Torah. This is referred to in the *pasuk* that states ולמדתם אותם את בניכם.

B) אמנות התורה, remembering when the Torah was given on Har Sinai, referred to in the *pasuk* להודעתם לבניך ולבני בניך.

Using this, the *Harerei Kedem* answers that with regards to the mitzva of Talmud Torah, learning with one's own son is more important and more of a reason to hire a *rebbe*, as the Rambam suggests in *Hilchos Talmud Torah*. However, when it comes to the mitzva of אמנות התורה, not forgetting Har Sinai, a grandson comes first. He explains that this is because when the grandson is learning with his grandfather, this brings him closer in the timeline to when the Torah was given, and closer in terms of how many people the Torah went through since Har Sinai, as opposed to if he was learning with his father.

One question which occurred to me is that this *teretz* only explains why a grandson should want to learn with his grandfather over his own father. Since his grandfather is closer to Har Sinai than his father, learning with his grandfather brings him closer to the source. But what does the grandfather gain by teaching his grandson over his son, as his grandson is further from Har Sinai than his son?

I would like to suggest a similar but slightly different answer based upon two *gemaras*, one in *Bava Basra* and one in *Bava Metzia*.

The *gemara* in *Bava Basra* (59a) discuss a case where a pipe is dripping water from someone's roof into his neighbor's property and the neighbor wants the pipe to continue to water his field. The *gemara* asks if he can prevent the roof owner from sealing the pipe. The *gemara* says:

איתמה רבי אושעיא אמר מעכב, ר' חמא אמר אינו מעכב. אזל שיייליה לרבי ביסא, אמר להו מעכב. קרי עליה רמי בר חמא (קהלת ד, יב) והחוט המשולש לא במהרה ינתק, זה רבי אושעיא בנו של רבי חמא בנו של רבי ביסא.

Rav Oishia held that he can stop the roof owner, Rav Chama (who was the father of Rav Oishia) said he cannot. He went to ask Rav Bisa (who was Rav Chama's father and Rav Oishia's grandfather) and he said like his grandson, that the field owner can stop the roof owner from sealing the pipe. Regarding this circumstance, Rami Bar Chana quoted the pasuk ינתק במהרה המשולש לא במהרה ינתק, a three twined string does not snap quickly.

The praise here is that the Torah from the grandfather was not forgotten. Similarly, and more clearly, the *gemara* in *Bava Metzia* 85a says:

אמר ר' פרנך אמר ר' יוחנן כל שהוא תלמיד חכם ובנו תלמיד חכם ובנו תלמיד חכם שוב אין תורה פוסקת מזרעו לעולם שנאמר (ישעיהו נט, כא) ואני זאת בריתי וגו' לא ימוש מפיק ומפי זרע ומפי זרע זרעך אמר ה' מעתה ועד עולם. מאי אמר ה' אמר

הקב"ה אני ערב לך בדבר זה. מאי מעתה ועד עולם? אמר ר' ירמיה מכאן ואילך תורה מחזרת על אבסניא.

Rebbi Parnach quotes Rebbi Yochanan who explained that if one is a Talmud Chacham and his son and grandson are also Tamidei Chachamim, he has a guarantee from Hashem that the Torah will never cease from existing in that family.

With this we can say, along the lines of the *Harerei Kedem*, that besides the actual mitzva of teaching and learning Torah, teaching Torah is also a קיום of not forgetting הר סיני. מעמד הר סיני. When one learns with his grandson, he has the opportunity to teach a third generation Torah, which has the direct potential to cement Torah in his family forever. This would be a massive קיום of not forgetting הר סיני and of אמונת התורה! And this is why a grandfather would want to learn with grandson.

עוסק במצוה פטור מן המצוה

The *gemara* in *Shabbos* (11a) says that if one is learning Torah and it comes time to say *kriyas shema*, one takes a break from Torah to say *shema*. The *Minchas Asher*, in his *sefer* on Talmud Torah (*siman b*), asks that we have a rule that when one is performing a mitzva, he is *patur* from doing another mitzva that comes along, so why doesn't that apply over here?

I would like to try and apply the Ramban that was quoted earlier to answer this question. There are two types of learning:

A) Teaching someone else Torah (or even learning by yourself) for the purpose of remembering Har Sinai. If one would be in middle of this type of learning and another mitzva would come along, then of course one should stop learning and do this other mitzva, since the entire purpose of your current learning is to remember Har Sinai and all the mitzvos that were taught there. Learning Torah reminds you and teaches you to do those mitzvos, so if one comes along, you better do it!

B) The second type of learning Torah is learning for the *geshmak* of it, with love for the Torah and to make oneself more holy and pure. If you are engrossed in this type of learning, than it is no different than any other mitzva that makes you *patur* from doing other mitzvos.

דברי תורה

בעברית

ועכשיו יכול להבין את שלשה חלקי המצוה בהגמרא שהתחלנו והם ידי יין, ידי חירות, והעקר דין של ד' כוסות. ונמצא שאם שתאן חי ידי יין יצא ידי חירות לא יצא, כי אף על פי שסוף סוף שתה ד' כוסות למעשה עשה זה בדרך מבוהל ולא בדרך בני מלכים ובני חורין. ומשום שהתוצאה היא העיקר אם שתאן חי מביא לשכרות וחסור הכרה ולא לתוצאה הראוי שהיא מחשבות של חירות. וגם אם שתאן בבת אחת ידי יין יצא ידי ארבעה כוסות לא יצא, כי צריך להיפרד את כוסות ולא לשתותם בחיפזון. ונראה מדבריו שמצות ד' כוסות לא רק לשתות את הכוס ודי, אלא יש דינים מסוימים למביא את מעשה השתייה לתוצאה של בן חורין והם מקיף על היסוד שצריך לשתות את הכוס כבן מלך בנחת וברוח בלי שום דואג או מהירות. ומלבד שתקנת הד' כוסות שייך להגברים נראה שעיקר תכליתו הוא לגבי הנשים כמו שמביא לעיל.

ושמחתי שראיתי שכונתי לדברי הקודש של המהר"ל וז"ל⁶ פסח, מצה ומרור הם נגד האבות שבכוחם יצאו בני ישראל ממצרים וזכו לגאולה. הפסח בא כנגד יעקב שנקרא (ירמיהו נ"ז) "שה פזורה ישראל" והפסח הוא שה תמים. מרור כנגד יצחק שהיה במרירות כשכהו עיניו מראות. מצה כנגד אברהם, וכמו שהמצה נבדלת מן השאור כך אברהם נבדל מן השאור של האומות. ולפי"ז יש לומר שד' הכוסות הן כנגד ד' אמהות, שהרי פסח מצה ומרור הם באכילה, וד' כוסות הן בשתייה, ואי אפשר שתהא אכילה בלא שתייה, והשתייה טפלה לאכילה, שהרי בזכות אבות ואמהות יצאו ישראל ממצרים, שכן המדרש אומר (שמות רבה טו:ד) אמר ר' יהודה מהו (שיר השירים כ:ח) "מדלג על ההרים" ? אמר הקב"ה: אם אני מסתכל במעשיהם של ישראל אינן נגאלים לעולם, אלא למי אני מסתכל? לאבותיהם הקדושים, שנאמר (שמות ו:ד) "וגם אני שמעתי את נאקת בני ישראל וגו'". בזכות אבותם אני גואלם לכן כתיב "מדלג על ההרים", ואין הרים אלא אבות, שנאמר (מיכה ו:ב) "שמעו הרים את ריבה". ולפי"ז יתפרש המשך הפסוק בשיר השירים "מקפץ על הגבעות" בזכות האמהות, ואלו הן ד' כוסות, כנגד ד' האמהות.

ובזכות קיום מצות הד' כוסות כתיקנו נחזיר לזמן שהשמחה שורה לא רק ביין אלא מקווים להשיג אותה על ידי הבשר של הקרבנות בביאת גואל צדק במהרה בימינו.

6 מצאתי לשון זה בהגדה של פסח דברי נגידים וכמו כן כתב המהר"ל בגבורת השם פרק ט'.

(בספרו על תפילה) והרב שלמה וולבי (עלי שור כרך ב דף שנא) ועוד הרבה רבנים גדולים הסביר שהאשה פטורה ממצות אלו כי היא במדרגה עליונה מהאיש ויכול להסיג את מהות המצוה בלי עסיקה אם מעשה המצוה. והביא הרב הירש רמז לדבר ששם נרדף לאיש הוא זכר כי צריך לזכור את העבר והמעשה מצוה הם השלבים להשיג את מה שצריך לזכור. ברם נשים הם נקבות מלשון (בראשית ל:כח) נקבה שכרך אליו, וזה מלשון קבע וקצוב. כי האשה אינו צריכה שום מעשה לזכור את העבר כי כל מה שהיה היא קבוע בה ורק יכול לכוון לאותו מדרגה.³

ואם כן כל זה קב ונקי מדוע נשים פטורות מרוב המצוות עשה שהזמן גמרא כי הם זכר להעבר אבל לגבי הד' כוסות שמהות המצוה היא התוצאה, ולא רק על העבר וזכירה בעלמא, אז ממילא נשים מחויבות בד' כוסות כי העיקר היא להגיע לאותו מצב של חירות ולא די שיוזכר יציאת מצרים.⁴ ויש להוסיף שלפי זה יכול להסביר סתירת רש"י. שרש"י בראש ערבי פסחים (צט: ד"ה ארבע כוסות) מביא דלגבי האנשים מקורו של ד' כוסות מהארבעה לשוני גאולה האמורים בגלות מצרים והוצאתי אתכם והצלתי אתכם וגאלתי אתכם ולקחתי אתכם בפרשת וארא. אבל רש"י (קח. ד"ה ארבע כוסות) מביא טעם אחר לחייב את נשים בד' כוסות משלשה שהוא כנגד ג' כוסות שנאמרו בפסוק זה וכוס פרעה בידי ורביעי ברכת המזון. ומדוע רש"י מביא שתי טעמים נפרדים.⁵

אבל לפי משהבאנו לעיל יכול לומר שהחייב של הנשים משונה מהגברים. כי היא חייבת רק בתוצאת השתייה ופרסום הנס שבא. אבל האנשים חייב גם על השתייה ומשום כך רש"י צריך להביא שתי מקורות נפרדים. ומשום שהתוצאה היא העיקר לגבי הנשים אז לא צריך דווקא ד' כוסות מטעם עצמו אבל חז"ל גוזר דין של לא פלוג ואם כן לגבי הקידוש שהיא מחויבת בה רש"י לימד את מקורו מקידוש דווקא ולא שום רמז מהפסוקים ומשום הלא פלוג רש"י מביא מקורו של שאר הג' כוסות מרמז בתורה. וחלוק בין הנשים להאנשים נמצא גם בהראבי"ה (סי' תקסט"ט) שמסתפק דכמו שיש חילוק בין אנשים לנשים לגבי מצות מקרא מגילה גם יש לומר דלגבי הד' כוסות החיובים נפרדים. ולפי זה יכול להסביר את שיטת התוס' לעיל שאפשר לומר כי וודאי התוצאה היא העיקר כמו שכתבתי אלא שלגבי אנשים יש גם צורך להמעשה. ואם כן יש ספק לגבי המעשה מצוה אם הכוס ראשון הוא כמו כוס של קידוש לכל דבר או יש דין חדש של ד' כוסות שיש הלכות משונים. כי בשאר מצוות יש לנו הלכות מיוחדים איך לקיים את המצוה וכל זה לגבי מצוות שעיקר קיומו היא המעשה. אבל לגבי הד' כוסות שעיקר קיומו היא התוצאה תוס' לא היה בטוח אם גם כן צריך דינים מיוחדים או די רק בשתייה מכוסו של בעל הבית.

3 וכדאי להביא את דברי הרב משה פיינשטיין (באגרות משהא"ח ד:מט) שענה שאלה על נשים חשובות שרוצין להלבש ציצית ותפילין מאת מוהר"י קעלעמער שליט"א השם ישלח לו רפואה שלמה בקרוב. ובתרוצו הרב משה הסביר שממילא זה שהתורה פטרה ממצות עשה שהזמן גרמה הוא מן התורה וגם רבנן לא חייבו כי לא ראו בזה שום צורך לחייבן ואדרבה משמע שהצורך הוא לפטור דווקא מהטעמים שפטרותן תורה, ולבד טעמי התורה שלא ידוע לסתם אינשי אף לא לת"ח גדולים ואנו מחוייבין להאמין שאיכא טעמים גדולים לקב"ה נותן התורה איכא גם טעמים גלים לכל, כי סתם נשים בעולם אינם עשירות ועליהן מוטל גידול הילדים והילדות שהיא מלאכה היותר חשובה להשי"ת ולהתורה. ושנית צריך לדעת כי אין זה בשביל שנשים פחותות במדרגת הקדושה מאנשים דלענין הקדושה שוות לאנשים.

4 וכדאי לחזור על עניינו של "אף הן היו בנס" שכתבתי בקונטרס אור הצפון חלק ה' שיוצא לאור ע"י חבירי וחשוב רבותי מבית כנסת דודמיר צפון. והסיכום היא שכל המצוות של "אף הן" חובת הנשים משונה מאנשים. כי לגבי האנשים החיוב היא המעשה (קריאת המגילה, הדלקת הנרות, ושתיית הד' כוסות) אולם הנשים אינן חייבות במעשה פעולה (רק שמיעת המגילה, ראיית הנרות, תוצאה של חירות על הד' כוסות).

5 והגאון רב ירוחם אלשין (ירח למועדים סימן יא) מסביר את סתירת רש"י על פי הגר"ז שמביא לעיל שביאר שיש ב' דינים במצוות ד' כוסות והם שתיית ד' כוסות דרך חירות ודין כוס של ברכה. ואם כן צריך ב' מקורות. ולפי זה צריך לומר שהדין שתיית הד' כוסות ילפינן מהד' לשונות של גאולה, והדין של כוס של ברכה ילפינן מהכוסות של פרעה. ומשום שהנשים אינם חייבות בשתיית הד' כוסות אלא בדין כוס של ברכה לכך הביא רש"י הטעם של כוס פרעה כי רק טעם זה שייך לחובת הנשים.

מהונך (משלי ג:ט) ממה את מכבדו? ממה שיחננך, מפריש לקט שכחה פאה מפריש תרומה ומעשר ראשון ומעשר שני ומעשר עני וחלה ועושה סוכה ולולב ושופר ותפילין וציצית ומאכיל את העניים ואת הרעבים ומשקה את הצמאים אם יש לך אתה חייב בכלול ואם אין לך אין אתה חייב באחת מהן, עכ"ל. ומירושלמי זו נמצא שמי שאין לו כסף לקנות איזה חפץ של מצוה אז הוא פטור מן המצוה בתואר של אינו מצווה. וזה רחוק מאונס כי בוודאי כל איש צריך לעשות כל מה שביכולת לקיימה איזה מצוה וחייב לעבוד ולפרנס עצמו כדי שיהיה לו מומן לקנות מצוה וסוכה וכדומה. דפשוט הוא שהבורא צוה לו עשה כך וכך הכוונה היא שתעשה כל ההכנות על מנת שתהיה לך האפשרות וההיכוי תמצוי לקיים הציוויים. אך שונה שאלה על הפתחים בזה שהוא יותר מחויבו וצווי, כי אחרי שעשה כל שביכולתו ומ"מ אין לו, הרי שהוא בכוחותיו לא היה יכול להגיע לקיום המצוה, ולשאול ולבקש מחבירו הוא יותר מכוחותיו. וכל זה דווקא ברוב מצות שהם גזרת המלך וכמו שהקב"ה מצווה לאכול מצוה אז הוא פטור מי שאין ביכולת לקנות או לאפות מצוה לעצמו. אבל יש מצות מסוימים שהעיקר קיימו לא אם המעשה אלא בהתוצאה ואף על פי שהקב"ה יכול לפטור את המעשה המחסר למעשה לא השיג את התוצאה. וכמו שהעני יכול לחזור בעבור מוזן לסעודתו כי המעשה אכילה לא הצריך אלא צריך לאכול בעבור שיחיה כך העני יכול לחזור בעבור הד' כוסות כי לא השתייה העיקר אלא התוצאה של הרגשת חירות.²

ויש לנו להסביר מדוע הגמרא דידן לא הביא שום מקור להדין של ד' כוסות. כי מלבד שיש הרבה סברות ופסוקים שלימד על מספר ד' וחייב הארבע כוסות אין שתיית הד' כוסות העיקר אלא התוצאה. ואף על פי שהד' כוסות הם ההיכא תמצא להרגשות של חירות העיקר היא התוצאה ולא הד' מעשי מצוה ומשום שהדרשות והסברות לנתח על המספר ארבע ולא על התוצאה של חירות הגמרא דידן השמיט את סברות אלו.

אבל יש לנו לחקור מדוע דווקא במצות ד' כוסות יש לנו דין כזה. מדוע עיקר מצוותו היא התוצאה ולא המעשה כמו בשאר מצות?

ולוא דמסתפינא הייתי אומר שיסוד החילוק היא הסברא של המצוה. כי למרות מצות מצוה שאנו אוכלים על שום מה על שום שלא הספיק בצקם של אבותינו להחמיץ. ונראה שעיקר מצוותו היא לזכור את יציאת מצרים. וכמו כן לגבי מצות סוכות (ויקרא כג: מג) כי למען ידעו דרתיכם כי בסכות הושבתי את בני ישראל, והעיקר היא הזכירה. למרות זה סיבת הד' כוסות היא כמו שסיבר הרמב"ם (הלכות חמץ ומצה ז:ו) בכל דור ודור חייב אדם להראות את עצמו כאילו הוא בעצמו יצא עתה משעבוד מצרים שנאמר (דברים ו:כג) ואותנו הוציא ממש וגו', ועל דבר זה צוה הקב"ה בתורה (דברים ה:טו) וזכרת כי עבד היית כלומר כאילו אתה בעצמך היית עבד ויצאת לחירות ונפדית. ונמצא שהנקודה היא הווה ולא רק זכירה בעלמא.

מהות החיוב לגבי נשים

וכבר נודה שנשים פטורות ממצות עשה שהזמן גמרא. והרב שמשון רפאל הירש (בקונטרס יהדות ניצחית כרך ב דף נא) ורב אברהם יצחק קוק (ביסודר עלת ראייה דף עא) והרב שמאון שוואב

2 והוסיף הרב זיבלד שזה הבנת הגמרא שהקשה שדין של אפי' מן התמחוי היא פשוט ומתריך (דף ק"ב). לא נצרכה אלא אפי' לר"ע דאמר עשה שבתך חול ואל תצטרך לבריות, הכא משום פרסומי ניסא מודה. כי כמו בשבת יש דין שעשה שבתך חול ואל תצטרך לבריות ומשום כך פוטר את העני מסעודת שלישה יכול לומר שגם פוטר את העני מד' כוסות, קמ"ל שמצות ד' כוסות משונה משלש סעודות כי יש דין של פרוסמי ניסא. והוא משום דהמצוה גופא היא חלק מחיותו של האדם, דמצות ארבע כוסות כל ענינה הוא לחיות ולהרגיש בפועל יציאת מצרים וחירות ומשום הא חייבים לתת לו מן התמחוי, ולא משום שהמצוה היא חלק מצרכיו הגשמיים דבזה פליג ר"ע אחכמים וסבר דהאדם נדון כביים חול, אך במקום שכל המצוה נתקנה לחיות את קיומה וצורת המצוה שונה, מחדשים בגמ' דר"ע מודה שיטול מן התמחוי שהרי כך הוא חיותו.

שבעה"ב ישתה את הכוסות ועליו הוטלה חובה זו, אך שאר בני הבית שלא קיימו בעצמם עיקר מצות הד' כוסות היינו שלא אמרו ההגדה והלל על הכוס אלא שמעו מן הבעה"ב שהיה כוסו לפניו, שוב אינם טעונים לשתות ד' כוסות. ומ"מ זו פשיטא להתוס' דאין דין כוסות הללו כשאר כוסות של ברכה, וטעונים הם שתייה והסיבה דרך חירות, כן נראה עיקר בספיקת התוס'.

סיכום דברי הרב וייס היא שאפילו תוס' מודה שיש דין של ד' כוסות וצריך לשתותם אלא שספקתו היא אם עיקר הדין של ד' כוסות היא השתיה דרך חירות וחז"ל קבעו את סדר ההגדה סובב הד' כוסות או שההגדה וברכותיה היא העיקר וחז"ל קבעו שתיתת הכוסות סביב לה. אולם צריך עיון בדברי רב וייס כי אף על פי שהבנה זו מתרץ את הקושיות על הגר"ז יש לנו עוד קשות שלא יכול להסביר אם סברה של רב וייס. כי אם יש מצוה של ד' כוסות למה משנה מצוה זו שקטנים יכול לקיים באופן משונה מההורים שלו. וגם צריך עיון מדוע עניים יכולים ליקח מן התמוי בעבור מצות ד' כוסות שלא מצינו בשאר מצות. ויש עוד קשות והבדלים שהביינו לעיל שאם למד שמצוה לשתות את הד' כוסות כמו המצוה לאכול את המצה או לאכול בסוכה אז השאלות נותרו ללא מענה.

מעשה או תוצאה

ואפשר לומר שיש מצוה של ד' כוסות (כמו שהרב וייס מביא) אבל הקיום ומהות של המצוה לא בהשתייה דווקא אלא העיקר מצוה היא התוצאה ממעשה השתיה. וזה לשונו של הרב שלמה וואהרמאן זצ"ל בספר אורות הפסח (סימן לד) דבתקנת חכמים לשתות ד' כוסות לא תקנו דאיכא מצוה בעצם השתייה דזה אינו, והעיקר היא התוצאה ממעשה השתייה שעל ידי השתייה ירגיש הרגשות חירות וכדמבואר ברמב"ם בפ"ז מהל' חמץ ומצה ה"ז שכתב דכיון דחייב כל אדם להראות את עצמו כאילו הוא יצא ממצרים שוב כל אחד ואחד חייב לשתות ד' כוסות דע"י השתייה יגיע לאותו מצב של חירות.

והוסיף רב וואהרמאן שלפ"י שפיר ס"ל לר"י שקטנים יכולים לקיים את מצות ד' כוסות באגוזים דבשתיית יין לקטנים לא יתכן בזה חינוך כלל דאין ביכולתם של הקטנים להגיע למצב זה (שהוא עיקר החיוב) שהרי אין נהנין ושמחין בו.

ולפי סברא זו יכול להבין איך שייך לומר שיש פרסום הנס במצוה של ד' כוסות אף על פי שאנו שותים בבתים פרטיים כי פרסום הנס לא שייך רק להעוברי דרכים אלא שצריך לפרסם הנס לעצמך כי יש חיוב של להראות את עצמו כאילו הוא יצא ממצרים. וכאשר כל איש ישראל שותים את הד' כוסות והגיע לדעת שהוא בן חורין אז הוא פרסים את הנס של יציאת מצרים לעצמו. וזה לשונו של הרב יעקב זיגלד בקונטרס מאורות ירושלים שיוצא לאור ע"י אברכי קהל עדת ירושלים (ניסן תשס"ה) זו כוונת הגמ' "משום פרסומי ניסא", פרסום הנס הוא לבטא את הנס בפועל ולמעשה, לחיות להרגיש ולהתנהג בהתאם לנס, ואף בינו לבין עצמו מקיים פרסומי ניסא כי אינו רק מקיים אלא חי ומתנהג בהתאם חייב אדם לראות את עצמו כאילו הוא יצא ממצרים.¹

נחזור לשאלותינו

ואם כינים הם דברים אז יכול להבין מדוע דווקא במצות ד' כוסות יש לנו דין של ואפי' מן התמחוי. כי ברוב מצות הכלל היא אל יבזו אם אין לנו. וכמו שמביא הירושלמי (פ"א דפאיא) כבד את ה'

1 ולפי סברא זו יכול לתרץ את קושית האבודרהם בסדר ההגדה שהביא לעיל לגבי מדוע אין אנו מברכים על מצות ד' כוסות. ויש לומר שלא תקנו ברכת המצות בשתיית ד' כוסות ד"ל דכיון דהמצוה אינה בעצם מעשה השתי' והעיקר הוא שיעגל למצב שיראה את עצמו כבן חורין וכאילו הוא בעצמו יצא ממצרים שהיא תוצאה ממעשה השתי' שוב לא תקנו בזה ברכה שלא תקנו ברכה רק כשמעשה המצוה היא כל המצוה כבאכילת מצה ומרור מה שאין כן במצוה דד' כוסות.

הלל והודאה על אלו הכוסות. וזהו שנסתפקו התוס' בריש ערבי פסחים אם נותנין כוס לפני כל אחד מבני הבית או ד' אין נותנין אלא לפני בעל הבית והוא מוציא את כולם בשלו, דאם נימא דמצות ד' כוסות בשתייתן א"כ יש ליתן ד' כוסות לכל אחד מבני הבית, אולם אם נימא דעיקר מצות ד' כוסות לברך על הכוס א"כ הוה כשאר כוסות של ברכה דאמרינן בהו שומע כעונה ויוציא האב לבני ביתו.

ברכה על מצות ד' כוסות

האבודרהם (שם) מביא שתי טעמים למה אין מברכין על מצות ד' כוסות וז"ל יש שואלין מפני מה אין מברכין בא"י אקב"ו לשותות ארבעה כוסות כמו שמברכין על המרור שהוא מדבריהם בזמן הזה. וי"ל היאך יברך לשתות ד' כוסות והרי יש כוסות של קידוש שהוא מצווה בו ועומד. ואם תאמר יברך לשתות שלשה כוסות והלא מחוייב הוא בארבעה הלכך לא אפשר. ועוד טעם אחר מפני שאין מברכין אלא על מצוה הנעשית בבית בלא הפסק אבל ארבע כוסות שעושה מצוה על כל אחד ואחד מהם ואם שתאן בבית אחת לא יצא אין מברכין.

והרב יונתן זקס בהגדה שלו (חזון לימים דף פא) מסביר שסברא הראשון של האבודרהם מאוד מדמה לשיטת תוס' אבל לא אותו דבר. כי לפי תוס' אין שום מצוה של ד' כוסות אלא שחז"ל קבעו את ד' ברכות של הסדר על הכוס. אבל לפי טעם ראשון של האבודרהם נראה שכוס ראשון לא מביא בתואר מצוה ד' כוסות ורק משום מצות קידוש אבל שאר הג' כוסות הם בתואר מצות ד' כוסות. אבל לא נראה לי מה ההבדל בין כוס א' לשאר כוסות. דאם אין רואים את כוס ראשון בסיכום חשבון הכוסות אז מדוע רואים את שאר הכוסות באופן זה. ויותר מסתברא לומר כדברי התוס' דכמו שאין שום מצוה של ד' כוסות בכוס ראשון כי המצוה היא הקידוש והכוס רק כוס של ברכה כמו בשאר קידושים כך בשאר כוסות אין שום מצוה של ד' כוסות והכוס היא כוס של ברכה על מצות סיפור יציאת מצרים, ברכת המזון והלל.

אבל קשה לומר שתוס' הסביר שאין שום מצוה של ד' כוסות אלא שהיה חלק ממצות של ברכת הסדר כי יש לנו הרבה סוגיות בש"ס שמשמע שהד' כוסות הם חיוב בפני עצמו. כמו (פסחים דף קט:): רבינא אמר: ארבעה כסי תקינו רבנן דרך חירות, כל חד וחד מצוה באפי נפשה הוא. ונראה מזה שלא רק מצוה אחת של ד' כוסות אלא שהד' כוסות הם ד' מצות נפרדים. וכמו כן (שם דף קח). יין איתמר משמיה דרב נחמן צריך הסיבה ואיתמר משמיה דרב נחמן אין צריך הסיבה ולא פליגי הא בתרתי כסי קמאי הא בתרתי כסי בתראי. ונמצא שיש חילוק על איזה כוסות צריכין הסיבה אבל ודאי יש מצוה לשתות את הכוסות. ואם תמצא לומר לפי הבנת תוס' שהכוסות באים רק לשים לב ולמחשיב על הברכה או אין צריך לשתות וזה נגד משמעות הגמרא.

חידושו של רב אשר

ועל זה מחדש רב אשר וייס (מנחת אשר הגדה של פסח סימן ז וגם נמצא במנחת אשר על ספר שמות סימן ח) דזו פשיטא דשתיית ד' כוסות מצוה, אולם זאת נסתפקו התוס', דמאחר שידענו שתקנו מצות הגדה והלל אף הן על הכוס, א"כ שוב יש לעיין עיקר תקנתם מה היא ומה נוסף על עיקר מצוה זו, האם עיקר ד' כוסות לשתייה דרך חרות נתקנו אלא שחכמים הוסיפו עלה שיהיו מסדרין הגדה והלל על הכוסות ומברכין עליהם, או ד' עיקר תקנת ד' כוסות לסדר עליהם אמירת הגדה והלל ובאו חכמים וקבעו דמצוה לשתות ד' כוסות אלה שנאמרו הלל והגדה עליהם. והנה אי נימא דעיקר תקנת ד' כוסות לשתייתן נתקנה א"כ פשיטא שחייב כל אחד ואחד מבני הבית לשתותן ולא יוציא בעה"ב לבני ביתו כשם שלא יוציאם יד"ח מצה ומרור, אולם אם עיקר תקנת ד' כוסות לסדר השבח על הכוס ולקרנות עליו הלל והגדה מסתברא דאין כ"א מבני הבית מחוייב בשתיית ד' כוסות ודי בזה

הקטן, אם הקטן לא יכול לשתות את הד' כוסות ראוי לומר שהקטן פטור ממצות זו. ומדוע חז"ל תקנו את הדין של קליות ואגוזין ואיך מועיל אכילת האגוזין לקיים מצות ד' כוסות?

מקור להדין

ואף על פי שהש"ס דילן לא הביא שום מקור להדין של ד' כוסות, רש"י כתב (פסחים צט: ד"ה דארבע כוסות) שהם כנגד ארבעה לשוני גאולה האמורים בגלות מצרים והוצאתי אתכם והצלתי אתכם וגאלתי אתכם ולקחתי אתכם בפרשת וארא. והרשב"ם גם כן הביא (ב"ב נח: ד"ה רביעית של תורה) משום דארבעה כוסות של פסח שיעורן ברביעית ומצאו להן חכמים סמך מן התורה מד' כוסות האמורים במצרים מד' לשוני גאולה האמורים בפ' והוצאתי והצלתי וגאלתי ולקחתי. וכמו כן מביא הר"ן (פסחים צט:): תרצו אותן חכמים לד' ברכות כדי שתהא כל אחד על הכוס ובירושלמי אמרו כנגד ארבע כוסות הכתובים על פרעה, ואמרו עוד כנגד ארבע כוסות התרעלה שעתיד הקב"ה להשקות את העמים. ונראה מדבריו שהמצוה של ד' כוסות היא עיקר קיומו של ליל הסדר כל כך שחז"ל קבעו את הד' ברכות ואופן הסדר סביב הצורך של הד' כוסות. ומלבד שהדין היה שצריך ג' או ה' כוסות אז האופן של הסדר וברכות הלילה צריך לשנות.

אולם תוס' (סוכה דף לח: ד"ה מי שהיה עבד ואשה) הביא דמסתמא לא תיקנו ד' כוסות אלא כדי לומר עליהם הלל ואגדה. וגם בפסחים תוס' מביא (דף צט: ד"ה לא יפחתו לו מארבע כוסות) שמתוך הלשון משמע קצת שאין נותנין לבניו ולבני ביתו כי אם לעצמו והוא מוציא את כולם בשלו וסברא הוא דמאי שנא ארבע כוסות מקידוש דכל השנה שאחד מוציא את כולם. וכמו כן מסביר האבודרהם (סדר ההגדה ופירושה) שהכוס הראשון אומר עליו קידוש היום והכוס השני קורא עליו ההגדה עד גאל ישראל. והכוס השלישי מברך עליו ברכת המזון. והכוס הרביעי גומר עליו את ההלל. ונמצא לפי דבריהם שאין מצוה דווקא בד' כוסות אלא הם חלק מין המצוה של הלל. וכמו שיש הידור לברך על הכוס בשאר מצות כן לגבי הד' ברכות של ליל הסדר כדאי לומר על הכוס אבל אין שום סברא לד' כוסות. ואם היה ג' או ה' ברכות בליל הסדר אז ממילא היה צריך ג' או ה' כוסות.

והמהר"ל (גבורות ה' פרק מח) פליג על תוס' ואמר שתקנו ארבע כוסות דרך חירות והטעם יתבאר למה ארבע לא פחות ולא יותר. ופירשו התוספות דמתוך הלשון משמע דאין צריך ארבע כוסות כי אם לבעל הבית והוא מוציא את כלם דמאי שנא ד' כוסות מקידוש של כל השנה, ועוד דאמרינן בגמרא השקה ממנו לבניו ולבני ביתו יצא והוא דשתה רובא דכסא משמע דהם יצאו בשמיעה. ויש לדחות דאיירי שלא הגיעו לחינוך ומיהא משמע בגמרא שצריך כוס לכל אחד ואחד דקאמר הכל חייבים בד' כוסות אחד נשים ואחד אנשים, ויש לדחות וחייבים לשמוע ארבע כוסות קאמר ע"כ. ולא הבנתי דבר זה דלא שייך שיהיה מוציא את אחרים בד' כוסות, דמאי שנא ממצה ומרור דכמו שאין יכול האחד להוציא את האחר במצה ובמרור כך אינו יכול להוציא בד' כוסות דמצוה דרמיא עליה הוא. ומה שהביא רביה מן קידוש של כל השנה התם עיקר מלתא לאו הכוס הוא אלא עיקר מילתא הוא הקדוש אלא שאין מקדשין אלא על הכוס וכיון ששתה בעל הבית שפיר דמי, אבל הכא עיקר מלתא הוא הכוס ולא הקידוש רק שתקנו שכל אחד ואחד מן הכוסות יעשה עליו מצוה, אבל הכוס הוא עיקר ולא שייך בזה שהוא מוציא אחר.

וחלוק זה התפרסם בחדושי מרן רי"ז הלוי (פ"ז מהל' חו"מ) וז"ל וכבר שמעתי מאמנו"ר הגאון זצ"ל דגם בארבע כוסות אין עיקר המצוה בשתיית הכוסות רק הברכות שעל הכוסות והוי ממש דוגמת קידוש דכל השנה וכל הכוסות של ברכה עכ"ל. ונראה דפליגי רבוותא ביסוד מצוה זו דד' כוסות, אם עיקרה בשתיית הכוסות ומשום חרות, או דילמא אין מצוותן אלא בסיפור הנס ושירת

בגדר ד' כוסות

יונתן זאב קירשנער

הגמרא בפסחים הביא הפסק (קח:): שתאן חי - יצא. אמר רבא ידי יין יצא ידי חירות לא יצא. שתאן בבת אחת, רב אמר ידי יין יצא ידי ארבעה כוסות לא יצא. ונראה מדבריו שיש שלשה דינים משונים שנכללים במצות ד' כוסות והם ידי יין, ידי חירות, והעיקר דין של ד' כוסות. וצריך להבין הגדרים והסברא של שלשה דינים אלו. ובגלל שהמספר ארבע מאוד נודע בליל הסדר כדי להבין הדין של ד' כוסות יש לנו לקשות עוד שלשה קושיות.

ד' שאלות

הגמרא בבלי לא הביא שום מקור להדין של ד' כוסות. ומלבד שהירושלמי (פסחים י א) מביא הרבה מקורות: מניין לארבעה כוסות? רבי יוחנן בשם ר' בנייה כנגד ארבע גאולות (שמות ו ו) לכן אמור לבני ישראל אני ה' והוצאתי אתכם וגו' ולקחתי אתכם לי לעם וגו' והוצאתי והצלתי וגאלתי ולקחתי. רבי יהושע בן לוי אמר כנגד ארבעה כוסות של פרעה (בראשית ס יא-יג) וכוס פרעה בידי ואשחט אותם אל כוס פרעה ואתן את הכוס על כף פרעה ונתת כוס פרעה בידו וגו'. רבי לוי אמר כנגד ארבעה מלכיות. ורבנן אמרי כנגד ד' כוסות של פורענות שהקב"ה עתיד להשקות את אומות העולם (ירמי' כה טו) כי כה אמר ה' אלהי ישראל אלי קח את כוס היין החימה וגו' (שם נא ז) כוס זהב בבל ביד ה' (תהילים עה ט) כי כוס ביד ה' (שם יא ו) ימטר על רשעים פחים אש וגפרית ורוח זלעפות מנת כוסם. וכנגדן עתיד הקב"ה להשקות את ישראל ארבעה כוסות של נחמות (תהילים טז ה) ה' מנת חלקי וכוסי (שם כג ה) דשנת בשמן ראשי כוסי רויה והדין (שם קטז יג) כוס ישועות אשא תריין עכ"ל. וכעין זה מצא גם במדרש רבה (פרשת וישב פרשה פח:ה).

יש להבין מדוע התלמוד בבלי לא הביא שום סברא או מקור להדין של ד' כוסות ורק המשנה בראש פרק ערבי פסחים (צט:): פסק בפשיטות שלא יפחתו לו מארבע כוסות של יין, ואפילו מן התמחוי.

ובגמ' (שם קי"ב). ואפי' מן התמחוי, פשיטא, לא נצרכה אלא אפי' לר"ע דאמר עשה שבתך חול ואל תצטרך לבריות, הכא משום פרסומי ניסא מודה. ונמצא דחייב כל אדם כשאין לו יין לארבע כוסות לשאול מהתמחוי והטעם בזה הוא משום פרסומי ניסא. ויש להבין מאי הפרסום בשתיית ד' כוסות דהא כל אחד יושב ושותה ד' כוסות בביתו בחדר פרטי ואינו מפרסם בזה מידי. דבשלמא נר חנוכה שמדליק בפתח ביתו לרה"ר הרי נראה לכל נתקן ויש עוברי דרכים שרואים ויש כן פרסומי ניסא, אך ד' כוסות מאי פרסום הנס איכא?

ובגמ' (שם קח:): תנו רבנן: הכל חייבין בארבעה כוסות הללו, אחד אנשים ואחד נשים, ואחד תינוקות. אמר רבי יהודה: וכי מה תועלת יש לתינוקות ביין? אלא, מחלקין להן קליות ואגוזין בערב פסח, כדי שלא ישנו, וישאלו. ויש להקשות מה נשתנה מצות זו משאר מצות. דבכל התורה כולה יש כלל שקטנים פטורים ממצות כי אין להם דעת ומדוע דווקא במצות ד' כוסות התינוקות מחייבים? ועוד שלא מצינו שחז"ל תקנו מעשה מצוה משונה בעבור מי שלא מבין או משיג את עיקר מעשה המצוה. וכמו שקטן שלא יכול לשמור את גופו פטור מציצית וחז"ל לא תקנו מעשה משונה עבור

מה נשתנה

שלום בלאבשטיין

הכלי יקר אמר ביאור נפלה ב"מה נשתנה" והוא אמר שהד' קשיות שאנו מקשים הם כנגד הד' טעמים של הגלות, והם: מחלוקת, ממון, תאוה, וגאווה. קודם כל צריך להבין "שלילה" הוא מרומז לגלות, שהוא ההיפוך "מיום" שמרומז לימות המשיח. ועוד צריך להבין שמצה מרמז למחלוקת וכמו שכתוב "כי ינצאו אנשים" (דברים כה:יא), והוא ההיפוך מחמץ שמרומז לשלום כי הקמח והמים והשאר מעורבים בו ביחד. מה נשתנה הלילה הזה דהיינו הגלות שאנו עומדים בו עכשיו, מכל הלילות מכל שאר גליות שהיינו בו לפני גלות זה. כי בכל שאר הגליות היה לנו חמץ ומצה, דהיינו שהיה לנו זמנים של שלום ושל ויקוח. אבל בגלות זה רק מצה, רק מלחמה. והקשיא השניה היא שבכל שאר הגליות היינו אוכלים כל יקרות, היינו שובעים בכל מה שהיה לנו. אבל בגלות זה מרור, אנו מרורים, ואין לנו שובעים במה שיש לנו. ובכל שאר גליות אין אנו מטבילין אפילו פעם אחת, היינו שלא היה לנו כל כך תאוות. אבל בגלות הזה שתי פעמים, שלא די לנו בטיבול אחד להפסיק התאוות שלנו, שיש לנו יותר מדי תאוות. והקשה הרביעי היא שבכל הלילות אנו אוכלים בין יושבין ובין מסבין, שבשאר הגליות היינו אוכלים ונוהגים בין בדרך ענוה היינו הישיבה, ובין בדרך גאווה היינו המסובין, אבל הלילה הזה גלות הזה כלנו מסובין רק בדרך של גאווה. ואף על פי שאנו עניים ובעלי תאוה ומחלוקת ומשום כך ראוי להיכר זה ונוהג בענוות מכל מקום אנו לא רואים זה ומהלכים בדרך גאווה. והוא העבודה של ליל הסדר, שאנו צריכים לשאול עצמינו איך בלילה הזה אנו יעשה שינוי בעצמינו לטוב. איך אנו יצאו למדרגה יותר גבוה ממה שהיינו עד עכשיו?

דברי תורה בעברית

מה נשתנה
שלום בלובשטיין

א

בגדר ד' כוסות
יונתן זאב קירשנער

ג

ספר

והשיב לב אבות

כרך ב • פסח, שבועות תשע"ז • קהל לב אבות