

INTERNET PARSHA SHEET
ON TOLDOS - 5759

B'S'D' to use his own uniqueness to serve G-d. It's more difficult to change from one good to another good, than from bad to good.

To receive these Parsha sheets by e-mail, contact crshulman@aol.com and cshulman@cahill.com
To subscribe to individual lists see <http://www-torah.org-virtual.co.il-shamash.org>
shemayisrael.co.il-jewishamerica.com-ou.org/lists-youngisrael.org-613.org
Thank you to Michael Fiskus for distributing in YIJE

From jr@novell.com Wed Jan 3 22:55:43 1996 mj-ravtorah@shamash.org
Shiur HaRav on Parshas Toldos

"And Yitzchok was forty years old when he married Rivka..." (Bereishis 22:20). Rashi explains that Yitzchok was 37 years old at the time of the Akeida. At the conclusion of the Akeida the news was received of the birth of Rivka. He waited until she was three years old and then married her. Rabbi Soleveitchik explained the reason for this seemingly long delay in marrying:

Yitzchok was the first of the Avos to be Kodosh M'rechem: holy from the time of birth (NOTE: The Rav did not offer a specific source for this statement). This Kedushah was that of an intended Korbon. From the time of his birth Yitzchok was intended to be a Korbon Olah and this was the mission which he had to fulfill. Until this mission was completed Yitzchok could not marry, have children, or engage in any other worldly pursuit, since to do so would have been Me'ilah Bekodoshim-improper use of an intended korbon. Just as Yitzchok could not profane himself with the mundane, likewise Avrohom could not send Eliezer to find Yitzchok a wife because to take a wife would have been me'ilah bekodoshim. Once the Akeida was accomplished, Yitzchok acquired the status of a "Dovor Shena'asis Mitzvoso"-property of Hekdesh whose Mitzva had already been completed. For such property, the prohibition of Me'ila no longer applies and hence Yitzchok could marry. (c) Dr. Israel Rivkin, Gershon Dubin and Josh Rapps. Permission to reprint and distribute, with this notice, is hereby granted. These summaries are based on notes taken by Dr. Rivkin at the weekly Moriah Shiur given by Moraynu V'Rabbeinu Harav Yosef Dov Halevi Soloveichik ZTL over many years.

* TORAH WEEKLY * Highlights of the Weekly Torah Portion

<http://www.ohr.org.il/tw/5759/Bereishi/toldos.htm>

My Son, the Doctor "And these are the generations of Yitzchak, the son of Avraham; Avraham gave birth to Yitzchak." (25:19) If a poor person has a rich relative, he will not hesitate to identify himself with his rich relative. "My cousin -- the millionaire." The reverse, of course, is rarely true. No one exalts himself by saying "My cousin -- the pauper." The beginning of this week's Parsha is tautological: "Yitzchak, the son of Avraham; Avraham gave birth to Yitzchak." If we know that Yitzchak was the son of Avraham, we don't need to be told that Avraham gave birth to Yitzchak.

Rather, when the Torah says that Yitzchak was "the son of Avraham," it is telling us the greatness of Avraham; for Yitzchak is no more than the "son of Avraham" -- my cousin the millionaire. In other words, Avraham was greater than Yitzchak. On the other hand, when the Torah says that "Avraham gave birth to Yitzchak" -- Avraham is defined as the person who gave birth to Yitzchak. Meaning that Avraham's status was no more than Yitzchak's progenitor. This implies that Yitzchak was greater than Avraham. So which is it? Was Avraham greater than Yitzchak, or was Yitzchak greater than Avraham? The answer is...both. Avraham was greater than Yitzchak because Avraham, unlike Yitzchak, had no teacher. He alone came to a recognition of his Creator. There was no one to educate him in the ways of G-d. Yitzchak, however, had his father Avraham and his mother Sarah. And they were the greatest of teachers. On the other hand, Avraham turned his back on a world of evil to become the representative of truth in the world. A choice which is as clear as day and night. Yitzchak, however, changed from good -- to good. A much more difficult achievement. It's always easier to follow in someone else's footsteps rather than to blaze one's own path on the spiritual road. Yitzchak was not content to duplicate his father's spiritual achievements. He wanted

Extremity and Mediocrity "Yitzchak entreated opposite his wife because she was barren. Hashem allowed Himself to be entreated by him." (25:21) Picture two worlds. A world of black and white, of extreme good and total evil. And a world of gray mediocrity. In which world would you prefer to live? Is true moral excellence worth the price of a concomitant great evil, or is it better that neither extreme should exist, at the price of great blandness? When Rivka conceived, world history could have taken one of two paths: Rivka could give birth to twins -- one the personification of good and truth and the other one evil and falsehood. Alternatively, she could give birth to one child who would be a synthesis of great good and great evil -- a great blandness. Yitzchak prayed that there should be two children. Rivka prayed that there should be only one.

"Hashem allowed himself to be entreated" by Yitzchak's prayer, meaning to the exclusion of Rivka's. Why did Hashem listen to Yitzchak and not to Rivka? Yitzchak was a "tzaddik ben tzaddik," a righteous person descended from righteous parents, Avraham and Sarah. Rivka was a "tzaddik ben rasha," a righteous person descended from evil parents. Rashi tells us that you can't compare the prayer of a righteous person who comes from righteous parents, to that of a righteous person whose parents were evil. That of a righteous person is heeded more. Ostensibly one would think the reverse to be true: That the prayers of someone who is righteous in spite of their background would be more effective and reach higher in the Heavens. After all, someone coming from negative influences has to put more effort into making themselves into a good person. Their greater effort should make their supplications more powerful. Hashem, however, listened to Yitzchak's prayer and Rivka gave birth to twins, Yaakov and Esav. Yitzchak was a righteous person who came from a background of holiness. He knew what moral excellence was. He had seen his father Avraham walk this planet. It was untenable for him to think that in the next generation there would be no one like his father in the world, no one of outstanding righteousness. Even if there would be a price to pay -- that there would also be someone in the world of incomparable evil -- the existence of superior good and truth would be worth it. Yitzchak thought this because he was a "tzaddik ben tzaddik," a righteous person of righteous lineage. He knew, first hand, what true righteousness was. Rivka, however, was a righteous person who came from evil parents, a "tzaddik ben rasha." She knew true evil first hand. It was untenable to her that there should be someone in the next generation of such evil. Infinitely preferable would be that evil should be diluted with good in one body. Better mediocrity than infamy.

Sources: * My Son, The Doctor - Ohr HaChaim Hakadosh, Rabbi Eliyahu Dessler as heard from Rabbi Yehoshua Bertram * Extremity and Mediocrity - Rav Mendel of Kotzk as heard from Rabbi Reuven Lauffer

Written and Compiled by Rabbi Yaakov Asher Sinclair General Editor: Rabbi Moshe Newman Production Design: Eli Ballon Prepared by the Jewish Learning Exchange of Ohr Somayach International 22 Shimon Hatzadik Street, POB 18103 Jerusalem 91180, Israel Tel: 972-2-581-0315 Fax: 972-2-581-2890 E-Mail: info@ohr.org.il Home Page: <http://www.ohr.org.il> (C) 1998 Ohr Somayach International - All rights reserved.

Yeshivat Har Etzion Israel Koschitzky Virtual Beit Midrash (Vbm) Student Summaries of Sichot Delivered by the Roshei Yeshiva Parshat Toldot Sicha of Harav Yehuda Amital Shlit"A (Summarized by Rav Eliyahu Blumenzweig)

"AVRAHAM BEGOT YITZCHAK" 'Avraham begot Yitzchak' - for the scoffers in that generation said, 'Sarah became pregnant from Avimelekh...' so God made Yitzchak's face look similar to that of Avraham... (Rashi, Bereishit 25:19). Rashi's words prompt us to ask why God must 'go out of His way,' as it were, and perform a special action just because of the scoffers of the day. Is it really necessary for an extra verse to be added into the Torah just because of these scoffers? The problem of childlessness is a theme among all the patriarchs - Avraham, Yitzchak, and even Yaakov, in the case of his wife Rachel. Parallel to this

physical childlessness, a type of spiritual barrenness also existed. Avraham taught belief in the Creator to the nations and all those around him. This belief was pure, devoid of any type of anthropomorphism or physicality, and demanded ideals of charity and justice that were beyond anything that the nations had previously known or believed. In response, those around him acknowledged that his faith was genuine, but considered it too lofty and pure, and they doubted the possibility that future generations would follow in his path and continue the same pure faith. Humanity, to their minds, was incapable of this, and therefore should continue to worship idols, out of an inability to reach the level of Avraham. This was, in fact, a spiritual barrenness - an inability to create a nation that would have genuine and pure faith. Avraham and his descendants waged a constant battle to prove that indeed there could be a continuity of faith, and that there was a nation capable of continually following the path of truth. It was Avraham who revealed the attribute of 'chesed,' the influencing of others and calling on God's name, to the world. Yitzchak would later reveal the attribute of 'yirah' - the withdrawal and silence inherent in Divine service. But even if Avraham was no longer childless in the physical sense, can we really say that from a spiritual point of view he had a successor who would continue in his faith, or had his son left his path and created a new and innovative path of his own? Yitzchak was truly unlike Avraham, the influencer. He was withdrawn and introverted. Perhaps we might be led to imagine that Sarah had indeed become pregnant from Avimelekh, and not from Avraham! For this reason, God made Yitzchak's face appear similar to Avraham's, in order to make it clear that Yitzchak's faith was the same as his, and that Yitzchak was indeed following in his father's way. Rather than creating a new path, he was simply adding a new track to the existing one. While Yitzchak truly 'dug new wells,' these were the same wells which Avraham his father had dug before him, and he called them by the same names which his father had used. "Avraham begot Yitzchak" teaches us that there is continuity; there is a nation which walks in the lofty paths of Avraham. It teaches us that Yitzchak is indeed Avraham's son, continuing in his path, adding scope and renewal. (Originally delivered on Leil Shabbat Parashat Toldot 5732. Translated by Kaeren Fish.)

REMINDER: To all Yeshivat Har Etzion Alumni Shalom U-verakha It is with great pleasure that we invite you and your family to participate in the tenth annual YESHIVAT HAR ETZION SHABBATON with HaRav Aharon Lichtenstein shlit"a. This year the shabbaton will be held IY"H on Shabbat Parashat Toldot, November 20-21, in Teaneck, New Jersey. For more information, please contact the NY office, 212-732-4874. We hope to see you all.

"RavFrاند" List - Rabbi Frاند on Parshas Toldos - These divrei Torah were adapted from the hashkafa portion of Rabbi Yissocher Frاند's Commuter Chavrusah Tapes on the weekly portion: Tape # 169, The Blind in Halacha. Good Shabbos!

Clothing Alone Do Not Make the Man This week's parsha contains the story of Yakov and Eisav, the two brothers who went their different ways. Yakov was righteous and Eisav was wicked. The Rabbis teach that although Eisav was wicked, there was one thing that he did extremely well. His performance of the command to honor parents was exemplary. He was a 'chosid' at performing this mitzvah. The Medrash Rabbah records that the Tanna, Rabban Shimeon ben Gamliel, bemoaned the fact that although he served his father his entire life, his actions did not measure up to even one percent of what Eisav did for Yitzchak, his father. "When I served my father, I served him in my regular, dirty clothes; but when I went out in public, I would wear clean (e.g. -- distinguished) clothing. However, Eisav would only serve his father wearing royal clothing as if he was serving a king..." Rav Shimeon ben Gamliel was bemoaning his inability to serve his father properly. The Succas Dovid asks a simple question: there was an easy solution -- Rav Shimeon ben Gamliel should have simply worn his good clothing when he served his father! The answer is that Rav Shimeon ben Gamliel was not bemoaning his inability to wear good clothing. He was bemoaning the attitude difference between Eisav and himself. He certainly could have worn good clothing, but that would have been a hollow act.

Eisav wore royal clothing for his father because he sensed that he was dealing with a king when he dealt with his father. Rav Shimeon ben Gamliel was not bemoaning the fact that he was missing the clothing -- he was bemoaning the fact that he was missing the sensitivity and emotion that Eisav felt for Yitzchak. We can, in fact, interpret the Talmud in Yoma [47a] in the same way. The Talmud records that Kimchas had 7 sons who all became High Priests. She attributed this merit to the fact that "all my life, the rafters of my house never saw my hair". She was so modest that even in the confines of her own home, she never removed her hair covering. The Talmud comments, "Many women attempted to imitate Kimchas, but they did not have her success". Why? The answer is the same. It was not covering her hair per se that produced High Priests. Modesty is a reaction to an inner feeling that "I am in the Presence of G-d". If a [married] woman would feel that she is always in the Presence of the Master of the World, then she would naturally never uncover her hair. But the act of simply covering the hair in the total privacy of one's home, when it is not because of the feeling of "I have set Hashem before me always..." [Tehillim 16:8] is merely a hollow act which will not produce High Priests. This is a concept that we must contemplate. Sometimes there are things that we do that cause us to feel good and right and religious. Yet, we must ask ourselves -- are we just doing the act, or are we doing that which is behind the act? It is not good enough to merely wear clothes or to do things that perhaps make us look more religious or feel more religious. We need the emotions and the feelings behind those acts to be the inspiration for the feeling of religiosity.

Transcribed by David Twersky; Seattle, Washington twerskyd@aol.com
 Technical Assistance by Dovid Hoffman; Yerushalayim dhoffman@torah.org Tapes or a complete catalogue can be ordered from the Yad Yechiel Institute, PO Box 511, Owings Mills MD 21117-0511. Call (410) 358-0416 for further information. Now Available: Mesorah / Artscroll has recently published a collection Rabbi Yissocher Frاند: In Print <http://books.torah.org/RavFrاند>, Copyright (c) 1998 by Rabbi Y. Frاند and Project Genesis, Inc. Project Genesis: Torah on the Information Superhighway learn@torah.org 6810 Park Heights Ave. <http://www.torah.org/> Baltimore, MD 21215 (410) 358-9800 FAX: 358-9801

Yated - Peninim Ahl Hatorah Parshas Toldos

by Rabbi A. Leib Scheinbaum Hebrew Academy of Cleveland

"And the boys grew up and Eisav was a man who knew hunting, a man of the field; Yaakov was a wholesome man dwelling in tents." (25:27)
 With these few words, the Torah characterizes the essence of Yaakov and the essence of Eisav. Indeed, it seems that the text pinpoints the predominant difference between the two brothers. One question is readily apparent. Eisav was a rasha m'rusha, evil incarnate. Even before his birth, in his mother's womb, his wicked tendencies were already manifest. Chazal teach us that when Rivkah passed by a house of idolatry, Eisav gravitated towards it. All this while he was still in the womb! On the day that he sold his birthright, he committed five cardinal sins. Is this a man who should be described as "a man who knew hunting"? Let the Torah tell it like it is: Eisav was an evil man throughout his life. In contrast, Yaakov, who is the bechir ha'Avos, the chosen one of the Patriarchs, is described so humbly, "A wholesome man dwelling in tents." One would think that referring to the Patriarch who fathered the Shivtei Kah, the twelve tribes, the individual who established the foundation of Am Yisrael, the Torah would present more noteworthy praise. Horav Yechezkel Levinstein, zl, infers a fundamental lesson from this ambiguity. The essence of an individual's greatness is not determined by actions but rather by his fundamental nature. Eisav was the requiem rasha because of his evil roots. We are inclined to believe that sin is determined by observable action. The greater and more iniquitous the behavior, the more pronounced is the sin and the more evil is the perpetrator. The truth is that one's evil roots and the actions that originate from them determine the level of one's malevolence. Eisav became a rasha m'rusha as a result of his origin. Had his roots not have been so corrupt, he would not have become the notorious Eisav. One does not become a sinner as result of his behavior. Rather, the innate evil within him is manifest through his actions. One whose roots are evil will become a sinner! Let us return to the Torah's characterization of Eisav and Yaakov. When the Torah describes Eisav as "a man who knew hunting," it is emphasizing Eisav's roots, the

source of his nefarious behavior. He was the essence of sheker, falsehood. He was a cunning hunter; trickery, deceit and treachery were the prime components of his personality. One who possesses such character traits is destined for evil. Eisav was exposed to a father and mother who were paragons of virtue and morality, as well as a grandfather who fought paganism and set the standard for the middah of chesed. He lived in a home in which the sight of Divine angels was commonplace. Nevertheless, he descended to the nadir of depravity. Unless the roots of such an individual are expunged, he does not have a chance. He can be aware of the greatness of Hashem and of the power of a tzaddik's blessing, as Eisav was. Yet, it all loses meaning in light of his compulsion to remain the epitome of evil. Eisav knew hunting; his cunning was his downfall, for it originated in falsehood and ended in blasphemy.

The Torah notes another aspect of Eisav's character. He was an "ish sadeh," a man of the field. Rashi interprets this to characterize a man of leisure who hunts to his heart's content. Eisav led an easygoing lifestyle, rejecting the yoke of responsibility, doing whatever he pleased. He lived for the moment, ignoring the consequences tomorrow might bring. This frivolous attitude has become common. Such an absence of focus stems from an individual's lack of maturity. Fun is not an intrinsically negative concept, providing that one establishes and adheres to appropriate limits. One who disdains responsibility reverts to childishness, ignoring the consequences of his actions. At times, children may do terrible things, paying no attention to the person whom they have hurt or the seriousness of the injury. So, too, the "ish sadeh" does whatever he wants, wherever he desires to do it regardless of whom he has affected. Eisav was a man of the field who lived for today with no thought of tomorrow. He disdained authority, ignored responsibility, and scoffed at retribution. Do we have to search far to find this type of person or this attitude? Indeed, without realizing it, many fall into this category. Whether it is individuals who spurn responsibility, or others who simply refuse to grow up to accept the role of mature individuals, a drop of "Eisav" exists in many of us. It has become a trait to which some aspire. Our society has venerated those who have lived without fear of consequence, acted without compunction or restriction, responding with utter contempt towards those who scrutinize their behavior. Horav Levinstein suggests that actually Eisav's characteristics are interrelated one to another. One who is truthful is concerned with the future. He sees the underlying goal in every act. Therefore, he seeks to reconcile the present with the future. The liar lives by, and for, the fleeting moment. His life is one of consummate deceit toward others, but ultimately he deceives himself the most. Yaakov Avinu, the "ish emes," man of truth, who dwelled in the tent of Torah, knew the essence of life. He apportioned his time wisely, realizing that every minute was an eternity in a spiritual sense. He truly lived for the future. The reality of the present is found in its function as an investment in the future.

"And Eisav was a man who knew hunting, a man of the field, and Yaakov was a wholesome man dwelling in tents." (25:27) Eisav is not depicted as a hunter, but as a man who "knew" hunting, a professional hunter who is an expert at his chosen vocation. Eisav is the consummate hunter, the one who sets the standard for excellence in the field of hunting, the one to whom everybody looks up. Eisav is a "doer;" his entire essence bespeaks accomplishment and success. Yaakov, on the other hand, is portrayed as a man who dwells in tents, the quiescent scholar who remains cloistered from society, his mind buried in his books. Undoubtedly he is successful at what he is doing. In the future, he will probably produce wonderful novellae and serve as a wellspring of knowledge for his community. In addressing the here and now, however, what is he really accomplishing for the community? Indeed, in comparison to his successful brother, Yaakov gives the impression of being the mellow type of fellow who is not achieving at the moment. This is what one might see at first glance from a cursory reading of the text. Targum Onkelus, however, translates "yode'a tzayid" as a "nachshirchan" or a "batlan," a ne'er do well, who does nothing! This suggests quite the opposite impression that one gleans from reading the text. What does this all mean to us? Horav Avigdor Nebentzhal, Shlita, presents a specific perspective. Some individuals mistakenly believe that the real movers and

shakers are the "Eisavs" of our day. They accomplish; they act; they are the so-called experts in every field who seem to be doing so much. The Targum, in his departure from what seemed the simple interpretation, teaches a fundamental principle. It is the "Yaakovs" who are studying Torah with enthusiasm and self-sacrifice, who are tucked away from the public forum, who are not constantly creating a tumult; they are the ones who are accomplishing; they are the ones who are truly building and sustaining a world. Veritably, Eisav might seem to be the one who is momentarily building, creating and executing an important function in the world. However, this is only a temporary state. It is Yaakov who is building nitzchuyus, eternity. He is building for generations to come. His accomplishment will bear fruit for the future, long after Eisav's exploits will have dissipated and disappeared. Yaakov is the "ish ha'maasi," the man of action, while Eisav is the batlan, the ne'er-do-well who has a lot of form but no substance.

PARSHA Q&A * In-Depth Questions on the Parsha and Rashi's commentary. Parshas Toldos

<http://www.ohr.org.il/qa/5759/bereishi/toldos.htm>

Recommended Reading List Ramban 25:23 Two Nations 26:1 Yitzchak in Exile 26:5 The Avos and Mitzvah Observance 26:20 The Wells and the Future 27:4 Rivka's Secret 27:33 Why Yitzchak Trembled Sforno 25:24 Esav's Name 25:26 Yaakov's Name 27:1 Yitzchak's Blindness 27:29 Yaakov's Portion

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

1. Why was it important that Yitzchak look like Avraham? 25:19 - So that everyone would agree that Avraham was indeed his father.
2. Why does the Torah stress that Rivka was the daughter of Besuel and the sister of Lavan? 25:20 - To praise her, that even though her family was evil she was righteous.
3. What are the two differences between Tamar's pregnancy and Rivka's pregnancy? 25:24 - Rivka gave birth at full term to two children, one righteous and one wicked. Tamar gave birth after seven months to two righteous children.
4. Why was Esav named Esav? 25:25 - Because he was born fully developed. The name Esav is based on the Hebrew word for "made."
5. Who gave Yaakov his name? 25:26 - Hashem.
6. How did Esav deceive his father? 25:27 - Esav deceived Yitzchak by asking questions that suggested that he was very strict in mitzvah observance.
7. Why was Esav faint when he returned from the field? 25:29 - From having murdered.
8. Why are lentils a food for mourners? 25:30 - They are round like a wheel and mourning is like a revolving wheel that eventually touches everyone.
9. What was the birth right that Yaakov bought from Esav? 25:31 - The right to bring sacrifices.
10. Why was Yitzchak not permitted to go to Egypt? 26:2 - Through the akaida he had attained the status of a korban and was forbidden to leave Eretz Canaan.
11. Why did the Philistines plug up the wells? 26:15 - They felt that either marauders would attack to capture the wells, or if attacking for other reasons, they would use the wells as a water supply.
12. What caused Yitzchak to lose his sight? 27:1 - The smoke from the incense offered by Esav's wives to their idols.
13. At what age should one anticipate his own death? 27:2 - When he reaches five years from the age his parents were when they passed away, until five years after.
14. Why did Rivka ask Yaakov to bring two kid goats? 27:9 - One for Yitzchak and the other to offer as a korban Pesach.
15. Why did Esav leave his special garments with Rivka? 27:15 - He suspected that his wives might steal them.
16. What fragrance did Yitzchak detect on Yaakov's garments? 27:27 - The scent of Gan Eden.
17. What was the "fat of the land" promised to Esav? 27:36 - Italy.
18. When will Esav be freed from subjugation to Yaakov? 27:40 - When the Jewish People transgress the Torah.
19. What inspired Esav to marry the daughter of Yishmael? 28:7 - When he saw that his father despised his current wives, he resolved to take a wife from his father's family.
20. If we know that Machalas was Yishmael's daughter, it's self-evident that she was the sister of Nevayos. Why, then, does the Torah state that Esav married "Yishmael's daughter, the sister of Nevayos?" 28:9 -

To indicate that Yishmael died between her betrothal and her wedding, and that it was Nevayos who gave his sister in marriage to Esav. Knowing the date of Yismael's death we can determine the date of Esav's marriage and thus Yaakov's age, 63, at the time of his flight from Esav.

Written and Compiled by Rabbi Reuven Subar General Editor: Rabbi Moshe Newman Production Design: Eli Ballon Prepared by the Jewish Learning Exchange of Ohr Somayach International 22 Shimon Hatzadik Street, POB 18103 Jerusalem 91180, Israel E-Mail: info@ohr.org.il Home Page: <http://www.ohr.org.il> (C) 1998 Ohr Somayach International

<http://www.ou.org/torah/ti/> OU Torah Insights

Project Parashat Toldot Rabbi Joel Finkelstein

The Torah's statement in Parshas Toldos that "Yitzchak prayed across from (lenochach) his wife" raises several questions. Rabbi Eliyahu Mizrachi asks: How could Yitzchak pray in front of Rivka? He would seem to be praying not to G-d but to his wife. The Maharal of Prague raises the issue of his being distracted by his wife. Furthermore, why would Yitzchak need to pray across from his wife? Does G-d need Yitzchak to point out Rivka? Rashbam answers that Yitzchak prayed for his wife--about her, but not necessarily in her presence. He did not pray at or to her. Seforno and Redak maintain that Yitzchak simply stood across from her when he prayed. Redak claims that he did so in order to stir his emotions as he prayed. Just as visiting the sick stimulates one's compassion to pray for them, so too did Yitzchak feel that by being in the presence of Rivka he would feel more compassion for her and pray with more devotion. We are always encouraged to pray for all Jews; there are hardly any prayers, in fact, that are just for an individual. This fits well with the notion that prayer replaces the communal sacrifices brought in the Temple. The daily sacrifice was brought on behalf of all Israel. We too should pray for all of Israel together.

However, we also are taught that prayers were instituted by our Forefathers, centuries before the Temple. This conception of prayer addresses the need for individual prayer for individual circumstance. Jewish prayers emphasize the community over the individual. Our overriding concerns for the Jewish People and the State of Israel often distract us from the needs of the individual. Our challenge is to maintain our interest and concern for the individual within our universal and broader concerns. We have to continue to be concerned with our own personal needs and the personal needs of others, and not get lost in broad generalities. We cannot allow our communally oriented prayers to distract our heartfelt concerns for those who are nochachim, who stand opposite us in our own families. We must follow the advice of the Talmud, which states, "One who has a sick person in his home, says [a prayer for him] in the blessing for healing." We need to add our own private prayers to our communal prayers and we must never shy from pleading the case of the individual within the context of the community.

Rabbi Joel Finkelstein Rabbi Finkelstein is rabbi of the Anshei Sphard-Beth El Emeth Congregation in Memphis, Tennessee. Torah Insights is brought to you every week as a service of the Department of Jewish Education of the Orthodox Union. OU.ORG - Your Gateway to the Jewish Internet

From jr@sco.COM Thu Nov 27 00:43:56 1997 toldos.97 Shiur HaRav Soloveichik ZT"L on Parshas Toldos (Shiur date: 11/11/75)

The Haftorah for Parshas Toldos at first glance appears to have a limited connection to the Parsha itself in that the first 5 verses contrast the relationship between Hashem and Jacob and Hashem and Esau. The prophet then rebukes the Kohanim and all those that bring sacrifices that are not the best and most attractive, Lechem Megoal. (The Rav noted that there is a rule in Hilchos Kodshim that a sacrifice must be brought from the best, (Min Hameula). This is a separate Halacha from the prohibition against offering a Baal Mum, an animal with a deformity.) The prophet continues to discuss the Kohen Gadol and Hashem's covenant for life and peace with him. This is a reference to Aharon Hakohen.

The Rav asked what is the connection between the beginning of the Haftorah and its subsequent portions? One might suggest that indeed there is no connection between the beginning of the Haftorah and the remainder. There is a requirement that a Haftorah be a minimum of 21 verses, this

Haftorah has 21 verses. However, the Gemara says that if the Haftorah that we read is a complete topic, even though it is less than 21 verses, we may read it even if it is less than 21 verses. In fact we read several Haftorot that are fewer than 21 verses. Since we read more than the few verses that appear to be connected to the Parsha that would form a complete unit on their own, we deduce that Chazal noted some connection between the rest of the Haftorah and the Parsha.

The Rav explained: Jacob purchased the birthright from Esau. Having the Bechora meant having the responsibility to be the Kohen. Indeed, prior to the sin of the golden calf, the first born were designated to perform the ritual service in the Beis Hamikdash. After the sin of the golden calf, the obligation of the first born to serve in the temple was given to Shevet Levi. Hence, in the home of Isaac, it was Esau who was the Kohen until it was purchased by Jacob.

The Yalkut Shimoni quotes a Midrash Avkir that when Jacob was wounded by the angel Michael [note: this Midrash says that Michael was the angel who battled Jacob, in order to show him that if he is capable of battling an angel to a standstill, he need not fear Esau. The Yalkut also brings another Midrash that it was the angel of Esau] Hashem said "you are causing My priest to be deformed", and Michael asked Rephael to help him heal Jacob. Michael, who is called the Kohen Shel Maalah, the priest upon high, is sent to heal the Kohen Shel Matah, the human priest, Jacob.

Rashi comments on the verse where Jacob says to Esau that he should sell his birthright to Jacob "Michrah Kayom Es B'chorascha Li": Jacob said that the first born is obligated to offer sacrifices and serve as a Kohen. Rashi comments on the verse Hinei Anochi Holech Lamus that Esau asked what benefit may one derive from this service. Jacob responded that [quite the opposite] this service has many restrictions and prohibitions that carry severe penalties, including death, for transgressions like performing the Avodah in a drunken state. Esau responded, if that is the case, he will surely die because of this service, he has no use for it and he rejects it and gives it to Jacob. The concept of Kehuna, serving Hashem in the Temple, is emphasized in the Parsha in this story of Jacob and Esau.

To understand the Haftorah vis a vis the Parsha, we must understand the concept of Kehuna. The tribe of Levi was divided into 24 shifts of priests. Each of these shifts consisted of 7 Batei Avos. This setup applied to Shevet Levi as well as the Kohanim. This meant that the Kohanim worked only 2 times a year. What did the Kohanim do the rest of the year to deserve the Matnos Kehuna that they were granted?

The primary task of Shevet Levi is to teach Torah to Bnai Yisrael. The Torah tells us "Yoru Mishpatecha Lyaakov, Vtorascha L'Yisrael", they will teach Your laws to Jacob and Your Torah to Israel. Only after that comes the obligation of "Yasimu Ketorah B'apectha Vkhilil al Mizbechecha", they shall place incense and sacrifices on Your altar. The Torah refers to the Sanhedrin and Chazal as Kohanim, for example, it says "Uvasa El Hakohen Asher Yihye Bayamim Hahem", and you shall approach the Kohen that will live at that time, where Kohen means the Chachamim of the generation. Another example is the obligation of the king to write a Sefer Torah based on the guidance of the Kohanim and Leviim, again indicating Chachamim. The Sanhedrin was to have Kohanim as members.

The prophet describes the role of the Kohen (Malachi 2:6-7) as the teacher of the people, the one who helps the people return from sin, and the one whose Torah knowledge is sought after. The prophet is rebuking the Kohanim for not behaving properly. They did not guard the Shulchan Hashem correctly, allowing it to become a Shulchan Megoal, a corrupt, dirty altar. The job of being a teacher of Torah goes beyond giving lectures. It includes the obligation to practice Chesed, to help people with acts of kindness, to help the people steeped in sin to return to Hashem. Of the Kohen acts improperly regarding the Korbanos Hashem, he can cause a Chilul Hashem, a desecration of the name of Hashem. The Kohen must teach the people the art of Hakravas Korban: how they are to prepare for and experience the obligation to offer themselves as personal Korbanos to Hashem, by teaching the people how to follow the ways of Hashem. The Ramban interprets Korban to mean self sacrifice, that each Jew should

attempt to recreate Akeidas Yitzchak. For example we say in our Tefilos on Yomim Noraim that Hashem should look at the Afaro Shel Yitzchak, the ashes of Yitzchak. How could this be: Yitzchak was not sacrificed on the altar. Why don't we say that Hashem should look at the ashes of the ram that was brought in his place? The answer is that since Yitzchak was prepared to offer himself he achieved the level of Korban. We ask Hashem to view the ashes as if they were from Yitzchak himself.

Why is this Haftorah relevant to Parshas Toldos? This Haftorah would appear to be more relevant to Parshas Emor. The Rav said that this Parsha is where the concept of Kehuna vis a vis Bnay Yisrael begins. The Haftorah sets forth the program of Kehuna.

Just as Shevet Levi are the Kohanim to Klal Yisrael, the Jewish people are the Kohanim for the whole world, as our mission is to be a Mamleches Kohanim V'goy Kadosh. We are obligated to set an example of sanctity for the rest of the world to follow. The individual Kohen must teach the people the path of Torah and Chesed. Likewise, Knesses Yisrael (Chazal often refer to Knesses Yisrael as a single entity) has an obligation to teach the rest of the world the ways of Hashem. Chilul Hashem results when the Kohen defiles the Shulchan Hashem which results in driving people away from Hashem. When Yaakov bought the Kehuna, he bought it for the individual Kohanim vis a vis the Avodah for Bnay Yisrael, and for Knesses Yisrael relative to the rest of the world.

The prophet says (Malachi 1:4) "And your eyes shall see and you shall exclaim let the glory of Hashem overflow the boundaries of Israel". The ultimate goal and hope of the Jewish People is that the name of Hashem be recognized by all creation as the King of the universe. Knesses Yisrael can accomplish this. The prophet is saying that if the Kohanim do not set the proper example and standard for Klal Yisrael, then the ultimate goal of spreading Hashem's name to all creation cannot happen. The prophet rebukes the Kohanim saying that their ultimate goal should be that Kedushas Hashem should be evident and acknowledged from one end of the world to the other.

Yet, the prophet continues, you, the Kohanim, act in counter productive ways and defile My name by your actions. The ultimate greatness of the name of Hashem can only be recognized by all if you set the appropriate example. The Jew prays that Muktar Mugash Lishmi, offerings should be made to Hashem from everywhere. It is the job of the Jew to sanctify the name of Hashem so this can happen. However if you defile the name of Hashem this can't happen. The realization of Malchus Hashem over the entire world depends on the ability of the Jewish People to act appropriately and to set an example of Chesed and Rachamim. The prophet (Malachi 2:4) emphasizes that the covenant was given to Levi, where Levi represents the entire Jewish nation. Knesses Yisrael was entrusted with the Torah and Mitzvos in order that they may be the priests to the world and glorify the name of Hashem.

The theme of Parshas Toldos is Kehuna. Abraham was not granted Kehuna, as Malki Tzedek was the Kohen of his generation. Isaac received the gift of Kehuna through the Akeidah. Jacob purchased the rights to the Kehuna from his brother Esau. The Parsha tells us that the Kehuna passed from Isaac to Jacob, that it was a Kehuna that carries with it a history of suffering, loneliness and sanctifying the name of Hashem. The Haftorah tells us the program that the Kohanim must follow.

This summary is copyright 1997 by Dr. Israel Rivkin and Josh Rapps, Edison, N.J. Permission to distribute this summary, with this notice is granted. To receive these summaries via email send mail to listproc@shamash.org with the following message: subscribe mj-ravtorah firstname lastname

From: dvartorah@torah.org 11/23/95 4:17pm

Dvar Torah - Parshas Toldos by Chaim Ozer Shulman

The end of this Parsha describes how Yitzchok wanted to bless Eisav before he died, and told him: "Hunt for me delicacies the way I like them so that I may bless you before I die." (27:2-4) Why did Yitzchok need to eat his favorite dish in order to bless Eisav? We are actually told earlier in the Parsha that Yitzchok loved Eisav because he enjoyed the meat that he hunted for him. (25:28) Again, it is strange that he should love Eisav

because of the food!

From Chazal we see that Yitzchok loved Eisav, not because he enjoyed his food, but because Eisav was so zealous in Kibud Av (honoring his father). As the Midrash tells us (Bereishis Rabbah 65): Our teacher Shimon Ben Gamliel stated: "All of my days I served my father, and I didn't accomplish even 1/100th of the degree to which Eisav honored his father. When Eisav served his father he served him (wearing) royal garments." Even Raban Shimon Ben Gamliel's Kibud Av did not compare with that of Eisav. Similarly, it is brought down from the Zohar that there was no one in the world who honored his father like Eisav did, and that Zechus (merit) protected Eisav in this world. Yaakov, on the other hand, was not as careful as he could have been with Kibud Av. This is seen from the fact that he had to mourn his son Yosef whom he thought dead for 22 years as a punishment for the 22 years that Yaakov was away from his father; 20 years hiding from Eisav in the house of Lavan, and 2 years on the way back. (37:34) What remains to be understood, though, is why was it so important that Eisav be involved in Kibud Av at the same time that he receive the blessing.

I would suggest that there is a direct connection between Kibud Av and the blessing of Veyiten Licha Elokim Mital Hashamayim Umishmanei Haaretz (may G-d give you from the dew of heaven and the fat of the earth) (27:28). This is a blessing for the material gifts of this world. Kibud Av, the Sefer Hachinuch tells us, is a Mitzvah of Hakaras Hatov (appreciation) to our parents for bringing us into this world. And in fact, in the Aseres Hadibros (Ten Commandments) we're told that we should honor our father and mother "so that it will lengthen your days". If we honor our parents we will be rewarded with a long life. Long life is an appropriate reward, Midah Keneged Midah (measure for measure), for one who shows appreciation for life by honoring one's parents who gave life in the first instance. Because Eisav was zealous in Kibud Av his father thought that he should get the blessing of Olam Hazeh (the physical world) as a reward for recognizing the value of life and parents. It is therefore understandable why Yitzchok felt that in order for such a blessing to take effect Eisav must be involved in Kibud Av at the very moment of the Bracha. Several commentators point out that Yitzchok always intended to give what is known as the "Birchas Avraham" (blessings of Avraham) to Yaakov. Before Yaakov leaves for Lavan, Yitzchok blesses him as follows: "May He give you the blessings of Avraham for you and your children..." (28:4) This "Birchas Avraham" is the promise given in Parshas Lech Lecha, "and I will make you a great nation," that Avraham's descendants will become the Am Hanivchar (the chosen people). The Birchas Avraham, is in a sense the spiritual blessing, while "may He give to you from the dew of heaven, and the fat of the land" is the physical blessing. Yitzchok always intended that the spiritual blessing of Avraham should go to Yaakov.

Although Yitzchok felt that the blessing of material wealth should go to Eisav, Rivka felt that even the worldly blessing should go to Yaakov. Rivka was right. In fact Yitzchok in the end draws this same conclusion when he finds out that Yaakov stole the blessing, and he says "Gam Baruch Yihiyeh" (even he shall be blessed) (27:33). He saw that when Yaakov entered the room the smell of Gan Eden (paradise) entered with him, while when Eisav entered he saw Gehenam (hell) open up under him. He also saw that Yaakov spoke in a soft respectful manner - Kum Na (please sit up), while Eisav spoke in a commanding manner - Yakum Avi (rise father). Thus, Eisav was lacking in Morah Av (reverence), which Yaakov had. The Talmud says in Tractate Kidushin (30): "The Torah equates reverence of parents with reverence of G-d." Fear of one's parents comes with fear of G-d. Eisav could never achieve this fear. Thus, the Torah acknowledges that Yaakov properly merited not only Birchas Avraham (the blessings of Avraham) but also the physical blessing of Mital Hashamayim Umishmanei Haaretz (the dew of heaven and the fat of the earth).

DvarTorah, Copyright (c) 1995 Project Genesis, Inc. This list is part of Project Genesis, the Jewish Learning Network. Permission is granted to redistribute electronically or on paper, provided that this notice is included intact. For information on subscriptions, archives, and other Project Genesis classes, send mail to learn@torah.org for an automated reply. Project Genesis, the Jewish Learning Network learn@torah.org http://www.torah.org/

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

Perhaps father will feel me and I shall appear to him as a mocker(27:12) IS IT EVER PERMITTED TO LIE? Yaakov Avinu was the amud ha-emes, the Pillar of Truth. Indeed, according to the Talmud(1), the greatest fear that Yaakov Avinu had was that he might encounter life situations where he would be forced to lie. When Rivkah commanded Yaakov to falsely present himself to his blind father as Eisav, he protested, for our Sages(2) compare lying to idol worship. It was only when Rivkah told him that it was the will of Heaven that he be the one to receive the blessings from his father Yitzchak, that Yaakov relented and allowed his mother to disguise him to appear as Eisav. What is the definition of lying? R' Yonah(3) lists nine different categories of lies. In order of severity, they are: People who cheat in business, causing others financial loss; People who exploit others after gaining their trust through deception; People whose lies cause others to lose out on some gain or benefit that was coming to them; People who fabricate stories merely for the sake of lying; People who hold out the promise of giving another person material goods while never intending to follow up on their promise; People who intend to keep a promise but do not honor their commitment; People who claim that they did a favor or a good deed for another when in fact they have not; People who praise themselves for virtues that they do not possess; People who change minor details when retelling an episode.

A careful analysis of these nine categories shows that all of the lies are told either for the purpose of cheating another person, or for self-glorification, etc. R' Yonah, however, does not list those who lie for a "good" purpose or for a "good" reason. Thus, we may ask, is it ever permitted to lie?

Throughout Talmudic literature, we find stories about our Sages veering from the truth for "good" reasons(4). Obviously, however, only the poskim can draw practical conclusions from such cases, since these very episodes can be understood on various levels. Moreover, not everything quoted in the Talmud is applied in practical Halachah, as we often rule differently from an opinion stated in the Talmud. The following, however, are some real-life situations with which the poskim deal:

If one is asked information about a matter that is supposed to remain secret, he may answer, "I don't know"(5). Similarly, although one is not allowed to lie in order to avoid telling bad news(6), it is permitted to say, "I don't know"(7). During an appeal for funds, one is not allowed to announce a donation in an amount greater than he is planning to give, even if the aim is to spur others to commit themselves to larger donations(8). A wealthy man is permitted to lie about his wealth if he fears "the evil eye" (ayin ha-ra) or if he does not want to arouse jealousy(9). When collecting funds for a poor Torah scholar, one may say that he is collecting for hachnasas kallah, marrying off a bride, if he thinks that people will be more receptive to that cause(10). It is also permitted to raise funds for hachnasas kallah even when the collection is primarily for the benefit of the groom(11). It is prohibited to lie for the sake of financial gain, even when no stealing is involved(12). If one fears that a package will be mishandled, it is permitted to write "glass" on it, even though it does not contain any glass(13). If one sees that his wife will be late for Shabbos, he is permitted to tell her that the hour is later than it really is. This is permitted only when it is clear that she is procrastinating. If, however, she is rushing and harried and telling her that the hour is later than it really is will only pressure her further, it is forbidden to do so(14). If, by refusing to receive a visitor, the visitor's feelings will be hurt, one is permitted to leave instructions saying that he is not home(15). One should not, however, instruct a minor to lie about his parents' whereabouts, since that teaches the child to lie.

FOOTNOTES: 1 Makkos 24a. 2 Sanhedrin 92a. 3 Sha'arei Teshuvah 3:178-186. 4 See, for example, Berachos (43b) - episode with R' Papa; Pesachim (112a) - attributing a statement to a fabricated source so that it will be readily accepted; Sukkah (34b) - quoting Shemuel's threat to the haddasim merchants; Yevamos (65b) - lying for the sake of peace; Bava Metzia (23b) - departing from the truth for the sake of humility, modesty or discretion; Bava Metzia (30a) - episode with R' Yishmael. There are many other such examples. 5 Harav S.Z. Auerbach and Harav S.Y. Elyashiv quoted in Titen Emes l'Yaakov, pg. 76. 6 Y.D. 402:12. 7 Harav S.Z. Auerbach, Harav S.Y. Elyashiv and Harav Y.Y. Fisher quoted in Titen Emes l'Yaakov pg. 89. See also Metzudos David, II Shemuel

18:29. 8 Minchas Yitzchak 3:97, based on Maharsha, Sukkah 29a. 9 Harav S.Y. Elyashiv quoted in Titen Emes l'Yaakov, pg. 78. 10 Teshuvos Mishneh Sachir (end of vol. 1) quoting a story with the Chasam Sofer. Part of the ruling is based on the Midrash Rabbah (Ki-Sisa) that compares a talmid chacham to a kallah. In that story the Chasam Sofer allowed a tzedakah fund intended for hachnasas kallah to support a well-known talmid chacham. 11 Harav S.Z. Auerbach quoted in Titen Emes l'Yaakov, pg. 55. 12 R' Yonah (Sha'arei Teshuvah 180,186); Rasha's'h (Shabbos 140b) and Sdei Chemed (vol. 4, pg. 87) opposing the Maharsha (Shabbos 140) who implies that it is permissible; Chafetz Chayim (Sefas Tamim 2). 13 Harav S.Y. Elyashiv, Harav Y.Y. Fisher and Harav C. Kanievsky, quoted in Titen Emes l'Yaakov, pg. 66. 14 Harav S.Y. Elyashiv quoted in Titen Emes l'Yaakov, pg. 86. 15 Harav S.Z. Auerbach and Harav S.Y. Elyashiv quoted in Titen Emes l'Yaakov, pg. 76. See also Machatzis ha-Shekel O.C. 156 which states that if one has no time to answer a question about a particular subject, he may say that he is not learning that subject now and cannot answer the question.

The Weekly Halachah Discussion Volume 2 on Vayikra, Bamidbar and Devarim is published and on sale in your local bookstore! Halachah by Rabbi Doniel Yehuda Neustadt is based on the Weekly Halachah column that you have been subscribing to through Project Genesis. Weekly-Halachah, Copyright (c) 1998 by Rabbi Neustadt, Dr. Jeffrey Gross and Project Genesis, Inc. The author, Rabbi Neustadt, is the principal of Yavne Teachers' College in Cleveland, Ohio. He is also the Magid Shiur of a daily Mishna Berurah class at Congregation Shomre Shabbos. The Weekly-Halachah Series is distributed L'zchus Doniel Meir ben Hinda. Weekly sponsorships are available - please mail to jgross@torah.org . The series is distributed by the Harbotzas Torah Division of Congregation Shomre Shabbos, 1801 South Taylor Road, Cleveland Heights, Ohio 44118 HaRav Yisroel Grumer, Marah D'Asra. Project Genesis: Torah on the Information Superhighway learn@torah.org 6810 Park Heights Ave. http://www.torah.org/ Baltimore, MD 21215 (410) 358-9800 FAX: 358-9801

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

Pesachim 88 QUESTION: Rebbi Elazer asked: What does the verse mean when it says, "Many nations will go and say, 'Let us go up to the mountain of Hashem, to the house of the G-d of Yakov'" (Yeshayah 2:3)? Is He the G-d of Yakov and not the G-d of Avraham and Yitzchak? The Gemara answers that at the time of the redemption, the Beis ha'Mikdash will not be as it was in the days of Avraham when it was called merely a "Har," a mountain (Bereishis 22:14), nor will it be as it was in the days of Yitzchak when it was referred to as a "Sadeh," a field (Bereishis 24:63). Rather, it will be as it was in the days of Yakov, who called it a "Bayis," a house -- "And he called the name of the place, 'The house of Hashem'" (Bereishis 28:19). What is the significance of the allusions to a "mountain," a "field" and a "house?" ANSWERS: (a) On a simple level the passage can be explained as follows. The Beis Ha'Mikdash is the place where Hashem reveals His glory to us in this world, in such a manner that all can appreciate His dominion. This is what Chazal refer to as "the dwelling of the Divine Presence in this world" (Hashra'as ha'Shechinah). When each of the Avos visited the site where the Beis ha'Mikdash was to be, they prayed there that Hashem reveal His Presence to the world and let everyone see His glory. They asked Hashem to cause His Shechinah to dwell in this world and to establish the Beis ha'Mikdash on this spot. The prayers of each of the Avos had a cumulative effect until they eventually succeeded in accomplishing their goal. Our Sages conveyed this thought to us through a series of metaphors, calling the place of the future Beis ha'Mikdash first a mountain, then a field, then a house. When Avraham Avinu first approached the site, he saw a mountain. The place on which the Beis ha'Mikdash was to be built resembled a raw mountain, in that one could see no sign of its owner, or Creator, by looking at it. By the time Yitzchak came along, however, Avraham's prayers had already had an effect. Yitzchak saw a field. A field shows signs of an owner; crops are growing in it in an organized manner. However, one does not see the owner himself. The owner does not live there. When Yakov Avinu came and experienced a vision there he called the place "the *House* of Hashem." He saw that the Jewish people would eventually merit that this place would resemble a house where the owner can constantly be seen. A Beis Ha'Mikdash would be built and Hashem would reveal His glory there on a permanent basis. It is in this manner that the Beis ha'Mikdash will once again be perceived at the time of our redemption. (M. Kornfeld) (b) The MAHARSHA adds a deeper dimension to this Gemara. He says that the three descriptions (mountain, field, and house) allude to the three Batei Mikdash, the two that were destroyed and the final one that will be built. Although Avraham, Yitzchak and Yakov each had a vision of the Beis Ha'Mikdash, each of them saw a *different* one of the three Batei Mikdash which were to be built in the course of Jewish history. Avraham Avinu saw the first Beis ha'Mikdash, Yitzchak saw the second, and Yakov saw the third. The first one -- the one which Avraham Avinu saw -- lasted 400 years before it was destroyed. When it was destroyed, it was referred to as, "The *mountain* of Zion which is desolate" (Eicha 5:18). Avraham Avinu referred to this spot as a mountain, because he saw that after the destruction of the first Beis ha'Mikdash it was to remain a bare mountain. Yitzchak saw the second Beis Ha'Mikdash, which was also destined to be destroyed. About its destruction it is said "Zion will be plowed as a *field*" (Michah 3:12; see Rashi, Ta'anis 29a, DH Nechreshah ha'ir). The Beis Ha'Mikdash which Yitzchak saw would end up as a field. Yakov Avinu, though, saw the third Beis Ha'Mikdash, which will never be destroyed. That one could be referred to as a house. It was destined to endure and to remain a house for all eternity. This is the "house" which will be seen by those who return to Yerushalayim at the end of days. (c) An ingenious suggestion for an entirely different approach to our Gemara was offered by the BELZER REBBE, ha'Gaon Rav SarShalom of Belz (Chidushei Maharash, Parshas Va'eschanan; see also Sefer Ben Yehoyada, Pesachim 88a). The Gemara (Nedarim 39b) teaches that the creation of the Beis Ha'Mikdash preceded that of the entire world (see Ran there). Now, we know that there was no Beis Ha'Mikdash on *earth* until 480 years after the exodus from Egypt. However, we find (Rashi, Bereishis 28:17) that besides the earthly Beis Ha'Mikdash, there is a *heavenly* Beis Ha'Mikdash which is situated opposite the earthly one. That one existed even before the Beis Ha'Mikdash was built on earth. If so, perhaps we can suggest that the Beis Ha'Mikdash which preceded the creation of the earth was the *heavenly* Beis Ha'Mikdash. Our Beis Ha'Mikdash was built from stone and wood, but the heavenly one certainly could not be built from such materials. In the desert, the Jewish people surrounded the Mishkan for four sides

with four different camps. Our Sages tell us that so, too, in Heaven, Hashem surrounds Himself, end with four different camps of angels (see Midrash Shemos Rabbah 2:9, quoted by Ramban, Bamidbar, end of 2:2). Perhaps it is these camps of angels that are referred to as the "heavenly Beis Ha'Mikdash." The heavenly Beis ha'Mikdash, then, is made up of the four camps of angels that are encamped around the Divine Presence. (See Bereishis 32:3, where a group of angels is referred to as a *Machaneh*. The encampments of the Jews which surrounded the Mishkan are also referred to as *Machaneh* in Bamidbar 2:3). However, as long as Hashem had not yet fully revealed His presence on earth, and there was no earthly Beis Ha'Mikdash, the heavenly Beis Ha'Mikdash was also incomplete. Before Avraham Avinu came along there were not four Machanos of angels surrounding the Shechinah. There was a heavenly Beis ha'Mikdash (the one that preceded the creation of the world) but it consisted of only one wall surrounding the Shechinah, made up of one camp of angels -- one Machaneh Elokim. As the Avos began to reveal the presence of Hashem on earth to its inhabitants, the heavenly Beis Ha'Mikdash became more and more complete. Avraham Avinu prayed at the place where the Beis ha'Mikdash would be built, opposite the heavenly Beis ha'Mikdash, and with his prayers he added an additional wall to the heavenly Beis ha'Mikdash -- a second Machaneh of angels. Machaneh (103) plus Machaneh (another 103) equals 206. That is why Avraham called it a "Har," the Gematria of which is 205. (A rule of Gematria often resorted to is that one may add 1 to the combined numerical value of a word's letters. This extra 1 corresponds to the word as a whole.) Yitzchak prayed there and added another Machaneh of angels to the Heavenly Beis Ha'Mikdash, giving it a third "wall." Now that there were three Machanos, he referred to it as a "Sadeh" which has the Gematria of 309, or three times Machaneh (103). When Yakov prayed there he added a fourth wall, making it a "Bayis," which has the Gematria of four times Machaneh (103), or 412, which is the value of "Bayis." The Belzer Rebbe adds that the heavenly Beis Ha'Mikdash did not yet have a ceiling, just as the Mishkan in the desert had four walls but no ceiling, only a covering of cloth. Later on, before Moshe Rabeinu was taken away from the Jewish people, he was shown all of Eretz Yisrael, including the place of the Beis Ha'Mikdash (Rashi, Devarim 3:25). At that time Moshe Rabeinu also prayed for the completion of the heavenly Beis Ha'Mikdash. He prayed using the word, "Va'eschanan" (Devarim 3:23). He used this word because his prayer was to add a ceiling -- a fifth Machaneh of angels -- to the heavenly Beis Ha'Mikdash. Five times Machaneh is 515, exactly the Gematria of "Va'eschanan!" (See "Torah Ha'Netzer," Judaica Press, Parshas Vayera)

Pesachim 94 BEIN HA'SHEMASHOS QUESTION: The Gemara quotes a Beraisa in which Rabbi Yehudah states that an average person can walk 10 Parsa'os (40 Mil) in one day. He adds that in the time between Amud ha'Shachar (dawn) and Hanetz ha'Chamah (sunrise), and in the time between Sheki'ah (sunset) and Tzeis ha'Kochavim (nightfall) a person can walk 4 Mil. This implies that according to Rabbi Yehudah, Bein ha'Shemashos (the period of time between sunset and nightfall) is the time that it takes to walk 4 Mil. However, in Shabbos (34b-35a), Rabbi Yehudah himself holds that Bein ha'Shemashos is the time that it takes to walk $\frac{3}{4}$ of a Mil (according to Rabah's interpretation of Rabbi Yehudah's opinion there, and $\frac{2}{3}$ of a Mil according to Rav Yosef's interpretation)! How could Rabbi Yehudah say that the duration of Bein ha'Shemashos is $\frac{3}{4}$ Mil, when in Shabbos he says that it is only $\frac{2}{3}$ or $\frac{3}{4}$ of a Mil? How do we reconcile these two statements of Rabbi Yehudah? (TOSFOS, DH Rabbi Yehudah) ANSWERS: (a) TOSFOS (DH Rabbi Yehudah, and in Shabbos 35a, DH Trei) explains, in the name of RABEINU TAM, that there is a difference between the Gemara here and the Gemara in Shabbos. The Gemara here says "mi'Sheki'as ha'Chamah," (and not "mi'Shetishka ha'Chamah, as it says in the Gemara in Shabbos), and it is referring to the moment that the sun disappears *from our eyes*. That point marks the *beginning* of sunset. At that moment, though, it is still journeying through the firmament (i.e. away from us). When the sun passes through the entire thickness of the firmament, it is considered to be the "end of the sunset." This is referred to as "mi'Shetishka ha'Chamah." Shortly afterwards ($\frac{3}{4}$ Mil), its remaining light disappears altogether and three stars can be seen. In summary, the order of events is: (1) the sun disappears from our view, after which time the sun *begins* to set (2) a period of $\frac{3}{4}$ Mil (or $\frac{1}{3}$ according to Rav Yosef) passes, after which the sun has finished setting. This point marks the start of the Bein ha'Shemashos under discussion in Shabbos. (3) Then a period of $\frac{3}{4}$ Mil (or $\frac{2}{3}$ according to Rav Yosef) passes, after which time the light of the sun has completely disappeared and the stars come out. According to this, Halachic nightfall does not occur until after sunset -- the time it takes to walk 4 Mil. This is the view of RABEINU TAM. (b) The VILNA GA'ON (SHENOS ELIYAHU, beginning of Maseches Berachos, and in BI'UR HA'GRA OC 235 and 261) explains that both here and in Shabbos, the times mentioned (4 Mil and $\frac{3}{4}$ Mil) start from the time that the sun completely disappears from our view. However, the Gemara here is talking about a different *Tzeis ha'Kochavim* than the Gemara in Shabbos (and not a different Sheki'as ha'Chamah, as Rabeinu Tam suggests). Here in Pesachim, "Tzeis ha'Kochavim" refers to the time at which every last ray of light disappears from the sky (which is four Mil after sunset), and *all* of the stars can be seen. In Shabbos, "Tzeis ha'Kochavim" refers to the time at which *three medium-size stars* can be seen, which is the Halachic definition of nightfall. (The Gemara here, by contrast, is an Agadic discussion and is not referring to the Halachic definition of Tzeis ha'Kochavim.) According to the VILNA GA'ON, then, nightfall occurs shortly after sunset -- the time that it takes to walk $\frac{3}{4}$ of a Mil. (c) The RE'EM (SEFER YER'EMIM) says that the Gemara here is talking about both a different Sheki'ah and a different Tzeis ha'Kochavim than the Gemara in Shabbos. The Gemara here is talking about the period of time from when the sun sets until the last ray of sunlight disappears. The Gemara in Shabbos, when it discusses "Bein ha'Shemashos," is talking about the time *before* the sun has set, the last moment that it is still visible. Bein ha'Shemashos is a period of $\frac{3}{4}$ of a Mil beginning from *before* the sun has completely set, i.e. while the sun is still visible. Nightfall is when the sun can no longer be seen, which comes at the end of Bein ha'Shemashos. Our Gemara is Agadic and is not discussing Halachic definitions of sunset and nightfall.

HALACHAH: THE TIME THAT IT TAKES TO WALK ONE "MIL" OPINIONS: The Gemara, in many places, expresses a value of time in terms of how long it takes the average person to walk one Mil. For example, in Pesachim (46a) the Gemara says that dough becomes Chametz if left without being baked or handled for the amount of time that it takes to walk one Mil. The RAMBAM (Hilchos Ma'achalos Asuros 6:10; SHULCHAN ARUCH YD 69:6) says that in order to remove the blood from meat it must be salted for the amount of time that it takes to walk one Mil. How long is this time period? Our Sugya is the basis for ascertaining the length that it takes to walk

one Mil. Ula (93b) states that in one day (the day of the equinox, when daytime and nighttime are of equal duration), a person can walk 10 Parsa'os, or 40 Mil. However, 5 of these Mil are used for the period between Amud ha'Shachar and Hanetz ha'Chamah (that is, a person can walk 5 Mil in the time between dawn and sunrise), and 5 more are used for the period between Sheki'as ha'Chamah and Tzeis ha'Kochavim. As a result, a person can walk 30 Mil from Hanetz (sunrise) until Sheki'ah (sunset). If that period is 12 hours long (720 minutes), then the time that it takes to walk 1 Mil is $\frac{720}{30} = 24$ minutes. However, the Gemara challenges Ula's opinion from Rabbi Yehudah in a Beraisa. Rabbi Yehudah says, like Ula, that a person can walk 40 Mil in one day. However, as Rashi explains, according to Rabbi Yehudah, a person can walk only 4 Mil, and not 5, between Amud ha'Shachar and Hanetz and between Sheki'ah and Tzeis ha'Kochavim. If so, that leaves 32 Mil which a person can walk during the day, between sunrise and sunset. Accordingly, the time that it takes to walk 1 Mil is $\frac{720}{32} = 22.5$ minutes. However, there is a different understanding of Rabbi Yehudah's statement in the Yerushalmi (Berachos 1:1, as cited by the SHENOS ELIYAHU Berachos 1:1 and BI'UR HA'GRA OC 459). When Rabbi Yehudah says that a person can walk 40 Mil in one day, it means 40 Mil from sunrise to sunset. The distance one can walk from dawn to sunrise (and from sunset to nightfall) is an *additional* 4 Mil, and is not part of the total 40 Mil. Although this creates a much greater discrepancy between the distance a person walks per day according to Ula and the distance he walks according to Rabbi Yehudah, on the other hand, it is much more consistent with Rabbi Yehudah's contention that the time between Alos and Hanetz is "1/10 of the day" (i.e. of the 12 hours *between Hanetz and Sheki'ah*). This, then, may be what our Gemara means by saying "[Ula] made a mistake in counting the time from Hanetz to Sheki'ah," when he heard Rabbi Yehudah's statement. That is, Ula thought that the 10 Mils *included* that period, while it actually was *besides* that period (Vilna Gaon, ibid.). Consequently, according to the Yerushalmi, the time it takes to walk one Mil is $\frac{720}{40} = 18$ minutes. What is the Halachah? (a) The BEIS YOSEF (OC 459, and in SHULCHAN ARUCH 459:2) cites the opinion of the TERUMAS HA'DESHEN who says that the time it takes to walk one Mil is 18 minutes. The Terumas ha'Deshen bases this opinion on our Gemara. Although he reaches this figure through a different calculation (see Bi'ur ha'Gra, ibid.), this figure is consistent with the understanding of the Yerushalmi in Rabbi Yehudah. This is also the ruling of the Rambam at the beginning of his Perush ha'Mishnayos in Berachos. (b) The RAMBAM (Perush ha'Mishnayos, Pesachim 3:2) says that the time it takes to walk one Mil is $\frac{720}{24} = 30$ minutes. The Rambam seems to be ruling like Ula, as is clear from his ruling in Hilchos Korban Pesach (5:8) where he states that "Derech Rechokah" is defined as 15 Mil outside of Yerushalayim, which is the opinion of Ula. Even though Ula's opinion was refuted by the Gemara, apparently the Rambam had a different text in his Gemara (Bi'ur ha'Gra OC 459). TOSFOS (Pesachim 11b, Dh Echad Omer) and the ROSH (Ta'anis 1:12) also cite the opinion of Ula. (c) The BI'UR HA'GRA (OC 459) points out that according to way Rashi and Tosfos seem to understand the conclusion of our Gemara (i.e. not like the Yerushalmi), the time that it takes to walk one Mil should be 22 $\frac{1}{2}$ minutes. HALACHAH: THE BI'UR HALACHAH (OC 459:2) writes that when it comes to making Matzah, we are stringent and consider dough that sat still for 18 minutes to be considered Chametz. On the other hand, when it comes to salting meat, we are stringent and consider a Mil to be 24 minutes, and thus require that meat be salted for at least 24 minutes (that is b'D'eved; l'Chatchilah, meat should be salted for at least an hour).

89b "GIVE ME ONE HUNDRED RAV PAPAS INSTEAD OF ONE RAVINA!" QUESTION: Rav Huna brei d'Rav Yehoshua left the meal he was sharing with Rav Papa when he saw that Rav Papa ate four times more than he did, and he went to join Ravina. When he saw that Ravina was eating *eight* times more than he, he declared, "Give me one hundred Rav Papas instead of one Ravina!" What was the point of his exaggeration? Obviously, one loses much less when he eats with one person who eats eight times more than he, than when one eats with a hundred people who each eat four times more! ANSWER: Rav Huna did not mean that there will be more left over for him to eat if he eats with one hundred Rav Papas than if he eats with one Ravina. Rather, he meant that economically, it is more profitable to eat with one hundred Rav Papas than with one Ravina. How is this? The key to understanding Rav Huna's exclamation is the following point: the more people with which one makes a partnership, *the less one pays* relative to the total value of the food. When one makes a partnership with one other person who eats four times more than he does, they pay together for 5 portions, thus each one entitled to 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ portions. However, the one who eats four times more ends up eating 4 portions, while the other person is left with only 1 portion, receiving 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ portions less than what he was entitled to receive. In other words, he loses 60% of what he should have received. If he makes a partnership with *two* people who each eat four times as much as he eats, then each person pays for 3 portions, but the larger eaters each receive 4 portions and the smaller eater receives 1. He loses 2 out of the 3 to which he was entitled, or 67%. In such a manner, the more "eaters" one joins in his partnership, the more he loses. However, even if he joins with 100 people who each eat four times more than he ("100 Rav Papas"), he will still not lose as large a percentage as he would lose by eating with a single Ravina. With many Rav Papas, his loss will never be more than 75% of his portion, because if he were to eat four times more than he is eating now he would be eating as much as each Rav Papa. However, with one Ravina, out of the 9 portions available, he only receives 1 instead of the 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ which he pays for; he loses 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ portions out of 4 $\frac{1}{2}$, or 77%. Therefore, Rav Huna rightly complained that he would be better off with 100 Rav Papas than with one Ravina! (MIRKEVES HA'MISHNAH, in his "Berechos b'Cheshbon," a collection of mathematical insights into the Talmud) Mordecai Kornfeld [Email: kornfeld@virtual.co.il/TFx(02)6522633 6/12 Katzenelbogen St. | kornfeld@netvision.net.il/US:(718)520-0210 Har Nof, Jerusalem, ISRAEL] kornfeld@shemayisrael.co.il/POB:43087, Jrslm