

INTERNET PARSHA SHEET
ON VAYETZE - 5759

B'S'D'

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](http://www-torah.org-virtual.co.il-shamash.org)
shemayisrael.co.il jewishamerica.com [ou.org/lists youngisrael.org](http://ou.org/lists-youngisrael.org) & 613.org
Thank you to Michael Fiskus for distributing in YIYE

Yeshiva University's weekly devar Torah Eiyanim Latorah - Vayetzey
Publication of Student Organization of Yeshiva University

The Twice Promised Land
by Rabbi Eli Baruch Shulman

Ha'aretz Asher Ata Shocheiv Aleiha Lecha Etnena Ulezaracha The
land on which you lie, to you will I give it and to your descendants.. (28:13).

The Talmud (Chulin 91b) remarks, This teaches that G-d folded
the entire land of Israel and placed it underneath Yaakov, in order that it be
easier for his descendants to conquer.

We find a similar statement in the Talmud in regard to Avraham. G-d
said to Avraham: Kum Hithaleich Ba'Aretz Lerkah Ulerachbah Ki Lecha
Etenah Arise, walk in the land through the length of it and the breadth of
it; for I will give it to you (13:17) The Talmud (Bava Batra 100a) rules that
this was not a legal act of acquisition; rather: Out of affection for Avraham
He told him so in order that it be easier for his descendants to conquer it. (R'
Eliezer, however, quotes this verse as a source for a view that walking the
length and breadth of a piece of property is an actual act of acquisition.)

We might ask: Why does Avraham pave the way for his
descendants by traversing the land, while Yaakov does so by having the land
fold up under him as he sleeps on it? (Parenthetically: Hashem later says to
Avraham, "Lezarachah Nataati et ha'Aretz Hazot" - "To your seed I have given
this land" (15:18). Rash"i, following the Midrash, explains that the verse
uses the past tense since G-d's promise is as good as done - prophetic past
tense. But R' Yossi in the Yerushalmi (Challah 2:1) uses the past tense of
this verse to prove that the Jews were in possession of the land of Israel from
the time of Avraham and that, therefore, even grain that grew before they
entered the land was obligated in challah. Why does Rash"i reject this
explanation? If one examines the discussion in the Yerushalmi one finds that
R' Yossi's statement is advanced on behalf of R' Eliezer, who holds that
grain that grows outside of the land of Israel is normally exempt from Challah.
Not surprisingly, then, it is consistent with R' Eliezer's own view in Bava
Batra that Avraham performed a legal act of acquisition by traveling the land
its length and breadth; according to this view, the past tense of the verse indeed
implies that Avraham was already in legal possession of the land Rash"i,
however, follows the view of the Sages in Bava Batra that walking the length
and breadth of a piece of land is not a legal act of acquisition; accordingly, he
follows the Midrash and explains the past tense of the verse as being an
example of the prophetic past tense.)

After receiving this promise Yaakov vows: "Vechol Asher Titein
Li Aser A'srenu Lach" And of all that You shall give me I will surely give a
tenth (ma'aser) to You (28:22) We find that Avraham (14:20) and Yitzchak
(26:12, see Rash"i there) also gave maaser; only Yaakov, however, makes a
vow to do so. Why should this be so?

To answer these two questions we must preface several items of
information: The Talmud in Yevamot (82b) states that the obligations of
terumah and ma'aser took effect only after the Jewish people took possession
of the land of Israel. This happened twice; first, at the time of Yehoshua, and
again at the time of Ezra, after their return from the Babylonian exile. The
Ramba"m (Shmita 6:16) distinguishes between these two acts of acquisition;
the first was accomplished through conquest, whereas the second was
accomplished through chazaka (a form of legal acquisition). (See there the
ramifications of this distinction.)

Furthermore, the Ramba"m (Terumot 1:26) rules that at the time of
the Second Temple the obligations of terumah and maaser were only

Rabbinic, because only a part of the people were settled on the land of Israel.
On a Biblical level these obligations require that all of the Jewish people be
living in the land of Israel. The source for this ruling seems to be the
Yerushalmi in Shevi'it (6:1; see Resp. Beit Halevi 3:1) which records the
view that, at the time of Ezra, the people accepted the obligations of terumah
and maaser of their own accord, rather than as a Biblical obligation. The
Yerushalmi finds a source for this in the verse in Nechemiah (10:1ff), And
because of all this we make a covenant and write it... that we shall bring the
first portion of our dough and our terumah... and the maaser of our land...

In the light of the above, we can answer our first question by
suggesting that when the Talmud in Bava Batra states that Avraham was told
to traverse the land of Israel in order to pave the way for his descendants, the
reference is to his descendants at the time of the first acquisition of the land of
Israel. As the Ramba"m writes, this acquisition was accomplished through
conquest. Furthermore, it was only completed at the close of the seven years
of division in which the boundaries of the tribes were laid out. Avraham's
travels throughout the land prefigured the campaign to conquer the land and
the laying down of its boundaries. But when the Talmud in Chulin states that
G-d collapsed the entire land under Yaakov in order to make it easier for his
descendants, the reference is to his descendants at the time of the second
acquisition of the land of Israel. As the Ramba"m writes, that acquisition was
accomplished through chazaka. Likewise, Yaakov's laying on the land was an
act of chazaka, as we find bedding down on a piece of property is, under
certain circumstances, an effective chazaka (hatzoat matzot; see Hil.
Zechiyah u'Matanah, 2:4. Cf. Tzofnat Paaneach al HaTorah, Breishit 28).

Accordingly, we find an answer to our second question; we
understand why Yaakov's giving of maaser was preceded by a vow, whereas
Avraham and Yitzchak gave maaser without a vow. As the Yerushalmi in
Shevi'it states, at the time of the second acquisition the Jews did not
automatically become obligated in terumah and maaser; they made a
covenant and obligated themselves. Likewise Yaakov, whose actions
portended theirs, undertook a vow and obligated himself.

Shabbat-B'Shabbato - Parshat Vayetzey (28 November 1998) SHABBAT-ZOMET
is an extract from SHABBAT-B'SHABBATO, published by the Zomet Institute of Alon Shevut,
Israel, under the auspices of the National Religious Party. Translated by: Moshe Goldberg

"LET THERE BE NO FAULT IN MY OFFSPRING"

by Rabbi Naftali Bar-Ilan, member of the Rabbinical Office, Rechovot

Yaacov made a vow on his way from Be'er Sheva to Charan: "The
Almighty will be a G-d for me" [Bereishit 28:21]. As Rashi explains, his
prayer was, "Let me be worthy of His name from beginning to end, let there
be no fault in my offspring." This was years before he had any children, but
he already prayed that his children would continue in his path. And in the
end, Yaacov achieved what his father and grandfather did not. As far as
Avraham was concerned, Yitzchak was the only one who continued his way.
Similarly, for Yitzchak, only Yaacov continued on the righteous path.
Yaacov himself is not sure of his sons, asking, "Is there some fault among
you? Is there anybody who does not stand with me in following G-d?"
[Rambam, Hilchot Keriyat Shema 1:4]. The reply is: "Hear, Yisrael - that is,
hear us, our father Yisrael - our G-d is one. And he replied, Blessed is the
honor of His kingdom for ever." [Rambam, ibid]. This desire, to pass on the
yoke of heaven to all his children, without any exception, is Yaacov's
guiding principle throughout his life. At his first meeting with Yosef, after
22 years of separation, he didn't fall over him and kiss him, but he "recited
the Shema" [Rashi, Breishit 46:29]. In spite of the fact that his sons had told
him that Yosef had been killed by an animal, he still feared that they had a
hand in his death, acting in a way more befitting Esav than Yaacov. When
he saw that Yosef was indeed still alive, he cried out, "Shema Yisrael - I am
happy that all my children follow the path of G-d." But Yaacov is concerned
not only with his own children but with all of mankind. That is how Rashi
interprets the first verse of Keriyat Shema: "G-d, who is only ours for now
and not the G-d of all the nations, will in the future be a single G-d, as is
written, 'Then will I change the nations to speak clear language, that they
will all call out in the name of G-d' [Tzefania 3:9], and it is written, 'On that

day, G-d will be one and His name will be one' [Zechariya 14:9]." [Devarim 6:4]. The mitzva of "Love your G-d" is not concerned only with the Jew himself and his family, but is interpreted to mean, "Cause Him to be loved by all mankind, as was your father Avraham, as is written, 'and the souls which he made in Chevron' [Bereishit 12:5]" [Sifri, Devarim 6:8]. Rabbi A.Y. Kook wrote in "Teudat Yisrael U'Leumi'uto" as follows: "It would be a mistake to leave nationalistic feelings in their natural state, in terms of materialistic desires, related to nothing more than the needs of life. It is necessary in addition to this to attempt to understand and to explain how our nationalistic feelings are related to the lofty goal of love for all mankind. This is our ultimate goal and desire." Yaacov's great vision, from the time he escaped all alone to Aram, and from then on, was that there should be no fault not only in him and his children, but in all of mankind as well.

A MITZVA IN THE TORAH PORTION: Our Forefathers Observed the Entire Torah by Rabbi Binyamin Tabori

According to our traditions, our forefather Avraham observed all the mitzvot of the Torah, even before it was given to us (Kidushin 42). This was true not only of Avraham himself but also of his children and all of his household, who were all guided by him to follow the path of G-d. As is written in the Midrash, Yaacov says of himself, "I observed 613 mitzvot." However, this brings up a question: How could Yaacov marry two sisters, violating the prohibition, "Do not marry a woman together with her sister" [Vayikra 18:18]?

The Ramban explains that the mitzvot were meant to be observed only in Eretz Yisrael, and for this reason Yaacov commands his household, "Remove the idols from among you" [Bereishit 35:2] only after entering into the land. For this reason Rachel died after they had entered the land, saving Yaacov from the pitfall of violating this command. According to this reasoning, the fact that the mitzvot are observed outside of Eretz Yisrael is only to keep in practice, so that they will not be new and strange when they must be observed. Rabbi J.B. Soloveitchik noted in his book "Chamesh Derashot" that the holiness of the forefathers was linked to the sanctity of the land when the Almighty sealed the covenant with Avraham, as is written: "And I will give the land of your journeys to you and to your offspring after you, the Land of Canaan, as a permanent heritage; and I will be a G-d to you." [Bereishit 17:8].

The Maharal, in "Gur Aryeh," gives several answers to the question of how Yaacov could marry two sisters. First, he notes that the forefathers accepted the Torah in the same way as a convert to Judaism. A convert has the status of a newly born child, and all previous family relationships are canceled and no longer valid. This would mean that under strict Torah law Rachel and Leah no longer had the status of sisters. While it is true that under rabbinical law such a marriage is still prohibited, Yaacov at least did not violate Torah law.

Second, it can be assumed that Yaacov was blessed with Ruach HaKodesh, a link to the spirit of G-d. This inner knowledge showed him that he should marry both sisters in order that they could both participate in building the nation of Yisrael, so that the same Divine source which usually prohibits such a marriage approved it in this case.

But the Maharal's third answer is the one about which he writes, "This is my real opinion, and it is the correct answer." He writes that only Avraham himself observed the entire Torah, including all of the positive mitzvot and all the prohibitions. Yaacov only observed the positive mitzvot. What was the reason for this? Positive mitzvot can be observed even by one who is not commanded to perform them (such as women, who are not obligated by time bound mitzvot but may perform them if they wish). However, the way to observe a negative prohibition is to refrain from doing something which G-d has forbidden. There is no logical reason to refrain from doing an action which G-d has not prohibited, and in fact such abstinence might even be considered a fault. Yaacov therefore did not observe the prohibitions.

"Rav Yissocher Frand <ravfrand@torah.org>" Nov. 30, 1995

Rabbi Frand on Parshas Vayeitzei

Why is the Beis HaMikdash Called "The House of Yaakov?" The second verse in this week's portion tells us, in regard to Yaakov's journey, "Vayifga BA-makom" (and he encountered THE place). The prefix "BA" means not just a place but THE special place. Our Rabbis tell us Yaakov prayed in the (future) place of the Beis HaMikdash.

This prayer was the third prayer which we find that the Patriarchs instituted. The tradition tells us that Avraham enacted the morning prayer (Shachris), Yitzchak enacted the afternoon prayer (Mincha), and Yaakov Avinu enacted the evening prayer (Ma'ariv).

The Yalkut cites an interesting Medrash on a verse in Tehillim, (81:2), "Give Praise to the L-rd our Strength; blow a Teruah to the G-d of Yaakov". The Medrash asks the obvious question: Why is Yaakov singled out here? Why not say "the G-d of Avraham, Yitzchak, and Yaakov".

The Medrash gives a parable to a King who had three friends. He shared with these friends his plans to build a palace on a certain site. When the site was pointed out to the first friend, the friend said, "You mean on that hill?" The King left that friend. When the site was pointed out to the second friend, the second friend said, "You mean in that field?" The King left that friend also. When the King pointed out the site to the third friend, the third friend looked at the site and said, "Oh yes, there's going to be a palace over there!"

The Medrash says Avraham called the spot of the Beis HaMikdash a Mountain (Bereishit 22:14); Yitzchak called it a Field (24:63); but Yaakov called it a House -- "This is none other than the House of Elokim ..." (28:17). As a result of that, the Medrash continues, G-d says "By your life, you called it a House before it was built, the House will be called by your name as it says in the verse 'The House of the G-d of Yaakov'. (Isaiah 2:3)"

[Ed. Note: Also in last week's Daf Pesachim 88; See Rabbi Kornfeld's INSIGHTS INTO THE DAILY DAF in last week's parsha sheets]

In order to understand the significance of this Medrash, we have to understand the significance of the 3 Tefilos the Patriarchs respectively established. It was not merely coincidence that Avraham established Shachris, Yitzchak established Mincha, and Yaakov established Ma'ariv.

Shachris is prayed in the morning -- a time of brightness; the day is just beginning and is full of hope. Avraham's life was a life of daylight -- of peace, security, and plenty. He was respected, admired, and wealthy ("...You are a Prince of G-d in our midst... (23:6)"). He lived the life of the "Morning" and he enacted a requirement to pray to G-d when things are good and when we have plenty.

Yaakov on the other hand instituted Ma'ariv -- the prayer that is recited at night. Yaakov's whole life was a life of tsores. -- Yaakov runs away from Esav, has problems with Lavan, has problems with Dina and Yosef. -- Yaakov has not a moment of peace. Yaakov had a life of "Night" so it is appropriate that specifically he enact the Ma'ariv prayer -- teaching us that we must also pray at night -- when (figuratively) things are going badly.

Rav Sholmo Breur points out that the first time the Torah indicates that Avraham prayed Shachris is when he gazed out at the destruction of Sodom and Amora (19:27-28). Through this act, Avraham is teaching us that when things are going good -- when one has wealth and plenty -- that's the time when it is necessary to look out at Sodom and Amora and see what too much wealth and plenty can do to a person.

Sodom was fertile and affluent and full of riches -- that's what drew Lot there in the first place. Avraham teaches that we should daven Shachris but we should do it looking at Sodom. This reminds us that riches and affluence that get out of hand can cause us to forget G-d, the result being a Sodom.

Yaakov davens Ma'ariv at the spot that will eventually be the Beis HaMikdash. Looking at that spot now, one would see nothing -- only nighttime and desolation. But Yaakov could stand in that spot and see the light at the end of the tunnel. Yaakov is teaching us to look optimistically towards the future to see a Beis HaMikdash where there is now darkness and despair. Life can change. G-d "lowers the haughty" but he also "raises the lowly."

Rav Breur cites the Gemara in Berachos (11b) which says, "One must

mention the attribute of night during the day and one must mention the attribute of day during the night." [In the morning we mention "He Creates Light and Darkness"; In the evening we mention "He rolls away the Light from Darkness and the Darkness from the Light].

The moral lesson indicated in this requirement is precisely the point mentioned before. In Shachris, when things are going well, we cannot let it go to our heads and must remember that it can change if we don't act correctly. That's why we have to mention "the attribute of darkness during the daytime."

Likewise, when things are bleak and it looks like the trouble will never end, we have to mention that G-d rolls away the Darkness to make way for the Light. This was the attribute of Yaakov. The Patriarch who lived such a bitter life remained steadfast and taught us that we must daven at night and that the night will end.

This is what the Medrash means: Yaakov looked at the desolate spot of the Beis HaMikdash. This was the spot where Avraham looked and saw only a Mountain; Yitzchak looked and saw only a Field. But Yaakov looked and saw in the darkest of times and in the most desolate of spots that this indeed would be the future sight of the Beis HaMikdash. That is why he was the one to enact the prayer of Ma'riv and why the Beis Hamikdash was called by his name.

Transcribed by David Twersky; Seattle, Washington twerskyd@scn.org RavFrاند. Copyright (c) 1995 by Rabbi Y. Frand and Project Genesis, Inc. Project Genesis, the Jewish Learning Network learn@torah.org <http://www.torah.org>

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

Recommended Reading List Ramban 28:12 Yaakov's Dream 29:2
Three Flocks 30:2 Yaakov's Anger 31:19 The Terafim
Sforno 28:12-13 Yaakov's Dream 29:6 A Proper Guest 29:11
Why Yaakov Cried 31:32 Yaakov's Curse 32:1 A Father's Blessing

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

1. When Yaakov traveled to Charan, the Torah stresses that he departed from Be'er Sheva. Why? 28:10 - The departure of a righteous person leaves a noticeable void in that place. 2. On the night of his dream, Yaakov did something he hadn't done in 14 years. What? 28:11 - Sleep at night lying down. 3. In his dream, Yaakov saw angels going up and down. What were the missions of these angels? 28:12 - The ascending angels accompanied Yaakov in Eretz Canaan. The descending angels accompanied Yaakov outside of the Land. 4. Hashem compressed the entire land of Israel underneath the sleeping Yaakov. What did this symbolize? 28:13 - That the Land would be easy for his descendants to conquer. 5. Why did Yaakov rebuke the shepherds? 29:7 - He thought they were loafing, stopping work early in the day. 6. Why was Rachel tending her father's sheep; that is, why didn't her brothers tend the sheep as was customary in those days? 30:27 - Her brothers weren't born yet. 7. Why did Yaakov cry when he met Rachel? 29:11 - He saw prophetically that they would not be buried together; or because he was penniless. 8. Who was Elifaz, and why didn't he kill Yaakov when he had the chance? 29:11 - Elifaz was Esav's son who chased Yaakov in order to kill him. But because Elifaz had grown up under the tutelage of Yitzchak, he relented. 9. Why did Lavan run to greet Yaakov? 29:13 - He thought Yaakov was carrying money. 10. Why were Leah's eyes tender? 29:17 - She cried continually because she thought she was destined to marry Esav. 11. How old was Yaakov when he married Leah and Rachel? 29:21 - Eighty-four. 12. Why did Rachel envy Leah? 30:1 - She envied her mitzvos, thinking they were the reason Leah merited having children. 13. Who was Yaakov's fifth son? 30:5 - Dan. 14. How do you say "dudaim" in Arabic? 30:14 - Jasmine (Yasmin). 15. "Hashem remembered Rachel" (30:22). What did He remember? 30:22 - That Rachel gave Leah the "signs of recognition" that Yaakov had taught her, so that Leah wouldn't be embarrassed. 16. What does "Yosef" mean? Why was he named that? 30:24 - "Yosef" means "He will add." Rachel prayed to Hashem for another

son, in addition to Yosef. 17. How many times did Lavan change Yaakov's wages? 31:7 - One hundred times. 18. Where are there two Aramaic words in this week's Parsha? 31:41 - Yagar Sahadusa, meaning "wall of testimony."

19. Who was Bilhah's father? Who was Zilpah's father? 31:50 - Lavan. 20. Who escorted Yaakov into Eretz Yisrael? 32:1 - The angels of Eretz Yisrael.

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 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.

http://www.tabc.org/koltorah/Vayeitze_Kol_Torah_5757

A House For All People by Rabbi Yosef Adler

At the very end of the parsha, Yaakov and Lavan part company. The Torah states, "Yaakov set out on his way and he encountered angels of God. Yaakov said as he saw them, 'This is a camp of God,' and he called the place Machanayim." Yonatan Ben Uziel deviates from the other Targumim and says, "He called the place the holy house, Machanayim." Yonatan Ben Uziel simply could have said, "Yaakov called the place Machanayim in Lashon Hakodesh," Hebrew. But the phrase he uses is Bilishin Beit Kudsha. What does Yonatan Ben Uziel wish to add?

The Rav zt"l offered the following interpretation. Yaakov understood that the presence of angels is indicative of a holy place. Apparently only Yaakov was able to perceive and identify the cluster of angels. Ibn Ezra comments on the phrase, "Yaakov said as he saw [the angels]," that, only Yaakov [was able] to identify the presence of God. This disturbed Yaakov. Is sanctity, limited to the privileged few? Are the masses to be excluded from the opportunity to be inspired by contact with the Divine Presence? Is the place of Kedusha to be defined as a Bayit, a house, which denotes that there is an owner, who determines who shall enter and who shall be denied entry? Yaakov did not believe that this was the case.

Every individual member of Klal Yisrael is given the opportunity to interact with Hashem Himself. The poor, the rich, the scholarly, and the yet-to-be enlightened are all provided with the opportunity to feel, see, hear, and engage the Shechina of Hashem. For this reason this spot destined to be a Beit Kudsha, a Holy House, is now to be called Machanayim. A Machaneh in Tanach is often used to designate a battlefield. In this week's Parsha, we will read that Yaakov will divide his flock into two Machanot. Were Eisav to attack one camp, the other camp would be spared. On a field of battle, there are no favorites, there is no "protectzia." Everyone has an equal chance to be a hero and everyone faces the risk of having to make the supreme sacrifice for his cause. And so Yaakov designated this place which might be referred to as Beit Kudsha, as Machanayim, a camp which will enable not only Yaakov, but all who accompany and travel with him as well, to see heavenly angels. Striving for Kedusha, yearning for holiness, is everyone's challenge. All we require is to seek it with all our heart and soul.

Yeshivat Har Etzion Israel Koschitzky Virtual Beit Midrash (Vbm) Student Summaries of Sichot Delivered by the Roshei Yeshiva Parashat Vayeitze Sichah of Harav Aharon Lichtenstein Shlit"l Summarized by David Tee

"And Yaakov answered and said to Lavan... This twenty years have I been with you... Thus I was: in the day the drought consumed me, and the frost by night; and my sleep departed from my eyes..." (Bereshit 31:40) The gemara (Bava Metzia 93b) derives the following halakha: What is the limit to which a paid guardian (shomer sakhar) is obligated to guard? Until he reaches the stage of "Thus I was: in the day the drought consumed me..." There is a debate in the gemara as to the nature of the obligation itself: One side maintains that it applies to any paid guardian, while the other side insists that this applies only to the guardian of a city (shomer ha-ir), which involves a special degree of obligation. According to the latter opinion, Yaakov was NOT obligated to maintain this degree of guardianship, but had promised Lavan that he would guard

with special care, on the same level as the guardian of a city. This idea, that Yaakov volunteered to guard on this special, higher level, is compatible with the image that we have of him as it is depicted in the parasha. Yaakov tells his wives about his years of labor (even before he started being paid for them!): "And you know that with all my power I have served your father..." (Bereishit 31:6). Thus we see that we may distinguish two areas in which Yaakov excelled: The first involves the quantitative aspect ("in the day... and... by night, and my sleep departed from my eyes"), the second involves the qualitative aspect ("with all my power I have served").

We have already mentioned the debate with regard to the obligation to guard as Yaakov did. With regard to a paid worker, the Rambam is quite clear in his stipulations: He must be careful not to steal when working for the landlord by wasting a little time here and a little time there, such that the whole day of work turns out to be a sham. Rather, he is obligated to keep precise track of his time - and [our Sages] were so strict in this regard that they instructed that the fourth blessing of Birkat Ha-mazon be omitted [for this purpose, i.e., when a worker is under time pressure]. And he is obligated to work with all his strength, as Yaakov Ha-Tzaddik declared: 'With all my strength I served your father.' For this reason he was rewarded even in this world, as it states: "And the man increased exceedingly."

Hence we find that in the Rambam, too, there is a dual emphasis: in terms of quantity - the worker is forbidden to waste time, and must work continuously every minute that he is employed; and in terms of quality - he must work with all his strength. It is important to realize that this applies to every area of our lives. No matter what it is that one is engaged in - be it studying, working or serving in the army - one is obligated as a "ben Yisrael" to behave in the same way as Yaakov Avinu: Whatever one does should be done in the quantity required of him and should also be of the quality required of him. Hagahot Maimoniot, at the end of Hilkhot Sekhirut, explains the Rambam as follows: The Yerushalmi (Demai 7:3) recounts the story of R. Yohanan who once saw a teacher of young children who was as weak as an invalid, and he questioned him as to the reason for this. The teacher replied that he fasted regularly. R. Yohanan said to him: "You are forbidden to do so. If this would be forbidden when serving a human master, then how much more so when serving God!" Based on this, the Ra'avia (quoted in the Hagahot Maimoniot and in Or Zarua siman 246) stipulates: "It is forbidden for a teacher to stay awake at night for longer than he usually does, for the following day he will lack the energy to teach..." Clearly from here we may learn a 'kal va-chomer, ben beno shel kal va-chomer'.

In the modern world we are used to thinking of 'mussar' as an area which pertains to relations between man and his fellow. Moral behavior means behaving morally towards others - not insisting on one's honor, being lenient with one's money, and so on. The Jewish approach rejects this concept totally. Anyone steeped in the ideals of Judaism knows that mussar is not necessarily an area which applies only to relations between people. A person should speak the truth not because his fellow will be offended by falsehood, but rather because truth in and of itself is a desirable and worthy characteristic. Mussar is defined in terms which are independent of interpersonal relations: we must cleave to truth because it is one of the thirteen attributes of God, and God's 'seal' is truth. Yaakov indeed demands of himself both maximum quantity and maximum quality in his interpersonal relations, but at the beginning of the parasha we find that in his relationship with God, too, he invests everything that he has: "And Yaakov went out from Beer Sheva and went toward Charan. And he lighted on a certain place..." (28:10-11). Chazal explain that Yaakov had already reached Charan, but turned around and went back, saying: "Could it be that I passed a place where my fathers prayed, and I myself did not?!" So he turned around and went back as far as Bet El..." We should not imagine that Yaakov himself was not on a sufficient level to be able to stand up to Lavan and to say afterwards, "I lived with Lavan and nevertheless kept the 613 mitzvot." But if he was already on

such a high spiritual level, why did he return from Charan to Bet El? Yaakov said to himself, "Here I have the opportunity to increase my spiritual inspiration and potential - shall I not take advantage of it? Did I pass a place where my fathers prayed without praying there myself?!" Yaakov returned to Bet El in order that afterwards he could say, with a clear conscience, "With all my strength I served my God." In Berakhot (32b) we learn, "Four things require 'chizzuk' (strengthening), and they are: Torah, good deeds, prayer, and derekh erez." Rashi explains, "Derekh erez - if he is an artisan, then with respect to his art. If he is a merchant, then with respect to his merchandise. If he is a warrior, then with respect to his war." We can understand this in terms of the discussion above. Every person, no matter what he does, needs 'chizzuk' in order to perform his work in the best possible way, both quantitatively and qualitatively.

(Originally delivered at Seuda Shelishit, Shabbat Parashat Vayetze 5750. Translated by Kaeren Fish) Copyright (c) 1998 Yeshivat Har Etzion.

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

Pesachim 99b HALACHAH: ACCEPTING SHABBOS EARLY QUESTION: The Mishnah states that on Erev Pesach, one may not eat from close to Minchah time until it gets dark. The Gemara cites a similar Beraisa which says that this applies (according to Rabbi Yehudah) to Erev Shabbos and Erev Yom Tov as well. The Beraisa, though, leaves out the words "until it gets dark." Is there a difference between the Halachah of not eating on Erev Pesach and the Halachah of not eating on Erev Shabbos? If so, why is there a difference? ANSWERS: (a) TOSFOS writes that with regard to Erev Pesach, there is a special requirement that Matzah must be eaten at the time of the Korban Pesach (after nightfall). When it comes to Shabbos, though, a person is permitted to recite Kiddush and begin the meal even before nightfall. This is also the approach of the ROSH. (b) The BACH (beginning of OC 472) cites the MAHARAL (Gevuros Hashem, ch. 48) who writes that on Shabbos, although one may begin his meal before nightfall, *part* of his meal must still be eaten after nightfall. The reason for this requirement is because the source for eating three meals on Shabbos comes from the verse (Shemos 16:25) which mentions the word "HaYom" ("the day") three times (Shabbos 117b), and before nightfall it cannot be called the *day* of Shabbos. Therefore, at least part of the meal must be eaten on Shabbos itself. (c) TOSFOS (DH Ad) cites RABEINU YEHUDAH who quotes the opinion of the Yerushalmi that says that Erev Shabbos and Erev Pesach are the same; just as one may not eat until it gets dark on Erev Pesach, so, too, one may not eat on Erev Shabbos until it gets dark. The Beraisa which discusses Erev Shabbos should also say "Ad sheTechshach" ("until it gets dark"), because the same Halachah applies there. The reason one may not eat on Erev Shabbos until it gets dark is presumably because one cannot fulfill the Mitzvah of declaring the sanctity of Shabbos ("Zachor Es Yom haShabbos") when the day of Shabbos has not yet entered.

HALACHAH: On Erev Pesach, one must wait until it gets dark before he even recites Kidush at the beginning of the Seder. The TERUMAS HA'DESHEN (137) says that the reason is because the four cups of wine, which include the cup of Kidush, represent the Ge'ulah which we celebrate Pesach night, and since the Ge'ulah occurred after nightfall, the Seder must wait until that time as well. (Shulchan Aruch OC 472) Regarding Shabbos, the SHULCHAN ARUCH (OC 267:2) writes that one may begin his Shabbos meal before nightfall, as long as he begins *after* the time of Plag ha'Minchah (1 1/4 hours before nightfall). The MISHNAH BERURAH mentions the BACH who cites the MAHARAL (the second opinion mentioned above), that if one eats his Shabbos meal prior to nightfall, he should eat a k'Zayis of bread after Shabbos actually starts (nightfall). However, the Mishnah Berurah raises another question. The MAGEN AVRAHAM (OC 233) writes that a half-hour before nightfall, one is not permitted to eat because it is near to the time of Kerias Shema (and if he begins to eat, he might get involved in his meal and forget about Kerias Shema). Therefore, if one does recite Kidush and begin the Shabbos meal early, he must begin at least a half hour before nightfall (but, again, after Plag ha'Minchah). The Mishnah Berurah cites the dissenting opinion of the TAZ (OC 233 and 271) who argues and allows a person to start eating even within a half-hour of nightfall, if he has already recited Kerias Shema. This is based on the opinion cited by TOSFOS (Berachos 2a) that one may say Kerias Shema even before nightfall (see Insights to Berachos 2a). (However, the Mishnah Berurah (in BI'UR HALACHAH 271:1 and Sha'ar haTziyon 267:1) points out that the Heter of the Taz might not be applicable today. It only applies to people who have a Minhag to always Daven Ma'ariv early. Since we always Daven Ma'ariv after Sheki'ah, there is no Heter to recite Kerias Shema early on Friday eve and begin the Shabbos meal early.)

Pesachim 100 HALACHAH: EATING ON EREV SHABBOS OR ON EREV PESACH OPINIONS: The Mishnah (99b) states that one may not eat on Erev Pesach close to Minchah time, referring to the ninth hour of the day (107b). The Gemara here discusses the Halachos concerning whether a person is allowed to begin eating after the ninth hour on either Erev Pesach or on Erev Shabbos, and whether one must stop eating if he started. These Halachos are the subject of a dispute between Rabbi Yehudah and Rabbi Yosi. (See Chart #17.) ... HALACHAH: The Halachah seems to be in accordance with both the leniency of the Rosh (b) regarding Erev Pesach, and the stringency of the Behag and Rambam (c) regarding Erev Shabbos. SHULCHAN ARUCH 249:2 rules that a person should not begin eating a regular meal (the type of meal he eats during the week) after the ninth hour on Erev Shabbos, like the Rambam. On Erev Pesach, of course, one may not start any type of Se'udah after the ninth hour. It should be noted that included in this prohibition is beginning to eat before the ninth hour *with intent* to continue until after the ninth hour (RASHBAM 107b, DH Sof Sof). If one intends to continue until after the time at which it becomes prohibited to eat, it is equivalent to starting the meal at that time. If one was in middle of a meal on

Erev Pesach at nightfall, the SHULCHAN ARUCH (OC 472:3) rules that one is not required to stop with Akiras Shulchan (removing the table and reciting Birkas ha'Mazon), but one needs only to be Pores Mapah and recite Kidush. That is, regarding stopping the meal by nightfall on Erev Pesach, the Shulchan Aruch seems to be following the ruling of the ROSH, that one need not stop immediately and recite Birkas ha'Mazon (as Rabbi Yehudah rules).

Pesachim 101 "SHINUY MAKOM" WHEN MOVING FROM ROOM TO ROOM QUESTION: The Gemara says that Kidush must be recited b'Makom Se'udah. That is, when one recites Kidush, he must recite it in the place where he is going to eat his Se'udah. For this reason, one may not recite Kidush in one house and go to another house to eat his Se'udah. Furthermore, he may not even go from one room to another room ("mi'Makom l'Makom") in one house, or from the roof to the ground floor.... HALACHAH: There is a basic difference of opinion reflected in three answers to our question. Is going from one room to another room in the same house considered a Shinuy Makom with regard to making a new Berachah Rishonah? 1. The ROSH says that it *is* considered a Shinuy Makom. 2. The RAN says that it is a Shinuy Makom only when eating bread, but not when drinking wine. 3. MAHARAM CHALAVAH says that going from one room to another in one house is *never* considered a Shinuy Makom. How do we rule l'Halachah? The SHULCHAN ARUCH (OC 178) cites the opinion of the Rosh and says that even going from one room to another room is a Shinuy Makom and one must make a new Berachah. However, the BI'UR HALACHAH says that the widespread Minhag is *not* to recite a new Berachah when one goes from one room to another room, and he supports that opinion by showing that it is the opinion of the majority of the Rishonim (whose Girsas of the Gemara included the same phrase with regard to Kidush b'Makom Se'udah as with regard to making a new Berachah). Therefore, when drinking wine or other snack foods, one need not make a new Berachah when going from one room to another room in the same house. (When eating bread, the Halachah follows Rav Chisda and therefore b'Dieved one does not make a new Berachah in the new place in any case, see Insights to 102.) The Bi'ur Halachah concludes that *l'Chatchilah*, one should not walk into another room in the same house when eating, out of respect for the opinion of the Rosh and Tosfos that it is considered a Shinuy Makom. On the other hand, one need not stop those who do move from room to room, since there is strong support in the Rishonim for their practice. In two situations it is permitted to move from room to room while eating even l'Chatchilah: (1) If one can see the other room or part of it -- even through a window -- from where he recites his first Berachah (Mishnah Berurah 178:12). (2) or if he has in mind when he starts his meal that he will walk to the other room (Ra'avad, cited in Rema 178:1).

Pesachim 102 HALACHAH: SHINUY MAKOM OPINIONS: The Gemara discusses whether a person is required to recite a new Berachah when he began eating in one place and then moved to another place. The subject is a matter of dispute among the Tana'im and Amora'im. According to Rabbi Yehudah, one must recite a new Berachah in the second place. The Rabanan, though, maintain that one only needs to recite a Berachah for foods which do not normally require a Berachah Acharonah in the original place. When one eats foods that do require a Berachah Acharonah in the original place, one does *not* need to recite a new Berachah in the new place (the reason is because when eating such foods, one's intention in eating them in the new location is to add to the previous meal, making it a continuation of his meal in the first location -- see Background to Daf 101). This is how Rav Chisda rules. What is the Halachah? (a) The RASHBAM and the ROSH (10:6) rule like Rav Chisda, since the Gemara itself states that a Beraisa supports his opinion. Furthermore, he is following the opinion of the majority (the Rabanan). ... (b) The RIF, however, rules like Rav Sheshes, that one must always make a new Berachah, because Rabbi Yehudah in the earlier Beraisa clearly supports Rav Sheshes. ... This is also the ruling of the RAMBAM (Hilchos Berachos 4:4). The Rambam is also stringent regarding a Berachah *Acharonah*. ... HALACHAH: 1. The SHULCHAN ARUCH (OC 178:1) rules like the RAMBAM, who rules like Rav Sheshes, and is stringent in both respects, requiring a Berachah Acharonah for the food one ate in the original place, and a new Berachah Rishonah for the food one wishes to eat in the new place, even for bread. The REMA, however, rules leniently in both respects, like the ROSH. The MISHNAH BERURAH (OC 178:28) adds a limitation of this Halachah in the name of the MAGEN AVRAHAM: When we say that if one ate bread (an item which requires a Berachah Acharonah in its original place) he does not need to recite a new Berachah Rishonah, this is only when he ate at least a k'Zayis of bread in the original place. 2. All agree, though, that l'Chatchilah, a person should not change his location while eating, unless he needs to go in order to perform a Mitzvah or unless he had in mind to change his place when he made his original Berachah. According to the SHULCHAN ARUCH, having in mind to change one's place enables one to go from one room to another room in one house. According to the REMA (who rules like Rav Chisda and does not require a new Berachah when eating bread), one may have in mind to go even from one house to *another house* (MISHNAH BERURAH 178:33, 40). RAV MOSHE FEINSTEIN (IGROS MOSHE OC II:57), who follows the lenient ruling of the Rema, adds that even if one is eating fruit (or other items which normally require a new Berachah if one changes places), he does not need to recite a new Berachah in the new location if he *continues eating as he goes* to the new place and does not stop for a period of "k'Dei Dibur." 3. It should be noted that when the REMA rules like Rav Chisda, that means that b'Dieved one does not need a new Berachah Rishonah in the new location. What is the Halachah, though, if a person needs to leave his place for the sake of a Mitzvah and he knows that he is going to return? Is it preferable that he make a Berachah Acharonah before he leaves, and begin his meal anew when he returns? Or should he leave without reciting a Berachah Acharonah, and recite it only after he returns and finishes eating? The BI'UR HALACHAH concludes that it is better not to recite a Berachah Acharonah if one intends to return and eat more, in order to avoid making unnecessary Berachos. Rather, one should leave without reciting a Berachah Acharonah, unless there is a possibility that one will be away for a long time (more than 72 minutes), after which one may not recite a Berachah Acharonah. In such a case he should recite a Berachah Acharonah before he leaves (Bi'ur Halachah, end of DH b'Lo Berachah).

FOOD ITEMS NEED A "BERACHAH ACHARONAH BIMEKOMAN" OPINIONS: Rav Chisda says that if a person goes to a new location while eating a food which requires a Berachah Acharonah in its place, one does not need to recite a new Berachah Rishonah in the new location. Which items require a Berachah Acharonah in the place where the food was eaten ("Te'unim Berachah Achareihem bi'Mekoman")? ... (a) The RASHBAM writes that this phrase refers to all

foods of the Shiv'as ha'Minim. This is also the ruling of the RAMBAM (Hilchos Berachos 4:1). (b) TOSFOS (101b) and the ROSH (10:6) write that this refers only to foods made from grain. (c) The RASHBA (Berachos 53b) rules that only *bread* is considered an item which requires a Berachah Acharonah in its place. HALACHAH: The SHULCHAN ARUCH (OC 178:5) cites the opinion of the Rambam (a) and the opinion of Tosfos and the Rosh (b). The REMA cites the Rashba's opinion (c). The VILNA GA'ON rules like Tosfos, that bread and other foods made of grain require a Berachah Acharonah in the original place. The MISHNAH BERURAH (178:45), therefore, rules that a person should be stringent and, l'Chatchilah, should recite a Berachah Acharonah in the original place whenever he eats any of the Shiv'as ha'Minim. One should take on the stringencies of the VILNA GA'ON and not leave his place where he started eating foods of the Shiv'as ha'Minim that are not grain-based, because he might be required to recite a new Berachah Rishonah if he goes to a new place (since according to the Vilna Ga'on such foods are *not* items which require a Berachah Acharonah in the original place). ...

Pesachim 104... THE SEPARATION BETWEEN TWO TYPES OF KEDUSHAH QUESTION: Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi ruled that when reciting Havdalah, a person should mention only those forms of separation that appear in the Torah. However, the Gemara says that when Yom Tov falls on Motza'ei Shabbos, one says "ha'Mavdil Bein Kodesh l'Kodesh" in the Berachah of Havdalah, to express that Hashem separated between the Kedushah of Shabbos and the Kedushah of Yom Tov. Where does the Torah ever mention a separation between Shabbos and Yom Tov? The Torah does not even make explicit mention of the separation between the Kedushah of Shabbos and the lack of Kedushah of the rest of the week (see RASHBAM, DH v'Chosem!) ANSWER: (a) It seems from the Rishonim that the stipulation that a Havdalah be mentioned in the Torah only applies to what is mentioned as part of the main text of Havdalah. The Berachah at the end of Havdalah, though, need not be limited to what is mentioned explicitly in the Torah. (b) The ME'IRI, though, offers another answer. He asserts that we *do* find mention in the Torah of a separation between two types of Kedushah. The verse says that in the Mishkan, the purpose of the Paroches is to separate between the Kodesh and the Kodesh Kedoshim (Shemos 26:33). This is the source that there is a separation between two types of Kedushah, and therefore it will apply to the separation between the Kedushah of Shabbos and the Kedushah of Yom Tov as well. ... 105b "I AM NOT A CHACHAM, I AM NOT A CHOZEH, I AM NOT A YACHID" -- THE CRYPTIC INTRODUCTION OF RAV NACHMAN Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak asserted that even though a person is allowed to recite Kidush ha'Yom ("Vayechulu...") throughout the day of Shabbos if he neglected to say it at night, it is best to say it at night because "Chavivah Mitzvah b'Sha'ato," a Mitzvah is most beloved when done at its proper time. He was asked what is the difference between Kidush and Havdalah -- which we are supposed to delay and not say immediately at the conclusion of Shabbos, even though that is its proper time. Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak answered, "I am not a Chacham, I am not a Chozeh, I am not a Yachid. I am a Gamar and a Sadar, and they say in the Beis Medrash the same thing that I say, that there is a difference between the onset of the day (Kidush) and the conclusion of the day (Havdalah). When it comes to Kidush, we want to recite it as soon as possible, and when it comes to Havdalah, we want to delay it." What is the meaning of this strange introduction, "I am not a Chacham... and they say in the Beis Medrash the same thing that I say," that Rav Nachman gave in his answer? ANSWER: The OHR SAME'ACH (Hilchos Shabbos 29:12) offers a brilliant interpretation of Rav Nachman's comment. Rav Nachman's answer is based on the fact that Havdalah should be delayed, in contrast to Kidush which should be recited promptly. When to recite Havdalah is actually the subject of a dispute between Amora'im earlier (102b-103a). The Gemara there discusses the order of blessings when Yom Tov occurs on Motza'ei Shabbos, and one must recite both Kidush (for Yom Tov) and Havdalah (for Shabbos). Seven different Amora'im and Tana'im took sides regarding the blessing of Havdalah is said first or whether the blessing of Kidush is said first (see Chart #18). The Amora'im who said that Kidush must be said first were Rav, Levi (according to our Girsas, and not the Rashbam's), the Rabanan, and Mar brei d'Ravna. These Amora'im agreed with Rav Nachman bar Yitzchak's conclusion that Havdalah should be delayed. Those who said that Havdalah should be recited first, in contrast to Rav Nachman's opinion, were Shmuel, Rabah, and Rabbi Yehoshua ben Chananya (Rebbi Yehoshua is mentioned twice -- first he is quoted by Marta and then by Rebbi). When Rav Nachman presented his case about delaying Havdalah, he chose to allude to those who preceded him in discussing the topic. He referred to six of the seven, stating that three agreed with him and three argued with him. He said, "I am not a Chacham," meaning that he does not hold like the one who was called a Chacham. Rabbi Yehoshua ben Chananya is called "Chakima d'Yehuda'i," the Chacham of the Jews (Bechoros 9b). He said, "I am not a Chozeh," referring to Shmuel, who was an expert astronomer who observed ("Chozeh") the stars and celestial bodies (Berachos 58b; Tosfos, Ta'anis 7a). Finally, he said, "I am not a Yachid," referring to Rabah [bar Nachmani], who said in Bava Metzia (86a), "I am a Yachid (peerless) in the study of Nega'im, and I am Yachid in the study of Ohalos." After alluding to those with whom he argued, he alluded to those with whom he agreed. "I am Gamar (learned)" refers to Levi, about whom the Gemara (Sanhedrin 17b) says that whenever a reference is made to "the one who learned (Gamar) before the Chachamim," it refers to Levi. "I am Sadar (I organize my learning)" refers to Rav, who is called "Reish *Sidra* d'Bavel" (Chulin 137b). Finally, Rav Nachman said that "they say in the Beis Medrash the same thing that I say" for he is in agreement with the anonymous Rabanan of the Beis Medrash who also said that Havdalah should be delayed. (The only one to whom he did not refer was Mar brei d'Ravna. Since he was a contemporary of Rav Nachman, Rav Nachman felt no need to address his opinion.) A similar approach is suggested by RAV REUVEN MARGOLIOS (CHEKER SHEMOS V'KINUYIM #4; see fn. 8 there).

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

The Weekly Daf #249 Pesachim 100-106 Parshas Vayetzte <http://www.ohr.org.il/yomi/yomi250.htm> ... The Great Kiddush Upon his arrival in an unfamiliar community, Rabbi Ashi was honored with saying kiddush on wine Shabbos morning on behalf of the congregation. "Please say kiddusha rabba for us" they requested. "Kiddusha rabba?" Rabbi Ashi silently pondered. He

had never heard that phrase before and he began to wonder what sort of a kiddush was traditionally said in this community. Then he hit on a foolproof plan. Every kiddush begins with the blessing on wine -- "borei pri hagefen." He therefore said that blessing and paused. If no one in the congregation would drink from the cup of wine before him, he would assume that the communal tradition was to say the longer kiddush said on Shabbos eve, and he would continue with its text. When he observed one of the older congregants bending down to partake of his wine, he knew that their tradition was no different from his, and that the kiddush consisted of no more than that one blessing.

But why is this kiddush, which consists of only a single blessing (the passages from Torah and Prophets traditionally recited before the blessing are customary but are not an essential part of the kiddush), called by the paradoxical name of kiddusha rabba -- the "great kiddush"? The Torah commands us to "remember the Shabbos day to sanctify it," which obligates us to verbally declare its holiness. Our Sages directed us to fulfill this command by making this declaration in the kiddush we say at the onset of the holy day, and therefore designed a special text for it which concludes with the praise of Hashem as the "One Who sanctifies the Shabbos." Since the Shabbos meal eaten during the day gives more honor to the holy day than the one at night, our Sages commanded us to make a token kiddush before it as well. But in order to distinguish this kiddush of rabbinic origin from the Torah-mandated one at night, they limited its text to the single blessing on wine.

Rashbam (Rabbi Shmuel ben Meir, grandson of Rashi) explains that this kiddush of a single blessing is accorded this grandiose title because it is the universal opening for every Shabbos and Festival kiddush.

Rabbeinu Nissim (RaN) takes an almost opposite approach by suggesting that this title is a euphemism to cover up the brevity of the kiddush, in the same way that we euphemistically refer to a blind person as "one with much light." * Pesachim 106a

Written and Compiled by Rabbi Mendel Weinbach General Editor: Rabbi Moshe Newman
Production Design: Eli Ballon Prepared by the Jewish Learning Exchange of Ohr Somayach
International E-Mail: info@ohr.org.il Home Page: <http://www.ohr.org.il>
