



Rabbi Reisman – Parshas Vayigash 5783

1 – Topic – A Thought on the Parsha Relating to a Sugya in the Gemara

As we prepare for Shabbos Parshas Vayigash. This week's Parsha has so much available to talk about, let me talk about a few Sugyos that have to do with Gemaras and that are related to this week's Parsha. Let me begin with the third Posuk in the Parsha. Yehuda says in 44:20 that (וְאָחִיו מָתָה). Yehuda reports that he said that Yosef is dead. The first Meshech Chochmo on this week's Parsha says something absolutely beautiful. He says where did he get the right to say that (וְאָחִיו מָתָה). He brings the Sugya of Trei V'trei in Kesubos 22b (11 lines from the top). The Gemara there says that if two witnesses say that a man died and two witnesses say that he did not die, that is called Trei V'trei, two against two, the wife is not permitted to remarry because she is not sure that her husband died.

The Gemara says if she does remarry, we allow the marriage to continue. The Gemara asks why. The Gemara says (כגון שנשאת לאחד מעדיה). She married one of the witnesses that says I know for sure he died. If he says he knows for sure, we allow her to continue.

The Gemara asks that this is good for the man because he knows for sure, however, the woman doesn't know. There are two witnesses that say he died and two witnesses that say he didn't die. The Gemara answers that the case is where she says (ברי לי), I know he died. Even though Beis Din is not sure what happened, but these two individuals who say we know for sure are allowed to marry.

Says Rashi what does it mean that she said I know he died? Rashi says that she says I know him and he has been away so long, he would not have stayed away so long without contacting me. If he didn't contact me, it must be that he died. Says the Meshech Chochmo that we see from Rashi that there is such a Bori, that if a person says I am sure he died and he says that because it is so many years and he didn't contact me. The same thing with Yehuda. Yehuda said (וְאָחִיו מָתָה). Yosef must have died because it has been so many years and he didn't contact us, it must be that he died. A beautiful Meshech Chochmo.

In the Meshech Chochmo with a Pirush on the bottom which is written extremely well, it explains that the Meshech Chochmo is bringing a Raya to Rashi and saying that Rashi is right. You see from this Posuk that if he didn't contact you, you have the right to assume that (וְאָחִיו מָתָה). That note to the Meshech Chochmo seems to be totally incorrect. It is not a Raya to Rashi. It may be an explanation of Yehuda, but as you see, in this case the conclusion was incorrect. It is a Kasha on Rashi, it is not like Rashi because Yehuda Tak'e said (וְאָחִיו מָתָה), because he never contacted us, but the fact is that Yosef was alive. Sometimes a person doesn't contact you and there are reasons that you are unaware of. It seems on the contrary, while it explains Yehuda, this would seem to be

a Raya that we say not like Rashi and that a woman who says he didn't contact me that that is not a Bori.

2 – Topic – A second thought on the Parsha relating to a Sugya in the Gemara

We go on to Perek 47:2 much later in the Parsha where Yosef introduces his brothers to Pharoh. How does he introduce them to Pharoh, he brings five of them and it doesn't say which five but he brings five of his brothers in to meet Pharoh and the Posuk says (וַיִּקְרָא אֶתְיוֹ, לְקַח חֲמִשָּׁה אָנָשִׁים;). Which ones did he bring? Rashi says (החלשים). He didn't want to bring the strong ones because then Pharoh would want them to do work for him. (החלשים), he brought the weaker ones.

Which are the weaker ones? Rashi says (אותם שלא כפל משה שמותם כשברכם). Later in Parshas V'zos Hab'racha some names were said twice like for example Yehuda (וַיִּזְכֹּר לַיהוּדָה שְׁמֵעַ ר' קוֹל יְהוּדָה). Certain Shevatim names were said twice. The ones that it says the name twice those are the strong ones. (החלשים) the weak ones (אותם שלא כפל משה שמותם כשברכם). The ones whose names are not mentioned twice, are the weaker ones and they are the five. Rashi says he is quoting this from a Medrash of Agudas Eretz Yisrael.

This Rashi is problematic because Rashi is not going like the Gemara in Bava Kamma 92. The Gemara in Bava Kamma 92 is saying exactly the opposite. The Gemara agrees that he brought the Chalashim, however, the Gemara says which ones are the Chalashim?

The Gemara says that the weaker ones are the ones that are mentioned twice. (אותם שהוכפלו שמותם). Rashi on the Gemara says (בברכת משה דן וזבולון גד ואשר ונפתלי הודיעך הכתוב שחלשים שבכולן היו וצריכין). So Rashi on Chumash is choosing not to say like our Gemara but to say like the Agudas Eretz Yisrael which is the opposite of what it says in the Gemara. It turns out everyone agrees that the weak ones came. Who are the weak ones? According to the Medrash the ones that are mentioned twice are the strong ones and the ones not mentioned twice are the weak ones. According to the Gemara in Bava Kamma the ones that are mentioned twice are the weak ones.

What is this Machlokes if they were the weak ones or not the weak ones? It is a little hard to know. It may be that this brings us back to a topic that we must have discussed many times. What is the issue? It seems that the Agudas Eretz Yisrael holds that the weak ones are the ones whose names are not mentioned twice. In other words, to say, that Moshe Rabbeinu gave a Beracha to the strong ones by mentioning the name an extra time, he gave them a Beracha that you are going into Eretz Yisrael to do war. Who is going to do the fighting, the strong ones not the weak ones. So I give you a special Beracha that you should be strong and that you should be Matzliach in the Milchama. Who did he give that Beracha to? He gave that Beracha which is part of saying the double name to the strong ones.

However, the Gemara says not that way. The Gemara says just the opposite. The strong ones they will fight the battle. The weak ones how are they going to be able to fight? They need the extra Beracha of the name two times, and therefore, he gave them the name two times with that extra level of Beracha. This is the way the Sefer Acharei Ro'i explains the dispute.

This goes back to an old Shaila. We have discussed I believe on numerous occasions the question. What should a person work on, what is his Ta'kid, is his Ta'kid to work on his strengths or his weaknesses. You have a person who finds learning Geshmak and finds Chesed difficult. You find someone who finds Chesed Geshmak and finds learning difficult. Everyone has to do Chesed and everyone has to learn, but what should a person focus on his strength or his weakness?

Rav Pam in the Atara L'melech writes that a person comes to this world, how is he supposed to know his Ta'kid. He used to say that some people come in a Gilgul to fill in something they are missing. We don't come with instructions so how do we know which part we are missing. The answer is you do know. HKB"H gives you a nature towards that thing that you have to do. Your Teva is inclined towards that which you need to do. The language in the Atara L'melech, that is his way to grab on to the tree of eternal life of Olam Habo. That which you have a Niti'a to, which you have an inclination to, you have to do. You have to do all Taryag Mitzvos. Everyone has to have a Seder in learning, everyone has to do Chesed. However, the place to excel, is the place which you have a Niti'a, where you have the nature to go. This was the Shittah that Rav Pam explained.

In the past I mentioned that Rav Yisrael Salanter in Ohr Yisrael goes with this Mehaleich and the Kotzker in the introduction of Ohel Torah and that was his Shittas Hachaim among others.

Rav Tzaddok in Tzidkos Hatzaddik says the opposite. He says that a person's test in this world is the thing that comes with more difficulty. Whatever comes to you with difficulty that is what you have to accomplish in this world. What comes with a challenge. Mamash the other way around. What is a challenge is your job.

I must add that there are others who say like Rav Tzaddok. There are two sides. It would seem that is what they are arguing in. When you are going into Eretz Yisrael there is a Mitzvah of Kibbush Eretz Yisrael and everyone has to be involved. Who has to excel, who has to work hard? The Agudas Eretz Yisrael holds that it is the strong ones, they are the ones that are capable, their Nitios is towards it. They will do that and be at the head of the battle.

The Gemara is saying no. The weak ones, the ones who find it difficult, we give them a Beracha that they should have the strength to do it. They are the ones of course who will be in the battle. We want to win the battle, we don't want the weakest ones. The ones who are not inclined they have to strengthen themselves to be able to do it. It seems that this is a Machlokes.

It is a question why Rashi ignored the Gemara and chose the Medrash of Agudas Eretz Yisrael. That is a discussion for a different time, what Rashi's approach is in Chumash. Maybe we will find someone who explains it here. So, one Gemara in Kesubos that we discussed and one Gemara in Bava Kamma on 92.

3 – Topic – A third thought on the Parsha relating to a Sugya in the Gemara

Let me share something that actually came up in our learning this week in Maseches Bava Kamma. We are up to the Gemara Daf Zayin Amud Beis and the Gemara discusses how to assess the value

of a field or for that matter anything. The Gemara has a discussion if something has a depressed value in a certain season and in the future will have a higher value. What is the real value, is it the current value or is it the future value. Obviously we don't go by future value. It is talking about something that is normal to hold and not sell until the future. A field that it is normal to sell fields in the spring rather than in the winter. You get more money for it in the spring. If you are paying with a field in the winter do you go by today's value or future value? That is the discussion of the Gemara.

That led us to looking in the Shulchan Aruch. As you know, that is what I enjoy doing and I looked in Siman Kuf Tes in the issue of evaluating fields in S'if Gimmel. The Bais Yosef, the Rama alludes to a Teshuvah Harivash which is in the Bais Yosef. If you want to see it you can look in the Bais Yosef. Or in the column in Siman Kuf Tes in Choshen Mishpat, S'if Gimmel, the Taz quotes it verbatim. He quotes the Shaila of land (קרקע של יתום שנמכרה בזמן שהיה מגפה חזקה בעיר). Something was sold at a time during a Makeifa, during Covid it was sold.

During Covid the prices of real estate were depressed. People were not exactly running around buying it. It was sold to satisfy a debt obligation for the Yesomim. It was sold during the time of a Mageifa. The Tashbatz says (מכר זה בטל). That is not a sale. Nothing to do with Yesomim. It is because (דאע"ג דקי"ל אין להקדש אלא מקומו ושעתו) (וה"נ) go according to its time and place, still (היינו בזמן שנעשה המכר בזמן הראוי למכור). That is if it is a normal time when people would sell. (אבל זה שמכר בזמן שאין ראוי למכור). But here it was sold in the wrong time and that is not the real price. That is what it says in the Tashbatz.

This is not only Yesomim. When the Rama brings it he says (דאם מכרו הקרקעות בשעה שאין קונין כגון) (בשעת מגפה). We are talking about the real price. The real price is not the price Bish'as Hamageifa. That is the Shittah of the Tashbatz.

Someone correctly asked what is going on in this week's Parsha. Yosef did not like the Tashbatz. At the end of the Parsha he took all of the fields of the Mitzrim and they did not have what to eat, they were strapped. He said you need seeds, then sell your fields to Pharaoh. Now it could be that Yosef paid top dollar although it doesn't seem that he had enough money for all of the fields. He probably paid the depressed value of the money. After all, what favor is he doing for Pharaoh if he is paying top dollar for it? So it must be that he was paying a cheaper price. That must be the Poshut Pshat in the Pesukim. What is going on? He violated the rule because that is not the correct price. It is a big Kasha.

You might want to see the rest of the Taz as it is a Geshmak Taz. However, as far as the part that is Noge'a to this week's Parsha, I think that I have covered my bases. If you want to have a real Oneg Shabbos then learn the whole Tashbatz and Teshuvah HaRashba and the Taz's Peshara between them as Geshmak as could be.

So three thoughts to have you thinking for this week's Shabbos Kodesh. I want to wish one and all and absolutely wonderful Mishmar evening and a wonderful Shabbos. A Gutten Shabbos to everybody!

Rabbi Reisman – Parshas Vayigash 5782

1 – Topic – A Thought on the First Aliyah.

As we prepare for Shabbos Parshas Vayigash and we head into the stretch of the winter Zman with a renewed energy and vigor to B'ezras Hashem have a great winter Zman. Especially with Daf Yomi coming to very short Masechtos. Even those of you who never learn Daf Yomi. Beginning on Tuesday, they will be learning Masechtas Megillah. You can do it. You can do a Daf of Masechtas Megillah every day. If you fall behind you catch up later as you are only going to do it for Megillah. Chap a' Rein, join the Daf. IY"H you will be happy you did.

We look at Parshas Vayigash. I would like to try a Vort on the first Aliyah, second Aliyah and third Aliyah. The first Aliyah. At the beginning of the Parsha we find a very strange inconsistency with Yehuda which I know many Meforshim talk about. The inconsistency is this. In the previous Parsha when the Shevatim are first accused of stealing the Geviah, first they say that as is found in 44:9 (אֲשֶׁר יִמָּצֵא אֹתוֹ מֵעֶבְדֶּיךָ, וְמָת) (גם-אֶנְהוּנָּה, נִהְיָה לְאֹדְנִי לְעֶבְדִּים). First they say, the one in whose possession is found should die (גם-אֶנְהוּנָּה, נִהְיָה לְאֹדְנִי לְעֶבְדִּים). A very strict punishment, Misah.

Then after it is found, they say that we should all be Avadim to Pharaoh. In other words, they are accepting a punishment. Then in this week's Parsha Yehuda says if you don't let us go I am going to kill out the whole Mitzrayim as it says in 44:18 (כִּי כְמוֹךָ, כְּפָרְעֹה) as Rashi explains. What is going on? Were the Shevatim ready to do battle, were they willing to concede? I know there is a lot of Divrei Torah on this, but I saw in the Nesivos' Sefer on Chumash Nachlas Yaakov, he says something which is very Karov to Pshat.

He says the following. We know that when Lo Aleinu a Tzarah happens to a person, a person should say what does the Ribbono Shel Olam want from me? A person should try to analyze and see what is it that HKB"H wants. Certainly Gedolim like the Shevatim did such a thing. Zagit the Nesivos, they immediately said as it says B'feirush in last week's Parsha, this is happening because we sold Yosef. When the accusation of the Geviah came, the Shevatim understood that what was going to happen to them was a punishment for the selling of Yosef.

As it says in Shemos 21:16 (וְגֵנֵב אִישׁ וּמִכְרוֹ, מוֹת יוּמָת) (גם-אֶנְהוּנָּה, נִהְיָה לְאֹדְנִי לְעֶבְדִּים). There is a Chiyuv Misah. They felt that Min Hashamayim it may well be the Geviah is found perhaps in the possession of Shimon or Levi who had been instrumental in the idea of selling Yosef, therefore, they said in whoever's possession it is found it seems from heaven he is deserving of Misah.

Afterwards, subsequently, they were told no, we only want to make you Avadim. Then they made a Cheshbon and they said okay it is not for the selling of Yosef but it is the Shibud Mitzrayim that Avraham Avinu was told at the Bris Bein Habesarim that your grandchildren will be Meshubad in Mitzrayim. So then they said to themselves, okay, we did an Aveirah with Yosef and HKB"H wants to start the Shibud Mitzrayim, so we will all be Avadim. That was the Cheshbon Hanefesh.

Then Yosef takes only Binyamin and tells them to go home. At that point Yehuda said Cheshbon Hanefesh? All of our Cheshbonos are wrong. If it is for the selling of Yosef why is Binyamin being held, he wasn't there. If it is for the Bris Bein Habesarim, the Shibud in Mitzrayim, then why are

we being sent home? At that point it became clear to Yehuda that his Cheshbonos were incorrect and then he got up like a lion and said (כְּפָרְעָה, כִּי כְמוֹהוּ), we don't deserve this and he was ready to do battle. This is the Nesivos' take B'derech Hap'shat, an idea in what the Shevatim were thinking in their back and forth. That is a thought on the first Aliyah.

2 – Topic – A Thought on the Second Aliyah

In the second Aliyah Yosef reveals himself and actually does it twice. If you look at the Pesukim you see very clearly that he tells them (אָנִי יוֹסֵף, הַעוֹד אָבִי חַי) twice. Once in Posuk Gimmel (אָנִי יוֹסֵף, הַעוֹד אָבִי חַי) and then again in Posuk Daled (אָנִי יוֹסֵף אֶחָיֶכֶם, אֲשֶׁר-מִכַּרְתֶּם אֹתִי, מִצְרָיִמָה). Why does he say (אָנִי יוֹסֵף) twice? Why does the Posuk bring it down two times?

I once heard that two Mechanchim, two elementary school Rabbeim came to the Brisker Rav. They had a disagreement and they asked him who is right. What was the disagreement? One Rebbe said I start the year very strict and I get the boys in line, and then I lighten up and I get them to like me. That is the best way to do it. The other Rebbe said no, that is the wrong way. You start the year easygoing and they start to love you. Then you buckle down on them once they love you and you have them in your hand you are as strict with them as you need to be strict with them. They asked the Brisker Rav which approach to Chinuch is best.

The Brisker Rav answered either way is fine, however, a Rebbe has to have an approach. A Rebbe who has no approach, no plan, and he just goes in day by day, he is not going to be successful in his Talmidim. He has to think through an approach and have a plan. Have a way of doing it. You can start strict and get soft, you can start soft and get strict. As you wish.

This came to mind when I read about Yosef. Yosef took the approach of giving them Mussar and then softening up. First he says to them in Posuk Gimmel (אָנִי יוֹסֵף), he says to them I am Yosef (הַעוֹד אָבִי חַי) as the Meforshim say you were so worried that our father will die if Binyamin is taken away. Why didn't you think about it then? (וְלֹא-יָבִיאוּ אֶחָיו לַעֲנוֹת אֹתוֹ). In that Posuk it is clear he was being strict with them and it says they could not answer him.

Then he backed off and softened up. Look at it. What does he say in the next Posuk? (וַיֹּאמֶר יוֹסֵף) (אָנִי יוֹסֵף אֶחָיֶכֶם). Come close, he drew them close and said (אָנִי יוֹסֵף אֶחָיֶכֶם). He used the word (אֶחָיֶכֶם). I am Yosef, I am your brother (וַעֲתָה אֵל-תַּעֲצָבוּ, וְאֵל-יִחַר (אֶחָיֶכֶם). (אֲשֶׁר-מִכַּרְתֶּם אֹתִי, מִצְרָיִמָה). He says words of Pi'us. So that sometimes it is necessary to say something that is strict, something that is tough. It could be times that it is necessary. However, Yosef had a plan. His plan was that he would tell them what has to be said and then he will soften up and make sure that the relationship is good.

It is very important. Sometimes we have a relationship with somebody and there is sort of a mixed bag. There is a need to say something tough and on the other hand you want to keep the relationship. People end up creating a Cholent, people end up sending confusing messages. It could be to children, it could be to other close relatives or to friends. Confusing messages. Yes, no, where are you? A person has to have an approach, has to have a Mehaleich. You don't just do things as the mood tells you to do. You have an approach. Yosef had a clear approach. He told them something sharp at a time they would hear it and (נִבְהָלוּ), and then like Chazal say in Sanhedrin

107b (22 lines from the top) (לעולם תהא שמאל דוחה וימין מקרבת) with one hand he pushed them away and now he brought them close and he said (אל-תעצבו), don't worry about it (שְׁלַחְנִי) because G-d said to do this. A wonderful message from the second Aliyah.

3 – Topic – A Thought on the Third Aliyah

In the third Aliyah Yosef is already sending for his father and he sends tons of food. I don't know why he sends so much food if he is telling them to come. Okay, but I think that I asked that a different year probably. He sends them a lot and 45:23 (מְטוֹב מְצָרִים). Besides what is listed there is something else. (מְטוֹב מְצָרִים). Rashi brings from Megillah 16b (21 lines from the top) (יין [ישן]). (שדעת זקנים נוחה הימנו). He sent some old wine which elderly people tend to enjoy. That is what it says. In other words, we are saying that old wine is better than fresher wine. It is better to have aged wine then wine that is Yayin Chadash, that is non-aged. That is what people say. Old wine is good.

It seems to be a contradiction because this is a Gemara in Megillah 16b, however, there is another Gemara in Menachos 86b (in the Mishnah) where Rabbi holds (אין מביאין ישן דברי רבי). You don't bring old wine for Nesachim, for it to be poured in the Beis Hamikdash and Rashi there on 87a says (כשעברה שנתו עוברת אדמיות ואינו אדום כל כך כשנה ראשונה). Wine that is aged more than a year is not so good anymore. (אין מביאין ישן) for Nesachim. You have to remember that Rashi was in the wine business. Rashi was from France. That is why Maseches Avodah Zorah has so much Rashi and Tosafos on the Sugyos that deal with wine because they dealt with wine all of the time. We find that Rashi says that wine that is a year old is not so good, it is inferior. Isn't that a Stira to our Rashi? We need to look for a third Rashi somewhere.

In Pesachim 108b there is a Rashbam. The Gemara says (11 lines from the top) that the Arba Kosos on Pesach could be (אחד חדש ואחד ישן), old wine or new wine. You are Yotzei with each one. What is the Chiddush of the Gemara that it could be old wine or new wine? The Rashbam says that (ישן) you can use old wine (שאין בו טעם יין כל כך). It doesn't taste as good (שנעשה חלש) as it has gotten weak, it has gotten old. Says the Rashbam (אי נמי חדש אין בו טעם יין). Maybe not, maybe fresh wine is inferior. It is very strange. The Rashbam says maybe the old wine is inferior or maybe the new wine is inferior. Maybe the Rashbam was bothered by these two Gemaras.

Tosafos there says the Ikkur is that old wine is better like we find by Yosef. It is a very confusing set of Chazals regarding the quality of old wine or new wine, aged wine or non-aged wine. Personally, I like low alcohol wine. I have been ashamed because all the Bekiim around me have always said high alcohol is good. Finally I decided no Busha, I like low alcohol wine. When you send me wine for Purim B'eizras Hashem, I like good old Rashi wine, wine that is low alcohol, good quality wine. It seems (יין [ישן] שדעת זקנים נוחה הימנו). When you get old you like old wine. We will see. Maybe it will yet happen. When you are young you like fresh wine. Sounds like Chazal. It is difficult to have different Chazals talking about the quality of wine in two different ways.

Once we are on the topic of wine, I do want to make a public service announcement. The Jewish wine stores sell any wine that has any Hechsher at all. If it has Hebrew lettering on it they sell it.

You should know that not all Hechsheirim are good for wine. As a matter of fact, I would say that about 50% of the bottles of wine that are brought to me by guests are wines that I would not drink.

How are you supposed to know which wine is good and which wine is not? So I will tell you what I do. Khal Adas Jeshurun, KAJ - the community of Washington Heights has a list of acceptable Hechsheirim for wine. As a matter of fact, it is on the KAJ Pesach list. If you Google “kaj pesach list” it is alphabetical. You go down to wine, you get a list of Hechsheirim they accept. Now they say right away there may be other good Hechsheirim. These are the ones they know are good. Well what I did is I made a copy of that list, scotch taped it onto the wall in the place where I keep my wine and if it is not on the list I don’t use it. This is because you can’t just use any wine because it has a Hechsher. Some wines are made in far flung places, and therefore, it is very hard to give a Hechsher on wine. If something goes wrong for a minute and the machine button is pushed by an Aino Yehudi it makes the wine not good.

As a matter of fact, there are issues even with transporting the grapes. Grapes are transported by dump trucks and they are dumped into receptacles. Even that dumping may constitute pouring of the grape juice which is at the bottom of the dump truck which accumulates. It is a very complicated and difficult issue. Without getting into all of the details, you should be careful with which wine you drink. Yayin Yashan, Yayin Chadash, whatever it is you like. A’bi Yayin L’chvod Shabbos Kodesh.

Wishing one and all an absolutely wonderful, Gevaldige, extraordinary and best Shabbos ever. Prepare for Masechtas Megillah. Those of you who don’t learn Daf Yomi prepare, cheat, start ahead of time. Why not? IY”H you will make a Siyum in a couple of weeks and you will be happy you did. Be well!

Rabbi Reisman - Parshas Vayigash 5781

1 – Topic – A Thought on Parshas Vayigash

As we prepare for Shabbos Parshas Vayigash with an unusual Erev Shabbos Taanis Asara B’taves which begins tomorrow morning a few minutes after 6 o’clock at least here in Brooklyn. Here in Parshas Vayigash we find in 46:30 that Yaakov Avinu is delighted of course to hear that Yosef is alive and he makes a statement which seems strange (אָמִיתָהּ הַפֶּעַם). Poshut Pshat in the Posuk is that now that this happened (אָמִיתָהּ הַפֶּעַם) I am ready to die. In other words, Boruch Hashem I have what I need from my life.

However, Rashi says something else. Rashi says on (אָמִיתָהּ הַפֶּעַם) that Yaakov Avinu said that this is a relief to him. Why? Because he had thought that somehow he would suffer two deaths and now he is only going to suffer one death. What does it mean two deaths? So Rashi’s Lashon is בעולם הזה ובעולם הבא, שנסתלקה שכינה. (סבור הייתי למות שתי מיתות). I thought I would have two deaths. (ממני, והייתי אומר שיתבעני הקב"ה מיתתך). I thought that because I indirectly caused your death, I am guilty. (עכשיו שעודך חי לא אמות אלא פעם אחת).

What does that mean? It is a very strong Lashon. Rashi says Yaakov thought he was going to die besides the natural death that every human being who comes to this world dies, there will be another death of what I had done.

Now even if we would say that what Yaakov Avinu did was sending Yosef someplace where he died, does one Aveira erase all the Schar he has of Taryag Mitzvos Shamarti, the fact that he withstood living in the house of Lavan and the battles with Eisav and the Sar of Eisav. The fact that he raised twelve children, the Shivtei Ka is that all erased (אָמוּתָהּ הַפְּעָם). Rashi doesn't say that he would lose something because he caused Yosef's death. He says a strong Lashon of (אָמוּתָהּ הַפְּעָם).

Rav Mordechai Schwab in the Maimar Mordechai, Siman Nun Daled, says an idea which is elaborated upon in quite a number of early sources but not heard much in the later sources in the Achronim. Rav Mordechai Schwab writes about a rule in Olam Habo, that if a person comes there and he has Mitzvos and Aveiros which of course is typical. Most people who come to the Yom Hadin have Mitzvos on one side of the scale and Aveiros on the other side of the scale. The question is how does it work in that great day of judgment. The Yom Hagadol V'hanora, the day of judgement that we will all someday face.

Does it work that the Mitzvos and Aveiros cancel each other out and hopefully what remains on balance is Mitzvos. Sort of like a checking account. There are deposits and there are withdrawals or checks that are paid and then you look at the balance. Is that the way it works in Olam Habo? Or does it work that everything a person does has a judgement and then hopefully the good outweighs the bad.

So Rav Mordechai Schwab writes that it doesn't work that things cancel each other out. Everything a person does in this world ultimately is something for which he faces judgment and consequences. If you do something and you don't do Teshuva for it, there are consequences for it.

He alludes to the Rambam in Pirkei Avos 4:22. Where the Mishna says (ברוך הוא שאין לפניו לא) (עוולה, ולא שכחה, ולא משוא פנים, ולא מקה שוחד). That there is no bribery in front of G-d. The Rambam says Im Asa Tovah Harbei, even though a person did a lot of good in his lifetime, Yai'aneish Al Ha'avon Vi'kabeil Schar Al Hamitzvos. There is retribution for sin and Schar for Mitzvos. Meaning to say that a person shouldn't sit on his laurels and say I am very comfortable that I have more Mitzvos than Aveiros and I am in a good shape for the Olam Ha'emes, because whatever a person did there is retribution for. A person must Chap'a'rine with Teshuva and regret the Aveiros that he does. This is the Shittah of the Rambam.

The Ramban in Parshas Eikev 10:16 holds this way as well. (מיד אדם. ופירשו בשוחד, שאפילו חסיד גמור) (שיעבור עבירה לא יקח ממנו מצווה ממצוותיו בשוחד לכפר לו, אבל יענישהו על חטאיו ויגמול לו ככל טובותיו). According to this approach, we understand Rashi. Rashi is saying that Yaakov Avinu knew he had a lot of Mitzvos, he knew that he had a lot of Schar coming to him, but he thought that since he had sent Yosef off to his death, that punishment, that (שתי מיתות) is still something he has to suffer.

What is interesting, is that there are those that do disagree. The Medrash Shmuel on Pirkei Avos brings from the Ri Ben Shushan who disagrees. Rav Nissan Gaon as well. If you look at the Sefer

Chassidim Os Taf Reish Hei, he brings from Rabbeinu Nissan Gaon who was one of the Gaonim who is printed on the side of the Gemara in Maseches Berachos. (This is not the Ran). They hold that there is a cancellation. The Mitzvos and Aveiros cancel each other out.

It is hard to imagine a Rasha Gamur getting Schar for his Mitzvos in the Olam Ha'emes like a person thinks according to the Rambam. The idea that things cancel each other out seems to be a Gemara in Sotah 21a (8 lines from the bottom). The Gemara says (שעבירה מכבה מצוה). Aveiros cancel out Mitzvos. Certainly Mitzvos cancel out Aveiros. It is interesting because the Gemara goes on to say (ואין עבירה מכבה תורה). Torah survives any iniquity. But at any rate, their Shittah is that things do cancel each other out. Therefore, according to their Shittah, the Yom Hadin Hagadol V'hanora is a Din on balance, where a person is on balance.

Of course the Rambam and the Ramban's Shittah are probably the Ikkur and with this we understand that we say Kaddish for 11 months after someone's Petira. We consider the first year to be a year of difficulty for the Neshama. Why so if we know that the person who passed away on balance was a great person, was a person who stayed Frum, who kept Shabbos, Davening three times a day and learning. Because nevertheless there is some consequence for Aveiros that a person does and that is all in the first 11 months.

I want to add importantly, that there is one thing that does cancel out Aveiros according to everybody. That is that the Gemara says Kol Hamevater Mevatrim Lo. Somebody in this world who has Bein Adam L'chaveiro Middah of being a Mevater. Someone offends him and he doesn't get angry, he doesn't give retribution, he doesn't do anything. Such a person who doesn't get angry or doesn't do anything to other people who wrong him, such a person, Mevatrim Lo. His Aveiros could be erased by such good behavior. In that area everyone would seem to agree that there is a canceling out.

Here we have an important idea in the Hashkafa of Klal Yisrael. The idea that whatever a person does a person has a Din on. It is told that the GR"A in his wanderings during the time of his Galus he once saw a Jew eating without a Beracha. He said eating without a Beracha you are going to have a Din on that. This Jew told the Vilna Gaon, Rebbe you don't know me. I am Mechaleil Shabbos, I eat Treifos and I am Over on all kinds of Aveiros. You are worried about me not making a Beracha?

The Gaon said to him, you should know. Whatever you do in this world is something you have to face up to in that world. It doesn't matter what other Aveiros you do, eating without a Beracha, you are going to have to answer to it and there are consequences for it.

It is a sobering thought. Even though we live a whole life and Boruch Hashem we do Mitzvos all the time, but we have to be careful and I am talking to myself, to make a Borei Nefashos when I have to, a Beracha Rishona when I have to. What a Mussar!

2 – Topic – The YTV “36 hour” Fundraiser

I would like first to thank the 200 of you who called in yesterday on the phone call. I am aware that there was difficulty getting in to our group phone call last night and I would like to share with

you the basic thought that I mentioned last night. For those of you who are hearing it a second time it is not a bad thing.

The basic thought that I meant to share last night was a Hanhaga, a behavior. Something which I hope you will take as regular practice. That is the idea that when there are people around you who are suffering, who are struggling. We know people who may have lost their jobs, people who may be in middle of a divorce or broken engagement, people are having problems with an illness be it a physical or mental illness. The tendency of others is to shy away from them, to not talk to them. Why? There is a fear that I will not know what to say. It is very important that people get beyond that. That people pick up the phone and call. You won't know what to say and you will ask him about his divorce? That of course you are not going to ask him. So what are you going to say? I will tell you what to say. Practice saying this. I heard you are going through hard times, I just want you to know I am thinking of you. I just want you to know I feel for you. That is all. That is all you have to say. It is very meaningful.

Why does that come to mind in the context of the Parsha? This is because in these Parshios we read about Yosef. How Yosef saved Mitzrayim. Yosef really saved the whole world. The world was ready for a hunger and Yosef saved the whole world. He brought his family down to Mitzrayim in a good way instead of them coming down to Mitzrayim like other Galusin. Where did that all start from? It is important to note that it all began from four words. When Yosef saw the Sar Hamashkim depressed he said as is found in 40:7 (מֵדוּעַ פְּנִיְכֶם רָעִים, הַיּוֹם). He said buddy, why do you look so downcast today? (מֵדוּעַ פְּנִיְכֶם רָעִים, הַיּוֹם). The whole Yeshua came from those four words. Because he met somebody, and he said Oy you look so upset. He made a comment. From that was Nisgalgeil the entire incredible story of saving the world, saving Klal Yisrael and everything that followed. It is a lesson (מֵדוּעַ פְּנִיְכֶם רָעִים, הַיּוֹם). You meet somebody you should ask him (מֵדוּעַ פְּנִיְכֶם רָעִים, הַיּוֹם). Try to reach out to people. This is the lesson I mentioned.

Rav Chaim Volozhiner's son writes in the Hakdama to Nefesh Hachaim, his father was Rav Chaim Volozhiner, the prime Talmid of the Vilna Gaon. One of the greatest men that he ever knew as he started the whole Yeshiva system. His son writes, Haya Ragil L'hochiach Osi, he would be critical of me, give me Tochacha. When? Al She'ra'a She'ai'neni Mishtateif B'tzaar Shel Achrini. When he saw that I don't feel for the pain of others. Amazing. I would think that he gave me Tochacha when I Bat'tled. He gave me Tochacha when I missed Minyan, he gave me Tochacha when I didn't make a Beracha properly. No. he says, Haya Ragil L'hochiach Osi Al She'ra'a She'ai'neni Mishtateif B'tzaar Shel Achrini. If I don't feel along with the pain of others. It is something that we all have to do. I am talking to myself as well.

We have to be more cognizant, aware that people need just support. Support doesn't mean that you find Eitzos for someone's problems, support means that you recognize, you emphasize, you feel along with someone else.

Last night I was given the opportunity of 5 – 10 minutes to share a message with Talmidim of the Yeshiva. This is the greatest message that you can have. It is something you can get used to doing and bring tons of Schar to the scale L'asid Lavo. What is it? It is being a good person, being a caring person and being a kind person.

Last night I requested from everyone and I am sharing the request. YTV, all the Mosdos and all of the Yeshivos were not able to have their dinners, their honorees. These dinners are really what brings in the bulk of the money outside of tuition. In other words, every Yeshiva has a serious deficit and a couple million dollars are typically brought in in connection with the dinner. It didn't happen this year. There is a big hole in the budget here in Yeshiva. The Yeshiva is growing and expanding. Last year we bought two additional buildings next to our dormitory. Those who were in Yeshiva remember the building to the left to house additional Talmidim for the dormitory.

We also renovated another building we own on the block to serve as a dormitory. The Yeshiva is growing and expanding. On the 4th floor we added an extra dining room for Talmidim of the Beis Medrash. We are adding classes every year. We don't know where we are going to put them next year, we don't have enough classrooms. Every year we are adding one class in the elementary school. Boruch Hashem. But we need funding for it.

You may have seen and you will see ads for a matching funding campaign which will be taking place from Motzoei Shabbos through Monday. They are calling it 36 hour matching campaign from Motzoei Shabbos until Monday night which is a funny 36 hours. But I guess they are not counting 6 hours in the middle of the night on Motzoei Shabbos and Sunday night, but you can already contribute. Contribute and please reach out to others, tell your friends. Send a group email that you heard that Yeshiva is having a matching campaign. Please click on it and be part of it.

It is a Hakaras Hatov that I owe to the Yeshiva. I beg all of you to be part of this. With that, may this Asara B'teves be the last Taanis Asara B'teves. We look forward to the day not only will Tisha B'av be a Yom Tov but the Navi Zecharya says all of the 4 Tanaisim will be Yomim Tovim. Asara B'teves too. It will be a Yom Tov, a very short Yom Tov because it is a short day. IY"H we look forward to the day that HKB"H will turn it into a Yom Tov.

This year Asara B'teves is very special because it comes out on a day where many people have off from work and it could be like it once was that a Yom Taanis was a day where Yidden got together and thought about serving HKB"H. Tomorrow morning I will be doing a Hakhel Shiur from 9 – 10 AM for an hour and it will be broadcast on Torah Anytime as well. It will be live in Shul. Looking forward to speaking to you again tomorrow morning B'ezras Hashem. A Gutten Shabbos to one and all!

Rabbi Reisman-Parshas Vayigash 5780

As we prepare for Shabbos Parshas Vayigash. We prepare for a Shabbos of joy of Siyum HaShas all over Klal Yisrael. We prepare for Sunday's Haschalas HaShas where many of us will start Maseches Berachos. I want to mention to you that it is not really possible for me to learn Daf Yomi given my different responsibilities but I think that I can manage Maseches Berachos. I think that I can but I am not certain so I will give it a shot Bli Neder. It is my intention to start Maseches Berachos with the Daf Yomi and B'ezras Hashem hope to finish it with them. Worse comes to worse, I will be Zoche every seven years to learn Maseches Berachos. Join me and do what I am doing. You can even cheat and start Berachos on Shabbos. IY"H we should be Zoche all of us that yesterday's extraordinary Asifa, it was really more than anything a sense of joy, of camaraderie, it

was a festive feeling. It wasn't a feeling of getting together for Drashos, it was a feeling of getting together to celebrate. Extraordinary. IY"H we should be Zoche to truly build on it.

1 - Topic - A Vort on the word Vayigash.

The Mekor for taking three steps forward at the beginning of Shemoneh Esrei is from the Sefer Harokai'ach. Now after Shemoneh Esrei, stepping out of Shemoneh Esrei has the Mekor in Shas. The Gemara in Yoma says that it is very important and that someone who doesn't step three steps out of Shemoneh Esrei, the Gemara says that there is something wrong with his Shemoneh Esrei. Three steps forward the Sefer Rokeiach learns from the three Vayigash in Tanach. It says in Beraishis 18:23 (וַיֵּגַשׁ אַבְרָהָם), it says in Melachim I 18:21 (וַיֵּגַשׁ אֶל־הוֹרֵן) and in our Parsha 44:18 (וַיֵּגַשׁ אֶל־יְהוָה). The question is that the other two have to do with Davening we understand, however, (וַיֵּגַשׁ אֶל־יְהוָה) what in the world does that have to do with Davening?

Why did Yehuda walk towards Yosef? It has nothing to do with Davening. When you talk to someone you walk towards him. Zagt Rav Aron Leib Shteinman when you start Shemoneh Esrei we want you to feel the Ribbono Shel Olam is in front of you. What is (וַיֵּגַשׁ אֶל־יְהוָה) when you talk to someone you walk towards him. Exactly. Talk to the Ribbono Shel Olam and sense that there is a Ribbono Shel Olam.

There is a GRA that Teitches (בְּרוּךְ אַתָּה ר) that they refer to the beginning of every Beracha as a hidden reference to Avraham, Yitzchok and Yaakov, to the Avos. Baruch is Avraham, Ata is Yitzchok and Hashem is Yaakov. Why is Baruch Avraham? As it says in 12:3 (וַיִּבְרָכֵהוּ, מְבָרְכֶיךָ). That doesn't take much explanation. Why is Hashem Yaakov? 33:20 (קל, אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל). Rashi actually says that Hashem Kavayochel shared his name with Yaakov.

Ata is Yitzchok. What does that mean? Baruch is a name. We have heard the name. Hashem is certainly a name. What is Ata? Have you ever heard of someone named Ata? How is Ata Yitzchok?

Zagt Rav Hutner in Pachad Yitzchok, do you know why Ata is Yitzchok? Yitzchok is Yir'a. There are two types of Yir'a. You could be afraid of a king but he is far away. You could be driving and you are afraid to speed because you are afraid of a policemen but you don't see him. That is one level of Yir'a.

There is another level of Yir'a, when you are standing in front of the king. You are driving down the road and there is a police car behind you. It is very different being afraid of a police car behind you and a police car that might come. Those are two different types of Yir'a. The Yir'a of Yitzchok. The Yir'a that Yitzchok Avinu gives to us is Ata. It is a look at HKB"H Kavayochel as if he is in front of you. Baruch Ata Hashem. Ata is an extraordinary Madreiga. That is what Rav Shteinman is saying. Take three steps forward. Feel Ata.

I was inspired by a member of our Shul to do the following when I kneel and bow to Hashem by Baruch Ata Hashem to just raise my hand towards HKB"H in Shemoneh Esrei. Don't worry no one is looking as everyone is Davening Shemoneh Esrei. When you are up to the first three words no one has finished yet probably. To raise my hand not high up but to remind myself G-d is in

front of me. I hope it works. But it is a reminder, Baruch Ata Hashem to see Hashem in front of you.

I would add. We just had a GRA in Divrei Hayamim 28:18. The GRA says that Yerushalayim was given to us in the Zechus of Avraham Avinu, the Har Habayis in the Zechus of Yitzchok and the Bais Hamikdash in the Zechus of Yaakov. The GRA is probably referring indirectly to what Chazal say that Avraham, Yitzchok and Yaakov referred to the Har Habayis in different ways. Avraham is Ir, Yitzchok is Har and Yaakov is Bayis. What is Yitzchok's Har Habayis?

You know what it is? Yerushalayim could be Chorev. Today you go to Yerushalayim and there are parts of Yerushalayim that are full of enemies of the Jewish people, full of Arabs that wish us harm. We have parts of Yerushalayim but not all of it. The Bais Hamikdash we don't have at all. It is all gone, soon to return. But the Har Habayis is the mountain, is the place.

Yitzchok's Madreiga is Yir'a to the degree that you see the Har Habayis and you have a Yir'a of the Ribbono Shel Olam, a fear. When you stand by the Kosel you have to have the Yir'a. People look at the Kosel and they are missing the message. The message of the Kosel is not what is in front of it, it is beautiful what is in front of it, Yidden Davening. The message of the Kosel is what is behind it, what is missing.

Somebody had a beautiful drawing of the Kosel with the Bais Hamikdash on top of it. You should look at it once. Our Kosel and it is built up with the Bais Hamikdash on top of it. That is what is missing. That is what you have to see. The Har Habayis. The Makom Ha'aima. It is a job. A hard job. To improve our Davening by the sense of having Ata, by having the sense of (וַיִּגַּשׁ אֵלָיו יְהוָה).

2 - Topic - A Vort from Rav Chaim Kanievsky on Sheker.

Why did the Shevatim when they came to Yosef have to bring Binyamin. Question. Why didn't they hire an actor or an imposter? After all, the viceroy of Egypt does not know what Binyamin looks like.

Rav Chaim Kanievsky in Taima Dik'ra (on 44:22 on page 57) asked the question. Why didn't they just bring an imposter, a fake? I once heard B'sheim the GRA a beautiful answer. That is why Yosef imprisoned Shimon. Had he sent them all back and said bring Binyamin and when they need food they would be stuck to bring Binyamin, they could have brought an imposter. Ah, but he had Shimon in jail. If they would bring an imposter Shimon would have the job of picking Binyamin out of a lineup. He would line up the imposter together with a couple of others and would have asked Shimon which one is Binyamin. So this is a technical answer.

Rav Chaim Kanievsky says a different answer. He says that you should know lies have no permanence. Sheker Ain Lo Raglayim. If they would have brought a faker or an actor they would have been caught. Yosef would have figured out how many questions to ask. Sheker Ain Lo Raglayim. People when they start to lie end up paying for it. It has to be with an Emes. Emes has a Kiyum. Sometimes it is painful to say the truth but from there you can build. Sheker, one Sheker leads to another. People cover up for lie number 1 with lie number 2. Very very difficult.

3 - Topic - A Question on the Parsha.

It says that when Yosef instructed the Shevatim to come, he told them to come and say you are shepherds. Rashi says that it is disgusting to Pharoh. It is disgusting to the Mitzrim. He will let you live in your own neighborhoods. So just tell him that you are shepherds and then there will be no problem. Excellent. It makes a lot of sense and we all remember the Rashi (in 46:34).

What do you do with the Posuk in 47:6 right after they come. What does Pharoh say? Pharoh says to Yosef (וְאֵם-יָדְעָה וְיֶשֶׁ-בָּם אֲנָשֵׁי-חֵיל) (וְאֵם-יָדְעָה וְיֶשֶׁ-בָּם אֲנָשֵׁי-חֵיל). If you got some good people among your brothers, (וְאֵם-יָדְעָה וְיֶשֶׁ-בָּם אֲנָשֵׁי-חֵיל). You will place them (וְאֵם-יָדְעָה וְיֶשֶׁ-בָּם אֲנָשֵׁי-חֵיל) as people who take care of the livestock of my animals. I thought Rashi said that if the brothers portray themselves as Anshei Bakar Pharoh won't be interested. So what does it mean (וְאֵם-יָדְעָה וְיֶשֶׁ-בָּם אֲנָשֵׁי-חֵיל)? Confusing! There must be an answer and I invite you to suggest it.

With that I want to wish everybody an absolutely wonderful Gevalidge Shabbos. A beautiful Haschala for Berachos. You certainly could learn Daf Bais. It will hopefully be one of many and IY"H we should be Zoche that the sense of joy and festivity that permeated MetLife stadium and everyone felt it, a very happy gathering, should radiate and we should have a Simcha Shel Torah in our homes, in our lives with our children and with our grandchildren. IY"H so that we could elevate our level of Avodas Hashem, all of us. Wishing everyone a wonderful Berachos Daf Bais Amud Aleph and a Gutten Shabbos!

Rabbi Reisman - Parshas Vayigash 5779

1 - Topic - An Inyan of Machshava from the Maharal on Ger Shenisga'yeir K'koton Shenolad Dami.

As we prepare for Shabbos Parshas Vayigash. Some wonderful Machshavos on this week's Parsha. The first is from the Melech Hamachshavos, the Maharal on the Posuk 46:10 (וְאֵם-יָדְעָה וְיֶשֶׁ-בָּם אֲנָשֵׁי-חֵיל). In the list of the Yardei Mitzrayim there is a person named Shaul Ben Hak'nanis and Rashi there says that it is (בן דינה) Ben Dinah. Rashi tells us the Chiddush that Shimon married Dinah. The Kasha that all of the Meforshim on Rashi are troubled by, is that Bnei Noach are not allowed to marry their full sister. Although Avraham Avinu had said in an earlier Parsha that a Ben Noach is allowed to marry a half-sister as it says in 20:12 (וְאֵם-יָדְעָה וְיֶשֶׁ-בָּם אֲנָשֵׁי-חֵיל; וְאֵם-יָדְעָה וְיֶשֶׁ-בָּם אֲנָשֵׁי-חֵיל). But to marry a full sister is Assur and this is a full sister. There are numerous Terutzim said on the topic.

I would like to share with you one that is not well-known and that is the Maharal. This Maharal is so Yesodosdik that the Shev Shmaitzsa in his Hak'dama to Sefer Shev Shmaitzsa actually brings it down. Let me tell you the Maharal and you will look up the Hak'dama to the Shev Shmaitzsa on your own.

The Maharal says that the Avos were Mekabeil the Torah on themselves and have a Din of Ger Shenisga'yeir K'koton Shenolad Dami. The Avos have a Din of someone who is a Ger. You all

know that someone who is Megyair Biz'man Hazeh or Bizma'nei'hem, he is no longer considered to be related, to be a blood relative to the relatives that he had before.

Somebody who is Megayeir and his sister is Megayeir is allowed to marry his sister. Zagt the Maharal, the Avos had a Din of Ger Shenisga'yeir K'koton Shenolad Dami and that is why Yaakov married sisters and Amram married his aunt and Yehuda did Yibum to his daughter in law. All of these difficulties says the Maharal is answered if you say Ger Shenisga'yeir K'koton Shenolad Dami. All right. It is a nice enough Teretz. Is it such a great Machshava? He is not finished.

The Maharal asks a Kasha if so, after Kabbalas Hatorah we know that the Yidden remained Assur to their relatives as it says in Bamidbar 11:10 (בָּקָה לְמִשְׁפַּחְתִּי) and Rashi says (ורבותינו אמרו למשפחותינו) (על עסקי משפחות, על עריות הנאסרות להם). That they became Assur to their relatives.

Why did they become Assur to their relatives? By Mattan Torah we should say the same thing that Ger Shenisga'yeir K'koton Shenolad Dami. The question being, why by the Avos and the Shevatim we are saying that they have no relatives K'koton Shenolad Dami and the Yidden by Kabbalas Hatorah do have relatives? This is the Maharal's follow up Kasha.

The Maharal answers with a Machshava. The Maharal says that a Ger Shenisga'yeir is K'koton Shenolad Dami because he took a bold step and he recreated himself as a Bir'ya Chadasha. He turned himself from one type of person into another type of person. It is the person who does it. Of course Halacha has to say K'koton Shenolad Dami. But the power, the energy with which this comes is from the person who recreates himself as a Bir'ya Chadasha.

Zagt the Maharal, the Avos and the Shevatim chose to be Mekabeil Kol Hatorah Kulah. They are Ger Shenisga'yeir K'koton Shenolad Dami. At Mattan Torah Klal Yisrael had no choice, because as it says in Shabbos 88a (18 lines from the top) (שִׁכְפָּה הַקֵּב"ה עֲלֵיהֶם אֶת הָהָר כְּגִיגִית). Since they had no choice but to be Mekabeil, for that reason they don't have a Din of Ger Shenisga'yeir K'koton Shenolad Dami because the Geirus is Baal Korcha.

This is an incredible thought and a beautiful Machshava and it is certainly a very big Chiddush that Ger Shenisga'yeir K'koton Shenolad Dami is only when a person does it willingly and not when a person is forced and is not given a choice and is Megayeir. This is the Yesod of the Maharal and the main point of course is the ability of the human being to transform himself to a Bir'ya Chadasha. The Rambam in Hilchos Teshuva says when someone does Teshuva he is not the same person that he was yesterday. He is a Bir'ya Chadasha, he is a new person. This is the idea of the Maharal.

I would like to add that this answers a big Shver'keit, a Halacha problem. There is a Halacha issue when we try to determine who is the true mother of a baby. Nowadays there is an ability and it happens that the egg of one mother is implanted into the womb of another woman. The child that is born from the womb of what we call the host mother, however, biologically is related to the original mother. There has been a Chalukai Dai'a on how to look at this child. I think that the overwhelming majority of Poskim today agree that the biological mother is the true mother and the host mother is the host mother, no more than an incubator that carried the child. There are Cholkim but this I believe is the majority opinion.

There is a Kasha that is asked on this opinion. The Halacha is that when a woman is Megayeir and she is expecting a baby, that if she is Megayeir while pregnant that the baby that is born is still her child. Not only that, but Tosafos in Kesubos brings that if twins are born they are related to each other. The question is that here at the time of conception she was a Goy. When she gave birth she is a Jew. We see that motherhood is determined at birth. If motherhood is determined at conception, Ger Shenisga'yeir K'koton Shenolad Dami. She should not be related to these children and certainly the children shouldn't be related to each other. According to the Maharal it is very Geshmak.

It is true that there is rule of Ger Shenisga'yeir K'koton Shenolad Dami, but that only applies to someone who is Megayeir voluntarily. The U'bar that is Bim'ai Imo (in the womb) is Megayeir Baal Korcho and the Geirus happens when the mother is Tovel. The Tevila counts for the child. It is a Tevila for the child and then the child is born a Jew. In that case Zagat the Maharal, there is no Ger Shenisga'yeir K'koton Shenolad Dami, and that would explain why it is like by Mattan Torah they remained related to the original mother. Zagat the Maharal, that is an Inyan of Machshava and it answers a very difficult problem in the world of Halacha L'mayseh.

2 - Topic - A thought from Rav Druk on how Agalos is a sign to Yaakov Avinu of the Eglah Arufa that was the last topic learned between Yaakov and Yosef.

One of the most puzzling things in this week's Parsha is Rashi telling us as is found in 45:27 (וַיֵּרָא אֶת-הָעֶגְלוֹת) that Yaakov Avinu saw the wagons and he said it is a sign from Yosef that we learned Eglah Arufah and (רַב עוֹד-יוֹסֵף בְּנִי, הִי). I see that he is still thinking about what we learned and he is a Fum Yid.

Very puzzling. All of the Meforshim struggle with it and there is no Geshmake Teretz that I have seen. The difficulty being that first of all Agalos are wagons and Eigel is a calf. What has one thing got to do with the other? Second of all, Pharoh is the one who originally sent the Agalos. Third of all, what is the Chiddush, you sent wagons and Yaakov sees wagons. If it would be an unusual thing then it would be a Remez. It is not unusual. It is very puzzling.

Rav Mordechai Druk in the Sefer Darash Mordechai (page # 296 - 298) says something fascinating. It is very puzzling and I don't have a good Teretz he says. He says but we have to realize that when we look with our eyes it is not the same looking at things as when great people, Gedolei Yisrael, certainly Yaakov and Yosef look at things. It is a whole different world of looking at things.

He gives a Mashul in his style, that he was once in a vehicle traveling to Tzefas, traveling down the Mediterranean road along the Mediterranean Sea. They saw the sea and one Bachur piped up we can make the Beracha Oseh Maiseh Beraishis as there is a Beracha that you make when you see the Mediterranean. (Not really because you make the Beracha without Shem Hamalchus but that was not the point). The Bachur grabbed his hat and jacket in the vehicle and said I will make a Beracha.

There was another Bochur looking and said oh wow the Mediterranean, do we have time to stop and take a dip into the beach? So Rav Druk says two people can look at exactly the same thing and

one person sees Oseh Maiseh Beraishis, he sees the Ribbono Shel Olam, and one person sees the opportunity to go swimming. Kach Heim Hadevarim.

I would add that Rav Akiva that is his Koach in Shas. The other Chachamim look and they cry and Rav Akiva looks and he laughs and he sees a Yeshua in everything (Ed. Note: see Gemara in Sanhedrin 101a (towards the bottom) or Makkos 24b for example). Other people look at water dripping on a rock and see nothing and Rabbi Akiva sees a message to do Teshuvah. Great people look at things differently.

Zagt Rav Druk, Yaakov Avinu knew that Yosef was sending for him. Yaakov knew Yosef and he knew that if it was the same old Yosef, the one who is Oduk in Torah, the first time I see him there is going to be some connection to what we learned last.

I remember once as a Bochur, I was in Staten Island camp and Rav Moshe was heading to visit Rav Yaakov who was in Ohr Shraga. So of course I tagged along. I went along and Rav Moshe came to Ohr Shraga to visit Rav Yaakov who had just come up to the Catskills. The first thing that they spoke about when they met each other when they said hello is that they picked up on a learning discussion that they had previously. They continued. I had no idea what they were talking about as I was a teenager at the time. But the first thing they did is that they remembered what they were talking about in learning the last time and they picked up on it.

Kol She'kain Yaakov and Yosef. Yaakov knew that if Yosef was alive there will be some hint about what they were learning. Somehow, I don't know how, the Agalos were the hint to the Eglah Arufah. Yaakov knew what to look for and Yosef knew he would look for it. How, What, Where. What type of wagons, where would the wagons be? I don't know. But that is the point. The point is that the way they looked at it wasn't the way we look at things. This is Rav Druk's take on something that is hard to understand and we have to say that we don't understand. But we have to understand why we don't understand.

3 - Topic - A Dikduk point on the Parsha to inform your Baal Korei.

In this week's Parsha we find in 47:11 (בְּמִיטֵב הָאֶרֶץ בְּאֶרֶץ רַעַמְסֵס). We find that the Jews settle in the land of Ramseis. Ramseis is spelled with two Sh'vas. Ra and then (עָ), two Sh'vas. In Shemos in 1:11 we also find the city Ramseis but there it is spelled with two Patachs (רַעַמְסֵס). Why is it spelled one way in one place and another way in the other?

The Even Ezer in Shemos says that it is two different cities. In Parshas Vayigash it is a city that is pronounced with one Patach, Ram'seis and in Shemos it is referring to the storage cities of Pison and Ra'a'mseis with two Patachs. It is two different cities. The Raya is that in Parshas Maasei 33:5 (וַיֵּסְעוּ בְּנֵי-יִשְׂרָאֵל, מִרַעַמְסֵס). Where Klal Yisrael lived is with one Patach. Alright if you don't like Dikduk I got you dizzy.

But the point is this. In this week's Parsha there is a Patach on the Reish and two Shvas, the Shva on the Ayin and the Shva on the Mem. When you have two straight Shvas the second Shva is a Shva Na. Which means to say that the correct pronunciation is Ra'm'seis as opposed to in Shemos where it is Ram'seis. Here it is Ra'm'seis. Why does it matter?

Normally it doesn't really matter, but here it does matter. The reason why it does matter here is because the difference in pronunciation turns it into two different cities. If you pronounce it Ram'seis this week you are pronouncing the city that was Pisom and Ram'seis which is a different city. However, if you pronounce it properly Ra'm'seis that is the correct pronunciation. So make sure that the Baal Korei is fully aware of what it is that he is pronouncing. A Gutten Shabbos to one and all!

Rabbi Eli Reisman (son of Rabbi Yisroel Reisman) - Parshas Vayigash 5778

1 - I would like to start with a Rashi in 46:1. We are going to see from the Poskim who quote him how important it is to learn Rashi on Chumash. The Posuk says (יָסַע יִשְׂרָאֵל וְכָל-אָשֶׁר-לֹו) Yaakov Avinu is coming now to Mitzrayim (וַיָּבֹא בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם) and they arrive in B'air Sheva and (וַיִּזְבַּח זִבְחִים) he gave Korbanos to (לְאֵלֹהֵי אָבִיו יִצְחָק) to the Ribbono Shel Olam of his father Yitzchok.

Rashi comments here why does it say (לְאֵלֹהֵי אָבִיו יִצְחָק) and it doesn't mention Avraham his grandfather. (חַיִּיב אָדָם בְּכָבוֹד אָבִיב יוֹתֵר מִבְּכָבוֹד זָקֵנוּ) a person is Chayuv to honor his father more than he is Chayuv to honor his grandfather. (לְפִיכָךְ תִּלְהֵ בִיצְחָק וְלֹא בְאַבְרָהָם) therefore, the Posuk here treats his acknowledgment to his father and it doesn't mention his grandfather. So it comes out from this Rashi that a person does have a Chiyuv to honor his grandfather but the Chiyuv to be Mechabeid his father is greater.

This Din is brought down in Hilchos Kibbud Av V'a'im in Yore Dai'a 240:24. In the Darkei Moshe on the Beis Yosef he brings down a Maharik who says that there is no Chiyuv to be Mechabeid your grandfather only a father. The Rama here on 240:24 brings it down and he argues. He says that some say (The Maharik) that he doesn't have to have honor for his grandfather but it doesn't appear correct to me and you are Chayuv to have Kavod for a grandfather, however, the Kavod for a father is greater. It brings down the Medrash that Rashi just quoted.

The Darkei Moshe on the Tur explicitly says that his problem with the Maharik who says that there is no Chiyuv of Kavod for a grandfather is Mifurash a Medrash as we just read in Rashi. The Taz's question on him is that there is a Rashi that says otherwise. So the Shach and Nikudas Haketzef is bothered with what the Taz is adding to the conversation. The Rama already said that is why he is arguing on the Maharik. The Nikudas Haketzef writes that it is a Medrash which is much earlier than Rashi. So he writes that it could be that the Taz holds that the Peirush of Rashi in Chumash it is expected that it is known by people more so than a Medrash. This is because there are Poskim who say that Rashi takes the place of Targum for Shnayim Mikra V'echad Targum. So Rashi is very familiar to people and how can the Maharik not know a Rashi in Chumash.

There is another place in Shulchan Aruch where the Taz does something similar. The very first Siman in Shulchan Aruch Yor'e Dai'a in Hilchos Shechitah. The Halacha is that the Shechitah is only Kosher if he or she knows all of Hilchos Shechitah through testing. This is besides for the practical test on Shechitah. So the Shulchan Aruch has a question if someone was already tested in Hilchos Shechitah and passed, however, later when tested again was found to not remember all of the Halachos (as he didn't Chazer over the material). So certainly the Shechitah from today is

no good, however, what about the Shechitah from yesterday or the day before. The Rama says that the person has a Chezkas Kashrus (Chazaka D'mai'ikara that he knew the Halachos) and therefore, even though now he forgot the Halachos but everything until this moment is Kosher.

The Taz argues and says if someone forgot the Halachos now he didn't forget it this second. It is evident that he forgets it in pieces. He forgets some today some yesterday and some the day before that like a small leak. This is how we Darshun the Posuk that is found in Devarim 8:19 (וְהָיָה, אִם-יִשְׁכַּח). If you started to forget then you will end up forgetting everything as Rashi says in Parshas Eikev. It is interesting because this is also a Medrash Rabba. So how come the Taz is saying that he has a Kasha from a Rashi when you have a Medrash that is a much older source. You see that the Taz has a tremendous emphasis on knowing the Rashi. In general we find that even the Rishonim attached a tremendous importance and Chashivus to Rashi on Shas as well but even more so on his Peirush on Chumash.

The Meiri in his introduction on Avos where he talks about Peirushim of Rishonim which he is discussing Shas, he says that the main Mefareish of Shas is Rashi. Even though he has many who argue with him and ask Kashas, he still says that if you pay close attention to what he is saying you will know his answers. He says that only individuals who work really hard can understand what Rashi is saying because with one word he can be answering Teirutzim on many Kashas. The Chidah also writes incredible things about Rashi that it is based on Kabbalah. He brings the Mara Mei'panu who was a great Mekubal and he brings from Rabbeinu Tam who says that I could have written a Peirush on Shas like my father but I would never be able to write a Peirush on Chumash like Rashi. Sometimes we think that Rashi on Chumash is simple but there is really a lot of depth to it.

2 - Let's go on to another issue and that is the Rashi on the count of Klal Yisrael. The Posuk tallies up the Shivim Nefesh that were the Bnei Yisrael at the time. Everyone knows the famous Kasha that if you count the names you arrive at a total of 69 and not 70. Rashi says based on a Medrash, based on a Gemara that Yocheved was born as they were entering Mitzrayim so she is not counted and mentioned by name, however, she was the 70th person.

The Rosh gives a surprising different Teretz to this Kasha. The Rosh is in his Peirush on Shas in his Pesakim at the very end of Maseches Pesachim. He says regarding Sefira that it says Tisperu Chamishim Yom, however, there are only 49 days. He says it is not a Kasha because since it is 49 the Torah rounded it to 50. The Rosh holds in general that a number which is within one when it is 49 you can call it 50.

He gives additional examples like by Malkus where it says Arbaim Yakenu where it is really 39 Malkus and not 40. Another example that he gives is the Shivim Nefesh that when you count the people there are 69. The Teretz is that the last one is not another person just that the Torah rounded it up to 70 since it was that close.

This is a Pele because I didn't quote Rashi accurately. Rashi says in Posuk 15 where the Bnei Leah are mentioned by name it counts them as 33 people. Rashi says that it is 32 and not 33. The 33rd person who was a descendant of Leah was Yocheved. That means that really there are two

places where the number is off. One by the number of 70 and two by the breakdown of Leah's descendants where if you count the people it is only 32.

Rashi's Teretz is a great Teretz that Yocheved brings Leah's descendants up to 33 and the grand total up to 70 (in Posuk 27). But the Rosh's Teretz that it rounded up the grand total to 70, how does that explain why the Torah counted the Bnei Leah as 33 if it is only 32? You can't round off 32 to 33? This Kasha is actually mentioned in the Even Ezra later on in Posuk 23. This is a Peledika Kasha on the Rosh which I heard many years ago from Rav Moshe Aaron Friedman (of the Mir) and over the years I have been trying to figure out if there is a good Teretz.

I want to give a Mehaleich which is not a complete Teretz. Before, I said that I was misquoting Rashi. I said that Rashi is asking on the 70 but really he was asking earlier on the 33 which was really 32 (Bnei Leah). If you look in the Gemara in Bava Basra 123 (end of Amud Aleph to the top of Amud Beis), the Gemara also asks on the 70 and not like Rashi is asking. The Gemara says (בכללן אתה מוצא שבעים בפרטן אתה מוצא שבעים חסר אחד). If you look at the Medrash Rabbah, the Medrash Tanchuma and the Pesikta and pretty much everybody who asks this Kasha, they don't ask the Kasha the way that Rashi is asking it or the way that Even Ezra is asking it. They are only asking it on the 70 that it is off by one. Why didn't they ask that the 33 is off by one?

I want to point out that even if we don't have a Teretz to this question but the fact that the Gemara and the Medrashim are only bothered by the fact that the 70 is off by one even if we postulate that there is another Teretz that we don't know of, that will help us for the Rosh. This is because the Rosh was answering that the Kashas were rounded off. So it is not a Taina so much on the Rosh that your Teretz doesn't answer a different Kasha that he asks. There is a reason why they don't ask it. The question is what is the reason.

I'm not sure but the Meforshim on the side of the Medrash Rabbah have a suggestion that the Bnei Leah even though it says Bnei, Yaakov might be counted with her because she was the wife that had the most children. That would Far'enfer why it would call them 33 and maybe that is a good answer but at the end when it calls them 70 it says Yotzei Yerech Yaakov. It is a possible Teretz. But the Kasha is a very good Chap Kasha.

3 - The final Nekuda that I would like to talk about is the city of Ramseis. Ramseis is only mentioned in two places in the Torah. One is in this week's Parsha and the other is in Shemos. In Parshas Shemos in 1:11 (וַיִּבְנוּ עָרֵי מִסְכָּנוֹת, לַפְּרֹעָה--אֶת-פָּתֹחַ, וְאֶת-רַעְמָסֵס) which is the more well-known mention of Ramseis where it says that they built the city of Pisom and Ramseis.

The Even Ezra has a very short Ha'ara on this Posuk. On the word (רַעְמָסֵס) he says that there is a Patach under the Ayin of the word Ramseis and it is not the place of the Jews. What is he coming to explain? It seems Poshut that the Even Ezra is bothered by a Kasha. In 47:11 it says that the Yidden came and settled in Ramseis which was a district in Goshen. It says (וַיֵּשְׁבוּ יוֹסֵף, אֶת-אָבִיו וְאֶת-), Ramseis was the best part of Mitzrayim and that is where they lived. Really? It was the best part of Mitzrayim? One second. The Gemara is Sotah at the beginning near Daf 11a (5 lines from the bottom) says (רַב וּשְׁמוּאֵל חֲדָא אָמְרֵי פִיתוּם שְׁמָה) ולמה נקרא שמה רעמסס שראשון ראשון ולמה נקרא שמה רעמסס שמה ולמה נקרא שמה פיתום שראשון ראשון (פי תהום בולעו) that why was the city called Ramseis because anything that you built there fell apart

or sank into the ground. You couldn't build there. Everyone knows that you would build and it would collapse.

So it is a Stira as in our Parsha it says that it was Meitav Ha'aretz and in Parshas Shemos it says that Ramseis is the worst place. Zagat the Even Ezra that if you pay attention you will see that the word Ramseis mentioned in Shemos and in Vayigash do not have the same Nekudos. In Shemos it is (רַעְמָסַיִם) and in Vayigash it is (רַעְמָסַיִם). So it is a different word which is why the Even Ezra says this is not the same city where the Yidden lived. A very interesting Teretz.

Other Meforshim like the Targum Yonason don't hold like this because he translates the word in both places as Pilusim which in Greek means clay or mud which sounds like he is learning in both places that if you built on it the buildings would collapse.

The Maharsha in Masseches Sottah also understands that they were the same city. So if you don't hold like the Even Ezra then the Kasha comes back. What is the answer to the Stira, is Ramseis a good place to build or a bad place to build? It could be that it is not such a Stira as I saw in the Sefer Eglei Tzon from Rav Abba Tzvi Neiman Shlita. We are envisioning Ramseis as if it is a big mud pit, like quicksand where if you drop a pen it will sink into the ground. I think that it means that you just couldn't build big buildings as there was no bedrock. You want to build then you are limited to a one family house but to build stone castles or Arei Miskanos (fortified cities) you couldn't do that there.

You have to keep in mind that this was the Yidden's first taste of Galus and if so then maybe Al Derech Druch this is an appreciation of what Ramseis was like something of a telling paradigm. The message is that Galus is not a place to be making palaces and castles, you can make a tent because a castle will fall apart. The job in Galus is to Shteig in Ruchnios and marble and ebony or whatever else should wait until Moshiach comes. V'hameivin Yavin. Good Shabbos everybody!

Rabbi Reisman - Parshas Vayigash 5776

1. This is the Parsha of the Yerida of Yaakov and the Shevatim to Galus, to Eretz Mitzrayim. Certainly there is much to be learned from this week's Parsha. Let's begin by suggesting that you learn the Ramban in 46:1. There is a very long Ramban on Yaakov's moving from Eretz Yisrael to Chutz L'aretz and let's try to explain at least a little bit of this long interesting Ramban.

In the beginning the Ramban makes the following point. It says here in the Posuk that when Yaakov Avinu came to B'er Sheva as he is coming to the boundary of Eretz Yisrael (וַיָּבֹא בְּעֶרְשָׁבָה) he brought Korbanos. Says the Ramban that this is the first time we find in the Torah that a Korban Shelamim was brought. As opposed to all the other Korbanos that were mentioned in the Torah until here were all Korban Olos.

The Ramban says that there is something significant about it. He writes somewhat mysteriously (הַקָּרִיב שְׁלָמִים לְהַשְׁלִים אֵלָיו כָּל הַמִּדּוֹת, כְּמוֹ שֶׁדָּרְשׁוּ (תּוֹרַת כְּהָנִים וּיקרא טז א): שְׁלָמִים שֶׁמִּטִּילִין שְׁלוֹם בְּעוֹלָם). Something about the Shelamim was special. It is Mekareiv Kol Hamiddos. What does this have

anything to do with Parshas Vayigash more than Noach after the Mabul or Yaakov leaving his father's house to go to Lavan is somewhat mysterious. Why over here Dafka a Korban Shelamim? The Ramban does not explain.

I would like to share with you today an explanation that I once heard from Rav Avigdor Miller (I hope that I am saying it over correctly). This Yesod is certainly the Yesod that he said over in the explanation of the Korban Shelamim and to explain its place here.

The idea of the Shelamim being, bringing together all of the Middos is something the Ramban mentions as well at the beginning of Parshas Kedoshim. There he says on 19:5 (שהשלמים מדתן של (ישראל). Somehow the Shelamim are the Middos of Klal Yisrael and again what does that mean the Middos? What is the concept here?

The Posuk in Shir Hashirim says in 4:16 (עורי צפון ובואי תימן). Wake up those in the north and come those in the south. The Gemara Darshuns that Tzafon refers to the nations in the world who can only bring a Korban Olah in the Bais Hamikdash. Although a non-Jew is entitled to bring a Korban in the Bais Hamikdash, that is only an Olah. An Olah is a Korban Tzafon, that has to be Shechted in the northern part of the Bais Hamikdash. (תימן). (ובואי תימן). is the southern part of the Bais Hamikdash where even a Shelamim (שחיטתן בכל מקום בעזרה). They could be Shechted anywhere. Klal Yisrael is called the nation that brings Korbanos even in the southern part of the Bais Hamikdash, and the nations of the world bring an Olah in the Tzafon part. Again, we see some reference to this idea of the Bnei Yisrael bringing a Shelamim as being indicative of the personality of Klal Yisrael. What is that?

Rabbi Miller explained as follows. He said that the Korban Olah is totally Kodesh. There is nothing about it that is eaten by a human being and that idea of making yourself totally holy is something that anybody can understand, even the nations of the world. They understand, if someone wants to be a priest he has to abstain, he has to not get married, he has to practice certain levels of abstinence. They understand in India that for someone to be a holy man he lives on top of the mountain, he doesn't eat much and he abstains from the pleasures of this world. There is such an idea of Kedusha, of Kedusha being something that is above this world and certainly there is truth to it.

Klal Yisrael has a new Midda. Klal Yisrael's Midda is to be Mekadeish Olam Haze. Our Midda is not to refrain from eating, not to refrain from getting married, not to refrain from being involved in this world, but to use this world for a Midda of Kedusha. As a place where things are done according to the guidelines of the Torah and in that way are holy. The nations of the world don't understand that. The religions of the world typically understand total holiness and separation from this world. We say no, a person can enjoy Olam Haze and still have pleasures.

Uri Zohar in the book that he wrote shortly after he became Frum, explained why many of the non-religious people have a hatred for religious people. He wrote that if you would practice abstinence, stay away from the pleasures of this world and say that you are holy, we can live with that. But here you are enjoying good food, some are wealthy, some have fancy homes, nice homes, and you are saying because you put a Mezuzah it is holy, because you eat Kosher your food is holy. That we can't take. It is a different level of serving the Ribono Shel Olam where a person says I will

serve the Ribbono Shel Olam and enjoy Olam Hazei. The Goyim don't understand it. The truth is that even Frum Yidden have a hard time with it. It is difficult.

It is easier the years you are in Yeshiva, in a dormitory, cut off from the rest of the world and immersing yourself totally in Torah study, it is one level of challenge. It is a greater level of challenge to be out in the world, to be working, to be raising a family, to be involved with things like homework, balancing the checkbook, and still being able to have Kedusha. That is much harder. That is the Midda of a Korban Shelamim.

That is Klal Yisrael going down to Mitzrayim. Going down to Mitzrayim, Yaakov Avinu says it is time to introduce a Korban Shelamim. Says the Ramban, (כמו שדרשו , כל המדות , שלמים להשלים אליו כל המדות , כמו שדרשו) (תורת כהנים ויקרא טז א): שלמים שמטילין שלום בעולם. In this world there are a lot of challenges, there are a lot of things that we do that have Kedusha because you are in business and we are in business honestly according to the Mitzvos Hatorah. We eat and have Kedusha because we make Berachos, because we refrain from eating non-Kosher things, because we Shecht the animal and salt its meat. It is much more difficult, it is much more challenging. The Korban Shelamim represents (ובואי) (תימן) the coming of a whole Klal Yisrael to be able to serve HKB"H in all these ways.

Many ask, what was the Kor Habarzel of Mitzrayim? Mitzrayim, the experience of Galus Mitzrayim was supposed to perfect Klal Yisrael like a Kor Habarzel, an iron furnace. While the iron is melted the finest metals are taken out. It didn't seem to happen. They went down to Mitzrayim with 70 Kedoshim and they came out a nation that was struggling with the 50th Shaar Hatumah.

The answer is this Yesod. They went down Kedoshim, Elyonim, Malachei Hashem. Avraham, Yitzchok, Yaakov, and the Shevatim, it was a Klal Yisrael of angels. That is not the Klal Yisrael that is going to be Mekabeil the Torah. Klal Yisrael that is Mekabeil the Torah are ordinary mortals. People who struggle with Sharei Tumah and will elevate themselves and pick themselves up despite that.

The Kotzker said that it says in Tehillim 115:16 (הַשָּׁמַיִם שְׁמַיִם, לִירֵרָה) the heaven is holy that is HKB"H (וְהָאָרֶץ, נָתַן לְבָנֵי-אָדָם) but to make Shamayim out of Aretz that is given to us. Hashem has enough Malachim. And so, the Yerida of Mitzrayim is the Yerida of a Korban Shelamim.

We have this Yerida every time a young man picks himself up and leaves Yeshiva and goes to earn a Parnasa to support his family. The challenge of (עוֹרֵי צָפוֹן וּבּוֹאֵי תִימָן). Of leaving the place where you are totally surrounded by Kedusha and trying to bring Kedusha into the rest of the world. That is what going down to Mitzrayim is about. A beautiful insight into the Korban Shelamim.

2. I would like to share with you a second Nekudah on the theme of Yaakov going down to Mitzrayim. I had once seen an idea that Yaakov Avinu's going down to Mitzrayim and Rabbeinu Hakadosh leading Klal Yisrael into the Galus Edom are similar and are Maisch Avos Siman L'banim. Yaakov Avinu led Klal Yisrael to that Galus and as the Bais Hamikdash is destroyed the Bais Hanasi comes to an end, Rabbeinu Hakadosh writes the Mishnayos and leads Klal Yisrael into a new existence. It is incredible how many parallels between there are Yaakov and Rabbi.

The Gemara says in Maseches Taanis 5b (13 lines from the bottom) that Yaakov Avinu Lo Meis. The Gemara in Maseches Kesuvos 103a (9 lines from the bottom) says that after Rabbeinu Hakadosh passed away, he was still alive, he returned to his home on Leilei Shabosos. We find by Yaakov Avinu as it says in Beraishis 25:23 (וַיֵּלֶאֱמֹן מְלָאֵם יִצְחָק) his birth together with Eisav is foretold and Rashi says on (שְׁנֵי גֵיִם בְּבֶטֶן) that (אֵלֹהֵי אֲנֹשִׁינוֹס וְרַבִּי). Who is in the womb of Rivkah? Yaakov and Eisav (אֵלֹהֵי אֲנֹשִׁינוֹס וְרַבִּי). Yaakov was the end of a certain chain, a Shalshelos. Avraham, Yitzchok, and Yaakov, Ein Korin Avos Ela Shelosha. Rabbeinu Hakadosh is the end of the Shalshelos of the Nesiim from Hillel down to a 7th generation grandchild Rabbi. After Rabbi, his Talmidim Rav and Shmuel went to Bavel and spread out Torah just like after Yaakov the Shevatim went and Torah was spread among many. Yaakov Avinu is the Middah of Tiferes. In Pirkei Avos, the Rabbeinu Hakadosh Memra is in the beginning of Perek Bais (רַבִּי אֹמֵר אֵיזוֹ הִיא דֶּרֶךְ יִשְׂרָאֵל שִׁבְרֵי (לוֹ הָאָדָם כֹּל שֶׁהִיא תַּפְאֶרֶת לַעֲשִׂיָּה וְתַפְאֶרֶת לוֹ מִן הָאָדָם). So that, there is a tremendous parallel between Yaakov Avinu and Rabbeinu Hakadosh and Maiseh Avos Siman L'banim.

Now we are used to these ideas from Chassidishe Seforim. Rav Yosef Engel in Bais Ha'otzer in Klal Lamed Gimmel says that we find in the Gemara numerous times that Rabbeinu Hakadosh says the words Omer Ani and then he says a Memra. A very strange thing, he says I say and then he says something. In Bais Ha'otzer, Rav Yosef Engel writes that Ani is an abbreviation for V'ani Nitzutz Yaakov. I am a Hemshech of Yaakov Avinu. What an incredible idea.

The Ben Yehoyada writes in the beginning of Berachos that Nasi, Rabbi was a Nasi, and that Nasi is an abbreviation for Nitzutz Shel Yaakov Avinu. So there is an idea of a Hemshech of Rabbeinu Hakadosh leading us into our present Galus as being a Siman L'banim of the Maiseh Avos.

There is a message to be taken from this. When Yaakov Avinu comes before Pharaoh he says as is found in 47:9 (מַעֲטִים וְרָעִים, הָיוּ יָמַי שְׁנֵי חַיִּי). I have had few and difficult years in my life. The Ribono Shel Olam said you are complaining. I am busy making your son the Melech and you are complaining?

Today too, there are tremendous challenges to Klal Yisrael. We don't understand. What does the world want from Klal Yisrael. Why is it that when Klal Yisrael does something it is no good and the nations do the same things and it is good? We look around. We talk about civilian fatalities in battles all over the world and the investigation is for Klal Yisrael who are defending themselves.

We see all over the world there are drone strikes and targeted killings and we remember just a few years ago when Jews were doing it, it was considered wrong and Treif. What do they want from us? We are complaining. Says HKB"H I am busy preparing for Yemos Hamashiach and you are complaining! It is a lesson to learn from the parallel of Yaakov Avinu's Yerida to Mitzrayim and our own Yerida to this deep and difficult Galus. What we call Galus Edom, the Galus of America today. And so, these are two lessons with the Yerida down to Mitzrayim.

3. I would like to end with a short message, an idea. Something which I invite you to pursue further. The Haftarah is perhaps one of the most beautiful and memorable Haftarahs. It is a Haftarah where Yechezkel has a Nevua regarding the Yemos Hamashiach. It has a beautiful beginning where it talks about the Achdus of Klal Yisrael. There, Yechezkel was told to take two sticks, one

representing Sheivet Yehuda and the Shevatim that align themselves with Yehuda and one representing Ephraim and those who affiliated themselves with Ephraim and taking these two sticks that represent the ten Shevatim and the two Shevatim and joining them together as one stick. The Yemos Hamashiach the Shevatim will come together as one and bang you have a fertile place for a discussion of Achdus of Klal Yisrael. Hurray! Everybody loves Achdus!

The Nevua of Yechezkel is much deeper than that. Having spent some time studying this Haftorah, I would like to introduce you to a short Nekuda which is a Nekuda of the Haftorah. Know, that Yehuda and Ephraim are two paths in serving Hashem. Rachel and Leah are two paths in serving Hashem. If you want to pursue it, the Michtam Eliyahu in the second volume discusses it at length. The point I want to make is that the joining of the sticks is not Stam an Achdus of a people that are divided and people fight. There are fights within families and fights within Shuls, Achdus is wonderful. It is not that. It is something much deeper. It is the fact that there are many paths in serving Hashem, many ways in serving Hashem.

The Yemos Hamashiach are in Achdus, a coming together, a joining together of all the paths of serving Hashem. All the Mehalchim. We tend to say about ourselves that our level of Frumkeit is such and such, we are comfortable with it. There are people who do more, there are people who stay up late to learn, there are people who Daven Vasikin, there are people who go for Yarchei Kallah, I am the middle of the road. The middle of the road is comfortable. I am not them, I am not someone who doesn't learn at all, I am somewhere in the middle. It is a comfortable place to be.

Nebach! How sad! What do you mean that it is a comfortable place to be? If something is better you go for something better, you go for something more. You don't say I am this Sheivet they are that Sheivet. No! You need something more, something better. The joining together of the sticks is not an Achdus as opposed to fighting. It is an Achdus of seeking the same excellence in serving the Ribbono Shel Olam. That is the Yemos Hamashiach. That is what we dream. We dream to come to a point of pursuit of excellence in serving Hashem. May it be our will that we strive to reach for a little more. The joining together of the sticks, the people who learn more hours than you, be one with them. You can do it to. A Gutten Shabbos to one and all.

Rabbi Reisman - Parshas Vayigash 5775

I would like to share with you a thought or two on the Parsha and something more appropriate for this time of the year. Let me start with a Gevaldige insight to the Parsha regarding Galus Mitzrayim.

1. Throughout Tanach, particularly in Daniel's dreams, we find the concept of the four Galios which Klal Yisrael suffered. Bavel, Paras Umadai, Yavan, and Edom being the four. Many ask why Galus Mitzrayim is not counted into this. I really don't understand the question. Daniel had a dream about what was going to happen in the future. I guess the question is why in general references when we talk about Klal Yisrael suffering through the four Galus do we find that there aren't five Galus. Ok, a fair enough question.

What I had seen is that Galus Mitzrayim actually has in it the Maaseh Avos Siman L'banim for all four Galus. In other words, it is the Galus which is the prototype, which is the example for the four Galus which come later. The idea is presented as follows.

I believe that this idea comes from the Chida in his Hagaddah Simchas Haregel. Klal Yisrael went down to Mitzrayim four times. That is, first the ten Shevatim went down because Yeish Shever B'mitzrayim. They went to get from Mitzrayim food. Then they went down a second time when they went with Binyamin. They went a third time when the Shivim Nefesh went down to Mitzrayim in this week's Parsha. Then they went down a fourth time in Parshas Vayechi after burying Yaakov Avinu they returned to Mitzrayim for the fourth time. Those four trips from Eretz Yisrael to Mitzrayim are the Maaseh Avos Siman L'banim of the four Galus. Of course we all understand that the fourth time they went they had buried Yaakov Avinu and they came back and this was the darkest Galus, the longest Galus. It was a period that would lead to Shibud Mitzrayim and certainly that is an appropriate Remez to the Galus to which we are suffering today.

What is also beautiful is that the second time they go down, when they go down with Binyamin, we find that there are many acts that happen that fit well to be a Remez with the second Galus. The second Galus is the Galus of Paras Umadai was the easiest of the four Galusin. The Neis Purim takes place there. Indeed we find in 43:34 (וַיִּשְׁתּוּ וַיִּשְׁכְּרוּ, עֲמֹ). When they go down the second time we find that they drink (וַיִּשְׁכְּרוּ) and they somehow become drunk (עֲמֹ). We find also in 45:22 that (וַיִּלְבְּנֵימָן נָתַן וְחָמֵשׁ חִלְפֹת שָׂמָלָה). Binyamin is given five garments and Rashi brings that this is a Remez to Mordechai who would go with his five garments as is found in 8:15 (וּמַרְדֵּכִי יֵצֵא מִלִּפְנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ, בִּלְבוּשׁ). Again that is a sign to the second Galus. 43:33 (וַיֵּשְׁבוּ לָפָנָיו--הַבָּכָר כְּבִלְרָתוֹ, וְהַצֶּעִיר כְּצִעְרָתוֹ; וַיִּתְמָהוּ הָאֲנָשִׁים, אִישׁ אֶל-רַעְהוֹ). The Pele that they saw in Yosef's behavior is part of the Maaseh Pele of Mitzrayim. Therefore, it fits well that the four Galusin are Mirumaz here so it is actually one Galus here plus the four Galusin which would come later which would be Mirumaz in these four trips down to Mitzrayim.

2. Let me move on to a second topic which is more technical and it has to do with the Posuk that we have here in the Parsha in 45:20 (וְעַיִנְכֶם, אֶל-תְּהִים עַל-קְלִיכֶם: כִּי-טוֹב כָּל-אֲרֶץ מִצְרַיִם, לָכֶם הוּא). We find here a Posuk which describes all of the goodness of Mitzrayim, everything that Mitzrayim had and Pharoh offers it to Klal Yisrael. As the Jewish people will be coming to Mitzrayim they are offered a part in everything that exists in Mitzrayim. What I would like to talk about is a Machlokes regarding the word Tov, or the word Tuv. As you all know, the word good is sometimes pronounced Tuv like in (וּמִכָּל טוֹב לְעוֹלָם אֵל יִסְפְּרֵנוּ) and sometimes the word is Toiv which is probably the more common of the Pesukim that we have. The question is what is the difference between them.

This is a Machlokes between the two great Baalei Dikduk of the late 1700's Rav Zalmen Henna and Rav Yaakov Emden. Their opinions are as follows. Rav Zalmen Henna says that the word Tov is the word for good. Tuv is a word of Smichus, like Tuv Ha'aretz. Tuv is a word that is used when it rides together with another word. It is used as a descriptive word. Tuv Ha'aretz, Tuv Ha'adam, however you would like to use it is only used in that way. That is Rav Zalman Henna's opinion. He says that we shouldn't say (וּמִכָּל טוֹב לְעוֹלָם אֵל יִסְפְּרֵנוּ) but we should say Kol Tov Al Yechasreinu. Rav Yaakov Emden disagrees. He says that on the contrary the proper noun for goodness is Tuv

and Tov is an adjective. Like for example, (אֶרֶץ חֲמֻדָּה טוֹבָה וְרַחֲבָה) or Tov Leiv. It is the word that is used as a descriptive word.

There are Rayos to the two sides. There are many Kashas on Rav Yaakov Emden. The famous Posuk in Koheles 7:20 (אִשֶּׁר יַעֲשֶׂה-טוֹב, וְלֹא יַחֲטִיא). We say that there is no one in the world (אִשֶּׁר יַעֲשֶׂה-) (טוֹב, וְלֹא יַחֲטִיא). Tov there seems to be the proper word for goodness. Or (סוֹר מְרֵעַ, וַעֲשֶׂה-טוֹב) in Tehillim 34:15. Or (וְנִקְּשׁ רַעְבָּה, מִלֹּא-טוֹב) in Tehillim 107:9. So the word Tov certainly appears to be the proper noun as Rav Zalmen Henna says and if so the word Tuv can only be used together with another word. (וּמִכָּל טוֹב לְעוֹלָם אֵל יִחְסְרוּנוֹ) is somewhat problematic.

My recollection growing up is that when we Bentch Gomel we say (שְׁגַמְלֵנִי כָּל) (הַגּוֹמֵל לְחַיִּים טוֹבוֹת). The one who caused good to people who don't deserve it, he gave us good. I remember using the word Tuv, however, now when I look in the Siddurim they all say Kol Tov. I am not sure which is right. The Kaf Hachaim in 219:16 says like Rav Zalmen Henna. He says that Tuv is a Semichus word and therefore, says that it should be (שְׁגַמְלֵנִי כָּל טוֹב) (הַגּוֹמֵל לְחַיִּים טוֹבוֹת). Rav Yaakov Emden would seem to say that it should be (שְׁגַמְלֵנִי כָּל טוֹב). When I looked at Rav Yaakov Emden's Siddur it says Kol Tov and I don't know if that is a Raya one way or the other.

Be that as it may, we end up with two possibilities. Either the word is Tov and Tuv is a Semichus word or the word is Tuv and the word Tov is a descriptive adjective. Come back to our Posuk here in Parshas Vayigash in 45:20 (וַעֲיֹנֶכֶם, אֶל-תְּחֹס עַל-כְּלִיכֶם). Pharoh says when you come down to Mitzrayim don't Shlep all the utensils that you have (כִּי-טוֹב כָּל-אֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם, לָכֶם הוּא). Because the goodness of Eretz Mitzrayim is yours. Well according to Rav Yaakov Emden it is easy (כִּי-טוֹב) the goodness of Eretz Mitzrayim is yours. So Tuv is the absolute word. According to Rav Zalmen Henna it would seem to be problematic. Unless we read it (כִּי-טוֹב כָּל-אֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם) like Ki Tuv Ha'aretz. the word Tuv goes with Aretz. I guess it depends on how you read the words and this would have to do with that Machlokes. End of Topic.

One minute. A long time ago (Ed. Note: Parshas Shemini 5774 & Parshas Bamidbar 5774) I mentioned in one of these Shiurim that in the Trop for reading the Torah, the Trop is divided between the Melachim, the kings which are the Sof Posuk and the Esnachta and the Trop which are Meshamshim and Mafsikin. For example, Mercha Tipcha where the Mercha is Meshameish and the Tipcha is a pause. Or Munach Esnachta, where the Munach is a Meshameish and Esnachta is a pause. Or Kadma V'azla, where the Kadma is Meshameish and the Azla is a pause. So the Trop are divided basically between those that are pausing and those that are flowing. Darga Tevir, the Darga is a Meshameish and the Tevir is a pause. I mentioned then that we find occasionally that the Tevir alone among all of the Trop is a Meshameish as well. I mentioned then the Pesukim in Parshas Naso which prove it. Here the word Tuv has a Tevir on it so I guess this comes back to the same Machlokes. If you say like Rav Yaakov Emden then Tuv is the absolute word for good so (כִּי-טוֹב) pause, (כָּל-אֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם, לָכֶם הוּא). If you say here that Tevir is a Meshameish like Rav Zalmen Henna, (כִּי-טוֹב כָּל-אֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם, לָכֶם הוּא) have it one way or the other. This is a concept which struck me as I read the Parsha.

3. I would like end by giving you a little bit of history regarding the calendar. The Nital night is the 25th of December. The night that our catholic brothers observe the birth of their savior, of the one who started their religion. As you know, the Russian Orthodox Church observes it on January

6th. What is the reason for that? The answer is that there is a little bit of history that is not well known. The calendar originally had ten months. Julius Caesar came along over 2,000 years ago and changed it to the current twelve month calendar. As a matter of fact he named July after himself. Julius is July. That is why September for example is Sept which is seven, October is Oct which is eight, November which is nine, December which is Decade for ten. They are the seventh, eighth, ninth, and tenth month. They are the ninth, tenth, eleventh, and twelfth month. Why do they have this name? The answer is that originally there were ten months. Two months were added and these were pushed to a higher number.

When Julius Caesar set up the twelve month calendar he set it up that every fourth year being a leap year figuring that a solar year is 365 and $\frac{1}{4}$ days and therefore, every fourth year a leap year is 366 and it all evens out. He was right except that there are about 11 minutes and a few seconds which are missing. Meaning it is 365 and $\frac{1}{4}$ days minus about 11 minutes but what is 11 minutes. 11 minutes adds up. After 128 years it adds up to a full day. Therefore, over the centuries, Julius Caesar's calendar fell behind. Until a Pope by the name of Gregory came along and he decided to fix it in the late 1500's. He changed it to a calendar which has every fourth year a leap year except that every hundredth year a non-leap year. That would compensate for the 128 year discrepancy. He added some fine tuning to it but that is the basics for how it works. Even though every fourth year is a leap year the year 2100 will not be a leap year. But Gregory had a problem because they had already fallen behind at least 11 days in those 1800 years. Therefore, in one October he decided to jump 11 days. They just skipped 11 days on the calendar. It went from the 5th of October and the next day was the 17th of October. They just jumped 11 days. The Russian Orthodox Church was not Gores this. They didn't observe the Italian Churches teachings and they did not jump the 11 days. Hence their December 25th is January 6th according to our calendar. That is how it came to be that the Russian Orthodox Church has its own Xmas day because of that 11 day difference.

This comes up importantly in learning because when you look at the Tur and the Bais Yosef on the Halachos of V'sain Tal Umatar Livracha, when do we switch to V'sain Tal Umatar Livracha? Everyone knows December 4th or 5th. If you look in the Bais Yosef it says in November. He says to do it on November 23rd. what is going on? The answer is this little piece of history. This 11 day difference where they just switched the calendar and skipped 11 days. This is a little piece of our history of the calendar. It in itself is a piece of a very fascinating study of the calendar which is obviously not for this setting. I wish everyone an absolutely wonderful Shabbos!

Rabbi Reisman - Parshas Vayigash 5774

1. I would like to share with you today a Vort on the beginning of the Parsha, a Vort on the end of the Parsha and if there is time something in between. The Vort at the beginning of the Parsha has to do with an important Yesod. I would like to start with a Gemara in Masseches Sanhedrin on 111b. There we find that Rav Yochanan and Reish Lakeish argue regarding the rules of Chalukas Ha'aretz, the rules of dividing Eretz Yisrael. The dispute there is whether it is permissible to divide a single city between two Shevatim. Or do we say that each city has to belong to an independent Sheivet. There is a difficulty. How could anyone hold that a city can't be split, if you read Sefer Yehoshua and you read the chapters that explain which parts of Eretz Yisrael went to each Sheivet, you find that the city of Yerushalayim in 15:8 fell to the Cheilek of Yehuda right at the edge of his

boundary. Later in 18:16 it fell to the Cheilek of Binyamin. The same city yet it belonged to two Shevatim. Now don't tell me but Yerushalayim was different because Yerushalayim was not different. It is another over 400 years for Yerushalayim to be singled out as a city where the Bais Hamikdash would be built. At the time that Yehoshua divided the land there was a Mishkan in Shiloh. Yerushalayim was not known as a unique city. Yet they divided the city between two Shevatim. This appears to be a Kasha on that Gemara in Sanhedrin on 111b.

This Yesod is something which I had heard many times in the name of Rav Yaakov Kaminetzky although I don't know where it might be printed. Rav Yaakov pointed out that we find in Tanach that Binyamin and Yehuda are called one Sheivet. The most striking place is in Melachim I 11:31 when the Navi Achiya Hashulani predicts that the 12 Shevatim would be divided into two kingdoms. He says to Yeravam, V'nasati Lecha Es Asara Hashevatim. V'hasheivet Ha'echad Yiyeh Lo. You will get ten Shevatim and one Sheivet will go to Rechavam the son of Shlomo. $10 + 1 = 11$. Where is Sheivet Binyamin? The Sheivet Ha'echad Yiyeh Lo is Yehuda and Binyamin together. An interesting Yesod, that Yehuda and Binyamin are consistently counted as one. From where does this come? It comes from this week's Parsha and last week's Parsha. Yehuda said to Yaakov Avinu regarding Binyamin in 43:9 Anochi Ervenu Miyadi Tevakshenu, I will guarantee Binyamin's safety. Im Lo Haviosiv Eilecha V'hitzantiv L'fanecha V'chatasi Lecha Kol Hayomim. He guarantees his safety. He doesn't just say it, in this week's Parsha he does it. In 44:33 Yehuda says V'ata Yeishev Na Avdecha Tachas Hanar Eved Ladoni, he is willing to take the place of Binyamin. We call that Arvus. The word Arvus, Kol Areivim Zu Lazu comes from the Shores of Areiv, a guarantor. Someone who guarantees a loan. Arvus is connected to the word Iruv or mixture, to mix. We find in Shas most prominently in Maseches Kiddushin 7a a concept of Din Areiv. An Areiv is somebody who is considered combined with another person in a sense. In the Gemara's case a woman says give money to Ploni (my friend) and it will be as if I accepted it and I will be married to you. That is called Din Areiv. There is an Iruv. This woman and the one she wants to give the gift to are combined as if they were one person. When the other person took the money it is as if she took the money, that is the Din Areiv and she can get married in that manner.

Yehuda and Binyamin are like one Guf. When someone guarantees someone else and follows through on it, that creates an Iruv, a combination, a connection. So Yehuda and Binyamin in many aspects were considered two Shevatim, but really one Sheivet.

This concept is found in the Sefer Tomer Devora which is a Sefer from the Ramak, Rav Moshe Cordeviro one of the great Baalei Machshava of the Mekubalim in Tzefas. He talks about a Midah called She'aris Nachalaso in the first Perek. That HKB"H has a Midah of considering himself Kavayochel like Guf Echad with Klal Yisrael, one body with Klal Yisrael. Klal Yisrael was supposed to emulate that and be Areivim Zu Lazu, be as if they are mixed as one. The most prominent Arvus was Yehuda and Binyamin who became one.

With this I would like to comment on a mystery. Klal Yisrael has a legend. It is a well-known legend taught to children, brought in books with no known Mekor. It is a legend that there were two brothers and the two brothers shared a field on a mountain in Yerushalayim. One brother had a family and the other did not. Since they were Shutfim they divided their wheat. In the middle of the night one brother with the family said to himself you know my brother has nothing, he has no family at least let him have some more money to give him some comfort. In the middle of the night

he would go bring sheaves of wheat to his brother's side of the field and give it to him. The other brother who had no family said to himself I don't need money as much as my brother, he has to support a family. In middle of the night he would carry wheat to his brother and deposit it by him. This is what each one did. One night they met and they embraced each other and in Shamayim they said on this spot the Bais Hamikdash should be built. The legend has no known Mekor at least to my knowledge, however, based on what we are saying today it does have some sort of Mekor. It is the Arvus of Yehuda and Binyamin. The combination, the connection of Yehuda and Binyamin that exists at that boundary line where the Bais Hamikdash stands and it is Yehuda's dedication to his brother which is the love that is perhaps the source of this legend and Mekor for the Makom Hamikdash. That is the beginning of the Parsha.

2. At the end of the Parsha we find that Klal Yisrael, the 70 Jews, the descendants of Yaakov come to Eretz Mitzrayim and the Posuk in 47:27 says Vayeichazu Ba. Rashi says it is a Lashon of Achuzah. They came to be strangers in the land but yet Vayeichazu Ba they passed on an inheritance from generation to generation in the land of Mitzrayim. They lived there longer than they would have liked to.

Rav Schwab points out that it should be Vayochazu Ba because Vayeichazu is not a nice Lashon, is not an appropriate Lashon for inheriting something. So what is Vayeichazu Ba? Really Vayeichazu means that the land took control of them. Says Rav Schwab that is what happened. Vayeichazu Ba there was a Yeridas Hadoros, a Yeridos Hamadreiga over the generations that were in Mitzrayim. Why did that happen? Because when they came to Mitzrayim instead of remaining strangers in the land, Vayeichazu Ba, they were influenced by the land itself. The land took hold of them. What a Mussar for us who live here in America proud in a certain way to be Americans. The land sort of takes hold of us. That is a Yeridos Hamadreigos, to be influenced by the pursuit of Gashmiyos in the world we live in, to suddenly need more and more and more. It is a dangerous thing. It is the Vayeichazu Ba.

Chanukah will soon come to an end. We have said Yevanim Nikbitzu Alai Azai Bimai Chashmanim Ufortzu Chomos Migdalai V'timu Kol Hashmanim. We all know that they were Metamei all of the Shemen. What is Ufortzu Chomos Migdalai, where did they break the Chomos, the walls of the Migdal, what walls did the Yevanim break, they let the walls of the Bais Hamikdash continue to stand? There is a Mishnah in Masseches Middos. It says that Klal Yisrael had a custom to bow in 13 spots where the Bais Hamikdash stood. What were those 13 spots? Those 13 spots the Rav and the Tosafos Yom Tov both bring that those 13 spots were spots that the Yevanim had made holes in the Srug. The Srug was a flimsy wooden lattice like wall around the perimeter of the Bais Hamikdash. Chazal tell us that they didn't destroy the Srug they made 13 openings and later when the Yevanim were defeated and the Chashmanayim rebuilt the wall, Klal Yisrael would bow at the spot of those 13 openings. Two questions. Why did they start off with the Srug with this flimsy wall, and why is it called Chomos Migdalai the Chomah (strong wall) of our Bais Hamikdash, what is strong about that wall? The answer is that the Srug is the spot where the Goyim were allowed to enter. A Goy could bring a Korban but the Srug was the boundary line to where a Goy could enter. The Yevanim in their Greek philosophy held that all human beings are equal, all people are the same and therefore, they made Pirtzos in the Srug, they made openings and they allowed Goyim to enter the Bais Hamikdash. Klal Yisrael came after the Neis of Chanukah and strengthened themselves, the Chomah, the lattice like wooden flimsy wall. But for

Klal Yisrael it was a boundary, it is a boundary to understand a separation between the values of the Torah that we have and the values of the world around us. To avoid the Vayeichazu Ba. What a wonderful idea. What an important idea to strengthen ourselves with as Chanukah now comes to a close.

3. I would like to end with an important insight from the Chasam Sofer. The Mishna in Pirkei Avos 5:3 says (ה,ג עשרה נסיונות נתנסה אברהם אבינו, ועמד בכולם, להודיע כמה חיבתו של אברהם אבינו). A big deal is made over the 10 Nisyonos of Avraham Avinu. Yaakov Avinu had at least as many Nisyonos. Eisav, Lavan, Dinah, Yosef, Shimon, Vayeiveik Ish Imo, the hunger, going down to Mitzrayim in this week's Parsha. It would be easy to find 10 Nisyonos of Yaakov Avinu, why do we make a big deal of the Nisyonos of Avraham? The Chasam Sofer at the end of Parshas Vayeira tells us an extraordinary lesson that is Noga to each and every one of us. When is something a Nisayon and when is it part of the Mazal of life? When is something a particular challenge and when is it part of the normal challenges of life? Says the Chasam Sofer, a Nisayon comes with a feeling of distance from HKB"H, a Nisayon comes without a sense of Ruchniyos. When Avraham Avinu went to the Akeida 22:4 (וַיֵּרָא אֶת-הַמָּקוֹם--מֵרְחֹק). That Avraham Avinu saw Hamokoim (Hashem) as if he were distant from me. Part of his Nisayon was this feeling of distance from Hashem. That is a Nisayon. Yaakov Avinu had difficulties in life but wherever he went Hashem spoke to him. When he ran away from Eisav Hashem said in 28:15 Hinei Anochi Imoch Ush'marticha Bechol Asher Teilech. When Yaakov goes down to Mitzrayim Hashem says as is found in 46:3 Al Tirah Mairda Mitzraima. So that, life has two types of challenges. The everyday challenges which sometimes become quite severe but there is a feeling of closeness to the Borei Olam in doing so. The real Nisyonos in life, the most challenging aspects of life are those Nisyonos which come with a feeling of distance of HKB"H and it happens, we know it happens. Things happen to us and we feel Oy Hashem, so distant. At those moments we should realize these are the Nisyonos of Avraham Avinu. These are the Nisyonos of greatness. These are the most challenging Nisyonos of all. So the Chasam Sofer gives us an insight into our experiences. What is a Nisayon, a Nisayon Gadol, a landmark Nisayon in life? What is a Nisayon that we can deal with a feeling of closeness to HKB"H. With that I wish everybody a tremendous Hatzlacha in carrying forward from today, there are no Yomim Tovim until Purim and it is 100 days until Purim. A long winter Zman. We should be able to continue in our Avodas Hashem. To continue with great drive and Hatzlacha to pull ourselves into the Bais Hamedrash as often as we can. A Gutten Shabbos to all!

Rabbi Reisman - Parshas Vayigash 5773

44:18 (וַיֵּגֶשׁ אֵלָיו יְהוָה). This Posuk is actually brought in the Poskim. The Rama and Darcei Moshe in Hilchos Tefillah Siman 95. There the Rama brings in the name of the Sefer Rokeach the custom of taking 3 steps before one begins Shemoneh Esrei. The custom of taking 3 steps before one ends Shemoneh Esrei is mentioned in the Gemara Maseches Yoma 53b (3 lines from the top) (אמר רבי (אלכסנדרי אמר רבי יהושע בן לוי המתפלל צריך שיפסיע שלש פסיעות לאחוריו ואחר כך יתן שלום). However, the custom of taking 3 steps before one begins Shemoneh Esrei actually has no Mekor in the Gemorah and the Rokeach brings the source of the custom. He says that we find 3 Hargoshos L'tefillah. We find 3 times in Tanach Vayigash. We find in Beraishis 18:23 (וַיֵּגֶשׁ אֲבְרָהָם), in Beraishis 44:18 (וַיֵּגֶשׁ), and we find in Melachim I 18:21 (וַיֵּגֶשׁ אֵלָיו). Because there are 3 instances of Vayigash in relation to Tefillah we take 3 steps forward before we begin Shemoneh Esrei. That is what it

says in the Darcei Moshe. Anyone who reads this is Nispoel. What kind of Hargasha to Tefilla is (וַיִּגַּשׁ אֵלָיו יְהוֹדָה)? (וַיִּגַּשׁ אֵלָיו יְהוֹדָה) is not a Hargasha to Tefilla as he was stepping up to Yosef the king of Mitzrayim to complain to him. How is this related to Tefillah?

Rav Druk in his Sefer Darash Mordechai on page # 291 brings in the name of Rav Aharon Leib Shteinman who explains with the following idea. He says Yehuda was standing in the room and he was close enough to be heard by the king. He didn't have to step forward. Why did he step forward? That is the human nature. You step forward to address somebody. You step forward as if you are saying I am going from here to there. I am moving to a new position. From that new position I am going to talk to you. That is the idea of 3 steps in Tefillah. It is stepping in to a new Matzav, a new situation. That we learn from here, we learn from these words that a person steps forward before Shemoneh Esrei to symbolize a change in the persons perception. To symbolize a change in who the person is and what he is doing. That is appropriate to learn from (וַיִּגַּשׁ אֵלָיו יְהוֹדָה). This is Rav Aharon Leib Shteinman's explanation of this Rama.

I was thinking that something that I had heard once from Rav Avigdor Miller would explain this as well. Rabbi Miller explained that when a person goes to the doctor and he says to the doctor, doctor please help me or doctor please heal me, he should be saying it to the doctor but he should be thinking it to the Ribbono Shel Olam. Doctor please heal me, he is really talking to Hashem and not to the doctor in front of him. I would imagine that the same thing was true about Yehuda. (וַיִּגַּשׁ אֵלָיו יְהוֹדָה). Yehuda stepped forward and he said (בִּי אֲדֹנָי). Who was he saying (בִּי אֲדֹנָי) please Adoni too? (וְאֵל-יִחָד אָפָה בְּעֵבְרָה), he was saying it to the man in front of him, however, in his heart of hearts he was talking to Hashem. He was saying HKB"H help me, do things for me. (וְאֵל-יִחָד), HKB"H don't be angry with me. Mimeila we can learn from here (וַיִּגַּשׁ אֵלָיו יְהוֹדָה) a Halacha for Tefillah. An important lesson. Whatever it is we say to someone who will help us in an Ofen Gashmi we should try as best we can to be thinking of the Borei Olam. This is one thought regarding (וַיִּגַּשׁ אֵלָיו יְהוֹדָה). A thought that comes from Halacha.

Now let me try a thought on (וַיִּגַּשׁ אֵלָיו יְהוֹדָה) which comes from the world of Dikduk. Before you hang up, it is an easy Dikduk idea and there is a Mussar lesson that we are going to take from it. (וַיִּגַּשׁ), the Shoresh of the word (וַיִּגַּשׁ) is Nun Gimmeil Shin. Negisha is to step forward. Similar to the word Nefila to fall which when it comes in the form of (וַיִּפֹּל) becomes (וַיִּפֹּל). What is similar about these two words is that one of the letters of the Shoresh falls off, namely the Nun. (וַיִּפֹּל), (וַיִּגַּשׁ)...there are words in Hebrew which have a 3 letter Shoresh and lose the first letter. However, this is found uniquely by words that begin with the letter Nun. (וַיִּאָמֵר) becomes (וַיִּאָמֵר), (וַיִּדְבֹּר) becomes (וַיִּדְבֹּר), (וַיִּאָכֵל) becomes (וַיִּאָכֵל). All the words that go into this structure retain all of their Shoresh letters. When the Nun is the first Shoresh letter, it falls away. (וַיִּנָּד) becomes as it says in Beraishis 28:20 (וַיִּנָּד יַעֲקֹב, וַיִּנָּד). The Nun falls away. (וַיִּנָּטַע) is to plant which becomes as it says in Beraishis 9:20 (וַיִּנָּתֵן) (וַיִּנָּטַע, כָּרְם). (וַיִּנָּתֵן) is to give which becomes (וַיִּנָּתֵן). (וַיִּנָּתֵן) is to blow which becomes as it says in Beraishis 2:7 (וַיִּנָּפֵחַ בָּאָפָיו) the Nun falls away. The Nun uniquely falls away.

The Nun is also unusual in that it uniquely comes as an addition to a Shoresh. We find numerous times that the nun gets thrown in. it gets thrown in only for the Tiferes Haloshon (beauty of the language). For example, Ish in plural is not Ishim but Anashim. Bas in plural is not Bitim which would be an awkward word. Bitos becomes Banos with a Nun that is added. What I mean to say is that there is a concept in Dikduk which is Tiferes Halashon. Sometimes certain Dikduk rules are

there to make the language be pleasant to the ear. The Nun uniquely falls away as in Vayigash not Vayingash which would be an awkward word or Vayinagash which would also be awkward, the Nun falls away or is added where it is needed. In Eicha 3:22 we find (הִסְדִּי יְרוּרָה כִּי לֹא-תִמְנֶנִי), the Nun is added as it is not the Shoresh. The Shoresh is (תִּמְנֶנִי) but for Tiferes Halashon it gets thrown in. (זרועים) becomes (זִרְעוֹנִים). Nashim Tzidkanios where is the Nun? The Nun uniquely gets added or gets taken away for Tiferes Halashon. Ok so we learned some Dikduk. What Mussar could there be in Dikduk?

The Pachad Yitzchok on Sukkos in Maimar 17:2 he talks about the letter Nun. The examples he brings there is something you can look up. What is Noguea to me is his Yesod. His Yesod is that the letter Nun is Mor'e Hagadlus, it is a symbol of greatness. We know that the 50th Shar (the 50th gate) of anything is a symbol of being complete. The word (כָּל) is complete. The letter Nun shows Gadlus.

Here is the Mussar. Of all of the letters of the Alef Bais the letter which is willing to come or go depending on the use, the need, the Tiferes Halashon, the need of the sentence, the need of the word, is that letter which symbolizes greatness. Because it is somebody who is great that is willing to give of himself to go or to go away depending on the general need.

According to this we can well understand why in Parshas Behaloscha we have an obligation to put a Siman before and after the Parsha of (וַיְהִי בִּנְסֹעַ הָעָרֹן) which is found in 10:35. The letter Nun is used. As you know a backwards Nun (ן) is used and not a straight Nun which would be read but a backwards Nun. The Maharshal famously asks why are you using a Nun? However, if in fact in the rules of the language of Dikduk the Nun is that great letter which is which is willing to give of itself, which is willing to be there or not be there depending on the greater need, than we understand that the letter Nun is used. The lesson again is a lesson of greatness. These are two very different ideas both coming from the word (וַיֵּצֵא).

For the third Vort of the day let us move to the end of the Parsha and a Vort from Rav Yaakov Kamenetzky in his Sefer on Chumash Emes L'Yaakov page # 225 on the Posuk 47:4. The end of the Parsha is a bit confusing. We have the story of course of Yaakov and the Shevatim, the 70 Nefashos coming down to Mitzrayim. In the very last section of the Parsha we have the discussion that is found in 47:1 (וַיָּבֹא יוֹסֵף, וַיֵּגֵד לְפָרְעָה, וַיֹּאמֶר אֵבִי וְאָחִי וְצֹאנָם וּבְקָרָם). A discussion of the arrival of Yaakov and his family and their coming in front of Pharaoh and being sent to the land of Goshen. All that is fine. After Shvii we read in 47:11 (וַיּוֹשֶׁב יוֹסֵף, אֶת-אֲבִיו וְאֶת-אֶחָיו, וַיִּתֵּן לָהֶם אֶחָדָה בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם). He settles them down in the land of Mitzrayim. Suddenly, the Posuk switches focus. It goes to Yosef's discussion with the Egyptian, how he sold them food in Mitzrayim. As Rashi says on Posuk 47:13 (וְלֶחֶם אֵין בְּכָל הָאָרֶץ: חֹזֵר לַעֲנִין הָרָאוּשׁוֹן לְתַחֲלַת שְׁנֵי הָרַעֲבָה) that this is out of order because when Yaakov came the years of hunger ended. Rashi says that it goes back in time which is totally out of place. After the brothers come we learn about Yosef dealing with the Egyptians in selling them the food. Totally out of place. What is it doing here?

Answers Rav Yaakov, Yosef in all of his work and all of his preparation was really preparing the land of Egypt for the arrival of Klal Yisrael. That it should be as best as it could be. For example, we found earlier that Yosef did population transfers. He made people move as it says in 47:21 (וְאֶת-הָעָם--הָעִבְרִי). He made the people move from one place to another. We find that here in the last part

of the Parsha. Why did he do that? Rashi says (לזכרון שאין להם עוד חלק), לזכרון שאין להם עוד חלק, בארץ, והושיב של עיר זו בחברתה. ולא הוצרך הכתוב לכתוב זאת, אלא להודיע שבחו של יוסף שנתכוין להסיר חרפה (מעל אחיו, שלא יהיו קורין אותם גולים) it was in preparation for when the Yidden come. It shouldn't be unusual that people should be out of their normal place. We learn here in 47:22 that (רק אֶדְמַת) (הַכֹּהֲנִים, לֹא קָנָה). Yosef made an exception for clergy. Clergy were exempt from the taxes. Clergy were exempt of the rules of paying for the food. Why did he do this? Says Rav Yaakov, Yosef wanted to do something that would be in preparation for Klal Yisrael coming. When Sheivet Levi came, they fell under this law. This law which allowed those who are clergy, those who are totally devoted to learning to be exempt from taxes. This was Yosef's effort. It belongs here. It belongs when Klal Yisrael comes down. The story of what Yosef did to prepare for their coming. To prepare for their coming (וְאֶת-הָעָם--הַעֲבִיר) (רק אֶדְמַת הַכֹּהֲנִים, לֹא קָנָה) he made an exception for clergy.

I would add to this that it is probably and undoubtedly the longest surviving recorded law. Today in the United States there are parsonage rules for clergymen. It is not natural that such a law should exist in this country. It is not natural that such a law should be unchallenged on a basis of separation of church and state. It is only with the Siyata Dish'maya that came with the Hishtadlus of Yosef which remains to this day an exemption. Rabbeim in Yeshivas today are paid wages which is a crime. It is a crime. L'asid Lavo we will look back and ask how did we allow Rabbeim to be paid wages which in some families are below the poverty level. The Rabbeim are very devoted. Yosef prepared. He set up a parsonage rule, an idea which lasts to a great degree to this day. Clergymen are not totally exempt but have exemptions. This was in the year 2238, Yosef was 3500 years ago. He was preparing Klal Yisrael for living in Galus. So here in the end of the Parsha we have an insight why the story is brought after Yaakov appears. Otherwise it is not important. What Yosef did business wise is not important or relevant to us. But to the degree that it was meant to be a preparation, it is very Geshmak, then it belongs.

Rabbi Reisman - Parshas Vayigash 5772

At the end of the previous Parsha Yehuda speaks in a very meek tone to Yosef. He says 44:16 (וְעִבְדֶּיךָ--הַנִּנְנוּ עִבְדִּים לְאֹדֹנִי, גַּם-אֲנִי וְנִיִּאמָר יְהוּדָה, מֶה-נֹאמַר לְאֹדֹנִי, מֶה-נִּדְבָר, וּמֶה-נִּצְטָדֵק; הָאֲלֵרִים, מִצָּא אֶת-עֹן) (גַּם אֲשֶׁר-נִמְצָא הַגִּבִּיעַ בְּיָדוֹ). He says what could we answer, we were caught and we are prepared to be slaves. That is how the Parshas Mikeitz ends.

The beginning of this week's Parsha which is 2 Pesukim later says in 44:18 (וַיִּגַּשׁ אֵלָיו יְהוּדָה, וַיֹּאמֶר) (בִּי אֲדֹנִי, יִדְבָר-נָא עִבְדְּךָ דָּבָר בְּאָזְנֵי אֲדֹנִי, וְאֶל-יְסֹר אֶפְדֶּךָ בְּעִבְדְּךָ: כִּי כְמוֹדָה, כִּפְרָעָה) (וְאֶל יַחַר אַפְךָ: מִכֵּאן אֶתָּה לִמַּד שְׁדַּבֵּר אֵלָיו קְשׁוּת) As Rashi says that he spoke to him in a very stern and strict way.

It is a very sudden change from one attitude to another attitude. There has certainly got to be a reason for it and not only that but there has got to be a lesson in the way the Torah portrays this.

Rav Schwab in his Sefer on Chumash Mayan Bais Hashoeva page # 107 brings that the lesson is that actually Yehuda was somewhat afraid as Binyamin had been caught. Then he remembered that he had guaranteed the return of Binyamin. This gave him the energy the strength and the

courage to be able to do the things that he had to do. The idea is that when a person feels a responsibility then a person has more energy. If a person feels that something is a job that he has to do and it is up to him to do it, he feels an Achrayos to do it. That gives him the strength the ability to do things that he might otherwise not have been able to do. That is the 44:32 (עֲבֹדָה עָרַב) (אֶת-הַנֶּעֱרָר). Yehuda reflected on his responsibility and with that he got the energy to do that which he had to do.

Many years ago Rav Pam spoke to Rav Nosson Tzvi Finkel. Rav Nosson Tzvi had asked a certain Talmid to take a job as a Mashgiach in one of the Yeshivos. Rav Pam held that this Talmid was still young and that he was not ready for that type of Achrayos. Rav Nosson Tzvi called him and said with the Achrayos come the Kochos. With the responsibility a person gets the energy, gets the maturity to do the things that he has to do. Rav Pam was very moved by that attitude. That is something that he repeated and he said over to us his Talmidim. An attitude that with the acceptance of responsibility, with that comes the energy.

The lesson is that every day in Shema in addition to the first part of Kriyas Shema which is Kabbalas Ol Malchus Shamayim, the acceptance of the kingdom of Hashem we also have the second Parsha which is known as Kabbalas Ol Mitzvos where we accept upon ourselves the Mitzvos of the Torah. That Kabbalas Ol Mitzvos is meant to be a feeling of responsibility, an Achrayos. We remind ourselves that we have certain responsibilities, certain things that we have accepted upon ourselves to do. Mit Di Achrayos Kumin the Kochos. When a person feels that he can't do something but he then reflects and realizes that it is his Tafkid, his purpose, his job to do, then a person can reach back and get greater energy.

I believe Rav Chaim Shmuelevitz says a similar Vort regarding Moshe Rabbeinu's words when the Bnei Yisrael asked for the Slav. Bnei Yisrael made an extraordinary request and Moshe Rabbeinu says to the Ribbono Shel Olam in Bamidbar 11:12 (הָאֲנֹכִי הָרִיתִי, אֶת כָּל-הָעָם הַזֶּה--אִם-אֲנֹכִי, יִלְדֵתִיהֶם). Did I carry these people, were they my children, did I give birth to them that you tell me to undertake providing Slav for all of them? From Moshe Rabbeinu's expression, Rav Chaim Shmuelevitz makes the following observation that as impossible as it would be to provide suddenly meat for so many people, however, if indeed (הָאֲנֹכִי הָרִיתִי, אֶת כָּל-הָעָם הַזֶּה--אִם-אֲנֹכִי, יִלְדֵתִיהֶם), if Moshe Rabbeinu had been the parents of these children and he would have felt the same Achrayos as a parent feels toward a child and if they in turn had looked towards Moshe Rabbeinu that way, then it would have happened. Because when there is a sense of Achrayos (responsibility) it happens. That is the lesson of Rav Schwab, really a true lesson for all of us. We are busy we have Tirdus and we don't have time for Sedarim, if we feel the responsibility (the Achrayos) then we would be able to do it.

In presenting his argument, Yehuda refers to Binyamin as a Yeled Zekunim in 44:20 (וְיֵלֶד זִקְנִים). Someone who is very close to his father and he says in the last words before Sheini 44:30 (וְנִפְשׁוּ, קִשּׁוּרָה בְּנִפְשׁוֹ). The soul of Yaakov Avinu is tied to the soul of Binyamin. The Baal Haturim writes that the word (קִשּׁוּרָה) starts with the letters Kuf and Shin. Kuf is Gematriya 100 and Shin is 300 which together is 400. If you replace the Kuf and Shin with a Taf then Kishura becomes Torah. What is the lesson in that? What are we supposed to learn from that Baal Haturim.

Rav Chaim Kanievsky in Derech Sich'a Volume II page # 57 says the following. He says a real connection of love comes when there is a connection of Torah. When someone teaches and someone else learns and there is a sense of learning and of teaching that which is most important in the Briya. That which is most central to our existence in this world. When there is that type of relationship then there is real Ahava. (וְנִפְשׁוֹ, קְשׁוּרָה בְּנִפְשׁוֹ), through the Keshet of Torah, Binyamin was the youngest son and stayed home with his father and therefore, there was more learning with that son than with other sons. (וְנִפְשׁוֹ, קְשׁוּרָה בְּנִפְשׁוֹ) the extra strength in this Ahava was based on Torah.

We find that as well by Yosef. When the Posuk told us earlier that Yosef was beloved to his father it said 37:3 (כִּי-בֶן-זִקְנִים הָיָא, לוֹ) and the Targum Unkelos Teitch on (בֶּן-זִקְנִים) is Ben Chakim Hu Lo that he is a son of wisdom. What does that mean a son of wisdom? It means a son who learned his wisdom from his father. This is as Rashi brings it (בֶּן זִקְנִים: שְׂנוּלָד לוֹ לַעֲת זִקְנָתוֹ. וְאוּנְקְלוֹס תִּרְגָּם בְּרַחֲמֵי) (הוּא לִיָּה כָּל מֵה שֶׁלָּמַד מִשֶּׁם וְעִבֵּר מִסֵּר לוֹ). Whatever Yaakov learned he gave over to Yosef and therefore, it is a connection based on Torah. A connection based on Torah brings true Ahava.

I believe I saw once a Rav Tzaddok that said the following. He said Reuvein, Shimon, and Levi gave Yaakov a hard time. At the end of his life when it came time to give the Berachos, Yaakov was very tough with Reuvein, Shimon, and Levi. He was very strict with them. He gave them Berachos that were not clear Berachos. It is not clear in the Pesukim that he is giving them Berachos at all. He seemed to be giving them Mussar.

Moshe Rabbeinu also had a difficult time especially with Sheivet Reuvein. He had a difficult time with rebelliousness with these Shevatim. Yet when Moshe Rabbeinu gave them Berachos at the end of V'zos Habracha he said as it says in Devarim 33:6 (יְחִי רְאוּבֵן, וְאֶל-יָמָת) (וְאֶל-יָמָת). He gave a Beracha to every one of the Shevatim even the ones that had given him a difficult time.

Rav Tzaddok writes that that is the difference in attitude between a parent and a Rebbe. A parent sees the Tzad Hamussar of the child, the Tzad that he has to correct. Whereas a Rebbe has the Ahava the love for a child. So that is a difference of attitude between a father and Rebbe. That is the idea of (וְנִפְשׁוֹ, קְשׁוּרָה בְּנִפְשׁוֹ), the close tie comes from the Rebbe Talmid relationship, from that special relationship.

We notice in Krias Shema where we say Devarim 6:7 (וְשִׁנְנָתָם לְבָנֶיךָ) teach it to your children. The Gemara says this refers to the students. Later it says 11:19 (וְלִמְדָתָם אֹתָם אֶת-בְּנֵיכֶם) and the Gemara says that this refers to biological children.

The question is normally when you have a Posuk twice the first Posuk is the simple Pshat and the second Posuk is to teach us something different. So I would think that the first (בְּנֵיךָ) would be for the biological children and the second one which would be now extra would be the one that we Darshun for the Talmidim. That is not the way it is because (וְשִׁנְנָתָם לְבָנֶיךָ) is for the Talmidim. So it seems that the Torah understands that true children are Talmidim. It is only the second (בְּנֵיךָ) that is Darshuned to refer to actual children. A Peledika Chiddush. The Gemara actually says that if you find an object that belongs to your father and an object that belongs to your Rebbe that the object that you found belonging to your Rebbe is the one that you are first obligated in returning. The Gemara says that when it comes to giving respect for a father or a Rebbe that the Rebbe is first.

This idea is related to this very special Keshet that a Rebbe and a Talmid have to have. But that depends, when you go to a Shiur and you learn from somebody if you are just getting information that doesn't develop a Keshet but if you have this feeling this Hergish that this connection is a connection of doing what is most important in this world that which brings a person to Chayei Olam Haba to an eternal life then there is a Keshet. Then there is a love. That Hergish brings out the Ahava and Chibah, and this is something that we have to learn to appreciate.

Let me move on. Yosef proved to them that he was Yosef because he said my mouth is speaking to you and as Rashi says on the Posuk 45:12 (כִּי-פִי, הַמְדַבֵּר אֵלֵיכֶם) that (ועוד כי פי המדבר אליכם בלשון) that I am speaking in Lashon Kodesh. Last year we discussed this. The idea that Lashon Kodesh is something very unique in the fact that somebody who has a spiritual level can speak Lashon Kodesh well. It shows spirituality that he was able to speak in Lashon Kodesh. This is the idea that I mentioned last year.

This year I would like to add because I see that there is a Rashbam that when Moshe Rabbeinu says at the Sene that I don't speak well because of the Aral Sefosoyim the Rashbam says that when Moshe Rabbeinu spoke to Klal Yisrael he spoke well, he was a marvelous teacher because he was speaking in Lashon Kodesh. What was the problem with his speech? This was because he was speaking Lashon Mitzri. He was speaking a foreign language that was lacking Kedusha. Mitzrayim was not a Tahor country it was full of Znus. Moshe Rabbeinu found it difficult to speak, he stuttered and he had a hard time getting the words out when he was speaking Lashon Mitzri. When he spoke Lashon Hakodesh it came in very smoothly.

The Ramech brings this Rashbam to explain Tehillim 114:1 (בְּצֵאת יִשְׂרָאֵל, מִמִּצְרָיִם; בֵּית יִצְחָק, מֵעַם) (מֵעַם לֵצֹן). They left the land of a foreign tongue. Why was it a foreign tongue, they were there for 210 years? Even though they spoke Lashon Kodesh but certainly they knew the Egyptian language as well. The answer of course is that it is a foreign tongue because it is not a tongue of holiness. It is a tongue of Znus and Zimah. Therefore, a holy soul found it hard to speak the language. That is another insight into the Mayla of Lashon Hakodesh.

The question of the week is: this morning I got to the end of the Parsha in learning Rashi and in doing so there seems to be 2 Rashis which are inconsistent. It explains the same word in 2 different ways. That is in Perek 47 the Perek with which the Parsha ends. In Posuk 12 Rashi explains the Posuk (לְפִי הֵטָף) Yosef provided food according to the amount of children. Rashi says (לְפִי) Rashi is saying that Taf is not only small children but anybody in the house is included in Taf, in child. There is no problem with that.

However, in Posuk 24 there is a very similar Posuk, Yosef is providing food (וְלֹאֲשֵׁר בְּבֵתֵיכֶם--וְלֹאֲכָל) (לְטַפְכֶם) to feed the little ones. There Rashi says (טַפְכֶם: בָּנִים קְטָנִים) Banim Ketanim small children. Why in one Posuk does Rashi say that (טַפְכֶם) refers to specifically small children and in the other one Rashi says whoever is in your home is included. Tzorech Iyun because it is the same word (טַף). This seems to be a contradiction in Rashi.

There seems to be a contradiction in Ramban as well. The Ramban in the beginning of Parshas Vayechi when Yosef is told to bury Yaakov in Mitzrayim by Paroh brings the well-known Chazal that Paroh said be Matir Neder because I want him buried in Egypt. To that the response was if I

am Matir that Neder I can always be Matir the Neder of not to tell people that you don't know Lashon Kodesh. So the Ramban goes with this idea of Chazal that Paroh was not fluent in Lashon Kodesh as Rashi brings in 50:6 (אבל ירא לומר עבור) על השבועה, שלא יאמר אם כן עבור על השבועה שנשבעתי לך שלא אגלה על לשון הקודש שאני מכיר עודף על שבעים (לשון ואתה אינך מכיר בו, כדאיתא במסכת סוטה (דף לו ב)).

This seems to be inconsistent with the Ramban mentioned in our Parsha on the Posuk mentioned earlier 45:12 (פִּי-פִי, הַמְדַבֵּר אֲלֵיכֶם). The Ramban says (כי איננה ראה) ויתכן שאמר להם כך לאמתלא ולפיוס, כי אברהם לא הביאו מאור כשדים ומחרן כי ארמית שידבר אדם אחד במצרים בלשון הקדש, כי על דעתי הוא שפת כנען, כי אברהם לא הביאו מאור כשדים ומחרן כי ארמית :היא, והגל הזה עד, ואיננו לשון לאיש אחד לבד, אבל הוא לשון כנען

ורבים במצרים יודעים אותו כי קרוב הוא, ואף כי המושל, שדרך המלכים והמושלים לדעת הלשונות, וכמו שתראה בנבוכדנצר שאמר בלשון הקדש (דניאל ב ג): חלום חלמתי ותפעם רוחי לדעת את החלום, בעבור שהיו שם חרטומים ואשפים ומכשפים וכשדים מלשונות רבים ומישראל, וכולם יבינו אותו. והם ענו לו בארמית, וידברו הכשדים למלך (ארמית). The Ramban says that it is not so because the fact that he spoke Lashon Kodesh is no proof because the land of Canaan is close to the land of Mitzrayim. People of neighboring countries can speak the language of. many Egyptians knew the language of Lashon Kodesh. There the Ramban seems to disagree with Rashi and says that Lashon Kodesh was well known. In Parshas Vayechi he goes with the approach that Paroh did not know Lashon Kodesh and that seems to be an inconsistency and certainly something for you to think about.

Rabbi Reisman - Parshas Vayigash (Zos Chanukah) 5771

There is a Kasha (פֶּל-הַנֶּפֶשׁ הַבָּאָה לִיעֶקֶב מִצְרַיִם, יֵצְאֵי יֶרֶכוֹ, מִלֵּבָד, נָשִׂי בְנֵי-יַעֲקֹב--כָּל-נֶפֶשׁ, שְׁשִׁים וָשֶׁשׁ) 46:26 that I had for many years regarding all the Seforim of Tanach, wherever people are counted, women are not typically counted. We understand that in the Midbar they counted the Yotzei Tzavah so the women were not counted. Still here in Parshas Vayigash we have a particular difficulty. This is because Yocheved is counted as she is the 70th person who was born Bain Hachomos. Even if we ignore that she was counted, what about Serach Bas Asher and Dina who were counted? What about the rest of the women, could it be that Yaakov Avinu at the age of 130 had only 3 female descendents and 66 male descendents? This is very difficult to understand.

כל הנפש הבאה ליעקב: שיצאו מארץ כנען לבוא למצרים. ואין הבאה זו לשון עבר, אלא לשון הווה, (Rashi learns כמו (אסתר ב יד) בערב היא באה, וכמו (לעיל כט ו) הנה רחל בתו באה עם הצאן, לפיכך טעמו למטה באל"ף, לפי שכשיצאו לבוא מארץ כנען לא היו אלא ששים ושש. והשני (להלן פסוק כז) כל הנפש לבית יעקב הבאה מצרימה שבעים, הוא לשון עבר, לפיכך טעמו למעלה בבי"ת, לפי שמשבאו שם היו שבעים שמצאו שם יוסף ושני בניו ונתוספה להם יוכבד בין החומות. ולדברי האומר תאומות נולדו עם השבטים צריכים אנו לומר שמתו לפני ירידתן למצרים, שהרי לא נמנו כאן. מצאתי בויקרא רבה (ד ו) עשו שש נפשות היו לו והכתוב קורא אותן (לעיל לו ו) נפשות ביתו, לשון רבים, לפי that according (שהיו עובדין לאלהות הרבה, יעקב שבעים היו לו והכתוב קורא אותן נפש, לפי שהיו עובדים לאל אחד to the one who learns that each Sheivet was born with a twin girl you have to say they all died.

Many are Matmia on this saying that how can it be that Yaakov suffered such a tragedy and it is not mentioned anywhere. Rav Moshe in the Darash Moshe first Cheilek page # 32 has a fresh approach to the whole topic of women being counted in Tanach. Rav Moshe writes that a man and

his wife are counted as 1 because they are one Neshamah. Therefore, men and women are not counted as two people.

Ai, some women are counted? There are exceptions. There are situations where a woman has become greater than just the role of being a support for her husband. Not to belittle the role of a woman being a support for their husband. A wife and husband working out one Tafkaid, nevertheless there are women who reach beyond that and who fulfill more than just the Tafkaid of just helping out their husbands. Those women are counted separately. Serach Bas Asher and Dinah are counted separately. The other daughters of Yaakov who presumably married the Shevatim who were only half brothers and were Muttar at that time, they are not counted because Ish V'ishto are Chad Gufa and therefore, they are counted as one.

That explains Derech Klal why in Tanach that is the way that it works. It is a beautiful thought and what is even more beautiful is that the Otzar Rishonim Chumash, the Chumash of Rav Yehuda Hachasid says on the Posuk that says (מִלְכָּד, נָשִׁי בְנֵי-יִצְחָק) the wives of the Bnei Yaakov were not counted because husband and wife count as one.

It is a beautiful thought into the idea that husband and wife are counted as one and Mimeila they were counted this way. The exception being those extraordinary people.

The only difficulty with this is with Yocheved if she was just born how did she already fulfill her great Tafkaid and why was she counted if she couldn't have reached her Tafkaid?

The answer is that Yocheved was single and was not married. The others were all married, however, Chazal Darshuns that Ish U'baiso Ba'u that every person who came was married and therefore, Yaakov wanted that even the young ones should come to Mitzrayim with the anchor of marriage. Therefore, Yocheved was the only woman who was not married and Mimeila of course she is counted. This is a fresh idea, a new approach, and is very Geshmak.

A Teshuvah of the Node B'yehuda, Choshen Mishpat, Teshuvah 38, which has to do with our Parsha. A man died and left a will commanding that an amount of principal (Keren) should be created to support those descendents of his that would be sitting and learning.

The will instructed as follows; these funds should be used to support descendents who are learning Ad Dor Revii, until the 4th generation. At that point the money gets divided amongst the surviving relatives.

The question was as follows, how do you count the 4th generation? This wealthy man died and had children, grandchildren, and great grandchildren. The great grandchildren came and said that they wanted money because they felt that they were the 4th generation. 4 generations are up, so divide the money. The others felt that the wealthy man's son is the first generation, the grandson the second generation, the great grandson the third generation, so that there would still be another generation of Torah support until the money gets divided.

The Shaila came to the Node B'yehuda who said that in our Parsha the Yidden go down to Mitzrayim. A promise was made in Parshas Lech Lecha to Avraham Avinu in 15:16 (וְדֹר רְבִיעִי,)

the 4th generation would return, meaning the 4th generation of people who were in Mitzrayim will return. Let us try to figure out by looking in the names in the Parsha who was the (דור רביעי), those that returned to Eretz Yisrael. Actually, we can cheat. We can go to Rashi on 15:16 who says (והרביעי) לאחר שיגלו למצרים יהיו שם שלשה דורות, וזה רביעי, לפי שבארץ כנען היה מדבר עמו וכתר ברית זו, כדכתיב (פסוק ז) לתת לך את הארץ הזאת לרשתה, ישובו לארץ הזאת, (וכן היה יעקב ירד למצרים. צא וחשוב דורותיו יהודה, פרץ, חצרון, וכלב בן חצרון מבאי הארץ היה Yehuda, Peretz, Chetzron, Caleiv. Caleiv was the 4th generation who was going to return. Yaakov Avinu came down to Mitzrayim, however, he is not counted in going down to Mitzrayim. So we count the 4 generations outside of Yaakov.

The Ibn Ezra on Parshas Lech Lecha counts (דור רביעי) differently. Kehas went down to Mitzrayim. He had a son Amram who had a son Moshe and Moshe's children entered Eretz Yisrael. The Ibn Ezra counts the 4 generations the other way. He counts the ones who went down to Mitzrayim as generation 1. It appears that the Machlokes Rashi and Ibn Ezra says the Node B'yehuda, is the same Machlokes as in this Din Torah regarding the wealthy man with the will. Since generally we see Rashi as the Ikkur compared to the Ibn Ezra, the Node B'yehuda said that in this case we would Pasken like Rashi and the wealthy man who dies is not considered the first generation.

A thought for Zos Chanukah as Chanukah leaves. We have all been saying Hallel now for 8 days. Sefardim make the Beracha on Hallel with the following Nusach. The end of the Beracha is Ligmor Es Hahallel (to complete the Hallel). When half Hallel is said as it is on Rosh Chodesh, they don't make a Beracha at all.

We Ashkenazim make a Beracha Likro Es Hahallel. This is based on a Rama in Taf Pei Ches (488). The Mishna Brurah explains the Rama's reasoning. The Rama says don't say Ligmor Es Hahallel because if you miss one word or even one letter Hallel you are not Yotzei.

The Mishna Brura in Shaar Tzion says that it is similar to reading the Megillah. In Megillas Esther if you don't read every word or even if you mispronounce one word you are not Yotzei the Megillah. So too with Hallel, a person is obligated to say Hallel not missing a single word or even mispronouncing a word. If we are going to say Ligmor Es Hahallel then if you miss one word then you made a Beracha Levatala. Therefore, says the Mishna Brura in his understanding of the Rama, that it is better to make a Beracha Likro Es Hahallel and not be committed to catching every word, that it is better than saying Ligmor Es Hahallel and if we miss a word then it was a Beracha Levatala. This is the Minhag Ashkenaz and the Psak of the Rama.

There is a tremendous difficulty with this and in the Mishna Brura the Shaar Hatzion presents the following Kasha. What is the difference if you say Likro or Ligmor Es Hahallel you still have an obligation to say the whole Hallel, so if you miss a word of Hallel the Beracha is a Beracha Levatala whether you said Ligmor Es Hahallel or Likro Es Hahallel?

I would suggest the following answer. Let us say that a person is in a place on Chanukah that he has no Siddur, can he at least say the partial Hallel that he does remember? It is Mistaveir that if a person can't do the ideal Hallel, he should at least have the Mitzvah of the partial Hallel which is also a Hallel.

Let's see, according to the Sefardim which is the Shittah of the Bais Yosef, on a half Hallel they would never make a Beracha. They only make a Beracha Ligmor Es Hahalel. For them if they miss a word their Beracha is a Beracha Levatala.

We hold that we make a Beracha on half Hallel because we hold that you make a Beracha on a Minhag. If so, when we are saying the whole Hallel it is a great idea to switch to Likro Es Hahallel. If we would say Ligmor Es Hahallel and miss a word, we would be Over on a Beracha Levatala. This is because we were not Gomer Es Hahallel. If we are saying half Hallel and we miss a word it may be true that we don't have a Mayla of a Hallel that is perfect, still there is an Inyan of Hallel that applies on Rosh Chodesh days and that we were Yotzeh. This is because we said an incomplete Hallel that is also a Mitzvah. Likro Es Hallel. This is a possible Teretz to a Kasha of the Mishna Brura regarding the Yom Tov which just passed.

The Mussar of course is, Ligmor Es Hahallel. That our thanks to the Ribbono Shel Olam has to be complete, has to be whole, and has to be as perfect as can be. It is a Yids job to do things Ad Gemirah, with a complete heart and certainly we hope that something will remain from Chanukah with each of us. Some influence of inspiration, some desire to Daven better, to be Misracheik from the Yevonim (the non Jewish influences that surround us) as best we can. Zos Chanukah.

The question of the week is: 46:1 (וַיִּבְאֵהוּ בְּאֶרֶץ שְׁבַע; וַיִּזְבַּח זִבְחִים, לֵאלֹהֵי אָבִיו) Yaakov Avinu offers up sacrifices to the G-d of Yitzchak. Rashi says (לֵאלֹהֵי אָבִיו יִצְחָק : חֵיִב) Yaakov was obligated in the honor of his father more so than the honor of his grandfather Avraham. This is why Yaakov does not mention Avraham. The question is that in Parshas Vayishlach 32:10 (וַיֹּאמֶר, יַעֲקֹב, אֱלֹהֵי אָבִי אֲבָרְהָם, וְאֱלֹהֵי אָבִי) Yaakov is sending Malachim and mentions Avraham and Yitzchok when he is Davening that Hashem should save him from the hand of Eisav. Yaakov not only mentions Avraham he also mentions Avraham first. What happened to the fact that a father should get more Kavod than a grandfather?

Rabbi Reisman - Parshas Vayigash 5770

It says in last week's Parsha 42:2, Parshas Mikeitz, (רדו-שָׁמָּה). Rashi explains that the use of the word Ridu instead of Lichu alludes to the 210 years that they were subjugated to Mitzrayim (רדו (שמה: ולא אמר לכו, רמז למאתים ועשר שנים שנשתעבדו למצרים, כמנין רד"ו says (רדה אלי). Why did Yosef use the Lashon of Rida, either he should have said Lichu or Ridu?

In the Sefer Toisafos Brocha written by the Torah Temimah there is a Pshat. He says that a year had past between the time that the brothers first came for Tevua and the time that the brothers came now to Yosef when he sent them back. If that is the case, then it is very Geshmak. The use of the word Rida which is Gematriya 209 works out perfectly because that was the amount of years that remained.

45:4 When Yosef reveals that he is Yosef to his brothers, Rashi says on the words (גָּשׁוּ-נָא אֵלַי), that he showed them his Bris Milah (קרא להם , אמר עכשיו אחי נכלמים, גשו נא אלי: ראה אותם נסוגים לאחוריהם,

(בלשון רכה ותחנונים, והראה להם שהוא מהול Many Meforshim ask on this that in Parshas Mikeitz 41:55 on the words (אָפֶּר-יֹאמֶר לָכֶם תַּעֲשׂוּ) all the Mitzrim had a Bris Milah so how did it prove that he was Yosef?

The second Siman that Yosef gave was that he spoke Lashoin Kodesh at it says in Rashi to 45:12 (והנה עיניכם רואות: בכבודי, ושאני אחיכם, שהרי אני מהול ככם. ועוד כי פי המדבר אליכם בלשון הקודש). This is also Shver because there were others who spoke Lashoin Hakoidesh? So both Simanim weren't good enough to prove that this was really Yosef?

Rav Schwab in his Sefer on Chumash Mayan Bais Hashoeva page # 107 on 45:4 has an amazing Vort. He says Yosef wasn't showing his Bris Milah as that is not a normal thing to show. He said, I was in Mitzrayim a place that is full of Znus and I stayed Tahor. Rav Schwab says based on a Moreh Nivuchim, that how someone speaks, especially Lashoin Hakoidesh, there is a Siman to his Tzniyus and Zehirus B'inyanei Znus. Mimeila, (כי פי המדבר אליכם), he spoke to them (בלשון הקודש). The Shevatim could tell from the way he spoke his Gadlus. From that they saw that (והראה להם) (שהוא מהול), it shows that he stayed Naki B'inyanei Znus. Rav Shwab's Yesoid is to connect Lashoin Koidesh to speaking with Tzniyus. With that we understand why Paroh could not master Lashoin Koidesh even though every other language he knew. This is because Paroh was Shataf Biz'nus.

This also explains the Minhag of Metzitz B'peh. Why is the mouth touching the Makoim Milah? Dafka because those 2 are connected, the Dibur and the Makoim Milah.

A third thing that is explained by this is that in Galus Bavel Klal Yisrael quickly forgot Lashoin Koidesh. We find that in that Galus there was intermarriage as is found in Sefer Ezra.

A fourth thing that is explained by this is the Middah of Yesoid. Yosef is Yesoid. The 7 Middois that are mentioned by Sefira are corresponding. Chesed is the right hand. Gevurah is the left hand. Tifferes is the body. Netzach and Hoid are the 2 legs. Yesoid is considered the Makoim Milah. When we do Ushpizim we put Yosef as the Makoim Milah.

The head is the same thing. The right eye is Chesed. The left eye is Gevurah. The nose is Tifferes. The 2 ears are Netzach and Hoid. The mouth is K'neged Yesoid. So that the mouth is K'neged the Makoim Milah. Both of them are related. There is Devarim B'tailim and Zera L'vatalah. The Mussar of course is, the way a person speaks says a lot about his Middah of Tzniyus.

This is Rav Schwab's Vort that he heard when he was young from a Chochom Echad.

45:23 The Posuk says, (וְעֹשֶׂר אֶתְנֵת נִשְׂאֵת בָּר וְלָחֶם) (ומזון, לאֲבִיו--לְדָרְךָ) Meaning, Yosef sent ten male donkeys loaded with the best of Egypt, and ten female donkeys loaded with grain and bread. It seems to be a lot of food to be sending to his father Yaakov if all he wanted was that Yaakov should come down to Mitzrayim?

Rabbi Reisman - Parshas Vayigash 5769

In 45:4, Yosef reveals himself to his brothers (וַיֹּסֶף יוֹסֵף אֶל-אֶחָיו גִּשּׁוֹ-נָא אֵלָיו, וַיִּגְשׁוּ; וַיֹּאמֶר, אֲנִי יוֹסֵף) (אֶחָיְכֶם, אֲשֶׁר-מָכַרְתֶּם אֹתִי, מִצְרָיִמָּה גִשּׁוּ נָא אֵלָי: רָאִה אֹתָם נְסוּגִים לֹא-חֹרִיָּהֶם, אָמַר) (עֲכָשְׂיוּ אֲחֵי נְכַלְמִים, קִרְא לָהֶם בְּלִשׁוֹן רַכָּה וּתְחַנּוּנִים, וְהִרְאָה לָהֶם שֶׁהוּא מֵהוּל).

This seems to be a contradiction to an earlier incident in 41:55 (וַיִּצְעַק הָעָם אֵלָיו -) (פָּרְעָה לְלֶחֶם; וַיֹּאמֶר פָּרְעָה לְכָל-מִצְרָיִם לֵכּוּ אֶל-יוֹסֵף, אֲשֶׁר-יֹאמַר לָכֶם תַּעֲשׂוּ), where Paroh says whatever Yosef says, do. Rashi on this Posuk says that Yosef commanded the Egyptians to circumcise themselves (אֲשֶׁר יֹאמַר לָכֶם תַּעֲשׂוּ: לִפִּי שֶׁהִיָּה יוֹסֵף אוֹמֵר לָהֶם שִׁימוּלוּ, וְכִשְׁבָּאוּ אֶצֶל פָּרְעָה וְאוֹמְרִים כֵּךְ הוּא אוֹמֵר לָנוּ, אָמַר לָהֶם) לְמַה לֹּא צִבְרָתָם בָּרַ, וְהִלָּא הִכְרִיז לָכֶם שְׁשָׁנִי הָרַעַב בָּאִים, אָמְרוּ לוֹ אֲסַפְנוּ הָרַבָּה וְהִרְקִיבָהּ, אָמַר לָהֶם אִם כֵּן כָּל אֲשֶׁר (יֹאמַר לָכֶם תַּעֲשׂוּ, הִרִי גֹזֵר עַל הַתְּבוּאָה וְהִרְקִיבָהּ, מַה אִם יִגְזֹר עָלֵינוּ וְנָמוּת). So it comes out, that everyone in Mitzrayim had a Bris Milah. That was a requirement for the Egyptians to procure T'vuah for themselves. So how did the fact that Yosef showed that he had a Bris Milah, prove that he is who he claimed he was?

The Rama in Yorei Deiya says that it is Osur for a Yid to be Mal a Goy. So how could Yosef say that the Mitzrim should have a Bris Milah if it is not the Ratzon Hashem?

The Gemara in Maseches Yevamos says that a Bris Milah was Metzava to Avraham Avinu. The Priyah was first Metzava in the time of Yehoshua. So at this time, the only Mitzvah was Bris Milah, however, we find at the end of Parshas Lech Lecha, in 17:25, that Avraham Avinu did Priyah as it says in Rashi on the Posuk (לִפִּי שְׁלֹא הָיָה חֶסֶד) אֲלֵא חֲתוּךְ בָּשָׂר, שֶׁכֹּכֵר נִתְמַעֵךְ עַל יְדֵי תִשְׁמִישׁ, אֲבָל יִשְׁמַעְאֵל שֶׁהִיָּה יֶלֶד הַזֹּזֶק לְחֲתוּךְ עֶרְלָה וּלְפְרוּעַ הַמִּילָה, לִכְךָ נֹאמַר (בּוֹ אֵת). This explains why we make a Brocha on the Priyah, L'hachnisoi Bivrisoi Shel Avraham Avinu. The reason is, because Avraham Avinu did a Priyah, voluntarily. The Priyah actually prevents anything from growing back by folding back the skin of the cut of the Bris Milah.

If so, it could be that Yosef commanded the Mitzrim to perform Bris Milah, without a Priyah. Why? The Miforshei Rashi say, the reason Yosef told them to do a Bris Milah, is so that when the Yidden come down to Mitzrayim, they wouldn't be ashamed to have a Bris Milah themselves. So the Mitzrim only did a Bris Milah without a Priyah, because there was no Chiyuv for Priyah until the times of Yehoshua. Yosef himself had a Bris Milah like Avraham Avinu, with a Priyah. That is how Yosef was able to prove to his brothers that he was who he said he was and it answers up the Stirah in Rashi.

This answers up the Rama as well, who said that we don't do a Bris on Goyim. The Taz in Reish Samach Gimel Seif Hei in Yorei Deiya says the reason is, because the Bris is an Ois between Klal Yisroel and the Ribboinoi Shel Oilam, so obviously, Goyim are excluded from this Bris. So it fits well, because, Yosef had the Mitzrim do a regular Bris, which does grow back. They didn't perform the Priyah, which would prevent the skin from growing back. This means that it wasn't an Ois. While in contrast, Yosef was able to show his brothers that he had a Bris with a Priyah which proved that he was part of Klal Yisroel.

In Parshas Shemos 1:11 (וַיִּשְׂמוּ עָלָיו עָרֵי מִסִּים, לְמַעַן עֲנֹתוֹ בְּסִבְלָתָם; וַיִּבְנוּ עָרֵי מִסְכָּנוֹת, לַפְּרֹעָה--אֶת-פֶּתֶחַם, וְאֶת-) (רעמסס), we find that part of the Avoidas Perech of Paroh is that the Yidden had to build Pisom and Ramseis that was built on quicksand, so it would always not last. In our Parshah, Yosef has his brother's settle in Goishen. After Sh'vii, in 47:11, it says (וַיָּשֶׁב יוֹסֵף, אֶת-אֶבְיוֹ וְאֶת-אֶחָיו, וַיִּתֵּן לָהֶם אֶרֶץ גּוֹשֵׁן) (רעמסס: מארץ גושן היא). Rashi says (בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם, בְּמִיטַב הָאָרֶץ בְּאֶרֶץ רַעְמָסֶס--כְּאֶשֶׁר, צִוָּה פְּרֹעָה). So here Ramseis is the best of the lands. In Shemos, Ramseis always sinks. So it is Tzarich Iyun Gadol?

Maybe we have to say that it was good grazing land, however, buildings sunk. In the Tzavo of Rav Yehuda Hachosid it says, that when Yidden are in Galus, they should not build big homes, and as a matter of fact it says, you should not even build brick homes. It very well may be, that homes that are considered best of the lands, are ones that are not permanent. Meaning, they are small and inexpensive. So maybe Eretz Goishen is the best of the lands because everything sunk and they wouldn't have a sense of permanence.

The Kli Chemda in Ois Gimmel on this weeks Parsha talks about the Yesoid that we can't make Cheshbainois not to do a Mitzvah if we are Michuyav to perform a Mitzvah. Before Matan Torah when Mitzvois were performed on a voluntary basis, Cheshbainois could be made.

The Gemarah that discusses this is in Maseches B'rachos, in the first Perek that discusses Chizkiyah Hamelech who didn't have children. The reason why he didn't want to have children is because he knew that his child (who turned out to be Menashe) was going to be a Rasha. The Navi Yeshaya tells him that Hashem's secrets are none of his business. So since there is a Mitzvah of P'ru U'rvu, you must try to be Mekayaim that Mitzvah without making Cheshbainois.

Yaakov Avinu married sisters because he knew B'nevua that the Shivtei Ka would come from them. The Chiluk is that Yaakov's Cheshbainois came prior to Matan Torah while Chizkiyah was after Matan Torah so no Cheshbainois were permitted at that point. This answers numerous other things, and we will touch on a few of them. One of the reasons that Yosef didn't inform Yaakov that he was alive, and waited until the whole charade played itself out, is because Yaakov was Maamin that the dreams had to be Mikuyam. Until the dreams were Mikuyim, if Yosef would have made it known that he was alive, it would have disturbed the sequence of events. This seems to contradict a Gemara in Maseches Sanhedrin that has a Klal that dreams have no impact on Halachah. This seems to contradict the behavior of Yosef, who at the very least was Oiver on Kibbud Av when his father was B'tzar over the supposed death of Yosef. It is a Davar Peleh, however, he did it with a Cheshbon. The answer is, that this was before Matan Torah.

Another question that gets answered is, when Avraham Avinu didn't let Yishmael inherit him, it was because he had a Cheshbon that Yishmael wouldn't have children who were Tzadikim as he saw B'ruach Hakoidesh. This Cheshbon again wouldn't have been allowed after Matan Torah.

Another question that gets answered is, we find in Shemos, when Amram divorces his wife Yocheved, and then Klal Yisroel followed his lead. If they both agreed not to have children, just don't have children. What did he think would help by giving a Get?

For those who were Mekayaim P'ru U'rvu, then this Cheshbon of just not having children would have been fine, as it was before Matan Torah. However, those who didn't have both a son and a daughter, would not have been allowed to just decide not to have children. Therefore, Amram, knowing that Klal Yisrael would copy him, divorced his wife as then she can go get married to someone else who was not Mekayaim P'ru U'rvu yet and have additional children.

Another question that gets answered is how was Yocheved born at the gates of Mitzrayim if it was Shnas Harov (times of famine)? The answer is, that Yocheved's father did not have a daughter at this time yet, so he couldn't make a Cheshbon not to have children as he was Metzuvah in the Mitzvah of P'ru U'rvu.