

דף החסידי

THE CHASSIDISHE DAF

A COLLECTION OF
THOUGHTS, EXCERPTS AND IDEAS
THROUGH THE LENS OF THE REBBE'S TEACHINGS
ON SHAS - THE TALMUD
ON THE TRACTATES
BROCHOS, SHABBOS, ERUVIN & PESACHIM



תשורה • MEMENTO
COMMEMORATING
THE BAR MITZVAH OF
SHI'Y MORDECHAI ELIMELECH
TENNENHAUS

28 ADAR 5781

IN HONOR OF THE BAR MITZVAH OF

Mordechai Elimelech ז"ש

AND HIS PARENTS

Rabbi Mendy & Endi Tennenhaus שיחין

HIS SIBLINGS

Chayale, Dovid, Yisroel, Sarah, Chana & Shneur
שיחין

HIS GRANDPARENTS

Rabbi Raphael & Goldie Tennenhaus שיחין
Rabbi Moshe & Bassie Spalter שיחין

HIS GREAT- GRANDPARENTS

Mrs Miriam Fellig שתל'יט"א
Rabbi Shmuel & Mirel Spalter שיחין
Rabbi Yosef & Tzuppy Goldberg שיחין

AND IN LOVING MEMORY OF

Reb Avrohom Dovid & Chana Tennenhaus ז"ר
Reb Yosef Mordechai Fellig ז"ר
Rabbi Yisroel Tennenhaus ז"ר
Mrs Chaya Aydel Lebovics ז"ר

Introduction

In honor of the Bar Mitzvah of our dear grandson, Mordechai Elimelech ש"י, Tennenhaus, it is my honor to present a Teshurah, a Memento, to mark this occasion, called THE CHASSIDISHE DAF - דף החסידות.

THE CHASSIDISHE DAF - דף החסידות, has become one part of my weekly Oneg Shabbat, that I send out each week to some 4,000 people.

Every week I select and translate (except on occasion where I choose something already in English on Chabad.org or from Sichos in English) one Torah from the Rebbe's vast teachings on the Shas, and it is my hope that this English translation will benefit people who are not familiar with the Rebbe's Talmudic teachings, as well as those who have studied the Rebbe's Sichos etc.

This Teshurah includes a sampling of insights, primarily from the Rebbe, on the Talmudic Tractates Berachos, Shabbos, Eruvin, and Pesachim.

The insights were collected from the hundreds of volumes of Torah teachings, from both the Rebbe's talks, edited and unedited, and letters.

The Rebbe's Torah and Talmudic knowledge is unparalleled. In the words of Rabbi Yisroel Yitzchok Piekarski ל"צ, one of the Rabbis from whom I received ordination, and the Rosh Yeshiva of the Central Lubavitcher Yeshiva:

“The Rebbe’s incredible genius spanned across every discipline. There is no area of the Talmud – Babylonian and Jerusalem – as well as the legal decisors, early and late commentaries etc. with which he was not intimately familiar ... even to differentiating between matters that seem identical, and connecting subjects that seemed entirely disparate and having no apparent link. This is the uniqueness of the Rebbe, the completeness of his study in every category of greatness...”

Rabbi Pinchas Hirschprung, the late Chief Rabbi of Montreal ה'צ, would tell the Yeshiva students after attending the Rebbe’s Farbrengen: “You really don’t appreciate the Rebbe’s Farbrengen like I do. Every sentence the Rebbe says, is a Chazal, is a saying from our sages, whether from the Talmud, the Midrash , the Zohar etc etc.”

The Rebbe’s encyclopedic knowledge of the Talmud was paralleled by the depth in which he understood and explored each subject. To that effect, the Rebbe often quoted and analyzed the profound and deep Talmudic insights of the Rogatchover Gaon, considered off limits even to elite Torah scholars due to its complexity, novelty, and need for a sea of prior knowledge. After the Rebbe’s explanations of the Gaon’s teachings, breaking it down to basics and building it up again, it was made available that even a person without prior knowledge could appreciate it in simplicity and applicability.

The Rebbe viewed the Talmud through a lens that included the entire ס"תנ, the PaRDaS of Peshat, Remez, Drush and Sod, the four primary levels of

Torah interpretations, and how they are all intertwined, and how even an obscure subject that is mentioned in the Talmud is pertinent to our daily Avodas Hashem on a practical level, and how even a Minhag is of supreme spiritual importance.

All of this "lens on the Talmud" was enhanced by the teachings of Chabad Chassidus, which incorporates the four levels of PaRDaS-interacts with all four levels of PaRDaS, and is the quintessential essence of Torah teachings, understanding and scholarship.

The Bar Mitzvah boy Eli has the merit that his four great grandfathers, both my father Reb Avrohom Dovid Tennenhaus ל"ז and my father in law Reb Yoseph Mordechai Fellig ל"ז immensely and diligently enjoyed studying Talmud daily, as do (may they live until 180 long and healthy years) Rabbi Shmuel Spalter שליט"א and Rabbi Yosef Goldberg, שליט"א.

It is my hope that THE CHASSIDISHE DAF - the דף החיים will be an added step in the spreading of the wellsprings חכמה, to the largest and widest possible audience, and that Eli grows up to be a true נ"י, a Chossid, a Yirei Shomayim and a Lamdan, giving his parents, grandparents and great grandparents, much Yiddishe and Chassidishe Nachas.

I extend a great amount of thanks to everyone who helped prepare THE CHASSIDISHE DAF, including Rabbi Eli Phillips, Rabbi Eli Schochet, Mrs Chana Eliyahu and my Rebbetzin, Mrs Goldie Tennenhaus.

A special thank you to Rabbi Shmuly Tennenhaus and Rabbi Eli Phillips, who teach the Daf Yomi every day, at 6:00am Monday through Friday, Motzoei Shabbos, at 9:15pm in the summer, 8:15 pm in the winter, and at 7:15am on Sundays.

To receive the weekly Oneg Shabbat that includes THE CHASSIDISHE DAF, and for information on all our Zoom classes, including the Daf Yomi, or for any questions please email the office at chabadsboffice@gmail.com.

May everyone have a שָׁרֵךְ פֶּסַח a Kosher and Happy Pesach and may we celebrate Pesach this year in Yerushalayim with Moshiach, NOW!

Rabbi Raphael Tennenhaus
Hallandale Beach, Florida
28 Adar, 5781

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Berachot 2a

מִאֵתֶתֶן קֹרֵין אֶת שְׁמָעַ בְּעַרְבֵּין
From when does one recite the Shema of the evening?

In regards to the first Mishnah in Berachot, which begins with the evening Shema, the Gemara discusses why the evening Shema is mentioned before the morning Shema.

The Gemara answers that the Pasuk regarding reading Shema says: *וּבשְׁכָב וּבְקֻומָךְ - when you lie down and when you rise* (Devarim 6:7) - therefore since the Pasuk speaks first about the time you lie down (evening) and then the time you rise (morning) - that's why the Mishnah starts with the evening Shema;

The Gemara then says another explanation: *לִפְנֵי מִבְרַיתָנוּ שֶׁל עָלָם, דְּכַתִּיב וַיְהִי עָרֵב וַיְהִי בְּקָר וּמָאֻחָד. That we learn from the order of creation: First there was evening then there was morning.*

The term "we learn from the order of creation" brings to mind the famous argument whether darkness is the absence of light, or if darkness is a creation unto itself.

This subject is discussed by many authorities, including the Vilna Gaon in *Idras Eliyahu* - in the beginning of Bereishith, who

says that darkness is a creation unto itself. In the Sefer גליות הש"ו from R' Yosef Engel, many references are made from both sides of the spectrum, from those who hold that darkness is merely a removal of light, to those who hold darkness is a creation unto itself.

Chassidus and the Rebbe clearly explain that darkness is a creation itself, and it is plainly written in the verse in Isaiah 45:7- יוצר אור ובורא - חושך - He formed light and CREATED darkness, which is part of our daily prayers.

The Rebbe actually clarifies that both are true: darkness is a negation of light and it is also a creation unto itself.

See שער אמונה of the Rebbe page 187 for further details.

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Berachot 10a

הנִּזְבֵּן חַמְשָׁה "בָּרָכִי נֶפֶשִׁי" כְּנַגְדֵּן מֵאַמְרָן ذָהָד? לֹא אָמְרָן אֲלָא
כְּנַגְדֵּן הַקָּדוֹשׁ בָּרוּךְ הוּא וְכְנַגְדֵּן נְשָׂמָה.

Corresponding to whom did David say these five instance of “Bless the Lord, O my soul”? He answered him: **He said them about none other than the Holy One, Blessed be He, and corresponding to the soul**, as the verse refers to the relationship between man’s soul and God. The five instances of “Bless the Lord, O my soul” correspond to the five parallels between the soul in man’s body and God’s power in His world.

The 5 times that בָּרָכִי נֶפֶשִׁי was said by King David are connected to the five parts of the soul - נֶפֶשׁ Nefesh, Ruach, Neshama, Chaya and Yechida.

The Arizal makes reference to this (the five levels of the soul נֶפֶשׁ Nefesh) alluded to in Berachot 10a) in Eitz Chaim, and the Pnei Yehoshua elaborates at length (on Berachot 10a) based on his knowledge of Kabbalah, and his understanding of the five parts of the soul.

The Pnei Yehoshua understood that while every person has Nefesh, Ruach and Neshama, only Tzaddikim have Chaya. The Complete Tzaddikim after they pass away have Yechida, with the exception of Moshe Rabbeinu who had Yechida during his lifetime.

How fortunate are we who study Chassidus, and we know how every person has all five levels of the soul at all times, and how these five levels are utilized in one's service to HaShem.

Haaros HaShluchim of Florida 10 Shvat 5780, commemorating 70 years of the Rebbe's leadership. See also chabad.org "Levels of Soul Consciousness" for a more in depth explanation of the souls levels.

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Berachot 22a

דתניא: "וְהִזְעַפְתֶם לְבָנֶיךָ וּלְבָנֵי בָנֶיךָ", וכתיב בתריה "יום אשר עמדת לפני ה' אלקיך בחורבך", מה להן באימה וביראה
ובברתת ובציע, אף כאן באימה וביראה וברתת ובציע.

As it was taught in a baraita: It is written: "And you shall impart them to your children and your children's children" (Deuteronomy 4:9), and it is written thereafter: "The day that you stood before the Lord your God at Horeb" (Deuteronomy 4:10). Just as below (latter posuk), the Revelation at Sinai was in reverence, fear, quaking, and trembling, so too here, in every generation, Torah must be studied with a sense of reverence, fear, quaking, and trembling.

In a letter from the Rebbe in Iyar 5711 (1951) the Rebbe quotes the Arizal (from Likutei Shas of the Arizal on Moed Katan) that reverence - is in the brain, fear - is in the heart, quaking - is in the inner limbs, trembling - is in the external limbs.

The Rebbe asks: At Mattan Torah, we saw the thunder and the lightning etc, face to face HaShem spoke to us etc, so how can we have the same fear etc all the time?

Says the Rebbe: When a person recognizes that the Torah that he learns is the drawing down of Supernal Wisdom where over there dwells and is revealed the infinite light of HaShem, that is beyond the orderly descent (connected to creation) and in front of

HaShem, darkness is like light, up and down, spiritual and physical are equal, then we can live up to this passage of the Talmud with the proper reverence when studying Torah (and the Rebbe refers to Torah Ohr in VaYeitzei).

See Shaarei HaMoadim of Shavuos pg 169 onward.

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Berachot 26b

רבי יהושע בן לוי אמר: תפנות כנגד תפניהם
Rabbi Yehoshua Ben Levi says that the prayers were instituted based on the daily offerings sacrificed in the Holy Temple, and the prayers parallel the offerings, in terms of both time and characteristics.

The Alter Rebbe explains in the Tanya (chapter 34), that in the case of sacrifices, all living creatures were elevated to G-d through the offering of one animal, all plants through the “meal offering” which consisted of merely “one tenth of fine meal mixed with oil” and so on.

Similarly, all of one’s earnings are elevated when one gives one fifth to charity.

See the earlier quote in this chapter of Tanya, (from Sukkah 49b) - In a well-known statement, our Sages have declared that the Mitzvah of Charity is equivalent to offering all the sacrifices.

Tanya Chapter 34

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Berachot 30b

אין עומדים להתפלל אלא מתוך כובד ראש
One may only stand and begin to pray from an approach of gravity and submission.

The Rebbe offers a fascinating analysis on the argument of the Amoroim from which verse the teaching - אין עומדים להתפלל אלא מתוך כובד ראש one may only stand and pray from an approach of submission and gravity, is derived from the Mishnah.

There are three opinions. The Rebbe breaks this down to three levels of submission and awe, using terminology of the Rogatchover Gaon.

The Rebbe explains the difference between the Babylonian Talmud and the Jerusalem Talmud on this matter, in addition to an insight from the Yalkut Shimoni.

Later on, the Rebbe explains the teaching of the Magid of Mezritch on this subject.

see Likutei Sichos volume 34, pg 67-74

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Berachot 35a

אמר ר' יהודה אמר שמואל: כל הננה מן הולם זהה שלא ברכה כאילו נרינה מקדשי שמיים, שנאמר: "לה הארץ ומלאה "

Rav Yehuda said that Shmuel said: One who derives benefit from this world without a blessing, it is as if he enjoyed objects consecrated to the heavens, as it is stated: "The earth and all it contains is the Lord's, the world and all those who live in it" (Psalms 24:1).

Then on 35b: Rabbi Chaninah bar Papah says: One who derives benefit from this world without a blessing it is as if he stole from G-d and the community of Israel etc.

There is a very scholarly Sicha from the Rebbe that includes deep analysis of the Talmud and the Rambam, practical Halacha, and Chassidic insights all woven together. The Sicha begins with the Radbaz on the Rambam in the end of the Laws of Sanhedrin chapter 18, that makes a distinction between the soul (and body) of man, that is not his possession, vis a vis the money of man that is his possession. (Even though one's money is ultimately also really G-d's money as well).

This concept is connected to a blessing a person must make when he derives benefit from this world (Berachot 35a-b, above).

One is obligated to make a blessing on something that his body benefits from (eating, drinking etc).

When a person benefits from receiving money, he is not obligated to make a blessing. (See footnotes 25 and 26 in this Sichah).

The Rebbe shows a significant distinction between the benefit to the body vs the benefit of receiving money, and connects this to Sanhedrin 2b-3a, that by Torah law, both monetary law and capital law require inquiry and interrogation... but the Sages in monetary law did not require inquiry and interrogation so as not to lock the door in the face of potential borrowers.

The Sichah continues with the story of the Chassid of the Alter Rebbe, Reb Binyomin Kletzker, who had a lumber business, that after going through his inventory and sales etc reached the sum total of... אין עוד מלבדו...that ultimately, there is nothing besides HaShem and that is the true and real result of his business.

Likutei Sichos Vol 34 pg 106-113

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Berachot 48a

אבי ורבא הו יתבי קמיה דרבא. אמר להו רבבה: למי מברכין? אמר ר' ליה: לרוחמן. ור' חמא היכא יתבי? — רבא אחוי לשמי טללא. אבי נפק לבבא, אחוי קלפי שמי. אמר להו רבבה: תרוייכו רבנן חייתנו. הימנו דאמר איינשין: בוצין מקטפיה!^{דיע}.

The Gemara relates that **Abaye and Rava**, when they were children, **were seated before Rabba**. **Rabba said to them:** To whom does one recite blessings? They said to him: To God, the All-Merciful. Rabba asked them: And where does the All-Merciful reside? Rava pointed to the ceiling. Abaye went outside and pointed toward the heaven. Rabba said to them: You will both become Sages. It is as the popular saying goes: A cucumber can be recognized from its blossoming stage. Similarly, a great person can be recognized even from a young age.

Rabbi Levi Yitzchok, the Rebbe's father, explains (haoros leshas Kidushin page 139) that according to Kabbalah and Chassidus, in addition to the terms Makif and Pnimiyyus, a light that is more internalized and one that is more hovering, there is also within Makif, the hovering light, Makif Hakorov and Makif HaRachok, a hovering light that is close and a hovering light that is distant.

Rava (for numerous reasons including the span of his lifetime) represented Makif Hakorov, the hovering light that is close, that's why he pointed to the ceiling.

Abaye (for numerous reasons including the span of his lifetime) represented Makif HaRachok, the hovering light that is distant, that's why he went outside and pointed to the heavens.

In a haarah written by R' Yisroel Tennenhaus z'l on 11 Nissan 5746, he notes how the Rebbe explains that the Baal Shem Tov relates to Atik, which is Makif HaRachok. This fits well with what the Baal Shem Tov said (as recorded by the Previous Rebbe), when asked where he has the power for such wondrous miracles, that it is "from the power of Abaye, which is an acronym for Im Briyah Yivra Hashem, referring to incredible miracles which override nature."

Toras Levi Yitzchok Vol. 1 p 137 and further

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Berachot 51a-b

בֵּית שְׁמַאי אָמַרִים: "שְׁבָרָא מֵאוֹר הָאֵשׁ", וּבֵית הֶלְלָא אָמַרִים:
"בָּורָא מֵאוֹר הָאֵשׁ".

With regards to the blessing over the Havdalah candle, **Beit Shammai says: Who created (Bara) the light of fire. And Beit Hillel say: Who creates (Boreh) the lights of fire.**

The Rebbe explains that Beit Shammai and Beit Hillel often argue (different subjects) based on the following: Does one first look at something in general, or does one first look at something in its details?

Beit Shammai says the light of the fire- singular- because throughout Shas, (and the Rebbe gives examples of all six orders of the Mishnah), his rule is to look at the general picture. And in general, one sees one light.

Beit Hillel holds (and the Rebbe gives examples from all six orders of the Mishnah) that when one looks at something, one immediately sees the details, and therefore he sees the various colors of the light.

Sicha of 20 Av 5731

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Shabbat 2a

הַעֲנִי עֹמֵד בְּחוֹזֶק, וַיָּבֹל הַבַּיִת בְּפָנָיו
The poor person **stands outside**, in the public domain, **and the homeowner stands inside**, in the private domain.

In a Siyum of Tractate Shabbos, the Rebbe brings the explanation of the Meiri (and others) on Shabbat 2a, why the terms עני and עשיר, the poor man and the rich man, are used in the first Mishnah when discussing the forbidden labor of carrying.

It is to emphasize that EVEN FOR A MITZVAH, such as Tzedakah, it is forbidden to violate the forbidden labor of **הוצאה** - carrying etc, and the rich man may not give the poor man Tzedakah (even permitted Tzedakah on Shabbos such as giving food etc to a poor man) by way of **הוצאה** - carrying etc, and transferring an object from a private domain to a public domain etc.

Likutei Sichos vol 14 pg 12 and onward

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Shabbat 6b

אבות מלאכות ארבעים חסר אחת

The primary categories of prohibited labor are forty-less-one

The Gemara quotes the famous Mishnah later in Shabbos - אבות מלאכות ארבעים חסר אחת that there are forty minus one (39) forbidden labors one Shabbos.

Many commentaries question the strange term "forty minus one", which is similar to the term for the 39 lashes required for numerous sins; there too, the term forty minus one is used.

The Tosefot Yom Tov gives three answers to this question. Many other answers are offered, by both traditional and Chassidic commentaries.

A few years ago, while learning our daily Shiur in the Chassidic Discourses of the Rebbe Rashab, the fifth Rebbe, Rabbi Sholom DovBer Schneersohn, we came across a fascinating answer.

The Rebbe explains as follows: The term forty minus one - literally means that there are forty labors on Shabbos. However, forty minus one means - 39 are forbidden labors - but one labor, the 40th, is permissible (and mandatory) on Shabbos.

Which labor? Studying Torah diligently! This insight from the Rebbe Rashab is priceless. Unlike all the other answers, which are indeed helpful and logical, this explanation takes forty minus one to a whole new level!

Forty indeed means there are forty labors on Shabbos. Minus one means, 39 are forbidden, while one, the 40th, is a labor we must do on Shabbos- to exert ourselves in Torah study!

Sefer HaMamorim 5679

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Shabbat 11a

אמר רבי יוחנן: לא שמו אלא כגון רבינו שמעון בן יוחאי וחכיריו שתורעתן ואומנותן. אבל כגון אנו, מפסיקין לקיירת שמען ולתפלה.

R' Yochanan said: They only said that they need not stop for prayer for the likes of R' Shimon Ben Yochai and his colleagues, whose Torah is their vocation, and they never interrupt their Torah study. However, for the likes of us, who also engage in other activities, we stop both for Shema and for prayer.

There is a well known dispute between the Babylonian and Jerusalem Talmud. Our Talmud above, says that for Shema, one does interrupt. The Jerusalem Talmud (Berachot 1:2; Shabbat 1:2), quotes Rabbi Shimon Bar Yochai who says we don't even interrupt for Shema.

The Rebbe explains an innovative approach that the Babylonian and Jerusalem Talmuds are in agreement. Both Torah and Krias Shema are parts of "studying". Being that studying Torah was more dear and common (todir) the entire day, as opposed to Shema, which is only done twice a day. Therefore, he would not interrupt studying Torah to say Shema.

Likutei Sichos Vol. 17, pg 357-358

Shabbat 21a

כדי שתתיהא שללהבת עולה מאיליך

The Temple Menorah must be lit to the point **that the flame goes up on its own**

Which literally refers to the flame in the Menorah of the Bais HaMikdash being lit in a manner that it goes up on its own, and doesn't require assistance from other avenues.

This Talmud is quoted in Rashi the beginning of Behaalochecha.

In Chassidus and in the Rebbe's talks, the concept of the flame going up on its own extends not only to the flame in the Mishkan, the Mikdash, and the Beis HaMidrash.

It also refers to the "flame" in the individual, even when he's not occupied at the time in Torah and Mitzvot, but in weekday and mundane matters, the flame that he ignited in his spiritual service to G-d must be constant, remaining with him all the time, as the flame goes up on its own in the literal Menorah of the Temple.

Additionally, the concept of the flame going up on its own, refers to how one succeeds in bringing the next person closer to HaShem.

When you bring someone closer to HaShem, it must be in a manner, that this individual is so inspired and uplifted in Torah and Mitzvot etc, that he or she does not need your constant influence and encouragement.

The individual you bring close to HaShem must attain the level of **כדי שתהא שלhabbat uvara mai'lia** that now the “newcomer” to Yiddishkeit is so strongly connected to HaShem, that his flame goes up on its own, without constant coaching and prodding by the one who inspired him.

Toras Menachem 5750 p 322-328

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Shabbat 30a

"ואדעת מה חידל אני" — אמר לו: בשבת תמותת. אמות באחד בשפט? אמר לו: כבר הגיעה מלכותו בנוך, ואין מלכות נוגעת בחברתך אפילו כולה נימא. אמות בערב שבת? אמר לו: "כִּי טוב יומם חציריך מאלף" — טוב ליום אחד שאתנו יושב וועסוק בתורה מאלף עולות שעמיד שלמה בנוך להקריב לפניו על גביה המזבח.

Let me know how short-lived I am" (Psalms 39:5)? It means that David said before the Holy One, Blessed be He: Master of the Universe, Lord, make me to know my end; in how long will I die? God said to him: **It is decreed before Me that I do not reveal the end of the life of flesh and blood.** He asked further: **And the measure of my days;** on **what day** of the year will I die? He said to him: **It is decreed before Me not to reveal the measure of a person's days.** Again he requested: **Let me know how short-lived I am;** on what day of the week will I die? **He said to him: You will die on Shabbat.** David requested of God: **Let me die on the first day of the week** so that the honor of Shabbat will not be tarnished by the pain of death. **He said to him:** On that day **the time of the kingdom of your son Solomon has already arrived, and one kingdom does not overlap with another** and subtract from the time allotted to another **even a hairbreadth.** He said to him: I will cede a day of my life and **die on Shabbat eve.** God said to him: **"For a day in your courts is better than a thousand"** (Psalms 84:11); a single day in which you sit and engage in Torah is preferable to Me than the thousand burnt-offerings that your son Solomon will offer before Me **on the altar** (see I Kings 3:4).

The Rebbe explains why King David passed away on Shabbos, even though he wanted to pass away on Friday, as the Talmud relates in Kesubot, that passing away on Friday is a good omen.

When Rabbi (Rabbi Yehudah HaNasi) became ill, Rav Chiyah visited him and found him crying, he told him, “Rebbi, why are you crying? Behold we have learnt, ‘If a person dies in the midst of laughter, it is a positive omen for him. If he dies amidst tears, it is a negative omen for him... If he dies on Friday, it is a positive omen for him If he dies from a stomach disorder, it is a positive omen for him, for most of the righteous die from stomach disorders.’ ” [Rebbi] replied: “I am crying for the sake of the Torah and its mitzvos.”

The question arises: Why did Rav Chiyah quote the entire teaching to him? Seemingly, if he wanted to inform Rebbi of the adverse effects of his tears, it would have been sufficient to mention that concept alone.

It can be explained that Rav Chiyah wanted to offset the negative influence of Rebbi’s crying, by mentioning the positive omens associated with his passing, that he died of a stomach disorder and that he died on Friday.

Nevertheless, additional explanation is necessary. Rabbi explained that he was crying “for the sake of the Torah and its mitzvos,” i.e., that after his death, he would no longer be able to continue their observance. If so, how can that difficulty be resolved because he died on a certain day of the week or for a certain reason.

The latter difficulty is reinforced by a Talmudic passage concerning King David’s death. It is explained that he desired to die on Friday, because he appreciated the positive dimension associated with dying on that day. G-d, however, refused, telling him that “One day when you sit occupied in Torah study is preferable to Me more than a thousand burnt offerings which your son Shlomo will offer before Me on the altar.” Thus we see that the observance of the Torah and its mitzvos outweighs the advantage of dying on Friday.

In resolution, it can be explained that there is a unique advantage to death on Friday which compensates for the negation of the observance of the Torah and its mitzvos. This can be explained by going to the very source of the issue, the events of the first Friday, the day when man was created. On that day, G-d caused Adam to sleep and removed from him a rib from which Chavah was created.

Our Sages describe sleep as “one sixtieth of death” and like death, it reflects a withdrawal of

life-energy from the body. Nevertheless, this sleep led to added life, the creation of Chavah and through her, to the revelation of the infinite potential within man which is reflected in the power of conception. Although man's life is limited, through conceiving children, an infinite dimension of life is expressed.

The Sages of the Kabbalah were known to reflect the above mentioned spiritual qualities in their conduct. For example, Rav Hillel of Paritch would lie down to sleep on Friday, because in the spiritual realms, it is a time of sleep above. During sleep, the soul "draws down energy from the source of life," and has the potential to express that life through rededicated efforts in Torah study in connection with the commencement of Shabbos.

Based on the above, we can understand the positive nature of dying — sleep in macrocosm — on Friday. Just as in regard to sleep, death's ultimate purpose is a renewal of life. There are two dimensions to this concept:

- a) In regard to Yaakov our Patriarch, our Sages state, "Yaakov did not die... just as his descendants are alive, he is alive." Similarly, after a person's death, the positive activities which his children perform (and "students are considered like children") show how his influence is still alive and present. Indeed, the

infinite dimensions of a person's life are revealed after his passing, for then it becomes obvious that his life is not confined merely to his physical person. b) The ultimate reflection of life which will come in the Era of the Redemption when the souls of the previous generations are resurrected.⁴

Thus, when a person dies on Friday, it is emphasized that his death is associated with the two dimensions of infinite life mentioned above. And this will outweigh, in a certain aspect the negative aspects associated with death, the negation of the observance of the Torah and its mitzvos. For the righteous will be resurrected before the Jewish people as a whole in the era when our people will still be obligated in the observance of the Torah and its mitzvos and will observe the mitzvos on the higher plane of spirituality that will characterize the Era of the Redemption.

Furthermore, the positive factor communicated by the Torah, "the Torah of kindness" and "the Torah of life," that there is a positive factor to dying on Friday which will be reflected in infinite life, can be understood in a non-literal sense, i.e., as involving our spiritual service (for there have been sufficient individuals who have fused the spiritual and the literal interpretations together). And this will lead to a fruitful and continued life from which we will

proceed, without interruption, to the unlimited life of the Era of the Resurrection.

(Afterwards, the Rebbe mentioned the passing of Rabbi Moshe Yitzchak Hecht, one of the shluchim of the Previous Rebbe and of the Rebbe, who died on the preceding Friday. The Rebbe explained the significance of his personal names and his family name.)

Sicha Parshas Vaeira 5752

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Shabbat 33b

כִּי תָקַף גְּזִירָתָא... אֶזְלָו טָשׁו בְּמַעֲרָתָא... אֵיתִיבּו תְּרִיסֶר שְׁנִי בְּמַעֲרָתָא. אַתָּא אֶלְيָהו וְקַم אֲפִיכְתָּחָא דְמַעֲרָתָא, אָמָר: מְאָן לֹדוּעָה לְבָר יוֹחָי דְמִית קִיפָר וּבְטִיל גְזִירָתָה.

When the decree intensified...They went and they hid in a cave.... They sat in the cave for twelve years. Elijah the Prophet came and stood at the entrance to the cave and said: Who will inform bar Yoḥai that the emperor died and his decree has been abrogated?

This unity within the Torah which Rabbi Shimon recognized enabled him to perceive the Divine unity within our material world, and moreover, to have this unity expressed in actual fact as well as in the abstract. He understood Torah study as all-encompassing, being able to influence and control every aspect of our lives.

Thus the *Zohar* relates that *Eretz Yisrael* once suffered a severe drought. When the Jews appealed to Rabbi Shimon for help, he expounded the verse, "How good and how pleasant it is for brothers to dwell together" — and it began to rain. In the same vein, the *Midrash* relates that one of Rabbi Shimon's students returned to *Eretz Yisrael* after acquiring wealth in foreign lands. Seeing that some of his other students grew envious, Rabbi Shimon led them to a valley and called out, "Valley, valley, fill up with gold coins," and it did. "Anyone who wants may take," declared

Rabbi Shimon, “but he should know that he is taking from his portion in the World to Come.” Rabbi Shimon was able to make the spiritual wealth of the World to Come manifest as material wealth in this world.

On Lag BaOmer, we seek to emulate this quality of Rabbi Shimon’s. On this day, it is customary for young *yeshivah* students to leave the halls of study and go out to the fields. The intent of this custom is obviously not to mark Rabbi Shimon’s *yahrzeit* by taking a vacation from the study of Torah, but rather, to bring the *yeshivah* out into the fields. Rabbi Shimon was able to unite the deepest mystical elements of the Torah with the natural elements of the world. In emulation of him, children extend the atmosphere of the *yeshivah* to encompass even the field, an area seemingly beyond the realm of Torah.

Rabbi Shimon taught that the underlying unity of Torah and worldliness should be expressed every day, not only once a year. In light of this, we can understand a classic Talmudic debate on the verse, “This Torah scroll shall not depart from your mouth.”

Rabbi Yishmael maintains that the verse cannot be taken literally; rather, as much time as possible should be devoted to Torah study, but part of one’s time should be devoted to earning a livelihood. Rabbi Shimon, however,

argues that the verse should be taken at face value. A person should devote all of his time and effort to Torah study, leaving it to G-d to ensure that his material needs will be met.

Rabbi Shimon was true to his own teachings. The *Talmud* says of him, *Toraso umanuso* — “*His profession was Torah.*” He devoted himself solely to Torah study, remaining completely uninvolved in worldly concerns.

Is Rabbi Shimon’s view relevant to us? Summing up the debate, the *Talmud* notes: “Many followed the opinion of Rabbi Yishmael and were successful; others followed the opinion of Rabbi Shimon and were not successful.” Although Rabbi Shimon himself was able to function at this exalted level, it appears to be beyond the grasp of most people. In fact, our Rabbis state that the concept of *Toraso umanuso* as exemplified by Rabbi Shimon no longer exists.

How, then, are we to understand his teaching? Our Sages note that the Torah was given only to those — i.e., the Jews in the wilderness — who ate manna. This statement is not intended to limit the number of people who have access to Torah study; it aims, instead, to teach us how we should approach it. While our ancestors received their food from heaven, they did not have to worry about earning a living. With all their needs miraculously

provided for, they were able to concentrate their energies on spiritual growth alone. We, by contrast, do not enjoy overt miracles, and must therefore spend a certain amount of time involved with worldly concerns. Nonetheless, during the time we study Torah, all of our cares and worries, all our concern for material affairs, should be set aside. In this manner, during the time we have designated for Torah study, we can approach the level of “those who ate manna,” and emulate Rabbi Shimon’s state of *Toraso umanuso*.

The Alter Rebbe explains that fulfilling a *mitzvah* establishes an eternal union with Hashem. Thus, studying Torah even briefly with undivided attentiveness affirms us in a timeless bond with G-d at the level of Rabbi Shimon Bar Yochai. Even after such study is completed, this inner connection is maintained.

In the Era of the Redemption, the fusion between the material and the spiritual exemplified by Rabbi Shimon will be reflected throughout the world. May this take place speedily in our days.

Likutei Sichos Vol 3 Lag B’Omer p 1002 - 1007

Shabbat 40b

אמר רבי זירא: אנה ח'זיתיה לרבי אבבהו דשט באמבעט', ולא ידענא اي עקר אי לא עקר. פשייטא דלא עקר, דעתנא: לא ישוט אדם בבריכה מלאה מים, ואפילו עומדת בחצר! לא קשייא, לא דלית ליה גידוזי, הא דעת ליה גידוזי.

Rabbi Zeira said: I saw Rabbi Abbahu floating in a bath on Shabbat, and I do not know if he lifted his feet and was actually swimming in the water, or if he did not lift his feet. The Gemara questions Rabbi Zeira's uncertainty. It is obvious that he did not lift his feet, as it was taught in a *baraita*: A person may not float in a pool full of water on Shabbat, and even if the pool was in a courtyard, where there is no room for concern lest he violate a prohibition. This is not difficult; this *baraita* is referring to a place that does not have embankments surrounding it. Since there are no partitions, it appears like an ocean or a river. That incident involving Rabbi Abbahu occurred in a place that has embankments and looks like a vessel. Therefore, the Sages did not prohibit it.

Seemingly, modern day pools are more similar to a bath, in that they have an embankment around it, as opposed to an ocean or river. However, there are a number of other issues which one must take into account before using a swimming pool on Shabbos.

Among them are sechita, squeezing water out of a bathing suit, and carrying water on one's body from one domain to another. Additionally, the accepted custom is to refrain from washing

even with cold water on Shabbos, which would negate the option of using the pool as well.

If there is a mitzvah involved, for example a man using the pool as a mikvah, that would be allowed, as well as in a situation in which one is medically required to use the pool every day. Care should be taken for the above - mentioned issues.

Shulchan Aruch HaRav Orach Chaim 339:1

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Shabbat 49b

הא דתנו אבות מלאכות ארבעים חסר אחת
That which we learned in the mishna: **The primary categories of labor**, which are prohibited by Torah law on Shabbat, **are forty-less-one**

In an earlier Chassidishe Daf, I mentioned how in Chassidus it explains (beyond the many traditional explanations) that the strange term “forty less one” - actually means that there ARE forty labors on Shabbos: 39 are forbidden labors. One is the permissible labor of studying Torah with diligence on Shabbos.

This profound insight is elaborated by the Rebbe Rashab in פ"ר המאמרים עטרת.

The Rebbe Rashab expounds on this concept by first quoting the Midrash Rabah that says כי שבת מכל מלאכתו בז, that on this day HaShem rested from all His work, meaning the work of His world, but did not rest from the work of the Tzaddikim.

Sefer Maamarim 5679 p 44

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Shabbat 50b

תניא: רוחץ אדם פניו ידיו ורגליו בכל יום בשכילת קונו, משות שפואמה: "כל פעול ה' לפערתו".

It was taught in a baraita: A person must wash his face, his hands, and his feet every day for the sake of his Maker, as it is stated: "The Lord has made everything for His own purpose" (Proverbs 16:4). Every beautiful thing that exists in the world sings the praise of God Who created beautiful things. Therefore, it is appropriate for one to beautify himself in praise of God.

The Rambam's position is (laws of prayer 4:3), that before Shachris one washes one's face, hands and feet, as the Kohen who sanctifies his hands and feet before the Avodah - service in the Temple, (responsa (ושב הכהן ס"א טאו"ח א"ז סקצ"א)); The Raavad questions the washing of the feet (see the Migdal Oz and the Tosafot who discuss the Raavad).

The Migdal Oz quotes the Rashba (responsa טאו"ח ח"א סקצ"א) as to why there's a difference in the Rambam between washing before Shachris and the other prayers.

And there's the position of the Alter Rebbe in his Shulchan Aruch (או"ח מהד"ק ט"ו סקצ"א); also connected to the reason of the Rashba, where he only mentions the washing of the hands; The Alter Rebbe specifies that this obligatory washing applies even if he doesn't want to

Daaven until after a few hours, hence it's an introduction to his all day service to HaShem.

For this reason, the Alter Rebbe brings this law in the laws of washing hands, unlike the Rambam who brings this law in the laws of prayer. The Rambam also includes the washing of the feet, which from the responsa of שב הכהן this is rooted in the sanctification of the feet of the Kohen.

The Alter Rebbe only brings the obligation of washing one's hands, even though he brings the reason that it's connected to the sanctification (of the hands and feet) of the Kohen.

The Sicha defines and expounds upon two גדרים - categories- of the washing of the Kohanim - קדושה וטהרה - holiness and purity.

The Sicha has 63 footnotes etc, filled with many Rishonim and Achronim, and brings clarity to Shabbat 50b, and the position of the Rambam, the Raavad, the Rashba, the Alter Rebbe, and many others, on many levels.

Likutei Sichos volume 31, pgs 184-190

Shabbat 55a

דאמר רבי חיינא: חותמו של הקדוש ברוך הוא "אמת"
For Rabbi Chanina said the seal of The Holy
One Blessed Be He, is "truth".

The seal (signature) of HaShem is Emes - truth - (it begins with an א Aleph, the middle letter is a מ- Mem, and ends with a ת -Tav).

Much is written in Chassidus about this, including the teaching from Reb Bunim of Peshischa - that the final letters of the first three words of the Torah: ברא אלקים in - ברא and א' מ' the beginning G-d created - are and. Which makes up the letters of the word אמת - truth. An author often puts his seal and sum total of his works in his introduction etc.

Hashem in the opening statement of His written word (G-D used the Torah as a blueprint to create the world, and when man looks into the Torah he sustains the world *B'R, and Zohar*) the Torah, starts with Emes - truth - because that is His seal.

There is an additional explanation on how אמת, made up of the first, middle and final letter of the Alef Bet, represents a Divine service that is through and through, without changes, because Emes - truth - is unchangeable.

Likutei Sichos Vol 31 p 26, Hiskashrus #1189

Shabbat 66b

מאי קשרים? אמר אדאMari אמר רב נחמן בר ברוך אמר רב אשי בר אבין אמר רב יהודה: קשורי פואה.

What are these knots? Adda Mari said that Rav Nahman bar Barukh said that Rav Ashi bar Avin said that Rav Yehuda said: They are garlands of the madder plant that are tied for their medicinal qualities.

In Shabbat 66b through 67a-b, there are several medical treatments for various maladies, along with various incantations to remove different illnesses. The Gemara begins the discussion of these remedies in connection to Shabbos if the remedies are an issue to wear when walking outside (without an eruv) on Shabbos and their halachik status, and from there launched into a discussion of the various remedies that existed.

Much is discussed in Halacha (Jewish law) in regards to how these cures and treatments etc, and those mentioned by the Rambam (Maimonides), both here in Shabbat 67a-b, and all over the Talmud, and in Maimonides, הלכה למשנה רשות פ"ז (Deut. 22:8) is often not practical nor Halachically applicable nowadays. The subject matter and sources are vast.

The Rebbe elaborates how even if practically and in Halacha, these medicines and cures are generally not used today, nevertheless, everything in Torah is true as discussed earlier,

including these teachings. Hence even if in practical Halacha they may not apply today, on a spiritual level all of these teachings are applicable, as the Torah is - eternal. The נצחות - the medical cures found in the Shas (the Talmud) and in the Rambam (Hilchos Deios chapter 4) are eternal, and have a place spiritually even in our times.

Sources on the Halachic reality today on these matters is brought in the Sicha, footnote 30, from:

רמ"א אה"ע סקנ"ז ס"ד. מג"א או"ח סקע"ג סק"א.
ובכ"מ. וראה שד"ח כרך א, ר", א ואילך. כרך י"ד ע' [ב'
ר"י, א] קצ"ז

The Sicha has 85 footnotes with scores of Rishonim, Achronim, Poskim, Kabbalistic teachings and Chassidic teachings referenced (and discussed) on this subject.

Likutei Sichos vol. 23, pgs 33-41. See also Letter from 11 Tishrei, 5712, published online on chabad.org

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Shabbat 68a-b

מתניתין בתינוק שנשבה לבין הגויים

Our Mishna is speaking about a child who was taken captive by gentiles.

The Mishna discusses a case of a Jew who forgot the essence of Shabbos, the Gemara questions how this is possible for a Jew to forget the essence of Shabbat, and brings an answer that this can be in the case of a Jewish child who was taken captive, and due to circumstances beyond his control forgot.

Below is a link to a fascinating chapter from a book from my colleague Rabbi Nissan Dovid Dubov, with the Halachic and contemporary definition of this Talmudic description - and how it applies to a vast part of the Jewish community nowadays. Included are letters and teachings from our Rebbe and the Previous Rebbe on this subject.

Chapter 9: Our Generation: The Tinok SheNishbah - Sichos in English

<https://www.sie.org/article.asp?aid=2312348>

The following is one of the letters quoted in this work from the Previous Rebbe Yosef Yitzchok Schneersohn:

In our generation there are, thank G-d, hardly any heretics or apikorsim at all, because the terms “min” or “apikores” apply to those who

deny Torah and Mitzvos as a result of heretical theology; this was the case when there were baalei seichel (accomplished intellectuals) who were involved in intellectual investigation, but nowadays — even those people who are completely irreligious — the majority of them are very distant from true intellectual investigation and they just follow the opinions of those who deny the truth. The real reason that they do not keep the Mitzvos is, by and large, because it is easier that way. It is not done, however, with the intention to rebel, G-d forbid.

Even when transgressing negative commandments, it is not lehachis, i.e., to arouse anger, but rather to fulfill their desires.

Therefore, even though they may compare in their actions to those whom the Alter Rebbe wrote in Tanya that it is a Mitzvah to hate, i.e., to the apikorsim, in reality, looking at their true status, one should consider them in the category of those whom the Alter Rebbe says that a love/hate relationship must prevail ... and therefore, in truth, they should without too much difficulty be able to return to HaShem.

This has actually been demonstrated in that, thank G-d, many (and many more) have done teshuvah, and in particular those who were conceived and born into homes that are very remote from Judaism. They were educated

without any Yiddishkeit and naturally followed the ways of those who removed the yoke of Torah and Mitzvos [from themselves], but now have come under the influence of Orthodox Jews and have been influenced.

In particular, if they were aroused in the correct manner, they have accepted it with all their hearts — and I know of such people. And since every Jew is very precious, even where there exists a doubt, one must exert all efforts to draw them near.... Even in this matter one must, however, conduct oneself according to the Torah and not to one's own intellect. One should draw the other nearer to oneself and not let oneself be drawn to the other.... Many make a mistake in this matter with bad results, and it must be stressed that all efforts in the area of kiruv must be only in the ways of the Torah.

Igros Kodesh of the Previous Rebbe, Vol 2 p 526

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Shabbat 86b

אָדָכוּלְמָא, בְּשַׁבָּת וַיִּתְגֹּנֵה תֹּרֶה לִיְשָׁרָאֵל
All agree that the Torah was given on Shabbos

The Talmud in Keritot 9a states, that our forefathers entered the covenant of circumcision, immersion and the sprinkling of the blood on the Altar according to Reb Yosi ben Reb Yehudah, (Mechilta Yisro, 19:10), on “that day of Matan Torah all the Maasim - actions of conversion - took place.”

The Rebbe questions: How were the Jewish people permitted to immerse on the 6th of Sivan for the sake of conversion (which was Shabbos as mentioned above from Shabbos 86b), - for one does not immerse a convert on Shabbos?

The Sicha includes a שְׂקוּעַ, a back and forth series of questions and answers in the גָּדר - the category (guidelines) of the acceptance of Mitzvot by a convert, and when exactly this took place in the conversion of the Jewish people at Matan Torah, and how it was permissible.

Likutei Sichos Vol 33, pgs 26-33

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Shabbat 97a

אָמַר לוֹ: הֵן מְאמִינִים בָּנֵי מְאמִינִים
He (Hashem) **said to him** (Moshe) **They** (the Jews) **are believers the children of believers.**

Indeed, we find this explicitly stated in the Torah in connection with the spies sent by Moses to scout out the Holy Land. At the outset, they declared: “For he (the enemy) is stronger than we”, and, interpreting the word **תְּהִלֵּת**, the Sages say: “Read not ‘than we,’ [but ‘than He,’]” meaning that they had no faith in G-d’s ability to lead them into the Holy Land. But afterward, they reversed themselves and announced: “We will readily go up [to conquer the Land].”

Whence did their faith in G-d’s ability return to them? Our teacher Moses, peace unto him, had not shown them in the interim any sign or miracle concerning this, which would restore their faith. He had merely told them that G-d was angry with them and had sworn not to allow them to enter the Land

What value did this Divine anger and oath have to them if in any case they did not believe in G-d’s ability to subdue the thirty-one kings who reigned in the Land at that time, for which reason they had had no desire whatsoever to enter the Land?

Surely, then, the explanation is as follows: Israelites themselves are “believers, [being] the descendants of believers.” Even while they stated, “The enemy is stronger than He,” their divine soul still believed in G-d. They professed a lack of faith in His ability only because the *sitra achara* clothed in their body in the person of their animal soul had risen against the light of the holiness of the divine soul, with its characteristic impudent arrogance and haughtiness, without sense or reason.

Therefore, as soon as G-d became angry with them and thundered angrily: “How long shall I bear with this evil congregation...your carcasses shall fall in this wilderness...I, G-d, have spoken: I will surely do it unto all this evil congregation...,” — their heart was humbled and broken within them, as it is written, “And the people mourned greatly”... But the Israelites themselves i.e., as far as their divine soul was concerned had believed in G-d all along.

Tanya end Chapter 29

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Shabbat 101b

אמר ליה ר' ספרא: משה, שפיר קאמרת?
Rav Safra said to him: You (Rava), who are as great in this generation as Moses, did you speak well?

We see from here that an Amorah of the Talmud was called “Moshe”, even though his name was not Moshe. In general, no one can be compared to Moshe. But in a particular aspect and detail of Torah, one CAN be compared to Moshe.

This is also connected to the teaching that a part of Moshe is in every Jew. It’s a part of Moshe Rabbeinu that is in every Jew, but not the entire Moshe.

Sicha Parshas Vaeira, 5731. See also Tetzaveh 5735 end of section 2, Vayikra 5736 section 1, and Vov Tishrei, 5745 section 37.

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Shabbat 105b

המקרע בגדיו בחמתו, והמשבר כליו בחמתו, והמפזר מעוטיו בחמתו, יהא בעיניך כעובד עבודה זרה

One who rends his garments in his anger, or who breaks his vessels in his anger, or who scatters his money in his anger, should be like an idol worshipper in your eyes

- כל הכוועו כאילו עובד עבודה זרה “whoever is angry is as if he serves an idol” - is referenced to Shabbat 105b - albeit the terminology is a slightly different than the exact expression above.

The Rambam brings this exact expression above in Hilchos Deios (see below the sources) as does the Zohar in numerous places (see below). Chapter 25 in Tanya, Igeres HaKodesh, elaborates on this subject as does the Rebbe in many letters and talks.

How to Deal with Anger - The Rebbe's Advice By Mendy Kaminker

Rabbi Eliezer says: "...Do not be easy to anger." (Avot 2:10) Anger is one of the traits most condemned in Jewish literature. "Someone who gets angry," we are told, "is like one who worships idols." Anger can cause a sage to lose his wisdom, or a person who is destined for greatness to forfeit it.

It's not hard to see why. When we get angry, we tend to act irrationally. Things said or done in anger are almost always destructive and cause for later regret.

Everyone gets angry occasionally, but some people are more prone to anger than others. They may have a "short fuse" and blow up over small things, or they may be chronically irritable. However it is manifested, anger that is not dealt with in a healthy way is dangerous for the angry person and for those close to him or her. Dealing with anger is a lifelong challenge, but the results are unquestionably worth it. A person who learns to control, or at least reduce, his anger will be surprised by how greatly his life and relationships improve—at home and at work.

In the letters of the Lubavitcher Rebbe, Rabbi Menachem Mendel Schneerson, of righteous memory, there are several pieces of advice about dealing with anger. The Rebbe's guidance ranges from simple, practical suggestions to more advanced meditations that address the root causes of our anger. Below is a loose adaptation of some of these, to study and hopefully put into practice.

A Simple Recommendation: Wait!

The Rebbe writes: Regarding what you wrote about the traits of anger and pride: As with

anything else, the way to correct these is step by step. The first step is to wait. Don't express your anger or pride verbally. In this way, those emotions will not gain momentum, as can be seen in practice... If you feel yourself getting angry, stop, take a deep breath and wait a minute before you react. The anger may dissipate when the heat of the moment has passed.

Someone Is Watching

Another bit of advice, found in Tanya, is to remember Who is watching us when we get angry. In 5717 (1957), the Rebbe wrote to a young student:

In answer to your letter . . . in which you write that you sometimes suffer from the trait of anger: You should learn by heart the first part of ch. 41 of Tanya, from the beginning of the chapter to p. 112, second line, ". . . before the king." Also, ask your teacher to explain to you the general outline of Iggeret Hakodesh, Epistle 25. When you feel yourself beginning to get angry, review by heart the beginning of Ch. 41 and think about the summary of the epistle; as you get used to doing this, your situation will continue to improve.

In Chapter 41, Rabbi Schneur Zalman of Liadi explains that we must constantly remember that the Creator of the world is watching at

every moment: “Behold, G d stands over him, and the whole world is full of His glory, and He looks upon him and examines his conscience and heart [to see] if he is serving Him as is fitting.” Somehow, it’s easier to hang onto our self-control when we know that someone is watching. And the truth is, Someone is always watching. This idea is useful for dealing with most negative traits and behaviors. For more on this, and to study Chapter 41 in depth, visit our Tanya site.

Remember the Consequences

Here’s a practical piece of advice that is fairly easy to follow: If we realize that our anger has consequences, we will think and behave differently.

The Rebbe writes to a young woman: Keep the Mitzvah found in the Shulchan Aruch [Code of Jewish Law], that if you hurt someone’s feelings—even out of anger—you must apologize in person and ask for complete forgiveness. It is by nature difficult for a person to apologize. Nevertheless, you should overcome that difficulty and do it. In that way, every time you are about to get angry, you will remember that afterwards you will have to brace yourself and ask for forgiveness... That itself will help you weaken your tendency towards anger.

Remember Who's in Charge

Finally, there is one idea that, when understood and employed properly, can uproot anger at its source. As we saw above, the Rebbe often advised people who struggled with this issue to study Epistle 25 of Iggeret Hakodesh, found in the last section of Tanya. There the Alter Rebbe explains why anger is compared to idolatry. Granted, anger is a negative trait, but how can it be compared to idol worship?

The Alter Rebbe puts it like this:

The reason is clear to those that have understanding: because at the time of his anger, faith has departed from him. For were he to believe that what happened to him is of G-d's doing, he would not become angry at all. And though it is a person possessed of free choice who is cursing him, or hitting him, or causing damage to his money, and therefore is guilty according to the laws of man and the laws of Heaven for having chosen evil—nevertheless, as regards the person harmed—this was already decreed from Heaven, and "the Omnipresent has many deputies."

Getting angry means you don't have faith that what's happening to you is really coming from G-d. The person you're angry at is just a messenger. Now, obviously, he or she still had

free choice, and will be held accountable. But getting angry is not the answer. Rather than asking, “Why is this person hurting me?” ask a bigger question: “What is G-d trying to tell me in this moment?” Making these ideas part of your consciousness is the work of a lifetime.

See also Epistle 25 of Iggeret Hakodesh, Jay Litvin’s meditations on anger, Anger Management 101, and Angry with G-d.

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Shabbat 114b

אַתְּ מִצְאָ לֵיהּ אַנְךָ: כֶּהָנִים זָרִיזִין הוּא

And I said to him: You cannot prove this from here, because **priests are vigilant** and can be trusted to know this on their own,

This rule was mentioned in Shabbat 20a, and there it references all other times this - **כלל** - principle, is mentioned in Shas.

The Rebbe alludes to a discussion of this rule by R' Yoseph Engel, in **גָלוּנוֹ הַשׁ”וֹ** - on Shabbat 20a, and explains that there is a - **חֲקִירָה** - a debate - behind the logic that the Kohanim are vigilant: 1- is it because of their service of priesthood, working with holy matters in the Temple etc; or 2- is this part of the essence of being a Kohein (see sicha for a reference to a Rashi in Shabbat 20a, a Rashi in Shabbat 114b, and a Rashi in Eruvin 103a).

The **נְפָקָא מִינָה** - the practical difference between the two ways of viewing why Kohanim are vigilant - will apply in a situation that doesn't involve their service in the priesthood.

Do we even then say Kohanim are vigilant? Or is the vigilance of Kohanim only applicable in regards to their duties as Kohanim?

Likutei Sichos Vol 37 p 64

Shabbat 118a-b

כל המעניג את השבת נוטין לו נחלות בל' מקרים
All that delight (keep) Shabbat, it is given to them boundless portions (unlimited reward).

The Talmud speaks of the unique reward of keeping Shabbat that is especially connected to Yaakov who was blessed with Ufaratzta.

Ufaratzta represents a level (of blessing) that has no boundaries. The Rebbe and the Chabad-Lubavitch movement since the late 1950's have been synonymous with Ufaratzta. Who would have thought that Chabad would exist in over 100 countries and still adding new countries every year? Who would have thought that there are more Seforim (in quantity and quality - both on Talmudic and Chassidic subjects) being published every year on the Rebbe's Torah, and by Chabad Chassidim who write Chiddushei Torah, new insights in the depths of Torah teachings, than by any other Torah organization or Yeshivas (combined) in the world?

When my brother in law Rabbi Steve Solomon הכהן, may he live until 180, traveled some time ago from Israel to Newark, to his grandson Zundel Muszkat's wedding in Lakewood (my great nephew), he told me: Ben Gurion airport was dark. Only one door was open. No stores were open. On the plane for 11-12 hours no hot drinks were served. There was only one

place open at Ben Gurion. The Chabad House! (And they served hot and cold drinks besides the religious goodies and services)! That's Ufaratza!

The Rebbe in his talks- Sichos, discourses- Maamorim, and letters - Igros Kodesh, explains Ufaratza and its explanation on Shabbat 118a-b, hundreds of times!

In the talk referenced below, the Rebbe explains why the Shabbos observance of Yaakov was so special that it merited the blessing of Ufaratza, a blessing with no boundaries.

Likutei Sichos Vol. 15 p 226

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Shabbat 127a

אמר ר' יהודה אמר ר' גודלה הכנסת אורחים מהקבלה פניהם

Rav Yehuda said that Rav said on a related note:
Hospitality toward guests is greater than receiving the Divine Presence.

Below is a sample of the Rebbe's insights in the great Mitzvah of receiving guests, that it is greater than receiving the Divine Presence.

Hachnassas orchim... does not consist of providing help to the poor. Rather, it is a matter of attitude — being kind, warm, caring and concerned for all of one's guests.

This is why this *Mitzvah* applies not only to the poor but to the wealthy as well. For inasmuch as the main theme of the *Mitzvah* is not that of providing the guest with food or lodging but with receiving him with a cheerful countenance, the *Mitzvah* of *hachnassas orchim* therefore pertains to a wealthy individual as well. All people are to be treated equally when it comes to making them feel comfortable and welcome.

https://www.sie.org/templates/sie/article_cdo/aid/2628430/jewish/Hospitality.html

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Shabbat 132a

רבי אלעזר בן עזריה אומר: מה מילוה שהיא אחת מאיבריו של אדם דוחה את השבת — קל וחומר לפיקות נפש שדוחה את
השבת

Rabbi Elazar ben Azarya says it is derived from the mitzva of circumcision: Just as circumcision, which pertains to **only one of a person's limbs, overrides Shabbat**, all the more so **it is an a fortiori inference that saving a life**, which is a mitzva that pertains to the entire person, **overrides Shabbat**.

Saving a life takes precedence over keeping Shabbat. Taking the time to ask a Rabbi whether it's allowed - is tantamount to murder, and shows that the Rabbi didn't do his job of ensuring everyone knows this basic principle.

There are those who are of the opinion that it's better to have a non-Jew or child perform the acts to save the life, or a Jew to act with a shinui (perform any actions needed in an irregular manner), in order to minimize the desecration of Shabbat.

However, there are multiple reasons to have an able adult be the one to act, especially if they were to be a Torah scholar, so everyone understands the gravity of such a situation. Although many people have become accustomed to ask a non-Jew to help, Halachically - a Jew should do it themselves.

It is similar to the idea that one shouldn't waste time looking for ways to avoid Chillul Shabbos in saving a sick person's life.

The Rebbe explains that when it comes to a choice between 2 doctors, one of whom is a Yorei Shamayim, very religious and G-d fearing etc, that shouldn't make a difference in which doctor to choose. For this can lead a person to waste time in finding a G-d fearing doctor, as opposed to treating the issue. Finding the best doctor immediately is what one has to do, regardless of their religious observance or lack thereof.

The subject of saving a life overriding Shabbat, has come up very frequently recently, during the Pandemic, for many, many reasons.

Sichos Kodesh 5737 Vol 1 p 347

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Shabbat 138b

כתיב: "וַיָּנֻעוּ מִם עַד יְם הַמִּזְפֹּן וְעַד מִזְרָחֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לְבַקֵּשׁ אֶת
דְּבָר ה' וְלֹא יִמְצָאוּ". "דְּבָר ה'" — זו הַלְּכָה, "דְּבָר ה'" — זה
פִּיאָה, "דְּבָר ה'" — זו בְּבָאָה.

It states: “And they will drift from sea to sea, and from north to east they will roam to find the word of the Lord, but they will not find it” (Amos 8:12). “The word of the Lord” in this context bears many meanings. “**The word of the Lord**”; that is **halakha**. “**The word of the Lord**”; that is the end of days. “**The word of the Lord**”; that is **prophecy**. All these will be lost from the Jewish people.

The theme of Matos is a reference to Halacha, and the theme of Masei, is a reference to the end of days (the final journey - Masei). The Rebbe emphasised how when Matos-Masei are on one Shabbos (as in most years), there is greater significance, since the Talmud alludes to Matos (a reference to Halacha, something that is unbending and strong, like Matos) in immediate close proximity to an allusion to Masei (a reference to the end of the days, the end of journeying- Masei).

Sicha Parsha Matos-Masei 5742

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Shabbat 147b

אמר רבי חלבו: חמרא דפרוגיטה ומיא דדיומסת קייפחו עשרה
השכטנים מישראל.
רבי אלעזר בן עמר איקלע לסתם, אימשיך בתריהו איעקר
תלמודיה. כי הדר אתה, קם למייקרי בספרא, בעא למקרי
“החדש חזה לכם”, אמר “החרש היה לכם”. בעז רבנן רחמי^{עליה ובדר תלמודיה.}

Rabbi Ḥelbo said: The wine of Phrygia [Perugaita] and the water of the Deyomset deprived Israel of the ten lost tribes.

Rabbi Elazar ben Arakh happened to come there, to Phrygia and Deyomset, and he was drawn after them, and his Torah learning was forgotten. When he returned, he stood to read from a Torah scroll and was supposed to read the verse: “This month shall be for you [*hahodesh hazeh lachem*]”, and instead he read: Have their hearts become deaf [*haberesh haya libbam*], interchanging the similar letters *reish* for *dalet*, *yud* for *zayin*, and *beit* for *khaf*. The Sages prayed and asked for God to have mercy on him, and his learning was restored.

The Rebbe discusses this passage of the Talmud in a sharp critique of people going on Shlichus - and losing focus of their mission:

Although we try to focus on the positive aspects when speaking about "Hachodesh Hazeh Lachem", this story in the Gemara is with an alternative spin.

Now, Rabbi Elazar ben Aruch was one of the greatest Sages of his time, as in Pirkei Avos it

says, that if all the Sages would be on one side of a scale, and he alone would be on the other side, he would outweigh them. Yet, by indulging in the wine of Prugisa, and waters of Diomses, it had such a negative effect on him that this happened to him.

The explanation is: "Hachodesh Hazeh Lachem" refers to the exodus from a narrow, contained place, to broadness. This can refer to the flow from the brain to the heart, through the narrow straits of the neck. Therefore, Rabbi Elazar read the words "Hacheresh Hayah Libam" ("Their hearts were deaf and mute"), that his mind was lacking the inspiration, and therefore there was no flow to the heart.

Now, if the wine of Prugisa, and waters of Diomses had such an effect on someone like Rabbi Elazar, how much more so people of our stature must be cautious. For example, when one is sent by the Rebbe on a mission to a certain place, and he forgets the goal of the mission, and instead indulges in "the wine of Prugisa and waters of Diomses", and later he comes up with excuses as to why his mission was not successful. He is unable to effect others to learn Chassidus (let's assume for the positive that he learns himself), as he was too busy promoting himself to a high stature, thinking this was the purpose of his mission!

He requests helpers - really, as he is a batlan, he should be sent a batlan to assist, to help remind him who he his. Surely there should be wealth in a physical and spiritual sense - we see by Rabbi Elazar that he maintained his wealth afterwards, yet changed his spiritual stance for the better. So too, those sent should change their focus to fulfilling their mission.

Sicha Parshas Tazria 5714

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Shabbat 157a-b

מתני'... ומעשה ביום אביו של רבי צדוק ביום אבא שאול בנו בטנית שפרקנו את המאור בטעית, וקשרו את המקידה בגמי, לידע אם יש בגיית פותח טפח אם לאו, ומדבריהם למדנו, שפרקון ומזרין וקושרין בשבת. גמרא: ... עוזא איקלע לבי ריש גלותא. חזייה לרבה בר רב הונא דיתיב באזונא דמייא, וקא מיטח ליה. אמר ליה: אמר רצמי רכנן מדידה דמייה, דלאו מצוה מי אמרו? אמר ליה: מתעתק בעלמא אנא.

There was an incident in the time of Rabbi Tzadok's father and the time of Abba Shaul ben Botnit, in which they sealed a window using an earthenware vessel and tied an earthenware shard with a long reed-grass with a temporary knot, in order to ascertain whether or not the roofing had an opening the size of a handbreadth. And from their statements we derived that one may seal a window, and measure, and tie a knot on Shabbat.

Ulla came to the house of the Exilarch. He saw Rabba bar Rav Huna sitting in a tub [avna] of water and measuring it. He said to Rabba bar Rav Huna: Say that the Sages said one can measure on Shabbat only a measurement for a Mitzva. However, that which is not for a Mitzva, did they say that it is permitted? Rabba bar Rav Huna said to him: I am merely acting unawares and am not at all interested in the measurements.

The Rebbe made a public Siyum - festive conclusion or Hadran on Tractate Shabbos, on numerous occasions.

The Siyum analyses the final Mishnah that deals with sealing, measuring and tying on Shabbos, and how the conclusion of the Tractate explains how only measuring for a Mitzvah is permitted, how the Shulchan Aruch instructs that only for a Mitzvah one can permit the knot of a craftsman that is not permanent, and that sealing according to Tosefot is permitted even not for a Mitzvah.

The Rebbe connects the beginning of Tractate Shabbos to the end of the Tractate, as is customary, and expounds concepts of the Tractate in their inner dimension, according to Chassidus and Kabbalah, interwoven with Rishonim and Achronim and practical Halacha and life lessons from Tractate Shabbos.

Likutei Sichos volume 14 pgs 12-20

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Eruvin 4b

"וְרֹחֵץ אֶת כָל בְּשָׂרוֹ (בְּמַיִם)", שֶׁלֹא הוּא ذָכָר חֹצֵץ בֵין בְּשָׂרוֹ לְמַיִם. "בְּמַיִם" — בְּמַיִם מִקְוָה. "כָל בְּשָׂרוֹ" — מִים שֶׁכָּל גֻּפּוֹ עַלְיהָ בָּהָן, וְכַפְתָּה הָן — אַמְּתָה עַל אַמְּתָה בְּרוּם שֶׁלֹּשׁ אַמְּמוֹת. וְנִשְׁעַרְוּ חֲכָמִים מֵי מִקְוָה אַרְבָּעִים סָאָה.

"And he shall bathe all his flesh in the water" (Leviticus 15:16), and the Sages derived **that nothing should intervene between his flesh and the water**. The definite article in the phrase "**in the water**" indicates that this bathing is performed in water mentioned elsewhere, i.e., specifically **in the water of a ritual bath**, and not in just any water. And the phrase "**all his flesh**" indicates that it must be in **water into which all of his body can enter**, i.e., in which a person can immerse his entire body at once. **And how much water is that?** It is a **cubit by a cubit by the height of three cubits**. And the **Sages calculated** the volume of a ritual bath of this size and determined that **the waters of a ritual bath measure forty se'a**.

Why is this interesting terminology used: **שֶׁכָּל גֻּפּוֹ עַלְיהָ בָּהָן** - which literally means that his whole body is elevated in them, and not **בְּטַל** - commentaries explain **בָּהָן** (as the verse **שׁו"ת הריב"ש סרכ"ד** see **עַלְיהָ בָּהָן** that means nullified in them or **נִכּוֹה בָּהָן** - covered in them - as the verse **כָמִים לִים מִכּוֹסִים** as the waters covers the sea?

The Rebbe explains that in their profound wisdom, the sages are alluding (also) to one's immersion in the "waters" of (Torah) knowledge. To be assured that one's

knowledge is pure and not defiled with knowledge that is impure, one must be in a state of Bittul, nullification, to the level that one elevates himself beyond any precondition that may taint and defile his understanding of Torah, hence עולה בהן, his knowledge elevates him entirely.

Below is a link to the majority of the Farbrengen of Purim 1964.

https://www.lahak.org/templates/lahak/article_code/aid/4300140/jewish/.html

Sicha Purim 5724

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Eruvin 13b

תנו רבנן: שניים וממחצאה בחלוקת בית שמאלי ובית הימני הילו אומרים: נוח לו לאדם שלא גברא יותר משגברא, והילו אומרים: נוח לו לאדם שגברא יותר משלוא גברא. ומהו וגמרא: נוח לו לאדם שלא גברא יותר משגברא, עכשוו שגברא — יפנפוש במעשייו. ואמרי לה: ימשמש במעשייו.

The Sages taught the following *baraita*: For two and a half years, Beit Shammai and Beit Hillel disagreed. These say: It would have been preferable had man not been created than to have been created. And those said: It is preferable for man to have been created than had he not been created. Ultimately, they were counted and concluded: It would have been preferable had man not been created than to have been created. However, now that he has been created, he should examine his actions that he has performed and seek to correct them. And some say: He should scrutinize his planned actions and evaluate whether or not and in what manner those actions should be performed, so that he will not sin.

The wording isn't that it is "BETTER to not be created", for there is a definite benefit to the Neshama with a person being created, with the ascent it will receive afterwards. Rather, "easier/simpler to not be created", as the work one must do in this world is very complex and difficult. However, what was the original logic of Beis Hillel, that it's easier/simpler to have been created?

According to Beis Shammai, even with the descent remaining in the stage of potentiality, without coming down into an actual physical body, the future ascent of the Neshama will still be brought about. Beis Hillel holds, that the great ascent can only come about through actuality, with the Neshama descending into the physical body. The reward is something so great, that it will always be considered "easier/simpler" to be created, no matter the outcome.

However, the final consensus was "it is easier/simpler to not have been created". Being that a person should not be focused on the future reward he will receive for his work in this world, rather everything should be done for Hashem's sake alone. With this in mind, it would definitely be easier/simpler to not have to do the work in the first place.

The Rebbe in many Sichos, explains the difference of opinions in many places in the Talmud between Beis Shammai and Bais Hillel, that Beis Shammai goes according to **נַע** - potential, and Bais Hillel goes according to **פָעַל** - actual.

Likkutei Sichos Vol 22 p 53-54

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Eruvin 19a

אמר ריש לקיש: פושעי ישראל אין אור גיהנם שולחת ביהם, כל
חוואר מפזביה הזרב.

Reish Lakish said: With regard to the sinners of the Jewish people, the fire of Gehenna has no power over them, as may be learned by *a fortiori* reasoning from the golden altar.

In a Siyum of tractate Chagigah, the Rebbe questions our Talmud in Eruvin and its brevity compared to how this discussion is elaborated at the conclusion of Chagigah.

The main discussion regarding "The fire of Gehinnom does not subjugate the sinners of Israel" is in Tractate Eruvin. It is there (19a) that the Gemara should have mentioned the statement regarding Torah scholars, that Gehinnom doesn't subjugate them as well, for two reasons:

- 1) Eruvin is the main discussion of this topic
- 2) Eruvin comes before Chagigah.

The explanation is, there are two ways a Jew connects to Hashem - through learning Torah, and doing Mitzvos. Learning Torah unites one's existence to Hashem, while doing Mitzvos, one becomes a vehicle for Hashem's will, albeit remaining in his own existence.

This is why both statements are separate, and require individual sources. Although Torah scholars are called "bodies of fire" through their Torah learning, were they to commit a sin, it would be worse than a sinner, and not necessarily would they be spared from Gehinnom, as the sinner (who does Mitzvos) would be.

The source for the Torah scholar being saved from the fire is from a salamander, whose existence is from fire - implying the Torah scholar's existence is Torah. While the source for the sinners being spared is from the Gold-plated Altar, which is only plated with the Mitzvos - implying that it does not take over their existence, only something additional.

Overall, Hashem's presence in the Mishkan/Beis Hamikdash can be based in one of two places:

- 1) The Aron, with the Luchos, which is the concept of Torah.
- 2) The Mizbayach, with the korbanos, the idea of Mitzvos.

Likutei Sichos Vol 16, pgs 435-442

Eruvin 22b

הַוְשָׁע אֹהֶב יִשְׂרָאֵל הִיא, עַמְד וַיַּקְרֵן לְהֵם דָּرְכִים וּסְרִטִיא, כִּי
הִיכָא דְנִיחָא תְשִׁמְישָׁתָא — מִסְרָה לְרַבִּים, כִּי
תְשִׁמְישָׁתָא — מִסְרָה לְבַחֲדָה.

Joshua, who conquered the land and divided it among the tribes, **was a lover of Israel**. He rose up and established roads and highways for them; any place that was convenient to use he handed over to the public, and any place that was inconvenient to use he handed over to an individual.

On the second day of Shavuos, 1977, I was at the Farbrengen when the Rebbe quoted this Gemara.

After explaining the similarities between Moshe Rabbeinu, King David and the Baal Shem Tov, who are all Jewish leaders connected to the holiday of Shavuos, (Moshe received the Torah and gave it to the Jewish people on Shavuos, both King David and the Baal Shem Tov passed away on Shavuos) and they all excelled in being faithful shepherds, lovers of Israel, and Jewish education, the Rebbe makes mention of the Gemara in Eruvin: When it looks for a “title” to describe Yehoshua, the Talmud uses the same term that it uses in Menachos (65b) about Moshe... משה אהוב by יִשְׂרָאֵל הִיא - Moshe was a lover of Israel (the Jewish people).

Concerning Yehoshua it says (Exodus 33:11) that פָנֵי מֹשֶׁה כְּפָנֵי חִמָּה וּפָנֵי יְהוֹשֻׁעַ - (he) would not depart from the tent; and פָנֵי מֹשֶׁה כְּפָנֵי הַלְבָנָה - the face (countenance) of Moshe was like the face of the sun, the face (countenance) of Yehoshua was like the face of the moon (Bava Batra 75a, Rashi and Sifre, Numbers 27:20) - and therefore, since Moshe was an Ohev Yisrael, a lover of Israel, so too was Yehoshua an Ohev Yisroel, a lover of Israel.

Sicha Shavuos 5737

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Eruvin 30b

הנקנו לארכז העמים בשדייה תיבת ו מגיל — רבוי מטה מא, רבוי יוסי ברבי יהודא מטהר. במא קמי פלאג? מר סבר אهل זריך לאו שטמיה אهل, ומיר סבר אهل זריך שטמיה אهل.

With regard to **one who enters the land of the nations**, i.e., any territory outside Eretz Yisrael, not on foot, but **in a carriage, a crate, or a cupboard**, **Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi** renders him ritually impure. **Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda, renders him pure.** With regard to what do they disagree? One Sage, Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi, **holds that a moving tent is not called a tent.** The principle is that only something fixed can shield against ritual impurity, but if one is situated inside a portable vessel, the vessel contracts impurity and he becomes impure along with it. **And the other Sage**, Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda, **holds that a moving tent is called a tent**, and it shields the person inside from contracting ritual impurity.

The principle is that only something fixed can shield against ritual impurity, but if one is situated inside a portable vessel, the vessel contracts impurity and he becomes impure along with it. And the other sage, Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehudah, holds that a moving tent is called a tent, and it shields the person inside from contracting ritual impurity.

There is a Sicha which offers a fascinating analysis between Rebbe and the Sages, in many places in Shas, if one is obligated to explain the wording of the Torah and the Rabbis, in a complete literal sense, including

all the details, or not. The Rebbe gives an example from each of the six orders of the Mishnah.

The above case from Eruvin 20b, is an example on the subject (Order) of Taharos.

According to Rebbe, for an Ohel to be **צויין** (intervene) for impurities, it has to be exactly as an Ohel in all the details, that does not transport, then it has a law of Ohel not to be **צויין** - not to intervene.

According to Rabbi Yosei Ben Yehudah, even though it's not equal in all details to an Ohel, but since it is equal in regards to being a place unto itself, it has a law like an Ohel, and it intervenes re impurities, as the position of the Rabbanan, mentioned above (in the Sicha) and it's pure.

Likutei Sichos Vol. 17, p 22-33

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Eruvin 41a

דברת ר' ינשא גופא איזיל

the body must follow the head, i.e., we must follow the statements of the earlier authorities and not deviate from established *halakha*.

There are many dimensions to this teaching. Here in Eruvin it is speaking about leadership, and the importance of following the leader, the head of the Jewish people.

In Sotah 45b, there is the painful Halachic subject of measuring in the case of a corpse, where the head and body were r"l separated, that the measurement (for the law of עגלת ערופה - decapitating the calf when a body is found in between two cities) is made from where the head is found.

The Rebbe, emphasizing how a good measure outweighs a bad measure, מרובה מדה טובה ממדה פורענות - connects all of this to Rosh Hashanah.

The body follows the head means, that the entire year is determined how you conduct yourself on Rosh Hashanah. It is called ראש השנה and not תחילת השנה - the head of the year, not the beginning of the year.

So if one conducts oneself properly on Rosh Hashanah, in the head of the year, that's how

one will be judged during the **גוף השנה**, the body of the year. One won't be judged by one's conduct during the Guf Hashanah, during the body and the rest of the year. Rather, one will be judged (even if you "slipped" in your behavior during the body of the year) by how you conducted yourself on Rosh Hashanah. **גוף באתר רישא איזיל.**

Ultimately, one's conduct, behavior and Divine service will be so refined on Rosh Hashanah, as the head influences the body, so too will your Rosh Hashanah influence for the good all the days of the rest of the year, the body of the year!

Many times, the Rebbe quoted this teaching from our sages of the body following the head, of how a Chossid must follow in the ways of his Rebbe.

Sicha 2nd Day of Rosh Hashana 5715

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Eruvin 45a

ובעיר הסמוכה לסתור, אפילו לא באו על עסקי נפשות אלא על
עסקי תבן וקש — יוצאים עליהם בכל'ין זיון, ומחללין עליהם את
השכלה.

And with regard to a town that is located near the border, even if the gentiles did not come with regard to lives, but rather with regard to matters of hay and straw, i.e., to raid and spoil the town, they may go out against them with their weapons, and they may desecrate Shabbat due to them, as the border must be carefully guarded, in order to prevent enemies from gaining a foothold there.

This is the Talmudic source of the Halacha in Shulchan Aruch Orach Chaim Siman 329, that the Rebbe constantly repeated, clamored, and corrected those who erred etc etc, in regards to not yielding an inch of land that was in Israel's possession.

Many who did not have the Rebbe's clarity on Halacha, eventually yielded to the Rebbe's position, based on Shulchan Aruch, and rooted in our Talmud in Eruvin. They realized that "giving up land" meant only pressure to make more concessions - and this puts millions of Jewish lives in danger.

Here is a very clear letter from the Rebbe on this subject back in 1980. Many large scholarly Seforim have been written on this clear

Halachic ruling, and there are also even videos etc that bring clarity to this subject.

Let us pray for true peace in Eretz Yisroel, and for Moshiach's arrival, so that there will never be any more "concessions and even talk of concessions" and the land of Israel will be 100% safe and secure, never to know of any loss of life or injuries due to terror or war.

Here is the letter from 1980: The Rebbe cried out on this subject hundreds of times publicly, and countless times privately and in correspondence with Israeli Prime Ministers, Knesset Members, Israeli Generals, Rabbis, etc.

"I am completely and unequivocally opposed to the surrender of any of the liberated areas currently under negotiation, such as Yehudah and Shomrom, the Golan, etc., for the simple reason, and only reason, that surrendering any part of them would contravene a clear Psak-Din (ruling) in Shulchan Aruch (Orach Chayim, section 329, par. 6,7). I have repeatedly emphasized that this Psak-Din has nothing to do with the sanctity of Eretz Yisra'el, or the "days of Mashiach", the Geulah, and similar considerations, but solely with the rule of Pikuach-Nefesh (danger to life). This is further emphasized by the fact that this Psak-Din has its source in the Talmud (Eruvin 45a), where the Gemora cites as an illustration

of a border town under the terms of this Psak-Din – the city of Neharde'a in Babylon (present day Iraq) – clearly not in Eretz Yisra'el. I have emphasized time and time again that it is a question of, and should be judged purely on the basis of, Pikuach-Nefesh, not geography.

The said Psak-Din deals with a situation where gentiles (the term is גויים, not enemies) besiege a Jewish border-town, ostensibly to obtain “straw and hay,” and then leave. But because of the possible danger, not only to the Jews of the town, but also to other cities, the Shulchan Aruch rules that upon receiving news of the gentiles (even only preparations), the Jews must mobilize immediately and take up arms even on Shabbos – in accordance with the rule that “Pikuach-Nefesh supersedes Shabbos.”

Should there be a question whether the risk does in fact create a situation of Pikuach-Nefesh, then – as in the case of illness, where a medical authority is consulted – the authority to make a judgment is vested in the military experts. If military experts decide that there is a danger of Pikuach-Nefesh, there could be no other overriding considerations, since Pikuach-Nefesh overrides everything else. Should the military experts declare that while there is such a risk, yet it should be taken for some other reason, such as political considerations (good will of the gentiles) this

would clearly be contrary to the Psak-Din, for the Psak-Din requires that Pikuach-Nefesh, not political expediency, should be the decisive factor.

Now in regard to the liberated areas, all military experts, Jewish and non-Jewish, agree that in the present situation giving up any part of them would create serious security dangers. No one says that giving up any part of them would enhance the defensibility of the borders. But some military experts are prepared to take a chance in order not to antagonize Washington and/or to improve the "international image," etc. To follow this line would not only go against the clear Psak-Din, but would also ignore costly lessons of the past. One glaring case in point is "the Yom-Kippur War." Days and hours before the attack, there were urgent sessions of the government discussing the situation with the military. Military intelligence pointed to unmistakable evidence that an Egyptian attack was imminent, and the military experts advised a preemptive strike that would save many lives and prevent an invasion. However, the politicians, with the acquiescence of some military experts, rejected this action on the ground that such a step, or even a general mobilization, before the Egyptians actually crossed the border, would mean being branded as the aggressor, and would jeopardize relations with the USA. This decision was contrary to the said Psak-Din of the Shulchan

Aruch, as pointed out above. The tragic results of that decision bore out the validity of the Shulchan Aruch's position (as if it were necessary), for many lives were needlessly sacrificed, and the situation came close to total disaster, but for G-d's mercies. Suffice it to mention that the then Prime Minister later admitted that all her life she would be haunted by that tragic decision.

I know, of course, that there are Rabbis who are of the opinion that in the present situation, as they see it, it would be permissible from the viewpoint of the Shulchan Aruch to return areas from Eretz Yisra'el. But it is also known on what information they based this view. The argument is that the present situation is not identical with the hypothetical case of a state of "being besieged by gentiles." A second argument is that the present surrendering of some areas would not endanger lives.

That these arguments are based on misinformation is patently clear. The Arab neighbors are prepared militarily; what is more, they do demand that these areas are theirs to keep, and openly declare that if not surrendered voluntarily, they will take them by force, and eventually everything else. A Rabbi who says that the said Psak-Din of the Shulchan Aruch does not apply in the present situation is completely misinformed on what the situation actually is...

I was taken to task for placing so much emphasis on the security of Eretz Yisra'el, the arguments being that what has protected the Jewish people during the long Galus has been the study of Torah and the practice of Mitzvos; hence Torah-observant Jews should not make the inviolability of Eretz Yisra'el as the overriding cause. I countered that they missed the point, for my position has nothing to do with Eretz Yisra'el as such, but with the Pikuach-Nefesh of the Jews living there – which would apply to any part of the world.

It is said that my pronouncements on the issues are more political than Rabbinic. Inasmuch as the matter has to do with Pikuach-Nefesh, it is surely the duty of every Jew, be he Rabbi or layman, to do all permitted by the Shulchan Aruch to help forestall – or, at any rate, minimize – the danger. In a case of Pikuach-Nefesh, every possible effort must be made, even if there is *psak* (doubt) and many doubts whether the effort will succeed.

Sichos In English - an excerpt from a series of correspondence between the Rebbe and Chief Rabbi Emmanuel Jakobowitz z'l

Eruvin 54a

אמר ר' שמואל לר' יהודה: שׁוֹנְאָה, חֲטוּفָה וְאַכְול חֲטוּפָה
איישתי, דעלא דאצלין מײַיה כהלוֹלָא דמִי.

Shmuel said to Rav Yehuda: Keen scholar, grab and eat, grab and drink, as the world from which we are departing is like a wedding feast, whose joy is only temporary, and one who does not take now will not be able to do so in the future.

The Rebbe in countless edited and unedited talks quotes this passage, based on a teaching from the Rebbe Rashab in Kuntres Umaayon, that in our days, if you have the opportunity to bring someone closer to Yiddishkeit, don't make calculations - - חשבונות - and say - עצמן תחלה - let me first perfect myself, and only then can I involve myself in the (spiritual) wellbeing of the next person.

Indeed, there are times in life that Seder, an orderly approach to one's Divine service, is necessary. But as we hear the "footsteps of Moshiach", we must act beyond Seder, we must break the comfort zone of the orderly Divine path, that once was necessary, and step up to the mode of "grab and eat and drink." We are soon leaving this "wedding feast", and must prepare everyone to increase in Yiddishkeit to prepare for the righteous Moshiach.

Sefer Hasichos 5749 Vol 1 p 126

Eruvin 62b

אמר ליה אביו לר' יוסף: קיימא לנו משנת רב' אליעזר בן יעקב
קב' ונקי', ואמר רב' יהודה אמר שמאלו: הילכה כרב' אליעזר בנו
יעקב.

Abaye said to Rav Yosef, his teacher: **We maintain that the teaching of Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov measures a kav, but is clean**, meaning that it is small in quantity but clear and complete, and that the *halakha* is in accordance with his opinion in all instances. Moreover, with regard to our issue, **Rav Yehuda said that Shmuel said:** The *halakha* is in accordance with the opinion of **Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov**, and therefore there is no doubt about the matter.

The Rebbe brings a similar Gemara (Shabbos 65b) concerning the term Kav, and how Kabbalah and Chassidus explains this passage of the Talmud in Shabbos, in our Gemara in Eruvin, and in Yevamos 49b.

Even though Reb Eliezer Ben Yaakov only said “few” Halachos - 102 Halachos, see Chidushei Agodos Maharashoh to Gittin 67a. (Although he lived a very long life, as discussed in the earlier Farbrengen of Behaaloscho, section 28, since we don’t find two **- תנאים** - two Tanoim with the name Reb Eliezer Ben Yaakov, we must say he lived a long life, meaning that he lived in the days of the Beis HaMikdosh and was also counted as a student of Rabbi Akiva, so after living such a long life, 102 Halochos is seemingly a small amount),

Yet his Halachos are called Noki, that the Halacha is like him, (Rashi in Yevamos) ונק'י

One issue is connected and dependent on another: Since Reb Eliezer Ben Yaakov was unassuming and minimized his significance, he made a great effort not to say many Halochos, and only said Halachos when it was absolutely necessary. And for this reason he was Kav ViNoki, the Halacha was like him, as the Talmud in Chulin 89a says on the verse **אתם המעט מכל העמים** (Devarim 7:7) - that you are not only the fewest of all the people but you humble yourself with humility.

The Rebbe goes on to connect this with the power of the prayer , תפלה לעני , the prayer of the pauper, and the impact Reb Eliezer Ben Yaakov had not only on Torah and Mitzvos but also on the world.

Sicha 15 Tammuz 5741

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Eruvin 67b

בזאקי'תא — מותבין תיובתא והדר עבדין מעשה, בדרכ'נו
— עבדין מעשה והדר מותבין תיובתא.

With regard to a Torah law, we first raise objections and then we perform an act, i.e., if someone has an objection to a proposed action, we must first clarify the matter and only then may we proceed. However, **with regard to rabbinic laws, we first perform an act and then we raise objections**.

Why is the order with Rabbinic laws, to first perform an act and only later to ask?

According to Nigleh, the revealed teachings of the Torah, the Rebbe explains, that the Rabbis were great scholars, and by bonding (Hiskashrus) with the Rabbis, you could rely on their teachings. This that you have a question, is because you have not merited their level of studying with true diligence. If you one day merit, you will study with true diligence and understand the teachings of the Rabbis. That's according to Nigleh - the revealed teachings of Torah.

According to Pninimius HaTorah, the inner teachings of Torah, true Hiskashrus (bonding) with the Rabbis is by way of Kabbolas Ol - the acceptance of the yoke.

One carries out the teachings of the Rabbis like a soldier, who is not a Metzius (an existence) for himself. A soldier carries out the instructions of his commander, and that is his whole mission. Hence, the Talmud teaches, that in regards to Rabbinic Law, we first perform the act, and only then we ask...

Sicha Shabbos Shemini 5718

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Eruvin 82b

הָא דְּאָמַרִי אֵינֶנִּי: רְוֹחָא לְבָסִימָא שְׁכִיחָן

There is a popular saying: There is always room for sweets.

It is generally accepted that one dining on delicacies eats more, and therefore, the amount of food in Shabbat meals is greater than that of weekdays, as they include more sweet foods.

On this teaching in Eruvin 82b, (also found in Megillah 7b), the Rebbe explains how one can add both in Teshuvah and in Torah study during the month of Elul.

When something is done willingly and with **תענוג**, pleasure and delight, it literally broadens one's physical digestive system, so that there is always room for sweets.

How much more so spiritually, when one adds to his Teshuvah and Torah study willingly and with delight in the month of Elul, this expands his horizons and broadens his mind and intelligence within his body.

The Rebbe compares this to the teaching of the Alter Rebbe, that when one involves oneself with communal affairs, his brain and heart become one thousand more times refined, (hence he can study and understand

Torah correctly much more than one who is not involved with communal affairs), to which the Tzemach Tzedek adds, based on a Chazal, that “one thousand” is not an exaggeration by the Alter Rebbe, but it really gives us an understanding how one can spiritually expand one’s “vessels”, similar to the teaching of the Talmud that there is always room for sweets.

Sicha Motzoei Shabbos Re'eh 5738

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Eruvin 86a

רבי מכבד עשירים. רבי עקיבא מכבד עשירים
Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi would **honor the wealthy**,
and **Rabbi Akiva** would likewise **honor the wealthy**

The Rebbe addressed this subject on countless occasions, including this excerpt below spoken to Baalei Batim at a Machne Israel Development Fund Yechidus:

In this context, we can better understand our Sages' statement: "Rebbe (Rabbi Yehudah HaNasi) honored the wealthy." Now, Rebbe did not need to curry favor with anyone. (Indeed, our Sages compared his personal wealth to that of the Roman emperor.) He honored the wealthy because of his awareness of the trust which G-d vested in them to utilize their bounty to spread good and blessing around them and in the world at large.

Surely, the resolutions you accept will involve the *mitzvah* of *tzedakah*. Indeed, the desire to become involved in such activities is one of the personality traits which characterize the Jewish people who are, to quote our Sages, "merciful, humble, and perform acts of kindness."

Eruvin 100b

אמר רבי יוחנן: אילמלא לא ביתה תורה, פניו למידין צניעות מפתחת, וגזל מEMPLלה, ערכיות מזינה

Rabbi Yoḥanan said: Even if the Torah had not been given, we would nonetheless have learned modesty from the cat, which covers its excrement, and that stealing is objectionable from the ant, which does not take grain from another ant, and forbidden relations from the dove.

The following is an historical analysis of the Baal Shem Tov's cardinal teaching that one should learn something from everything one sees and hears.

The Baal Shem Tov taught his Chassidim an unlikely lesson in our service of G-d from the carving of a cross. His pupils had observed a gentile carving an image of a cross in the ice. The Baal Shem Tov, who saw G-d's hand in every moment of every event, commented, "Look what can happen when there is coldness, indifference. The frozen river symbolizes human insensitivity. It was only the freezing of the river that enabled the cross to be seen and provide a lesson for the students: that coldness and indifference is the antithesis of what a Jew stands for" (*Toras Menachem*, Vol. 35, p. 129).

The question may be asked: If the importance of finding meanings and lessons in all one sees

is conveyed throughout Torah and the Rabbinic writings, what unique insight does the Baal Shem Tov's teachings bring regarding our need to be aware of and to learn from our daily experiences?

The answer is that the Baal Shem Tov would *expound* on the deeper and more sublime interpretation of these providential occurrences. This is the meaning of *pirush HaBaal ShemTov* ("the interpretations of the Baal Shem Tov"). He actually delineated and revealed a whole new concept and mystical approach to that which may have been understood previously as just a simple idea (Commentary on *Tanya*, *Shaar HaYichud VeHaEmunah*, ch. 1).

The Baal Shem Tov elucidated and expounded on this concept, applying it to every element of our universe, even that which outwardly seems to be contrary to Torah: as discussed, the actions of a thief and the carving of a cross.

From an article on chabad.org

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Eruvin 104b -105a

Siyum

מתני'...רבי שמעון אומר: מקום שהתרו לר חכמים, משליך גתנו לר — שלא התרו לר אלא משום שבות. ... היכא קאי? הtmp קאי, דקאמיר תפא קפוא — קושרה. ואמר ליה רבי שמעון — ענבה. ענבה, דלא אתי לידי חיזב חטאת — שרוי ליה רבנן. קשירה, דעתך לידי חיזב חטאת — לא שרוי ליה רבנן.

Rabbi Shimon further said: **As they permitted to you only activities prohibited due to rabbinic decree**, but not actions prohibited by Torah law. The Gemara asks: **On the basis of what teaching did he formulate this principle?** The Gemara answers: He taught it **on the basis** of the mishna **there, where the first tanna said** with regard to a harp string in the Temple that broke on Shabbat, that **one may tie it with a knot, and Rabbi Shimon said: He may form only a bow.**

The reason why only forming a bow is permitted, is that it cannot lead to liability for a sin-offering, as forming a bow cannot constitute a violation of the category of the prohibited labor of tying. Consequently, **the Sages permitted it. However, with regard to tying a knot, which can lead to liability for a sin-offering** when performed outside the Temple, **the Sages did not permit it**, as Rabbi Shimon maintains that the Sages permitted only activities whose prohibition involves a rabbinic decree.

On 20 Menachem Av (the Rebbe's father's Rabbi Levi Yitzchok's Yahrzeit) 1962/5722, the Rebbe made a Siyum on Eruvin.

In addition to the actual Siyum, the Rebbe discussed the subject of Eruv a number of times during the Farbrengen.

Right before the Siyum, the Rebbe shared a story of how his father received Semicha from many great Rabbis, including Rabbi Chaim Brisker, zt”l. One of the questions posed by Reb Chaim was connected to Eruv. As written on chabad.org: “R. Chaim presented his father with a practical legal question, which had been brought to his attention, involving both the laws of Shabbat and Sukkot. On Shabbat one cannot carry from a private home into a public courtyard unless an *eruv* is set up. Loosely defined, an *eruv* is a legal mechanism that changes the status of the public courtyard, making it an extension of your private space. On Sukkot you are required to eat in a sukkah-hut built under the open sky. Several private householders had built a shared sukkah in a public courtyard, and had forgotten to put an *eruv* in place to allow them to carry their food to the sukkah on Shabbat. What were they to do?

Without skipping a beat, R. Levi Yitzchak asserted that the sukkah itself was an *eruv*. Since the private householders intended to eat their meals there, it automatically transformed the public courtyard into an extension of their private domains. The laws of *eruv* are notoriously complex, and R. Chaim was

impressed and gratified by R. Levi Yitzchak's conceptual clarity, agility and innovation."

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Our Sages say, that the verse "No one should go out from his place on Shabbos" is the source for the prohibition of leaving the techum, going 2000 cubits outside of your area.

As a detail of the techum, if a person finds themselves outside of the techum when Shabbos begins, even by one cubit, they can't reach their home on Shabbos. Rabbi Shimon says, even if they were to be up to 15 cubits outside the techum marker, they can go all the way home. The reason being, that the techum was strategically placed 15 cubits before the actual end of the techum, to avoid people accidentally passing it unwittingly.

Rabbi Shimon explains, that these 15 cubits are really yours already, as they are part of the 2000 cubit limit, so there is no reason to forbid a person from using them.

Rashi explains, that this doesn't contradict Rabbi Shimon's approach in a totally different scenario, in which a harp string in the Beis Hamikdash tore. Although there are those who permit retying it, Rabbi Shimon forbids it, as it

can lead a person to transgress the prohibition of tying elsewhere. The only method he permits would be through making a bow.

Why was Rashi bothered to explain the possible contradiction, when the answer is pretty straightforward and simple?

To explain, we must preface with the idea that it is a mitzva to make an eruv in your courtyard, so that you can enjoy Shabbos by bringing items to your house. So too, a person should be in their techum in order to properly enjoy Shabbos, and not isolated outside of it. So when Rabbi Shimon says that someone outside the techum “shall enter”, it isn’t just a leniency that he may enter, it is also a command, that the proper way to honor Shabbos is by entering.

In general, this can be explained as quantity outweighing quality.

Although entering the techum is based on a Pasuk in Torah, and much more severe than not enjoying Shabbos properly, which is only based on a Pasuk in Navi. However, being that this person would be transgressing not enjoying Shabbos EVERY MOMENT of Shabbos that he remains outside the techum, it would be better to transgress only once, by

entering the techum, than to transgress every moment of Shabbos.

Now we can understand the connection to the law regarding the string of the harp.

Although tying can lead a person to do a more severe act on Shabbos, a bow is not a strong bond, and may end up requiring a person to tie the bow many times on Shabbos itself. So seemingly, it is the same logic in this argument, as to whether transgressing something more serious one time is a better option, than something less serious more often.

For this reason, we needed an explanation as to why Rabbi Shimon forbids tying the real knot on Shabbos, contrary to his overall approach of quantity outweighing quality. The reason would be, that Rabbi Shimon only permits this approach when both prohibitions are Rabbinic. In tying the harp string, being that tying a knot is forbidden from the Torah, Rabbi Shimon will not apply this logic, and will forbid the more serious, qualitative prohibition.

A similar idea we see in the Alter Rebbe's Shulchan Aruch, that if a Jew is sick and needs meat on Shabbos, another Jew should slaughter and prepare meat for him. Although slaughtering is a prohibition normally liable to the death penalty, this is preferable than the

sick person eating non-kosher meat, which is not liable to the death penalty. For with the non-kosher meat, every bite he takes is a new prohibition, while with the slaughter, there was only one prohibition done. However, in regards to transgressing Rabbinic commands to save a life, as in where the sick person needs wine, a Jew should pour the wine to avoid it becoming *Yayin Nesech*, and a non-Jew should light the fire to heat up the wine.

Based on the above, we can understand as well this that Rabbi Shimon's statement is a continuation, and connected to the Mishna "A dead reptile found in the Beis Hamikdash", whether to remove it with a piece of wood or the shirt of a Kohen.

First, an explanation according to Chassidus of the general rules of Rabbi Shimon:

Chassidus explains, that the Melacha (forbidden act on Shabbos) of Hotza'ah, transporting an item from one domain to another, is the basis of all 39 Melachos. As is seen from a story with Rabbi Akiva, who was once asked: "If Hashem keeps Shabbos, He shouldn't make the wind blow, rain fall, or grass grow!" Rabbi Akiva replied, "In one's own domain there is no issue of Hotza'ah. The entire world is Hashem's domain, so for Hashem it is not an issue". By answering how the Melacha of Hotza'ah is not an issue, which

is the foundation of all 39 Melachos, the entire question falls away.

This is also why Tractate Shabbos begins with practical applications of Hotza'ah, even though it is the final of the 39 Melachos when they are enumerated. Seemingly, the Tractate should begin with the list of Melachos instead.

The explanation is, the meaning behind Shabbos is a day that is completely given over to Hashem. As opposed to Yom Tov, which is "half given over to Hashem, half given to us (to enjoy)", Shabbos is completely given over to Hashem. Refraining from work on Shabbos helps us feel how Hashem created the world in 6 days, and is continuously creating it anew from nothing (during the 6 days of the week with his speech, and on Shabbos Hashem rests from creating with speech, and creates the world through a higher emanation from his thoughts).

Meaning, although Hashem created the world in a way that there can be confusion, and an idea that there are 2 separate domains - One of goodness and holiness, and a separate domain of evil and impurity - by keeping Shabbos, one's belief becomes strong, that in reality the world is just one domain, belonging to the one true existence, Hashem.

From this it's understood, that when one performs a Melacha on Shabbos, he not only weakens his overall belief in Hashem, but strengthens the mistaken ideology of "Hotza'ah" from the one domain of Hashem. This is why Hotza'ah is the general idea of all 39 Melachos.

This is also why Rabbi Akiva answered regarding Hotza'ah alone. For, being that in regards to Hashem, there is no confusion - it is perfectly clear that the entire world, including evil, is part of his domain - there is no basis for Hashem himself to refrain from transporting items, and likewise the basis for all of the other 39 Melachos has no place by Hashem as well.

All concepts in creation are divided into 3 categories:

- 1) Matters of Holiness, which corresponds to the Private Domain (Reshus Hayachid)
- 2) Forbidden Matters, corresponding to the Public Domain (Reshus Harabim)
- 3) Discretionary Matters, which are in a middle ground, which can be dealt with in one of two ways: a) Refrain from getting involved, or b) Elevate them to Holiness.

In regards to the domains of Shabbos, this can be compared to a courtyard with many houses, which is an intermediate category of domain, and by making an Eruv, it becomes a Reshus Hayachid.

This is the general concept of an Eruv, to expand the domain of a Jew, and matters of holiness, to reach greater boundaries.

We can now connect this to the rules of Rabbi Shimon from earlier:

“What the Sages have permitted to you, is already yours”, which is in regards to the techum of Shabbos.

“They have only permitted that which is Rabinically forbidden” - which is in regards to transporting an object from one domain to another.

Seemingly however, there is a major difference between the idea of Shabbos boundaries, and the other Melachos on Shabbos. When one does a melacha, he has created a void, where the holiness of Shabbos is now lacking. By traveling outside the techum, one is BRINGING Shabbos with him!

Based on this it is understood, that the prohibition of going outside the techum extends

the entire time that one is found there, which is why if there is an opening for him to reenter the techum, it is an obligation for him to do so. As Rabbi Shimon says "He must enter".

As in all Torah matters, there is a lesson for us to take in our practical lives:

The main identity of a Jew is his G-dly soul, which is a part of G-d himself. G-d is infinitely higher than any semblance to this world. Even the creation of this world was done through G-d's speech, which was referred to as "commoner's talk" - not something of actual importance to Him. Similarly, a Jew is higher than his involvement in this world - true the Torah tells us "Six days you shall work" and be involved in the world, but the involvement should be similar to G-d's involvement, which is in a limited manner.

As a Jew's inner purpose is the idea of Shabbos, which is removed from weekday activities, we can learn two points from the difference between refraining from work, and remaining in the Shabbos techum:

Refraining from work on Shabbos - Shabbos refers to one's brain. One shouldn't invest his innermost power into his work - it should be reserved for Torah and serving Hashem. As the pasuk says, "By the work of your hands

shall you eat", with the intention being specifically the work of your hands, not the work of your head and heart. By investing one's brain into the mundane work, this brings about a void in oneself from being able to feel G-dliness. For if one truly felt how Hashem is the one who sends the sustenance through one's physical effort, he wouldn't involve his head and mental capabilities into it. Rather, this mental work takes him away from Torah study, and withholds Hashem's blessings from coming to fruition.

Even for someone who doesn't submerge his mental abilities into the mundane workload, there is another warning: Even one's externals must remain in the techum, in the realm of holiness. The capabilities that during the week are and should be involved in the work, must now be only involved in matters of holiness.

The final Mishna in Eruvin deals with an impure reptile in the Beis Hamikdash. For even after one is already careful with all of the earlier lessons learned in Tractate Shabbos and Eruvin - he refrains from all matters of Shabbos desecration, and is careful to remain in the techum as well - there still is a possibility of something impure in one's own Sanctuary. Being that the world around us has not reached its complete refinement, it can still be a source of impurity.

Although it is not one's own fault that this impurity came about, one is nonetheless obligated to remove it. These are the 2 manners mentioned in the final Mishna:

Remove it with one's garment - this is to involve oneself immediately to remove the impurity. although one must touch it and be invested, it is worthwhile to not let it wait.

Remove it with a piece of wood - this may take some time until the wood can be located. Similarly, this is waiting until the opportune time to power oneself to overcome the impurity, without giving it any importance.

Being that we are in the time leading up to Mashiach, who will come when Teshuva is reached, which can be in one moment, we must remove the impurity from ourselves through spreading the wellsprings of Chassidus to the outside, which will hasten Mashiach's arrival.

Likutei Sichos vol 11, pgs 63-73

Pesachim 2a

אור לארבעה עשר בזקין את החמצן לאור הנר
On the evening [or] of the fourteenth of the month of Nisan, one searches for leavened bread in his home by candlelight.

In one of the numerous Siyumim the Rebbe made on Pesachim, in 1976 (and I had the privilege to be present) the Rebbe connected the beginning of tractate Pesachim with the end of the tractate, which is customary.

A beautiful Chassidic insight on the first line of Pesachim, the Rebbe explained as follows: The time period between Pesach and Shavuot is similar to the time period before a boy becomes Bar Mitzvah and obligated to do the Mitzvahs.

אור לארבעה עשר - Before entering one's fourteenth year, i.e. 13, Bar Mitzvah, בזקין את החמצן - one searches (and removes) the Chometz, i.e. the Yetzer Harah, the evil inclination, לאור הנר, with the light of the candle, i.e. the light ofadam , the lamp of Hashem is the Neshama of man.

Sichos Kodesh 5736 Vol 2 p 66-67

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Pesachim 8a-b

האומר "סלא זו לזכקה בשכיל שיחיה בני" או "שאהיה בז
העולם הבא" הרי זה צדיק גמור

One who says: I am contributing this sela to charity so that my son will live, or so that I will be one destined for the World-to-Come, this person is a full-fledged righteous person.

The Rebbe asks, that according to Tosefot (Avodah Zarah 19a heading על מנת) the same applies to other Mitzvahs, so why does the Gemara specify the example of the one who gives Tzedakah? The Gemara should have simply stated: One who performs a Mitzvah...

The explanation is: Since amongst all the Mitzvahs, there is a particular Mitzvah that has a particular Segulah (benefit) for one's son to live, which is the concept of Tzedakah, as it says in Tanchumah (Mishpatim 15), that he who gives a Perutah to a poor man, Hashem says that the day will come, if one's son will need to receive this benefit, in the merit of Tzedakah, one's son will live!

Sicha 13 Tammuz 5736. See also Likutei Sichos Vol 6 p 271

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Pesachim 21a

רבי יהודה אומר: אין ביעור חמץ אלא שריפה

Rabbi Yehuda says: The removal of leavened bread is to be accomplished only through burning.

The majority opinion of the Rabbis is, that burning is not required. Rather, one may even crumble it and throw it into the wind or cast it into the sea.

The Rebbe in a Siyum of Tractate Tamid explains how many arguments between Rabbi Yehudah and the Rabbis including Rabbi Shimon, are based on a logical approach discussed by the Rogatchover Gaon.

The Torah says about chometz on Erev Pesach: תשביתו שאר מבתיכם - “You shall destroy all leaven from your houses”. Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Shimon argue as to how to fulfill this Mitzva.

Rabbi Shimon (and the majority of the Rabbis) - “Destroying” can be fulfilled by crumbling it up and throwing it into the ocean or wind.

Rabbi Yehuda - “Destroying” can only be accomplished through burning the chometz.

This difference between their way of learning is found in many of the recorded arguments between them.

On the verse וְהשַׁבְתִּי חַיָּה מִן הָאָרֶץ “And I will destroy all wild animals from the land” - Rabbi Shimon says the wild animals will no longer harm, while Rabbi Yehuda says they will be physically removed from the world.

Similarly, regarding Shabbos, the pasuk uses the same word - וּבַיּוֹם הַשְׁבֵיעִי תַּשְׁבַּת “And on the Seventh day stop (working).” Rabbi Shimon says there are situations where work is done, and one is not liable, *מלאכה שאינה צריכה לגופה*, while Rabbi Yehuda holds quite literally, that all work must be stopped.

Likutei Sichos Vol 7 p 188-197

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Pesachim 26a

קֹול וְמִרְאָה... אֵין בָּהּ מַפְשִׁית... וְרִיחַ
Sound, sight, and smell have no substance.

Of these three, appearance is the one that is the least connected to this world. Sound does create a change in the air particles, and smell is connected to a physical item from which it emanated from. Appearance has no connection to a physical item.

It is for this reason that light, appearance, was chosen to signify spirituality. This is why the miracle of rededicating the Beis Hamikdash after the victory over the Syrian Greeks was with the menorah specifically, and why we commemorate the miracle each year with the lighting. For light, from all creations in this world, is the most spiritual.

Likutei Sichos Vol 25 p 239

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Pesachim 35a

תנא דברי רבי אליעזר בן יעקב אמר קנא לא תאכל עליו חמץ שבעת ימים תאכל עליו מצות דברים הבאים לידי חימוץ — אולם יוצא בהן ידי חובתו במצה, יצאו אלו שאין בהם לידי חימוץ, אלא לידי סירחו.

the school of Rabbi Eliezer ben Ya'akov taught that the verse states: “**You shall eat no leavened bread with it; seven days you shall eat with it matza**, the bread of affliction” (Deuteronomy 16:3). This verse indicates that only with **substances which will come to a state of leavening**, a person **fulfills his obligation to eat matza with them**, provided he prevents them from becoming leavened. This **excludes these foods**, i.e., rice, millet, and similar grains, **which**, even if flour is prepared from them and water is added to their flour, **do not come to a state of leavening but to a state of decay [siraḥon]**.

The Rebbe explains in a Sicha published in later editions of the Rebbe's Hagadah, the difference between our Talmud Bavli Pesachim 35a, and the Yerushalmi.

There are 2 sources, for which Matza must be made in a way, that it could have turned into chometz.

The Talmud Bavli: “seven days don't eat chometz, rather eat matzah”. From this it is inferred that only grains that could have been chometz can be used for matzah, not rice and millet.

The Talmud Yerushalmi: “guard the matzos” matza needs guarding. This excludes a dough which is scalded, which doesn’t need to be guarded (as the baking is done too quickly to have the potential to become chometz)

Although the Yerushalmi holds of what the Bavli says, not necessarily does the Bavli hold of the Yerushalmi.

The Alter Rebbe paskens that matzah must be made with water, no other liquids, as only water can bring a dough to become chometz.

Haggadah Shel Pesach later editions, p 352-353

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Pesachim 44b

ומה נזיר ... עשה בו טעם כעיקר, כלאים ... אינו דין שיעשה
טעם כעיקר?

Just as with regard to a nazirite... the Torah rendered the legal status of **the taste of food** forbidden to him **like that of its substance**; with regard to a **forbidden mixture** of diverse kinds, **is it not right that** the Torah should render **the legal status of the taste of its forbidden food like that of its substance**?

A fascinating discussion between the Chief Rabbi Mordechai Eliyahu זצ"ל, and the Rebbe, based on a commentary on our Gemara:

Rebbe: there is a sensational innovative thought from the Maharam Chalava (ד"ה לר"ע) based on our Gemara, (פוחים מ"ד ע"ב) that if one eats less than the forbidden amount (kzayis), he hasn't transgressed a Torah prohibition. In regards to the Halacha, all others disagree, and there is a prohibition even for a smaller amount, although there is no punishment for it.

Rabbi Eliyahu: There is a Midrash, that the command to Adam and Chava not to eat from the Etz HaDaas was even less than a kzayis.

Rebbe: A Mashehu, a minuscule amount, is able to be divided into thousands upon thousands of additional minuscule portions.

Rabbi Eliyahu: This is especially so in regards to Pesach, when a Mashehu of chometz is forbidden. The reason being, as chometz is the idea of the Evil Inclination, which must be totally eradicated. This is also why yeast cant be brought on the Mizbayach.

Rebbe: The one exception, where chometz is brought on the Mizbayach, is on Shavuos, with the offering of the 2 Loaves. The lesson is, although haughtiness and boastfulness is a negative trait, when it comes to matters of holiness, it is a positive and necessary quality. We must be proud that we were chosen to receive the Torah.

Toras Menachem 5752

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Pesachim 50b

אמר רבי יהודה אמר רב: לעוזם יעסוק אדם בתורה ומיצות אף על פי שלא לשלמה, שמתוך שלא לשמה בא לשמה

Rav Yehuda said that Rav said: A person should always engage in Torah study and performance of mitzvot, even if he does so not for their own sake, as through the performance of mitzvot not for their own sake, one gains understanding and comes to perform them for their own sake.

In the literal sense, this means that after doing Torah and Mitzvos for an ulterior motive, not for the sake of the Mitzvah itself, a person will come to eventually do it for its sake alone.

On a deeper sense, it can be read that the תוך, the inner being of every Jew, is already doing the Torah and Mitzvos for its sake alone.

However, there are different ulterior motives a person may have to learning Torah. If one learns in order to be honored for his learning, this is still a positive act, that can lead a person to learn for the Torah itself. If one learns however, to taunt others through his learning, about such a person it says “it is better if he were to not be born”.

If the תוך, the inner part of every Jew is really for the Torah’s sake, why is this type of learning so negative?

The Rebbe explains, that the תור isn't referring to the inner part of the Jew himself. Rather, to the deeper meaning behind his intentions.

When a Jew learns Torah for his physical honor, that is in relation to his body. In relation to his soul, the honor is the honor of the Torah, and Hashem, that the soul craves to promote. So the deeper reason is really something positive.

When a person learns for a totally negative purpose, to taunt others, there is no possible deeper reason that the soul can relate to. So for this type of learning, there is no "תור", which can be regarded as לשםה - for it's sake.

Likutei Sichos volume 20 p 50-52

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Pesachim 54b

תנו ר'בון: שבעה דברים מכוונים מבני אדם, אלו הן: יומם הפינה, ויום הגנומה, ועומק הדין, ואין אדם יודע מה בלבו של חבירו, ואין אדם יודע במה משתכר, ומילכות בית דוד מות תחזור, ומילכות ח'יבת מתי תכליה.

The Sages taught: Seven matters are concealed from people, and they are: The day of death; and the day of consolation from one's concerns; the profundity of justice, ascertaining the truth in certain disputes; and a person also does not know what is in the heart of another; and a person does not know in what way he will earn a profit; and one does not know when the monarchy of the house of David will be restored to Israel; and when the wicked Roman monarchy will cease to exist.

ה מנת חלקך וכוסך, אתה תומיך, גורי - "The L-rd is my allotted portion and my cup; You guide my destiny" (Psalms 16:5)

This verse is brought down by the Rambam at the conclusion of the Laws of Shmitah and Yovel, to show that not only the tribe of Levi is unique to serve Hashem, but every Jew can choose to devote himself to serving Hashem as well, as seen in the first portion of the verse, "The L-rd is my allotted portion and my cup".

What connection is there to the final words "You guide my destiny" - why were they quoted as well?

The Talmud (Pesachim 54b) states: "Seven matters are concealed from men... One doesn't know which business will make him prosper, and when the Kingdom of David will return." One's business ventures are referred to as a "goral", also translated as a lottery, for one doesn't have direct control over it.

This is why the Rambam added the ending of the verse "You guide my destiny (goral)", that for someone to devote themselves to Hashem's service, they need the assistance from Hashem to enable their physical needs to be supported in a simple manner, which won't confuse them or leave them scattered, and unable to maintain their focus on Hashem.

As the Rambam includes this in his book of Halacha, we see that even a businessman, who is still involved in business, can elevate himself to become the status of "Holy of Holies" in his connection to Hashem, and the Torah and mitzvos.

Toras Menachem Vol 40 p 235-236

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Pesachim 59b

כופה דכהנים לא אכל בשר בעליים לא מתפפר, דתניא:
"ואכלו אתם אשר כפר בהם", מלמד שהכהנים אוכלים
בעליים מתפפרין

As long as the priests have not eaten the meat of the offering, the owners of the offering have not achieved complete atonement, as it was taught in a *baraita* that the verse: "And they shall eat those things with which atonement was made to consecrate them, (to sanctify them; but a stranger shall not eat of them for they are sacred" (Exodus 29:33), teaches that the priests eat, and consequently the owners of the offerings achieve atonement.

Although Simchas Beis Hashoeva was run by the Pirchei Kehuna, the teenage Kohanim, now that the Beis Hamikdash was destroyed, this service can be done by every Jew.

As the Ramban writes, not just the tribe of Levi (was separated to study Torah and teach), but every Jew who chooses to devote himself to Hashem's service, will become sanctified, just like the Kohanim were.

From here we see, that the services done specifically by the Kohanim in those times, can now be done by every Jew. Also, not just the teenagers, even those much older, as we see if someone truly wants to get something done, it can be done energetically like a young person.

So the job of lighting up the celebration of the Shoeivah, which requires climbing up extremely tall ladders while holding heavy jugs of oil, is now an obligation on everyone.

This that our Sages say “Yerushalayim will expand to the entire Land of Israel, and the Land of Israel will expand to the entire world”; the meaning is, every place in the world where there is a Jew, the Land of an Israelite, will be elevated with the fear of Hashem “yerei shalem” (the meaning of the name Yerushalayim).

As mentioned that every Jew can reach the service of the Kohanim, one's eating as well becomes like the Kohanim eating, which brings about forgiveness for the owners of the offering, as mentioned in Pesachim 59b.

“Forgiveness for the owners” - the owner is referring to Hashem, the true owner of the world. The forgiveness is, as Hashem says I need forgiveness for making the moon smaller, for this led to the rise of the Snake in the Garden, the Evil Inclination, Golden Calf, and all sins thereafter. As our Sages say there are a few creations that Hashem regrets.

Sicha Simchas Beis Hashoeiva 5720 section 29

Pesachim 68b

אמר רבי אלעזר: הכל מודים בעצרת דבעינן נמי לכם. מאין טעם? يوم שפיטתנה בו תזרעה הוא

Rabbi Elazar said: All agree with regard to *Atzeret*, the holiday of *Shavuot*, that we require that it be also “for you,” meaning that it is a Mitzva to eat, drink, and rejoice on that day. **What is the reason? It is the day on which the Torah was given**, and one must celebrate the fact that the Torah was given to the Jewish people.

This statement is expounded and illuminated in the Rebbe’s talks at length in at least 40 *Sichos!* However, for this Amud we will explain a different statement below, from *Sichos* in English:

רב ששת כל תליתין יומיין מהדר ליה תלמידיה, ותלי וכאי בעיברא דצשא, ואמרה: חדאי נפשאי, חדאי נפשאי, לך קראי, לך תנאי,

Rav Sheshet, that **every thirty days he would review his studies** that he had learned over the previous month, **and he would stand and lean against the bolt of the door and say: Rejoice my soul, rejoice my soul, for you I have read Scripture, for you I have studied Mishna.**

With regard to Rav Sheshes, *Shaar HaGilgulim* (the conclusion to Introduction 4) and *Sefer HaGilgulim* (ch. 10) interprets Rav Sheshes’ statement: “Let my soul rejoice. I read for your sake. I studied for your sake” as follows: Rav Sheshes knew that his soul was previously

incarnated in the body of Bava ben Buta and was perfected to the extent that it lacked very little. Afterwards, it was reincarnated in the body of Rav Sheshes. In this instance, the ordinary pattern is that the fundamental reward for the Torah and *Mitzvos* performed in the second incarnation is for the soul and not for the second body. For in the Era of the Resurrection, [the soul] will return to the first body in which it carried out the majority of the Torah and *Mitzvos* that it required. Therefore Rav Sheshes' body was sad. Hence, he would say: "Let my soul rejoice," i.e., [his soul,] but not his body.

It appears that this applies with regard to other expressions of Torah and *Mitzvos*. When, however, someone would repeat a teaching in the name of Rav Sheshes and thus *his lips* rustle in the grave *in this world*, we are speaking of the lips of Rav Sheshes' body rustling. There he in particular endeavored that teachings be recited in his name. (Nevertheless, he also said: "Let *my soul* rejoice. I read for your sake." For he was saying this with regard to his own Torah study. When, however, [he spoke of] having a teaching recited in his name, he was speaking about his instruction of others.)

Sichos in English

Pesachim 70a

חגיגה הבאה עם הפסח נאכלת תחילה, כדי שייהא פסח נאכל על השבע.

The Festival peace-offering that comes with the Paschal lamb is eaten first; the reason for this is so that the Paschal lamb will be eaten when one is already sated.

Although practically this means sated in a physical state, this refers to a stated spiritual state as well, referring to one's soul.

The reason being, that Pesach, from the Hebrew word for skipping, is a time one can reach great heights by skipping levels, which normally requires one to attain step by step.

This is similar to the steps the Jews took in Mitzrayim - taking the deity of the Egyptians, the lamb, slaughtering and putting the blood on the doorposts - without taking the danger into account.

One can ask, why is such an extreme service required? Maybe something more on a person's level should be demanded? This is coming from the Yetzer hara - for the whole year is a time to act based on where a person is holding. On the night of Pesach, it is different.

On Pesach, “we open the door”. For sure Hashem does the same, as He does what He tells us to do. All entrances are open, and a Jew can reach the highest levels, by way of skipping, beyond the step by step process that is normally entailed.

When Pesach falls on Motzei Shabbos, the idea of the Korban Pesach being eaten when one is sated does not apply - one can eat the meat even to satisfy one’s hunger. This is because the hunger on Shabbos is a higher source - which elevates the food one eats, through having enjoyment on Shabbos.

Being that the underlying point of the physical world is to elevate it; therefore, this is the ultimate goal, to elevate the spirituality of the body, similar to the way it will be in the World to Come.

Toras Menachem Vol 3 pp 10-15

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Pesachim 88b

מה שקנה עבד קנה רבו

Whatever a servant acquires, he does not gain ownership of it; rather, **his master acquires it**.

The Rebbe explains, that being that a servant has no existence of his own, everything he does is considered to be that of his master. This is why whatever he acquires belongs to his master - not that he first acquires it, and then it transfers to his master, but that he acquires it for his master.

Therefore, by a servant, whose existence is an extension of his master, there is no room to differentiate between different levels, or what his status is during different types of work. These distinctions can be made in regards to a Shliach, someone who is just a messenger for another. A servant, however, is not a separate entity that such distinctions can be made.

With this we can also explain the verse “And Yaakov went on his way”. A different verse says “Yaakov my servant”. We can extrapolate from here, that being that Yaakov was Hashem’s servant, “his way” wasn’t really something of his alone, rather it was Hashem’s way.

(Likutei Sichos Vol 20, pp 303-4)

Pesachim 95a

מתני' מה בין פסח הראשון לשני? ... הראשון טען היל באכילתו, והשני אינו טען היל באכילתו. זה וזה טען היל בעשיות

MISHNA: What is the difference between the Paschal lamb offered on **the first Pesah** and the Paschal lamb offered on **the second Pesah**? ... on **the first Pesah** requires the recitation of **hallel as it is eaten and the second does not require** the recitation of **hallel as it is eaten**. However, they are the same in that the Paschal lambs sacrificed on **both** the first and second **Pesah** require the recitation of **hallel as they are prepared**, i.e., as they are slaughtered.

The reason for not saying Hallel when eating on Pesach Sheni, is based on a Pasuk in Yeshaya, that the song (of Hallel) is connected to the night of Yomtov, while Pesach Sheni is not a Yomtov that is forbidden to do work.

The Rebbe explains that the overall service of bringing the Korban Pesach is a general service, which prepared the Jewish people to become Hashem's servants. In this regard, there is no difference as to when the Korban Pesach is brought - it must be brought with the joy of singing Hallel throughout the process.

When it comes to eating the actual Korban Pesach, although one partakes of this korban for it to become connected to him and part of

his own body, it is not considered an act of preparation to become Hashem's servant.

Therefore, Hallel is only sung when there is an additional factor of it being a Yomtov, and not on Pesach Sheni, when this additional component is not there.

Likkutei Sichos Vol 16 pp 108-113

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Pesachim 109a

תניא, רבי יהודה בן בתירא אומר: בזמן שבית המקדש קיים אין שמחה אלא בבשר, שנאמר: "זבחת שלמים ואכלת שם ושמחה לפני ה' אלהיך", וכיון שאין בית המקדש קיים, אין שמחה אלא ביום, שנאמר: "וין ישמח לבב אנוש".

It was taught in a *baraita* that Rabbi Yehuda ben Beteira says: When the Temple is standing, rejoicing is only through the eating of sacrificial meat, as it is stated: "And you shall sacrifice peace-offerings and you shall eat there and you shall rejoice before the Lord your God" (Deuteronomy 27:7). And now that the Temple is not standing and one cannot eat sacrificial meat, he can fulfill the mitzva of rejoicing on a Festival only by drinking wine, as it is stated: "And wine that gladdens the heart of man" (Psalms 104:15).

The blessings for bride and groom, the Sheva Berachos, commence with the blessing of "borei pri hagafen" over a cup of wine. The betrothal blessings begin with this blessing over a cup of wine as well.

Other mitzvos too, such as kiddush for Shabbos and the Festivals, and havdalah on the nights following Shabbos and the Festivals, are also made over a cup of wine.

Blessings are recited over wine, as wine possesses the singular trait of arousing joy, as the verse states, "Wine gladdens man's heart." Our Sages comment: "Joy is only with wine." So, too, writes the Chinuch about the nature of

wine: “Man’s nature is very much affected by it: it satiates and brings him joy.” Thus, it is a mitzvah to drink wine on special joyous occasions. This is particularly so regarding a wedding when it is a tremendous mitzvah to cause joy to the groom and bride, as the Tur states: “It is a truly great mitzvah to cause the groom and bride to rejoice.” Furthermore, our Sages note: “There is no greater joy than that of a wedding.”

“When Wine Enters, Secrets Are Revealed”

An additional reason why wine is particularly connected to a wedding lies in wine’s singular nature of opening hearts and revealing that which had previously been concealed and masked. In the words of our Sages: “When wine enters, secrets are revealed.”

Its connection to a wedding is, that a wedding affects and reveals the most concealed and hidden aspects — the souls of bride and groom that unite and are now revealed as one (as explained earlier at length). There is thus a clear relationship between a wedding and wine, which both reveal the “secret” and the “hidden.”¹

¹ Everything that exists within the world possesses a spiritual source Above. Wine, as well, possesses a G-dly spiritual source. By reciting the blessing over wine and by drinking it, one reveals its spiritual dimension and

[Additionally, Chassidus explains at length how the spiritual and Divine source of wine is truly lofty, and, at a wedding as well, truly lofty powers are granted to bride and groom².]

The cup of wine — the “cup of blessing” — is also linked to a wedding. Chassidus explains that husband and wife are an allusion to the “cup of blessing”: the cup alludes to the wife and the wine that is within the cup hints to the husband.

A Jew’s soul (which is so affected by a wedding) and wine are connected from yet another standpoint: Our Sages state: “The

source above; i.e., the revelation of the secret and covert aspects of the soul as well as the soul’s unification.

Additionally, we may say that spiritual wine, the “wine of Torah,” refers to the inner aspect of Torah: *Kabbalah* and *Chassidus*. The study of *Kabbalah* and *Chassidus* enables the individual to reveal the Divine “secret,” i.e., the G-dly soul.

² At times, however, wine can cause damage, as when one drinks to excess. *Chassidus* explains that it is specifically because of wine’s lofty spiritual stature that when one tumbles because of wine, he will plummet and descend to rock bottom, in keeping with the saying, “The loftier an object, the greater its fall.”

‘grapevine’ refers to the Jewish people.³” The reason for this is explained in Torah Or: “Wine is concealed within the grape, for the grape is round and wholly encompasses the wine within it. It is impossible to get at the wine without first squeezing and pressing the grape....

“So, too, it is impossible to reveal the soul’s hidden love for G-d — which is as concealed as wine within the grape — without first squeezing. Thus it says: ‘Be exceedingly humble,’ [achieve a] ‘contrite and broken heart,’ of the degree and rank of ‘my soul is as dust to all.’ When this is accomplished, the Divine soul is revealed.”

Sichos in English “Borei Pri HaGafen” Chapter XXII

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

³ *Chulin* 91a. The grapevine is also likened to “The mighty princes that materialize from the Jewish people in every generation ... Avraham, Yitzchak and Yaakov ... the Matriarchs ... the Tribes ... Torah ... Moshe, Aharon and Miriam ... the *Sanhedrin* ... the *tzaddikim* of each generation ... Jerusalem... the *Beis HaMikdash* ... the king ... the High Priest, etc.

Pesachim 116a

מִתְנֵי מֶצֶה לֹא כָּו שְׁבַי וְכָאן הַבָּן שְׁזֹאַל אֲבִיו. וְאֵם אֵין דַעַת בְּבָבָי אֲבִי מַלְמָדוֹן. מַה נְשַׁתְבָה הַלְילָה הַזָּה מִכֶּל הַלְילָות...

The attendants **poured the second cup for** the leader of the seder, **and here the son asks his father** the questions about the differences between Passover night and a regular night. **And if the son does not have the intelligence** to ask questions on his own, **his father teaches him** the questions. The mishna lists the questions: **Why is this night different from all other nights? ...**

Questions are essential to the Seder. They must therefore be asked even when no child is present. For example, even at a Seder attended only by two Torah scholars proficient in the laws of Passover, one scholar must ask the other. One who is alone asks the questions to himself. (Talmud, Pesachim 116a)

What is the point of asking oneself the questions? The mitzvah tonight is to tell the story to another person. By asking yourself the questions, you become the “other” to whom you will relate the story. Role-playing in this manner helps a person absorb the information with greater clarity and profundity.

Although once the children have asked the questions, the leader does not have to repeat them. (Maharil; Shulchan Aruch HaRav), nevertheless, the Rebbes of Chabad, after hearing the children and grandchildren ask the

questions, would then recite the questions themselves in an undertone.

This custom coincides with the opinion of Rambam, who maintains that the Seder leader recites the four questions. It is now the universal Chabad practice for everyone to recite the four questions after the children ask the questions. It was the custom of the Chabad rebbes to preface their recitation of the four questions with the words, “Father, I will ask you the Four Questions.” They did so even long after the passing of their fathers, and this is now the standard Chabad custom.

It was handed down in the name of the Baal Shem Tov that there are two versions to the introduction to the Four Questions:

- 1) “Father, I want to ask of you four questions”;
- 2) “Father, I will ask of you four questions.”

Each version, however, begins in an identical manner—“Father.” This refers to our Father in Heaven, to whom all of Israel ask the Four Questions. The child’s asking stimulates G-d’s love for us, like the love of parents for their young child, as in the verse (Hosea 11:1) regarding the time of the Exodus: “For Israel is a youth, [therefore] I love him . . .” The Torah in several instances describes us as being G-d’s

children. The above verse, however, emphasizes that G-d's love for us is like a parent's love for a young child.

Parents love their children because the parent and child are of one essence. But this love is most felt for young children. As children mature, the parents begin to love them for their accomplishments and qualities as well, for their wisdom, good character, or the honor and care they show to their parents. This latter love obscures to some extent the innate, unconditional parental love.

The love for a young child, by contrast, who is not yet wise, or good, or helpful, is pure parental love, the unconditional love of two beings that are of one essence. The love for the young child is therefore stronger and more evident, since it is not obscured by a conditional love.

Similarly, when we speak of G-d's love for us in the way a parent loves a young child, we refer to this essential, unconditional love born of our inherent bond with G-d.

Likkutei Sichot, vol. 12, p. 43
Toras Menachem 5743, vol. 3, p. 1230

Pesachim 121a

מתני' בירך ברכת הפסח — פטר את של זבח. בירך את של זבח — לא פטר את של פסח, דברי רבי יישמעאל. רבנן עקיבא אומר: לא זו פטורת זו ולא זו פטורת זו.

If one recited the blessing over the Paschal lamb, which is: Who sanctified us with His mitzvot and commanded us to eat the Paschal lamb, he has also exempted himself from reciting a blessing over the Festival offering. The blessing for the Festival peace-offering of the fourteenth of Nisan is: Who sanctified us with His mitzvot and commanded us to eat the offering. However, if he recited the blessing over the Festival offering, he has not exempted himself from reciting a blessing over the Paschal lamb. This is the statement of Rabbi Yishmael. Rabbi Akiva says: This blessing does not exempt one from reciting a blessing over this one, and that blessing does not exempt that one, as there is a separate blessing for each offering.

Rabbi Chayim Cohen (based on the *Jerusalem Talmud*) explains that Rabbi Yishmael's opinion is based on his conception of the Paschal sacrifice as being of fundamental importance (*ikkar*) and the *Chagigah* offering as being of secondary importance (*tafel*). Thus, by reciting the blessing over the *ikkar*, one satisfies the requirement of the blessing for the *tafel*.

This explanation raises an obvious question with regard to Rabbi Akiva's position. For seemingly, everyone would agree that the *Chagigah* offering is of secondary importance

to the Paschal sacrifice. (For there is no inherent obligation to bring a *Chagigah* sacrifice on the 14th of Nissan. Why is it brought? Only because one must eat the Paschal sacrifice when one's appetite has been satiated. To satisfy that requirement, the *Chagigah* offering is usually eaten first.)

Why then does Rabbi Akiva not accept Rabbi Yishmael's view? It is a universally accepted principle that if one recites a blessing over a matter of fundamental importance, one satisfies the requirement for reciting a blessing over a matter of secondary importance.

Rabbi Akiva's position can be explained as follows: With regard to eating for personal satisfaction, there is a difference between matters of primary importance and matters of secondary importance. For it is the person's own will which determines the relative importance of an object. With regard to *mitzvos*, by contrast, there is no concept of primary and secondary importance, as we are commanded: "Do not sit and weigh [the importance of] the *Mitzvos* of the Torah."

Thus it is true that the *Chagigah* offering is required only for the sake of the Paschal sacrifice, and there are times when it is not offered. Nevertheless, whenever it is offered, since it is required and it is a *Mitzvah* to

partake of it, it is not a secondary matter and requires a blessing of its own.

Indeed, Rabbi Yishmael also accepts the fundamental premise of this approach. For even according to Rabbi Yishmael, at the outset, a separate blessing should be recited for the *Chagigah* offering. It is only after the fact that he rules that the blessing for the Korban Pesach exempts the *Chagigah* offering.

According to this explanation, the difference between Rabbi Akiva and Rabbi Yishmael does not concern merely a particular point, but rather reflects a general difference in approach which finds expression in many contexts. For Rabbi Akiva's position is that every *mitzvah* is of inherent and indigenous importance, while Rabbi Yishmael maintains that there is a certain degree of primacy between *mitzvos*; some have greater importance than others.

These two perspectives flow from basic differences in the approaches of the two Sages. Rabbi Yishmael was a *Kohen*; according to some views, even a High Priest. Because his world was one of holiness, he perceived his challenge in the service of G-d to be the extension of the borders of holiness, drawing G-dliness into the framework of worldly existence.

Rabbi Akiva, by contrast, stemmed from a family of converts and did not himself begin studying Torah until he was forty. His approach to Divine service reflected the striving of the *baal teshuvah*, who rises above himself and his previous experiences and turns to G-d.

The ultimate goal of our Divine service is a combination of these two approaches, for each has its distinctive merits. This synthesis will reach its apex in the Era of the Redemption, when "*Mashiach*" will motivate the righteous to turn to G-d in *teshuva*h." The Divine service of "the righteous," which is directed towards drawing down G-dliness within the context of the natural order (Rabbi Yishmael), will be permeated by the all-encompassing mode evoked by *teshuva*h (Rabbi Akiva).

Since we are living in the time immediately preceding *Mashiach*, we can appreciate a foretaste. Through these efforts, we will hasten the coming of the time when we will achieve the ultimate expression of both these approaches, with the coming of *Mashiach*.

Likkutei Sichos, Vol. 6 p. 119