

Pesach 2016 part 2

1) Maggid- daled banim

Sichos Rabbi Shimshon Pinkes pages 40-41; Moshe taught the mitzvos of Pesach to the Jews. The pasuk then states “the people bowed their heads and prostrated themselves.” (Shemos 12, 27) Rashi explains that the Jews bowed because they knew that they would have children, as the previous pasuk states that their children would ask “what is this service to you?” What is peculiar is; in the Haggadah itself the rasha asks this question. The Haggadah states that the problem of the rashes’ question was that he excluded himself by saying “what is this service to you?” You but not him.’ With this introduction the question arises; **how is this considered good news? Knowing that their sons will be wicked is seemingly bad news.** When the Jews left Egypt their essence became new. They essentially became a new nation. As we recite daily in Shema (Bamidbar 15, 41) “I am Hashem, your God, Who has removed you from the land of Egypt to be a God unto you; I am Hashem your God.” Seemingly the statement “I am Hashem your God” is redundant. Rashi explains that the second statement of “I am Hashem your God” is not superfluous. The first statement of “I am Hashem your God” refers to willingly accepting Hashem. The second “I am Hashem your God” alludes to Hashem accepting us even if we don’t accept Hashem. After we left Egypt, the concept of the Jews sinning and repenting came into existence. It says in the Haggadah regarding the rasha ‘if he would have been there (in Egypt), he would not have been redeemed.’ However, after the Jews were taken out of Egypt there was a new hope even for the wicked people. Even though the Haggadah states ‘to whack/blunt his (the rasha’s) teeth,’ nevertheless we still answer his questions. This is the news that the Jews received regarding the wicked children they will bear; **even if someone has a wicked child who asks all different types of inappropriate and heretical questions, he has a place in the Haggadah and is a part of the seder. We will not give up hope, we patiently await his repentance. We blunt him in the teeth. We answer his questions.**

2) Diyanu

The most commonly asked question on דינו is; would it really have been enough? The simple answer to all questions pertaining to דינו are solved based on the explanation of the Malbim (on his commentary to the Haggadah), who explains דינו **doesn’t mean it would have been solely sufficient and we wouldn’t have needed additional goodness to be bestowed. Rather, דינו means it would have been enough to give thanks (הודאה) to Hashem for each individual act of kindness that Hashem bestowed upon us.**

The problem with this answer of the Malbim is; this is not the simple interpretation. The simple explanation of דינו is each individual act would have been sufficient even without any other act.

One of the cryptic lines in דינו is 'אילו נתן לנו את ממונם ולא קרע לנו את הים דינו' “Had He (Hashem) given us their money and not ripped the Sea for us, it would have been enough.” The obvious question is; how would this have been sufficient? Even if Hashem would have given us all the money in the world, but not split the sea, this seemingly wouldn’t have been enough.

a) The Orchos Chaim explains that **Hashem could have naturally saved the Jews. For example, He could have led the Jews in a different direction, a direction that the Egyptians**

would be unable to figure out where they went. Hashem went above and beyond by performing a miraculous miracle.

b) The Maggid Devarav Leyaakov offers a similar answer. **Hashem could have protected the Jews via the clouds of glory (ענני הכבוד). Performing the big miracle of splitting the Red sea was much greater.**

c) The Shaniyim Me Yodaya offers another answer. Splitting the sea was only needed because Hashem hardened Paro's heart. (See writings in parshas Va'eira 2017.) Since Paro's heart was hardened, he decided to chase after the Jews. **If Hashem wouldn't have hardened Paro's heart, Paro and the Egyptians wouldn't have run after the Jews.** Thus the statement 'Had He (Hashem) given us their money and not ripped the Sea for us, it would have been enough', refers to Hashem not hardening Paro's heart and **thus not needing to split the sea.**

Another cryptic line in דיינו is 'אילו קרע לנו את הים ולא העבירנו בתוכו בהרבה דינו' "if He (Hashem) would have split the sea and not brought us through it onto dry land, it would have been enough."

The obvious question is; how would this have been sufficient? If Hashem would have split the sea but not brought the Jews to dry land, this seemingly wouldn't have been enough.

The Rashbam and Avudrum answer and explain that the Haggadah is not telling us that the Jews wouldn't have gone thru the split sea at all. Rather, **we would have gone through; but we would have walked through on a muddy and wet sea floor.** We are thus thanking Hashem for allowing our ancestors to cross thru the split sea on dry land.

Another cryptic line in דיינו is 'אלו העבירנו בתוכו בהרבה ולא שקע צרינו בתוכו דינו.' "If you (Hashem) would have brought us through on dry land and not sunk our enemies within it, it would have been enough." The explanation of this statement is similar to the aforementioned explanation of the aforementioned statement. The Rashbam, Avudrum and Orchos Chaim explain that **even if the Egyptians wouldn't have drowned, it wasn't inevitable that the Egyptians would have tried to chase and kill the Jews. Once they witnessed the splitting of the sea, perhaps they would have realized what Hashem is capable of. Once they would see the sea closing and reverting to its original state, perhaps they would have gotten scared and returned to Egypt.**

Another cryptic line in דיינו is 'אילו קרבנו לפני הר סיני ולא נתן לנו את התורה דיינו.' "If you (Hashem) would have brought us in front of Har (the mountain of) Sinai and not given us the Torah this would have been enough."

What is the simple explanation of this enigmatic statement? Would merely approaching Har Sinai without receiving the Torah really have been sufficient?

a) Rav Moshe Feinstein zasa"l (Drash Moshe page 81 after parshas Tzav) explains that **it would have been enough if Hashem wouldn't have publicly given us the Torah. It would have been sufficient for Hashem to privately give the Torah to Moshe.** Hashem giving the Torah publically was definitely better and loftier, but unnecessary.

b) An additional answer is as follows; someone who enters into a perfume or cologne store will smell like perfume or cologne, even if they do not purchase anything. **If the Jews would have merely approached Har Sinai without receiving the Torah, the Jews would have still been affected from the 'smell', radiance and spiritual charge.** Rav Ari Marcus Shlita (Despair to Destiny pages 169-170) discusses the significance of Har Sinai and its importance even without

receiving the Torah. The tummah (impurity) that remained within mankind from the sin of Adam and Chava was eliminated only when the Jews came to Har Sinai.

c) Rabbi Yosef Shalom Elyashiv zasa"l quotes his grandfather Rav Shlomo Elyashiv who answers based on a Gemara. The Gemara in Baba Mesia (59b) relates a machlokes (dispute) amongst Rabbi Eliezer and others regarding the status of the oven of Achnai. A bas kol (heavenly voice) declared the halacha is like Rabbi Eliezer. To which Rabbi Yehoshua responded we do not pay attention to heavenly voices..אין משגיחין לבת קול. Rebbe Yirmiyah explains that once we received the Torah on Har Sinai we no longer pay attention to heavenly voices. The halacha is decided by human's only, not heavenly voices. The statement 'If you (Hashem) would have brought us in front of Har (the mountain of) Sinai and not given *us* the Torah this would have been enough', **means if Hashem would have given us the Torah even without the ability to definitively decide the final halacha, this would have been sufficient.** To never have received the Torah, though, would never have been enough.