

In last week's BR, we began our discussion of the first *Tosafos* in *shas*. *Rashi* on the *mishna* explains that the *chiyuv deoraisa* of the evening *krias sh'ma* (KS) can only be recited after *tzeis hakochavim*. *Rashi* then explains that the common *minhag* of many shuls to doven *maariv* before *tzeis* is halachikally acceptable because, although the KS that is recited at the early *maariv* does not fulfill the *mitzva* of KS, the bedtime, single *parsha* "KS *al hamita*" that we say, suffices for the *mitzva* of KS.

Tosafos raised 4 problems with *shitas Rashi*. Last week we discussed the first 2 problems. Namely, that the bedtime KS that *Rashi* views as fulfilling the *mitzva* does not appear to suffice, as it is only comprised of the first *parsha* of KS, and is not preceded or followed by any of the *b'rachos* that normally accompany KS. Having addressed these issues at length last week (see BR *Yarchei Kallah* edition # 1), we now turn our attention to a third problem that *Tosafos* had with *shitas Rashi*.

ISSUE #3 How could *Rashi* suggest that the "KS *al hamita*" is the actual *mitzvah* of the evening KS? Isn't there a concept of "s'michas *geulah letefillah*" (SGL) that demands that our *tefillos* be preceded by KS?

The truth is that this question of *Tosafos* presumes certain assumptions. The first assumption, which *Tosafos* himself points out, is that SGL is necessary at night. In support of this assumption, *Tosafos* points out the gm on 4b which discusses SGL at night. R' Yochanan holds that he who is SGL at night is a *ben olam habah* (*eizehu ben olam haba zeh hasomech geula l'tfila shel arvis*). *Rav Yehoshua ben Levi*, on the other hand, prefers that the *tefillos* of the day be recited in the midst of the recital of the morning and the evening KS (*tefillos b'emtza tiknum*). *Rav Yehoshua ben Levi* therefore prefers that the morning KS be recited before the morning *tefillah*, but that the evening KS be recited **after** the evening *tefillah*. *Rav Yehoshua ben Levi* therefore poses no contradiction to the *shita* of *Rashi*. *Tosafos* himself points out that his question is predicated on the assumption that we posken like *Rav Yochanan*, an assertion that is contested by the *Ohr Zaruah* (hil. KS 1:1) in defense of *Rashi*.

Another puzzling assumption of *Tosafos* has to do with the nature of SGL. What is the point of the institution of saying words of *geulah* before *tefillah*? *Rashi* on 4b (d"h (*zeh hasomech*)) seems to explain that before one asks for his needs from *Hashem*, he must first praise Him. *Rashi* there quotes a *yerushalmi* that likens one who does not say *shma* before *tefilla* to a servant who knocks on the king's door, and then leaves before the king comes to the door (*l'ma hadavar domeh l'ohavo shel melech sheba v'dafak al pishcho shel melech, yatza hamelech umetzao shehiflig*). We, as servants of *Hashem*, therefore praise *Hashem* for *yetsias mitzraim* before we doven *shmoneh esrai* and then immediately pray to *Hashem* to take care of us.

The question we posed in *shiur* was, if the thematic link between *geulah* and *tefilla* is the main goal of the SGL, is this thematic link any different if the KS that is recited fulfills the *mitzvah deoraisa*? Why does *Tosafos* think that the SGL is broken if the KS of *maariv* does not qualify for the *mitzva deoraisa*? After all, the KS is still being recited in entirety as its part of *maariv*, one would think that the halachik status of that KS is not relevant as long as the message of the KS and *geula* is expressed!

Tosafos is not alone in requiring a *mitzvas* KS *m'deoraisa* to accomplish SGL. In fact, most *rishonim* that defend *Rashi* are in agreement with this point of *Tosafos*. The *Ohr Zaruah* we mentioned above also assumed that the KS of an early *maariv* does not count for SGL, only he explains *Rashi* in accordance with R' *Yehoshua ben Levi* who does not require SGL at night. The *Rashba* (d"h *u'mah*) explains that *Rashi* allows for SGL to be forfeited in favor of *tefillah betzibbur*, but he agrees that in principle both *Rashi* and *Tosafos* agree that SGL is lost if the *maariv* KS does not fulfill the *mitzvah* of KS *m'deoraisa*. *Rav Amram Gaon* (*Tos* 4b *d'amar*) also agrees that SGL is lost unless preceded by KS *m'deoraisa*, but could explain for *Rashi* that SGL is not necessary for *maariv* because "*tefillas arvis reshus*".

R' Saffer asked on the aforementioned *rishoinim*: "why would the "*geulah*" of SGL that precedes the *tefillah* need to be part of a *mitzvas* KS *m'deoraisa*?" In fact, *Rav Mordechai Willig* Shlita in his sefer *Am Mordechai* (*siman daled*) quotes a *Ra'avad* that explicitly claims that according to *Rashi* the mere recital of KS prior to *tefillah* makes for a legitimate SGL regardless of whether the KS obligation was *d'robonon* or *deoraisa*. This understanding of *Rashi*, adopted by R' Saffer seems to be the position of the *Beur Halacha* (*sof siman* 46 d"h *ki leph'amim*) as well.

With this new understanding of *Rashi* the following question was raised by R' Saffer. What then is the point of contention (*nekudas hamachlokes*) between *Rashi* and the other *Rishonim*? Why would *Tosafos* and the other *rishonim* require the *mitzvas* KS *m'deoraisa* for SGL? *Rashi* according to the *Ra'avad* seems logical when he says that all the ideas of SGL are still being expressed in the KS and *birchas* KS of the early *maariv*.

R' Saffer pressed further raising a number of other difficulties in understanding this *sugya* of SGL. First he quoted R' **Zecharia Isaacson** who asked the following question on the aforementioned *Rashi* on 4b. If SGL is such an important introduction to *tefilla*, demanding praise for *Hashem* for *yetsias mitzraim* prior to our dovening to *Hashem* for our needs, why do we forego SGL at *mincha*? For that matter, why isn't *geulah* incorporated into the first three *brachos* of *tefillah* which is set aside for praise (*shevach*)?

Moreover, what is this *machlokes* between *Rav Yochanan/Rav Yehoshua Ben Levi* regarding SGL at night? Why in the world wouldn't *Rav Yehoshua Ben Levi* also want SGL at night and prefer that the *tefilla* precede the KS. What is this seeming need of "*tefillos b'emtza tiknum*". The gm (4b), in discussing the basis of the *machlokes*, entertains the possibility that it is either a rational argument (*sevara*), or an argument over the interpretation of the *pasuk* (*k'rah*). The gm continues to spell out each approach. For the "*sevara*" approach, the gm states that *Rav Yochanan* requires SGL at night due to the fact that there was some degree of *geula* at night (*geula m'orta nami havi*). *Rav Yehoshua Ben Levi* on the other hand does not require SGL at night due to the fact that the *geula* was incomplete until the morning (*geula malyasa lo havia ad tzafra*). For the "*k'rah*" approach the gm states that they both interpret the same *pasuk* comparing lying down in the evening (*b'shochvecha*) to arising in the morning (*u'vekumecha*). *Rav Yochanan* maintains that just as in "arising" in the morning KS precedes *Tefilla* so to when "lying down" in the evening KS precedes *Tefilla* (*ma kima krias shma v'achar kach tefilla, af shechiva krias shema v'achar kach tefilla*).

Rav Yehoshua Ben Levi maintains that the same way when "arising" in the morning KS is closer to the time he is lying in his bed, so too when "lying down" in the evening KS is closer to the time he is lying in his bed (*ma kima krias shma samuch l'mitso, af shechiva nami krias shema samuch l'mitso*). These two approaches of "sevara" and "kerah" are each difficult in their own way.

If the *machlokes* is based on "sevara", then it is difficult to see why *R' Yehoshua Ben Levi* not only allows but demands that KS be recited after *tefilla*. After all, he admits there was a partial (although incomplete) *geula* in the evening. He also admits that KS\geula is a required intro to *tefilla* in the morning, yet he does not state his reasoning for having *tefilla* lead-in to KS in the evening. How is the fact that the *geulah* of night is only partial reflected in reversing the order of *tefilla* and KS? The approach of "k'rah" on the other hand, is difficult according to *Rav Yochanan*. We can understand how *R' Yehoshua ben Levi* learns from "*b'shochvecha, u'vekumecha*" that KS is always "*samuch l'mita*", book-ending the *tefillos* of the day (*tefillos b'emtza tiknum*), but how does *Rav Yochanan* learn his concept of SGL from the *pasuk*? Even if you said that he compares the evening dovening to the morning dovening where KS is before *tefillah*, the fact remains that "*b'shochvecha, u'vekumecha*" is a *pasuk* that refers to KS, how does *Rav Yochanan* learn what the structure of *tefillah* should be from a *possuk* about KS?

Perhaps the most striking question on *Rav Yochanan* comes from a different statement of his on 14b. In that gm, *Rav Yochanan* states: "How does one achieve *kabbalas ole malchoos shomayim* in the most complete way? One should (when waking in the morning), relieve himself, be "*noteil yadayim*", put on *tefillin*, recite KS, and follow it with *tefilla*..." (*harotzeh sheyikabel alav ole malchus shamayim shleima, yifaneh, v'yitol yadav, v'yaniach tefillin, v'yikra krias shma v'yisparallel*). There is a glaring difficulty in this gm. We certainly know that the *mitzvah* that accomplishes "*kabbalas ole malchoos shomaim*" is KS. We can also appreciate how the prior activities of relieving oneself, *netilas yadayim* and putting on *tefillin* are preparatory prerequisites for the *kabbalas ole malchus shamayim* of KS. *Tefilla*, however, is merely an act of asking *Hashem* for *rachamim* and to fulfill our needs. In fact, the gm 21b (in the *sugya* of *hirhur k'dibur dami*) distinguishes between KS and *tefilla* by saying that *tefilla* is not an act of *kabbalas ole malchus shamayim* (*les bei malchus shamayim*). It is thus an act that is done **after** *kabbalas ole malchus shomayim* has already been achieved! Why, then, does *Rav Yochanan* describe *tefilla* as the culmination of a complete *kabbalas ole malchus shomayim*?

R' Saffer proceeded to first address the above question as he maintained it was the key to understanding our *sugya* and answering all the questions above. He did this by digging in to one of the most famous *Rabbeinu Yonah's* in *shas*. *Rabbeinu Yonah* (folio 2b d"h *eizehu*) was bothered by the *Rav Yochanan's* statement of "*Eizehu ben Olam Habah? Zeh hasomeich geulah l'tefillah*" (4b). How can a simple act of SGL be so powerful that it can guarantee a portion in the world to come? *Rabbeinu Yonah* suggests that there are two very powerful ideas implicit in *tefilla*. The first is that we are subservient to *Hashem* (*avdei hashem*). *Tefillah* itself is called "*avodah sheb'lev*" (service of the heart). Furthermore, we doven to *Hashem* because we recognize that He is the source of our sustenance, and there is no other place we can turn to for our needs, as He is the source of all we have. These two powerful concepts are concepts that were dramatically illustrated to us at *yetsias mitsraim*. We recognize and have *bitachon* in *Hashem* as our source of salvation who provides all our needs, and that we are bound as well to serve Him. With this *Rabbeinu Yonah* we can now understand that bringing out the themes *geulas mitzrayim* is the basis for and fundamental to our *kabbalas ole malchus shamayim* of KS. This *kabbalas ole malchoos shomayim* of KS is thus *m'chayev tefilla*. As *R' Yochanan* himself states (14b) the only way to express *kabbalas*

ole malchus shomayim shleima is by following it up with *tefilla*.

To summarize, what emerges from *Rabbeinu Yonah* is that SGL is not designed to enhance *tefilla* as we previously thought. It is in fact a *halacha* in KS! In *lomdush* terminology one would say, *tefilla* is not *m'chayev* KS, rather **KS is *m'chayev tefilla***. To quote *Rabbeinu Glanz*, reciting KS is "talking the talk", but it is that much more powerful when we back up our ideals with action. No action is more fitting and necessary following *shma* than *tefilla*. ***Tefilla* is "walking the walk"**. The halacha of SGL is that any time we say **KS, it is *m'chayev us to follow up the KS with action, the action of tefilla, the ultimate expression of kabbalas ole malchoos shomayim***. This is what *Rav Yochanan* must mean when he refers to *tefilla* as the culmination of "*kabbalas ole malchus shomayim shleima*".

Now that we have laid down our *yesod*, we can answer all of our questions. For example, why is there no SGL at *mincha*, nor are its concepts incorporated into the *shevach* portion of *tefilla*? According to our *yesod*, *tefilla* does not demand SGL, rather it is KS that is demanding (*m'chayev*) it. The truth is, if we consider the SGL analogy of the *yerushalmi* brought down by *Rashi* (4b), it makes much more sense in the context of our *p'shat*. The visual of the servant knocking on the door and taking off before the king comes to the door. We have knocked on *Hashem's* door by expressing the ideas incorporated and developed in KS. Now that we have expressed the ideas, only a fool would not capitalize on that opportunity right away by waiting for *Hashem* to "open the door" and immediately asking for our needs in *tefillah*. **Once again we see, KS is *m'chayev* and demands *tefillah*** (not vice versa).

This approach also explains the rationale of the dispute between *Rav Yochanan* and *Rav Yehoshua ben Levi* in the gm 4b. *Rav Yochanan* sees in the *k'rah* of "*b'shachvecha uvekumacha*" a halacha in KS, that it should always (morning and evening) be a *kabbalas ole malchus shomayim sheleima*, namely, one that is followed by *tefilla*. *Rav Yehoshua ben Levi* while requiring SGL in the morning to emphasize the *geula m'alyasa*, in the evening when there was an incomplete *geula* the structure of classical SGL gave way to the restructuring of KS \ *tefilla* to maximize its import. According to *Rav Yehoshua ben Levi* all the *tefillos* of the day are now book-ended with *kabbalas ole malchus shomayim* (*tefillos b'emtza KS tiknum*). This structure makes all the *tefillos* of the day including *mincha* (see *rashi d"h b'emtza tiknum*) expressions of *kabbalas ole malchus shomayim*.

With this we then proceeded to fully crunch our original *machlokes* between *Rashi* (*Ra'avad*) and *Tosafos* (*rov rishonim*). It is obvious why *Tosafos* and the other *rishonim* we mentioned wanted the *mitzvas* KS *deoraisa* in order to achieve SGL as it is the *mitzvas* KS that is *m'chayev* SGL. Understanding SGL as we do, we can also say that *Rashi* views SGL along the same lines. If you recall last week (BR *Yarchei Kallah* Edition # 1) we established that *Rashi* argued that KS as part of *maariv* is really an independent 3 *parsha* KS *derobonon*. It then makes sense that according to *Rashi* that the KS *derobonon* is what is *m'chayev* the SGL. This is logical because only the last paragraph of KS which almost everyone agrees is *derobonon* actually mentions *geulas mitzrayim*. *Tosafos*, who is of the opinion that *mitzvas* KS *deoraisa* is *m'chayev* SGL is following his approach in KS *derobonon*. To *Tosafos* KS *derobonon* was itself a 2 *parsha* expansion of KS *deoraisa*. This "KS *deoraisa* expansion" is what demands SGL with its *birchas* KS in the *zman* of KS.

We have now developed a comprehensive approach to the questions that *Tosafos* had on *Rashi* in this mammoth first *Tosafos* in *shas*. We have left out one of the four questions, as it is more technical in nature, but fits into our approach nonetheless. All those interested in further details and clarity should approach any of the members of the *chaburah* or join our google site <http://groups.google.com/group/r-saffer-biyun/web/yarchei-kallah>