

INTERNET PARSHA SHEET
ON BEHALOSCHA - 5758

To receive these Parsha sheets by e-mail, contact crshulman@aol.com or members.aol.com/crshulman/torah.html. To subscribe to individual lists see <http://www-torah.org-virtual.co.il-shamash.org-shemayisrael.co.il-jewishamerica.com-ou.org/lists-youngisrael.org-613.org>

weekly@virtual.co.il * TORAH WEEKLY * Highlights of the Weekly Torah Portion Parshas Beha'aloscha <http://www.ohr.org.il/tw/5758/bamidbar/behaalos.htm>

Street Heater "Miriam and Aharon spoke against Moshe regarding the Cushite woman that he had married." (12:1) Imagine a Native American, who has spent all his life on the reservation in Canyon de Chelly, Arizona, finding himself on the East Side of New York City around 29th and Lex. He walks down the street and stops. His attention is riveted on a nearby window. Straddling the window is a rectangular metal box about three feet long by eighteen inches high. It blasts out hot air, chugging away in a relentless mechanical symphony. He lifts his eyes. Brownstone apartments rear upwards to the sky. And in each and every window he sees the same metal box. Hundreds of them, all belching hot air into the humid Manhattan sky. He thinks to himself "These white men sure love the heat. It's so hot today -- and they still put these contraptions in their windows to heat the street!"

When Miriam found out that Moshe had separated from his wife, she thought that he had become conceited. She thought Moshe viewed himself as being so close to G-d that he had risen beyond a normal marital relationship, that his self-imposed monasticism was a product of an inflated ego. Of course, what would be considered conceit in Moshe, would to us appear humility beyond anything we have ever seen or experienced. We have no parameters to equate our concepts of conceit and humility to Moshe.

But, on that exalted level, Miriam thought that Moshe had succumbed to pride. But how could Miriam have thought that Moshe was acting out of pride? The Torah calls Moshe the "humblest of all men." Surely Miriam knew the Torah's evaluation of Moshe. How could Miriam have even suspected his motives?

Moshe may have been the humblest of all men, but he wasn't a shlepper. Being humble doesn't mean walking around hunched over with a miserable look on your face. Moshe knew that he was the king. But he also knew that compared to Hashem, he was nothing. His humility lay in understanding, like no man before or since, exactly how small he was compared to Hashem.

It was because Moshe worked on himself to this point that Hashem concretized his awareness by speaking to him "face to face." Then Moshe's humility became visceral. He could "see" how small he was. Humility is not something you can judge from the outside. There are some people who seem very humble, but inside they are watching everyone watching them be humble. They are starring in their own mental movie called: "A Life of Total Humility." On the other hand, a king may appear to behave in a rather grand fashion, whereas inside he genuinely sees himself as totally unworthy.

Sometimes things aren't quite the way they seem. Sometimes a cool air-conditioner can look like a street heater blasting out its own hot air.

Symptoms and Syndromes "Hashem said to Moshe, 'Gather to Me seventy men from the elders of Israel.'" (11:16) The waiting room was filled with people, most of them wheezing and coughing. It was that time of year again, and doctors' waiting rooms across the country were filled with flu patients just like this one. In the corner of the room sat a teenage boy. He was coughing a little, although a little less than most others in the room.

The surgery door swung open and a harassed looking man in his mid-fifties shouted from the doorway: "Next!" An old lady was just getting to her feet when the doctor's eye alighted on the young boy. "You!" he shouted, "You! In here immediately!" The doctor brought the young boy into the room and sat him down. Behind the closed door there could clearly be heard the sound of an old lady remonstrating that she had lost her turn, and these young people had no respect for the old.... After a minute or

B'S'D' two with his stethoscope, the doctor picked up the phone and ordered an ambulance. "Don't worry" he said to the boy, "you're going to be fine. We've caught it in time." A good doctor is someone who can read the symptoms of his patient like a book.

When the Jewish People tired of the manna, they developed a craving for meat. They cried to Moshe. Moshe turned to Hashem and asked "Where shall I get meat to give to this entire people?" Hashem's reply was that Moshe should gather together 70 men from the elders of Israel, to take them to the Tent of Meeting and have them stand there together with Moshe. Ostensibly, this was a strange reply. Hashem planned to give the Jewish People the meat they craved. So, wouldn't Moshe have been better served by gathering seventy ritual slaughterers (shochtim) rather than seventy elders? The craving for meat, for the physical things of this world, is no more than a physical expression of a spiritual lacking. The desire for meat wasn't the disease -- it was only the symptom. The Jewish People said that they craved meat, but in reality their souls craved spirituality. Our Rabbis teach us that someone who loves money will not be satisfied with money, he will want more. They also say that someone who loves Torah will not be satisfied with the Torah he has amassed, he will want more. The desire for money is no more than the physical expression of a spiritual lacking -- the desire for Torah. It's a good doctor who can tell the difference between the symptom and the disease.

Sources: Street Heater - The Malbim, Rabbi C.Z. Senter Symptoms and Syndromes - Rabbi S.R. Hirsch heard from Rabbi Mordechai Pitem
Written and Compiled by Rabbi Yaakov Asher Sinclair General Editor: Rabbi Moshe Newman Production Design: Eli Ballon Prepared by the Jewish Learning Exchange of Ohr Somayach International 22 Shimon Hatzadik Street, POB 18103 Jerusalem 91180, Israel E-Mail: info@ohr.org.il Home Page: <http://www.ohr.org.il>

hamaayan@torah.org Hamaayan The Torah Spring Edited by Shlomo Katz Beha'alotecha

.. According to one opinion in the gemara, there are not five books of the Torah but seven. The Book of Bemidbar is actually three books, of which the end of one, all of the second, and the beginning of the third are found in our parashah. (According to this view, verses 10:35-36 are a free-standing book.) ...

"With matzot and bitter herbs they shall eat it." (9:11) R' Moshe Sherer z"l (see page 4) writes: Compared to the symbols of the other holidays, matzah is rather low-key. On Rosh Hashanah, the shofar is blown loudly. On Sukkot, we parade with the lulav standing tall. On Chanukah, we light menorahs in our windows. On Simchat Torah and Purim, we also celebrate conspicuously. Why is it, then, that throughout history, it was Pesach which seemed to enrage our gentle neighbors the most? Why was it typically at Pesach time that Jews suffered from blood libels and pogroms? Certainly, writes R' Sherer, this was the work of the sitra achra (loosely translated: the angel who is the guardian of all evil forces) himself. Matzah represents too much for us to be allowed to eat it in peace. What does matzah represent? It reminds us of Hashem's strong hand and of the eternity of the Jewish people. Even when our ancestors in Egypt fell perilously close to spiritual oblivion, Hashem saved them. Also, matzah represents the transmission of our heritage and beliefs from generation to generation, as it is written (Shmot 13:8), "And you shall relate to your son . . ." Over the matzah, we tell our children of the many empires that forced our ancestors to eat matzah in secret and of the fact that we outlived those empires. From matzah, we also can learn how to fight those empires, R' Sherer writes. The gemara states that matzah which is made in direct sunlight is unfit for Pesach. So, too, our activism must be low-key. Matzah also may not contain food coloring. So, too, our activism must be free of foreign, non-Torah influences. (Be'shteit Enayim p. 43)

"When you go to wage war in your Land against the enemy who oppresses you, you shall sound short blasts of the trumpets . . ." (10:9) From the seemingly superfluous words, "against the enemy who oppresses you," Rambam derives that there is a mitzvah to sound the trumpets and pray to Hashem over any form of oppression, be it a drought, plague or other

trouble. He writes that this is part of the process of teshuvah/repentance, and that through teshuvah one causes his troubles to depart. The biggest sin, Rambam writes, is to ascribe one's troubles to fate or coincidence. R' Yaakov Yitzchak Halevi Ruderman z"l added (during the Yom Kippur War): Even those who ascribe troubles to coincidence start to pray when the troubles are their own. That is how we must see the troubles of our brethren in Israel - as our own. Moreover, said R' Ruderman, Chazal teach that every person should believe, "The whole world was created for me." This obligates each of us to believe that his prayers can make a difference. (Masat Levi p. 332)

Hamaayan, Copyright (c) 1998 by Shlomo Katz and Project Genesis, Inc. Posted by Alan Broder, ajb@torah.org . Project Genesis: Torah on the Information Superhighway learn@torah.org 6810 Park Heights Ave. <http://www.torah.org/> Baltimore, MD 21215 (410) 358-9800 FAX: 358-9801

Ravfrand@torah.org Rabbi Frand on Parshas Beha'aloscha

Why Wasn't Moshe Rabbeinu Depressed? At the beginning of the parsha, the Torah gives Aharon the mitzvah of kindling the lights of the Menorah in the Tabernacle. A very famous Rash"i here asks why this section immediately follows that of the offerings of the Princes at the end of Parshas Naso. Rash"i answers that when Aharon witnessed the offerings of all the Princes, he became depressed that neither he nor his Tribe were included in that dedication ceremony. Rash"i says that G-d therefore consoled Aharon, by telling him, "I swear, Your portion is greater than theirs -- you will kindle the Menorah". Rash"i says, as it were, that G-d gave Aharon a consolation prize. He didn't have a chance to participate in the Tabernacle Dedication with the other Princes, but he would have an opportunity for an even greater privilege. There is a famous Ramba"n that explains the allusion to the Menorah lit in each generation by all Jews to commemorate the Chanukah story, in which Aharon's descendants played a major role. There are many things to comment on this Rash"i, but I once heard an interesting insight from the Rosh Yeshiva [of Ner Israel in Baltimore], Rav Yaakov Weinberg, Shlit"a. Aharon was supposedly depressed because neither he nor his tribe were represented in the Dedication of the Mishkan. But who was the titular head of the Tribe of Levi? Off hand, we would say the head of that tribe was not Aharon, but was Moshe Rabbeinu. He was the head of all of Israel; he was a greater Novi than Aharon, so he was clearly the official leader of the Tribe of Levi. So who should get depressed here? If anyone, Moshe should have been depressed. Aharon is the head of the Priests, who are only a subset of Shevet Levi. Yet it was he who felt depressed at the fact that the Leviim were not represented in the Dedication. Why not Moshe Rabbeinu? Rav Weinberg explained that Moshe Rabbeinu, by becoming the leader of all Israel, was no longer a member of the Tribe of Levi. When one is the leader of the generation, he loses his provincial and parochial interests. He is no longer Shevet Levi; he is the 'Am' -- the People. He embodies the Nation -- Reuvain, Shimeon, Yehudah, Dan, everyone! For example, the President of the United States no longer represents his home state -- that is the job of the Governor, even though the President has achieved greater honor and higher office. The President can no longer be a Texan or a New Yorker or a Marylander -- he must represent all the people, l'havdil -- it is understood -- tens of thousands of times. That is the distinction between Aharon and Moshe. Moshe, by becoming the Rabbi of Israel, ceased to be merely a Levi. He had to leave behind any personal interests and biases and become the representative of the entire Nation.

Showing Appreciation For Miriam After 80 Years Now we skip from the first Rash"i in the Parsha to the last Rash"i. At the end of the Parsha we have another famous incident. The Torah tells us that Miriam had complaints about her brother, Moshe Rabbeinu, and she talked about these complaints. G-d Himself comes down and says do not speak about Moshe; don't hold him to the standards of any normal human being -- "Not so is My Servant Moshe, in My entire house he is the trusted one..." [Bamidbar 12:7]. Moshe was in a league by himself and for talking about him, Miriam was stricken with Tzora'as. The law concerning such a person who is stricken with Tzora'as is that they have to be sent outside the Camp. Miriam was in fact

sent outside the Camp of Israel for 7 days. The verse tells us that "...The nation did not travel until Miriam was brought back in." [12:15]. Rash"i, quoting the Talmud [Sotah 9b] says that this honor (that the entire Jewish people waited for her) was accorded to Miriam as reward for waiting by the Nile for her infant brother Moshe (to see who would pick up the basket in which he was floating). The question can be asked -- why now? It is 80 years since Miriam waited for Moshe. Why all of a sudden is now the time for her to receive a reward? At a simple level we could answer -- now is when she needed it. She is down and out, so to speak; now is a good time to give her honor. The Shemen HaTov gives a better answer. He says that the reason why it was now the appropriate time to reward Miriam is because now we -- as a people -- recognize what she did for us. Sometimes a person does an act and even though we appreciate the act, we do not appreciate it to its fullest extent. Right now, we retroactively realized what Miriam did -- we realize who Moshe Rabbeinu really is. Now is when G-d gives personal testimony and says something about Moshe Rabbeinu that He never said about any other human being: "You don't realize who Moshe is. I speak to him mouth to mouth. He is in a league by himself!" They had been living with Moshe Rabbeinu. They become used to Moshe Rabbeinu. They forgot who Moshe Rabbeinu was. So therefore G-d tells the people, "There is no one who was ever like him; there never will be any one like him." Now, eighty years later, they can realize what Miriam did. That act -- standing and waiting, making sure that all would be all right with her brother, eighty years earlier -- saved a Moshe Rabbeinu! Now they are first able, to fully appreciate this. Sometimes we do a Chessed and we don't realize the implications. Sometimes it takes time, a week, a month, a year. Sometimes it takes 80 years or longer to realize "Wow! What a remarkable act!" That is what they finally realize here. And now, 80 years later they had to show their appreciation.

Sources and Personalities Rash"i -- Rav Shlomo ben Yitzchak (1040-1105) Ramba"n -- Rav Moshe Ben Nachman (1194-1204) Rav Yaakov Weinberg -- Present Rosh Yeshiva of Ner Israel, Baltimore. Shemen Tov -- Rabbi Dov Weinberger, contemporary, Brooklyn, NY. Transcribed by David Twersky; Seattle, Washington twerskyd@aol.com Technical Assistance by Dovid Hoffman; Baltimore, MD dhoffman@clark.net Tapes or a complete catalogue can be ordered from the Yad Yechiel Institute, PO Box 511, Owings Mills MD 21117-0511. Call (410) 358-0416 for further information. Now Available: Mesorah / Artscroll has recently published a collection of Rabbi Frand's essays. The book is entitled: Rabbi Yissocher Frand: In Print RavFrand, Copyright (c) 1998 by Rabbi Y. Frand and Project Genesis, Inc. Project Genesis: Torah on the Information Superhighway learn@torah.org 6810 Park Heights Ave. <http://www.torah.org/> Baltimore, MD 21215 (410) 358-9800 FAX: 358-9801

drasha@torah.org DRASHA PARSHAS BEHA'ALOSCHA BLAND AMBITIONS Sweet memories do not fade fast. And neither do pungent ones. That is why the Jewish nation complained bitterly about their miraculous fare, the manna. The manna was a miraculous treat sent daily from heaven to sustain a nation of more than two million people in a barren desert. It was shaped like coriander seed, shone like crystal, and had a miraculous property. It would assume the flavor of any cuisine that its consumer would think about! If a person wanted steak, it tasted like steak. If ice cream was on the menu of the mind, then ice cream it was. My teachers, though I can't imagine they had Midrashic sources, claimed that it could even taste like Cookie Dough Ice Cream! There was a small catch, however. Though the manna had the miraculous ability to transform into a palette of delicacies, merely on the whim of its consumer, it was not able to transform into every imaginable taste. It could not assume the taste of onions, garlic, and a variety of gourds. The divine ability was of course there, but Hashem's compassion overrode His culinary metamorphosis process. Onions and garlic are not the best foods for nursing mothers. And if a pregnant or nursing mother would think of the pungent flavors of those foods, it would, perhaps, maltreat the child. And thus the men complained, "we remember the fish that we ate in Egypt - and the gourds and onions and garlic! But now there is nothing, we look forward to nothing but the manna!" (Numbers: 11:5-6). Though the complaint seems slightly ludicrous, for many years I wondered: Supernatural Divinity was able to transform the dough-like fare into the most sumptuous of meals - all according to the whim

and fancy of the individual taster. Why, then, didn't Divinity let the manna discern? Let a garlic taste manifest itself only for the men and women who it would not affect, and not for the women who were with child, whose babies would be harmed by the pungent effluvia?

Rabbi Dr. Abraham Twerski in *Not Just Stories* tells the legend of Rabbi Moshe of Kobrin, whose disciple, Reb Yitzchok, was in dire straits. Impoverished, he had hardly any food to feed his children, and in addition he had two daughters to wed. Reb Yitzchak's wife pleaded with him to ask the Rebbe of Kobrin for a blessing, but alas, each time Reb Yitzchak crossed the saintly Rebbe's threshold, he forgot about his own necessities. Finally, Reb Yitzchak mustered the courage to ask for a blessing of wealth. Rabbi Moshe promised him the blessing of great wealth, but he made one provision. He gave Reb Yitzchak two gold coins and ordered him to buy the finest food and drink. "However," added the Rebbe, "your wife and children may not partake in any of this food. Not a morsel. Not under any circumstance. After you use the money," concluded the Rebbe, "return back here." The next days were mere torture. As his starving wife and children looked on, Reb Yitzchak only nibbled on the food he had bought. He was sick to his stomach. The fine delicacies had no flavor. He could not bear to see the pain of his starving family while he enjoyed the finest food. The pain added a gall-like flavor to the normally delicious food. Reb Yitzchak pleaded with the Almighty to take his soul so that he would not bear the pain. Reb Yitzchak quickly returned to the Rebbe. "Yitzchak," said the Rebbe. "I could have blessed you immediately, but are you ready to enjoy the abundance of wealth, while knowing that other Jews do not have? Your recent experience is a lesson for those who have, while others are deprived. Now, Yitzchak, are you ready for wealth?" Reb Yitzchak exclaimed, "Never!" and returned home. Eventually, the blessing rested upon Reb Yitzchak and his wife, but they never forgot the plight of others.

Manna fell with inherent qualities; and it had the potential to explode with a bounty of delicious flavors. But it would not be fair to limit its pleasures only to a portion of the people. If expectant and nursing women could not partake in certain foods, their spouses and the entire nation had to share the restrictions too. And though there may be no great pain in abstaining from onion and garlic for a while, it is important to find commonality even in life's little inconveniences. Because true sharing is feeling the pain of even the minutest discomforts. It is a lesson that Klal Yisrael had to learn as they trekked together in the desert, striving to become one large unit. They learned to unite by joining together while missing out on some of the spices of life. Because the nation that blends together - bands together! Good Shabbos!

(C) 1998 Rabbi Mordecai Kamenetzky Mordechai Kamenetzky - Yeshiva of South Shore Dedicated by Karen and David Eisner in memory of Jamie Lehman of blessed memory L'ily Nishams R' Chaim Menachem ben R' Menashe Refa'el O'H 14 Sivan [rmk@torah.org](http://www.yoss.org) 516-328-2490 -- Fax 516-328-2553 <http://www.yoss.org> Drasha, Copyright (c) 1998 by Rabbi M. Kamenetzky and Project Genesis, Inc. Rabbi Mordechai Kamenetzky is the Rosh Mesivta at Mesivta Ateres Yaakov, the High School Division of Yeshiva of South Shore, <http://www.yoss.org/> Project Genesis: Torah on the Information Superhighway learn@torah.org 6810 Park Heights Ave. <http://www.torah.org/> Baltimore, MD 21215 (410) 358-9800 FAX: 358-9801

mj-ravtorah@shamash.org bhaloscha.98
Shiur HaRav Soloveichik ZT"L on Parshas Bhaloscha
(Shiur date: 6/74 RCA Shiur in honor of Rabbi Klavan)

Bhaloscha is one of the most difficult and puzzling Parshios. For example we don't understand the story of Miriam's criticism of Moshe. It was Miriam, the devoted and loyal sister who as a little girl stood alone on the shore of the Nile and watched the floating ark, maintained her faith when all the adults had abandoned hope in Egypt. How could such a sister turn into an accuser of Moshe? Why the strictness and speed with which HaShem punished her? What is the connection between this episode and the tragedy of the Kivros Hataavah? Another difficulty is that Moshe went through many crises and stressful moments. The worst of which was the golden calf experience which threatened to terminate the very relationship between HaShem and Bnai Yisrael. Yet he never despaired or complained. Quite the

opposite, he stood resolute to defend the people and argue their case. Chazal say that Vayechal Moshe, as opposed to Vaeschanan or other forms of prayer, emphasizes the element of strength and boldness of action and prayer, that Moshe, Kvayachol, grabbed the corner of the garment of HaShem and refused to let go until HaShem forgave the people. In the case of the multitudes, the Asafsuf, we find Moshe saying things that he never said before. He complains why HaShem placed the entire burden of the people on him. (Moshe said something similar after his first errand to Paroh met with failure and he asked why HaShem sent him, since he only made the situation worse. We can attribute that episode to the fact that Moshe was an inexperienced leader at that point. But his words at Kivros Hataavah are very uncharacteristic of the leader that he subsequently became.)

The most difficult problem of Bhaloscha is the apparent lack of continuity of the stories contained in the Parsha. The Torah is always careful to completely narrate and develop a story. However in Bhaloscha we do not know how many stories are told and how many are completed. If we summarize the events of the Parsha we have the Parshas Hamenorah, which according to Chazal, quoted by Rashi, is really connected to Parshas Naso as a part of the Chanukas Hamizbeach. So the first real story in the Parsha is that of Kedushas Haleviim. Next we have the story of Pesach in the second year and the laws of Pesach Shayni for those that were unclean and could not offer the Pesach in the right time. Where is the transition between Kedushas Leviim and Pesach Shayni?

The next story is the description of the cloud guiding the people on their journey. There is no transition between the Pesach story and the story of the guiding cloud. Next the Torah tells us the commandment to fashion trumpets to be used to signal the march and to assemble the people. Next the Torah resumes the story of the marching formation of the tribes. Next the Torah tells us the conversation between Moshe and Yisro, how Moshe humbly extended an invitation to his father in law to join them on their march to the promised land.

Next we have the Parsha of Vayehi Binsoa Haaron, 2 verses that are surrounded by inverted letter Nuun's. The inverted letters are intended to show that these verses are out of context. They would have fit beautifully at the end of Parshas Pikudei where it describes how the cloud would lead them. Why not put these verses at the end of Pikudei? Finally the Torah tells us the tragic story of the Kivros Hataava, those that lamented the restrictions on relationships, stealing etc. They complained simply because they had a desire that they could not fulfill. This story could apply today as well. Kivros Hataava can be translated as the grave that the desires dig for man. The Parsha concludes with the story of Miriam.

Where is the unity of the Parsha? Each story appears incomplete. [The Rav said that when he listened to Krias Hatorah for Bhaloscha, he felt like a bee jumping from flower to flower accumulating a bit of sweet nectar at each one.] The Rav explained the unity of the stories of the Parsha and how the inverted events indicate the inversion of Jewish History. Indeed, Chazal view the tragic stories of Bhaloscha among the most compelling and tragic.

The Chinuch says that HaShem commanded Moshe that the exodus will culminate in 2 events, indicated by the words Taavdun Es Haelokim Al Hahar Hazeh, the worship of HaShem on this mountain. The first was the receipt of the Torah, since following the laws of the Torah is the ultimate constant worshiping HaShem. The second was the construction of the Mishkan. The Mishkan was constructed immediately after Moshe descended with the Luchos and instructed them how to build the Mishkan. Indeed, HaShem mentions right after the Asseres Hadibros the commandment to build a Mizbach Adamah, the second half of the service they were to perform at Sinai.

The episode of the golden calf was a very critical event. Because of the sin of the Eigel, Moshe had to spend an extra 80 days on the mountain in prayer. This delayed the construction of the Mishkan. The construction of the Mishkan began immediately after Moshe came down with the second Luchos. The work was completed on Rosh Chodeh Nissan. Once the 2 objectives of Mattan Torah and Binyan Mishkan, the Taavdun Es Haelokim, were completed, there no longer was a reason for camping in Midbar Sinai.

In Parshas Naso we read the final acts of dedication of the Mishkan with the sacrifices of the elders of the tribes. The Torah then tells us about Kedushas Leviim. In Parshas Tzav we were told about Kedushas Kohanim. With the selection of the Leviim, all the prerequisites for the Mishkan and its service were completed. They were ready to march on the 13th of Nissan, after the Nessiim brought their sacrifices. But the cloud did not move, and the march was postponed till after Pesach. Everyone knew that the stay of the Jews in the Sinai wilderness was coming to a close. The Torah was given and the Mishkan was built. It was time to resume the march.

However the march was delayed till after the Jews brought the Korban Pesach. Those that were unclean approached Moshe and HaShem instructed Moshe about Pesach Sheini. The continuity is perfect: Kedushas Haleviim was the last act at Sinai. They were ready to march but it was to close to Pesach so HaShem ordered them to bring the Korban Pesach. All prerequisites had been met with the receipt of Torah and all aspects of the dedication of the Mishkan were completed with the dedication of the Leviim. They were ready to march into Eretz Yisrael. All 4 of the Leshonos Hageulah, terms of redemption mentioned in Parshas Vaayra, were completed with the receipt of the Torah and the Jews becoming the chosen people of HaShem. All that was left was the fulfillment of the fifth and final term of redemption, Vehayvasi, the promise to usher the people into the land, and the stage was set for this to be completed in a few days. In a short time they were expecting to enter the promised land.

Next the Torah tells us the order they were to march in, who was to lead and who was to bring up the rear. The story of the signal system and the trumpets was very important. Moshe was the leader and he needed to be able to communicate with the people. Hence the discussion of the trumpets and their uses. The Ark traveled before the people a distance of 3 days. There was a mood of mobilization and rigid marching order in the air. All conditions were met; the promise made to Abraham many years before was poised to be fulfilled. [The Rav said that we must appreciate the emotional mood created by Krias Hatorah as much as, if not more than, the intellectual aspects of the Krias Hatorah. We must feel the events and the mood of the people.]

Moshe was excited. He was expecting great things. There is a great excitement and expectation as the people prepare to enter the land. This mood is seen in the conversation between Moshe and Yisro. After the offering of the second Pesach and the people began to march, the people felt that this was the final journey. The impression we get of his conversation with Yisro is one of peace of mind and unqualified assurance that they are on their way. No delays, no procrastinations, the great event will happen right now. Moshe says *Nosim Anachnu*, present tense, we are in the process of traveling to the land right now. There are no more doubts, there are no questions as to whether they will succeed on their march. In a few short days they will receive the blessings of HaShem in the promised land. Moshe offered an invitation to his father in law to join them in these wonderful events.

Moshe's conversation with Yisro was not limited to his father in law. Moshe was extending an invitation to all converts and the entire non-Jewish world: come and join us! Chazal say that the verse "All streams lead to the sea and the sea does not fill up" refers to the fact that there is always room in Judaism to accept as many converts that truly wish to embrace Judaism. As long as the non-Jew is ready to subject himself to the same divine discipline that Bnai Yisrael accepted, they are welcome. This is what we say in our *Tefila n Rosh Hashonah*, *Kol Yoshvay Tevel Veshochnay Aretz*, there is plenty of room to accommodate committed converts in the Torah way of life.

There is something very moving about this Parsha: the simplicity with which Moshe, the greatest of men and prophets speaks. He uses the first person: We are traveling, we will do, etc. They were on their way to enter the land and begin the Messianic era. Moshe was certain beyond the shadow of a doubt that he will enter the promised land. He and the entire congregation would be classified as the generation that left Egypt and that entered the promised land. He was sure that he would see all of Israel. There was no reason to pray as he did in Parshas Vaeschanan. There was no doubt about his destiny. The entire conquest of the land would have taken a few days.

There was no need to send spies. Intelligence is needed if a person has doubts. There were no doubts at that time. They were going to enter without difficulty. The Torah tells us that the Ark traveled 3 days journey before them on the way to their final destination, entry to Eretz Yisrael. As Rashi says, they traveled the equivalent of a 3 day journey in one day because HaShem was anxious to usher them into Eretz Yisrael. At this point, prior to alienating HaShem, they had no doubts and no need for spies. All Jews believed that this was the consummation of their hopes. The cloud provided them security on all sides from their enemies. Moshe said *Vayehi Binsoa* and *Kuma HaShem* etc. Why was this necessary? No one would have stood up to them. In fact the only wars they fought were with Amalek and, 38 years later, with Sichon and Og. The next confrontation would have been in Eretz Canaan. The 2 verses would have been in the right place because they would have entered Eretz Yisrael right away.

The inverted Nuuns indicate the inverted destiny. They indicate that something has changed, something is now out of its proper context. Had the people entered the land with Moshe at the head, we never would have been exiled and the Messianic era would have commenced with Moshe as the *Moshiach*.

Neither Moshe nor the people expected anything to derail their march. What happened? Nothing in particular. The multitude that was among them felt a lust and a desire and the children of Israel wept etc. The Torah tells us that this seizure by desire was evil and aroused the wrath of HaShem, and also Moshe resented it, as it says *U'baynay Moshe Ra*. This brought the march to an end and the vision of Moshe as *Moshiach* and entry to Eretz Yisrael began to slip away. Why did Moshe feel discouraged? Why didn't he offer prayers for the people as he did in previous situations?

The sin of the golden calf was defensible because the people had just been freed and they were overcome with the terror of the thought that Moshe was gone and they wanted the calf to be the substitute for Moshe. There were mitigating circumstances. We must distinguish between the act of idol worship and the pagan life style. We know that it is possible for people to live like pagans without idol worship. Paganism is a way and style of life. The pagan way of life is in contradistinction to the Torah way of life. The pagan life style lusts after unbounded and insatiable desire. Unchecked desire is the worst characteristic that man can have. When man reaches for the unreachable, he acts in the pagan way of life, which goes beyond idolatry. The idol worship phase is short lived. Eventually man will recognize that worship of this lifeless object has no purpose. However the desire for a pagan way of life without shackles and controls is much worse, because there is no check or limit to it.

The pagan way of life is the antithesis of Judaism which demands the ability to withdraw and limit desire. The Torah describes the Jewish way of life in the Parshas *HaMan* (manna) in Parshas *Beshalach*. The Torah says that each person gathered what he needed. Those that accumulated more received what they needed while those that gathered less were given enough to satisfy their needs.

After this episode Moshe felt intuitively that his hopes to enter the land would never be realized, even though the *Meraglim* episode had not yet occurred and the edict of a 40 year sojourn had not yet been decreed. When the people began to weep because of their desires, Moshe realized that he would not enter the land. That is why he asked HaShem to kill him if this is what he must put up with. This fits in well with the prophesy of *Eldad and Maydad* that Moshe would die in the desert and Joshua would distribute the land to the people. With this context, we see how the Parsha of *Vayehi Binsoa* became dislocated as indicated by the inverted Nuuns. Everything changed. The triumphant march became a 38 year meander through the desert that ended with the death of Moshe without entering the promised land.

The Rav mentioned that intuition of a goal that slipped away and cannot be retrieved occurred to him as well. He mentioned that throughout the 4 years of her illness, the Rav always felt optimistic that his wife would somehow recover. The last Yom Kippur prior to the death of his wife, after *Kol Nidray*, the Rav handed the *Sefer Torah* that he was holding to a student

to return it to the ark. After placing it in the ark, the Sefer Torah slipped and fell inside the ark. At that moment, the Rav realized that his hopes for his wife's recovery would not be realized, and so it was that she passed away that year.

We see the continuity of the Parsha, how it all led to the triumphant entry to Eretz Yisrael. It ended with the disaster of the inverted Nuun and the inverted history that changed their march to Eretz Yisrael to a march away from the land.

Moshe knew that HaShem selected him as the teacher and spiritual leader of the people. HaShem told him that he was not chosen to be a politician or negotiator. The purpose of the exodus is not political freedom, but to accept the Torah. The people need a teacher and Moshe is the best candidate for that job. However Moshe did not expect, until the case of the Misavim, that in addition to his role of teacher he would have to accept the role of a nursing mother or father, an Omayn. A nursing mother is the most important teacher in the life of the baby. However, where the Rebbe teaches the child, the mother teaches and carries the baby in her bosom. The teacher teaches but the disciple does not become a part of the teacher. The Omayn, nursing mother, has one purpose: to protect the baby. According to Judaic thought, the mother belongs to the infant, she is responsible for the child's every need. The teacher, no matter how devoted, has a life of his own.

Moshe realized that he was an Omayn, he must devote his entire life to anticipating the needs of the people and to protect them. He is not entitled to enjoy life in an ordinary way like any other human being. He lost his immediate family and became the Omayn of the entire nation. That is why Chazal say that he separated himself from his wife. He had to give up any relationship with his own children and wife. In the census taken in the desert, the Torah calls the children of Aharon as the children of Moshe and Aharon. It does not mention Moshe's own children. Even when they are counted in Divray Hayamim, they are referred to as the children of Menashe. Why not call them the children of Moshe? Because Moshe could not have his own children. If Moshe would have children he would be responsible to first teach them Torah, as the Mitzvah is to teach your own child first before others. But Moshe was the teacher of all Israel, he could not have favorites. HaShem told Moshe that he must remain with HaShem at Har Sinai, even though the rest of the people could return to their tents. Moshe now realized that his acceptance of leadership meant completely giving up his own personal life.

Miriam and Aharon did not recognize this unique role of Moshe. Miriam said that she and Aharon are also prophets, yet they enjoy a normal life with their families. Why should Moshe be different and separate from his wife? They did not recognize the special role of Moshe and how we was indeed different from all other prophets. He is consecrated fully to HaShem. Miriam is rebuked immediately.

The events of the Pasrha are really one story. It is the story of Jewish leadership and the how difficult a task it is. The great march that could have led us to the messianic era was interrupted by the multitudes that sought their own pleasures and would not accept the limits imposed by Judaism. The same applies to Eretz Yisrael today. There are groups today that look to repeat the experience of the Misavim. True Jewish Torah leadership reflects the role of the Omayn, nursing mother. The covenantal community is a teaching community. The teacher not only instructs but loves and carries the child. It is a children's community with the mother figure in the middle. Moshe did not say that they should excommunicate the Misavim and separate from them. He expressed resentment of the magnitude of his task. He thought he was not qualified to carry the burden. All Jewish Torah leaders have such doubts. Yet they do not cast off the mantle of leadership. This summary is Copyright 1998 by Dr. Israel Rivkin and Josh Rapps, Edison, N.J.

parasha-page@virtual.co.il The Weekly Internet P * A * R * A * S * H * A - P * A * G * E by Mordecai Kornfeld of Har Nof, Jerusalem (kornfeld@virtual.co.il) This week's mailing has been sponsored by Avraham Schwartz of Nachla'ot, Yerushalayim. May Hashem bless all of your endeavors, Avraham -- Tizkeh l'Mitzvot! "TORAH FROM THE INTERNET," by RABBI MORDECAI KORNFELD, is

available now at a bookstore near you -- order it before the end of Israel's book week!
Parashat Beha'alotcha 5758 THE MISSION OF ELAD AND MEIDAD

Hashem said to Moshe: Gather 70 men from the elders of Israel... and take them to the Mishkan (Tabernacle), and have them stand there with you. I will come and speak to you there, and I will extend the spirit of prophecy that is upon you and place it upon them... (Bamidbar 11:16,17) Shortly after a tragic fire killed "those at the edge of the Jewish encampment" (Bamidbar 11:1), Moshe was asked to appoint 70 elders to become temporary prophets and permanent leaders of the nation. Rashi (11:16) explains that they were to replace the original 70-man Sanhedrin, or Jewish supreme court, who expired in the above-mentioned fire. ("The edge" of the encampment that was burned, was the cutting edge.) In truth, Rashi adds, the original Sanhedrin ought to have been punished earlier. The sin for which they paid with their lives occurred immediately before the Giving of the Ten Commandments, at which time the Sanhedrin was invited to climb Mt. Sinai along with Moshe, Aharon and Aharon's two sons, Nadav and Avihu, to experience a heightened measure of revelation of the Divine Presence (Shemot 24:11). Instead of approaching with the appropriate awe, however, they lightheartedly came to the appointment after a full meal, "like a slave that serves the king while biting on a piece of bread" (Rashi, Bamidbar ibid.) In order not to diffuse the Jews' joy of receiving the Torah, Hashem did not punish the elders of the Sanhedrin until this week's Parasha, after they had left Mt. Sinai on their trek towards the land of Israel. Evidence that this was indeed the role of the 70 elders chosen in this Parasha can be gleaned from the Torah's description of how authority was bestowed upon them: "I will extend (Hebrew root: Atzal) the spirit of prophecy that is upon you..." When the Sanhedrin climbed Mt. Sinai to experience the Divine Presence, they were called "Atzilei" -- that is, the spirit of prophecy that was on Moshe *extended* upon them as well. Now that spirit would be extended to be placed upon others. Although this explanation makes it obvious why 70 elders, and no more, were chosen for this experience, one early commentator (Moshav Zekeinim) points out that there was another factor that limited the number of "prophets" that Moshe appointed. Moshe could only "extend" his source of prophecy to encompass the other elders while they stood with him "surrounding the Mishkan" (11:24). The dimensions of the Mishkan were 30 x 10 cubits (Shemot 26:16-23), and a person is generally one cubit wide (Gemara Sukah 7b). If so, exactly thirty elders could line up on either side of the Mishkan and another ten could stand at its western flank, making a total of 70 elders surrounding the Mishkan! Moshe stood by himself at the open eastern end of the Mishkan, so that the Divine spirit that emanated from the Mishkan would envelop him and extend to the elders.

II Choosing 70 elders presented Moshe with a dilemma. How would he divide up the 70 fairly between the 12 tribes of Israel? As Rashi (11:26) explains, Moshe decided to choose six elders from each tribe (72 elders), and have them draw lots to see which two would not become leaders and share the prophetic experience. The Torah goes on to describe how two of the chosen elders, Eldad and Meidad, decided in their exceptional humility that they were not fit to be prophets or leaders. They remained behind when the others went to join Moshe at the Mishkan. As reward for their humility, not only did Hashem grant them prophecy, He granted them an even greater level of prophecy than was experienced by the elders who stood with Moshe at the Mishkan! The other elders only prophesied for a short period of time, while Eldad and Meidad did not cease to experience prophecy. (Gemara Sanhedrin 17a, according to the opinion of Rabbi Shimon. See Rashi in Ein Yakov, ibid, who explains that there is another, dissenting opinion presented there as well.) The Gemara's interpretation would seem hard to reconcile with the verses. The Torah tells us clearly that Hashem extended the spirit of prophecy that was upon Moshe and placed it upon "the *70* elders... who became *temporary* prophets." Since two of the elders, i.e. Eldad and Meidad, became permanent prophets, shouldn't the Torah have said that only *68* became temporary prophets? Upon further analysis the answer to our question is obvious. Moshe was told to take 70 elders and place them around the Mishkan. When Eldad and Meidad

did not come at the appointed time, Moshe took another two elders (from the 72 originals) instead of them. The spirit of prophecy rested on all 70 of those elders -- and also on Eldad and Meidad, who were back in the encampment, as well! All told, there were 72, and not 70, prophets besides Moshe on that day. (This appears to be the opinion of the Da'at Zekeinim 11:28,29 and Or ha'Chaim, 11:26, as well.) If this interpretation is correct, it may be pointed out that it is appropriate indeed for Moshe to have appointed two "extra" prophets at this point -- two men who were even greater than the original 70. As we mentioned above, the 70 elders were meant to replace the members of the Sanhedrin who were killed for their sin at Mt. Sinai. Besides the 70 elders of the Sanhedrin, another two people climbed Mt. Sinai and sinned by eating and drinking too much, in a manner similar to the elders. Nadav and Avihu lost their lives, in part due to their sin at Mt. Sinai, when they attempted to bring an unsolicited offering to Hashem at the dedication ceremony of the Mishkan (Vayikra 10:1; Rashi Shemot 24:10). When replacements were chosen for the 70 Sanhedrin, Hashem also chose replacements for Nadav and Avihu, who overshadowed them (as in Rashi Shemot 19:24).

III Chazal (our Sages) discuss in many places what the exact sins of Nadav and Avihu were at both Mt. Sinai and the dedication of the Mishkan. (See Torah from the Internet, p. 136, for some enlightening insights into this subject.) It would appear that Eldad and Meidad, who replaced them, were given the mission of correcting the wrong-doing of their predecessors by publicly demonstrating that Nadav and Avihu were mistaken in their attitude, as we shall explain. (1) The Gemara in Sanhedrin (17a) presents three opinions as to what was the subject of the prophecy of Eldad and Meidad. According to the first opinion, they proclaimed that "Moshe will die; it is Yehoshua who will bring us into the Promised Land." The Gemara tells us (Sanhedrin 52a) that Nadav and Avihu sinned by saying (or by thinking), "When will these two elders (Moshe and Aharon) pass on, already, that the two of us may lead the generation [into the Land of Israel]." Eldad and Meidad disclaimed this attitude. "Yes, Moshe will die before entering the Land of Israel," they announced -- "but we will not be the new leaders. Yehoshua, Moshe's faithful student, will take the nation into the Promised Land. (2) According to another opinion, Eldad and Meidad prophesied the arrival of the Slav (quail). The Jews had complained that they wanted meat to eat. They had enough of the Divine food that rained on them daily from heaven. Instead of Manna, they wanted to eat meat. Well, meat they got, in the form of bountiful Slav. But no sooner than they began to eat it, than they felt the wrath of Hashem. Hashem took the lives of the gluttonous ones who decried His Divine Manna in the episode of the "Graves of those who Craved" (Bamidbar 11:33,34). Why, indeed, did the Jews die for requesting meat? It may not be too far off the mark to suggest that they died for a reason very similar to the reason that Nadav and Avihu died. Throughout the time they spent in the desert, Hashem rested His Presence among the Jews. They lived in the presence of the Mishkan, ate the spiritual Manna for food, drank from the miraculous "rolling well" of Miriam (Rashi Bamidbar 20:2), walked upon and were shaded by the heavenly Clouds of Glory, and experienced numerous other miracles (Devarim 29:4). Under such circumstances, it was disrespectful for them to ask to fulfill their superfluous physical desires while in the presence of Hashem. It would be like "biting on their bread while serving the king!" This explanation can in fact be found clearly in the verse: "(the meat) will be like swords for you, since you have become disgusted with Hashem that is in your midst" (Bamidbar 11:20, according to Rashi). By eating the meat, they were showing a lack of respect for the Divine Presence which dwelled amongst them. Eldad and Meidad ushered in the Slav that would teach the Jews this lesson, as a way of announcing that Nadav and Avihu were mistaken. Let everyone learn from the Slav to show the necessary respect, and to control their physical desires when standing in Hashem's presence!

IV (3) The third and final opinion in the Gemara is that Eldad and Meidad prophesied about the messianic war against King Gog and his nation Magog (Yechezkel 38). (According to Targum Yonatan, all three of these opinions are true; they prophesied about all three subjects.)

The Targum Yonatan explains in more detail what this prophecy entailed. They described how Hashem will destroy Gog and his nation by "burning their souls with a fire that will emanate from under His Throne of Glory" while leaving their dead bodies intact. Afterwards, Hashem will bring all the righteous back to life and award them their eternal reward. When Nadav and Avihu offered their unsolicited offering in the Mishkan, they were also killed by a fire that emanated from the Holy of Holies and burned their souls while leaving their bodies intact (Sanhedrin 52a). It would appear that the intention of this Gemara is that they died through exposure to a higher level of perception of the Creator that they were ready to experience. This was indeed the sin for which they, and the Sanhedrin, ought to have been killed on Mt. Sinai: "They peeked and saw" what was beyond their true grasp (Rashi Shemot 24:10). The natural result of such an action is that the soul is taken from the body by the fire of Hashem -- "For Hashem is likened to a devouring fire" (Devarim 4:24). At the end of time, Hashem will reveal himself to us. All the forces of evil that cannot withstand such a revelation will be destroyed. Such is the fate of Gog and his nation, "their soul will burn, but their bodies will remain intact." Eldad and Meidad announced that Nadav and Avihu were indeed wrong. In the present world, it is not yet possible to perceive the Presence of Hashem as they had desired. The time when Hashem will reveal himself to us will only come with the final redemption, when Gog and his nation Magog are stifled and the righteous are brought back to life -- may that time come speedily in our days!

<http://www.virtual.co.il/depts/torah/rkornfeld/parsha.htm> Parasha-Page Archives:
<http://www.shemaisrael.co.il/parsha/kornfeld> Mordecai Kornfeld |Email:
 kornfeld@writeam.com| TL/Fx(02)6522633 6/12 Katzenelbogen St. | kornfeld@netvision.net.il
 US:(718)520-0210 Har Nof, Jerusalem,ISRAEL| kornfeld@shemaisrael.co.il| POB:43087, Jrslm

iyated-usa@itec.com Understand Your Talmidim by Rav Shmuel Kamenetsky, Shlita, Rosh Yeshivas Philadelphia A Jew is obligated to unceasingly reprove his fellow. "Hocheiach tochiach es amisecha," the Torah says, "you shall surely rebuke your friend." Our sages say one must persist in one's rebuke "afeilu me'ah pe'omim," even 100 times. One must ask, what will the hundredth time accomplish? If a person won't listen after four or five times, will he "come around" on the hundredth? Our sages tell us that the students of Rabbi Akiva perished in the days of Sefirah "shelo nohagu kovod zeh lazeh, for not treating one another with honor". This phrase requires some explanations: to what sort of treatment does "honor" refer? Perhaps the students were guilty of not trying hard enough to fully understand each other. Similarly, the sage Rami bar Chama, as related in Brochos, did not include Rav Menashia bar Tachlifa in a zimun, for he believed Rav Menashia to be an am-haaretz though in fact learned Mishna, Sifra and Sifri. When Rami bar Chama passed away, Rav said that he was nifter for no reason other than not having included Rav Menashia. The Gemarah defends Rami bar Chama, noting that as learned an individual as Rav Menashia might still be an am-haaretz, if he did not couple his learning with shimush talmidei chachomim=C4schooling at the feet of greater sages. So the Gemarah concludes that indeed Rav Menashia had been meshamesh talmidei chachomim but Rami bar Chama hadn't checked out this point thoroughly. One must conclude that even a sage the likes of a Rami bar Chama can overlook a student's accomplishments. This may be the logic behind the need to rebuke "100 times". For one can never presume to have totally researched the needs and accomplishments of a fellow Jew. Perhaps by the hundredth rebuke, he will have ascended to a higher madreigah, and one's rebuke will be heard. And by the hundredth time the moche'ach as well will have grown, empowering his words a little more. In chinuch as well, can one ever presume to have totally assessed the needs and powers of a talmid? Can one give up before the "hundredth" time on the certainty that rebbe and talmid have reached the limits of their potential to reach, and be reached? One sage who went to great lengths to understand his talmidim was Rabbi Yochanan Ben Zakai. He would "recount the good qualities of his students." (Avos 2) Rather than stating their obvious merits, Rabbi Yochanan was trying to understand their spiritual strengths, the better to instruct them. And even Yaakov Avinu was taken to task on this issue. When Rachel demanded that Yaakov give her sons, he responded, "hasachas Elokim anocheh?" am I in the place of Hashem? While it is understood that Yaakov was protesting Rachel's dependence upon a mere mortal, Hashem rebuked Yaakov, saying, "Is this how one responds to the oppressed?" (Rabbah 71:1) Despite Yaakov's righteous indignation, apparently he did not try quite enough to understand Rachel's pain.

If rebuke is the product of near endless fartaitching, it is clear why an angry person is exempt from this mitzvah. For in his temper he has lost his good sense and cannot understand the person enough to offer a proper reproof. (Kesser Rosh) This mitzvah of rebuke is perhaps the reason for our exceptional treatment of convicted criminals, says he Chazon Ish. One liable to death by burning is given a lightning-quick end by the court officials, because the Torah considers him a friend. "Ve'ahavta lereyacha kamocha, love your friend as yourself=C4bror lo misa yofoh" say Chazal, "choose an easy death for him." (Sanhedrin 52a) Is a convicted criminal indeed a "friend"? Perhaps if one didn't rebuke him enough, he is still innocent enough to merit such a title. So too must we be undaunted in our efforts to help a student, for he is still our achrayus until we have exhausted every angle of getting through to him. This mandate of re-examination is an outgrowth of our individuality, an individuality that defies a "quick look" at any Jew, and certainly at the entire nation. I is therefore impossible to count the heads of Jewish people. Shekolim, coins, can be quickly counted, but each Jew deserves a special consideration. And even during the desert

census, a Jew who stood on line received a special blessing by Moshe and Aaron (Ramban), in eloquent testimony to his individual *kochos hanefesh*. When an educator comes to terms with the special powers of every student, a trait that was showcased in the lives of our forefathers, our sages, and in the halacha, he will have the patience and confidence to offer his rebuke, time after time.

Adapted from the Rosh yeshiva's remarks at the Torah Umesorah convention by David Afra.

daf-insights@shemayisrael.com Insights to the Daf: Eruvin 36-40 INSIGHTS INTO THE DAILY DAF brought to you by Kollel Iyun Hadaf of Yerushalayim Rosh Kollel: Rabbi Mordecai Kornfeld daf@shemayisrael.co.il ERUVIN 36- has been sponsored by David Gerstman in order to support Torah-study, in lieu of a Todah-offering, for miraculously saving him and his brother from harm in a traffic accident (as recommended by the Mishnah Berurah OC 218:32).

Eruvin 36b THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN "BEREIRAH" AND A "TENAI" QUESTION: The Gemara says that according to Ayo, one may only make an Eruv stipulating that if the Chacham comes to one side or the other side of the town, the Eruv will be to that side. If one stipulates that if two Chachamim come to each side of the town then he reserves the right to choose the side on which his Eruv will take effect, the Eruv does not work. In either case, asks the Gemara, one is utilizing Bereirah! Why, then, is the second case not valid and the first case valid? (location). Why didn't the Gemara suggest a very simple difference between the cases of Ayo. Perhaps even if one stipulates "if the Chacham comes from the East my Eruv is to the East," the Eruv is valid, since it involves no more than a normal case of stipulating a "Tenai" (condition). It is comparable to saying, "If you so such and such, this Get will be a valid Get." However, when the person says "If two Chachamim come, I will choose tomorrow where I want my Eruv to be retroactively," Bereirah is involved rather than a simple yes/no choice. Therefore the Eruv is not valid!

ANSWERS: (a) A Tenai works only because it is in the hands of one of the parties involved to fulfill the condition, and it was his intention that the condition be fulfilled at the time that he stipulated the Tenai. (That is, because he plans on fulfilling it and wants the deal to go through, the event contingent upon the condition takes effect *immediately*, even before the Tenai has been fulfilled. If the Tenai ends up not being fulfilled, then the event that was contingent upon it is uprooted retroactively. It is possible to uproot an event retroactively, but not to cause it to take effect retroactively.) That is not the case in Ayo's case. In the case of making an Eruv, the condition (that the Chacham comes from this side) is not in the hands of the person who made the statement to fulfill. It is dependent on the Chacham, who himself has nothing to do with making the Eruv. Since the Eruv does not depend on something which is in your hands to fulfill, it is considered a case of Bereirah. (RASHI, Gitin 25b) (b) The RAMBAN in Gitin (25b) argues with Rashi and explains that a Tenai is when there are two possibilities -- either the event will occur or it will not occur. On the other hand, when trying to make something happen which can occur in one of several ways, then it is not a Tenai but a question of Bereirah. The case of the Eruv dependent on the Chacham coming to one of two sides is such a case and therefore it involves Bereirah. The event -- the Eruv taking effect -- is going to happen in one of two places; the arrival of the Chacham will determine where the Eruv takes effect. Still, why is the case of the Chacham a case of Bereirah? We can view it as two completely separate conditions: (1) If the Chacham comes to the east, then the Eruv will be to the east, and if he does not come to the east, then there will be no Eruv to the east. (2) If the Chacham comes to the west, then the Eruv will be to the west, and if he does not come to the west, then the Eruv will not be to the west. (REBBI AKIVA EIGER in a Ma'arachah on Eruvin.) TOSFOS, end of Yoma 56a, in fact asks this question on the explanation of the Ramban. Apparently, the Ramban maintains that the two Eruvei Techumim cannot be viewed as two independent events. Rather, one event is taking place (making an Eruv), and there are two possibilities as to how it will take place (to the east or west). The reason for this is that one cannot make two Eruvs to be Koneh Shevisah in two places (since a person lives only in one place at a time.) Therefore, when the person adds that if the Chacham comes to the other side his Eruv will be to that side, it is viewed as an addendum to his first condition.

Eruvin 38 YOM TOV THAT FOLLOWS SHABBOS QUESTION: The Gemara discusses whether Shabbos and Yom Tov that occur consecutively are considered to be two separate Kedushos, or whether they are considered to be one prolonged Kedushah. Rabbi Eliezer maintains that they are two separate Kedushos, and the Chachamim maintain that the two days are all one Kedushah. The Halachah follows the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer. According to the Chachamim, who maintain that they are one Kedushah, what is the Halachah when Yom Tov follows Shabbos? Will a person be permitted to slaughter an animal on that Yom Tov? Normally, a person is allowed to slaughter an animal on Yom Tov because it is a Melachah which is done for the sake of food preparation (Ochel Nefesh). However, when Yom Tov follows Shabbos, on Shabbos the animal is Muktzah because it is forbidden to slaughter on Shabbos. If Shabbos and the Yom Tov that immediately follows it are considered one Kedushah, what is the status of animals on that Yom Tov? Is the animal Muktzah on Yom Tov, since at the beginning of Shabbos the animal was Muktzah and it remains Muktzah throughout the duration of the prolonged single Kedushah? ANSWERS: (a) The RAN (Beitzah 2a) says that according to the Chachamim, animals *will* be Muktzah on Yom Tov that immediately follows Shabbos. On that Yom Tov it will be forbidden to slaughter animals. (b) The RAMBAN (Milchamos, Beitzah 31b) says that even the Chachamim agree that one *may* slaughter an animal on Yom Tov that immediately follows Shabbos. His reasoning is as follows: The only reason that animals are Muktzah on Shabbos is because they cannot be slaughtered and turned into edible products. This type of Muktzah is called "Muktzah Machmas Isur;" a prohibition prevents the object from being used on Shabbos (in this case, it is the prohibition of Shechitah which prevents the animal from being used on Shabbos). In such a case, the object itself does not really become Muktzah. Rather, it is the Isur which prevents the object from being used. As soon as the Isur is removed, that object becomes permitted, even on the same Shabbos. Therefore, on Yom Tov that occurs after Shabbos, when Shabbos is over and there is no longer an Isur of Shechitah, since the Isur falls away the animal becomes permitted. (We do find that oil that drips from a candle on Shabbos is Muktzah even after the candle is extinguished. Even though it was only Muktzah Machmas Isur, i.e. the prohibition of extinguishing made it forbidden to be handled at the beginning of Shabbos, nevertheless it remains Muktzah all Shabbos long. The Ramban will apparently explain that in such a case the oil is forbidden not only because of the

prohibition of extinguishing, but because the person specifically decided not to use it. That is, by lighting the candle, he has shown that he does *not* intend to use the oil at all. Since he has "pushed it out of his mind," even if it drips out before he expected it burns he may not use it.) (c) The OHR SAME'ACH (Hilchos Yom Tov 1:19) suggests that even if Shabbos and Yom Tov are one Kedushah, that applies only to laws that are relevant on both Shabbos and Yom Tov (such as Eruvei Techumim which is common to both Shabbos and Yom Tov). With regard to laws that are relevant only on Shabbos, though, such as Muktzah stemming from slaughtering an animal, since the prohibition of Shechitah applies only on Shabbos, Shabbos and Yom Tov are *not* one Kedushah. With regard to such a law, Shabbos and Yom Tov are certainly two separate Kedushos.

Eruvin 40b HALACHAH: RECITING "SHEHECHEYANU" ON A NEW VEGETABLE OPINIONS: Rav Yehudah said that he recites the blessing "Shehecheyanu" on a new gourd. What is the Halachah? Do we recite "Shehecheyanu" on new vegetables? (a) The REMA cites from MAHARI VEIL and the MAHARSHAL (OC 225:6) that one does not recite "Shehecheyanu" on new vegetables, because "they remain on the ground all year." There are two different explanations for what it means that they "remain on the ground all year." (1) The PERISHAH explains that it means that some vegetables actually stay on their stem or vine from year to year, and by the time the new produce comes in (shortly after Pesach), the old produce is still on the vine. Even though not all vegetables are like that, nevertheless some are like that, the Rabanan decreed that we do not recite "Shehecheyanu" on any new vegetables. (2) The MAGEN AVRAHAM says that vegetables that "remain on the ground all year" refers to vegetables that are stored away from year to year, and, consequently, last year's vegetables are still being used when the new ones grow in, and one does not have as much pleasure from the new vegetables. Even though some *fruits* are also stored away, since only a few types of fruits are stored the Rabanan did not make a general rule saying that we do not recite "Shehecheyanu" on fruits. On the other hand, most types of vegetables are stored away. The MISHNAH BERURAH (225:18) adds, though, that for cucumbers, carrots, radishes and the like we do recite "Shehecheyanu." Apparently, when it was said that no "Shehecheyanu" is recited on "Yerek," the statement was referring only to green, leafy vegetables. Other vegetables that grow on little trees and bushes like fruits, though, do require a "Shehecheyanu." A new gourd, as our Gemara says, should require a Shehecheyanu.

RECITING A BLESSING OVER WINE ON YOM KIPPUR QUESTIONS: The Gemara initially assumes that "Shehecheyanu" must be recited over a cup of wine. The Gemara asks how, then, can "Shehecheyanu" be recited on Yom Kippur. The Gemara suggests that one could give the cup of wine to a child to drink. RASHI (DH Lisvei leYenuka) explains that it is necessary to give the cup of wine to a child in order to avoid disgracing the cup of wine by reciting the blessing "Borei Pri ha'Gafen" and not benefiting from the wine by drinking it. It is therefore given to a child to drink, because one is allowed to recite a blessing for a child in order to teach him to perform the Mitzvos. (a) What does Rashi mean when he says that that is a disgrace to the cup of wine not to drink it? He should have simply said that it is a Berachah le'Vatalah (as the Ritva says)! (b) Why does Rashi say that one is allowed to recite the blessing for a child and give the wine to him because of Chinuch? These children obviously have not reached the age of Chinuch yet, because if they have, then part of their Chinuch is to refrain from eating and drinking on Yom Kippur! On the other hand, if they have not reached the age of Chinuch, then one may not recite a blessing for them! (YA'AVETZ) ANSWERS: (a) Apparently, Rashi understands that for a Kos Shel Berachah, one is permitted to recite the blessing "Borei Pri ha'Gafen" even though one is not going to drink the wine. That blessing is not necessarily being said on the wine that is inside the cup. Rather, it is a blessing that is said as a way of giving honor to the blessing of Kidush and Havdalah. That is, one gives honor to the blessings of Kidush and Havdalah by holding a cup of wine and reciting "Borei Pri ha'Gafen" over it as part of the Kidush or Havdalah procedure. Drinking the wine, though, is not necessary in order to make the blessing of "Borei Pri ha'Gafen" become a useful blessing. It is not considered a Berachah le'Vatalah because it is part of Kidush or Havdalah and necessary for giving honor to those blessings. (b) The RITVA answers that certainly the child has not reached the age of Chinuch of fasting on Yom Kippur. However, the child to whom one gives the wine *is* old enough to start saying blessings for himself. He is just not old enough yet to start fasting on Yom Kippur.

daf-discuss@shemayisrael.com Eruvin 022a: Studying Torah and Child Support Steven F. Friedell <friedell@crab.rutgers.edu> asked: On daf 22a, is Rava praising a person who studies at the expense of providing basic child support? If so, how can this be squared with the gemarah in Ketubot 49b which seems to require at least an attempt to persuade the father to support his children. And the Rosh there seems to say that until the age of 6 even a poor father can be compelled to support his children. Thank you very much. Steven F. Friedell Rutgers Law School

The Kollel replies: We find in Gitin (6b) that the sages condemned those who allow the study of Torah to override providing support for one's wife and family. (This appears to be the understanding of Tosfos there, DH v'Yitnu, and Kidushin 29b DH Ha Lehu. According to Rashi in Kidushin, this point may have been the hub of an argument of principle between the sages of Israel and the sages of Bavel. However, even according to Rashi it appears that the Babylonians only went to learn *before* they had children, and with the permission of their new wives, and not after they had children to support; see rashi Gitin ibid.) However, it seems that our Gemara refers to when one *is* providing the basic, support for his family even while studying Torah. (The Gemara refers to this basic amount of support as "eating the cheap vegetables of the swamps.") If so, Rava is saying that the study of Torah overrides providing any *more* than basic support (as we find, for example, in Eruvin 55b, Rashi DH Ein Talmid Chacham). He means to teach that a person should not let himself be convinced by his families pleas for a life of luxury to leave his studies. All the best, Mordecai

Eruvin 018b: Words of Torah at night Gedalliah <Gedalliah@aol.com> asked: (a) R' Yirmiyah ben Elazar said, 'any house which words of torah are said at night will never be destroyed'. If the Rambam holds a person learns most of his wisdom at night (Artscroll Shottenstein note #31) does that mean that a persons mind is NOT most able to learn torah first thing in the morning? I thought first thing in the morning was the best time to learn? ".....he who gives song at night (Job 35:10)" Thanks, Gedaliah

The Kollel replies: (a) Rav Moshe Shapiro, shlita, asked a similar question: we find in a number of places throughout Shas that the primary time for learning in the Beis Midrash with others was during the day. The Gemara in Berachos (63b) says that destruction comes to those who learn alone without others. If so, how can the Rambam say that one acquires most of his wisdom at night, when

he is learning alone? He answered that the Gemara must mean that one *review s* his learning at night, and by reviewing one acquires most of his wisdom, since he understands it better and remembers it. This can certainly be done alone.

Mordecai Kornfeld [Email: kornfeld@virtual.co.il| Tl/Fx(02)6522633 6/12 Katzenelbogen St. | kornfeld@netvision.net.il| US:(718)520- 0210 Har Nof, Jerusalem,ISRAEL| kornfeld@shemayisrael.co.il| POB:43087, Jrslm
