INTERNET PARSHA SHEET ON NASO - 5759

To receive this parsha sheet in WP 6.1 file (readable by Word), mailto:cshulman@cahill.com with copy to crshulman@aol.com.

Shlomo Katz[SMTP:skatz@torah.org] Hamaayan / The Torah Spring Edited by Shlomo Katz Contributing Editor: Daniel Dadusc Naso

In this week's parasha we read of the commandment that the kohanim should bless the Jewish people. The berachah which the kohanim say before performing that mitzvah is, "Asher kedishanu b'kedushato shel Aharon. . ."/ "Blessed are You Hashem . . . Who has sanctified us with Aharon's sanctity. . ." R' Yaakov Moshe Charlap z"l (died 1952) taught: This formulation reminds us that just as the greatness of the Jewish people is not a product only of their deeds, but is primarily inherited - indeed, our good deeds are possible because of our lineage, so the sanctity of the kohanim is inherited. One who denies this principle denies the fundamentals of Judaism ("mekatzetz be'netiot" in Rav Charlap's words). This was Korach's mistake. As we will read in three weeks, Korach said, "All Jews are holy." He maintained that anyone who prepared himself could be a kohen. Moshe replied, "In the morning Hashem will show who is His." Just as Hashem established clear boundaries in time, so He created boundaries in lineage and between different people's (and groups of people's) missions on Earth. (Mei Marom XIII p.129)

"Take a census of the sons of Gershon, as well . . . " (4:22) Many commentaries wonder about the purpose of the phrase "as well." R' Moshe Feinstein z"l explains it as follows: Levi had three sons - Gershon, Kehat and Merari. In last week's parashah we read that the descendants of Kehat carried the holiest of the mishkan's implements, e.g., the aron/ark, the menorah, and the shulchan/table. In the verses which follow, we read that the descendants of Gershon carried the mishkan itself, i.e., the columns, the curtains, etc. These objects had less holiness than the items carried by the family of Kehat. The family of Gershon could become dispirited by being assigned a seemingly less important role than their cousins. In order to prevent this, the Torah equates the sons of Kehat and Gershon. This is the meaning of "Take a census of the sons of Gershon, as well." This lesson has practical implications, says R' Feinstein. Some people refrain from studying Torah because they know that they will never be great Torah scholars. Others refrain from donating money to the construction of a yeshiva because they feel that their donation would be insignificant; after all, they cannot afford to dedicate an entire wing. This is wrong - just as the Torah equates the roles of Gershon and Kehat, so Hashem equates great Torah scholars and philanthropists with those who do less, so long, of course, as they do their best. There is another lesson here. Why was carrying the mishkan and its

implements restricted to Levi'im between the ages of 30 and 50? These objects were not heavy; indeed, Chazal teach that the aron was weightless and actually "carried those who carried it." (In other words, not only did carrying the aron require no physical energy, even walking all day long with the aron was effortless). For most of the other objects, there were wagons. R' Feinstein answers: The Torah is hinting to us that no matter how easy a mitzvah is, one should approach it as if it calls upon every ounce of his strength. One should not perform a mitzvah in an off-handed way, but rather should imagine himself to be a Levi in the prime of his life preparing to lift the seemingly heavy mishkan objects. (Darash Moshe) ...

Hamaayan, Copyright (c) 1999 by Shlomo Katz and Project Genesis, Inc. Posted by Alan Broder, ajb@torah.org . http://www.torah.org/learning/hamaayan/ ./www.acoast.com/~sehc/ hamaayan/. Donations to HaMaayan are tax-deductible. Project Genesis: Torah on the Information Superhighway learn@torah.org 17 Warren Road, Suite 2B http://www.torah.org/Baltimore, MD

From: Rabbi Yissocher Frand[SMTP:ryfrand@torah.org]

"RavFrand" List - Rabbi Frand on Parshas Naso These divrei Torah were adapted from the hashkafa portion of Rabbi Yissocher Frand's Commuter Chavrusah Tapes on the weekly portion: Tape # 195, Birchas Kohanim. Good Shabbos! This week's "RavFrand" shiur is dedicated by the Chait family l'iluy nishmas (in memory of) Russie Chait, Rus Elisheva bas HaRav Chaim Ozer, on the occasion of her 2nd Yarzheit, 10 Sivan.

A Redundant Word Introduces the Sotah Portion In this week's parsha, we learn about a Sotah - a woman who is suspected by her husband of unfaithfulness. The Torah prescribes a special mixture, "Sotah water" to ascertain whether or not the suspicion is correct. As a result of drinking this mixture, the woman either dies or is vindicated and blessed. The pasuk [verse] begins with the words "Ish ish..." ["Any man," or literally "Man, man"] "whose wife goes astray..." [Bamidbar 5:12]. It is peculiar that the Torah employs this style of "Ish ish" to connote the idea of "any man". The normal way to convey that message is by using the term "ish" [man] only one time. I saw an interesting comment from Rav Moshe Chafetz. Rav Chafetz explains that the Torah is using the extra "ish" to tell us that sometimes the situation of the suspected wife results from the husband being too much of an "ish". The husband asserts himself too much -- the "ish" is too demanding. The man is too interested in the "ish" part of the marriage and not enough in the "isha" [woman, wife] part of the marriage. If I had to pick one word to describe the quality or fault upon which most marital problems begin, I would have to pick the word "selfishness". And the word that I would pick to describe the key to a successful marriage is "selflessness". Most problems, whether money problems or in-law problems -- all the problems that we know which contribute to unhappy marriages -- usually stem from the fact that people are too insistent on themselves and for themselves. They are not compromising enough. They are not willing to give in enough. Sometimes the problem is the husband asserting too much of the "ish" part of the marriage, and sometimes the problem is the wife asserting too much of the "isha" part of the marriage. Marriages have problems when one of the partners places too much of an emphasis on him or herself. When marriages have such problems, Sotah situations can develop. Rash"i cites a famous Chazal, which asks: Why does the parsha of Sotah follow immediately after that of one who neglects to bring the proper gifts of Priesthood to the Kohain? The answer given is that if one does not take care of the Kohain by providing the proper gifts, one day he will find himself needing the Kohain to take care of his wife's "Sotah water". The Torah Temimah explains the connection between the two. The reason why a person does not give the proper items to the Kohain is because he is stingy, cheap, and selfish. Those are also reasons that can cause Sotah problems -- a stingy and selfish individual will also not have a giving and selfless relationship with his wife. A lack of generosity of spirit and refusal to compromise in marriage is bound to lead to Sotah situations.

Yaakov's Connection to the Sheep The majority of the parsha is devoted to the sacrifices that were brought by the Princes of the Tribes. Each Nasi [Prince] brought a single young bull (par echad), a single ram (ayil echad)

and a single sheep (keves echad). Rash"i explains that the young bull represents Avraham, as it says "He brought a young bull" [Bereshis 18:7]; the Avil represents the ram of Yitzchok, as it says "And he took the ram" [Bereshis 22:13]; and the Keves represents Yaakov, corresponding to the verse "And Yaakov separated the sheep" [Bereshis 30:40]. The Torah references each of the sacrifices to the essence of one of the Avos [Patriarchs]. What is the essence of Avrohom? Avrohom is the master of Chessed [kindness]. Therefore, by mentioning a young bull, the Medrash marshals an example of Avrohom's kindness - when Avrohom ran to the herd to bring a young bull to feed the Angels. The essence of Yitzchok is Gevurah [spiritual strength]. The Torah portrays this attribute of Yitzchak's Awe and Fear of G-d through the Akaidas Yitschak - the Binding of Isaac. Therefore, the ram alludes to Yitschak. We are able to understand that the first two references epitomize Avrohom and Yitzchak. However, how does the incident with Lavan's sheep represent the essence of Yaakov? Why does the Medrash use that pasuk? Rav Bergman, in his sefer [book] Sha'arei Orah, points out that the reason why Yaakov separated the sheep was to insure that Lavan would not have the slightest suspicion that Yaakov was trying to cheat. Yaakov wanted all of his sheep to be one kind and all of Lavan's sheep to be another kind, so that Lavan would not be able to claim that Yaakov took any of his sheep. Yaakov made great efforts, not only to avoid actual theft, but also to avoid even the slightest suspicion of theft. This illustrates Yaakov's essence: Give Truth to Yaakov [Michah 7:20]. That one sheep (keves echad) symbolizes the attribute of Yaakov: honesty above reproach. It is interesting that in the Yotzros of Hoshannah Rabbah, the author of the poem "Ta'aneh Emunim" (Answer the Faithful) describes Yaakov as "the one who peeled rods at the troughs of water". Is this is all that the author can think of to tell us about Yaakov? What about telling us about Yaakov learning in the Yeshivah of Shem and Ever for 14 years? What about fathering the 12 Tribes? Here too, the answer is the same. Yaakov's honesty and truth is his essence. Even when dealing with a crook like Lavan, Yaakov goes out of his way to be faithful in his dealings. Therefore, the sheep and the peeled rods of Yaakov do represent Yaakov's essence - that of Emes - Truth.

Transcribed by David Twersky; Seattle, Washington twerskyd@aol.com Technical Assistance by Dovid Hoffman; Yerushalayim dhoffman@torah.org ... 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. RayFrand, Copyright (c) 1999 by Rabbi Y. Frand and Project Genesis, Inc. Project Genesis: Torah on the Information Superhighway learn@torah.org 17 Warren Road, Suite 2B http://www.torah.org/ Baltimore, MD 21208 (410) 602-1350

From: Ohr Somayach[SMTP:ohr@virtual.co.il] * TORAH WEEKLY * Highlights of the Weekly Torah Portion Parshas Nasso

All in the Family "Any man whose wife shall go astray." (5:12) A hundred years ago in a brilliant Jewish mind, an exciting idea was born. It went something like this: Man is separated from his neighbor by a huge division, an unbridgeable gulf called individual property. If I own something, it means you can't have it. In a sense, my owning something "steals" it from you. Property is theft. If we could make a society in which everyone owned everything, then no one would be jealous of anyone else. What we need to do is to redeem Capital from the hands of the ruling elite and return it to the people. The Communist ideal spawned several social engineering experiments. The most notable of these was the collective farm. All property was owned by the collective. Everyone ate in a communal dining room. Every member of the collective was to give what he could and take only what he needed. Probably the most famous and successful application of the commune concept was the kibbutz movement in Israel. However, there were other countries where the idea also took root. In China, every commune had an economic and administrative unit that controlled the labor force and all means of production. This unit provided central management of industry, commerce, education, agriculture, and military affairs. Living communally, workers performed both industrial and agricultural tasks and supported a military unit. There were communal nurseries, bathing facilities, barbershops, and the like. Wages and

perquisites were controlled by the state. All products were marketed through state agencies. It must have seemed at the time like a Utopian dream.

What happened to the dream? The last vestiges of the collective farm have either become Capitalist enterprises or are moribund. Why did such a noble sounding idea fail? One inevitable aspect of collective living was a re-evaluation of the role of the family. Rather than sleeping under the same roof as their parents, children now slept in dormitories. One wonders who would answer a small child who might wake in the middle of the night and cry "Mommy, I want a glass of water!" How successful a mother-substitute could a dormitory supervisor be?

There's something very strange about this week's Parsha. Right in the middle of the description of the organization of the machane, the Jewish encampment, there is a seemingly illogical interruption in which the Torah presents, along with other mitzvos, the mitzvah of the sota. The sota is a wife whose behavior has provoked her husband to suspect her fidelity. The Torah prescribes a miraculous process by which, if proven innocent, will restore her completely to her husband's trust. What does the sota have to do with the Jewish encampment? The machane was the paradigm of the future social structure of the Jewish People. Not only did it mandate the placement of each individual tribe, but the machane represented Jewish Society as it was to be lived throughout the generations. The Torah puts the mitzvah of sota in the middle of the description of the machane to teach us that the harmony of society at large is predicated on the united and happy family. The family is the basic building block of society. When you tamper with its delicate balance, when you try and engineer it to conform to man-made concepts of utopian life, inevitably those experiments will be short-lived and will eventually flounder.

Sources: Ramban, Rabbi Moshe Eiseman, as heard from Rabbi Moshe Written and Compiled by Rabbi Yaakov Asher Sinclair General Zauderer 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 Tel: 972-2-581-0315 Fax: 972-2-581-2890 E-Mail: info@ohr.org.il Home Page: http://www.ohr.org.il (C) 1999 Ohr Somayach International

From: Ohr Somayach[SMTP:ohr@virtual.co.il] Subject: Parsha Q&A -Nasso Recommended Reading List Ramban 5:2, 5:6 Organization of this Parsha 5:20 Waters of the Sotah 6:11 Sin of the Nazir 6:24 Blessings of the Kohanim Sforno 7:13 Gifts of the Nesi'im Sefer Hachinuch 362 Tumah and Kedusha 364 Confession 365 Marital Peace 366 Sotah Offering 374 Appropriate Asceticism 378 The Blessing of the Kohanim

From: Jeffrey Gross[SMTP:jgross@torah.org] Subject: Parshas Naso-Amplified Sound Waves

WEEKLY-HALACHA FOR 5759 SELECTED HALACHOS RELATING TO PARSHAS NASO By Rabbi Doniel Neustadt

A discussion of Halachic topics related to the Parsha of the week. For final rulings, consult your Rav.

He heard the voice speaking to him (7:89)

AMPLIFIED SOUND WAVES

QUESTION: Can one fulfill a mitzvah which involves hearing something recited or read, e.g., hearing Havdalah or the reading of Megillas Esther, by hearing the words over a telephone or from the loudspeaker of a public address system?

DISCUSSION: The answer to this question, extensively debated by the poskim, depends on the halachic interpretation of certain technical facts. Both the telephone and the public address system "transform" sound waves in air, e.g., spoken words, into an electrical current within the instrument, and, ultimately, back into sound waves. It is debatable, though, how the halachah views these sound waves: 1) Are they an extension of the speaker's voice, merely amplified or carried to a distance that the unassisted human voice cannot reach; or are they 2) distinct from the speaker's voice, since the loudspeaker or receiver "creates" new sound waves from something - an

electrical current, which is not sound? Translated from technical into halachic terms, the question is whether the mitzvah in question can be fulfilled only with the authentic, original voice of the speaker, or also by means of sounds generated by electrical impulses derived from the original voice and occurring simultaneously with it. Some earlier authorities(1) were of the opinion that the sound heard over the telephone or from the loudspeaker is the original speaker's voice. It is permitted, therefore, in their opinion(2) to listen to the megillah read over a public address system or to Havdalah over the telephone. Other authorities(3) maintained that the halachic view of amplified sounds is difficult to resolve and cannot be clearly decided. Thus in their opinion it remains questionable if mitzvos can be performed by means of a public address system or telephone. It follows, therefore, that only under extenuating circumstances - when no other possibility exists - is it permitted to fulfill a mitzvah by means of a loudspeaker or telephone(4). However, the majority of the authorities(5) who have studied this issue, including Haray S.Z. Auerbach(6) who researched it extensively with the aid of a team of technical experts(7), have ruled conclusively that the sound waves emitted by a loudspeaker or telephone receiver are definitely not the speaker's original, authentic voice. In addition, they rule unequivocally that one's obligation cannot be discharged by hearing an electrically generated sound even if the original speaker's voice is heard simultaneously. Accordingly, one cannot, under any circumstances, fulfill a mitzvah by listening to sound waves from a microphone or a telephone(8). In practice, therefore, it is clear that when another possibility exists, mechanical voice amplifiers should not be used to fulfill a mitzvah. For example, a woman who is home alone and has no one to make Havdalah for her, should rather recite Havdalah herself(9) than listen to it being recited by someone else over the telephone. Even if she cannot or will not drink wine, grape juice, or beer, it is better for her to recite Havdalah over coffee(10), tea [with or without milk](11), or milk alone(12) [and, according to some poskim(13), grapefruit, orange or apple juice] than to listen to Havdalah recited over the phone(14). If one finds himself in a situation where otherwise he cannot recite Havdalah or hear the megillah at all, e.g. in a hospital, and there is no one who can come until Tuesday evening(15) to make Havdalah for him, he may have to rely on the poskim who permit listening to blessings, etc., over the telephone(16). But in a situation where someone could come and recite Havdalah for him before Tuesday evening, the correct procedure is to wait until then for Havdalah to be recited(17). If he is weak, he may eat before hearing Havdalah. If he is not, he should not eat until Sunday at chatzos(18). A related issue is whether or not it is permitted to answer amen to a blessing or Kaddish heard over a microphone, telephone, or during a live telecast transmitted by satellite. Some poskim(19) permit this and do not consider the answering of amen etc., to be l'vatalah ("for nothing"), since they remain undecided about the halachic status of amplified sound waves, as explained above. In addition, some poskim(20) permit it, based on the ancient precedent set in the great synagogue in Alexandria(21), where most people did not hear the blessings being recited because of its vast size, but were nevertheless permitted to answer amen when signaled to do so by the waving of a flag. Harav Auerbach, though, rejects this comparison and rules clearly that it is prohibited to answer amen upon hearing a blessing in this manner. He agrees, however, that one who is in the vicinity of the speaker, even though he hears the speaker's voice only over a microphone, etc., is permitted to answer amen, as was the case in Alexandria where everyone was inside the shul and part of the tzibbur that was davening.

FOOTNOTES: 1 Minchas Elazar 2:72; Minchas Aharon 18 (quoted in Tzitz Eliezer 8:11). 2 Their argument is based partially on the fact that sound waves - even without being mechanically transmitted - are carried through the air before they are heard by the listener. The fact that the microphone amplifies those sounds and furthers their distance should not be considered halachically problematic. 3 Harav T. P. Frank (Mikraei Kodesh, Purim 11 and in Minchas Yitzchak 2:113); 1gros Moshe O.C. 2:108; O.C. 4:126. [See, however, Igros Moshe E.H. 1:33 and O.C. 4:84.] Harav Y.Y. Henkin (Eidus l'Yisrael, pg. 122) also does not render a clear decision on this issue. See also Minchas Shelomo 9 quoting an oral conversation with the Chazon Ish. 4 Tzitz Eliezer 8:11. See also Shevet ha-Levi 5:84. 5 Da'as Torah O.C. 689:2; Gilyonei ha-Shas, Berachos 25a; Eretz Tzvi 1:23; Kol Mevaser 2:25; Mishpatei Uziel 1:5; Minchas Yitzchak 1:37, 3:38; She'arim Metzuyanim b'Halachah 129:25; 193:6; Kinyan Torah 1:75; Yechaveh Da'as 3:54; Moadim u'Zemanim 6:105. See also Teshuvos P'eas Sadcha 126 who quotes such a ruling f rom Reb Chayim Soloveitchik. 6

Minchas Shelomo 9. 7 Harav Auerbach and Yechaveh Da'as add that those who dissented were not familiar with the relevant technology. 8 Harav Auerbach makes clear that the same ruling applies to hearing-impaired individuals who cannot hear without a hearing aid. Igros Moshe O.C. 4:85 is hesitant over whether a hearing aid works exactly like a microphone, 9 Women are obligated to recite Havdalah and may recite it themselves. Although there is a well-established custom that women do not drink the wine from the Havdalah cup, this custom is discounted when a woman needs to fulfill her obligation of Havdalah; Mishnah Berurah 296:35; Aruch ha-Shulchan 296:5. 10 Instant or brewed (Harav S.Z. Auerbach, Shemiras Shabbos K'hilchasah 60 note 18). 11 The tea or coffee should be cooled enough to drink at least 1.6 fl. oz. within three minutes. 12 Aruch ha-Shulchan 272:14; Igros Moshe O.C. 2:75. 13 Tzitz Eliezer 8:16; Shemiras Shabbos K'hilchasah 60:5. 14 If a woman refuses to recite Havdalah on her own and there is no one available to recite it for her, her husband [or another man] may repeat it for her, even if he has already fulfilled his obligation earlier; see Mishnah Berurah 296:36; Aruch ha-Shulchan 296:5; Da'as Torah 296:8; Ben Ish Chai, Vayeitzei 22. The blessing over the candle, though, should be omitted, in the opinion of some poskim. 15 O.C. 299:5. 16 Igros Moshe O.C. 4:91 -4; Tzitz Eliezer 8:11. 17 In this case, one should specifically not listen to Havdalah over the phone, since the n it may not be repeated for him when the visitor comes. 18 Mishnah Berurah 296:21. Harav S.Y. Elyashiv, too, is quoted (Yad le-Yoledes, pg. 135) as ruling that it is better to eat before havdalah than to listen to it over the telephone, 19 Igros Moshe, ibid, 20 Yechayeh Da'as 3:54, 21 See Succah 51b and Tosfos, ibid,

Weekly-Halacha, Copyright (c) 1999 by Rabbi Neustadt, Dr. Jeffrey Gross and Project Genesis, Inc. The author, Rabbi Neustadt, is the principal of Yavne Teachers' College in Cleveland, O hio. He is also the Magid Shiur of a daily Mishna Berurah class at Congregation Shomre Shabbos. The Weekly-Halacha Series is distributed L'zchus Doniel Meir ben Hinda. Weekly sponsorships are available - please mail to jgross@torah.org Project Genesis: Torah on the Information Superhighway learn@torah.org 17 Warren Road, Suite 2B http://www.torah.org/Baltimore, MD 21208 (410) 602-1350 FAX: 602-1351

http://www.jpost.co.il/Columns/Article-0.html
The Jerusalem Post Internet Edition Thursday, May 27, 1999 12 Sivan 5759
SHABBAT SHALOM: On guard By RABBI SHLOMO RISKIN

(May 27) "From 30 to 50 years of age you shall appoint them... to serve in the army... They shall carry the tapestries of the Tabernacle, and the Tent of Meeting, its covering, and the covering of the sealskin that is upon it, and the screen for the door of the tent of meeting." (Numbers 4:23-25)

This week's portion of Naso helps us understand what makes a Jewish army Jewish. After all, is it merely that it is comprised of Israelis, and that the kitchen serves only kosher food? No more than seven decades ago, the idea of a Jewish army was fantasy. Our heroes were men of the book, not And yet, the idea of an army is prominent throughout the Bible, and until the Israelities were driven into exile by the Romans, battlefields were never alien to us. The concept of "obligatory war" is fundamental to our faith, and is prescribed (especially when a foreign nation is poised to destroy us) in the Bible and Talmud; indeed, in times of obligatory warfare it is forbidden to be a pacifist. But is there a unique quality to a Jewish army? And why does the Bible refer to the Levite protectors of the Sanctuary as soldiers? Prominent in this week's portion is the word tzava, translated as army, but we first come across the concept in the Book of Genesis, where the Torah tells us that "...the heaven and the earth were finished, and all the host of them." (Gen. 2:1) The Hebrew word for "all the host of them" is tzeva'am which literally means armies. What the Torah seems to be telling us is that the heavens and earth require protective soldiers. Hence the most fundamental meaning of tzava would seem to be protectors. Moreover, this biblical order of heaven, earth and hosts as it appears in Genesis is not arbitrary. The Bible is providing a perspective regarding creation: first heaven, then earth - the spiritual before the material.

Interestingly enough, when it comes to the creation of human beings the order is reversed. First the earthly: "God formed the human of the dust of the ground"; only afterwards comes the spiritual: "...and God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and the human being became a living soul" (Gen. 2:7). And once the complete person is formed, his function as developer and protector of the world is delineated. "And the Lord God took the human and put him into the garden of Eden to till and guard it." (Gen. 2:15) The change in order can be explained easily enough. The sequence in the first verse - heaven before earth - stands for the ultimate goal towards which we must aspire. But when it comes to the human creation, we come down to reality. Born of earth, the flesh and blood human spends his entire life struggling for a measure of spirituality and Godliness. He aspires to reach for the heavens, but can only reach for the stars after his physical well-being on the ground is assured. What is true for man in general is also true for the

nation of Israel in particular. Only after the physical bodies of the Israelites are freed from Egyptian enslavement is it possible for the revelation on Mt. Sinai to be brought to the people. As slaves, the Jews couldn't have begun to fathom the spiritual dimension of Sinai. Only one who is physically independent can properly choose to climb the ladder toward spiritual Hence the Israelites are first freed from Egyptian slavery. attainment. Only then can they appreciate Torah, and so the exodus is followed by the Revelation at Sinai and the construction of the Sanctuary. And just as the heavens and earth - as well as the Garden of Eden itself - required protection. so does the nation and its Torah require protection. Hence after describing our physical freedom (Book of Exodus) and our spiritual mandate (Book of Leviticus), we are commanded in the Book of Numbers to create a standing Aside from the Divinely mandated initial conquest of Israel, obligatory wars were fought against any nation lifting its banner in an attempt to destroy us. From this perspective, we can understand the symbolism which emerges from the very arrangement of the army on the ground in the desert. The Jews are formed in tribes and battalions - army like - around the aorta of our nation, the Sanctuary. Every Jew is a soldier, given the responsibility to guard his people and its Laws. Our army was not primarily created for conquest; its major purpose is protection. Peace is our goal. Because slavery is a worse option (both for us and the world) than war. war is sometimes a necessary evil. However, it is never a desirable goal - as it was among the Greeks and Romans. Our Mishna, for example, asks about the permissibility of carrying weapons on the Sabbath. R. Eliezer permits it, insisting that a weapon is worn as an adornment and is not carried as a burdern. The Sages violently disagree: "Weapons are a disgrace, since the Prophet Isaiah dreams of the day when swords shall be turned into ploughshares... and mankind will no longer learn war." (Mishna Shabbat 5:4)

An Israeli soldier doesn't have to be a Talmudic scholar to know that he belongs to a different kind of army. He knows from the draft itself that there is nothing elitist here. All officers rise up from the ranks. This year's recruit can become tomorrow's general. The Israeli army is not an army of slaves, mercenaries, volunteers. It is a true people's army, with every able-bodied individual liable to the draft. Every Jew must serve! And from this week's portion we know that a Jewish army is not an end in itself. Just as the tzava of the Levites was bound up with the Sanctuary, the ultimate goal of a Jewish army must be to protect the nation of Israel and its Torah until we truly become a "kingdom of priests" serving in God's Temple. When the Jews of Israel put down their guns for good, it will be a sign that the world has truly entered an age of peace. Shabbat Shalom

From: Yeshivat Har Etzion's Israel Koschitzky Virtual Beit
Midrash[SMTP:yhe@vbm-torah.org] Subject: SICHOT -31: Parashat Naso
YESHIVAT HAR ETZION PARASHAT NASO
SICHA OF HARAV AMITAL SHLIT"A

The Levite Service

Summarized by Rav Eliyahu Blumenzweig

The tasks assigned to the Levi'im, which are detailed in our parshiot, seem to be temporary tasks, limited in their duration. However, the Levi'im in fact teach and demonstrate the paths of Divine service for all generations.

The Levi'im had three principal roles in the desert: carrying, dismantling and erecting the mishkan; guarding the mishkan and singing; and teaching the nation Torah ("They teach your judgements to Ya'akov").

The first task - carrying the mishkan - exemplifies and characterizes the nature of the Levite service. They are responsible for carrying the place where the Shekhina is revealed, bearing this holy site and building this edifice at each station. With each journey the nation reaches a new destination, each complete with its own new environment and new challenges. In each place they build this holy edifice. While the Kohanim are responsible for those aspects which are static and fixed - "And the Kohanim stood in their place" (Divrei Ha-Yamim II 35:10), the Levi'im take charge of that which changes - "And the Levi'im in their divisions" (ibid.) -

i.e. the various different situations, places and times. At the same time, despite the feeling of transition and change, they are commanded to build the edifice each time as a permanent and eternal building.

"If a matter for judgement be beyond you... you shall come to the Kohanim and the Levi'im... and they shall tell you the judgement" (Devarim 17:8-9). The Kohanim teach God's judgements, while the Levi'im "caused the people to understand the Torah" (Nechemia 8:7) - they explain the words of Torah to the masses, facilitating the acquisition of Torah by the nation as a whole, each person according to his ability and capacity.

From here we can understand the nature of their second task, too-that of guarding. The Levi'im guard the mishkan from outside forces. These forces change and renew themselves from time to time, and the Levi'im are continually forced to deal with new currents, to fight new battles and to approach new challenges.

We tend to believe that not every task uplifts its performer. With regard to those who carried the aron (ark), the Torah teaches us that the aron "carried its bearers" - their work uplifts them; their task elevates them, advances and develops them. But when it comes to the other associated tasks, much physical effort is required, and one may fear that the task limits and blocks the possibility of spiritual elevation. God's command at the beginning of the parasha comes to combat this conception: "And God spoke to Moshe saying, 'Count ("naso" - literally, "lift up?") the number ("rosh" - literally, "head") of the sons of Gershon, them too...'" - they, too, lift their heads proudly. The most important thing is the readiness to perform any task and any job, with the recognition that this is holy work. With such an attitude - one of readiness to perform work which would seemingly represent an obstacle to development and personal progress every task elevates. This attitude in Divine service is particularly emphasized in the service of the Levi'im. We are taught that a Levi who was supposed to sing, but chose to guard the gates because he felt that the job of singing was too elevated for him, was deserving of death; and a Levi who accepted all the mitzvot pertaining to the Levi'im except for one, was not accepted.

In a famous passage at the end of Hilkhot Shemitta ve-Yovel (13:13), the Rambam writes: "And not only the tribe of Levi, but any individual in the world whose spirit and understanding drive him to separate himself in order to serve God and to know God, and who walks straight as the Lord made him, and removes from himself the yoke of all the various mortal concerns - this person is sanctified as Holy of Holies, and God will be his portion and his inheritance for ever and ever, for all eternity. And God will cause him to receive all that he requires in this world, as He did for the Kohanim and Levi'im."

Anyone who wishes to join in Divine Service in fact enlists in the ranks of the Levi'im, and must learn from them how the task is to be performed

(Originally delivered on Leil Shabbat Parashat Naso 5733. Translated by Kaeren Fish.) YESHIVAT HAR ETZION ISRAEL KOSCHITZKY VIRTUAL BEIT MIDRASH ALON SHEVUT, GUSH ETZION 90433 E-MAIL: YHE@VBM-TORAH.ORG or OFFICE@ETZION.ORG.IL

From: Jonathan Schwartz[SMTP:jschwrtz@ymail.yu.edu] Subject: Internet Chaburah -- Parshas Nasso

Prologue: The gemara in Nedarim tells the story of Shimon Hatzaddik who never ate from the Korban Asham of a Nazir, except for one instance where a young man was overtaken by his own vanity that he accepted Nezirus upon himself in order not to get carried away in his beauty. Shimon haTzaddik was so moved by the man's devotion that he allowed himself to partake of the Korban. The Midrash notes that the reason that Parshas Birkas Kohanim follows the Parsha in Nazir seems to be contained in this idea. Notes the Midrash that someone who accepts Neizirus upon himself for proper reasons will merit the complete Berachos mentioned in Birkas Kohanim. The Ksav Sofer explains why. The Berachos of Birkas Kohanim mainly pertain to man's needs in this world. When a man is satisfied with that which he already has on this world, he tends to lose sight of the gifts he

has received and might take them for granted. In that situation, Berachos become Klalos. However, when a person can show that he can pass the test of wealth, when necessary through the process of Nezirus, he deserves the Berachos of Olam Hazeh and can handle having them. Hence, the Birkas Kohanim follows the Parsha of Nazir. Often, the lessons of the Nazir of Shimon HaTzaddik, the one who recognized his need to be careful not to get carried away by his hair should stand before us illuminating lessons of life in Olam HaZeh. With that in mind, this week's chaburah entitled:

Something to Dve For The Mechaber (Y.D. 182:6) notes that a man may not pluck out even one white hair because he will be in violation of the biblical prohibition of wearing women's clothing. Additionally, he may not dve his white hairs nor look into a mirror. The Taz (7) notes that the reason for this manifestation of the din is that dying one's hair is what a woman does for her beauty. However, the Taz quotes the Beis Yosef who states that bleaching one's hair from black to white would be mutar even l'chatchila. However, the sefer HaChassidim (379 < in newer versions 826>) implies the opposite. He notes that there was a story told of an older man who was told to dye his hair to fool a woman into thinking he was younger. The man refused because he did not want5 to mislead her. The implication is that dying one's hair from white to black would have been mutar according to this story if not for the faking involved in the process. What is the reason why the din of dressing like a woman would not have entered the discussion in the Sefer HaChassidim's story? Many want to explain that the issur of dying one's hair would not apply if there was a practical purpose involved in the process. Hence, the Sdei Chemed (Maareches Lamed Klal 116) brings many shittos that held different opinions on the matter, some held it to be assur, while others were matir. However, those opinions who did allow people to dye their hair only allowed it in lighter colors (red not black) or through a goy. In the Shut Shoel U'Mashiv (Kamma, 210) a proof is cited to support the Rambam's stance that there is a biblical prohibition being discussed here. At the same time, the Sreidi Eish (II, 82) disproves the proof and cites Tosfos (Yevamos 48a) who writes that even by the cutting of the Nazir's hair tyhere is a differentiation between pain and beauty. Tosfos refuses to compare the hair cut to that of a woman whose haircutting is not for beauty rather because it grows too long. Hence, it can even be cut with a Rav Weinberg (Sreidei Eish) actually spends a long time defining razor. the difference between pain and beauty and the heterim of each. Ray Weinberg seems to adopt the position that in a case of necessity, one could dye one's hair and not be subjected to the biblical prohibition. It seems that only when there is no practical reason to violate the halacha would the biblical prohibition remain. This is similar to the Shach and Taz who allow one to wear clothing of the opposite gender if it is to save him from the cold. Yet, where do we find a heter to offer our own reasons for mitzvos in the Torah and to define when they apply? To this, the Sreidei Eish answers that here things are different since the Torah already told us that Hashem finds those who do things like this despicable. This means that it refers to someone who intends on doing something despicable which the gemara (Nazir 59a) determines to mean looking like a woman and going to sit with them too. If there were another purpose involved, it would be mutar. of dying one's own hair, where there would be a practical component to the action, it should be mutar. This is even more true according to the Raavad who maintains that the whole issur by dying one's hair is rabbinic in origin. also B'IkVei HaTzoan and Contemporary Halachic Problems Vol. III) so there was no problem of "Lo Yilbash" wearing clothing of the opposite gender. The Minchas Eliezer (IV, 23) wanted to be lenient on this position especially when an individual is embarrassed as half his head is one color and half another. Yet, he did not want to argue on the Divrei Chaim who held it was assur. Still, the Divrei Chaim agrees that if if the person seeking to dye his hair is a young person to whom the embarrassment is overly great, there would be a reason to be lenient. Ray Wosner (Shut Shevet HaLevi) argues that one shouldn't violate the halacha in this case. Rather, let him dye his hair white and the embarrassment will subside (except in the case of the young person where he apparently would agree with the Divrei Chaim).

Battala News Mazal Toy to HaGaon Haray Hershel Reichman shlita and

family upon Zevi's engagement to Chaya Feurstein. and Aviva Markowitz upon the birth of Ilana Malka.

Mazal Toy to David

From: Zomet[SMTP:zomet@virtual.co.il] Subject: Shabbat-B'Shabbato: Nasso (Shavuot) http://www.moreshet.co.il/zomet SHABBAT-ZOMET is an extract from SHABBAT-B'SHABBATO, a weekly bulletin distributed free of charge in hundreds of synagogues in Israel. It is published by the Zomet Institute of Alon Shevut, Israel, under the auspices of the National Religious Party. Translated by: Moshe Goldberg

A MITZVA IN THE TORAH PORTION:

A Minyan is Needed for the Priestly Blessing

by Rabbi Binyamin Tabory

The mitzva of the blessing by the Kohanim, described in this week's Torah portion, is performed only in the presence of a minyan, as is written: "Public prayers are not recited, they [the Kohanim] do not raise their hands [to bless], and the Torah is not read ... with less than ten people present" [Megila 23b]. The commentators disagree about the reason for this rule. According to the Rashba, it is because the Kohanim mention the name of G-d, and this is similar to the Grace after Meals, which is recited using G-d's name only if there is a minyan. On the other hand, the RAN uses as a source the words of the verse, "Thus shall you bless Bnei Yisrael" [Bamidbar 6:23]. As with all holy rituals, a minimum of ten is required to consider the group as a community of Bnei Yisrael. Another reason given is that a minyan is necessary for Divine revelation, which occurs during the blessing (as is written, "And I will bless them" [Bamidbar 6:27]).

The fact that the blessing of the Kohanim is mentioned in the Talmud together with public prayer and reading of the Torah shows that this process is indeed a holy ritual. My teacher and mentor, Rabbi J.D. Soloveitchik, explained that what all "holy rituals" have in common is that the congregation recites a response, as in the recitation of Kaddish, Kedusha, and Barchu. But how does the congregation participate in the blessing of the Kohanim? The answer is in the appreciation shown by the people, and their thanks to G-d for the blessing He gives them. This would seem to be the source for the custom of reciting verses while the Kohanim are delivering the blessing.

The main obligation is for the Kohanim to perform the ceremony, but the Sefer Hachareidim is quoted as saying that there is also a mitzva for the community to accept the blessing. It is therefore forbidden for the congregation to let its attention wander during the blessing, leading to the rule that "nobody is permitted to look at the faces of the Kohanim while they are blessing the people." According to the Minchat Chinuch, women are also obligated to hear the blessing, since this is not a time-bound mitzva. However, the Ritva wrote: "There is no obligation for Bnei Yisrael to be blessed. This is a mitzva for the Kohanim." [Succa 31b].

In summary, the priests have an obligation to bless the Jews, and some commentators feel that the community has an obligation to accept the blessing. The third partner in this ritual is the Almighty: "And do not be skeptical and ask, what value can there be to a blessing by a simple person. For the blessing depends not on the Kohanim but on the Almighty ... The Kohanim perform the mitzva which they were commanded, and the Almighty Eventsham Region (Grant Haring Rurlen) (Grant Har

From: Rabbi Mordechai Kamenetzky[SMTP:rmk@torah.org]
Drasha Parshas Naso -- For Him the Bell Tolls Rabbi Mordechai

Kamenetzky Volume 5 Issue 37 05/28/98 Mazel Tov: With Gratitude to Hashem My wife and I are proud to announce the birth of a baby boy on Tuesday May 25th the 10th day of Sivan. May we be zocheh to bring him to the Bris in the proper time and raise him to Torah, Chupah (marriage) and ma'asim Tovim (good deeds) For Bris Time and location Please e-mail me Assista@horbhsing.syitte Subjush Mord@risaindteswillaCodewillindy@dsischnair becan Mordechai and Sora Kamenetzky

And Now for Parsha Parables / Drasha:

There is a verse in this week's portion which seems to have a misplaced possesive. But on closer analysis every noun and pronoun lend powerful meaning. "And every portion of Holies that the Children of Israel bring to a Kohen shall be his. A man's holies shall be his, and what he gives to a kohen shall be his" (Numbers 5:9-10). The question is obvious: if the holies shall be his then why are they the Kohen's; and if they are the Kohen's, as the Torah tells us, then why are they his? Rashi sheds some light by explaining the verse with a Medrash: The man who gives to a Kohen shall surely not lose, as whatever he gives shall ultimately be returned they will be his. On the other hand, one who wants to keep his holies, they shall be his. The only properties left to him shall be the small percent that he was supposed to allot to the Kohen. That is what will be his. These two diverse explications seem in contradiction. Does what he gives to the Kohen remain "his" or does only what he want to keep remain "his"? How does the word "his" play two different roles, one telling us of fortune, the other of adversity?

Many years ago, my father told me the following story: Before the turn of the century, Reb Dovid, a talented worker, decided that he had had enough of the shtetl. There was no money to be made, and he decided to travel to America in search of even a small fragment of the fabled streets that were paved with gold. Before he set off, he appointed his friend, Yankel, a prominent businessman, to receive the monies that would soon be pouring in from his successful overseas ventures. After taking a small fee for his services, Yankel would deliver the remaining money to the man's family. "How much should I take, and how much should I give your wife?" asked Yankel. The America-bound traveler put his full faith in the friend and simply told him to use his own discretion. After a few months, Dovid's efforts began to bear fruit, and he sent a respectable sum of money to Yankel's bank account in Kovno to be distributed to his wife and family. Yankel, however, had different plans. He kept almost the entire sum for himself, while allotting only a fraction of the cash to Dovid's wife and family. They, in turn, dejectedly, falsely assumed that Dovid was still not able to make ends meet. A few months went by and Dovid's wife received a letter from him assuring her that things were going well and soon he would be able to move the entire family to the United States. "Meanwhile," he concluded, "I am sure that the sums you are receiving enable you to live in extreme comfort." Dovid's wife was flabbergasted. She had hardly received enough to feed her family! She ran to the Kovno Ray, Rabbi Isaac Elchonon Spector, and cried her heart out. "Yankel is cheating us! My husband is sending him a fortune, but he is giving us a pittance!" Immediately, the Rav summoned Yankel to his study, "Is it true," asked Rabbi Spector, "that you were supposed to give the monies received to Dovid's wife?" "Yes," the man declared smugly. "But I was allowed to take my fair share." And what were you supposed to give her?" the rabbi asked, almost incredulously. "Dovid told me, 'Give her what you want.' So," he continued, a broad smirk on his face. "I took 90 percent of the money and gave her what I wanted. And that was 10 percent." Immediately Rabbi Spector stood up and asked the man to repeat himself. "Can you repeat yourself? What did Reb Dovid tell you to give her?" "He told me to give her exactly what I want." "Good," declared Rabbi Spector, knowing fully what Dovid's true intention was. "As Rabbi of Kovno, I command you to give her the ninety percent portion that you had kept for yourself." "But why?" stammered the man. "Because that is exactly what you want. You are to give her exactly what you wanted!"

The Torah tells us that a man whose holies are to him will remain his. There are many Heavenly ways to delineate what a man is meant to receive. The words "will belong to him" may ring with plenty or with poverty. If one's eyes are filled with greed then only his holies will be his. The tithe becomes his only want and Hashem assures him that that is what he will get But if he gives with generosity than what he gives shall be his in addition to what he already has. Because the One who interprets man's heart interprets the verse. He fills the meaning in accordance with the man's intent. And then He interprets the reward.

Good Shabbos Rabbi Mordechai Kamenetzky

Dedicated in memory of Irving Adelsberg -- Yitzchak Eizik ben Gedalia

of blessed memory whose Yartzeit is 12 Sivan by the Adelsberg Family

Drasha, Copyright (c) 1999 by Rabbi M. Kamenetzky and Project Genesis, Inc. Drasha is the e-mail edition of FaxHomily, a Project of the Henry and Myrtle Hirsch Foundation. Rabbi Mordechai Kamenetzky is the Associate Dean of the Yeshiva of South Shore, http://www.yoss.org/. Project Genesis: Torah on the Information Superhighway learn@torah.org 17 Warren Road, Suite 2B http://www.torah.org/ Baltimore, MD 21208 (410) 602-1350

[Didn't make AM distribution]

From: torahweb[SMTP:torahweb@torahweb.org]

Sent: Friday, May 28, 1999 11:29 AM To: weeklydvartorah@torahweb.org

Subject: Rabbi Yaakov Neuberger - Parshat Nasso

http://www.torahweb.org/torah/1999/parsha/rneu_nasso.html

Rabbi Yaakov Neuberger

Serving God Ka'asher Diber

(5:4)"And the Jews did so, and they sent them [those who were tameh, had tzora'as or were zavim] out of the camp as Hashem had told Moshe". There are many occasions in which the Torah reports that obligations were performed in accordance with Hashem's instructions, and all are appropriately noted as "ka'asher tzivah" - as Hashem commanded. However in an observation that only Rav Meir Simcha of Dvinsk could make, he notes that the pasuk quoted here is the only time in Torah where Hashem's instructions were carried out "ka'asher dibeir" - as Hashem spoke. Throughout all of Noah's preparations for the Mabul, he is described as following the command of Hashem, "And Noah [brought all the animals into the Teivahl - ka'asher tzivah - as Hashem commanded him" (6:22). "And Avraham performed the bris on his son Yitzchak, who was eight days old û kaÆasher tzivah - as Hashem commanded him" (21:4). "And they went and they [brought the korban pesach] as Moshe and Aharon were commanded (Ex12:28)". The record of the gifts that were brought for the building of the mishkan is punctuated with the refrain, ka'asher tzivah Hashem - as Hashem commanded. Why then is the reference to the mitzvah of sending some individuals who are tameh out of the camp, said to be observed ka'asher diber - as Hashem spoke.

Rav Meir Simcha in his commentary to the Torah, Meshech Chochma, answers that the word "tzivah" does not simply mean command. Rather, ka'asher tzivah implies encouragement, prodding, perhaps even demanding. KaÆasher tzivah indicates acts of obeisance alone, which are void of any anticipation of great satisfaction and certainly empty of any self serving consequences. Indeed Rashi at the beginning of Parshas Tzav reminds us that the very usage of "tzav" indicates that the loss of money associated with the korban olah required greater encouragement than other mitzvos. However, remarks the Meshech Chochma, sending the tameh out of the camp, was welcomed by the tameh as it would achieve kaparah, forgiveness and a reinstatement of his position in the eyes of Hashem. That did not require any additional encouragement and was carried out, "ka'asher dibeir," as something unceremoniously taught to Moshe, with no push or fanfare.

It would seem to me that there is another insight lurking in the Meshech Chochma's observation. Mitzvos that are observed "ka'asher tzivah", are by virtue of the added encouragement, informed with the vigor, passion and pride of one who sees oneself as doing the Creator's bidding. One can only imagine that all the misgivings that Noach had about the oncoming destruction notwithstanding, he must have been exhilarated to be chosen to ensure the survival of all that Hashem had wrought. Surely the paternal pain felt at the time of Yitzchak's bris was overwhelmed by the joy that filled Avraham, as he witnessed the continuation of all that he sought to bring into this world. There is no question that the bris was performed ka'asher tzivah. Can one doubt that the Jews leaving Egypt were joyous beyond description as they brought the Korban Pesach signaling their nascent redemption?

However there is one mitzvah that we understood on our own to carry out in a begrudging manner - "ka'asher diber", because He said so, as an act of obeisance. Asking someone to leave the camp, even if it is because he is

tameh and even if he welcomes the opportunity for kaparah, is one of the hard realities of communal life that Hashem has on occasion demanded of us. The Jews understood that the manner in which this mitzvah is exercised must communicate the hesitation always inherent in distancing Jew from Jew. When a destructive attitude or a negative influence has to be separated away, it must be done with the visible pain of someone doing one's duty and devoid of the satisfaction that should otherwise highlight all service to Hashem. In so doing one remains true to the love of every Jew that must guide all interactions with others.