

INTERNET PARSHA SHEET
ON KI SETZEI - 5759

B'S'D'

To receive this parsha sheet in WP 6.1 file (readable by Word), send e-mail message to cshulman@cahill.com

<http://www.ou.org/torah/ti/> OU Torah Insights Project
Parashat Ki Teitzei
Rabbi Bert Leff

In reference to war, the Torah emphasizes the word machaneh, camp. The Torah commands, "When you go out to encamp against your enemies, you shall guard against anything evil...for Hashem, your G-d, walks in the midst of your camp to rescue you and to deliver your enemies before you so that your camp shall be holy."

Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik, zt"l, distinguishes between machaneh, camp, and eidah, congregation.

Camp and congregation are two distinct sociological phenomena. A camp is formed in the face of a common enemy, who engenders fear and creates the need for self-defense. "When you go out to encamp against your enemies" the camp is established when people feel helpless and must join together to battle the enemy.

An Eidah, a congregation, on the other hand, shares a common ideology, and is nourished by love rather than fear. A congregation expresses man's powerful spirit. In a Jewish context, the eidah is grounded in the teachings of Sinai, a holy nation committed to a Divine destiny.

In order for the nation of Israel to fulfill its Divine mission and destiny, "your camp shall become holy." This machaneh, this camp, must develop into an eidah. It must become holy.

It is this notion of encampment that unites the beginning of our parshah, "When you will go out to war against your enemies," with its conclusion, "Remember what Amaleik did to you.... Wipe out the memory of Amaleik from under the heavens--do not forget."

Throughout our history we have united as a camp against our enemies, the Amalekites of the world. But too often we have failed to advance from there to become a holy congregation.

No doubt our unity in the face of Amaleik is part of our destiny. But, as the Rav defined it, it is a destiny of fate not a destiny of faith not the destiny of an eidah.

Even when eidah overtakes machaneh, it is possible for that congregation to maintain a negative ideology, such as the Spies and the followers of Korach. Though formed for ill purposes, the Torah nonetheless refers to each of these groups as an eidah.

We must be vigilant to insure that our eidah is a holy eidah, with a divine ideology, not one filled with the evil that destroys us.

The Jewish community is concerned with the crisis of Jewish continuity. The solution is to unite not only as a machaneh but as an eidah, a holy congregation committed to the destiny of faith a faith rooted in Torah and mitzvos. Such a covenant stems not from fear but from love, the love of G-d and the Jewish people.

Rabbi Bert Leff Rabbi Leff is editor of Torah Insights.

www.ohrnet.org * TORAH WEEKLY * Highlights of the Weekly Torah Portion Parshat Ki Teitzei

The Hidden Persuaders "And it will be that if you didn't want her" (21:14)

"Pediatricians Zap Media. No Television For Toddlers" ran the headline in a recent New York Times. "Children under two should not watch television, older children should not have television in their bedrooms and pediatricians should have parents fill out a media history along with a medical history." These recommendations by the American Academy of

Pediatricians were coupled with a warning that "television viewing can affect the mental, social and physical health of young people." Studies by the American Medical Association, the Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry and the National Institute of Mental Health have all concluded that there is a link between violence in television and violent behavior by young people. And yet the beat goes on. Western man sits glued to his TV. It's won't happen to me, he thinks. I'm sophisticated. I can see right through their blatant materialism. I know that my life isn't going to be better if I switch brands of mouthwash.

Don't fool yourself. Just as there is a kashrut for the mouth, there's a kashrut for the eyes. What you see goes in. It stays there. In the 1960s, a new form of advertising was discovered and almost immediately made illegal. Madison Avenue advertising firms realized that an image of their product on a single frame in a movie playing at 24 frames per second left a subliminal message imprinted in the mind of the viewer. A message of which he was totally unaware. Because of its extremely subtlety, the message managed to sneak under the defenses of the consumer and plant itself into his subconscious. You are what you eat. You think what you see. Just because we don't immediately feel the effects of watching television doesn't mean that the message doesn't lodge in our sub-conscious.

In this week's parsha the Torah legislates that if a soldier desires a woman captured in battle, he must go through a whole process before he can marry her. "You shall bring her into the midst of your house; she shall shave her head and let her nails grow....She shall dwell in your house and weep for her father and her mother for a full month..." The Torah continues "And it will be that if you didn't want her..." More grammatically correct, the Torah might have written "And it will be that if you will not want her." -- in the future tense. Why does the Torah choose the past tense here? The answer can be found in the way the Torah describes the first meeting between the soldier and his female captive -- "and you will see among its captivity a woman who is beautiful of form and you will desire her." The Torah here uses a different verb, "and you will desire her." It doesn't say "you will want her."

In life, there are "wants" and there are "desires." A want is based on logic and sound judgment. A desire is just that -- a fleeting fancy which fades like a lily and rots. When the Torah says "if you didn't want her," it's not listing an alternative, it's stating a fact. There never was a "want," just a "desire" -- thus the past tense. Even though you "desired" her, in truth you never really "wanted" her. Your emotions hijacked your reason.

Next time you turn off your television, notice that feeling of weariness and lethargy that wells up in your body and your soul. You drag yourself out of your chair and, rub your eyes to meet the light. You just spent a couple of hours tuned into the world of desire. Nothing is real. Do yourself a favor.

Take your TV(s) out into the yard, find a .303 gun and from the safety of your house, put a well-aimed bullet into the screen. You'll feel a lot better.

Source: * Ohel Mo'ed in Mayana shel Torah

Written and Compiled by Rabbi Yaakov Asher Sinclair General Editor:
Rabbi Moshe Newman Production Design: Eli Ballon 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>

From: Rabbi Pinchas Winston[SMTP:winston@torah.org] Subject: Perceptions - Parashas Ki Seitzei: War-n Out

If a bird's nest happens to be before you along the way in any tree, or on the ground, [with] young ones or eggs, and the mother is sitting upon the young or the eggs, then you must not take the mother with the young. You must send away the mother, while the young you may take for yourself, so that it may be good for you and you may prolong your days. (Devarim 22:6-7) "This excludes that which is already at hand." (Rashi) There are different kinds of mitzvos, and according to the Arizal, there are even male and female mitzvos! However, the mitzvah of "shiluach hakan" (sending

away the mother bird) is one of the rarer and more unusual mitzvot, comparatively-speaking. It is not the easiest mitzvah to perform, simply because coming across the mitzvah involves a certain element of chance, or, pardon me, Hashgachah Pratis. What makes this even more interesting is the fact that one of the rewards for doing this mitzvah properly is "arichus yamim," prolonged days. Now, who wouldn't want prolonged days, and go out of his wife to achieve it? To begin with, the Kli Yekar explains that such a powerful reward for such a seemingly simple mitzvah is because it has the ability to connect up a person with G-d. By acknowledging that the young are the product of the mother, one demonstrates that everything that exists has a source, and that source has a source, until the Ultimate Source of all: G-d, Himself. This makes this mitzvah a faith-strengthenener, and fortifies one's belief in a Creator of the Universe.

I would like to add something to this, in light of, or, should I say in "dark," of what happened last week, namely, the solar eclipse. One article that I happened to "chance" upon was from the Nasa Space Agency, which was providing background information to solar eclipses in general, and about what to expect of this one in particular. At the end of the article, the following was added: "It has often been asked if the similarity of the Moon's and Sun's diameters can be simple coincidence. In the absence of more data about the statistical distribution of sizes of stars, planets, and moons in solar systems other than our own, it would seem that the most likely answer is 'yes.' Nevertheless, it is a fortunate coincidence for the denizens of Earth." Why does this question come up? Because the sun is roughly 400 times the size of the moon, which means that, in front of the sun, the moon should be unable to block out very much of the sun at all (kind of like putting a ping pong ball in front of truck). So why a solar eclipse then? Because, "coincidentally," the sun happens to be about 400 times farther away from the earth than the moon is, making the moon and sun appear to the human eye the exact same size. And, to add coincidence to coincidence, this is only true about earth, the moon and the sun, making earth "the only planet with spectacular solar eclipses." Interestingly enough, this year's solar eclipse promised more bang for the buck, because the sun was also approaching its predicted maximum, the height of an 11-year cycle of solar activity. Also interesting is the fact that the lunar year is shorter than the solar year by eleven days, and there is a very Kabbalistic reason for that, tied to the concept of sublime Torah knowledge and the Jewish mission on earth. "Right, whatever that means ..."

Well, in any case, this is why the Jewish people are compared to the moon, as we have discussed many times in the past, and why the first mitzvah upon leaving Egypt (while still in Egypt) was that of sanctifying the new moon. This year's eclipse happened to occur before the last day of Av (August 11), when G-d finally forgave the Jewish people for their involvement in the golden calf episode. With more time, we could talk about the role of eleven in that whole fiasco, or, at least, the lack of it. I'm sure we could find more symbolism in all of this, and that many have already. However, what interests us is the fact that scientists are compelled to answer their own question and observation with a "yes":

"... In the absence of more data about the statistical distribution of sizes of stars, planets, and moons in solar systems other than our own, it would seem that the most likely answer is 'yes.'"

But what about the fourteenth verse of Bereishis: G-d said, "There shall be lights in the heavenly sky to divide between the day and the night." (Bereishis 1:14) --and the Midrash that says that, in the beginning, both the sun and the moon were the same size (Bereishis Rabbah 6:6)? Even though the moon's light was subsequently reduced because of a little "dispute," we see from here an inherent relationship between the sun and the moon, and the effect they are supposed to have on man. From a Torah perspective, there is no such thing as "chance," even when it comes to the apparent size of the sun and the moon from earth.

So, then, what about the mother bird and her young? That is a mitzvah that depends upon chance, or, tremendous Divine Providence. And, if it depends upon tremendous Divine Providence, then what kind of mitzvah is

it? "The reward of a mitzvah is a mitzvah." (Pirkei Avos 2:1) And, likewise, the reward for not believing in chance is a mitzvah that cannot be planned, but which can only be a function of Divine Providence. And, as the Kli Yekar explains, by doing the mitzvah, one demonstrates his belief in the concept that all things in the physical world are born from a spiritual source--the Spiritual Source, G-d, Himself.

You must have a perfect and just weight (ehven shlaimah) ... (Devarim 25:15) As an interesting aside to do with this week's parshah, there is the following:

"I heard from HaRav HaGaon Hishish ... from my teacher, HaRav Yitzchak Margolis, the head of the Bais Din in Shetutzin in Poland, who heard from the 'Light of the Exile,' our teacher HaRav Chaim from Volozhin, that the Gra (Vilna Gaon) said that the book 'Mishnah Torah' (Devarim) alludes in each parshah to what will happen in each one hundred years of the sixth millennium--ten parshios corresponding to ten periods of one hundred years (Nitzavim and Vayailech are considered one parshah). Rav Chaim asked him, 'Where are we hinted to in Parashas Ki Saitzai (which corresponds to the 100-year period we are in)?' He answered him that his [the Gra's] name was hinted to in the words 'ehven shlaimah,' but the name of Rav Chaim was hidden from him (it is not clear if the Gra hid it from Rav Chaim, or Rav Chaim left it out because of his humility) ..." (Sefer HaEmunah v'HaHashgachah)

First of all, the words "ehven shlaimah" as they are spelt, can be taken as, "Eliyahu ben Shlomo," the Gra's name, because the first word can be an abbreviation of "Eliyahu ben." When they asked the Gra why his last name was spelt in full, and his first name was abbreviated, he answered, "Because I was only meant to reveal part of the Torah I know, and to conceal part as well."

Secondly, according to the Gra, just as Parashas Ki Seitzei, the sixth parshah in Devarim would have corresponded to the period 5500-5600, or, 1740 CE to 1840 CE, Parashas Ki Savo, the seventh parshah, would have corresponded to the period, 5600 to 5700, or, 1840 to 1940 CE, ending in the middle of World War II. Parashas Ki Savo, we must recall, contains the infamous curses for straying from the Torah, describing in explicit detail what can be construed as a Holocaust. According to the Gra, this should come as no surprise.

Moving ahead in time, we arrive at the eighth parshah, Nitzavim-Vayailech, which we read this year on the Shabbos right before Rosh Hashanah 5760. Nitzavim-Vayailech, therefore, corresponds to the period from 5700 to 5800, or, from 1940 to 2040 CE.

What does this parshah speak about, and what does it speak to us? If you sneak a peak at these parshios (which we won't read until the week before Rosh Hashanah 5760), you will have little difficulty making connections between the parshios and our times. Or, you can wait until that week, when I will, b"H, address the issue as well.

Have a great Shabbos, Pinchas Winston

L'Shannah Tovah May this year be filled with much blessing, And only good news, For all of the Jewish People. Nizke Lirot Geulah Shlaimah!

All the best from The Winston Family Telzstone Rabbi Winston has authored fourteen books on Jewish philosophy (hashkafa). <http://books.torah.org/authors/winston/> Perceptions, Copyright (c) 1999 Rabbi Pinchas Winston and Project Genesis, Inc. Rabbi Winston teaches at both Neve Yerushalyim (Jerusalem) - <http://www.torah.org/neve/> and Neveh Tzion (Telzstone) - <http://www.neveh.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

From: Kenneth Block[SMTP:kenblock@worldnet.att.net] To: yitorah@vjlists.com Subject: NCYI Shatnes Parshat Ki Tetze Rabbi Chaim Casper Young Israel of Bal Harbour, FL. (In formation)

SHATNES

The RaMBa"M (Rabbi Moshe Ben Maimon) maintains that even though we may not understand a chok, a law in the Torah that is proscribed without any accompanying rational explanation, nevertheless, we have an obligation to try to understand that law.

One must ask, "Why?" when confronted with the mitzvah of shatnes: "You cannot wear shatnes, wool and linen (woven) together (Devarim 22:11)." Here is a case where we are not allowed to wear garments that are made by the intermingling of linen and wool. Following the dictate of the RaMBa"M above, we must ask ourselves why are we commanded not to wear linen and wool together? What lesson(s) can be learned from the mixing of these two clothing materials?

The RaMBa"M himself offers an explanation: the wearing of linen and wool together was a common practice for the idolatrous priests at the time of the Revelation on Mount Sinai (in fact, the RaMBa"M maintains it was still done in his time by the priests of Egypt). There is a general principle in the Torah of b'chukotayhem lo taylaykhu, that we as Jews are forbidden from copying the practices of other peoples. To wear shatnes would be to copy the ritual haberdashery of idolatrous priests, a concept that the Torah (and ultimately HaShem) expressly does not want us to do for minimally it would vindicate an idolatrous practice and maximally may lead someone astray, Heaven forbid, into a life of idolatry.

The Chizkuni (Rabbi Chizkiah Ben Manoah) points out that the first murder in the world came about because of linen and wool. Hevel offered the best of his first born sheep as a sacrifice to HaShem while his brother, Kayin, offered not his best linen seeds. In a fit of jealousy, Kayin killed his brother because Hevel's sacrifice was accepted while his, Kayin's, was not (B'reshit 4:4). In recognition of this black mark in human history, the Torah forbade us to mix these two species together unless they are both being used for Divine service (which is obviously what the preferred outcome of the two brothers' sacrifices should have been, namely, harmoniously working together in the service of HaShem).

[By the way, the only exception to the wearing of shatnes is that it may be worn in an article of Jewish haberdashery, namely a talit. This is learned from the smikhut, the connection, made between our pasuk of shatnes and the very next pasuk (Devarim 22:12) that describes the making and wearing of tsitsit. Our Chazal teach us that the purpose of placing these two mitzvot together in the Torah is to show us that one may use shatnes for tsitsit.]

Rabbi Samson Raphael Hirsch offers a different explanation. The minute a person dresses himself or herself, he/she acknowledges the rule of HaShem's Law in the world. Included in this Law is the concept of what Rabbi Hirsch calls l'minayhu, namely that HaShem created a world whereby the various different species are kept apart. For example, a farmer has every right to expect a corn plant (and not a tomato plant) to grow where he planted a corn seed. Similarly, we as humans have every right to expect that we will give birth to baby humans. We know scientifically that this miracle of each species giving birth to its' own occurs through the mechanics of genes and chromosomes, but it is HaShem's Law that mandates that genes and chromosomes work the way they do.

Clothes made out of linen are perfectly acceptable by themselves; the same holds true for clothing made from wool. It's only when they are mixed together that they are violating HaShem's rule of Law in the world. For when they are mixed together, the wearer "scorns His Laws" and denies HaShem is the "Lawgiver of Species" (to use Rabbi Hirsch's terms). For the Jew especially, the wearing of non-shatnes clothing in particular and performance of all the mitzvot in general expresses our taking our place amongst every living thing that obeys HaShem's Law for just as we follow HaShem's Law, so, too, does every living thing follow HaShem's Law.

In our society, the prohibition of wearing shatnes is very easy to observe. Most major Jewish communities have any number of shatnes checkers, people who take samples from suspected articles of clothing and send them to a lab for chemical verification. Smaller communities can obtain instructions from these shatnes labs on how to test and send in the

sample fabrics to the lab for testing. The usual culprit, if there is a problem, is jackets which are produced in Eastern Europe and which contain a linen collar and thread in a wool or wool blend jacket. Most other garments (e.g. slacks, dresses, shirts, blouses, undergarments etc.) are usually shatnes free. Of course, if there is any doubt one should check it out with the local shatnes lab. And because this is a negative commandment, both women and men are obligated to observe this easy-to-do mitzvah.

Eidut HaShem ne'emanah, mahkimath peti -- the laws of HaShem are perfect, for they make wise the simple (Tehillim 19:08).

A project of the National Council of Young Israel 3 West 16th Street, New York, NY 10011 212 929-1525 800 617-NCYI Kenneth Block, Internet Administrator kenblock@youngisrael.org

From: Ari Kahn[SMTP:kahnar@mail.biu.ac.il]

Dedicated to my wife Naomi on occasion of our 15th anniversary

Parshat Ki Tezæ 5759 ôTo Be As Oneö Rabbi Ari Kahn

While the Parsha of Ki Teze is made up of numerous apparently disconnected topics there is a subtext which repeats itself time and again throughout the Parsha: the topic of marriage.

The Parsha begins with conquest: And she shall take off the garment of her captivity, and shall remain in your house, and bewail her father and her mother a full month; and after that you shall go in to her, and be her husband, and she shall be your wife. (21:13)

The Torah proceeds to discuss a dysfunctional family in which there are two wives, oneá loved and the other scorned: If a man has two wives, one beloved and another hated, and they have borne him children, both the beloved and the hated; and if the firstborn son is hers who was hatedá (21:15)

From there the text continues to discuss a relationship where the husband hates the wife and is willing to soil her reputation: If any man takes a wife, and goes in to her, and hates her, and gives accusing speeches against her, and brings an evil name upon her, and says, æI took this woman, and when I came to her, I did not find in her the signs of virginityæ; (22:13,14)

The case of rape: If a man finds a girl who is a virgin, who is not betrothed, and lays hold of her, and lies with her, and they are found. Then the man who lay with her shall give to the girlÆs father fifty shekels of silver, and she shall be his wife; because he has humbled her, he may not put her away all his days. (22:28,29)

Divorce: When a man has taken a wife, and married her, and it comes to pass that she finds no favor in his eyes, because he has found some uncleanness in her; then let him write her a bill of divorcement, and give it in her hand, and send her out of his house. (23:1)

War exemption: When a man has taken a new wife, he shall not go out to war, nor shall he be charged with any business; but he shall be free at home one year, and shall cheer his wife whom he has taken. (23:5)

Leverite marriage (yibum) If brothers live together, and one of them dies, and has no child, the wife of the dead shall not marry outside to a stranger; her husbandÆs brother shall go in to her, and take her to him for a wife, and perform the duty of a husbandÆs brother to her. (25: 5)

While all types of unions, sordid and otherwise, are presented, the normal marriage situation is absent. This observation is really quite unexceptional; the Torah concerns itself with law and often deals with the out-of-the-ordinary situation. Nonetheless, aside from the opening chapters of Bereishit, the Torah does not address the philosophical and legal implications of the ônormalö relationship, only the abnormal exceptions.

The ideal model, presented at the dawn of history, is the idea of one man and one woman united by love: So G-d created man in His own image, in the image of G-d created He him; male and female He created them. And G-d blessed them, and G-d said to them, æBe fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it; and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the birds of the air, and over every living thing that moves upon the earth.Æ (Bereishit 1:27,28)

The description of the creation of man and woman is theologically breathtaking. The image of G-d which man possesses is the totality of the two together. "Male and female He created them". Each independently is lacking spiritually.

Said R. Abba: "The first man consisted of male and female, for it says: 'Let us make man in our image after our likeness' (Ibid. I, 26), which indicates that male and female were originally created as one and separated afterwards. (Zohar Sh'Emot 55a)

All agree [that] there was [only] one formation, [but they differ in this:] one holds [that] we go according to the intention, and the other holds [that] we go according to the fact, as that [statement] of Rav Yehuda [who] asked: It is written, And G-d created man in his own image, and it is written, Male and female created He them. How is this [to be understood]? [In this way:] In the beginning it was the intention [of G-d] to create two [human beings], and in the end [only] one [human being] was created. (Ketuvot 8a)

The Torah continues, and describes man's existential loneliness and the solution to the loneliness - a mate. And the Lord G-d said, "It is not good that the man should be alone; I will make him a help to match him." And out of the ground the Lord G-d formed every beast of the field, and every bird of the air; and brought them to Adam to see what he would call them; and whatever Adam called every living creature, that was its name. And Adam gave names to all cattle, and to the bird of the air, and to every beast of the field; but for Adam there was not found a help to match him. And the Lord G-d made Adam fall into a deep sleep, and he slept; and He took one from his ribs, and closed up the flesh. And the rib, which the Lord G-d had taken from man, made he a woman, and brought her to the man. And Adam said, "This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh; she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of Man. Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave to his wife; and they shall be one flesh. And they were both naked, the man and his wife, and were not ashamed. (Bereishit 2:18-25)

Man is created with both physical and spiritual ingredients; he has a common origin with all the species, yet he is endowed with a spiritual capacity, which is here identified with his ability to speak and intellectualize. The goal for man is to search and find the missing part of himself, in order to re-create himself in the image of G-d. This is the theological significance of the biblical description of man and woman being one, suffering separation, and becoming merged anew. It is a search for self as much as it is a search for a partner. This idyllic description precludes others, leaving just the two, together as one.

According to the Midrashic tradition Adam and Eve became estranged from one another (see Rashi Bereishit 4:25). In the aftermath of the expulsion from Eden, when it became clear that their relationship did not bring them closer to G-d, rather quite the opposite, the relationship provided the background for the distancing from G-d from which they and the world suffered. Adam and Eve separated. Love was replaced by suspicion, and trust by recrimination.

Later Adam and Eve renewed their bond. The impetus for the renewal returns us to a theme taught in this week's Parsha. In the aftermath of the fratricide perpetrated by Cain, we are told that Cain fathered children, as did his children and grandchildren after him. A great grandson named Lemech is born. He, too, decides to settle down, though in a unique fashion:

And Lemech took for himself two wives; the name of one was Adah, and the name of the other Zillah. And Adah bore Yaval; he was the father of those who live in tents, and of those who have cattle. And his brother's name was Yubal; he was the father of all who handle the harp and pipe. And Zillah, she also bore Tuval-Cain, forger of every sharp instrument in bronze and iron; and the sister of Tuval-Cain was Naamah. And Lemech said to his wives, Adah and Zillah, Hear my voice; you wives of Lemech, listen to my speech; for I have slain a man for wounding me, and a young man for hurting me. If Cain shall be avenged sevenfold, truly Lemech seventy and sevenfold. (Bereishit 4:19-24)

Instead of one wife - a soul mate - as has hitherto been the accepted

mode, Lemech decides to double his pleasure and take two wives. The Midrash explains the arrangement:

AND LEMECH TOOK UNTO HIM TWO WIVES, R. Azariah said in R. Yehuda's name: The men of the generation of the Flood used to act thus: each took two wives, one for procreation and the other for sexual gratification. The former would stay like a widow through-out her life, while the latter was given to drink a potion of roots, so that she should not bear, and then she sat before him like a harlot, as it is written, "He devours the barren that bears not, and does not good to the widow" (Iyob XXIV, 21). The proof of this is that the best of them, who was Lemech, took two wives, Adah, [so called] because he kept her away (ya'adah) from himself; and Zillah, to sit in his shadow (zillo). (Midrash Rabbah - Bereishit XXIII:2)

This arrangement reflects Lemech's seeing his wives, and women in general, not as soul-mates, but rather for the utility they could provide. One's domain was the bedroom, the other the nursery. This is certainly a far cry from the exalted description offered a mere two chapters earlier. "This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh; she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of Man. Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave to his wife; and they shall be one flesh."

Rav Yehonatan Eybshitz (Tiferet Yehonaton D'Evarim 21:15) understood that this warped perception is what brought about the rejected wife described at the outset of this week's Parsha, and is arguably the cause for the rebellious child described subsequently.

This also could provide insight to the individual who is willing to go out to war and bring back a bride of alien values and outlook. Perhaps this individual already has children with his "nice Jewish" wife. Now he is looking for a partner exclusively for libidinous activity.

Lemech had two wives who each bore him children; despite each having their clearly defined role, each had given birth. Subsequently both became disaffected with Lemech. Lemech searched for a mediator who could help heal his family, and decided to call upon his ancestor, the one who had spoken so romantically years ago: Adam.

AND LEMECH SAID UNTO HIS WIVES, etc. (IV, 23 ff) R. Yosi b. R. Hanina said: He summoned them to their marital duties. Said they to him: "Tomorrow a flood will come-are we to bear children for a curse?" Said he [Lemech] to them [his wives]: "Come, let us go to Adam [and consult him]." So they went to him. He said to them: "Do your duty, while the Holy One, blessed be He, will do His." "Physician, physician, heal thine own limp!" retorted the other. "Have you kept apart from Eve a hundred and thirty years for any reason but that you might not beget children by her!" On hearing this, he [Adam] resumed his duty of begetting children, and forthwith, "And Adam knew his wife again" (Gen. IV, 25). (Midrash Rabbah - Bereishit XXIII:4) Ironically, the wives of Lemech, mired in a dysfunctional relationship, jarred Adam and Eve, and caused them to return to one another. They reconciled and had another son:

And Adam knew his wife again; and she bore a son, and called his name Shet; "For G-d," said she, "has appointed me another seed instead of Hevel, whom Cain slew." And to Seth, to him also there was born a son; and he called his name Enosh; then began men to call upon the Lord by name. (Bereshit 4:25,26)

The birth of Shet, and subsequently of Enosh, marked a new beginning. Nine generations later another man named Lemech was born, and he had a son named Noach. The line of Cain was wiped out during the flood, together with this utilitarian perspective of marriage.

Judaism for its part tolerated more than one spouse, though it never idealized the situation. Our tradition is full of sayings and teachings stressing the importance of a monogamous relationship, a relationship that provides spiritual and physical nourishment. The Talmud explains that a first marriage which comes to an unnatural end is tragic. The Altar in the temple is said to shed tears when a first marriage is dissolved:

R. Eleazar said: If a man divorces his first wife, even the altar sheds tears, (Gittin 90b, Sanhedrin 22a, see Zohar Sh'Emot 102b)

Something spiritual and holy has been severed. By referring to the Altar,

the most obvious vehicle for getting close to G-d, the Talmud leaves us no room to mistake its perception of marriage. The *ô*soul unit \ddot{o} which the two of them were meant to create has been broken, the image of G-d which the two of them were meant to manifest is shattered.

In Mishlei, Shlomo, who had more relationships than perhaps anyone, taught: Let your fountain be blessed; and rejoice with the wife of your youth. Let her be like the loving hind and pleasant roe; let her breasts satisfy you at all times; and be you ravished always with her love. (Mishlei 5:18,19)

The Talmud explained: Rav Yehuda taught his son R. Yitzchak, æ A man finds happiness only with his first wife; for it is said, æ Let thy fountain be blessed and have joy of the wife of thy youth æ (Yevamot 63b)

This is a lesson which Adam should have learnt, and passed on to his children. This is a lesson not taught in this week's Parsha. Our Parsha speaks of other types of relationships. However, had this lesson been learned and internalized, all types of disharmonious, dysfunctional, spiritually challenged relationships about which our Parsha does teach could have been avoided.

Those interested in subscribing please contact me at akahn@aish.edu or Kahnar@ashur.cc.biu.ac.il <http://www.aish.edu/parsha/kahn> <http://www.tachash.org/texis/vtx/kahn> _ 1999 Rabbi Ari Kahn

From: Zomet Institute[SMTP:zomet@virtual.co.il] Shabbat-B'Shabbato - Parshat Ki Teitzei A MITZVA IN THE TORAH PORTION: Marriage by Rabbi Binyamin Tabory

The mitzva "Be fruitful and multiply" [Bereishit 1:22] is repeated in a different way in this week's Torah portion: "When a man takes a wife" [Devarim 22:13]. The Rambam gives this as a reference that it is a mitzva to perform the first stage of "kidushin" before full marriage. He feels that the blessing which is recited, "He who blessed us with his mitzvot, and commanded us about forbidden relations," is the blessing for this mitzva.

However, this would imply that the groom should recite the blessing, and not the rabbi who is performing the ceremony, as is our custom. The Noda B'Yehuda quotes the Rambam, and rules that anybody other than the groom who recites this blessing is making a blessing in vain. In fact, the Yemenite custom is for the groom himself to recite it. The Rosh, on the other hand, feels that the mitzva is not to perform a marriage ceremony but only to have children. Thus, the blessing during a wedding is not tied directly to a mitzva, but is a blessing praising G-d. And it is therefore proper for the rabbi to make the blessing, since anybody who is present at the wedding ceremony can praise G-d. A woman is not obligated by the mitzva of being fruitful, and according to the Rambam, she is also not obligated to marry. "A woman is permitted never to marry at all" [Sefer Hamitzvot]. On the other hand, he recommends that "a woman should not remain without a man." It may be that women are required to marry by a rabbinical decree, even though they have no direct Torah obligation. This is implied by the fact that it is preferred to have a woman participate directly in her wedding, even though she could theoretically send a messenger to take her place. Thus, it may be that there is a mitzva for the woman too, and she should therefore hear the blessing of the marriage ceremony herself if possible. In spite of the fact that mitzva obligations start at age 13, our sages have written, "age 18 is suitable for marriage" [Avot 5:25]. The reason may be that a younger man is not ready to accept the burden, for several reasons: intellectually (he is still busy studying), economically (he is not yet able to support a family), and emotionally (he is still immature). (The Rambam gives the preferred age for marriage not as 18 but as 17.)

From: Rabbi Lipman Podolsky[SMTP:podolsky@hakotel.edu] Subject: Parshas Ki Setze Of Alarm Clocks and Snooze Buttons

Our parsha treats us to an ostensibly unusual mitzva -- "When a man marries a new wife, he shall not go out to the army, nor shall it obligate him

for any matter; he shall be free for his home for one year, and he shall gladden his wife whom he has married (Devarim 24:5)." Unquestionably, this mitzva requires elucidation. Is the husband obliged to make his wife happy for only the first year? And for their first anniversary, may he lovingly present her with a beautiful bouquet of thorns? One would assume, probably not. Rather, the mitzva to make one's spouse happy certainly applies throughout their marriage (Ad Meyah v'Esrim!). This would fall under the category of loving one's friend as oneself. Moreover, there are specific Torah and Rabbinic responsibilities on each partner, with regards to the other one. So what is distinctive about this mitzva? What differentiates the first year of their marriage from the rest of their lives? Tragically, many fine couples today end their once hopeful marriage in divorce. This is an epidemic from which not only gentiles suffer. The misery which surrounds this unfortunate outcome is known and felt by far too many. In addition, how many young adults today are hesitant to marry simply because they are afraid of becoming another "statistic"? How can we protect ourselves from such a calamity? What kind of insurance policy can we purchase? "Society" has invented different and sundry ways of dealing with the problem. Some misguided people live together before the wedding, "just to make sure." Obviously, Orthodox Jews are unable to avail themselves of such a prescription, so instead, ultra-long engagements have become vogue. The hope is that over this extended period of time, they will truly get to know one another, and *really* find out if they are meant for one another. I haven't yet seen any statistics in this area, but I would be highly surprised if either of these two methods actually proves effective. The Torah, l'havdil, offers a very simple yet powerful solution to this all important issue: Although there is a life-long mitzva to make one's spouse happy, during the first year a special extra concentrated, undistracted effort must be made. During that year, joy must absolutely saturate their household. A person must fortify and strengthen the foundations upon which his entire married life will be built. For marriage is like a house. As great Aunts are wont to say: "Dear, you should build a bayis ne'eman b'yisrael -- a sturdy, Jewish house." Just as a house requires solid, sound foundations, so does marriage. Several years ago, in the then-new neighborhood of Har Nof, a large, almost-finished apartment building collapsed due to inadequate foundations (don't get nervous, O residents of Har Nof!). Boruch Hashem, the builder managed to flee the country in time! And of course, Boruch Hashem, no one was hurt. That is why during the first year it is so crucial to remain free of external obligations, and to devote oneself entirely to the task at hand. For once the house is already built, it is nearly impossible to strengthen the foundations. (By the way, I heard in the name of Rav Shlomo Wolbe shlit"a, that contemporary couples should consider the first five years as their foundation-building. Slowly but surely!) If this principle rings true for marriage, a prototype of life, then certainly it must also hold true for life itself. Especially for young people, the foundations of life must be laid ever so carefully and meticulously. Every year/day/minute/nano-second is a non-refundable slice of life. Better to wake up before it's too late. Rosh HaShana is the alarm clock of life. The clarion call of the Shofar reminds us that the clock is ticking; time's a'wastin! Tick...tick...tick... moments irrevocably swept away. Life, swiftly hurdling toward its universal conclusion. Don't press that snooze button! As we approach this new year, let us remember that we are planting seeds. The way we begin the year determines how it will continue and ultimately end. Tov Acharis Davar Mireishiso (Koheles 7:8). The end always depends upon the beginning -- upon the type of seeds sown. I heard the following from my rebbe, HaRav Chaim Pinchus Scheinberg shlit"a: The saying goes, Kol Hascholos Kashos -- All beginnings are difficult. He asked, it would seem to be the exact opposite. The beginning of any new zman (semester) in Yeshiva is always the most lively. Everyone seems to be on fire with enthusiasm. Yet as the zman progresses, the excitement wanes, until the end of the zman nears, and you wonder, what in the world happened? Are these the same people? It would seem that beginnings are easy; it's the end that is difficult! He answered that what the saying means is that a beginning

that remains strong throughout -- i.e. that remains a beginning -- that is a difficult undertaking. Anybody can start, but the reward goes to those who finish the race -- to those who stay in the running without conking out, or even slowing down. May Hashem inspire us to wake up, and strengthen us to forever shun the snooze.

Visit the HaKotel website at www.hakotel.edu!! We would like to express our gratitude to the Adam Smith Company which has so generously donated the computer center at the Yeshiva in memory of HaRav Aryeh Bina zt"l, founder of Yeshivat Hakotel. This enables us to communicate this sicha to you each week - "lehagdil Torah ulehaadira". (c) 5759/1999 by Lipman Podolsky and American Friends of Yeshivat Hakotel

From: Aish HaTorah[SMTP:aishlist@mail.netvision.net.il] To: Rabbi Baar's Brainstorming List Aish HaTorah's BRAINSTORMING WITH BAARS PARSHAT KI TETZEI

by Rabbi Stephen Baars Aish HaTorah Washington DC
"INHERITANCE"

"A wise child is a joy to his parent." - King Solomon, Proverbs 10:1

"Three children have I. To the first I bequeathed my appearance, to the second I bequeathed my money, and to the third I bequeathed good character. When they were young, the child of my appearance received my fondest love. As they grew, the rich child was at the heart of my attention. But now, in my final days, I see with a vision these fading eyes could never perceive: better had it been for them and me, if good character had been the legacy of all three."

TEACHERS & ORTHODONTISTS Parents will warn their children to avoid drugs and teenage pregnancy. Yet why don't we hear with such frequency a father instructing his child to refrain from being pessimistic or unkind? I have yet to meet the person who said that his father pressured him more about developing good character than he did about developing a high-paying career. And what parent is there today, who is so cruel and uncaring, who would not take his child to the orthodontist and fork out large sums of money for braces? Yet does this same parent pay as much attention to his child's spiritual well-being? Do you want your child to be wealthier than you? What about more kind and generous, more caring and considerate? If so, where is he going to learn these values from? Maybe you think comments made now and again, such as "share your toys," or "be nice" are the keys to generous and caring children. Or maybe you think they will learn to be good people in school - from a school that in fact teaches there are really no absolute values!! Unlikely. Where do you think your child is going to learn values? Are you teaching them? Is the school? Is not your precious child going to spend much (if not more) time with their teacher than you? Would you place your child in the chair of an unqualified dentist? When you select a school for your child, do you examine the teachers for their morals and values as well as for their diplomas? Is the school even qualified to teach values? You may claim that you don't want your child learning values in school. But there is no such thing as a vacuum. Be assured that one way or another, your child is absorbing an approach to life.

GOOD HABITS, BAD HABITS This week's parsha points out that a child is not punished for the crimes of a parent (Deut. 24:16) nor a parent for a child. But the Torah also tells us (Deut. 5:9): Children will suffer the consequences for crimes they commit, even if they have inherited such delinquencies from their parents. Will your child inherit your bad traits? Do you want to inflict your child with all the pain that you have suffered? Will he not most certainly inherit these flaws from you... if there is no instruction to the contrary? It is true your child will probably inherit your good side, too. But does that mean you should not try to make things better for him? At the very least, we should worry over the dangers of him acquiring our traits of selfishness, anger, pride and frustration. A child will see and imitate these traits, just as a child will often imitate a parent's drinking habit. The image of a pregnant woman smoking is one for which we all have disdain. But what about a pregnant woman being unkind? None of us seem too concerned! Yet

what terrible harm is awaiting that unborn child!

LEAVING THE RIGHT NEST-EGG How noble it is to leave one's heirs a nest-egg in case of hard financial times. But are we giving our children a similar repository of wisdom to know how to deal with the hard times of life? Does your child's school curriculum have a course on building relationships, a class on personal crisis management, or a seminar on developing a system of personal values? Are we living such wonderfully happy lives, care- and problem-free, that our only concern is that our children's teeth are straight and the right college diploma hangs on the wall? Shouldn't we be equally concerned that our children may lack the fortitude and wisdom to deal with the kind of personal problems we have faced? When all is said and done, your children may be well- equipped to buy you a tombstone. But will they know what to write on it? When we look back in our final days, will we say with confidence that we made the right choice for each of our children's inheritances? Aren't we just wishing upon a fallen star that against great odds our children will figure all this out by themselves?

<http://www.aish.edu/parsha/baars/current.htm> (C) 1999 Aish HaTorah International - All rights reserved. Email: sbaars@aish.edu Home Page: <http://www.aish.edu>

From: Ohr Somayach[SMTP:ohr@virtual.co.il]
Simcha's Torah Stories Parshat Ki Teitzei 5759

UNION SHOP Chaim, what did you learn about in history class today? Labor unions, Avi. Really? That sounds fascinating. What did the teacher say? He told us that about one hundred years ago, many factories were referred to as "sweatshops." Why was that, Chaim? Working conditions were very poor. The workers had long hours without breaks, the wages were very low, and the work was dangerous. The workers were very dissatisfied. What did they do about it? They banded together and formed labor unions. The unions fought for normal working conditions and went on strike if their demands were not met. Sounds like a good thing. It was for the most part, Avi. However, the unions realized that they had power, and in certain instances abused that power, taking advantages of the owners. It was a struggle, with each side trying to gain the upper hand. So, let me see if I got this right Chaim. The factory owners took advantage of the workers. When the workers finally got power, they took advantage of the factory owners. That's it, Avi. That would never happen if everyone followed the Torah's laws about employer/employee relationships. Really Avi? I never knew such a thing existed. Certainly, Chaim. This week's Torah portion, "Ki Teitzei," deals with bosses and workers. What does it say? Imagine that you owned an orchard Chaim, and you hired workers to pick your fruit. You must allow those workers to eat some of the fruit when they are going between the rows of trees. The Sefer HaChinuch, a book written by one of the great Rabbis almost one thousand years ago, explains this: A boss should be kind and generous to his workers. This will allow G-d to bestow all of His blessings upon him. An oppressive and overbearing boss exhibits very bad qualities. Only bad will come to him. You know, Avi, that reminds me of something that our Talmud teacher once taught us. One who is serving the food at a meal must be allowed to eat before he serves. It would be cruel to make him serve while he is hungry. Exactly, Chaim! Now we have addressed half of the problem, the boss's obligation to the worker. What about the worker's obligation to the boss? The very next mitzvah in the Torah commands the worker who is picking the fruit to eat only what he needs. He should not get carried away and assume that since the owner must allow him to eat, he is also allowed to take some home for his family to eat. That would be stealing. He is not allowed to take advantage of the owner. He can only eat what he needs. What wisdom the Torah teaches Avi!

The boss must be concerned about the worker, and the worker must be considerate of the boss. Each one is concerned for the other. If the "sweatshop" bosses and workers had followed the Torah, they could have avoided all of those problems. That is why King Solomon, the wisest of all men wrote about the Torah, "its ways are pleasant and all of its paths are

peaceful."

Simcha's Quiz Question of the Week A census taker approaches a house and asks the woman who answers the door, "How many children do you have, and what are their ages?" The woman says, "I have three children, the product of their ages are 36, the sum of their ages are equal to the address of the house next door." The census taker walks next door, comes back and says, "I need more information." The woman replies, "I have to go, my oldest child is sleeping upstairs." Census taker: "Thank you, I have everything I need." Question: What are the ages of each of the three children?

Answer to last week's quiz question: If some coffee is "97 percent caffeine-free," how many cups of it would one have to drink to get the amount of caffeine in a cup of regular coffee? The Answer! 33 1/3 cups. Because there is 3 percent caffeine left in the doctored coffee; in 100 cups there would be enough for 3 cups of regular; 3 goes into 100 exactly 33 1/3 times.

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.ohrnet.org> All rights reserved to the author Simcha Groffman

From: Mordecai Kornfeld[SMTP:kornfeld@netvision.net.il]
INSIGHTS INTO THE DAILY DAF brought to you by Kollel Iyun Hadaf of Yerushalayim daf@dafyomi.co.il, <http://www.dafyomi.co.il>
ROSH HASHANAH 31-35 (Siyum!) - have been sponsored by a generous grant from the Darchey Noam Foundation. *Please take a moment* to help the Dafyomi Advancement Forum continue its unique Harvatzas Torah. Send a tax-deductible contribution to D.A.F., 140-32 69 Avenue, Flushing NY 11367

Rosh Hashanah 34 ... EVOLUTION OF THE TEKI'OS: 9 TO 99
Throughout the lengthy description of how the Shofar is blown, the Gemara never mentions our practice of blowing one hundred blasts on Rosh Hashanah. Where does our practice come from? Let us trace the development of our current custom back to its sources.

(a) 9 - As the Gemara says, the number of Teki'os which the Torah requires us to blow is only 9 -- three "Teru'os," each with a Teki'ah before and after it, for a total of nine sounds.

(b) 27 - Rabbi Avahu enacted, because of the doubt concerning what a "Teru'ah" of the Torah is, to repeat the three biblical Teki'ah-Teru'ah- Teki'ah sets three times, each with a different type of Teru'ah (what we call "Teru'ah," what we call "Shevarim, and what we call "Shevarim- Teru'ah"). This triples the total number of sounds, bringing us to a total of 27 sounds.

(c) 30 - However, since this number includes three "Shevarim-Teru'ah," a double sound, most Poskim count these as a total of 30 sounds, and not 27. The ROSH mentions that whether they are counted as 27 or 30 sounds depends upon whether or not one is supposed to take a breath between the Shevarim and Teru'ah of the Shevarim-Teru'ah (see Chart #7 footnote #8).

(d) 40 - The Gemara (16b) says that besides the Teki'os that we blow "Meyushav" before the Shemoneh Esreh of Musaf, we also blow Teki'os "Me'umad" during the Shemoneh Esreh (i.e. during the Chazarah of the Sheli'ach Tzibur). The RIF in our Sugya explains that this means that aside from the full set of 30 sounds that we blow before Shemoneh Esreh, we blow another *ten* sounds during the Chazan's repetition (Teki'ah-Teru'ah-Teki'ah, Teki'ah-Shevarim-Teki'ah and Teki'ah-Shevarim-Teru'ah-Teki'ah). This brings the total to 40 sounds. This is indeed the way the She'iltos describes the Teki'os, and the Rishonim mention that this was the commonly accepted practice in most places in their time; 40 sounds altogether. The RA'AVAN suggests allegorically that these 40 blasts correspond to the 40 days during which the Torah was given, throughout which the blast of the Shofar could be constantly heard.

TOSFOS asks on this practice that the main Teki'os are those blown

during the Berachos of the Shemoneh Esreh of Musaf (16b, 34b). If so, how could we blow only one a set with Shevarim-Teru'ah for Malchiyos, a set with Shevarim for Zichronos and a set with Teru'ah for Shofros? By doing so, we have not removed ourselves from Rabbi Avahu's doubt and we will not have blown a valid Shofar blast for all three Berachos -- only one of the three Berachos will have been accompanied by a correctly blown Shofar blast! We should be required to blow a full set of *30 Teki'os each* for Malchiyos, Zichronos, and Shofros! Various answers to this question are given by the Rishonim.

1. TOSFOS says that perhaps we rule that mid'Oraisa, it is only necessary to blow the Shofar for *one* of the three Berachos of Musaf, and not for all three. Consequently, the Rabanan did not bother us to blow a full set for each of the Berachos, since no matter what we will still fulfill the d'Oraisa obligation and blow a proper Teru'ah for at least one of the three Berachos.

2. The BA'AL HA'ME'OR, citing a Teshuvah of RAV HAI GA'ON (see also RABEINU CHANANEL ad loc.), answers that there really is no argument over what is considered a Teru'ah. All three sounds are acceptable as a Teru'ah mid'Oraisa, which is why different communities blew different Teru'os until Rabbi Avahu's Takanah was instituted.. Rabbi Avahu did not make his enactment to resolve a doubt, but rather he enacted that we blow all three types of Teru'ah so that it would not *look like* different segments of Jewry were in disagreement. Therefore, each set is a perfectly valid blowing.

3. The RIF answers that mid'Oraisa, we do not have to blow the Shofar during the Shemoneh Esreh at all. Since we already blew the Shofar and now we are only blowing extra sounds in order to confound the Satan, the Rabanan did not trouble us to blow a full set for each Berachah of Musaf.

(e) 42 - Nevertheless, RABEINU TAM, cited by Tosfos ibid., was not at rest with any of the above answers. Instead, he recommended to slightly alter the common practice, and to blow a single Teki'ah,

Shevarim-Teru'ah, Teki'ah for *each* of the three Berachos, rather than three different types of Teru'os for the three Berachos. Even if Shevarim-Teru'ah is not the "Teru'ah" of the Torah, but rather Shevarim or Teru'ah alone is the correct way to blow, nevertheless one has fulfilled the Mitzvah b'Di'eved, albeit with a "Hefsek" in middle of the set, by blowing in this manner (since Shevarim-Teru'ah includes both Shevarim and Teru'ah -- see above 2a). The extra two blasts added by Rabeinu Tam bring our total to 42 sounds. This is the practice endorsed by the REMA in OC 590

(f) 60 - The ARUCH (in Erech Arav), cited by Tosfos (33b), writes that for *each* of the three Berachos of Malchiyos, Zichronos, and Shofros, we should really blow a full set of ten Teki'os (so that the proper Teru'ah sound will have certainly been blown), so that in the Shemoneh Esreh of the Shali'ach Tzibur there should be a total of 30 blasts (besides the first thirty that were blown before the Shemoneh Esreh). The practice of blowing 60 sounds was adopted by the RITZBA (cited in SEMAK #91) and the SHELAH (Maseches Rosh Hashnah, Amud ha'Din) supports this opinion well, as the MISHNAH BERURAH mentions (OC 592:4). According to their opinion, one should blow a full "T,ST,T; T,T,T; T,S,T" set for each of the Berachos (as most Ashkenazi Jews do today). This brings the total number of blasts to 60.

(The SHULCHAN ARUCH in OC 590 also mentions blowing 30 Teki'os during the Musaf prayer, but he counts them differently. He suggests that we should blow three T,ST,T for Malchiyos, three T,S,T for Zichronos, and three T,T,T for Shofros. This is a unique opinion, and it is not clear what his source is. What is the point of blowing these extra sounds, if this manner of blowing will not resolve the question of the Rishonim that we mentioned above, in (d)? It seems that his source if of Kabalistic nature, based on the writings of the PRI ETZ CHAIM in his section on Musaf of Rosh Hashanah.)

(g) 61 - The BA'AL HA'ME'OR gives a completely different explanation for when the Teki'os are blown, and how the extra Teki'os confound the Satan. He writes that we do not blow the Shofar at all before the Shemoneh Esreh of Musaf. Rather, when the Gemara says that we blow the first set of

Teiki'os "Meyushav," it means that we blow them during the Chazan's repetition of the Shemoneh Esreh, when the people are sitting down. When it says that we blow the second set of Teiki'os "Me'umad," standing, it means that we blow extra Teiki'os when we stand up *to leave* the synagogue (after Musaf is over). That is the point, he asserts, at which every individual used to blow the Shofar in Yavneh (Rosh Hashanah 30a -- there is support for this in the words of the Aruch as well). The Chazan would blow a long Teru'ah at that point, called a "Teru'ah Gedolah," to confound the Satan, reminding him of the great Teiki'ah of Tachiyas ha'Mesim (see Tosfos 16b DH Kedei). If we count this extra Teiki'ah at the end of Davening, it brings the total to 61.

(h) 100 - The ARUCH himself does not count just 60 Teiki'os. He mentions that the custom is to blow 100 Teiki'os altogether, corresponding to the 100 wails that Sisera's mother wailed for him when he did not return from the war with the Jews. (He apparently had a Midrashic source for these 100 wails.) It is from the Yevava (cry) of the mother of Sisera that we learn what a Teru'ah is (33b). The extra 40 sounds were blown as follows: 30 during the silent Shemoneh Esreh, and another 10 at the end of the Tefilah, before leaving the synagogue.

The MESHECH CHOCHMAH (Parshas Tazria) cites another allegorical source for blowing one hundred blasts. The Midrash (Vayikra Raba 27:7) says that when a woman gives birth, she wails and cries out one hundred times. 99 of those cries are out of the conviction that she is going to die, and the final, 100th cry is out of the realization that she is going to live after all. Similarly, we blow one hundred Teiki'os on Rosh Hashanah. 99 are blown out of our fear of the judgment of the day, but with the one-hundredth we demonstrate our confidence that we will emerge from our judgment blessed with life.

It is worth noting that the TUR (OC 590) records a beautiful allusion for the blowing of the Shofar "to confuse the Satan" so that he cannot prosecute us (above, (d)), from a verse in Melachim. The verse states, "Ein *S*atan *v*Ein *P*ega *R*a" (Melachim I 5:8). The first letters of consecutive words in this verse spell the word "Shofar," and thus the verse, which is saying that "there is no Satan to cause injury" is alludes that it is the power of blowing the Shofar which confounds the Satan! (This is the only verse in all of Tanach in which the word "Shofar" appears as either Roshei Teivos or Sofei Teivos.)

Rosh Hashanah 35 FULFILLING ONE'S OBLIGATION TO SAY SHEMONEH ESREH BY LISTENING TO THE "SHALI'ACH TZIBUR" OPINIONS: Raban Gamliel and the Chachamim argue whether a Shali'ach Tzibur can be Motzi everyone, or just those who do not know how to Daven by themselves. Raban Gamliel says that the Shali'ach Tzibur can be Motzi everyone, even one who know how to Daven by himself (a "Baki," or expert). The Chachamim argue and say that the Shali'ach Tzibur can only be Motzi one who does not know how to Daven by himself (an "Eino Baki"). The Gemara rules like Raban Gamliel in the case of the Shemoneh Esreh of Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kipur (of Yovel -- RAN and Rishonim), that the Shali'ach Tzibur can be Motzi even a Baki.

Later, though, the Gemara adds a condition to this ruling. Even according to Raban Gamliel, the *only* Beki'im whom the Shali'ach Tzibur is Motzi are those who are out in the fields and cannot come into the city to Daven in the synagogue. Since they have no choice, they fulfill their obligation with the Shali'ach Tzibur's Shemoneh Esreh. Those who are in the city, though, who have the opportunity to Daven by themselves, cannot fulfill their obligation with the Shali'ach Tzibur's Shemoneh Esreh.

Does this mean that the normal Baki may not be Yotzei with the Shemoneh Esreh of the Shali'ach Tzibur? The Rishonim differ on this point.

....
HALACHAH: (a) On Rosh Hashanah, we rule like Raban Gamliel (as the Gemara noted), that even a Baki may be Yotzei from the Shali'ach Tzibur. With regard to whether a Baki who was *not in the fields* may be Yotzei by hearing the prayers from the Shali'ach Tzibur, the TUR (OC 591)

cites both opinions mentioned above, and perhaps we should be Machmir that he is not Yotzei.

(b) A person who is not a Baki may be Yotzei with the Shemoneh Esreh of the Shali'ach Tzibur on any day of the year and not only on Rosh Hashanah, as cited in the SHULCHAN ARUCH (OC 124:1). However, he must hear every single word that the Shali'ach Tzibur says. The MISHNAH BERURAH adds that he also has to understand every word (whereas when one Davens by oneself, he does not have to understand every word in order to be Yotzei).

(c) The RITVA writes that if a person erred in his Shemoneh Esreh and needs to Daven again (for example, he omitted Ya'aleh v'Yavo on Rosh Chodesh), he may fulfill his obligation by hearing the Shemoneh Esreh from the Shali'ach Tzibur even though he is a Baki. The reason for this is because all opinions agree that mid'Oraisa one is Yotzei by listening to the Shali'ach Tzibur, and it is the Rabanan who enacted a Takanah that a Baki must Daven by himself and not rely on the Shali'ach Tzibur. In the case of a Baki who erred in his first Shemoneh Esreh, though, the Rabanan left the Halachah d'Oraisa in place and allowed him to be Yotzei with the Shali'ach Tzibur, in order that he should not have to Daven two Shemoneh Esrehs. The Ritva bases this ruling on the Gemara in Berachos (29b). However, the MORDECHAI (#721) argues and says that even in this case a Baki does not fulfill his obligation by listening to the Shali'ach Tzibur's Shemoneh Esreh.

The PRI MEGADIM (cited by the BI'UR HALACHAH in OC 124) says that if a person is in doubt whether or not he already said the Shemoneh Esreh of Shacharis on Shabbos, since he cannot resolve his doubt by reciting a Tefilas Nedavah (which is what one should do in such a case on a weekday) for a Tefilas Nedavah may not be recited on Shabbos (see Insights to Berachos 21:2), one should at least try to fulfill his obligation by listening to the Shemoneh Esreh of the Shali'ach Tzibur.

Ta'anis 8b

BLESSING IS FOUND ONLY IN OBJECTS THAT ARE NOT COUNTED AGADAH: The Gemara says that "Ein Berachah Metzuyah Ela b'Davar ha'Samuy Min ha'Ayin" -- blessing is found only in an item which is hidden from the eye (i.e. it has not been counted). TOSFOS asks that the Gemara elsewhere (Chulin 25b) says that Shedim (demons) do not have any power to take away something that is counted or tied up in a bundle. That implies that they *are* able to take away something that is not counted! Why, then, does the Gemara here say that *blessing* is found in something which is not counted? It should say the opposite -- that *decrease* is found in something which is not counted! ANSWER: TOSFOS answers that this question does not begin. Shedim only have the ability to take something which is Hefker, ownerless. Once something has been counted, it is not Hefker, and thus the Shedim cannot take it. If it has not been counted, Hashem gives a Berachah to the item so that it increases. The increase is Hefker (until it is noticed by the owner upon counting it), and that extra bit can be taken away by the Shedim. By not counting one's produce, one makes it possible for his produce to increase as a result of Hashem's blessing. That extra produce, though, is then vulnerable to the Shedim, for it is Hefker until it is counted.

The *D*AFYOMI *A*DVANCEMENT *F*ORUM, brought to you by Kollel Iyud Hadaf For information on joining the Kollel's free Dafyomi mailing lists, write to info@dafyomi.co.il, or visit us at <http://www.dafyomi.co.il> Tel(IL):02-652-2633 -- Off(IL):02-651-5004 -- Fax(US):603-7375728