

INTERNET PARSHA SHEET  
ON VAYIKRA PARSHAS HACHODESH - 5758

To receive these Parsha sheets by e-mail, contact [cshulman@aol.com](mailto:cshulman@aol.com)  
See also <http://members.aol.com/crshulman/torah.html>

weekly@jer1.co.il \* TORAH WEEKLY \*

<http://www.ohr.org.il/tw/5758/vayikra/vayikra.htm>

Insights THE BIG A "And He called." (1:1) Michaelangelo may have known a thing or two about sculpture, but when it came to Jewish anatomy he was a bit off. When he sculpted Moses he gave him little horns. Michaelangelo's problem came from a mistranslation of the Hebrew word keren. It's true, keren does mean a "horn," but it also means a "ray of light." The English word "corona," meaning a "glowing halo," is probably a derivation of keren. How did Moshe get his "horns?" When Moshe had finished writing the Torah, he had some ink left on his quill. He passed the quill across his forehead and the drops of ink made beams of light shine. Everything in Heaven and Earth is precise. If Moshe was given ink to write the Torah, he was given enough ink to write the Torah and not one drop more. We're not dealing here with end of season discounts and remnants. We're talking about the ink of eternity. Nothing can be too little or too much. How can there have been a little bit of ink left over? If you look at a Sefer Torah, you will see that the first word in Vayikra (Leviticus) is written in an unusual fashion. The last letter of that word - the aleph of the word Vayikra - is written much smaller than the rest of the word. Why is the aleph small? When Hashem told Moshe to write the word Vayikra - "And He called" - Moshe didn't want to write that last aleph. It seemed to Moshe that it gave him too much importance. How could he write that Hashem called to him? Who was he, after all? A mere man. Moshe would have preferred to write "Vayikar" - "And He happened (upon him)" - as if Hashem just came across Moshe, as if He didn't "go out of His way" to appear to him. In spite of Moshe's protestations, Hashem told him to write "Vayikra" - "And He called." Moshe put the aleph at the end of the word as Hashem had commanded him - but he wrote it small. What's in a small aleph? The aleph is the letter that represents the will, the ego. It is the first letter of the word "I" - "Ani." When a person sees himself as the Big A, the Big Aleph, Number One, he usurps the crown of He who is One. When a person sees himself as no more than a small aleph, then he makes room for the Divine Presence to dwell in him. His head is not swollen with the cotton-candy of self-regard. Moshe was the humblest of all people. Moshe made of himself so little that he was barely in this world at all. He didn't even want to be a small aleph. He, as no man before or since, saw that there is only one Aleph in all of Creation, only one Number One - Hashem. Moshe made his own aleph - his ego - so small, that he merited that the Torah was given through him. How did Moshe get his horns? That extra ink left on his pen was the ink that should have gone to write the big aleph. Instead it became a corona of shining light to adorn the humblest of men. Ba'al Haturim, Midrash Tanchuma Ki Sisa 37, MiTa'amim in Iturei Torah

Written and Compiled by Rabbi Yaakov Asher Sinclair General Editor:  
Rabbi Moshe Newman Production Design: Lev Seltzer(C) 1998 Ohr  
Somayah

<http://www.jpost.co.il/Columns/> 28 Adar 5758 SHABBAT SHALOM:  
There but for the grace of God By RABBI SHLOMO RISKIN

(March 26) "God said: 'Speak to the Israelites, and tell them the following: When one of you brings a mammal as an offering to God, the sacrifice must be taken from the cattle, sheep or goats... a sweet savor unto God.'" (Lev. 1:2,9) Animals, knives, entrails, gore. To the modern mind, the idea of animal sacrifice is undoubtedly one of the most disturbing subjects in the entire Torah. Does the Almighty really need our "gifts" of animal flesh? In his Guide to the Perplexed (Part 3, Ch. 32),

B'S'D' Maimonides takes a rational view of the issue. Disturbed himself about the need for sacrifices, he explains that moving from the idolatrous sacrifices in Egypt to the pure monotheistic worship required of a holy nation could not be done in one leap. To have commanded the future Israelites to abandon that world completely would hardly have been effective. Therefore the sacrifices were part of a weaning process. Several chapters later (Ch. 46), Maimonides points out that God specifically commanded the Israelites to sacrifice a lamb for Pessah in order to impress upon them the crucial distinction between Judaism and idolatry. Sheep were worshiped by the Egyptians, and God wanted the Israelites to understand that He will not tolerate idolatry. Nahmanides was not pleased with the Maimonidean approach, attacking his claim that the commands to sacrifice animals were merely a compromise for a nation still steeped in primitive ways. He argues that if there were not an inherently positive aspect to the sacrificial rites, the Torah would never speak of them as providing "a sweet savor unto God." Moreover, when Noah emerges from the Ark and offers sacrifices, we read how "God smelled the sweet savor." (Gen. 8:21) And earlier, when Abel brought his sacrifice, the Torah tells us that, "God had respect to Abel and his offering." (Gen. 4:4) After all, argues Nahmanides, all of this pre-dated the rise of Egypt. Nahmanides then goes on to explore a deeper level. "Since the lives of human beings involve thought, speech and action, God commanded that when a person sins he must bring a sacrifice, his hands leaning on the animal. This is an action. And he shall confess with his mouth. This is speech. And he shall burn the animal's innards and kidneys, which are the source of thought and lust... And he shall pour the blood on the altar, realizing that he himself would be liable to having his own blood spilled and his body burned, were it not for the lovingkindness of God who has taken a substitute... its blood for his blood, its life force for his life force." In dividing the elements of sacrifice into thought, word and deed, Nahmanides is alluding to the powerful link between the sinner and the sacrifice. The hand that leans on the doomed animal, the mouth that confesses, the fire that burns out those organs which correspond to thought, all make us realize that sacrifice is not for anyone's sake but our own. It is we who must be moved by the sacrifices, and not God; God will only be moved by our realization of wrongdoing and achievement of repentance. And lest we mistakenly believe that the "sweet savor" implies a Divine appreciation of the scent of burning flesh, Nahmanides reminds us that the Talmud declares: "Would anyone think that God requires food? He owns the world and all of its fullness." (B.T. Menahot 110a) Clearly then, sacrifices are for our sake, and for the sake of change - the self-awareness and self-understanding which result in an improved individual. Since true repentance is so difficult to achieve, it requires a traumatic jolt. Anyone who recognizes the fundamental truth that he was granted life only in return for his commitment to fulfill the Torah's commands, and that if he has fallen short of his responsibility he should be the one on the altar, cannot remain unmoved when he sees the fire lick the flesh of the animal, when he sees its blood sprinkled on the altar, when he hears himself make his confession over a living creature that is about to die. The horror and shock should give him the strength and resolve to change his ways. Just as he sinned with thought, word and deed, he must now realize that "thinking" of change, and "speaking" of change is not enough. He must act. He must transform himself. He must emerge from the sacrifice as a new individual, worthy of a renewed lease on life. The Ktav V'hakabala (Rav Yaakov Mecklenburg) also discusses sacrifices in terms of individual change, and his starting point is precisely the phrase "sweet savor." As expressed by Nahmanides, the words are intended to instruct the person bringing the sacrifice not to make the mistake of believing that his job is done automatically and his sin forgiven immediately upon the sprinkling of the blood. Sin will be forgiven only if the sacrifice works on the person offering it. The ritual must be accompanied by repentance, a profound change of heart. That's why it's called "sweet savor," says Rav Mecklenburg. When a person puts on perfume, we smell the fragrance before we see the person. In effect, the fragrance heralds the person's arrival. In this sense, sacrifice is a "sweet savor unto God," indicating that a new individual is in the process of being formed. Only if

that happens will sacrifice bring Divine forgiveness. Shabbat Shalom  
Rabbi Riskin, dean of the Ohr Torah Stone colleges and graduate programs,  
is chief rabbi of Efrat.

---

<http://www.ucalgary.ca/~akiva/HOJMI/drosho.html> [Last yr] Congregation  
House of Jacob-Mikveh Israel Calgary Parshiyot Vayikra - Tzav 5757

Rabbi Moshe Shulman  
THE GORY DETAILS

In one of our adult education classes on the laws of Shabbat,  
somebody remarked, "so many details, so much to remember".

There is a major dispute between the giants of Jewish philosophy,  
Maimonides and Nachmonides, over whether there is, in fact, an explanation  
and rational for every intricate detail of Halacha. The focus of this dispute is  
over the service in the Holy Temple, for nowhere is there more "detail" than  
in the sacrificial service described in these Torah portions; where to bring the  
animal... how to place one's hand over the animal's head... which animals to  
bring, for what purpose... what to do with the blood... where to sprinkle it...  
how many times... for each type of sacrifice... on and on...

Generally speaking, we view the sacrificial service of the Temple as a  
means to "come close" to G-d, taking the root of "Korban" as derived from  
"Karov", "close". Standing at the foot of the altar one realised that, in some  
small way, just like Isaac, we ourselves should be sacrificed on the altar! But  
instead, we are spared in order to learn that we should LIVE in Sanctity,  
rather than die in Sanctity. That's very true. But why do we need all the  
DETAILS? Who cares if the blood is sprinkled once, twice, four or seven  
times, or what parts of the animal are burnt, what parts are eaten and by  
whom? If the goal is the "experience", why get bogged down in tedious  
Halachic minutia?

In fact, Maimonides argued that, indeed, there is no explanation for  
the minutia. It simply had to be somehow! "The law that sacrifices should be  
brought is evidently of great use, but we cannot say why one offering should  
be a lamb, whilst another is a ram; and why a fixed number of them should  
be brought... You ask why must a lamb be sacrificed and not a ram? But the  
same question would be asked, if a ram had been commanded instead of a  
lamb..." (Maimonides, translation from Studies in Shemot, Nehama  
Leibowitz, p. 499) The philosophical explanations of the Mitzvot are to  
explain the general concepts, while the details are required because without  
details you cannot do the act!

Nachmonides, Abarbanel, Akedat Yitzchak, and many other  
commentaries, on the other hand, take the approach that every detail is  
significant, whether for symbolic, philosophical or mystical reasons.

Take, for example, the construction of the Menorah. In Maimonides'  
view, the Menorah had seven branches because "the Torah had to chose a  
number". While to the other commentaries, the number of branches is  
philosophically significant: 7 days of the week, the Sanctity of Shabbat as the  
seventh day, Shmittah as the seventh year, Yovel as the seventh Shmittah, 7  
branches of wisdom...

Today, most people are used to the approach of Nachmonides. They  
feel there must be a rational to the why's and wherefore's of every Halachic  
detail. But I think there is a danger here, and I'd like to explain Maimonides'  
view as well.

When we look at the Torah reading of the Parshiyot of Vayikra, we  
see a great deal of technical information, a great deal of "gory detail". What  
was the purpose of all of this? There answer is expressed in one phrase:  
"Veyeira aleichem kevod Hashem", "And the Glory of the Almighty shall  
appear to you." (Lev. 9:6) The entire service in the Tabernacle, with all its  
detail, was for the purpose of experiencing the presence of G'd, to "feel  
spiritually elevated", to have a religious experience equal to what we felt at  
Mt. Sinai! Yet, through all these technical halachot, we ask "where's the  
experience?" The answer is that WITHOUT THE DETAIL THERE CAN BE  
NO EXPERIENCE. That's what Maimonides is saying. It's not that the  
details are meaningless. It's that without the effort, the care, the  
meticulousness, without the planning, learning, and caring about exactly how

to perform each Mitzvah, each Mitzvah loses its meaning and its  
significance, and we lose the EXPERIENCE!

Look at the laws of Shabbat. Shabbat is defined as a day in which to  
recognise the Majesty of G'd, Creator of the universe. We have 39 categories  
of Melacha, from building and ploughing to how to cut up a salad. "Who  
needs all the details?" we ask. Shabbat is a day to declare our faith in  
Hashem. "I believe in Hashem. So I no longer need all the details! Right?"  
Wrong! Sure we can SAY we recognise G'd. But we cannot EXPERIENCE  
what recognising G-d's Mastery, we cannot FEEL what being subordinate to  
the true Master of Nature means unless we are willing to let go of our own  
mastery over nature and become truly subservient to G'd rather than  
beholden to the world around us! Shabbat cannot be just "observed", or even  
"understood". It has to be EXPERIENCED, it has to encompass every aspect  
of our lives that day, and re-focus everything we are, everything we think,  
and everything we do. Without the details, Shabbat is reduced from an  
EXPERIENCE to a PHILOSOPHY; it becomes mere words, lip-service, and  
is meaningless!

Imagine what Pesach would be like without the laws of Chametz,  
without the cleaning for Chametz, the going through the cupboards and  
shelves, the koshering of dishes, the questions over which products we can  
use, and which we cannot. Imagine if we could just forget all that, and just sit  
down to a seder, eat Matzah and go through the Pesach Seder. Big deal if  
there's a bit of Chametz under the kitchen sink! Pesach would be so  
much easier, but so much emptier! The Torah requires us not only to eat  
Matzah, but, in a sense, to BECOME Matzah, to be free of all chametz not  
only on the table, but in our homes, and in every corner of our lives. The  
Torah wants us to EXPERIENCE Pesach with the totality of our being. Sure  
it's harder! It's always harder to EXPERIENCE than to merely expound a  
philosophy. It's harder - but it works! It's the details of Pesach that in reality  
help us EXPERIENCE the Exodus from Egypt.

There 613 Mitzvot, each one with hundreds of details. We call these  
details Halachot!! Tefillin is one Mitzvah - with many Halachot, how to wear  
them, how to make them, what colour they should be, even the order of the  
scrolls inside them!! Kashrut is a handful of Mitzvot with hundreds of  
Halachot defining every detail.

Maimonides didn't say that the details aren't important! On the  
contrary, without them we can never EXPERIENCE the Mitzvot!

There is a beautiful statement of the Sages conveying this idea. "Rav  
said: the Mitzvot were given only to forge better human beings, for, after  
all, does G-d really care if we slaughter from the front of the neck of the back  
of the neck? Rather, the Mitzvot were given only to forge better human  
beings." (Breishit Rabbah 44) The purpose of Torah is to forge better  
people, more spiritual, better in our relationship with ourselves, with others,  
with the world around us, and with G'd, "forged" in the furnace of  
self-discipline, as a servant of the Almighty. We cannot just "believe" in  
self-disciplined! We must become self-disciplined.

That's what went on in the Temple. To us it may sound like a lot of  
"gory detail". Because we only real about it. We don't see the great  
EXPERIENCE that it was to actually feel the presence of the Almighty.  
"And the Glory of Hashem appeared to them." We dare not belittle the  
minutia of Halacha, for it, and it alone, leads us to experience the spiritual  
heights of Judaism!

---

weekly-halacha@torah.org Parshas Vayikra-Birchas Ha'ilanos SELECTED  
HALACHOS RELATING TO PARSHAS VAYIKRA By Rabbi Doniel  
Neustadt A discussion of Halachic topics related to the Parsha of the week.  
For final rulings, consult your Rav. BIRCAS HA'ILANOS - THE  
BLESSING OVER TREES IN BLOOM Rosh Chodesh Nissan marks the  
beginning of the season for saying a blessing upon seeing fruit trees in bloom  
- Bircas Ha'ilanos. Since this brachah, which extols Hashem's ongoing  
renewal of creation(1), is recited once a year(2), its halachos are difficult to  
remember. Women, too, may recite this brachah, since it is not considered a  
"time related mitzvah" from which women are exempt(3). THE TEXT

OF THE BRACHAH: In many siddurim(4) the following text is cited: Boruch Ata HaShem Alokaynu Melech Haolam Shelo Cheesar Baw'olawmo "Davar" ,U'vara Vo Breeos Tovos, V'ilanos Tovim,(5) L'hanos Bahem Bnei Adam A search through all the of the early sources(6) reveals that the original text had the word "klum", not the word "davar" which appears in our text. The reason for the change is unsubstantiated, and it is, therefore, proper to follow the early sources and recite the word "klum" and not the word "davar"(7). WHEN IS BIRCAS HA'ILANOS RECITED? The l'chatchilah, preferred time to recite this brachah is immediately upon seeing a tree in bloom during the month of Nissan. Most poskim agree that the halachah mentions 'Nissan' since generally, that is the month in which trees begin to bloom(8). Accordingly, in an area where trees start blooming in Adar(9), or where they do not bloom until Iyar or Sivan(10), the brachah should be recited in those months(11). In the countries where trees blossom in Tishrei or Cheshvan, the brachah should be said at that time(12). If a tree bloomed in Nissan, but one did not see it until later, he may recite the brachah the first time he sees the tree in bloom as long as the fruit of the tree has not yet ripened. Once the fruit has ripened, the brachah may no longer be said(13). One who saw the trees in bloom during Nissan, but forgot or neglected to recite the brachah, may recite the brachah at a later date but only until the time that the fruit of the tree has begun to grow(14). The brachah is said upon seeing the actual blooming (flowering) of the tree. The growth of leaves alone is not sufficient to allow one say the brachah(15).

Some poskim(16) hold that this brachah should not be said on Shabbos and Yom Tov, since we are concerned that it may lead to shaking or breaking a branch off the tree. All other poskim who do not mention this concern,(17) apparently do not forbid reciting this brachah on Shabbos and Yom Tov(18). It is customary, though, to recite the brachah only during the week(19), unless the last day of Nissan falls on Shabbos(20). The brachah may be said at night(21). WHICH TREES REQUIRE A BIRCAS HA'ILANOS?

Bircas Ha'ilanos is said only on fruit-bearing trees(22). If one mistakenly said the brachah on a barren tree, he need not repeat the brachah on a fruit bearing tree(23). The poskim debate whether one is allowed to say the brachah on a tree which has been grafted from two species, since the halachah does not permit such grafting(24). It is preferable not to make the brachah on such a tree(25). Some achronim prohibit the recitation of the brachah on an orlah tree(26). A tree is considered orlah during the first three years of its life. Many other poskim, however, permit reciting the brachah on an orlah tree(27). During the year of shmittah in Eretz Yisroel, it is permitted to recite the brachah even on a tree which - in violation of the halachah - has been cultivated(28). BIRCAS HA'ILANOS- HIDDUR MITZVAH There are several hiddurim mentioned in the poskim concerning this once-a-year brachah. According to the kabbalah, especially, this brachah has special significance. Among the hiddurim are: The brachah should be recited only on two or more trees. No brachah is said on a single tree(29). Although the two trees do not have to be from two different species(30), several poskim mention that the more trees the better(31). Indeed, l'chatchilah the brachah should be said on trees in an orchard that is planted outside the city limits(32). The brachah should be said in the presence of a minyan followed by kaddish. It should be preceded by V'yehi Noam and followed by with Hallelukah hallelu Keil min hashamayim(33).

The brachah should be recited at the earliest possible time, which is on Rosh Chodesh Nissan, unless it falls on Shabbos or it is raining(34).

FOOTNOTES: 1 Shita Mekubetzes Brachos 43b. 2 OC 226:1. 3 Har Tzvi OC 118. 4 Siddur Hagrah; Minchas Yerushalayim; ArtScroll. Their source may be Sefer Ha'shkol pg. 68. 5 The text in many of the early sources [including Rambam and Shulchan Aruch] is 'tovos'. [According to proper dikduk, tovim is the proper form, since ilan is lashon zachar, as in the Mishnah (Avos 3:7): ilan zeh.] 6 See Brachos 43b, Rambam (Brachos 10:13); Rokeiach pg. 235; Ohr Zarua 1:179; Avudraham (Brachos); Tur and Shulchan Aruch OC 226; Siddur Rav Yaakov Emedin; Chayei Adam 63:2; Siddur Baal Hatanyah; Kitzur Shulchan Aruch 60:1; Aruch Hashulchan 226:1 7 Minchas Yitzchok 10:16; Mibais Levi (Nissan 5756). 8 Mishnah Berurah 226:1 quoting achronim. 9 Be'er Heitev OC 226:1. 10 Aruch Hashulchan 226:1. 11 Note that there are several poskim who hold that according to kabbalah, this bracha should be said only during Nissan - See Sdei Chemed (Brachos 2:1) and Kaf Hachayim 126:1 who rule that one should not recite this brachah before or after Nissan. 12 Har Tzvi OC 118; Minchas Yitzchok 10:16. 13 Mishnah Berurah 226:4. 14 Mishnah Berurah 226:5. L'chatchilah, however, one should be particular to recite the brachah the first time he sees the blossoming, since several poskim hold that the brachah may not be said if one failed to say it the first time - see Machatzis Hashkefel 226, Kitzur Shulchan Aruch 60:1 Shaar Hatzion 226:3 and Ktzos

Hashulchan (Badei Hashulchan 46:18). For this reason it is important to know the text of the brachah by heart so that the brachah can be said the as soon as the blooming is seen. 15 Mishnah Berurah 226:2. 16 Kaf Hachayim 226:4 quoting Moed Kol Chai. Kaf Hachayim also holds that according to kabbalah this brachah may not be said on Shabbos and Yom Tov. 17 Indeed, it is clearly permissible to smell a hadas which is attached to a tree on Shabbos since we are not concerned that the branch will be broken off- OC 336:10. 18 Teshuvos Lev Chaim 2:44. 19 Mibais Levi Nissan 5756. 20 Yechave Daas 1:2. 21 Tzitz Eliezer 12:20-6. 22 Mishnah Berurah 226:2. 23 Shevet Halevi 6:53. 24 Both views are brought in Kaf Hachayim 225:26 and 226:11. 25 Ben Ish Chai (Re'eh 11); Sdei Chemed (Brachos 2:7); Minchas Yitzchak 3:25-3; Yabia Omer 5:20. 26 R' Akiva Eiger (Gilyon OC 226); Divrei Malkiel 3:2. If one is in doubt whether the tree in question is orlah, a brachah may be said according to all views. 27 Dovev Meishorim 3:5; Chelkas Yaakov 2:27. 28 Harav S. Vozner (Mibais Levi, Nissan 5756). 29 Chida (More B'atzba 198). Although there are poskim who hold that halachically two trees are required and no brachah is said when only one tree is seen, see Chazon Ovadia pg. 9-10, most poskim do not quote this requirement. See also Ktzos Hashulchan (Badei Hashulchan 46:18) that l'chatchilah, two trees are required for the brachah. 30 Kaf Hachayim 226:2. 31 Shu"t Halachos Ketanos 2:28. 32 Shu"t Lev Chaim 45 quoted in Kaf Hachayim 226:3 and in Chazon Ovadia pg. 8. 33 See entire procedure in Kaf Hachayim 226:7-8. 34 Mibais Levi (Nissan 5756).

Weekly-Halacha, Copyright (c) 1998 by Rabbi Neustadt, Dr. Jeffrey Gross and Project Genesis, Inc. The author, Rabbi Neustadt, is the principal of Yavne Teachers' College in Cleveland, Ohio. He is also the Magid Shiur of a daily Mishna Berurah class at Congregation Shomre Shabbos. The Weekly-Halacha Series is distributed L'zchus Hayeled Doniel Meir ben Hinda. Project Genesis: Torah on the Information Superhighway learn@torah.org 6810 Park Heights Ave. http://www.torah.org/ Baltimore, MD 21215

drasha@torah.org DRASHA PARSHAS VAYIKRA -- GIVE IT WHILE IT'S HOT This week the Torah tells us of a mitzvah that the Chofetz Chaim is alleged to have prayed never to have to perform. Difficult as it may be, it is a positive commandment. But as the Chofetz Chaim wished, may we all be spared from it. The Torah tells us that if an individual succumbed and stole property, or deceitfully held an item entrusted to him, there is a mitzvah to make amends. "And he shall return the stolen object that he stole, the fraudulent gains that he defrauded, the pledge that was secured with him" (Leviticus 5:23). The redundancy is glaring. Of course the stolen item is what you stole. Surely the pledge was secured with you. And the fraudulent gains are those that you swindled. Why does the Torah repeat the action words, "that he stole, that he defrauded, that was secured with him" ? On a Talmudic level, the Gemarah derives from the extra words the technical laws that determine when monetary restitution takes precedence over reparations of real property. If a person steals a piece of wood, for example, and builds a boat with it, must he return the newly formed item to the original owner of the wood, or would monetary compensation suffice? After all, the wood in the thief's possession is no longer the "the stolen object that he stole." The man stole wood. It is now a boat. On those issues and ideas there are tomes of analysis that translate into centuries of Torah observance. I'd like to explain the illusory redundancies on a simple, homiletic level. Rabbi Moshe Sofer, beloved Rabbi of Pressburg and author of the noted work Chasam Sofer, was about to preside as a judge in a difficult lawsuit. A few days before trial was to begin he received a package from one of the litigants. It was a beautiful sterling kiddush cup. That Friday night the Chasam Sofer took the cup out of its velvet pouch, and raised it for his entire family to see. "Look how beautiful this becher is. Do you notice the intricate etchings? It must be worth a fortune!" The family looked on in horror. They knew that the gift was sent as a form of a bribe. They could not imagine why the Chasam Sofer had removed it and was seemingly admiring it. Abruptly, the Chasam Sofer stopped talking. His eyes became sternly focused on the cup. He began, once again, to speak. "But, my children, the Torah tells us we may not take a bribe! Therefore I will put this beautiful cup away and never use it. It must be returned to the sender immediately! He must be chastised for this terrible breach." Then he continued. "You must be wondering why I even looked at the cup. You certainly must be bewildered why I even admired it openly. I will explain. How often is it that I am offered a bribe? Never! I never felt the passion or desire to accept a bribe, as it was never offered! When I had the opportunity to observe the Torah's prohibition against corruption, I wanted to make sure that I did it from a vantage of passion. I wanted to realize what I was turning down. I wanted to value the Torah's command over an exquisite and ornate silver goblet. I felt that by working up our appetite for the item we surely would appreciate its refusal."

Perhaps the Torah is hinting at the most proper aspect of restitution. There are two reasons to return a stolen item. First, you are in possession of an item that is not yours. Simple. But there is another reason. Every one of our actions helps mold us. By returning an item that we once desired enough to have stolen, we train ourselves to break the covetous constitution of our nature. We learn that even though we want something, we may not take it. That redemption is much more effective when the attachment for the item is still active. A stolen item that one may have forgotten about or lost desire for may be much easier to return. After all, ten years after you stole a bicycle you probably would be driving a car. The desire for the bike is no longer there. Maimonides teaches us that the greatest act of teshuva (repentance) is when the passion for the crime still exists. Repentance is always accepted, but if the item is still categorized in your mind with the expression "the stolen item that you stole, the fraudulent gains that you defrauded, the pledge that was secured with you," then the repentance is more meaningful. When desires conflict with conscience - and conscience prevails -- that is true teshuvah. 50 years after a crime, there are those who may issue statements of apologies and excuses. However a lingering question remains. Are the "stolen items ones that they stole" or are they just relegated to black and white memories of an almost forgotten crime? The words "I am sorry" should not be sorry excuses, but rather true regret with a commitment never to sin again. That can best happen while the iron (or steal) is still hot.

Good Shabbos Rabbi Mordecai Kamenetzky Dedicated by Mr. and Mrs. Lionel Fisch In Memory of George Fisch and Rebbecca Stein

Parabolic Reflections [From last week: In last week's FaxHomily (drasha) I wrote... "We go to Israel for many reasons;... Of course there is much to see there that will inspire us;...The Wailing Wall." Gail Morrison of Mitzpeh Yericho, Israel wrote: The term wailing wall is a derogatory one used by non-jews to describe the Kotel hama'aravi or the western wall. They mocked the jews praying there With tears. The last place I would expect to see it written would be from a Religious leader in a dvar torah. Please correct that term in the future. I apologize and thank her for the useful information.]

The response to the Wailing Wall controversy has been quite interesting. eitdom@aol.com wrote about remembering his grandparents talking about the tears of Yidden at the wall and that they always called it the Vainerdiker Vant -- Yiddish for Wailing Wall! Uri Portal wrote: Somehow, I see the term "Wailing Wall" in the exact opposite light. I think that the gentiles recognizing how Jews come with tears to pray is a tremendous Kiddush HaShem. Would it really be preferable if the world had the impression that the Kotel was just a good place for a bar mitzvah and a photo? I think that it is correct and proper when the world sees the Kotel as a place of Jewish tears and yearning and not simply as some sort of national historic monument. Why should anyone consider a term which refers to emotional prayer as a derogatory comment? If a non-Jew said that someone cried on Yom Kippur, would that be considered an insult or rather a wonderful complement?

In summary, I think the term Wailing Wall is a most appropriate term. Mordechai Kamenetzky - Yeshiva of South Shore rnk@torah.org or rnk@yoss.org 516-328-2490 -- Fax 516-328-2553 <http://www.yoss.org> for drasha <http://www.torah.org/learning/drasha> Drasha, Copyright (c) 1998 by Rabbi M. Kamenetzky and Project Genesis, Inc. Rabbi Mordechai Kamenetzky is the Rosh Mesivta at Mesivta Ateres Yaakov, the High School Division of Yeshiva of South Shore, <http://www.yoss.org> Project Genesis: Torah on the Information Superhighway [learn@torah.org](mailto:learn@torah.org) 6810 Park Heights Ave. <http://www.torah.org/Baltimore>, MD 21215

Parasha-page@jer1.co.il Parashat Vayikra 5758 - "The Sacrificial Service" The Weekly Internet P \* A \* R \* A \* S \* H \* A - P \* A \* G \* E by Mordecai Kornfeld of Har Nof, Jerusalem (kornfeld@virtual.co.il)

This week's publication has been sponsored by Alan, Sophia and their son Jared Ziegler to honor the memory of Alan's grandmother, Faige bat Shlomo Zalman (Fanny) Feibus (Yahrzeit: Adar 24).

"TORAH FROM THE INTERNET," by RABBI MORDECAI KORNFELD, is available now at a HEBREW BOOKSTORE near you, or from the publisher JUDAICAPR@AOL.COM

PARASHAT VAYIKRA 5758 THE SACRIFICIAL SERVICE

This week's Parasha introduces us to the details and intricacies of the sacrificial service, as practiced in the Mishkan (Tabernacle) and later in the Holy Temple. A good deal of the ensuing Torah portions dwell on this theme, listing the circumstances under which each of the various sacrifices must or may be brought, and the exact manner in which each of them were offered. In general, after an animal was slaughtered its blood was sprinkled on the sides of the Mizbe'ach (altar), certain of its fats were removed and burned on the top of the Mizbe'ach, and the remainder of the animal was eaten either by the Kohanim that were serving in the Mikdash or by the one

who offered the sacrifice (depending upon the nature of the sacrifice). Although this practice may seem bizarre to the uninitiated, the early commentaries point out the profound and enduring effect that offering a sacrifice has on a sinner. Man, like animal, is a physical organism of flesh and blood. Both are driven by their lusts and emotions; all that separates man from animal is his intellect. When a person sins because he allows his desires to get the better of his intellect, he puts himself on equal footing with the animal. It is necessary to impress upon such a person the futility of physical existence which is not led by the mind's rational judgment. This is accomplished by having him offer a sacrifice. The sinner brings a body of flesh and blood, like his own, to the Mikdash. There, he slaughters it and burns it on the altar -- much as he allowed his own body to be "burned" by the fire of desire (Rabeinu Bachye 1:9). The blood is sprinkled on the altar and the intestines and fats (the vehicles of desire) are burned, to demonstrate "there, but for the grace of G-d, go I" (Ramban 1:8). It is thus vividly portrayed to him that a body without a mind is valueless (Chinuch, Mitzvah #95). The meat of the sacrifice provides sustenance for the Kohanim, educators of the people and purveyors of the Torah (Devarim 33:10), who then pray for the complete atonement of the sinner (Ramban). This is one approach to the sacrificial service. Other approaches, ranging from the philosophical to the mystical, have been proposed as well, each shedding light on yet another aspect of the Temple service. Particularly intriguing is that of the Ramban.

II In his Guide to the Perplexed (3:46), the Ramban explains that the nations of the world that worshipped animals generally worshipped one of three domestic animals: either sheep (as did the Egyptians, Targum Onkeles Shemot 8:22), goats (as in Vayikra 17:7) or cows (as in India, until today). In order to remove any reverent thoughts for these animals from Jewish minds, Hashem commanded us to take specifically these three animals, and to slaughter them and burn them on the Mizbe'ach. (In ch. 3:32 of the Guide, the Ramban offers yet another approach to the matter of sacrifices.) Ramban (1:8), however, finds this approach absolutely unacceptable. It is unthinkable to assume that the purpose of sacrifices is no more than to demonstrate the absurdity of the foolish practices of idolaters! Besides, we find that before any idolaters began serving animals, animal sacrifices were offered by Adam (Shabbat 28b), his sons (Bereishit 4:4) and Noach (Bereishit 8:20). How can the Ramban state that sacrifices only became necessary after people began to deify animals? Perhaps the answer to these questions lies in a better understanding of what prompted people to deify animals in the first place. Rabeinu Bachye (1:9) explains that the Egyptians realized the great benefit that one derives from the wool, offspring and milk of sheep. In the words of Chazal (Rashi Devarim 7:13), "Why are [sheep] called 'Ashterot' (ibid.)? Because they make their owners rich (Me'ashrot)!" The same applies to goats, and to cows -- which provide not only milk and offspring but plow the fields as well, thus producing a large proportion of the daily rations. The nations deified these animals in an attempt to appeal to the powers of sustenance that they perceived in them. (This is not dissimilar from the manner in which people today often put considerable amounts of time and effort into a particular non-Torah mode of behavior, convinced that it will bring them "true happiness and peace of mind.") We, who know that Hashem provides us with our livelihood and no other, do not attribute any supernatural powers to such animals. They are simply the vehicles through which the Omnipotent One provides us with our daily needs, and have no power unto themselves. Even in the absence of actual idol-worship, the sacrificial service is necessary as a declaration that we "know the hand that is feeding us." By offering these animals on the altar in Hashem's service, we are declaring that He is the G-d of G-ds and all that we have is from Him alone. As such, the sacrificial service relates to more than just the folly of misguided nations; it denotes that we realize Who has granted us all that we have. It was certainly appropriate even for Adam and Noach to offer animal sacrifices.

III The Ramban (ibid.) adds a reason for specifically offering goat-sacrifices on the first day of the lunar month and

on Mo'adim (Jewish holidays). Citing a Midrash (see Yalkut Shimoni, Shemini, 1:521), the Rambam tells us that goats were brought for these, and other, public sin offerings in order to atone for the sin our grandfathers sinned by selling Yosef and dipping his cloak into the blood of a \*goat\* (to fool his father, Bereishit 37:31). By constantly bringing up this sin, we demonstrate how long lasting the effects of sin can be, discouraging future sins. Haga'on Rav Yehoshua Leib Diskin used this theme to explain a Gemara in Yoma (42a). The Gemara tells us that a red ribbon of two Sela-weights was tied to the scapegoat on Yom Kippur, and when the Jews achieved a full atonement through the scapegoat it turned white. Perhaps, Rav Diskin explains, this was because the scapegoat, like the other goats offered on the holidays, was meant to atone for the sin of selling Yosef. According to the Gemara (Shabbos 10b), the cloak given Yosef by his father which aroused the brothers' jealousy for Yosef (Bereishit 37:3) weighed exactly two Sela-weights more than those of his brothers. The two Sela-weight red ribbon turned white to demonstrate that Hashem would forgive the nation for persecuting Yosef because of his two Sela-weight cloak!

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

ravfrand@torah.org "RavFrand" List - Rabbi Frand on Parshas Vayikra  
- This week's "RavFrand" is dedicated in memory of Naftali Hertz Ben Avrohom, whose Yahrzeit is 2 Nissan.

Moshe Waited for the Call A verse in this week's parsha says, "And G-d called to Moshe and He spoke to him..." [Vayikra 1:1]. The Medrash comments that we learn from here that "any Torah scholar who does not have intelligence (da'as), an animal's carcass (neveilah) is superior to him." The Medrash elaborates: "Look at Moshe, the greatest of all Sages, the father of all the prophets and yet he did not enter the innermost Tent of Meeting until he was called, as it is written 'And He called out to him.'" Rav Bergman, in his sefer Shaarei Orah explains this Medrash. Rav Bergman proves that the word intelligence (de'ah) as used by the Medrash refers to Derech Eretz (manners, courtesy). The Sages are saying that a Torah scholar who does not display courtesy is inferior to a dead animal. The Medrash describes Moses as the greatest of all Sages. IQ and brainpower do not make a person the greatest of all Sages, but rather the desire to learn. A person excels in any endeavor as a result of an unquenchable thirst for knowledge. Consequently, Moshe must have had an overpowering desire to acquire wisdom. And yet, when G-d was there in the Tent of Meeting and Moshe had the opportunity to learn Torah from Him, and he was yearning to begin learning, he nevertheless waited for The Call. He dared not enter until summoned, because it would not have been proper Derech Eretz, proper conduct, to do so. The laws of Derech Eretz require us to wait until we are called. As great a Sage as Moshe was, he was a greater master of Derech Eretz. This is what the Medrash means -- a scholar that does not have Derech Eretz is inferior to a carcass. The Gerer Rebbe explained this very sharply. A dead carcass stinks, and everyone knows to stay away. But people do not necessarily stay away from a Talmid Chochom who does not possess manners - they even come and learn from him - because he doesn't stink on the outside!

We Must Be Doing Something Wrong Someone recently showed me a report called "The Current State Regarding Derech Eretz in our Schools." This was a report written about a specific Jewish community, but it is no Mitzvah to say which community it was. But it is a fine community -- a prominent city with a distinguished Jewish community, and many good Jewish schools. And the truth of the matter is that it applies to all communities. We are in a sad state... "Teachers are quitting in large numbers; parents seem unconcerned that teachers are victims of abominable disrespect by our children. There is a pervasive atmosphere of Moshav Leitzim (see glossary) in many of our schools. This is manifest in the classroom in the concerted effort to waste time, often combined with tremendous chutzpah and a derogatory attitude... "Many teachers have told their classes that they

have never seen such disrespectful behavior in twenty years teaching experience, and that our children are disgracing the community. The current favorite pastime of students is constant and vicious mimicking of teachers and principals... "Teachers will confirm that there is a serious lack of respect among the children themselves. A student who lives by Torah law and refuses to participate in class pranks is called the worst of all terms -- a 'Neb' [short for 'Nebach', an unfortunate] -- and is often ostracized..." Now we would be remiss if we did not remind ourselves that this is hardly unique to the Jewish community. We can count our blessings for all that has happened in the larger community, which is rare or unknown within the halls of a Jewish day school. But neither have we demonstrated ourselves immune to the general decline of the last several decades. Come and see -- Moshe was the greatest of all Sages, but he didn't breach the laws of etiquette, no matter how much he wanted to learn.

The Mystical Magic of "The Ox Gores the Cow" The Medrash Rabbah, Chapter 3 interprets a verse from the prophet Malachi "The Torah of Truth was in his mouth and many he returned from sin" [2:6]. The Medrash relates this to how Aharon the High Priest brought people near to Torah. We think that outreach to fellow Jews is a new phenomenon. This Medrash tells us that Aharon also worked in Jewish Outreach. But how did he do it? "He did not make forbidden that which was permitted and did not make permitted that which was forbidden." Aharon did not compromise. He told things as they were. His secret was that he was consistent and straightforward. People like consistency. They are not necessarily interested in permissiveness (heterim); they are not necessarily interested in stringencies (chumras); they are interested in the straight truth (meisharim). The Medrash explains that the way Aharon attracted people was to attract them to learning Torah. He learned with them! We, on the other hand, don't appreciate the value of Torah itself. I will tell you over a story that I heard from a prominent individual who works in Jewish Outreach. When he was he was newly married, and studying at a Rabbinic seminary in Israel, he couldn't afford an apartment in the desirable sections of Jerusalem. Therefore he bought one in what was then an outlying section, in a building where he was the only observant, religious Jews. All of the other residents were Israelis who were not religious. He went over to them and started building relationships. He invited every one of them to come once a week to his apartment to learn. After trying, he finally got several to come to learn, but he had not picked a topic. What would he learn with non-religious Israelis? In a certain sense non-religious Israelis are even more removed from Judaism, and have more negative attitudes towards Jewish learning, than unaffiliated Jews in America. So he deliberated his options: something philosophical, like Maimonides' Guide to the Perplexed, or a work which discusses the Jewish faith in comparison to others, like the Kuzari... he didn't know what he was going to learn. He went to morning prayers and there, as Hashgocha (Divine Providence) would have it, he met the famous Uri Zohar. Uri Zohar was Israel's foremost entertainer: comedian, television game-show and radio talk-show host, social satirist, movie star, and film producer, and an icon of modern Israeli secular society. Then, in the midst of his career, he turned towards religion, eventually becoming fully observant. [For more information, read Waking Up Jewish by Uri Zohar, which is available through Genesis Judaica (<http://books.torah.org/> or [books@books.torah.org](mailto:books@books.torah.org).)] He asked Uri Zohar what he should learn with these neighbors. Uri asked him, "What are you learning in Yeshiva?" The Rabbi responded that he was learning Bava Kamma. Uri Zohar told him "Learn with them tractate Bava Kamma". The Rabbi looked at him incredulously and said "Bava Kamma? The ox that gores a cow; The Pit; The Ox; Fire that damages?... This will turn people on to Judaism?" To which Uri Zohar responded "My dear friend, you don't believe in Torah! If you can question and doubt that learning with them tractate Bava Kamma is going to bring them back -- then you don't fully believe and appreciate the power of Torah." Learn pure, unadulterated, "the Four Major Types of Damages" (Arba avos nezikin). You do not need to learn philosophical works such as Kuzari and Moreh Nevuchim. Learn about the Ox that gores the cow. It does something to the soul. It is mystical. It is magical. It is the nourishment that

the soul thirsts for, and a teacher needs nothing more. To this day, what does the Rabbi learn with beginning adult students? Tractate Bava Kamma. That is what this Medrash says about Aharon. He returned sinners to Torah study. The power of Torah will prevail.

Sources and Personalities Rav Bergman -- Contemporary Israeli Rosh Yeshiva; Bnei Brak, Israel. Kuzari -- R. Yehuda HaLevi (1080-1145); poet, philosopher; Spain. Rambam; Moreh Nevuchim -- Guide to the Perplexed, philosophical work by Rabbi Moshe ben Maimon (1194-1270); Spain; Egypt.

Transcribed by David Twersky; Seattle, Washington twersky@aol.com  
Technical Assistance by Dovid Hoffman; Balt, MD  
dhoffman@clark.netRavFrاند, Copyright (c) 1998 by Rabbi Y. Frاند and Project Genesis, Inc. Project Genesis: Torah on the Information Superhighway learn@torah.org 6810 Park Heights Ave.  
http://www.torah.org/ Baltimore, MD 21215 (410) 358-9800 FAX: 358-9801

---

yhe-parsha.ml@jer1.co.il HAFTARAH - PARSHAT HA'CHODESH THE TANACH STUDY CENTER [http://www.virtual.co.il/torah/tanach] In Memory of Rabbi Abraham Leibtag

#### PARSHAT HA'CHODESH

HAFTARAH for PARSHAT HA'CHODESH - Yechezkel 45:9-46:18  
This week's haftara is especially fitting for BOTH Parshat Vayikra and Parshat ha'Chodesh for not only does it discuss Pesach and Rosh Chodesh Nisan, but ALSO the special korbanot chatat which the NASI must bring! [Recall that Parshat Vayikra discusses the special korban chatat that the NASI must bring should he transgress - see 4:22-26.] This special status of the NASI in the Mikdash, already alluded to in Parshat Vayikra, becomes very prominent in Sefer Yechezkel. This week's shiur explains why.

INTRODUCTION Chapter 45 constitutes an integral section of the final unit of Sefer Yechezkel (i.e. chapters 40->48) in which Yechezkel describes his vision of the final Bet HaMikdash. These nine chapters, which focus on the return of the SHCHINA to Yerushalayim, stand in contrast to the opening 24 chapters of the sefer which describe the SHCHINA leaving Yerushalayim and the prophetic reason for its destruction. This contrast, i.e. the changes which will take place due to the 'mistakes' of first Temple, will help us understand the reason for the special korbanot which the NASI must offer, as described by Yechezkel in chapters 45 and 46.

WHO'S THE KING? As we mentioned above, in this vision which takes place some eleven years after the CHURBAN, Yechezkel sees the SHCHINA returning to the Mikdash in a manner similar to his vision some twenty years earlier of the SHCHINA leaving (see 40:1-3 & 43:1-3!). However, the architectural plans of the Mikdash which Yechezkel envisions are quite different than the Shlomo's Mikdash. One of the primary differences is Yechezkel insistence that the King keep his 'distance' from the Mikdash. Recall from Sefer Melachim that in Shlomo's Mikdash the king's palace was built NEXT DOOR to Temple. In fact, Sefer Melachim describes the construction of the king's palace (7:1-12) as an integral part of the Temple complex (see 6:1-7:51). [I recommend that you scan those chapters to note this. Note that there is not even a 'parsha break' between 6:38 (the completion of the construction of the HEICHAL) and 7:1 (the beginning of the construction of Shlomo's palace). Note also that the description of remainder of the Temple complex (7:13-51) continues immediately after the description of Shlomo's palace!] Shlomo Ha'Melech had good intentions when he built the Temple complex in this manner for this proximity between these two palaces, with the House of God built high above the House of the King, emphasizes that God rules above all (and that man's kingdom is below Him). Despite the idealism of this original plan, in practice this plan backfired. Too often, the King perceived himself as God and acted as though he was in charge of what would take place in the Temple. [For example, see (in Divrei Ha'yamim) the acts of Assah, Amatzya, Uziyahu, Achaz, and Menashe in relation to the Bet Ha'Mikdash.] For example, if the king need to 'borrow' some money, his

neighbor - i.e. the treasury of the Mikdash - became an excellent source of funds. [See I Melachim 15:18-20, see also II Melachim 16:7-12, 18:14-17.]

With this background, we can appreciate the beginning of chapter 43, where Yechezkel explains that this is one of the primary reasons why the SHCHINA is leaving the Temple: "And God spoke to me saying... this place in which I have dwelled... Bnei Yisrael shall no longer defile My Name, they and their kings... For they placed their threshold next to My threshold and their doorposts next to My doorposts, leaving only a wall between Me and them, and they would defile My Holy Name..." (See 43:8 & its context in 43:1-9) Therefore, Yechezkel explains, God had destroyed the first Temple, so that the Kings would not be able to continue their wicked ways: "...and I consumed them in My anger. Now, let them put their apostasy and the CORPSES OF THEIR KINGS FAR AWAY from Me, and then I will DWELL among them forever." (43:9)

NEW BLUEPRINTS In order to emphasize this message to Am Yisrael in the Exile, Yechezkel informs them of the NEW plans for the next Temple (43:10). These plans put the King far away from the Temple. Instead of the King's palace next door, the Temple will now be surrounded (and spiritually protected) by large courtyards. [See the previous chapter 42:15-20, read carefully. See also context of the entire chapter. Clearly in 43:10, when Yechezkel tells the people of the plans for the Temple, he is referring to the details found in chapters 40->42.] In fact, the name MELECH (=king) itself is rarely used in Sefer Yechezkel to describe the king. [Only in 37:15-28, where he foresees that the Kingdom will no longer be split between the two kingdoms of Yehuda and Ephraim, which is probably why the name king is used specifically there, to emphasize that the KINGdom will not split again.] Instead, Yechezkel consistently refers to the national leader as the NASI - the prince. [Just like Vayikra 4:22.] This is yet another indication of God's disgust with the kings of Israel during the first Temple period. [It is not by chance that a Kingdom (and dynasty), like that of Bayit Rishon, never developed during Bayit Sheni. Yechezkel's rebuke left a lasting impression upon the nation. He may have even been a bit too successful, "v'akaml".]

Therefore, Yechezkel instructs Bnei Yisrael (in Exile) to study the new architectural plans for the Bet HaMikdash which reflect this change. By doing so, they will realize their sins and thus be better prepared for their return (see 43:10-12). Yechezkel continues in chapters 43->45 with the plans for the new MIZBAYACH (43:13-18), a special dedication ceremony, and the decree that the only Kohanim who will be permitted to officiate will be from the family of ZADOK, for only that family remained worthy (43:19 / see also 44:15-16!).

SPECIAL KORBANOT FOR THE NASI Not only does Yechezkel 'demote' the king to a NASI, he also requires him to offer special korbanot in the Mikdash. Most likely, these korbanot serve as a constant reminder to the king of the proper relationship between God and king. These special korbanot are discussed in this week's Haftara. First, we are told that the 'funding' for these korbanot is to be collected from the people (after all, he does represent the nation (see 25:16-17) and otherwise buying them with his own money would become quite a financial burden upon the nasi.) Then, after bringing a special korban on Rosh Chodesh Nisan (similar to "yom ha'shmini" in Vayikra 9:1-5 which coincided with rosh chodesh nisan), the NASI is commanded to bring a special korban chatat on the 14th of Nisan, together with the korban Pesach (see 45:18-22). Then, during each of the seven days of chag ha'matzot, the NASI must bring 7 "parim" and 7 "eilim" for an OLAH and a "seir" for a chatat. [See 45:23-24.] In a similar manner, the NASI is also commanded to bring this same korban for each of the seven days of SUCCOT (see 45:25)! Now, even though these specific korbanot are very similar to the regular korban MUSAF brought by the "tzibur" as described in Parshat Pinchas (Bamidbar 28:16-23; 29:12-16), it is important not to confuse them! [They can't be the same korbanot tzibur, for a navi is not permitted to change the laws of the Torah - see Rambam Hilchot Yeshodei ha'Torah chapter 9!] [It is important to note that Rashi understands these korbanot as a one time commandment, even though they were for an entire year, sort of a new MILUIM process which included chag

ha'matzot and succot that year. Other commentators explain that these laws reflect a new level of kedusha, which required the NASI to offer additional korbanot - see Radak, see also Avrabanel and Malbim.] As we explained above, the necessity for the NASI to offer these additional korbanot may reflect his need to recognize his proper status in relationship to God, in order that the problems of the first Bet Ha'Mikdash, caused by the haughty attitude of the king would not repeat themselves. Specifically when the nation gathers en-masse on pesach and succot at the Mikdash, it is necessary for the NASI to show his humility. A similar restriction of the NASI is discussed in chapter 46. When the NASI comes to the Mikdash to bring his korbanot, he can only come up to the gate, present his korbanot to the KOHANIM (who will offer them), then he must bow down and leave (see 46:1-2), just as the rest of the people do (see 46:3). Afterward Yechezkel describes an additional korban which the NASI must bring every shabbat (six kvasim! see 45:4-5), and on Rosh Chodesh (one par, one ayil, and six kvasim/ see 45:6-8). Yechezkel even tells us that when the NASI enters and leaves the Mikdash, he uses the same entrance and exit as the people (and should 'mingle' with them! / see 45:9-10). The Haftara concludes with one final limitation upon the NASI. He can only control the land which is part of his "nachala", but can no longer expropriate the land of others. Yechezkel assures the people that the 'next time around' the king will longer take advantage of his power and 'cheat' them from the land which God has given them (see 46:16-18). Even though Yechezkel's prophecy of the final Bet Ha'Mikdash has not yet been fulfilled, his guide for the proper relationship between the people, their political leaders, and God remains our guide for all generations.

shabbat shalom & chodesh tov,

menachem

FOR FURTHER IYUN A. See Mesechet Shabbat 13b; Chagiga 13a; & Menachot 45a; where the gemara discusses that chazal even considered banning Sefer Yechezkel, for certain parshiot appeared to contradict the Torah. Relate the topics discussed in the above shiur to this sugya.

Daf-insights@shemayisrael.com Insights to the Daf: Shabbos 116-119 brought to you by Kollel Iyun Hadaf of Har Nof Rosh Kollel: Rabbi Mordecai Kornfeld daf@shemayisrael.co.il

SHABBOS 116 - has been dedicated by Family Posen of Jerusalem & London, to the memory of their father, Reb Moshe ben Yehoshua (Frank) Posen Z"L, who completed Shas learning Dafyomi, insisting on continuing with his Kevi'us till his very last day.

Shabbos 116 1) THE PARAGRAPH OF "VA'YEHI B'NESO'A HA'ARON" QUESTION: Raban Shimon ben Gamliel says that the paragraph of "Va'yehi bi'neso'a" serves as a separation between two incidents of calamity involving the Jewish people. If we look at the verses prior to the passage of "Va'yehi bi'neso'a," we find no clear mention of any calamity. If we look at the verses that follow the passage, we find \*two\* incidents of calamity with no separation between them -- the incident of the complainers (Mis'onenim), and the incident of the lust for meat (Kivros ha'Ta'avah). What calamities, then, is the passage of "Va'yehi bi'neso'a" separating? ANSWERS: (a) RASHI explains that the Jewish people were already complaining for meat when they left Har Sinai; the calamity of Kivros ha'Ta'avah occurred as they left Har Sinai. Thus, when the verse before the passage of "Va'yehi bi'neso'a" says that "they traveled \*from\* the mountain of Hashem\* for three days," it is referring to the calamity of Kivros ha'Ta'avah, during which the Bnei Yisrael "traveled away from Hashem," i.e. rebelled. The RAMBAN (Bamidbar 10:35) explains that Rashi means that even though the Torah describes the incident of Kivros ha'Ta'avah later, it does not mean that the incident took place then. Rather, the Torah is going back and explaining that which it merely alluded to earlier. (b) TOSFOS (DH Purani'os) says that the calamity at Har Sinai (before the passage of "Va'yehi bi'neso'a") refers to what the Midrash describes: the Jewish people ran away from Har Sinai hastily, the way a child runs when he is let out of school. Although this was improper conduct on the part of the Jewish people, what exactly was the calamity (= punishment for their action s) involved? The RAMBAN (ibid.) explains that perhaps the Jewish people would have arrived at the border of the land of Israel immediately after leaving Har Sinai. Instead, it took them three days to get there, which was considered a punishment for their hasty departure. Why is there no break between the next two calamities? Perhaps Tosfos understood that only the Erev Rav (or the "Am," as the Torah calls them in the Parsha of Kivros ha'Ta'avah) were involved in the incident of Kivros ha'Ta'avah, while the first two sins involved all of the Jewish people ("Bnei Yisrael"). Therefore, there is only a need to separate between the first two calamities. (c) The RAMBAN (ibid.) explains that the Gemara does not mean that it is separating between \*two\* calamities. Rather, the passage of "Va'yehi bi'neso'a" serves to interrupt between \*three\* calamities, so that there should not be three calamities in a row, which would make a "Chazakah" of calamities.

116b 2) READING "KESUVIM" ON SHABBOS The Mishnah (115a) states that we do not read Kesuvim on Shabbos because of "Bitul Beis ha'Midrash." The Gemara cites another reason from Rabbi Nechemyah, who said that we do not read Kesuvim on Shabbos as a safeguard to prevent people from reading business contracts on Shabbos. The ROGATCHOVER GA'ON uses this Gemara to explain an enigmatic change in the text of Birkas ha'Mazon on Shabbos. During the week, we say "Magdil Yeshu'os Malko," a verse from Tehilim (18:51). On Shabbos, though, we say, "\*Magdol\* Yeshu'os Malko," from Shmuel II (22:51). Why is that? The reason for this change,

explains the Rogatchover Ga'on, is the rule that our Gemara expresses that one may not learn Kesuvim on Shabbos. Since "Magdil" is from Kesuvim (Tehilim), we replace it with "Migdol" (from a parallel verse in Nevi'im), since learning from Nevi'im is permissible on Shabbos (see Mishnah 115a and Rashi there)! [Even though there are many other verses from Kesuvim in our Shabbos prayers, we are allowed to recite them because there is no other choice, since they do not have a closely matching verse in Nevi'im. Since they are part of our daily prayers, it is permitted to recite such quotes from Kesuvim. However, in Birkas ha'Mazon we change "Magdil" to "Migdol" in order to remind us of the prohibition against learning Kesuvim, when \*not\* praying, on Shabbos. (M. Kornfeld)] (The TORAH TEMIMAH proposes, somewhat tongue in cheek, an interesting hypothesis to explain the change in Birkas ha'Mazon. The change in the text may stem from a misreading of an abbreviation in the early printings of Birkas ha'Mazon. In the margin next to the word "Magdil," the following appeared in parentheses: "Migdol, SB" (the Hebrew letters "Shin" and "Beis"), which meant that instead of Magdil, the word "Migdol" appears in Shmuel Beis (SB). Later, printers who copied from the original printings misinterpreted the abbreviation to mean that "Migdol" is recited on Shabbos (which can also be abbreviated as SB).

117b 2) CUTTING THE CHALAH ON SHABBOS OPINIONS: The Gemara says that when cutting the Chalah at the Shabbos meal, one should lift both loaves of Lechem Mishneh while reciting the blessing of "Ha'Motzi." Rav Kahana ruled that he should then cut \*one\* of the loaves. The Gemara then relates that Rabbi Zeira would cut "his entire meal" from the Chalah. What does that mean? (a) RASHI explains that he would cut a very large slice of bread which would last for the entire meal. He did this in order to show how beloved the Shabbos meal -- and thus the Shabbos -- was to him. (b) The RASHBA disagrees with Rashi. He argues that Rashi's explanation of Rabbi Zeira's custom of cutting a large slice has nothing to do with the Sugya, which is discussing preparing two loaves for Lechem Mishneh. Rather, the Rashba explains that the Gemara means that Rabbi Zeira cut through both of his two loaves of Lechem Mishneh. HALACHAH: The SHULCHAN ARUCH (OC 274:1) cites Rashi's opinion (a) as the Halachah, and says that one should cut one of the two loaves, and that he should cut a large slice. The VILNA GA'ON (on the Shulchan Aruch ad loc.) rules in accordance with the Rashba's opinion (b), that one should cut both loaves of Lechem Mishneh, like Rabbi Zeira did. Elsewhere, the Vilna Ga'on points out that this resolves a puzzling statement of the Zohar. The Zohar says that a person should have twelve loaves of Chalah on Shabbos, corresponding to the twelve loaves of the Lechem ha'Panim in the Beis ha'Mikdash that were eaten on Shabbos. If we eat Lechem Mishneh for three meals, we only have six loaves. How do we have twelve? (1) One common custom (of Chasidic Rebbes) is to recite Ha'Motzi on twelve loaves (or small Chalah-rolls) at each meal. (2) Another custom is to have four loaves at each meal, so that the total number of loaves after the three Shabbos meals comes to twelve. (3) The Vilna Ga'on says that it is sufficient to have only two loaves at each meal. However, since one is supposed to cut through \*both\* loaves, one obtains four halves of loaves at each meal, or twelve half-loaves over the course of Shabbos! (See Berachos 4b, where a "half" is also called one whole entity.)

Shabbos 118b 3) SAYING "HALLEL HA'GADOL" EVERY DAY QUESTION: Rabbi Yosi prayed that his lot should be among those who say the complete psalm of Hallel every day. The Gemara asks that we have learned that a person who says Hallel ha'Gadol every day scorns and blasphemes. The Gemara answers that Rabbi Yosi was praying that he should be among those who say Pesukei d'Zimra every day, and not Hallel ha'Gadol. We see, then, that the psalms of Pesukei d'Zimra are good to say every day. Furthermore, the Gemara in Berachos (6b) states that one who says Tehilah l'David (Ashrei) three times each day is assured of a share in the World to Come. What is the difference between the psalm of Hallel ha'Gadol and the psalms of Pesukei d'Zimra and Ashrei? ANSWERS: (a) The MAHARSHA says that the theme of Hallel ha'Gadol is to proclaim that Hashem wrought open miracles for his people. If one recites this psalm every day, even on days on which no open miracle occurred, then on days on which Hashem did cause a miracle to happen, the miracle will not be made evident through this person's recitation of Hallel ha'Gadol (since he says it every day). The other psalms, though, are general praises of Hashem which do not specifically praise Him for His miracles. (b) The MESHECH CHACHMAH (beginning of Parshas Bechukosai) explains that the entire process of nature itself is a miracle. However, a person gets used to it and fails to give adequate praise to Hashem. The open miracles that Hashem performs serve to "remind a person" about the miracles inherent in the natural order of the world. This is the purpose of saying Hallel ha'Gadol on days on which Hashem performed open miracles. One who says Hallel ha'Gadol every day loses this reminder, and thinks that he must praise Hashem \*only\* for the open miracles. On the other hand, Ashrei and the other psalms of Pesukei d'Zimra discuss how all of the parts of the natural world are governed by Hashem. By saying those psalms every day, a person praises Hashem for the subtle miracles of nature. The processes of nature are represented by the alphabetical composition of Ashrei since it progresses in a natural order, as does nature.

ARCHIVES: <http://www.shemayisrael.co.il/dafyomi2/MordecaiKornfeld> Email: [kornfeld@virtual.co.il](mailto:kornfeld@virtual.co.il) Tl/Fx(02)6522633 6/12 Katzenelbogen St. kornfeld@netvision.net.il US:(718)520-0210 Har Nof, Jerusalem, ISRAEL [kornfeld@shemayisrael.co.il](mailto:kornfeld@shemayisrael.co.il) POB:43087, Jrslm

dafyomi@jer1.co.il] Insights into Daf Yomi from Ohr Somayach The Weekly Daf #215 Shabbos 114-120

<http://www.ohr.org.il/yomi/yomi215.htm> The Secret Ingredient "Why does your Shabbos food have such a special fragrance?" the emperor asked Rabbi Yehoshua ben Chanania. "We put in a special ingredient," he replied, "and it's called Shabbos." "Give me some of that ingredient," asked the emperor. "It works for someone who observes Shabbos," explained the Sage, "but it will have no effect for one who does not." The climax of this famous dialogue is certainly appreciated by every Jew who finds a special delight in his Shabbos meal which cannot be duplicated during the weekdays. But a little analysis is required of the details of this exchange. Why did the emperor, who assumed that Shabbos was the name of a spice, not ask the obvious question: "Why don't the Jews use this spice in their recipes throughout the week?" This question did not bother the emperor, explains Iyoun Yaakov, because he was aware that Jews did special things in regard to clothes and food in honor of their holy day of rest. He therefore suggested that since such a wonderful spice was set aside for honoring Shabbos it should also be presented to him as an expression of honor for the throne. Sensitive to his Jewish subjects' respect for Shabbos he was even willing to reserve use

of this special spice to Shabbos alone, so that it would be used in honor of both the holy day and the august emperor. At this point Rabbi Yehoshua was compelled to explain that Shabbos was not a natural spice but a supernatural ingredient which worked only for those who were commanded to observe Shabbos. As the Zohar, quoted by Eitz Yosef, puts it, the very essence of intangible Shabbos holiness takes on a tangible form in the special taste and fragrance of Shabbos food.  
Shabbos 119a

Written and Compiled by Rabbi Mendel Weinbach General Editor: Rabbi Moshe Newman  
Production Design: Lev Seltzer (C) 1998 Ohr Somayach International - All rights reserved.

---