

INTERNET PARSHA SHEET ON VAYIKRA - 5759

To receive this formatted parsha sheet in WP 6.1 file (readable by Word), please email me at crshulman@aol.com (with copy to cshulman@cahlil.com). (Thank you to M. Fiskus and S. Gunsburg for distributing in JE.)

SOME INTERNET DVAR TORAH LISTS Virtual Jerusalem: E-mail to: listproc@jer1.co.il In msg type: subscribe -<listname> Your_Name' Some of lists: DafYomi (by Ohr Somayach); ParashaQA (by Ohr Somayach); Weekly (Ohr Somayach on Parsha); YSParasha (from Shaalvim); YITorah (Young Israel); Camera; ShabbatZomer; ...

or fine flour. After each of these categories, the Torah uses the phrase "a satisfying aroma to Hashem." Obviously, cattle are more expensive than sheep, which are more expensive than fowl, which are more expensive than fine flour. If the Torah wanted to tell us that G-d views all these offerings equally, wouldn't it have been enough to say that fine flour is "a satisfying aroma to Hashem," and we would have made the logical inference that fowl, sheep and cattle were certainly "a satisfying aroma to Hashem?" The answer is that had the Torah left this lesson to a fortiori logic, we might have made the mistaken assumption that fine flour was "a satisfying aroma to Hashem," and all the more so fowl; that sheep were yet more acceptable and cattle -- most of all. For this reason, the Torah writes after each category "a satisfying aroma to Hashem" to teach us that whether an offering is large or small, G-d looks at them absolutely equally, provided our intentions are for the sake of our Father in Heaven.

___A Rose by any Other Name___ "And He called to Moshe..." (1:1) Moshe had ten names. Moshe, Yered, Chaver, Yekusiel, Avigdor, Avi Socho, Avi Zanuach, Tuvia, Shemaya, Halevi. Of all his names, the only one that G-d used was Moshe, the name that Basya, Pharaoh's daughter, called him. If G-d Himself used the name "Moshe," it must be that this name defines Moshe more than any of his other names. Why? When G-d created Adam, the ministering angels asked, "This man, what is his nature?" G-d replied, "His wisdom is greater than yours." G-d then brought various animals before the angels and asked, "What are their names?" The angels didn't know. G-d then showed the animals to Man. "What are their names?" He asked. Man replied "This one's name is ox, and this one, donkey. This is a horse, and this a camel." "And you," said G-d, "What is your name?" "I should be called Adam because I have been created from the earth (Hebrew -- adamah)." "And I," said G-d "what should I be called?" "You should be called Adon-oy; for you are the Lord (Hebrew -- Adon) of all." The Holy One, blessed be He, said "I am Adon-oy. That is My Name. For that is what Adam has called me."

A name is more than a way of attracting someone's attention, more than a conventional method of reference. The wisdom of being able to name something is higher than that of the angels, for a name defines and describes the very essence. For this reason one name was not sufficient for Moshe. In order to define him, to bound his greatness in words, ten names were required. However, G-d said to Moshe that of all his names, He would only call him by the name Pharaoh's daughter, Basya, named him. What was so special about this name? The name Moshe comes from the word meaning "to be drawn," for Moshe was drawn from the water by Basya. When Basya took Moshe out of the river, she was flouting her father's will. Pharaoh wanted to kill all the Jewish baby boys. By saving Moshe, she put her life on the line. Because Basya risked her life to save Moshe, that quality was embedded in Moshe's personality and in his soul. It was this quality of self-sacrifice that epitomized Moshe more than all his other qualities, and for this reason Moshe was the only name that G-d would call him. This was the characteristic that made Moshe the quintessential leader of the Jewish People. For more than any other trait, a leader of the Jewish People needs self-sacrifice to care and worry over each one of his flock.

Sources: * Loose Ends - The Steipler, Rabbi Dovid Kaplan * A Fortiori - Ohr HaChaim, Rabbi Mordechai Perlman * A Rose By Any Other Name - Rabbi Chaim Shmulevitz Written and Compiled by Rabbi Yaakov Asher Sinclair General Editor: Rabbi Moshe Newman Production Design: Eli Ballon (C) 1999 Ohr Somayach International - All rights reserved.

* TORAH WEEKLY * Highlights of the Weekly Torah Portion Parshas Vayikra http://www.ohr.org.il/tw/5759/vayikra/vayikra.htm Parshas Vayikra

Loose Ends ___ "And when a soul will offer." (2:1) The world is a very precise place. It seems that there are no loose ends in Creation. If you stand on the edge of a cliff, a couple of inches is all that separates you from instant death. The tiniest embolism in a vein can end the function of the entire body. This world is built to very fine tolerances. Which is why the Torah too is built to very fine tolerances. When all the letters in your tefillin are written within the correct halachic norms, wearing them connects you to the Source. With one letter incorrectly formed, you're wearing nothing more than funny-looking boxes. Turn on a light two minutes before Shabbos and you lit up the room. Turn it on two minutes and one second later and you plunged the world and yourself into spiritual darkness. The Torah is as precise as a scientific formula. Which makes it difficult to understand why there should be a whole area where the Torah is seemingly vague: In the times of the Holy Temple, when a person brought a korban nedava -- a voluntary gift-offering -- the Torah makes no stipulation as to how large or small it should be. It was left entirely up to the person who brought the offering. Go into a hospital and watch people working. The ones who are running around the most and working the hardest are probably the volunteers. When we give what we want to give, we give it with a full heart. When our gift is mandated, it detracts from our enthusiasm. The essence of the voluntary offering was not the offering itself, but the love that was wrapped inside it. To the extent that we are able to express ourselves in the giving, to that extent will be our feeling of giving. The tzitzis (fringes on a four-cornered garment) can be seen as symbols of this symbiotic relationship between the Torah and Man. Part of the tzitzis are tied. Part of the Torah is as immovable as any law of the physical world; gravity, thermodynamics, calculus. Part of the tzitzis are untied: The Torah mandates that we use every last ounce of our individuality to serve the Creator. I am not you. You are not me. G-d made us all, and He wants us to serve Him as ourselves, not as each other. Interestingly, if you look at the tzitzis, you will see that the correct proportion of the tied part to the untied part is one third to two thirds. The majority of this world consists of the loose ends of Creation which each one of us is invited to tie in our own unique way.

___A Fortiori___ "A satisfying aroma to Hashem" (1:9) When a person brings an elevation offering to G-d, he may bring either cattle, sheep, birds

From: owner-ravfrand[SMTP:owner-ravfrand@torah.org] "RavFrand" List - Rabbi Frand on Parshas Vayikra - This dvar Torah was adapted from the hashkafa portion of Rabbi Yissocher Frand's Commuter Chavrusah Tapes on the weekly portion: Tape # 186, Shalach Monos and Other Purim Issues Good Shabbos! Note: This will be the last class until after Pesach. "RavFrand" will resume the week of Parshas Sh'mini. Have a kosher and happy Pesach!

Parshas Vayikra Sanctifying Oneself Through The Physical The Medrash in this week's parsha says, "Rabbi Yochanan said, G-d only reveals himself to idolaters at night -- a time when people separate from one another -- as it is written 'G-d came to Avimelech in a dream at night' [Bereshis 20:3] or 'G-d came to Bilaam at night' [Bamidbar 22:20]. However, G-d reveals Himself to Jewish prophets during the day, as it is written 'And he sat at the opening of the tent in the heat of the day [Bereshis 18:1]'" What is the meaning of this Medrash? The Ateres Mordechai explains that this Medrash is telling us a very significant difference between Judaism and other religions. Many religions believe in a basic dichotomy between the physical and spiritual. They believe that if a person really wants to reach the highest levels of spirituality, he must separate himself from physical things, be celibate, become a monk. The more separate a person can become, the more holy he can become. Judaism teaches us just the opposite. Torah teaches that the highest form of holiness comes through material matters. As the Kotzker Rebbe explains "V'ANSHEI-Kodesh Te'heyu Li" -- holy PEOPLE you shall be to Me. I want you to be both 'holy' and 'people', not holy angels. That is why we believe that a person can sanctify that which is physical. He can take a meal and make it into a Shabbos meal. He can take any act and elevate it to a higher form. That is our goal. "Through all your paths, know Him" [Mishlei 3:6]. By infusing all of our activities -- our eating and sleeping and drinking and work -- with holiness, we can become close to G-d. This is precisely the meaning of the Medrash. G-d must come to Bilaam the idolater at night, at a time when people are separated from one another and when physical activity is on the wane. Only then can Bilaam deal with spirituality. Otherwise he is not able to deal with the conflict between the spiritual and the physical. But G-d can come to a Jewish prophet, l'havdil, even during the day, when the prophet is occupied with daily activities. Even in the midst of all that, there can be spirituality. This is a powerful ethical teaching. The essence of a Jew's life is about taking his daily activities -- the accounting and the doctoring and the practicing of law -- and infusing them with a Kedusha [Holiness]. Every act that a person does should be for the sake of Heaven.

Sources and Personalities Ateres Mordechai -- Rav Mordechai Rogov, former Rosh Yeshiva in Beis Medrash L'Torah, Skokie, Illinois. Kotzker Rebbe -- Menachem Mendel of Kotzk (1787-1859), Poland.

Transcribed by David Twersky; Seattle, Washington twerskyd@aol.com
 Technical Assistance by Dovid Hoffman; Yerushalayim
 dhoffman@torah.org RavFrاند, Copyright (c) 1999 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

From: owner-perceptions[SMTP:owner-perceptions@torah.org] Subject:

... The descendants of Aharon, the priests, must put fire on the altar and arrange the wood on the fire. The priests, the descendants of Aharon must place the pieces, the head, and the fat, on top of the wood on the fire upon the altar ... to be burned on the altar by the priest as a Burnt-Offering, a fire-offering, a pleasing fragrance to G-d. (Vayikra 1:7-9) Rabbi Chaim Volozhin adds another element to the whole discussion of sacrifices that makes the concept apply to every day life. He writes: "... The matter of sacrifices is like this as well, because, as a result of the fire on the altar above, the evil is burned up, leaving behind a completely good portion, for the owner [who brought it], to enjoy. Likewise, the manna that fell from Heaven was completely good--since nothing evil can come from Heaven--therefore no part was considered "waste" and all of it was absorbed by the limbs. The same was true of the meat from sacrifices--all of it was absorbed by the limbs, and nothing became waste ... "Likewise one who eats and learns Torah--and his eating is for the right reasons--the good part adds holiness to his soul, and the 'bad' part is burned up by the Torah, whose nature is like fire ... "When one eats for the true reason, to sustain his body and soul in order to serve G-d, May His Name Be Blessed, and makes the

appropriate blessing, and learns Torah while he eats--the true purpose of his eating--he is literally like one who has offered a sacrifice ... The opposite is true as well of one who eats just to satisfy his hunger; not only does he not bring about a physical rectification, but he even damages himself spiritually as well, causing evil elements to enter him ..." (Nefesh HaChaim, Likutei Ma'amarim 33) As I sit here eating my coffee and cake, I take minor consolation in the fact that, at least I'm learning/writing Torah at the same time. (Was there any nutritional value in what I just ate?) And when I think about the way I eat, and how many times I do so quite unconsciously, I wonder what kind of sacrifices I have brought in the past! Furthermore, when I look at the way society approaches the whole topic of eating (indicative most, perhaps, from the entire concept of "fast food"), I wonder how much potential atonement is going out the window unused. And, I am reminded of the following as well: Rebi Yochanan and Reish Lakish said: When the Temple stood, the altar atoned for a person. Now the table of a person atones for him (Rashi: when he feeds guests; Chagigah 27a) Hence, though the actual bringing of animal sacrifices ceased with the destruction of the Second Temple, the process and atonement that they caused can live on to our benefit--in a Torah lifestyle for the person with a disposition for challenge and growth. Through such an approach to life, one's own eating habits can count as "a pleasing fragrance to G-d."

The priest will atone for the person who sinned, and he will be forgiven. (Vayikra 4:35) We don't know what we lost. We don't know what it means to be able to bring a sacrifice and atone for sins we have committed before G-d, and how much we lack in life because we can't. However, even before the Temple was built, it had been a concern of Avraham Avinu's: It is written, "He [Avraham] said, 'G-d, how can I know that I will inherit [Eretz Yisroel]?' " (Bereishis 15:8) ... Avraham said to The Holy One, Blessed is He, "Master of the Universe! Perhaps Israel will sin before You, G-d forbid, and You will do them as You did to the Generations of the Flood and the Dispersion?" He told him, "I won't." He said before Him, "But Master of the Universe, how can I know?" He answered him, "Bring Me a three-year old calf ... (15:9)" (That is, they will offer sacrifices to atone for their sins, and avoid Divine wrath.) He said before Him, "Master of the Universe, that is fine during Temple times [when they can bring sacrifices], but what about when the Temple is not standing ... [--how will they atone for their sins then]? He told him, "I have already established the order of sacrifices, and just reading them will count as if they offered them before Me, and I will forgive their sins!" (Megillah 31b) If you look in the average traditional siddur, you will find a section before the "Introductory Psalms" (Pesukei D'Zimra) that includes many passages from the Torah and the Mishnah dealing with the sacrifices and other Temple services. In case you were wondering what they were doing there, now you know. If case you were wondering whether or not it is worthwhile to come to shul a bit early and say them, the above quote from the Talmud should make it easier to decide.

Propositions in Vayikra: The Temple Called for Holiness and G-d. Bringing an actual animal sacrifice and offering it up was far from being as easy as opening a siddur and uttering a few paragraphs! How can our words compare to their actions?" It is a good question. Fortunately, there is an even better answer, and it is a good lead-in to Pesach. In the book, "Redemption to Redemption," the importance of speech is a central topic, and explained in detail. In short, we have the following two quotes: G-d formed man from dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils a living soul, and the man became a living spirit. (Bereishis 2:7) A living spirit: A speaking spirit. (Onkeles) According to Targum Onkeles, the main impact of the soul that G-d gave to man, which made him different from all other living beings within creation, was speech. Indeed, speech is not merely another tool to help mankind function in the physical world, like walking, or like the use of our thumbs. Speech itself is indicative of our whole raison d'etre, as the Talmud makes clear: R' Elazar said: Every man was created to toil, as it says, "Because man was made to toil ..." (Iyov 5:7). Now, I do not know if that means to toil through speech, or in actual labor; however, once it says, "A toiling soul toils for him, for his mouth compels him." (Mishlei 16:26), I know that a person was created to toil with his mouth. I do not know,

though, if this means to toil in Torah or just in regular conversation. However, once it says, "This Torah should not leave your mouth ..." (Yehoshua 1: 8), I know that man was created to toil in Torah [through speech]. (Sanhedrin 99b) Hence, the name of the holiday "Pesach," which, on one hand comes from the Hebrew word that means to "pass over," but, on a deeper level, says the Maharal, can mean: peh sach--the "mouth spoke." This is why the chief antagonist in the story was Paroah, whose name can be written: peh ra'ah--evil mouth, and why the chief protagonist was Moshe, whose "strength was in his mouth." This is also why Paroah enslaved the Jewish people with labor that the Torah refers to as b'pharach, but which the Talmud interprets to mean: peh rach--with a soft mouth! That is just the beginning of the story and the hints. However, it serves to remind us that the gift of speech is precisely that--a tremendous gift! As we learn from the episode of the manna (also in "Redemption to Redemption,"), and when Moshe brought forth water from the rock by hitting it as opposed to speaking to it, speech represents our ability to transform the physical reality through a spiritual means. Hence, if one merely says the sacrifices as he would read any book, it is true--the effect is limited. But if one repeats the words with the sense of the Talmud quoted about, and with the Targum's interpretation in mind, then one can well appreciate how doing so can count as if the act was actually performed, and atonement was actually achieved.

Have a great Shabbos, Pinchas Winston Perceptions, Copyright (c) 1999 Rabbi Pinchas Winston and Project Genesis, Inc. Rabbi Winston teaches at both Neve Yerushalayim (Jerusalem) - <http://www.torah.org/neve/> and Neveh Tzion (Telzstone) - <http://www.neveh.org/> Project Genesis: Torah on the Information Superhighway learn@torah.org 6810 Park Heights Ave <http://www.torah.org/> Baltimore, MD 21215 (410) 358-9800 FAX: 358-9801

<http://www.ou.org/torah/ti/> OU Torah Insights Project Parashat Vayikra March 20, 1999 Rabbi Steven Weil

The theme of Sefer Vayikra is korbanos, the animal sacrifices brought in the Tabernacle and, later, in the Temple. The Rambam, in his Guide to the Perplexed, writes, "The purpose of sacrifices being incorporated into the Divine service of the Jewish people was to accommodate the transition of the people going from the extreme falsehood of idol worship to the extreme truth of worshipping one true G-d. The Jewish people had been steeped in an idolatrous culture and could only free themselves from it by utilizing the same form of animal sacrifice that they were accustomed to. Now, through strict rules and regiments, they could direct it toward the service of God." Unfortunately, this statement has been grossly misunderstood. The Rambam never meant to imply that korbanos were a temporary means of service, whose practice would be abandoned as soon as the Jewish people were weaned from their idolatrous ways. Noach and his sons offered korbanos after the flood; Avraham offered various sacrifices. Neither of them needed to be weaned from idolatry. Though the concept of animal sacrifices seems foreign, almost antithetical, to our notion of avodas Hashem, korbanos were offered in the Temple on a daily basis. The detailed rituals of sacrifices played an essential role in the celebration of each Yom Tov, and various sacrifices were offered to mark significant events in the lives of people. Korbanos obviously played a major role in avodas Hashem. How are we to understand that role? The ultimate way to serve G-d and come closer to Him is through prayer and Torah study, for those methods involve one's heart and one's intellect. At the same time, we are created with physical drives, and we are therefore driven to relate to G-d in a physical, tangible way. Offering a korban (from the word karov--to come close) is a hands-on project. But this very human need is not given free reign; rather, the offering of sacrifices is governed by strict regulations, in order that we tangibly relate to G-d in a true, proper way. Furthermore, korbanos address the human emotion of guilt. After a person sins, it is natural for him to feel guilty about having done wrong, having failed to live up to expected standards of behavior. Instead of allowing a person to wallow in guilt, to feel disappointed and disillusioned and to succumb to a sense of

hopelessness, the Torah requires the sinner to bring a sacrifice. He must purchase an animal--a living creature--bring it to the Temple, confess his sin, express a firm resolve never to repeat it, and then offer the sacrifice upon the altar. These steps allow for the individual to express his natural guilt in a constructive manner, to improve and cleanse his character instead of tarnish it.

Even in today's times, in absence of korbanos, the Torah continues to challenge us to use our yeitzer hatov to control our yeitzer hara--our physical and emotional drives--and always channel them to achieve a higher purpose, to relate to G-d in a way that allows us to grow and improve and approach perfection.

Rabbi Steven Weil Rabbi Weil is rabbi of the Young Israel of Oak Park in Oak Park, Michigan.

[From Yated Neeman] Peninim Ahl HaTorah-Parshas Vayikrah by Rabbi A. Leib Scheinbaum Hebrew Academy of Cleveland

He called to Moshe. (1:1) In this pasuk, the Torah spells Hashem's summons to Moshe with a miniature aleph. The smaller size of this letter makes it stand out as if it were a word by itself. Horav Yosef Zundel Salant, zl, interprets the aleph's size in a novel manner. He cites the Midrash in Sefer Eichah in which Chazal extol the significance of young children in the eyes of Hashem. They say that when the Sanhedrin was exiled from Yerushalayim, the Shechinah did not accompany them. Likewise, when the mishmaros, who were the various "watches" of Kohanim that served in the Bais Hamikdash, were exiled, the Shechinah remained. Only after the tinokos shel bais rabbon, young school children, were driven into exile, did the Shechinah cease to dwell in Klal Yisrael. It was only in the merit of the Torah studied by such pure souls as the young children that the Shechinah continued to abide in Klal Yisrael. Horav Salant suggests that this is the underlying interpretation of the pasuk in Shemos 25:22, "It is there that I will set My meetings with you, and I will speak with you from atop the Kapores from between the two Keruvim that are on the Aron." Rashi explains that when Hashem spoke to Moshe, the Voice came from Heaven to the top of the Kapores. It emanated out from between the Keruvim to Moshe Rabbeinu. Apparently, a strong spiritual significance is attributed to the Keruvim. Chazal teach us that the Keruvim looked like little children. This implies that in the zechus, merit, of little children, Hashem constricts the Shechinah in order to teach Torah and mitzvos to Klal Yisrael.=09 We find this idea connected to the giving of the Torah. Referring to the pasuk in Tehillim 8:3, "Out of the mouths of babes and sucklings You have established strength", the Midrash relates that when Hashem was about to give the Torah to Klal Yisrael, He questioned who was to guarantee its observance. The people responded that they would be responsible to uphold the Torah. Hashem did not accept them as guarantors, noting that they were themselves too heavily in debt to Him. "Who is there that is not indebted to You?" asked Klal Yisrael. "The young children whose commitment is pure and virtuous. They will serve as security that the Torah will be observed. I will give you the Torah through the medium of their mouths. If you do not heed the Torah, I will collect from you the security--the young, innocent children." Thus, as Hashem's voice emanates from between the Keruvim, it begins with a miniature aleph. At times, the word "aleph" is defined as, "to teach." This implies that Hashem speaks to us in the merit of the "little aleph"--our commitment to teaching Torah to young children. The aleph zeira, is a metaphor for Jewish education. Our resolve to see to it that every Jewish child is provided with a Jewish education is the catalyst for the Shechinah's choice to repose among us. Indeed, we may be so bold as to posit that Hashem's relationship will be manifest with us commensurate with the type and manner of education we avail our children. We will receive in accordance to that which we commit.

He called to Moshe, and Hashem spoke to him. (1:1) The third Sefer of the five Chumashim opens with a summons to Moshe. Interestingly, the word-Vayikra-"He called" is spelled with a small aleph at the end of the word. The commentators all express their insights into this deviation from

the norm. We suggest the following reason for the small aleph, especially in light of its position at the beginning of Sefer Vayikra, which deals with sacrifices. The Midrash in the beginning of Vayikra minimizes our obligations as Jews. Chazal relate: Hashem says to Klal Yisrael, "I have given you ten pure animals which you may enjoy. Three of these are within your reach: the ox, the sheep and the goat. Did I ask you to go out to the mountains and valleys to find a sacrifice for Me from all ten species? No! It is sufficient if you bring your sacrifice from those three that are readily accessible, those that you tend and feed." The words of this Midrash, although simple, carry a profound message. Hashem does not ask a lot of us. He does not demand that we give everything up to serve Him. Indeed, He asks only a little. He does not ask for all ten species of kosher animals to be used as a korban. He does not demand that we scourge the forest looking for that hard-to-find animal. He does not demand that we give up every day of the week for Him-only Shabbos. We are to set aside time during the day for prayer-set aside-not devote the entire day. We have to pay the extra price for kosher food, but is that excessive? Pesach might be an inconvenience, but is it a reason to complain? Hashem asks very little of us, because that is all it takes to indicate commitment. Regrettably, the all too popular idiom, "es is shver tzu zein a Yid," "it is difficult to be a Jew," has been exaggerated by those who attempt either to magnify their commitment or to conceal their lack of dedication. One should not view the observance of mitzvos as a major sacrifice. First, as we have just explained, it really is not that demanding. Second, a Jew should view his Jewishness as a privilege, as an opportunity to come closer to Hashem. He should serve Him with excitement, enthusiasm and joy. He should celebrate every moment and opportunity that he is granted to serve Hashem. Indeed, Horav Shraga Feivel Mendelowitz, zl, was once asked why the children of the first Jewish immigrants to arrive on these shores went off the derech, alienating themselves from their heritage. He responded, "Because their parents kept Shabbos and mitzvos with mesiras nefesh, self sacrifice." What did he mean? One would think that the only way to serve Hashem is with mesiras nefesh! The answer, however, is that while one should serve Hashem with mesiras nefesh, he should not view it as such, and, surely, should not walk around complaining about what he must give up in order to keep Shabbos and be an observant Jew. Children growing up in a home in which the parents are despondent about their lot in life, where they constantly express their dissatisfaction regarding what they have to give up in order to be observant, will not have a strong inclination to follow in their parents' traditions. A Jew must take pride in his heritage, so that he can bequeath to his children a legacy of love, joy, and enthusiasm.

When a person offers a meal-offering to Hashem And he (the Kohen) shall scoop his three-fingersful from it, from its fire-flour and from its oil, as well as from its frankincense; And the Kohen shall cause its memorial portion to go up in smoke upon the altar.(2:1,2) The Torah begins the laws of the Korban Minchah, meal-offering. While the Torah lists five varieties of voluntary, personal meal-offerings, they all consist of the same basic ingredients: finely ground wheat flour, oil, and frankincense. Horav S.R. Hirsch, zl, infers from the word "minchah," which in the Hebrew language means "gift" or "tribute," that the meal-offering proclaims the owner's acknowledgment that his life and all he has is a gift from the Almighty. Grain, a staple of the human diet, represents our very existence. Oil symbolizes comfort, and the frankincense alludes to joy, both gifts from Hashem. We have only to recognize their source and appreciate them. Chazal recount a fascinating story in the Talmud Megillah 16. They relate how the wicked Haman was searching for Mordechai in order to carry out the king's decree that he take Mordechai through the streets dressed in royal garb. He found Mordechai teaching Torah to a group of students, specifically about the laws of kemitzah, the three-fingersful offering which was placed upon the Mizbayach. Haman questioned Mordechai, "What are you studying?" "We are studying the laws of kemitzah. In the times of our Bais Hamikdash, one would take a small scoop, place it upon the Altar, and it would serve as an atonement," was Mordechai's response. Haman scoffingly rejoined, "Let your 'kemitzah' attempt to push aside my ten thousand silver talents." Haman was telling Mordechai, "Let us see if your little bit of

flour has the power to override my decree backed by ten thousand silver talents." Obviously a more significant message can be derived from this interchange. Horav Mordechai Rogov, zl, suggests a noteworthy interpretation of their dialogue. Despondency and depression must have engulfed Mordechai when he saw the wicked Haman before him. Here was the man whose one goal in life was to use his guile and power to totally destroy every living Jew. What made matters worse for Mordechai was that the single antidote to Haman's decree-adherence to Hashem's Torah-was not prevalent among the Jews. Most of the people had assimilated. They not only went to Achashverosh's banquet, they enjoyed themselves eating whatever foods they desired, acting in a manner unbecoming Torah Jews. Only a small, insignificant group of Jews, "Mordechai's people," resolutely maintained their conviction, not acceding to the dominant, rampant assimilation. What could this small group do? How could they succeed in counteracting Haman's decree? The lesson of the kemitzah gave Mordechai hope. The bitter cup of fear and despondency transformed into a cup of consolation and encouragement when Mordechai realized that his small group of dedicated and determined Jews was essentially no different than the kemitzah. The Kohanim consumed the Korban Minchah almost completely-almost-except for one little bit: the kemitzah. The only part of the meal-offering which is placed upon the Mizbayach is the kemitzah. Yet, this insignificant "sacrifice" influences the atonement. While it is minute in quantity, its effect is overwhelming! Imagine the power and effect of a small amount if it is sacrificed upon the Mizbayach. This was Mordechai's lesson. Regardless of their number, in spite of their size, if people are committed and willing to sacrifice themselves for their ideals, then they have the potential to save Klal Yisrael. Our strength has never been in numbers, but rather in conviction. Our power has never been in quantity but rather in commitment to Hashem and His Torah. When Mordechai told this to Haman, his response was atypical. Haman's arrogance was humbled; his strength weakened. He told Mordechai, "You are right. The power of your kemitzah is sufficient to overcome my ten thousand silver talents. I cannot defeat you with physical strength as long as even a small segment of your people remain steadfastly committed to serving Hashem. That relatively small number of Torah observant Jews has the power to undermine all of my efforts.."

Kortz Un Sharf-Short and Sweet Parsha Vertlach by Shaya Gottlieb "Vayikra El Moshe" And Hashem called to Moshe 1:1 The Medrash notes: Moshe Rabenu did not enter the Ohel Moed until Hashem called him. From here our chachomim learn, "Talmid Chochom shein bo daas," a Talmid Chochom that does not have daas; "a carcass of a dead animal is better than him." What does this refer to? A Talmid Chochom who is arrogant and conceited. The punishment of a baal gahva is being smitten with negaim. Since the tumah of a dead animal is less than the tumah of one of has tzoraas, a dead animal is better off than him. -Yalkut Heorim o o o A godol was once asked "The Chazal say that one who runs away from kovod, will have the kovod run after him, while the kovod runs away from the arrogant one who runs after it. Both of these individuals, the kovod seeker and the one who runs away don't have the kovod. What is the difference between them?" "The difference," the godol replied, "is evident when they become old. The one who escapes from kovod will not have the strength to run anymore, and the kovod will catch up with him. However, the arrogant kovod seeker, who in his youth, caught up with a bit of kovod, will also become old, and then the kovod will run away so quickly that he won't be able to glimpse him from the distance anymore." o o o "Why does the kovod escape from those who seek it?" Asked the Kotzker Rebbe, who was known to abhor arrogance. "This is because someone who loves honor will run after it, and debase himself even when there is the slightest chance that he can catch some of it. However, since the kovod detests shame and 'bizyonos' he runs away as quickly as he can." o o o The Gemara relates: Rovo said, "I have asked three things from Hashem, and two were granted. I asked for the wisdom of Rav Huna, the wealth of Rav Chisda, and the humility of Rava bar Rav Huna. I was only given the first two, but denied the last." The reason he asked for the first two before the third is self

understood; humility is not a feat for an ignorant, poor man. However, why wasn't Rovo given his third wish? "He was given humility," says the Ksav Sofer, "and the proof lies in his assertion to the contrary. A humble man always feels lacking in humility." o o o Rav Pinchos of Koritz remarked, "All the aveiros require some degree of action, of activity. The only effortless aveiro is arrogance. A man lies on his couch, doing nothing, yawning from boredom, and convinces himself that he is great." o o o A guest once came to the Chasam Sofer, and tried to show how humble and self-effacing he was. The Chasam Sofer saw through his efforts, and remarked, "You are not so 'big' yet that you should need to make yourself 'small'." o o o When the Radomsker Rebbe, the Chessed L'Avrohom, was meshadech with a certain Chassidic group, he sent a shaliach to 'farher' the choson. When the messenger returned, the Rebbe asked him, "Is it true that the midda of humility is prevalent amongst these chassidim?" "True," the messenger replied, "however not everyone is equal in humility. One part of the town considers the other half to be an even greater nobody"

Halacha Discussion by Rabbi Doniel Neustadt Thirty days before Pesach the halachos of Pesach should be reviewed (O.C. 429:1). Hagalah: A Koshering Process As the Torah states in Parshas Tzav, not all utensils which become non-kosher [or chametz] by absorbing the taste of non-kosher food can be purged, or koshed. For instance, it is impossible to purge "taste" from earthenware. Once an earthenware utensil is rendered non-kosher, it must be shattered and thrown away. On the other hand, metal vessels can be purged of their absorbed taste through a procedure called hagalah, purging. The halachos of hagalah are complicated, and what follows is merely an outline of its basic principles. Our discussion here refers only to the process of hagalah, not to be confused with other types of koshering such as libun kal and libun chamur, which have different rules altogether. Which materials can be koshed by hagalah? Utensils made from any type of metal(1), stone(2), wood(3), bone(4), leather(5), or natural rubber(6) may be koshed by hagalah. Earthenware(7), china, porcelain(8), glassware(9) and paper(10) utensils cannot be koshed by hagalah(11). The poskim(12) differ as to whether hagalah applies to utensils made out of the following materials: Plastic, melmac, nylon, corningware, corelle, pyrex, duralex, enamel, formica, teflon and silverstone. When possible, these utensils should not be koshed by hagalah. In cases of absolute necessity or great financial loss, there are poskim who permit these items to be koshed. A rav must be consulted. Any utensil which may get ruined during the hagalah process may not be koshed, since we are concerned that its owner will not kosher the utensil properly for fear of damaging it(13). If one koshed such a utensil anyway, it should not be used(14). However, if it was used, the food that was placed or cooked in it does not become forbidden to eat(15). Which utensils can be koshed by hagalah? A utensil becomes non-kosher (or meat or dairy) if it comes into contact with a non-kosher food item in one of the following ways(16): Direct fire: A utensil which is placed directly on the fire with no liquid or minimal oil, butter or shortening added (such as baking pans or parts of a barbecue grill), cannot be koshed by hagalah(17). A frying pan(18), too, should preferably not be koshed by hagalah. Indirect fire: A utensil which contains liquid and is placed directly on the fire (such as a pot used for cooking on a range or a spoon used for stirring food in a pot on a burner) can be koshed by hagalah. Heat contact: Utensils which come into direct contact with hot, non-kosher food, such as a plate onto which hot non-kosher food is placed, a fork with which it is eaten, or a cup into which it is poured, etc. These utensils may be koshed by hagalah. Included in this category are dairy dishes which were inadvertently washed together with meat dishes or vice versa. Cold Contact: Utensils which come in direct contact with cold non-kosher food must be thoroughly washed with cold water(19). Hagalah is not required. If the non-kosher food was a liquid and it remained in the utensil for a period of 24 hours or more, however, hagalah is required(20). Cold "Sharp" Contact: In the case of a cold but "sharp" non-kosher solid food that was cut with a knife(21), the knife requires hagalah(22). Whenever a utensil

needs to be koshed, its cover(23) and handles(24) need to be koshed as well. How does one prepare a utensil for hagalah? Hagalah purges the "taste" of non-kosher food which is absorbed into the walls of the utensil, but has no effect on actual food, residue or dirt which may be on the surface of the utensil. Accordingly, it is imperative that before the hagalah process begins, the utensil be scrubbed clean of any actual residue or dirt. Rust spots(25), too, must be removed, since it is possible that particles of food are trapped between the rust and the utensil. One need not be concerned with rust stains, however, since no food particles can be trapped there(26). Because of this prerequisite, there are several utensils which should not be koshed by hagalah since they cannot be cleaned properly and thoroughly(27): Utensils which have crevices or cracks where food may be trapped, a pot that has a cover which is attached by hinges(28), a mixer, food processor, blender(29), thermos bottle(30), sieve, strainer(31), grater, grinder, rolling pin, kneading boards(32), and anything else which cannot be scrubbed thoroughly and cleaned in every spot where food may possibly be trapped. If hagalah is performed on a utensil which was not completely cleaned, it is not valid even b'dieved and the hagalah process must be repeated. Handles and covers must be cleaned as well as the utensils themselves. Any handle which is attached with screws should be removed and the area cleaned from food that may possibly be trapped before hagalah takes place. If the space between the handles and the utensil cannot be cleaned, the vessel may not undergo hagalah(33). Our custom (based on several halachic factors) does not allow a utensil to be koshed by hagalah if it was used for non-kosher food within the previous 24 hours(34). B'dieved, or in a situation where it is difficult to wait 24 hours, a rav may permit hagalah even within 24 hours under certain specific conditions(35). In what type of pot is the koshering done? When koshering for Pesach, it is preferable that the vessel used for the koshering process be either brand new or kosher for Pesach. It is also permitted to use a vessel which was previously used for chametz, provided that 24 hours have passed since it was last used(36). The custom is to kosher the vessel itself by hagalah before using it as a receptacle for koshering the other utensils(37). After the hagalah, the koshering pot should be put away. If it is needed for Pesach, it should be koshed again(38). When koshering from non-kosher to kosher, the non-kosher utensil should be koshed in a kosher pot(39). When koshering a meat utensil which became non-kosher through contact with dairy or vice versa, the koshering pot may be either meat or dairy. Neither the utensils being koshed nor the vessel in which the koshering is being done should be used for the previous 24 hours. The koshering process:

The following is the correct, l'chatchilah procedure for koshering utensils by hagalah(40): A pot with clean(41) water is placed on the fire and the water heated to a rolling boil. Care must be taken that the water continues to bubble throughout the koshering process. In certain cases(42), the hagalah is invalid if the water was not bubbling at the time of koshering.

The entire non-kosher utensil, including its handles, is placed inside the bubbling water. It should not be withdrawn immediately nor should it be left in too long(43). A few seconds is the right amount of time for the utensil to be immersed in the bubbling water(44). If a utensil is too large to be inserted all at once into the koshering pot, it may be put in part by part(45). L'chatchilah, care should be taken that no part be put in twice(46). Immediately upon removing the utensil from the koshering pot, it should be rinsed with cold water. B'dieved, if it is not, the hagalah is still valid(47).

Although halachically anyone is permitted to kosher utensils, nevertheless, since the halachos are numerous and complex, hagalah should not be performed without the supervision of a talmid chacham who is knowledgeable in this area. No blessing is recited over the koshering process(48).

1 Gold, silver, copper, steel, aluminum, etc. 2 O.C. 451:8. However, what is known today as "stoneware" is not made from stone. It cannot be koshed; ha-Mesivta, 1998, pg. 424. 3 O.C. 451:8. 4 Rama, ibid. See Mishnah Berurah 57 who rules that utensils fashioned out of a horn may not be koshed, since they may get ruined during the hagalah process. 5 Pri Megadim M.Z., end of 451. 6 Igros Moshe O.C. 2:92. 7 O.C. 451:1. 8 Mishnah Berurah 451:163. 9 Rama O.C. 451:26, regarding Pesach. Year-round, some poskim hold that glass never becomes non-kosher; see Igros Moshe O.C. 5:32. 10 Pri Megadim O.C. 451 quoted in Kaf ha-Chayim 126. 11 In certain cases some of these types of utensils may be koshed if 12 months have

elapsed since they were last used. This can be done only under the supervision of a rav, since there are several factors involved. 12 There are basically 3 groups of opinions in the poskim regarding koshing these materials: Some allow them to be koshed from non-kosher to kosher but not for Pesach; others allow them to be koshed for Pesach as well, while others do not allow koshing them at all. If at all possible, therefore, koshing these items by hagalah is not recommended. In extenuating circumstances, however, a rav has leeway to permit koshing these materials. It is important to mention to the rav the manner in which these utensils were rendered non-kosher, since many poskim allow these materials to be koshed if they were not in direct contact with fire. 13 Mishnah Berurah 451:23 and 57. 14 See Aruch ha-Shulchan 451:20 who maintains that once done it may be used, but other poskim imply that even b'dieved the hagalah should not be relied upon. 15 Pri Megadim 451:19. 16 There are also other issues which need to be explored before declaring a utensil non-kosher, such as the type of food, the amount of food, the degree of heat, etc. All the facts must be presented to a rav for a decision. 17 Mishnah Berurah 451:27. 18 Rama O.C. 451:11 and Mishnah Berurah 67 and Beirur Halachah. 19 Y.D. 121:1. 20 O.C. 451:21. 21 Mishnah Berurah 447:86. 22 There are conflicting opinions concerning vinegar, etc., that was in a utensil longer than 18 minutes; see Tiferes Yisrael, Pesachim 2:4 and Mishnah Berurah 447:42 and 71; 451:124. A rav should be consulted. 23 O.C. 451:14, since the cover is rendered non-kosher through steam, etc. 24 O.C. 451:12. Even the poskim who object to koshing plastic by hagalah will agree that plastic handles may be koshed; see Shearim Metzuyanim b'Halachah 116:10. 25 We are primarily concerned with rust spots inside the utensil. Rust spots on the outside of the utensil which rarely come into contact with food need not be removed; see Mishnah Berurah 451:43. 26 Mishnah Berurah 451:22. 27 See O.C. 451:3 and Mishnah Berurah 22. 28 Mishnah Berurah 451:44. 29 Rama O.C. 451:18. See Mishnah Berurah 102 that these utensils pose other problems as well. 30 Mishnah Berurah 451:120 and 156. 31 Rama O.C. 451:18. 32 Rama 451:16 and Mishnah Berurah 94. See also Beirur Halachah. 33 O.C. 451:3 and Mishnah Berurah 23. 34 Rama O.C. 452:2; Y.D. 121:2. Some poskim require that the utensil not be used at all in the previous 24 hours, even for kosher items. Accordingly, the utensil should be scrubbed clean before the 24 hours begin; see Mishnah Berurah 452:20 and Sha'ar ha-Tziyun 25. 35 See Igros Moshe Y.D. 2:31. See also Chazon Ish O.C. 122:6 and Y.D. 23:1. 36 Mishnah Berurah 452:13. See Hagalah Keilim, pg. 221. 37 Sha'ar ha-Tziyun 452:15. 38 Mishnah Berurah 452:10. If the volume of the water in the koshing pot was sixty times greater than the volume of the non-kosher utensil, then the koshing pot need not undergo hagalah, but this is difficult to calculate. 39 Mishnah Berurah 452:13 and Sha'ar ha-Tziyun 16-17. 40 Unless otherwise noted, all the halachos are based on O.C. 452 and Mishnah Berurah. 41 The water should not be dirty or filled with detergents and cleaners. Even if, during the koshing process, the water becomes dirty or tainted, it should be changed before continuing with the hagalah. 42 It depends whether the utensils became non-kosher by being placed directly on the fire or by coming into contact with heat. A rav must be consulted. 43 Sha'ar ha-Tziyun 452:28. 44 Sha'ar ha-Tziyun 452:3. 45 O.C. 451:11. See Hagalah Keilim, pg. 460. 46 Sha'ar ha-Tziyun 452:28. 47 Mishnah Berurah 452:34. 48 See Darkei Teshuvah Y.D. 121:2; Kaf ha-Chayim O.C. 451:200.

MEDICINES AND COSMETICS FOR PESACH

With the abundance of Kosher for Passover foods on the market today, it has become relatively easy to stock one's kitchen for Passover. But when it comes to inedible items such as medications and cosmetics, there is still much confusion about what is permitted and what is not. In the following review, we will attempt to clarify some of the principles which govern the Pesach laws for such items:

It is a Biblical prohibition to keep any edible chametz item in one's house over Pesach. Even an item which contains only a small admixture of chametz is prohibited(1). One must either get rid of it before Pesach or sell it to a non-Jew together with the rest of his chametz.

"Edible" is defined as an item which is fit for consumption by a dog. If an item becomes so spoiled that even a dog will not eat it(2), it is not considered chametz any more and it may be stored over Pesach. [Chametz items which a dog would eat but are not fit for human consumption, are generally considered prohibited chametz(3).]

It is permitted, therefore, to store and use all types of ointments, hand lotions, nail polish or medicated drops (for the ear or nose), etc., even if they contain an active chametz ingredient. These items are not fit for consumption and as the Rambam and Shulchan Aruch write, 'nifseda tzuras ha-chametz,' they have lost their chametz "form"(4). Similarly, certain cosmetics (eye shadow, eye liner, mascara, blush and rouge) and foot and face powders may be stored and used during Pesach(5).

Although, as stated, an item which is not fit for consumption and has lost its chametz "form" may be stored and used on Pesach, it still may not be eaten. By eating it, its status is elevated from "inedible" to "edible"(6). This re-classification is referred to by the poskim as achshavei, lit., an "elevation", or an upbringing of this item's halachic status. For instance: One is not required to get rid of a charred piece of bread, since it is no longer fit for consumption. One is not, however, allowed to eat it since by doing so, he is "elevating" it to the status of "edible".

There is a debate among the poskim if the prohibition of achshavei applies to items like foul-tasting pills or unflavored liquid medications. Some poskim hold that although these items are not fit for consumption, it is still forbidden to eat them because the person eating such medication elevates their status to "edible." But many other authorities(8) maintain that achshavei applies only to food items which have become unfit and are now being re-classified as food by the person eating them, such as the piece of charred bread previously mentioned. Achshavei does not, however, apply to medications or drugs. The person taking those medications does not intend to reclassify the item as edible; rather he is treating his pain or sickness with something which is inedible. While many poskim are lenient, it has become common practice that whenever possible, only chametz-free medications are ingested in deference to the poskim who are stringent(9). When a chametz-free, foul-tasting medication is not available, a sick person may take the medication, but only under the guidance of a rav(10).

Flavored lipstick, coated tablets, flavored medications, pleasant-tasting cough syrups and the like are generally considered items which are fit for consumption. Unless one is dangerously ill, they may not be taken on Pesach unless it is determined that they are completely(11) chametz free(12).

There are certain items on the market which, at the time of purchase are not fit for consumption but could be "fixed" and made fit, either by cooking (distillation) or by adding certain ingredients to them. The poskim debate as to how the halachah views the status of these items: Do we consider them as "unfit," since presently that is what they are, or do we view them according to their potential to become "fit"?(13) The majority of contemporary poskim rule stringently on this question(14). Accordingly, pure grain-based alcohol - which in its raw state is unfit for drinking - is prohibited to keep on Pesach since, by undergoing a physical change - distillation - it will become fit for consumption.

Many products use denatured alcohol as an ingredient. Denatured alcohol is alcohol which is mixed with small quantities of various chemicals or substances. Some of those products can be restored to their original "fit" status, which in the opinion of the many poskim listed above classifies them as "fit for consumption" even though presently they are not. While not all items containing denatured alcohol can be restored to "fit" status, especially not products using completely denatured alcohol (CDA), it is difficult to judge the potential status of every single item. Accordingly, whenever possible, items containing denatured alcohol should be sold with the chametz and not be used on Pesach.

The issue of restorable denatured alcohol applies only to products which are in a pure liquid state. Some possible examples include cologne, hair spray, deodorants and shaving lotion. Items like creams, hand lotions and ointments do not present a problem. Certain other liquid products, such as shampoo(15), ink(16) and paint are also not restorable to their original alcoholic state and they may be stored and used on Pesach even though they may contain chametz ingredients.

Note, of course, that not all alcohol is chametz. Methanol and Isopropyl alcohol have no chametz components and even ethyl alcohol (ethanol) is not always derived from grain but is sometimes synthesized from chemicals. Only a true expert in these matters can advise one about the exact nature of all these items. Experience has shown that even the manufacturers themselves do not - or cannot - always give reliable, up-to-date information.

A word of caution about perfumes, since the "base" product is "unfit" but the scent added to it may be a "fit" chametz derivative: Some poskim maintain that since the entire purpose of perfume is to exude a fragrance, and the fragrance is "fit", the perfume cannot be classified as "unfit"(17). While many other poskim do not agree with this opinion(18) since, after all, the perfume base itself is not fit for consumption, still it is proper to be stringent and use only such products that contain no fragrance derived from chametz.

[Medications which contain kitniyos may be consumed on Pesach when needed. Toiletries and cosmetics which contain kitniyos may be used on Pesach.]

In conclusion, the leniency of "unfit for consumption" is not a blanket heter to use any medicine or cosmetic on Pesach. Although many products

do fall into this category(19), there are other factors to consider before an inedible product can be permitted for use on Pesach. Products which contain alcohol that can be restored to "fitness" and products which are scented with a chametz derivative are examples of items which should not be stored and used over Pesach, even though, upon superficial examination, they may appear as "unfit for consumption".

FOOTNOTES: 1 Under certain conditions, even a minute amount of chametz will render an entire batch not kosher for Pesach [even if the chametz was added to the mixture before the advent of Pesach]; see Rama O.C. 447:4, Mishnah Berurah 35 and Chazon Ish 119:12. 2 Provided that it reached that stage of spoilage before midday of erev Pesach. 3 While normally an item which is unfit for human consumption is no longer considered non-kosher, chametz is different, since that level of spoilage would still allow the item to remain as sour dough which can make other doughs chametz; Beir Halachah 442:9. See Chazon Ish O.C. 116:8. who rules that if the spoiled chametz can no longer start other doughs, it is permitted, even if it still fit for consumption by a dog. 4 O.C. 442:1; Shulchan Aruch ha-Rav 24; Igros Moshe O.C. 3:62. 5 Sefer Hilchos Pesach, pg. 26. 6 O.C. 442:4 and Mishnah Berurah 20 and 43. 7 Sha'agas Aryeh 74-75; Achiezer 3:34-4. 8 Kesav Sofer O.C. 111; Darkei Teshuvah Y.D. 155:28; Chazon Ish 116:8; Orchos Rabbeinu, Pesach 24; Igros Moshe O.C. 2:92; Harav S.Z. Auerbach (quoted in Shemiras Shabbos K'hilchasah 40:74) 9 See Yechaveh Da'as 2:60; Tzitz Eliezer 10:25-20; Kinyan Torah 4:44; Nishmas Avraham O.C. 466:1. 10 The rav should first determine if the person taking the medication can be classified as a choleh. In addition, certain medications can be mixed together with other food times, rendering the chametz bateil. The rav may also be aware of an alternative medicine. 11 Sha'ar ha-Tziyun 466:6. 12 Shemiras Shabbos K'hilchasah 40:76; Sefer Hilchos Pesach, pg. 23. 13 This issue was already debated by the poskim of the previous generation; see Shearim Metzuyanim b'Halachah 112:8 who quotes the various opinions but does not clearly decide the issue. 14 Harav T. P. Frank (Mikroei Kodesh 54); Harav I. Z. Meltzer, Harav A. Kotler, Harav M. Feinstein and Harav Y. Kamenetsky, quoted in Sefer Hilchos Pesach, pg. 25. 15 Sefer Hilchos Pesach, pg. 26 16 O.C. 442:10. See Knei Bosesim 1:25 who permits using mouthwash even though it has chametz ingredients. 17 See Shoel u'Meishiv (Kama 1:143) and Divrei Malkiel 4:24. 18 See Shearim Metzuyanim b'Halachah 112:7 and Mikroei Kodesh 54. See also ha-Elef Lecha Shelomo O.C. 204. 19 One should not automatically assume about any given item that it is "unfit for a consumption by a dog." If a dog might possibly consume a given item, it may lose its status as "unfit".

Project Genesis: Torah on the Information Superhighway
learn@torah.org 6810 Park Heights Ave. <http://www.torah.org/> Baltimore

Shabbat-B'Shabbato - Parshat Vayikra No 744: 3 Nissan 5759 (20 March 1999) Visit the new Zomet Institute web site:
<http://www.moreshet.co.il/zomet>

WHY DO WE OFFER SACRIFICES? by Rabbi Benayahu Bruner, Head of the Hesder Yeshiva of Tzefat There are many mitzvot related to sacrifices, and they have been included in lists of mitzvot prepared by our sages. However, this seems to contradict the words of Yirmiyahu: "For I did not speak to your fathers and I did not command them on the day I took them out of Egypt about the matter of Olah and sacrifices. But this is what I commanded them: Listen to my voice, and let me be your G-d, and you will be my nation." [7:22-23]. How could Yirmiyahu say "I did not command them," when there are so many mitzvot in the Torah? Many of our sages suggested reasons for the sacrifices, including the Rambam and the Ramban. According to the Rambam, the mitzvot of sacrifices are part of the struggle against idol worship. Sacrifices were a common custom among idol worshippers, and Bnei Yisrael were also used to this practice. The Almighty did not try to abolish it completely but to modify its purpose. No longer to the pagan gods but to the Almighty: "Make FOR ME an altar out of earth" [Shemot 20:21]; "If a man from among you offers a sacrifice TO G-D" [Vayikra 1:2]. The Ramban strongly disagrees with this approach. "This is nonsense ... which transforms G-d's holy table into nothing more than a device to convince the evil and foolish people." As far as he is concerned, a man is sacrificing himself to G-d, instead of the fact that in principle he should have been killed as a punishment for his sins. Thus, the purpose of the sacrifices is educational. The meaning of Yirmiyahu's words is that G-d did not demand empty sacrifices which do not achieve their purpose of listening to the word of G-d. According to the Rambam, in his explanation based on the struggle against idol worship, the purpose of the sacrifices is to establish awareness of the Divinely unique traits in the hearts of the people. Idol worshippers brought sacrifices because they thought the idols needed them, and they would harm the people if they did not receive the sacrifices. The idol worshippers felt that the purpose of the sacrifices was to placate the idols. However, we are well aware that the Almighty does not need our sacrifices, as is written: "Does G-d want Olot and sacrifices more than to

listen to His voice?" [I Shmuel 15:22]. The purpose of the sacrifices is to bring man closer to G-d, by the very fact that they are offered in His name. And that is what the prophet meant to say: the Almighty does not want "the matter of Olah and sacrifices" in return for the redemption from Egypt. The only thing He wants from man is: "Let me be your G-d." "If a man from among you offers a sacrifice to G-d" - According to the Ramban, in bringing a sacrifice, one approaches G-d. According to the Ramban, the emphasis is on the end of the verse, "a sacrifice to G-d;" man's awareness of G-d is enhanced by giving a sacrifice. Sacrifices are unique in that their purpose is an integral part of the mitzva; without the proper intentions, they can be compared to a body without a soul, something which is not desired by the Almighty.

From:

owner-olas-shabbos[SMTP:owner-olas-shabbos@torah.org] Olas Shabbos beShabbato: Rabbi Eliyahu Hoffmann <Hoffmann@torah.org> Parshas Vayikra 5759

All the Best! The Rambam (Maimonides) (Hilchos Issurei Mizbeiach 7:11) writes that when one feeds or clothes the needy, he should give them his finest. And when one builds a synagogue, it should be more beautiful than his own home. An example of this is Abel, who presented Hashem with the choicest of his produce (see Genesis 4:4), which Hashem accepted, unlike the offering of Cain, which was rejected by Hashem, for it was not the best he had. The Rambam concludes by quoting a posuk in our parsha, "Kol cheilev le-Hashem - All of the choicest should be for G-d." This posuk dictates that if one sanctifies something for use in the Beis HaMikdash (Holy Temple), that too should be taken from his finest possessions. It is well known that in Europe, among the most desirable pairs of tefillin (phylacteries) were those containing the parshios (portions of the Torah hand-written on parchment) of the renowned sofer (scribe) R' Moshe P'shevorsker, a disciple of the holy Maggid of Mezritsch. Not only was R' Moshe a saintly man, but he also took meticulous care in writing every letter of the parshios, constructing each one according to the very exacting refinements contained in the Shulchan Aruch (Code of Jewish Law). Furthermore, he wrote each word, and in particular the name of Hashem, with great kavannah (concentration and meaning). It was not easy to find a pair of tefillin written by R' Moshe, and those that were for sale were generally very expensive. The Gerer Rebbe, R' Avraham Mordechai Alter (1866-1948), who was rebbe for more than forty years, owned a pair of R' Moshe P'shevorsker's tefillin. He treasured them, and had a custom of using them only once a year, on erev Yom Kippur. Once, a poor young boy came to the Gerer Rebbe and told him that he couldn't afford a pair of tefillin. "Stay here a moment," said the rebbe, "and I'll see what I can do." Soon, the rebbe returned with a pair of tefillin in his hands. They were his own treasured pair, the ones with the parshios of R' Moshe P'shevorsker. "Here," he said, "I rarely use these tefillin. Take them, and use them in the best of health." When the rebbe's family found out that he had given away his priceless tefillin, they were aghast. They protested and complained. "I don't understand," said the rebbe, "the Torah says kol cheilev le-Hashem f one should give the very best that he has for Hashem's mitzvos." For the mitzvah of tzedakah, he had given away his very best. (Adapted from The Maggid Speaks). Not too long ago, a sefer Torah (Torah scroll) was donated to our beis hamedrash (synagogue) by the father of one of our mispallelim. Although not a sofer by trade, he taught himself how to write, and personally wrote an entire Torah scroll. His wife, not to be left out, felt that she too would like to have a part in this great mitzvah. She sold her diamond engagement ring in order to buy a magnificent silver atarah (crown) for the sefer Torah. We were profoundly inspired by this amazing example of kol cheilev le-Hashem!

This week's publication has been sponsored by Mrs. Jennifer Hoffmann, in honour of the yohrtzeit of her mother, Mrs. Judy Davidoff/Silbert, Mina Yehudit bat R' Eliyahu o.b.m. Olas Shabbos, Copyright (c) 1999 by Rabbi Eliyahu Hoffmann and Project Genesis, Inc. The author is a teacher in

Yeshivas Bnei Zion of Bobov -- Toronto. 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

From: Jonathan Schwartz[SMTP:jschwartz@ymail.yu.edu]

Subject: Internet Chabura -- Parshas VaYikra

Prologue: The Torah opens the book of Torat Kohanim with a discussion of the various korbanot that are brought in the mikdash. One of the individual situations that require a korban, nefesh ki tishava lvateh bsifatayim L"HORA O L"HATIV (when a soul utters an oath for good or bad <5:1>) noting that there are different conditions that require a shavua. Chazal (Chofetz Chaim among others) discuss the difficulty of bringing a korban in a situation where one intended to do something for good. Can a shavua actually go bad? The truth is, we often undertake many responsibilities and are always striving to achieve betterment. Often, our goals are noble but our means or intents are somewhat flawed. As a result, our actions might take us off kilter. This case is specifically likely in the case of utterances of our mouths "Lvateh bsifatayim" the decision to enunciate with our lips can be good at times but can often have catastrophic effects. Sometimes it is better (Lhativ), notes the midrash, to say nothing. This was the case with Lavan who was warned by Yaakov to be careful not to speak to Yaakov Mtov ad ra. Similarly, there are times when too much overt spirituality might lead to sin. This is the focus in this weeks chaburah, examining whether one should write "Baruch Hashem" on documents or whether a different term might be appropriate. It is entitled:

Baruch Hashem or with the aid of shomayim? The Trumas HaDeshen (171) was asked if one could erase the name "yud-yud" that appears in many sidurim. He quotes Tosfos (Shavuos 35a) who notes that the name "alef Daled" which is there to stand for the name Adnus can't be erased (this is brought in halacha Yoreh Deah 276:10 in the Rema) even though the name is not complete since the understood intent of the printer is to use these letters as a reference to Hashem's name. The Trumas HaDeshen holds that the name "yud-Yud" is not like the letters "alef -Daled" and therefore can be erased. He adds the caveat that this is allowed only in cases of great need. (which is how the Rema paskens). Within the explanation of the Terumas HaDeshen is the understanding that the letter "yud" was taken from the name of "Yud-keh Vav-Keh" as a nickname to Hashem's name. As a result, we have reason to be worried about these letters at all. However, "Bet Heh" used to denote "Baruch Hashem" or "Bezrat Hashem" where the letter "heh" does not have a necessary direct connection to any name of Hashem which cannot be erased, should not be a problem. In fact, the letter "heh" seems to be the specific one that is the opening letter of the name Hashem - which can be erased. Even if we were to be machmir and not allow the erasing of the name Hashem, when one writes the abbreviation "B"H" he is not intending to erase it. Perhaps he will erase it, true, but that erasing is not intentional. The issur of erasing any of Hashem's names occurs when one intends to erase the name. This is apparent from the gemara in Sanhedrin (71a) concerning an Ir HaNidachas which cannot be destroyed if it has even one mezuzah because we cannot intentionally destroy the name of Hashem (proving our point acc. To Rabbi Eliezer). It also appears later (Sanhedrin 111b) in the name of the Rabbonon who allow the destruction of the city so long as the mezuzos and other items of kedusha are gathered. The Rambam quotes this opinion L'Halacha (Hil. Avoda Zara 4:15). The question must be raised: Why can we destroy the city? Why are we not concerned that perhaps we overlooked a mezuzah somewhere and we will wind up burning the name of Hashem? The expressed view of the Rabbonon seems to be that the issur of erasing Hashem's name seems to apply to situations when you erase the name with intent. Rabbi Eliezer holds that the intent to destroy the entire city is enough intent to make you chiyav if you do destroy the name of Hashem in the process (see Rabbi Yaakov Arieli, Ohala shel Torah, siman 40). Hence, the Rabbonon's stance is that destroying the name of Hashem in the case of Ir HaNidachas is based upon the logic of Psik Reishah which in this case is lo

nicha leih (destroying the head of achicken on shabbos which he does not want -in hilchos shabbos, often this is grounds for a lenient ruling). Even according to the Rosh (shabbos 14:9) who holds that the concept of psik reishah d'lo nicha leih makes one chiyav except for hil. Shabbos cases would see this case as different because the whole issur here stems from the possuk "Lo Ta'asun kein LaHashem" meaning that which we are commanded to do to avoda zara we cannot do to Hashem. We are commanded to destroy Avoda Zara with intent. Logic dictates that the destruction of Hashem's name requires the same intent in order to be chiyav. L'Halacha, the Piskei Teshuva (193) quotes the Rogatchovewr who notes that one cannot erase even one letter of Hashem's name. As a result, the Rogatchover recommends that one refrain from ewriting B"H and use "Bsiyata D'Shmiya" instead. However, later Chassidic authorities including some of the Gerrer Rebbes quoted the opinion we mentioned before. Namely, the letter "heh" in "B"H" is not a letter of one of Hashem's names. Rather it is a reference to the first letter in the name Hashem which can be erased as can B"H.

INSIGHTS INTO THE DAILY DAF brought to you by Kollel Iyun Hadaf of Yerushalayim Rosh Kollel: Rabbi Mordecai Kornfeld daf@shemayisrael.co.il

YOMA 59-88 have been dedicated to the memory of the late Dr. Simcha Bekelnitzky (Simcha Gedalya ben Shraga Feibush) of Queens N.Y. by his wife and daughters. Well known in the community for his Chesed and Tzedakah, he will long be remembered. Kollel Iyun Hadaf employs a full-time staff; your support is urgently needed. Write to donations@dafyomi.co.il for details. ***YOSEF DA'AS NOW ONLINE! http://www.dafyomi.co.il/ivrit2.htm***

Yoma 71b THE RESPONSE OF SHEMAYAH AND AVTALYON TO THE INSULT OF THE KOHEN GADOL OPINIONS: The Gemara relates that one Motza'ei Yom Kipur, the people were escorting the Kohen Gadol home as he left the Beis ha'Mikdash. When the people saw the two great sages, Shemayah and Avtalyon, they left the Kohen Gadol and went to accompany Shemayah and Avtalyon, to give Kavod to the Torah. When Shemayah and Avtalyon later came to the Kohen to take leave of him, upon seeing them the Kohen Gadol said, "Let the descendants of the [gentile] nations go to peace," insulting them as being converts. They responded to him, "L et the descendants of the [gentile] nations go to peace, who do the acts of Aharon, and let not the descendant of Aharon go to peace, who does not do the act of Aharon!" In what way did Shemayah and Avtalyon feel that they "did the act of Aharon" more than the Kohen Gadol did? (a) RASHI explains that when they said that "the descendants of the nations" do the "acts of Aharon," they meant that they themselves acted in accordance with the attribute of Aharon, who always pursued peace and brotherhood (Avos 1:12). They told the Kohen Gadol that by insulting them, he was not acting in accordance with the attribute of Aharon who pursued peace. (b) The KOZHINITZER MAGID (the "Avodas Yisrael," cited by REBBI TZADOK in Pri Tzadik, Erev Yom Kipur, #3) suggests an original interpretation. The Kohen Gadol had become arrogant after performing the Avodah of Yom Kipur, viewing himself as all-important for having achieved atonement for the Jewish people by entering the Kodesh Kadoshim, the holiest place, on Yom Kipur. It was because of this arrogance that he insulted Shemayah and Avtalyon, pointing out their status as converts, as if to say that it was because of his lofty familial descent that he was privileged to enter the Kodesh Kadoshim and perform the Avodah, which they, with no Yichus to speak of, could never do. They responded to him that his pride was completely out of place. It was not a result of *his* Avodah in the Beis ha'Mikdash that the Jewish people were granted atonement, for certainly the Avodah of an insolent Kohen is not effective (indeed, it was unlikely that he lived for the rest of the year, as the Gemara says earlier on 9a). Rather, they pointed out that it was a result of *their* Avodah that atonement was granted to the Jewish people. Through their prayers on Yom Kipur and their recitation of the order of the Avodah of Yom Kipur with all of the proper Kavanos, they caused the Avodah of the Kohen Gadol to attain atonement for the Jewish people. The Kohen Gadol's Avodah alone was not effective because it was done without the proper Kavanos, sanctity, and purity. It was the Tzadikim who were doing the real Avodah of Yom Kipur. This is what they meant when they said that "the descendants of the nations... do the acts ("Avodah") of Aharon" -- that is, they perform the Avodah that attains atonement for the Jewish people, and not the descendant of Aharon "who does not do the act of Aharon" -- who does not properly perform the Avodah. We might add that they also meant to reply to his remark about the difference between his Yichus and their Yichus. The Gemara in Horiyos (13a) says that the Yichus of Talmidei Chachamim who learn Torah is greater than the Yichus even "of a Kohen Gadol who goes into the Kodesh Kadoshim." Learning Torah confers the greatest Yichus to a person. ... Yoma 73 ... ASSISTING THE "URIM V'TUMIM" OPINIONS: The Gemara asks why does the Kohen Gadol need to have Ru'ach ha'Kodesh in order to receive an answer from the Urim v'Tumim if the letters themselves protrude or join together (see Rashi) to give him the answer. The Gemara answers that it is nevertheless necessary for the Kohen Gadol also to have Ru'ach ha'Kodesh, in addition to the letters protruding or joining together, because by having Ru'ach ha'Kodesh "he assists them." In what way does the Kohen Gadol assist the letters of the Urim v'Tumim? Why is Ru'ach ha'Kodesh necessary? (a) RASHI says that the Kohen Gadol would cogitate with Ru'ach ha'Kodesh, and as a result, his Ru'ach ha'Kodesh would cause the letters to protrude or join together. The RAMBAN (Shemos 28:30) and the RITVA here explain this in much more detail. They explain that Rabbi Yochanan, who says that the letters protrude, and Reish Lakish, who says that the letters join together, are not arguing. The letters both protrude and join together. The Kohen Gadol would first concentrate on the Name of Hashem known as the "Urim," and that would cause the letters to stand out by lighting up ("Urim"). Then, the Kohen Gadol would concentrate on the Name of Hashem known as the "Tumim," and that would enable him to see the correct order of the letters as they joined together ("Tumim" means that they are "Metamem Divreihen," they make their message complete, as the Gemara states on 73b -- see Rashi there). (b)

RABEINU ELYAKIM says that first, the Kohen Gadol would concentrate in order to perceive the answer by himself with Ru'ach ha'Kodesh. After he thought of the answer, he would then check the Urim v'Tumim to verify his answer. This is what the Gemara means when it says that "it (meaning the Urim v'Tumim) would assist him (meaning the Kohen Gadol)." It does not mean that the Kohen Gadol would assist the Urim v'Tumim. (c) The RITVA (end of 73a) writes that "the Urim v'Tumim didn't work for the Mashu'ach Milchamah the same way as it did for the Kohen Gadol, it just helped him." He appears to have had another Girsah in the Gemara. According to his Girsah, the phrase "he assists them" does not answer the question why the Kohen Gadol had to have Ru'ach ha'Kodesh. Rather, it is answering a different question. What question is the Gemara answering according to his Girsah? The CHAFETZ CHAIM (Zevach Todah) explains that the Gemara wanted to know how the Kohen Mashu'ach Milchamah can wear the eight Begadim in order for someone to ask a question of the Urim v'Tumim, when it was unlikely that the Kohen Mashu'ach Milchamah had Ru'ach ha'Kodesh, and thus the Urim v'Tumim would not work! The Gemara answers that, in fact, the Mashu'ach Milchamah's Urim v'Tumim was not entirely reliable. Rather, the answer that it gave served only as a support for the questioner's other reasons to act in that way. Another possible explanation of the Ritva is that his Girsah of the Gemara placed this phrase, "he assists them," at the end of the chapter, and it is answering a different question. The Gemara at the end of the Perek says that the Kohen Mashu'ach Milchamah could serve as the questioner when a question needed to be asked to the Urim v'Tumim (while the Kohen Gadol wore it). We see from there that the Kohen Mashu'ach Milchamah could *not* wear the Urim v'Tumim, but had to ask the question to the Kohen Gadol who wore the Urim v'Tumim. The Gemara answers that it is true that the Kohen Mashu'ach Milchamah may not wear it himself while a question is asked of it, but rather "the Urim v'Tumim assists him" -- i.e. Ravin meant that he has the authority to *ask a question* to the Urim v'Tumim while the Kohen Gadol is wearing it, and the Urim v'Tumim will give him an answer (even though it usually give an answer only to the king or the Sanhedrin). (M. Kornfeld)

Yoma 74 ARE THE FIVE "INUYIM" OF YOM KIPUR MID'ORAISA OR MID'RABANAN? QUESTION: The Mishnah (73b) lists the five Isurim of Inuy on Yom Kipur -- Achilah Shetiyah, Rechitzah, Sichah, Ne'ilas ha'Sandal, and Tashmish ha'Mitah. The Beraisa says that even though all of these acts are Asur on Yom Kipur, only Achilah and Shetiyah are punishable with Kares. The rest are Asur, but without Kares. The Beraisa implies that all of the Inuyim are Asur mid'Oraisa, but they are just not punishable with Kares. If so, why does the Mishnah state that it is permitted for a king and a Kalah to wash their faces, and for a woman who just gave birth ("Chayah") to wear shoes, on Yom Kipur? If these acts are Asur mid'Oraisa, how can the Rabanan make exceptions? ANSWERS: (a) RABEINU TAM in TOSFOS (77a, DH d'Tenan) says that the other Inuyim, besides Achilah and Shetiyah, are only Asur mid'Rabanan and not mid'Oraisa. When the Rabanan prohibited them, they only prohibited them when they give a person pleasure. When they do not provide pleasure but they serve a basic necessity as in the case of a king, Kalah and Chayah, the Rabanan did not prohibit them. (b) RASHI (DH Shabason, and in Shabbos 114b, DH Talmud Lomar Shabason) seems to say that the other Inuyim, in addition to Achilah and Shetiyah, are also Asur mid'Oraisa. This is also the opinion of the RAMBAM (Hilchos Shevisas Asor 1:4-5). If so, why are they permitted in the case of a king, Kalah, and Chayah? The SEFER YERE'IM explains that it is permitted for a king and Kalah to wash their faces, because washing one's face alone is not an Isur d'Oraisa. The Isur d'Oraisa of Rechitzah involves washing one's *entire body*. Washing part of the body is only Asur mid'Rabanan, and in the case of a king and Kalah, the Rabanan permitted it. Why, though, is a Chayah permitted to wear shoes? The TOSFOS YESHANIM suggests that perhaps according to those who hold that the Inuyim are d'Oraisa, the Isur to wear shoes applies only to a "Min'al" (a shoe that covers the entire foot). A "Sandal," though, is Mutar mid'Oraisa. (c) The RAN explains that the Inuyim may in fact be d'Oraisa, but the Torah gave the power to the Chachamim to interpret what is prohibited as an Inuy. The Chachamim determined (based on their understanding of the concept of Inuy) that only an act which is considered pleasurable is Asur as an Inuy. Consequently, it is permitted for a king and Kalah to wash their faces, and for a Chayah to wear shoes, because those acts are not acts of pleasure, but acts of necessity. The Ran asks, though, that the Mishnah (82a) tells us that children are not required to observe the other Isurim of Inuy. The Mishnah implies that an adult is permitted to wash a child. We know, however, that it is forbidden for an adult to feed an Isur d'Oraisa to a child or to help the child perform what the Torah prohibits for adults. How, then, can an adult wash a child on Yom Kipur? The child is certainly being washed for pleasure! (Rashi actually makes this very point on 78b DH Inshi Avdu Lei.) The Ran does not answer this question, but it could be suggested that the Isurim of Rechitzah, Sichah, and Ne'ilas ha'Sandal are all secondary Isurim, which are derived from the Torah's commandment to observe the primary Isurim of Achilah and Shetiyah (which are punishable with Kares). Since it is permitted for an adult to feed a child on Yom Kipur because of Piku'ach Nefesh (it is dangerous for a child to fast), then it is also permitted for an adult to give the child the secondary Isurim which are derived from Achilah and Shetiyah. (See also KESEF MISHNAH, Hilchos Shevisas Asor 1:5 - however, the Gemara on Daf 78b will have to be re-learned according to this assumption, see Insights there.)

"CHATZI SHI'UR" IS FORBIDDEN BECAUSE IT IS CAN COMBINE TO MAKE A FULL "SHI'UR" OPINIONS: Rabbi Yochanan and Reish Lakish argue concerning the Isur of "Chatzi Shi'ur." Rabbi Yochanan says that the Torah forbids Chatzi Shi'ur, and Reish Lakish says that the Torah permits it (and only the Rabanan prohibit it). The Gemara explains that Rabbi Yochanan derives that Chatzi Shi'ur is Asur mid'Oraisa from the verse, "Kol Chelev" (Vayikra 7:23). He gives a logical explanation as well. Since a partial Shi'ur of Isur is able to join another partial Shi'ur to make a complete Shi'ur which is certainly Asur mid'Oraisa ("Chazi l'Itzarufei"), a partial Shi'ur is also Asur. This logic would also explain why Chatzi Shi'ur is forbidden for all Isurim in the Torah, and not just for those that involve eating (see Rashi, Shabbos 74a). The Acharonim suggest a number of ways to understand the logic of "Chazi l'Itzarufei." (a) The most simple understanding is as follows. If one eats a Chatzi Shi'ur and then eats another Chatzi Shi'ur, he will then transgress the Isur d'Oraisa of eating a complete Shi'ur. The Torah therefore prohibits eating the first Chatzi Shi'ur as a safeguard, lest one eat a second Chatzi Shi'ur and transgress by eating a full Shi'ur. According to this explanation, there would be reason to suggest that if a person eats a Chatzi Shi'ur at the very last moment of the day on Yom Kipur, that Chatzi Shi'ur will *not* be Asur mid'Oraisa. Since there is not enough time to eat another Chatzi Shi'ur to add to the first Chatzi Shi'ur that he ate, the logic of "Chazi l'Itzarufei" does not apply, as a number of Acharonim point out (ACHIEZER 2:21 and

others). (b) The CHACHAM TZVI asserts that even according to Rabbi Yochanan, Chatzi Shi'ur is only forbidden by the Torah for prohibitions against *eating*. When one eats something, he gives it value and importance through the act of eating it ("Achshevei"), and therefore it becomes forbidden by the Torah. (That is, the amount of Isur that the Torah forbids is based on the amount that is considered "significant.") The Isur d'Oraisa of Chatzi Shi'ur does not apply to other types of Isurim, such as the Isurim of "Bal Yera'eh and Bal Yimatzei" (not owning Chametz on Pesach), in which case a person does not do any act to give the Isur significance. The Rishonim, however, do apply the Isur of Chatzi Shi'ur to all types of Isurim (see, for example, Rashi Shabbos 74a; Rambam, Perush ha'Mishnayos, Shabbos, end of ch. 12). (c) The SHA'AGAS ARYEH explains that the logic of "Chazi l'Itzarufei" means that the prohibition of Chatzi Shi'ur is more than a safeguard against eating a full Shi'ur. The reason for the prohibition is not just because it brings a person closer to doing an Isur d'Oraisa. Rather, the act of eating a *Chatzi Shi'ur itself* may end up becoming an act that was Asur mid'Oraisa. That is, if one eats more of the Isur, then the first Chatzi Shi'ur that he ate retroactively becomes a part of a full Shi'ur, which is prohibited mid'Oraisa. At the time that he eats the Chatzi Shi'ur, it is like eating a Safek Isur d'Oraisa (because he might eat more later), and therefore it is Asur. According to this explanation, in an Isur such as Bal Yera'eh and Bal Yimatzei it is not possible for Chatzi Shi'ur to be forbidden, because in order to transgress that Isur, the full Shi'ur of kZayis must be in one's house all at one time (since that Isur does not involve doing an action with the Isur). An Isur of Achilah can involve two acts done at two different times (within Kedei Achilah Pras) with two partial Shi'urim which join together to make one full Shi'ur, but when no action is involved, there is no temporal element to join two partial Shi'urim. Therefore, Chatzi Shi'ur should be Mutar d'Oraisa in the case of owning Chametz on Pesach, for the Chatzi Shi'ur cannot turn into an Isur itself. (If another Chatzi Shi'ur of Chametz is brought into the house at a later point, only then from that point on has the first Chatzi Shi'ur become part of an Isur.) In that case, it is certainly Mutar since and there is no question that the original act of Chatzi Shi'ur may retroactively be an act that was prohibited. (See Insights to Pesach Min 45:1.e.) The MINCHAS CHINUCH uses this explanation to answer a question on the Rambam. The RAMBAM (Hilchos Chametz u'Matzah 1:7) rules that eating a Chatzi Shi'ur of Chametz on Pesach is forbidden mid'Oraisa because of a separate verse, "Lo Ye'achel." Why does he need to say that it is Asur because of that verse? We know that Chatzi Shi'ur is Asur for *all* Isurim! (See Kesef Mishnah there.) The Minchas Chinuch explains that perhaps the Rambam understood that the normal Isur of Chatzi Shi'ur does not apply to the Isur of owning Chametz, as the Sha'agas Aryeh says, because that partial Shi'ur will never be Asur as a partial Shi'ur. For this reason the Rambam needs to cite a verse to show that a Chatzi Shi'ur of Chametz is Asur to eat *in and of itself*, and not just because of "Chazi l'Itzarufei." The prohibitions of Bal Yera'eh and Bal Yimatzei were meant to keep a person from transgressing the prohibition of eating Chametz (Avos d'Rebbi Nasan ch 1), and if it is prohibited to eat even half a Shi'ur of Chametz then the prohibitions of Bal Yera'eh and Bal Yimatzei should also apply to half a Shi'ur of Chametz -- even without resorting to the logic of "Chazi l'Itzarufei." (Had the prohibition of *eating* half a Shi'ur of Chametz been because of "Chazi l'Itzarufei," which is a preventative measure but not an Isur in its own right, than the prohibitions of Bal Yera'eh and Bal Yimatzei should not apply, since they would be a preventative measure to prevent the transgression of what is itself only a preventative measure.) (d) The MESHECH CHOCHMAH (Vayikra 7:23) and others explain that perhaps "Chazi l'Itzarufei" means something entirely different. It does not mean that perhaps one will eat a little more later and thereby transgress the full Shi'ur of an Isur d'Oraisa. Rather, the logic of "Chazi l'Itzarufei" means as follows. When the Torah forbids eating a certain item, such as a non-kosher animal, and the Isur depends on eating a minimal Shi'ur, it is not logical to assume that if one eats less than that Shi'ur he is eating a permissible item. The Torah would not permit the meat of a non-kosher animal if one eats less than a kZayis, while forbidding the same meat if one eats a little bit more (and making it punishable with Malkus). If each bite until the Shi'ur of kZayis was permitted, what changed at the last bite, at the point that he ate a kZayis? Why should the last bite of meat be more Asur than the others? Rather, says Rabbi Yochanan, Chatzi Shi'ur is also Asur mid'Oraisa, but one is not liable for Malkus until he repeats the Isur many times by eating a kZayis. "Chazi l'Itzarufei" means that if the Torah forbids a kZayis, it must be that any amount of the item is also Asur, but a person is not punished for it until he eats a Shi'ur of a kZayis. (We could say that the Meshech Chochmah understands that the logic of "Chazi l'Itzarufei" provides a *sign* that Chatzi Shi'ur is forbidden, and not a *reason* to forbid it.) Until now, it was simple to understand how Reish Lakish refutes Rabbi Yochanan's logic of "Chazi l'Itzarufei." He simply says that if eating less than a kZayis is not considered an act of Achilah, who is to say that a preventative measure should be taken and it should be prohibited. In addition, since there is no reason to suspect that the person will eat more of the prohibited food, thereby transgressing an Isur Torah, why should we suspect that the first half-Shi'ur will retroactively become Asur? However, according to the Meshech Chochmah's explanation, how does Reish Lakish refute the logical argument of Rabbi Yochanan by saying that Chatzi Shi'ur is not called Achilah? True, it is not Achilah, but an Achilah is necessary only to be punished with Malkus, not to prohibit the food! Reish Lakish apparently holds that the food itself is not inherently Asur. Rather, the Torah prohibits *person* from performing an "action of Achilah" with the food, and an action of Achilah is defined as consuming a kZayis through the normal manner of consumption. Until that point, he has not done a "Ma'aseh Achilah," and thus everything he ate until now was *Mutar*. Only at the point when he eats a full kZayis has he done an action of Achilah, and transgressed the Isur. (Rabbi Yochanan, on the other hand, holds that eating a kZayis is no different from an act of eating than eating less than a kZayis. The difference between the two is in the quantity of the Isur that was consumed.) (M. Kornfeld)