

INTERNET PARSHA SHEET
ON MATOS MASAI - 5758

B'S'D'

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

Weekly@virtual.co.il Torah Weekly - Matos / Masei * TORAH WEEKLY *
Highlights of the Weekly Torah Portion Parshas Matos / Masei For the week
ending 2 Av 5758 / 24-25 July 1998

Journey "These are the journeys of the Children of Israel" (33:1) Can you remember what you did on a certain Tuesday, five years ago? How about a particular day last year? How about last month? When our lives follow a routine, it becomes very difficult to separate one day from the next. The past seems to spread back behind us like an almost endless gray carpet. Here and there, however, landmarks protrude above the humdrum scenery. A marriage, a birth, a death, a golden wedding. The same is true when we travel. We remember clearly the five minutes we spent at Niagara Falls as though it were yesterday, although it happened ten years ago. We still smell the rain of a tropical rainstorm on Fiji, the fumes of a childhood traffic-jam on the way to Bognor Regis. Travel makes time significant and memorable.

We talk of life being a journey. The essence of life is to journey, to move, to develop. When Hashem appeared to Avraham and told him that he would be the progenitor of a holy nation, it was with the command: "Go to yourself." The essential journey is to the self, to develop the internal landscape of the soul. In order for Avraham to fulfill his potential and be the Father of the Jewish People, he had to go, to journey. Maybe it was for this reason that Hashem didn't tell him his destination. For the destination was not the essence of the journey, rather the journey itself. In this week's Parsha, the Torah lists the 42 encampments of the Jewish People on their journey from Egypt to the Land of Israel. Every time they move camp the Torah repeats the phrase "They journeyed from..." Why was it necessary to repeat this phrase with every encampment? Obviously, if they camped in different places they must have journeyed from the previous place. The Jewish People's journey through the desert was a spiritual rite of passage between the decadence of Egypt and the land flowing with the milk and honey of holiness. It's easier to take the Jew out of Egypt than Egypt out of the Jew. It took 41 separate spiritual journeys to impact on the collective spiritual psyche of the Jewish People and ready them to enter the Promised Land.

Self-Made Man "A thousand from a tribe, a thousand from a tribe" (31:4) People don't know what it is to work these days. When I was a kid I used to get up every morning at 4:30, rain or shine. I'm a self-made man, all right." More elusive than the Loch Ness Monster or the Yeti is a species called the Self-Made Man. Reports of his existence are very frequent, but to date he has never been positively identified. All the thousands of reported sightings have turned out to be mistaken wishful thinking. Let's take a look at a typical reported sighting: Morris is one of the biggest corporate stock whizzes on Wall Street. He is president of Huge and Wealthy International Inc., a top Fortune 500 company. Morris gets up every morning at 4:30 and works non-stop until late at night. But did Morris give himself this strength, this drive, or does it come from somewhere else? The bankruptcy courts are littered with financial whizzes who had no way of knowing that the bottom would drop out of their market, despite all the genius of their planning. And even those who make it to the top like Morris, can, in a few seconds, succumb to a heart attack, and the president of Huge and Wealthy International Inc. can suddenly become a statistic in a study on heart disease. When we're successful, it's all too easy to pat ourselves on the back and congratulate ourselves on how clever we are. In order to keep a true perspective as to where our success really comes from, we need constant reminders. In this week's Parsha, the Torah tells us that for every thousand soldiers that went out to fight for the Jewish People, another thousand stayed behind and prayed for them. For

each soldier at the front, there was another "soldier" responsible to pray for his counterpart. You might think that this was to give those at the front added protection. The real reason, however, was that those who were fighting shouldn't be under any illusion as to where their success came from. Not by the strength and the might of their own hand were they victorious in battle; rather their success -- like all success -- came from Hashem, the maker of the "Self-Made" Man.

I'm Not Me "If a man takes a vow to Hashem or swears an oath to establish a prohibition on himself." (30:3) Teshuva (return) is a miracle. How can someone who has transgressed, eradicate what has been? For teshuva doesn't just gain forgiveness for our errors, it rewrites history. It removes all scars of sin. How can this be? After all, what was done was done. It happened. How can teshuva re-weave the very fabric of reality?

Imagine the following: It's Shabbos. A Jew turns on a light. One scenario. But three possible realities: Reality number one: Man to second man "Don't turn the light on! It's Shabbos! You're transgressing a capital offense! Don't touch that switch!" Second man to first man. "I know it's Shabbos. I know it's a capital offense and I'm still going to do it. Watch me!" Click. Second reality: "Wow! I can't believe I just did that! I turned the light on. I completely forgot it was Shabbos!" Third reality: "And the next thing I knew, I fell back and my arm hit the light switch and the light went on!" Shabbos. A Jew turns on a light. One scenario. Three different realities. When we do teshuva, we are saying it wasn't really us who did the transgression. That person may have the same eyes, nose and hair as me. He may be my doppelgänger. He may even answer to my name. But that's not me! I'm a different person. I did teshuva. In this week's Parsha, the Torah teaches us about the binding nature of a neder, a vow. A neder is binding. It gives a person the ability to do something that heretofore only G-d could do: To create a new halachic status, a new reality. If a neder alters the reality of the world, then how can there exist the ability to nullify a neder? That's like re-weaving the world? The answer is that if a person had known certain information at the time of making the neder, he would never have accepted the vow upon himself. He is saying: "The person who made that neder is not really me."

Long Night's Journey into Day "These are the journeys of the Children of Israel, who went forth from the land of Egypt ... at the hand of Moshe and Aharon." (33:1) Nothing that the hand of man creates can endure for eternity. Statues crumble; poetry is forgotten. Nothing lasts forever. For this reason, the redemption from Egypt was not final, for it came "at the hand of Moshe and Aharon." For all their lofty spiritual height, they were no more than flesh and blood. It was inevitable, therefore, that the Jewish People would be subject to other exiles, since their Exodus from Egypt was mortal and this-worldly, and thus incomplete. "These are the journeys of the Children of Israel" -- these are the journeys of exile that the Children of Israel will undergo throughout the long night of history because "they went forth from the land of Egypt ... at the hand of Moshe and Aharon." In the future, however, when Hashem redeems His people, there will be no human imperfection in the redemption, and thus it will be complete and eternal.

Sources: * Journey - The Malbim, heard from Rabbi Dovid Orlofsky * Self-Made Man - based on Rabbi Chatzkel Levenstein heard from Rabbi Yehoshua Bertram * I'm Not Me - heard from Rabbi Dovid Orlofsky * Long Night's Journey into Day - Kesones Ohr in Mayana shel Torah Written and Compiled by Rabbi Yaakov Asher Sinclair General Editor: Rabbi Moshe Newman Production Design: Eli Ballon (C) 1998 Ohr Somayach International

Peninim on the Torah Rabbi A. Leib Scheinbaum Hebrew Academy of Cleveland Parshas Matos

Hashem spoke to Moshe saying, "Take vengeance for the Bnei Yisrael against the Midyanim; afterward you will be gathered unto your people. (31:1,2) Moshe is instructed to seek vengeance for the harm Midyan caused Bnei Yisrael. Chazal tell us that Moshe responded to Hashem, "If we had been idol worshippers they would not have harmed us. They persecuted us

only because we believe in You. Therefore, the vengeance is Yours, Hashem, not mine." Thus, when Moshe conveyed Hashem's message to Bnei Yisrael, he spoke only of avenging Hashem's honor, not his own. Moshe's death was connected with executing vengeance against Midyan. The Yalkut Shimoni tells us that Hashem was apparently aware of Moshe's distress over his "inability" to respond to Zimri's blatant desecration of Hashem's Name, as well as his own personal humiliation. Hashem told Moshe, "By your life, you will not leave this world until you will see their vengeance." We may infer that the degradation of a gadol, Torah leader, is a grave sin. It cannot be passively overlooked, like so many other transgressions. To disgrace a gadol is to denigrate Torah. Hashem Himself will seek vengeance for this iniquity. Moshe's response to Hashem is noteworthy. He suggested that Midyan was not concerned with us as a people. We would not affect their lives in any way. They hated us for one reason - our belief in Hashem. Midyan's war against the Jews was actually a war against the Almighty. They would do whatever possible to sever Klal Yisrael's relationship with Hashem. In their spiritual war, they chose to undermine our fidelity to Hashem by encouraging licentiousness and idol-worship. We are but pawns in the battle. Moshe asserted that Midyan was waging war with the Almighty. It was actually "nikmas Hashem," a vengeance for Hashem. Moshe's perception was correct: Midyan's conflict was with Hashem. One who is antagonistic to Judaism is by inference hostile to the Almighty. Moshe's vengeance was the Almighty's vengeance. And Moshe gave to them, to the Bnei Gad, and the Bnei Reuven and half of the tribe of Menashe ben Yosef. (32:33) In the previous text, we find that Bnei Gad and Bnei Reuven requested to remain in Eiver HaYarden. How did shevet Menashe enter into the situation? Moreover, why did only a part of shevet Menashe stay? Last, why did they receive such a large parcel of land? The Ramban contends that actually Moshe asked for volunteers to join the two tribes who remained in Eiver HaYarden. Part of the tribe of Menashe responded, probably because of their abundant flocks. In his commentary on Sefer Devarim, the Netziv claims that Moshe insisted that part of shevet Menashe move to Eiver HaYarden. No Jewish community can maintain its spiritual status quo unless Torah scholars are in their midst, teaching, disseminating Torah and inspiring people to follow the standard they exemplify. The tribe of Menashe included such people. Only after they consented to move east did Moshe agree to let Bnei Gad and Bnei Reuven remain. By doing so, Moshe meant to set a precedent for all future generations, asserting that a community has viability only if it also has dedicated Torah scholars among its active members. In Pirkei Avos 6:9 the Mishnah addresses the issue of living in a Torah environment, presenting the correct attitude one must manifest towards this endeavor: Rabbi Yosi ben Kisma said, "I was once walking on the road, when a man met me and greeted me. I returned his greeting. He said to me, 'Rabbi, from what place are you?' I told him, 'From a great city of scholars and teaching scribes am I.' He said to me, 'Rabbi, would you be willing to live with us in our place?' I would then give you a million dinarii and precious stones and pearls.' I answered him, 'Were you to give me all the silver and gold and precious stones in the world, I would live nowhere but in a place of Torah.'" On the surface, this simple narrative demonstrates how a talmid chacham, Torah scholar, reacted in a specific situation, indicating his overriding desire to reside only in a makom Torah, a community where the study of Torah reigns. The commentators, however, perceive that this Mishnah teaches us a number of compelling lessons. First, let us address the actual dialogue which ensued between Rabbi Yosi and his would-be benefactor. The man offered him an opportunity to improve his situation by moving to another city. Why did Rabbi Yosi immediately respond with a negative attitude? What prompted him to think that the city in which the man lived was not a place of Torah? Abarbanel suggests the answer lies in the formulation of the stranger's offer. When one is willing to pay an exorbitant sum of money for a commodity, it must be rare. If people are prepared to pay a million dollars for a Torah scholar, obviously the place must be bereft of Torah. We suggest that the stranger's attitude created a negative impression. He presented himself as a person who is used to getting what he wants - through money. He felt he could "buy" a Torah scholar. A city where the Torah scholars are "bought"

and "sold" as a commodity is not a place that can be considered a makom Torah. Furthermore, a Torah scholar is not engaged simply by offering him money. Did he investigate Rabbi Yosi? Did he have him tested? The stranger's alacrity was indicative of his attitude. Reb Yitzchak Bunim, zl, notes the "pronoun" "I" (will give you a million...) in the stranger's offer. A man who speaks for the community has no right to say "I," unless he is really implying that he represents the entire community. His power and position determine who will be hired. In effect, he was doing the hiring and dispensing of the salary. A community that has a single person "in charge," one individual who makes or controls the decisions, one person who -- due to his financial standing -- is obsessed with the pronoun, "I," is not a place for a ben Torah to live. After all was said and done, the situation was that a man of means offering support to Rabbi Yosi in a splendid and dignified manner. Rabbi Yosi would no longer have to worry about the source of his next "dollar." He could have immersed himself totally in the study of Torah. Is that really such a difficult proposition to accept? Furthermore, with all that money, even if the community was not Torah oriented, they would have been able to "buy" Torah. They would have had the means to bring in a kollel, build a Yeshivah and schools that would properly address the needs of their youth. What could be so bad? Reb Yitzchak Bunim feels the answer lies in the information that the stranger omitted. He did not mention a proposal to build a Yeshivah, arrange for community study groups, a shul, a mikvah -- any of the usual "staples" a Torah community needs to survive. Neither did he indicate that the people would support a school - morally or financially. He merely was prepared to offer a sizable salary/bribe to have a rabbi dwell among them, to dignify their community. He was not asking the rabbi to "do" anything - to teach, to build a Torah community. He sought a Torah "presence," the way some people desire a nice garden. This type of offer was an opportunity for stagnation and disaster, not creativity and growth. Last, the words of my rebbe, Horav Chaim Mordechai Katz, zl, appropriately summarize the reason for Rabbi Yosi's refusal. "We must realize," the Rosh Hayeshiva was wont to say, "you cannot create a makom Torah with money alone. One must apply blood, sweat, and tears to build Torah." Mesiras nefesh, self-sacrifice, heart's devotion, unstinting dedication to Torah ideals and values - these are the basic ingredients required for Torah to blossom in a community. Money cannot create a Torah atmosphere. Is it any wonder that Rabbi Yosi refused the offer?

Parshas Masei These are the journeys of Bnei Yisrael...and they journeyed...and they rested...(33:1) "And they journeyed...and they rested." These words are repeated forty-two times in this parsha. These words must be special if the Torah mentions them so many times. The Torah contains no redundancy, not even an extra letter. Why would the Torah dedicate so much space to the journeys of Bnei Yisrael? Is it pertinent for us to know where they stayed and where they went? Chazal address this question, explaining with an analogy to a king who had taken his sickly son to a distant place to be cured. On their return trip, the king pointed out to his son the various incidents that took place in each city. "Look, my son, at this spot we slept, at the other place you were overcome with fever, at this spot you were subdued with intense pains, etc." Likewise, Hashem points out to us the "stops" along our journey, so that we will learn from them. He notes the places where we erred, where we sinned and where our actions caused contention and strife. People think that to correct life's mistakes we must live over again. This is not the Torah perspective. To paraphrase Horav Moshe Swift, zl, "To make right the wrongs we have committed, we have only to look back." Our corrections can be made on the same journey; all we need to do is open our eyes and look back. Opportunities will arise when we will be confronted with the same challenges, the same problems, the same desires. Only this time we will be prepared, we will be armed with the lessons of the past so that we can confront the present. We can then be assured of a healthy future. "Here we slept:" We allowed an opportunity for growth, a chance for success, to escape. "Here we were overcome with pain:" We allowed periods of depression to overcome us. We deferred to the fear of rejection; we were afraid to chance success due to the risk of failure. "Here we rested from the heat:" We accepted the status quo, allowing ourselves to be spoiled by our

prosperity and good fortune. As long as we learn from our past - "va'yisru and va'yachnu," "they journeyed and they rested," is not redundant. The importance of reflecting upon the past cannot be overemphasized. Tisha B'Av, our day of national mourning, commemorates the destruction of the two Batei Mikdash. If we remember the tragedy, but do not deliberate over the entire period - what preceded the destruction and our reaction -- we would denigrate the memory of this sad period. If we forget one stage in our history, we cannot make amends; the lesson will be lost. Horav Swift suggests that this is the reason that the special Haftorah of rebuke for the "Nine Days" -- from Rosh Chodesh Av until Tisha B'Av -- takes precedence over the Haftorah of Rosh Chodesh. Shabbos Rosh Chodesh will occur again: We will never retrieve the tragic loss and never rebuild the ruins, however, if for a single year we do not heed Yirmiyah Ha'navi's anguished cry. "Listen to the word of Hashem, House of Yaakov, and all the families of Bais Yisrael." We must not ignore the mistakes of the past or forget to address our former errors, thereby silencing the cry of the Navi. "Only he who mourns Yerushalayim will merit to behold her joy." The privilege of sharing in the consolation and joy is reserved for those who have mourned - who have reflected on their errors and who seek to rectify the faults that precipitated the tragedy. These people will merit to share in the rebuilding of Yerushalayim.

And a murderer shall flee there, one who takes a life unintentionally...for he must dwell in his city of refuge until the death of the Kohen Gadol. (35:11,28) Had the Kohen Gadol prayed with greater devotion, had he entreated Hashem to arrange that fatal accidents not occur during his tenure as Kohen Gadol, they might not have happened. Chazal tell us that the Kohen Gadol's mother supplied the unintentional murderers with food and clothing, so that they would not pray for her son's premature death. It seems difficult to accept that food and clothing would take precedence over one's liberty. One has only to ask a person who has been incarcerated for an extended period of time, to determine whether food and clothing would be an acceptable trade for his liberty. Yet, we see that Chazal attribute success to the Kohen Gadol's mother's strategy. Why did it work? Horav Meir Bergman, Shlita, gives a penetrating answer based upon the foundation of prayer. Prayer has the ability to stretch the boundaries of nature; it is a vehicle for engendering miracles. This is only true if the prayer emanates from the innermost recesses of the heart, when it is an expression of one's inner being, his real essence. For prayer to have the ability to transcend the laws of nature, it must be real; it must have integrity; it must be from the heart. When the Kohen Gadol's mother benefitted the unintentional murderer, she knew that ultimately the exiles would be compelled to demonstrate their gratitude to her. Once this debt of gratitude was ingrained in their psyche, they would no longer be able to pray wholeheartedly for their deliverance. They would always think to themselves, "How can I pray for the Kohen Gadol's death, if his mother has been so kind to me?" Indeed, a heart whose allegiances are divided cannot achieve a significant response through prayer. The Kohen Gadol really had very little to fear. <http://www.shemayisrael.co.il> Jerusalem, Israel

Parsha Encounters Taken from our website
<http://www.cckollel.org/parsha.shtml>

Parshas Mattos-Masei Rabbi Zvi Kamenetzky
 Something For Nothing The beginning of Parshas Mattos focuses on the laws of nedarim, which describe man's ability to take on new obligations or restrictions in activity. The Torah also provides the opportunity to nullify an oath. Included in this, is a father and husband's power to "break" a self-imposed vow of deprivation taken by his wife or young daughter, if he does so soon after hearing it. Such authority is given based upon the assumption that a husband and father are familiar with the willpower of those who are close to them, and may absolve them of their painstaking aspirations. However, even after a man diffuses his wife or daughter's potential to transgress, the Torah concludes with a puzzling epilogue: "And Hashem will forgive her" (Bamidbar 30:6). Why is there

a need for forgiveness here? Wasn't the potential problem already nipped in the bud? Before any sin was committed, the man, with vision and foresight, broke the obligation, thus negating the necessity for forgiveness by G-d. How are we to understand this need to atone for a clean slate?

Rashi quotes a famous Gemorah in Nedarim that explains the scenario of this mysterious verse. A woman, not aware that her husband nullified her vow of abstention, gives in to her inclination and transgresses. Although no sin was actually committed because her neder was already void, she still requires the forgiveness of G-d, for attempting to transgress what she thought to be a sin.

The Gemorah in Kiddushim, 81b, elaborates on this concept of the Torah requiring forgiveness for a sin never committed. We learn that when Rebbe Akiva would read the pasuk "And Hashem will forgive her," he would cry out, "If someone who intended to consume pork but instead consumed lamb and needs forgiveness, then certainly one who intends to eat pork and actually consumes it, requires Hashem's forgiveness!"

Strange, is it not? Judging by his emotional reaction, it seems that Rebbe Akiva was confused about the halacha. It almost seems that only after learning this pasuk, which describes a woman requiring forgiveness for a sin never committed, that Rebbe Akiva was able to deduce that an intentional aveirah requires atonement. Was this kal v'Echomer's forterti deduction, really necessary for Rebbe Akiva? I heard my rebbe, HaGaon Rav Elazar Menacham Man Shach, the Ponovizher Rosh Yeshiva, shlita, explain this concept with remarkable insight. We tend to think that Hashem only takes note of those activities of a purely spiritual nature - prayer, Torah learning, acts of kindness, and the like. But what about activities performed during a time of relaxation, or even physical indulgences that fill the gaps of time in between our spiritual obligations? A few quiet moments will often provide us with the necessary peace of mind to prepare for the next day of mental turbulence. Is there room for reward and recognition when we go out and play ball with our kids? What about a night out for dinner with our spouse?

The answer is a resounding, Yes! Our mission in this world is to utilize all of the physical pleasures that G-d has provided us with as tools for His service. If we take a vacation in order to recharge our strength for avodas Hashem, then we've used our time and abilities for something positive and we are rewarded for that.

However, this concept does not apply if the intention is not geared for spiritual growth because then the physical pleasure has no value for G-d. When one wastes their potential to grow, this requires forgiveness. This is the case of a woman eating cheesecake and thinking that she is prohibited by a vow. Even though she didn't actually transgress because the vow was annulled, still nothing was gained from her intentions and for that, she is in need of kaparah.

For this, Rebbe Akiva cried. We are under the impression that when we sin, we will only pay for distancing ourselves from G-d and His service, an obvious observation, but Rebbe Akiva saw so much more from the lesson of this woman. She did nothing wrong, yet she needs forgiveness because she performed an act which involved no gain in her service of Hashem. For this he cried, realizing how precious each opportunity is and how every action, even seemingly meaningless indulgences, have the potential to carry endless rewards. Yes, we can get something for "nothing" - a simple act, but conversely lose so much as well. It all depends on our intentions.

Rabbi Zvi Kamenetzky is a rebbe at the Fasman Yeshiva High School of Bais Hamedrash L'Etora in Skokie. He is also a member of the Mifal Hashas Chaburah at the Chicago Community Kollel. Parsha Encounters is _ 1998 by the Chicago Community Kollel

Owner-drasha@torah.org Kohein-In-Waiting -- DRASHA - PARSHAS MATOS-MASEI

There is a fascinating law in this week's portion. The Torah tells us that one who kills accidentally must be banished to a city of refuge. The Torah refers to an accident that is tinged with a bit of negligence, not a total mishap or a death tainted with intent. The cities of refuge were the home of the

Levites, whose life's mission was service to others. Thus a lesson in care and concern during the murderer's stay would elevate of his soul. The Torah tells us very unique terms of release. The killer was to stay in the city of refuge until the Kohein Gadol (High Priest) died. Of course, the scene among his Levite neighbors, who were the protectors of the Kohein Gadol mourning the loss of their beloved leader, would put the murderer's joy of freedom in perspective. It would be almost impossible to be exuberant with his own release amongst the thousands of residents mourning their leader - and that would be another lesson, before his new life in society. But the Torah identifies the Kohein Gadol, whose death results in the killer's release, in a strange way. "He (the killer) shall remain (in the city of refuge) until the passing of the Kohein Gadol who he anointed" (Numbers 35:25). The Talmud in Makos is baffled by the words who he anointed. It somewhat implies that the killer had to do with the Kohein's anointing - and that just cannot be.

After all wasn't the Kohein anointed way before the accident occurred? The Talmud answers. True. This verse implies that if, after the time of the accident but before its judicial resolution, a new Kohein Gadol is anointed, then the killer only is released after the new Kohein's death. The Talmud asks why? This new Kohein Gadol was not around during the accident? True he was appointed before the verdict, but he was appointed after the death occurred. Why is he somehow involved the verdict of the accused? Why is his death the redeeming factor for the accused? Why is he punished? The Talmud answers that if there was a trial during the new Kohein's tenure, he should have prayed for the welfare of the accused. He should have interceded and prayed in order to mitigate a verdict of exile. Therefore, if the verdict came in his tenure, the man is released with his death. It is quite difficult to understand. How is an incoming Kohein Gadol, during the most exciting and prestigious period of his career expected to worry about the verdict of a man, he has never heard of, who is accused of manslaughter.

Rabbi Chaim Kanievski, of B'nei Berak, Israel, the son of the Steipler Gaon of blessed memory, is known for his amazing breadth of Torah Knowledge which is only paralleled by his great diligence in Torah study. With the passing of his father more than a decade ago, people from all walks of life line up in front of his home seeking answers to complex Torah and personal questions. But his greatness and wisdom were known to hundreds in the yeshiva world for many years. Many years ago, as a student in the Ponovez Yeshiva, I heard an amazing story. A young man came to Reb Chaim with a long list of questions. Reb Chaim seemed a bit preoccupied but the visitor insisted in asking the questions, to which Reb Chaim responded, one by one. Suddenly Reb Chaim began tidying himself up and put on a recently pressed kapote and new hat, and asked the young man's indulgence. He had to go somewhere but he allowed the visitor to accompany him. The younger man did, peppering him with questions the entire way. They walked a few blocks until they reached a wedding hall. Upon entering, Reb Chaim embraced the groom with a warm hug and kiss and apologized for the delay. Reb Chaim sat himself among the prestigious

Rabbonim who graced the dais as they prepared the marriage documents. The persistent questioner was almost oblivious to the scene and continued to ask as more questions and eliciting responses. Reb Chaim tried to juggle the needs of the groom while trying to accommodate the visitor who had besieged him with problems. But the persistent questioner received the shock of his life when, as the music began, heralding the march to the badekin, where the groom, flanked by his father and father-in-law, met the bride and covered her face with the veil. The groom rose from his seat and immediately his future father-in-law took hold of his arm. The groom's father took hold of the other arm. But before he did so, the groom's father turned around and apologized to the stranger who he had been talking to for the last hour or so. He said that would be unable to help him until after the ceremony. And then Rabbi Kanievski nodded Mazel Tov to the hundreds of well-wishers and began the procession to his own son's wedding!

The Torah tells us that the Kohein Gadol-elect, waiting to be anointed to the most spiritual position in Judaism has a responsibility to worry about the welfare of the common man - even those accused of manslaughter. He should worry about his welfare and the verdict on his life. There is no greater

inauguration to the responsibilities of priesthood than the concern for every single one of us.

Dedicated by the Hirsch Family in memory of Henry Hirsch of blessed memory My apologies to those of you who did not get Drasha (Parsha Parables) for Parshas Pinchas. Mordechai Kamenetzky - Yeshiva of South Shore rmk@torah.org 516-328-2490 -- Fax 516-328-2553
<http://www.yoss.org> for drasha <http://www.torah.org/learning/drasha>
 Copyright (c) 1998 by Rabbi M. Kamenetzky and Project Genesis, Inc.
 Rabbi Mordechai Kamenetzky is the Rosh Mesivta at Mesivta Ateres Yaakov, the High School Division of Yeshiva of South Shore,
<http://www.yoss.org/> Project Genesis: Torah on the Information Superhighway learn@torah.org 6810 Park Heights Ave.
<http://www.torah.org/> Baltimore, MD 21215 (410) 358-9800

Hamaayan@torah.org Hamaayan / The Torah Spring Edited by Shlomo Katz Matot-Masei 2 Av 5758

R' Moshe Tzurriel shlita writes: R' Samson Raphael Hirsch z"l comments that the mourning period of the Three Weeks, beginning on the seventeenth of Tammuz and lasting until the ninth of Av, is to be taken as an unfolding drama and not as a period of isolated afflictions. The various phases of remembrance include: the beginning of the siege of Jerusalem, the capture of the city, the burning of the Temple, and the murder of the kohanim. In other words, the historical fact of military defeat at the hands of the Babylonians (First Temple) or the Romans (Second Temple) was not the last word. The punishment for national sins was an ongoing process, capable of being halted at any step; more so, capable of being reversed from catastrophe to victory, if only we would have seized the opportunity to repent. It is never too late to return to G-d. Even as the flames licked at the sacred altar, if our ancestors had changed heart and returned to Torah loyalty, G-d would have reversed the disaster. That is why when Caramel, a cousin of the Prophet Yirmiyah came to the latter to sell his field, G-d ordered Yirmiyah to make a proper legally-binding deed, with good witnesses etc. (see Yirmiyah Ch. 32). Yirmiyah objected, "Behold the siege-works are being clasped against our city walls so to capture it, the city is falling before the sword, hunger and (subsequent) plague. What you proclaimed will be is being actualized - and yet you say, 'Make a legal and binding sale of the field?!'" Hashem answered, "True, I am the G-d almighty, is there anything impossible for Me? The Babylonians are burning the houses . . . yet I will still gather together the dispersed Jews from all their places of captivity, I will bring them back to Israel and they will dwell securely. They will be My people and I will be their G-d. I will give them one heart and one path, so that they fear Me forever. Therefore fields will be negotiated, since I will return their exiles." We learn from the above that the destruction was done in stages, allowing Bnei Yisrael to halt or alter it. This ability to stem the tide of disaster, this ability to be reborn and start life afresh, stems from G-d's mastery of history, G-d's manifest providence. The flood tides of countless persecutions all passes over our heads; individuals die, but the nation as a whole continues in full force. We reel with the forces of the waves, flexible as reeds, but immediately afterwards we stand spiritually erect, firm as oaks (see Taint 20a). We are resigned to our destiny, but steadfast in our obligations. (From Destruction and Correction, an e-mail lecture)

Matot "Moshe spoke to the heads of the tribes of Bnei Yisrael saying, 'This is the thing that Hashem commanded.'" (30:2) "To the heads of the tribes" may be translated, "Regarding the heads of the tribes." In other words, Moshe spoke to Bnei Yisrael regarding the heads of the tribes, and he said, "Whatever the heads of the tribes say, you should regard it as if that is the thing that Hashem commanded." One must obey the decrees of the Sages no less than the decrees of G-d Himself. (Torat Moshe; quoted in Ma'ayanah Shel Torah) Why, of all of the Torah's laws, do the laws of vows open with a reminder about the importance of obeying the Sages? Also, why is it that rabbis can annul vows? The answer is that the Torah expects a Jew to order his lifestyle according to the will of the Torah scholars. It therefore follows that, "Whoever takes a vow does so only if the rabbis approve." If the rabbis

do not approve of a specific vow, they can annul it. When one does not consult with rabbis, he may inadvertently sin precisely when he thinks he is performing a mitzvah. To take an extreme example, one may build an altar in his backyard and sacrifice an animal on it. Even if he is exacting in all of the laws of the sacrifices, he commits a grievous sin by bringing a sacrifice outside of the Temple. (Avnei Ha'azel; quoted in Ma'ayanah Shel Torah)

R' Mordechai Gifter shlita writes that the obligation to submit to the opinions of Torah scholars comes from our recognition that they are our link to Moshe Rabbenu and the giving of the Torah. From this deep conviction, he writes, Jews have derived the fundamental principle of *emumat chachamim*/faith in Torah sages: to believe in and be convinced of the correctness of the teachings of Torah sages. In the words of Chazal, even when they tell you that right is left and left is right - even when you feel that you know better, you must submit to their words. Woe to the generation that seeks to know the Torah's "right" and "left" but that seeks it according to its own understanding instead of according to the wisdom of the Torah itself. (Adapted from Torah Perspectives pp. 14-15)

Masei "My master was commanded by Hashem to give the inheritance of Tzlofchad our brother to his daughters." (36:2) R' Avigdor Nebenzahl shlita taught: Chazal (Bava Batra 119b) praise the daughters of Tzlofchad: "The daughters of Tzlofchad were wise, they were expounders of Torah, and they were righteous." The gemara explains that they were wise in that "they spoke in a timely fashion," they posed their question to Moshe precisely when Moshe was studying and teaching the laws of *yibum*/levirate marriages. What made these women wise was that they understood the true purpose of inheriting from their father. They did not simply desire his gold, silver, or even his portion in the Land of Israel. They realized that the purpose of inheritance was to provide a *tikkun*/correction for the soul of the departed. The Torah mandates that inheritance go to the next of kin. If there is a son, the son inherits, if there is not a son, then a daughter, and so forth as prescribed by the Torah in Parashat Pinchas. The reason the inheritance must go to relatives is because when one inherits his father's land, one can provide a *tikkun* for the father's soul. The same can be said of *yibum*. Rambam writes that although the law of *yibum* (that if a man dies childless his widow should marry his brother) applies only to the deceased's brother, the deeper meaning of this halachah applies to other relatives as well. Thus, the story of Yehuda's relationship with Tamar is referred to as one of *yibum*, as is Boaz's marriage to Ruth. Although the strict halachah cannot be fulfilled by other relatives, the *tikkun* can certainly be accomplished by them. The daughters of Tzlofchad applied this principle to all inheritance. Hashem gave a man a wife, as well as all his worldly possessions, in order to serve Hashem. If a man was unable to apply to the utmost in serving Hashem that which he had during his lifetime, his next of kin can provide a *tikkun* for that situation by inheriting it and using it in the correct manner. (R' Nebenzahl says that this is how his teacher, R' Eliyahu Dessler z"l understood the request of Tzlofchad's daughters.) The Torah (Bereishit 33:19) relates how Yaakov Avinu purchased a field. The Torah tells of this incident because purchasing a field in the Land of Israel is akin to acquiring for oneself a portion in the World to Come. The daughters of Tzlofchad felt that through them, their father would merit a share in the land of Israel and thus in the next world. Although one may argue that if inheriting the land is what provides the *tikkun*, then it need not be the daughters that inherit; perhaps if Tzlofchad's brothers had inherited, the same *tikkun* could be accomplished. However, Tzlofchad's daughters understand that the *tikkun* is greater if closer relatives such as themselves are the heirs. (From a lecture delivered at Yeshivat Hakotel 20 Tamuz 5758)

Hamaayan, Copyright (c) 1998 by Shlomo Katz and Project Genesis, Inc.
Posted by Alan Broder, ajb@torah.org.
<http://www.torah.org/learning/hamaayan/>.
<http://www.acoast.com/~sehc/hamaayan/> 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

The Jerusalem Post Internet Edition July 24, 1998 1 Av 5758 SHABBAT SHALOM: The shallow joys of exile By RABBI SHLOMO RISKIN

(July 23) "Now the children of Reuben and the children of Gad had a very great multitude of cattle; and they saw the land of Jazer, and the land of Gilead that beheld the place was a place for cattle..." (Num. 32:1)

I once had the privilege of taking a group of students to visit the first prime minister of Israel, David ben-Gurion, in his Negev retirement home. After providing the group with a fascinating description of the life of the early pioneers, he asked to spend a few moments with me alone. "Our generation has had two surprises," he said. "We thought that the Jewish religion was out of date, that it could never be transplanted in the new Israeli soil. I'll never be religious, but I'm constantly amazed at the staying power, and even growing influence, of the religion." "Secondly, we were certain that if we could only build the foundations of the Jewish State, world Jewry would come flocking, leaving every corner of the Diaspora. "But we were tragically wrong," he concluded, wistfully.

When we read of the two and a half tribes who chose to remain in Trans-Jordan more than 3,000 years ago, we realize that Diaspora mentalities have not changed. Toward the end of our portion, the tribes are crossing the desert. Soon the day will arrive when they will begin to take possession of the Promised Land. The purpose of the exodus from Egypt is soon to be realized. And then, out of the blue, Reuben and Gad and half of Menashe begin to have their doubts. Why cross the river into Israel if this side is rich in grazing land? The text records their suggestion to Moses that they stay behind:

"If we have found favor in your sight, let this land be given unto your servants for a possession; bring us not over the Jordan." (Num. 32:5) Moses' reaction is profound shock. "Shall your brothers go to war and you shall sit here?" How can a significant group of Israelites elect not to share in the challenges, risks and opportunities of our own Jewish State? For the next nine verses Moses explains the psychological consequences if this group were to remain on their ranches and haciendas outside mainland Israel.

The two and a half tribes immediately explain that yes, they do want to "...build sheepfolds here for our cattle and cities for our little children." But of course that doesn't mean they won't join the nation's struggle: "...We will not return unto our houses until the children of Israel have inherited every person his inheritance." (32:18)

Theoretically, this should be the end of the sequence. Yet the dialogue continues. In his response to their commitment to bear arms, we find Moses exhorting them "to be innocent before God and Israel," and reiterating that "every armed man of you will pass over the Jordan before the Lord, until He has driven out His enemies from before Him."

Moses' purpose in continuing the conversation is not merely to strengthen their resolve. He has listened very carefully to their words, and shifts the focus of their priorities - at the same time highlighting what it was that made them want to stay behind. They spoke of "sheepfolds for our cattle and cities for our little ones"; they first stressed their material possessions, and only secondarily their children. Moses turns that around, providing an implicit rebuke: "Build your cities for your little ones, and folds for your sheep." (32:24) The response of the tribes indicates that they have absorbed his message: "Your servants will do as my lord commands. Our little ones, our wives, our flocks, and all our cattle, shall be there in the cities of Gilead..." (32:26-27)

But what we may derive from this dialogue is what impels certain Jews to remain outside Israel: for them, material well-being comes before Jewish continuity. The second thing which keeps Jews out of Israel is perhaps hinted at by the half-tribe which joins Gad and Reuben in Trans-Jordan: "Moses gave to them, to the children of Gad and to the children of Reuben, and to the half-tribe of Menashe the son of Joseph, the kingdom of Sihon king of the Amorites, and the kingdom of Og king of Bashan..."

Note that when Moses includes Menashe, he makes sure to say, "Menashe son of Joseph," stressing the origin of the name: "And Joseph called the name of the first born Menashe 'for God had made me forget

(nashani) all my toil, and all my father's house.' " (Gen.41:51) Apparently Menashe is born to a father who identifies his early years in Israel with toil and suffering. By the time he gets to name his second son, he has changed his tune, naming him Ephraim, "...for God has made me fruitful in the land of my affliction." referring to Egypt as a land of affliction! And so Menashe, by virtue of his name, lives under the shadow of a perpetual memory of having suffered in the land of Israel. Hence his descendants, or at least a part of them, opt to remain in Trans-Jordan. The desert generation was frightened of the responsibility and challenge of leaving a God-protected desert cocoon for the hardships of the new land. But even after it became clear that the destiny of Israel was dependent upon a Jewish State directing its own destiny, offering a haven to a persecuted people and paving the way to redemption, there were still a resistant two and a half tribes that were kept away from mainland Israel by materialistic blandishments and the superficial safety which they perceived to be represented by "galut."

How little we really learn from the Bible, wherein "the actions of our ancestors foreshadow the experience of their descendants."

Shabbat Shalom Rabbi Riskin, dean of the Ohr Torah Stone colleges and graduate programs, is chief rabbi of Efrat. 1995-1998, The Jerusalem Post

Torah Insights for Parashat Matot-Masei 5758 Rabbi Abraham Kupchik

In the parashah of Matos, G-d commands Moshe to "exact the vengeance of the children of Israel from the Midyanites," for their aggression toward the Jewish nation. This would be Moshe's last mission. Afterwards, G-d tells him, "You will be gathered to your people" in death. It would seem advantageous for Moshe to have delayed the war against Midyan as long as possible. But Moshe immediately exhorts the Jewish people "to exact the vengeance of G-d upon Midyan." Rashi, quoting the Midrash, remarks that even though Moshe knew that his death would follow the completion of this matter, he carried it out with joy and did not delay. A leader, especially one who leads the Jewish people, must overlook personal advantages even if it means relinquishing his life. Moshe was asked to demonstrate for all generations the position of Jewish leadership. Although Hashem referred to this war as "the vengeance of the children of Israel," Moshe calls it "the vengeance of G-d." Rashi explains that "one who stands before Israel is considered to be standing before G-d." The Jewish people represent G-d in this world, and those who harm them are displaying a lack of faith in G-d. To carry the designation, Jew, is to be a representative of G-d. Thus, Moshe presents G-d's command to the Jewish people as a lesson for all Jews to know that their purpose in life is primarily to represent the existence of G-d. To defend the honor of the children of Israel is to carry out the mitzvah of sanctifying G-d's name. Rashi offers two reasons why Midyan, and not Mo'Av, is singled out for revenge by Israel. The Moavites were afraid of what the Jewish people might do to them. They were genuinely frightened by the prospects of being conquered by this new nation. So they recruited the Midyanites to help them. But Midyan had no reason to become involved in a fight that wasn't theirs. Additionally, two great figures would emerge from Mo'Av, Ruth and Na'amah the Ammonite. Midyan, though, offered no redeeming future benefits to Israel. We learn from the war with Midyan that a country which offers nothing of value to our nation, and seeks only recognition for itself and is ready to abuse the name of G-d for this purpose, has no reason to exist and must be made an example for the rest of the world. Moshe, at the same time, has to become the example of the selfless leader of the Jews, whose only thrust is to make the Jewish people a G-dly nation. Rabbi Abraham Kupchik Rabbi Kupchik is rabbi of Congregation Beth-El of Long Beach in Long Beach, New York.

OU Torah Insights 5758 Parasha Index OU.ORG - Your Gateway to the Jewish Internet _ 1998 - 5758 All Rights Reserved. Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America

PARASHAT MATOT - MASEI

By Rabbi Nathaniel Helfgot

As we come to the close of the Sefer, I would like to develop and tie together a number of strands that I have addressed in the VBM Bamidbar shiurim (both this year and last) and in two articles in TRADITION magazine (Spring 1993; Spring 1998) on the "sin" of Moses and the Benei-Reuven/Gad episode of our parasha, respectively.

A. In parashat Chukat, ch. 20 is a critical turning point in the narrative of the desert. The first generation has died out and the second generation is now on the scene. It is interesting to note that the first scene at Mei Meriva takes place at Kadesh (20:1), on the cusp of the southern border of the Land of Israel. After all the wandering in the desert, they ultimately arrive back at what was to be the original jump-off point for entry and conquest into the land. The Jewish people were, it appears, originally primed to enter the land directly from the south, going up through the Negev and reaching the mountains of Chevron and further. This is precisely the route that was earlier taken by the meraglim, and would have been the logical one to be taken by the people as a whole. Unfortunately, the mission was derailed by the meraglim incident and forty years had to pass for the older generation to die out. At this point, in ch. 20, however, a new generation was on the scene. The placement of the first narrative of the second generation at Kadesh certainly invites speculation that God's intention was for this new generation to pick up where their fathers and mothers had left off. They were now to once more begin the delayed march into the land directly through the southern corridor of the Negev.

It is here that the terrible tragedy of Mei Meriva occurs, causing once again a major change in the mission. Moshe loses his position of leadership. I have written elsewhere that the Torah seems to present the water crisis at Mei Meriva as a potential Matan Torah experience for the new generation:

Throughout this section, the Torah emphasizes that the entire congregation must witness the event. Moreover the phrase "take the rod and gather the assembly together" (hakhel et ha-eida) [Numbers 20:7] clearly echoes the experience of Sinai, which is termed "the day of assembly - yom ha-kahal" throughout the book of Deuteronomy (e.g., 9:10). It also reminds us of the gathering that is to occur once in seven years where the Torah uses similar terminology - "hakhel et ha-am..." (Deut. 31:12). Hakhel itself is patterned after the revelation experience at Sinai, whose goal was to imbue the community with yir'at shamayim, faith and commitment to the covenant." (TRADITION, SPRING 1993)

This idea, without the literary parallels, is already hinted at in a fascinating comment of Rav Meir Simcha of Dvinsk, zt"l, author of MESHEKH CHOCHMA, who writes in his comments to 20:11:

"It may be suggested in relation to the incident at Mei Meriva, that at the time of Matan Torah the Jewish people were elevated to the point that they 'saw the sounds' (Shemot 20:15), they saw that which is audible. ... Thus God also wanted that in Moshe's speaking to the rock the people see the divine utterance, which emerges from the throat of Moshe, wherein the Shekhina resides, and see how it affects the rock, and thus they should "see" that which is heard, and this should strengthen their faith in a similar fashion to that which occurred at the exalted event [i.e., Matan Torah]."

If this reading is correct, we can speculate as to what the subsequent weeks might have looked like. It is certainly plausible that the people would still have had to encounter Edom and Sichon and all the other nations that we find in the latter parts of Sefer Bamidbar. God would still have brought the people to Arvat Moav for a second covenant ceremony and most of the narrative and content of Sefer Devarim as we know it would have been the same.

I think, though, that it is possible that the repetition of the Torah and other parts of what we know today as Sefer Devarim might have been presented by Moshe directly to the people right here in ch. 20 of Bamidbar, at KADESH, before the intended entry. The encounters with Sichon and Og and Moav and Edom might not have happened at this juncture and would have been left until after the conquest of the land west of the Jordan. It is equally possible to suggest that this min-revelation of God's power and concern would not have included a repetition of the law. The revelation of God's power and concern might have been enough at this point. The people, led by Moshe, would have gone straight into the Land and only there, in the new reality, would they have engaged in a review of the covenant. This, however, is not what transpired and the Jewish people indeed did not continue directly into the Land led by Moshe. Instead, they once again began travelling in a circuitous route, eventually reaching the east bank of the Jordan River, hundreds of miles to the northeast of Kadesh. This context provides a fitting framework for the themes that we developed in other shiurim, including the shiur on parashat Balak. As I outlined in that shiur two weeks ago, the entire Balak/Bil'am narrative appears to be a mini-Yetzia Mitzrayim experience for the new generation. In effect, then, the entire process of the travels and travails of the desert, with, of course, the clear changes related to place and circumstances, are experienced by the second generation. In last year's shiur on parashat Matot, we further noted that the entire encounter with the daughters of Moav at Ba'al Pe'or appears to be a mini-Chet Ha-egel experience. Let me quote a portion of that shiur: It seems clear from both the thematic and literary presentation that the Ba'al Pe'or episode is a replay of the "CHET HA-EGEL - GOLDEN CALF" experience. In a word, it is the chet ha-egel II, that of the second generation paralleling the one of the first generation! Let us outline some of the major parallels pointing in that direction:

1. In both stories, the Jewish people, (in both narratives "ha-am") involve themselves in idolatry through the vehicle of eating from the pagan sacrifices and bowing: "...they offered olat and brought shelamim, and the people ("ha-am") sat down to eat and to drink, and they rose up to play ... and they worshipped it" (Shemot 32:6-8). "They called the people ("ha-am") to the sacrifices of their gods, and the people ate, and bowed down to their gods" (Bemidbar 25:2).

2. The Torah presents the idolatrous worship of Ba'al Pe'or as a direct result of the social interaction with the daughters of Moav and the subsequent sexual licentiousness leading to pagan behavior: "Israel abode in Shitim, and the people began to LIZNOT with the daughters of Moav..." (25:1). In the immediate aftermath of the chet ha-egel in Shemot 34, this is precisely the same order of events that the Torah forewarns the Jewish people will occur if they enter into covenant with the local inhabitants. In that chapter, which recounts the re-establishment of covenant between God and the Jewish people, God warns the people lest they repeat the same mistakes in the context of their encounter with the nations they will meet in the future. The people

are warned not to enter into treaty with those nations in almost the exact same language as that described in the Ba'al Pe'or incident!

"Lest you make a covenant with the inhabitants of the land and they will ZANU after their gods, and will sacrifice to their gods; and he will call you and you will eat of his sacrifice. And you take their daughters ... VE-ZANU ... VE-HIZNU ..." (Shemot 34:15- 16). Note carefully the repetition of the verb root "zana" relating to sexual licentiousness and the seduction theme that will lead your sons to "their gods," all elements reiterated in the Ba'al Pe'or incident! Finally, it should be noted that Chazal in a wonderful midrashic move inserted the theme of sexual licentiousness into tchet ha-egel story proper by interpreting the phrase "Va-yakumu letzachek" (to play - Shemot 32,6) as referring to sexual activity - (see further Seder Eliyahu Rabba ch. 13 and Rashi to that verse)!

3. In both episodes God's anger is kindled against the people with the specific term "charon af" (Shemot 32:10- 13; Bemidbar 25:3), with the threat of utter destruction hanging over the entire people captured by the same verb root - "kala," a verb rarely used in the sin narratives of the Torah: "Leave me... and I will consume them (akhalem)" (Shemot 32,10 and 32,12) "Pinchas ... was zealous for My sake among them, that I did not consume (khiliti) Bnei Yisrael in My jealousy" (Bemidbar 25:11).

4. In both episodes the command comes down for part of the Jewish people to take up arms against their fellow brethren: "Slay every man his brother, and every man his companion and every man his relative" (Shemot 32:27) "Slay every man his men, who joined Ba'al Pe'or" (Bemidbar 25:5)

5. In both stories the charge is lead by major figures of the house of Levi, i.e., Moshe Rabbeinu leading the charge in Shemot and Pinchas taking charge and killing the public offenders. This theme is succinctly noted in an anonymous midrash cited in Torah Sheleima (Pinchas #80) "The tribe of Levi stood up and acted at the chet ha- egel, and here the tribe of Levi acted as well, for once Pinchas saw the act of Zimri he said to himself my forefathers etc." Parenthetically, it is of course interesting to note that in the aftermath of each incident the status of those who eradicated the evil doers was elevated. After the chet ha-egel, the levi'im replaced the first-born for service in the Mishkan while in the aftermath of the Ba'al Pe'or incident, Pinchas and his line receive the "berit kehunat olam."

6. In both stories in addition to those who are killed at the point of the sword, an entire group of sinners dies as a result of a mageifa - a plague of retribution.

B. At this point let us return to our parasha, specifically to ch. 32 - the narrative of the Benei Reuven and Gad. I would like to develop a theme based on an idea that I heard many years ago from my good friend and colleague, Rabbi David Silber (director of the Drisha Institute for Jewish Education). Given that the second generation experiences the first of the major sins committed by the first generation, chet ha-egel, it follows that they might experience the second of the major crises of their forefathers, the chet ha-meraglim as well. And indeed, this is precisely one way to read the episode of the two tribes, Reuven and Gad, who request the land of Sichon and Og. This parallel clearly emerges from both a thematic and literary perspective of reading ch.32.

1. During the meraglim episode the spies were divided into two camps, TEN of them against entry into the Land of Israel and TWO, Caleb and Yehoshua (representing the tribes of Yehuda and Yosef-Efrayim), advocating continuation of God's mission. Here in the Benei-Reuven and Gad episode we have an inverted parallel, in that TEN of the tribes are ready to enter the land while TWO tribes (Reuven and Gad) would like to remain back, outside of the promised land. Moreover, the specific identity of the tribes is very significant. While in the meraglim section the two "good" tribes were Yehuda (Caleb) and Yosef (Efrayim), representing the leadership of the two centers of power in the Jewish people, the Leah line and the Rachel line, in our section the two tribes who want to remain back are specifically from the rejected line of leadership, from Reuven, who was replaced as bekhon at the end of Sefer Bereishit. (Gad is parallel to Reuven, as he is the first-born of Zilpa, the concubine of Leah. He is part of the nexus of the rejected Leah line, a point which is developed at greater length in my TRADITION, 1998 article.) Eventually, half of Menasheh, the rejected first-born of the Yosef line, joins in with Reuven and Gad, thus completing the inverted parallel to the meraglim which can be charted as follows:

MERAGLIM (ch. 13)

"GOOD" - 2 tribes

Yehuda (Caleb) - Leah line

Yosef_ Efrayim (Yehoshua) - Rachel Line

"BAD" - The rest of the 10 tribes

BENEI REUVEN AND GAD (ch. 32)

"GOOD" - 10 tribes INCLUDING Yehuda and Efrayim

"BAD" - 2 tribes Reuven and Gad - rejected leaders of

Leah line half of Menasheh - rejected leader of Rachel line

2. Moshe's reaction to their suggestion here in Matot clearly connects us back to the meraglim. Moshe speaks of Reuven and Gad as once again undermining the mission as their forefathers had done "when I sent them from Kadesh Barnea to scout the land" (verse 8). He continues with a lengthy recounting of the incident of the meraglim and explicitly mentions that Caleb and Yehoshua alone were allowed entry into the land, while all the others were left to die in the desert. He concludes his rebuke by telling them that they are now rising up in place of their parents and committing the very same sin. This action, he concludes, will once more bring God's wrath upon the people and they will continue to wander in the desert! (32:9-15) It is, here of course, that the two stories diverge. a. While in the meraglim episode proper, the majority of the people were in favor of abandoning entry into the land, here it was the reverse with most of the tribes not joining the request of Reuven. b. In ch. 13 the leadership of Am Yisrael, Yehuda and Yosef was in the distinct minority. Here Yehuda and Efrayim are part of the majority of the tribes wanting to enter. c. Most significantly, in parashat Shelach the people are frightened and not willing to engage in conquest of the land. They truly want to replace Moshe and return to Egypt, thus undermining and reversing the entire course of Jewish history until this point. Here in parashat Matot, it turns out that Moshe's concerns were exaggerated. Even the two tribes who wanted to remain in Transjordan had no desire to turn their back on their fellow brethren and

the collective mission of the Jewish people. They ARE willing to fight and take part in the conquest of the land, thereby ensuring the fulfillment of God's historical plan. Therefore, what emerges is that while the "meraglim" episode of the first generation leads to their downfall, that of the second generation does not. They, seemingly confronted with a parallel situation, do not act or react like the first generation. They truly are worthy to enter and fulfill the destiny that their parents could not. In this way, the Torah highlights the difference between the first generation that does not merit to enter and that of the second that does. The second generation experiences their own chet ha-egel (the daughters of Moav) overcoming that through the internal actions of Pinchas and the external actions of destroying the Midianites (who had originally seduced the Jewish men) in ch. 31. Similarly, the first generation had experienced the meraglim and failed while the second generation undergoes a similar challenge and emerges with the mission and its faith in God intact.

C. Given this superstructure, we may gain an insight into an enigmatic piece of information that is presented to us at the end of ch. 32. After the pact with the tribes of Reuven, Gad and Menasheh are sealed, the Torah tells us the following: "And the children of Makhir, son of Menasheh, went to Gil'ad and captured it in battle, and they dispossessed the Emori who were in it. And Moshe gave Gil'ad to Makhir the son of Menasheh; and he lived there. And Yair the son of Menasheh went and captured their villages and called them Chavot -Yair. And Novach went and captured Kenat and its hamlets, and he called it Novach, after his own name." (verses 39-42) What is the significance of this little addendum regarding territory captured by the sons of Menasheh in the northern tip of the Emori territory (today Northern Jordan)? In light of the thesis presented above identifying the Reuven-Gad narrative as an inverted meraglim story, it would appear that this smaller passage is an inverted "ma'apilim" story, the narrative that follows direction the heals of meraglim in ch. 14. After God decreed that the Jewish people would not enter the Land of Israel, there was a group of people who expressed remorse and decided to now go up and capture the Land by force. God, however, warned them NOT to go into battle, for he would not be with them. They ignored this admonition, and the text tells us that neither Moshe nor the ark moved from the camp. The people are decimated in battle with the Canaanites, who are significantly called "EMORI" in the recounting of this story in Devarim (1:44).

In our section we have the exact opposite scenario. After the Torah has made clear that Reuven and Gad are ready to go into battle on behalf of the land, the inversion continues. The children of Menasheh immediately go into battle against the EMORI and are successful in routing them off the land. Moreover, Moshe gives his stamp of approval to their initiative by directly giving them this territory, without in any way making it dependent on joining the effort of capturing Eretz Yisrael as he did with the rest of the territory of Sichon and Og (see the last lines of the Meshekh Chokhma's comments to 32:33). It is almost as if this area of northern Gil'ad had the status of Eretz Yisrael and not Transjordan. Thus, it is exactly parallel to the territory that the "ma'apilim" unsuccessfully had wanted to capture, i.e., the land of Israel proper, which the meraglim had rejected!

Furthermore, this approach gains added resonance in light of a famous midrashic comment regarding Tzlofchad. Rashi in parashat Pinchas (ch. 27) citing the Talmud in Shabbat, quotes a tradition that Tzlofchad was one of the ma'apilim. Building on this aggada, the last portion of the entire sefer is now filled with added meaning. At the end of ch. 36, the Torah recounts that the daughters of Tzlofchad, descendants of the tribe of Menasheh all married cousins from the clan of Makhir ben Menasheh. This is the very same clan that was one of those who captured the territory of the Gil'ad and settled there. Thus, the daughters of the ma'apilim end up in union with the sons of the "anti-ma'apilim." In effect, to use kabbalistic imagery, we have another stage in the "tikun" of the sin of the ma'apilim. The children of Menasheh go and fight for the Land and are rewarded by God, thus reversing the sin of the ancestors who attempted to battle against His wishes!

D. In conclusion, we now have before us a complete picture. The second generation re-experienced many of the seminal events of the first generation. Since the mission of the first generation had gone awry, the second generation now had to relive their history, overcome it, and continue. They picked up where their parents had left off, while confronting the formative experiences of Yetzit Mitzrayim (see the Balak shiur) and Matan Torah (see above). In addition, they confronted the major crisis-mistakes of the first generation, the egel, meraglim and ma'apilim and were able to emerge victorious. After the long detours of the desert both in their parents' experience and even in their own, they were now at Arvot Moav, ready to receive Moshe's last charge before entry into the promised land.

Shabbat Shalom and Chazak Chazak Ve-Nitchazek Tam ve-lo nishlam shevach le-Kel Borei Olam
The VBM thanks Rabbi Helfgot for writing the shiurim on Sefer Bemidbar. We hope to hear from him in the future. [HTTP://WWW.VIRTUAL.CO.IL/EDUCATION/YHE](http://www.virtual.co.il/education/yhe) Copyright (c) 1998 Yeshivat Har Etzion.

dafyomi@virtual.co.il The Weekly Daf Eruvin 77 - 83 Parshas Matos / Masei
<http://www.ohr.org.il/yomi/yomi232.htm> Room For More How much food constitutes a meal? This question arises regarding the law of eruvei techumin. On Shabbos, a Jew may not walk more than two thousand amos (approximately a kilometer) beyond the physical limits of his community unless he makes an eruv within that distance. This enables him to walk two thousand amos from the location of the eruv. The eruv is made by placing enough food for two meals at a designated location before Shabbos, thus establishing that spot as his virtual home for that Shabbos.

How much bread (or other food detailed in Orach Chaim 286:5-6) constitutes two meals is a subject of debate in our mishna. Rabbi Meir states that the criterion for an eruv meal is how much one eats in a weekday meal, not how much he consumes in a Shabbos meal. Rabbi Yehuda holds the opposite -- how much he eats in a Shabbos meal is what counts. Both approaches, explains the mishna, are based on the fact that the requirement of an eruv is a rabbinic one rather than a Torah law. The Sages were therefore more lenient in their requirement. Both Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Yehuda aimed to designate an amount of food which would be less demanding, but they approached their undertaking from opposite angles. On Shabbos, contends Rabbi Meir, the food is tastier than in the weekdays and a person is therefore accustomed to eating more. In order to be lenient, we must therefore establish the amount he eats in the weekdays as the standard for

the eruv. Rabbi Yehuda, on the other hand, points out that on Shabbos a Jew eats three sumptuous meals in contrast to the weekdays, and therefore he consumes less in each of those meals than he does in a single weekday meal. The gemara relates that Rabbi Yosef acted in accordance with the view of Rabbi Meir because of the common wisdom that "the stomach expands to accept tasty food." * Eruvin 82b <http://www.ohr.org.il> Written and Compiled by Rabbi Mendel Weinbach <http://www.ohr.org.il> (C) 1998 Ohr Somayach

daf-insights@shemaisrael.com Insights to the Daf: Eruvin 76-80 INSIGHTS INTO THE DAILY DAF brought to you by Kollel Iyun Hadaf of Yerushalayim Rosh Kollel: Rabbi Mordecai Kornfeld daf@shemaisrael.co.il

76b 2) THE MATHEMATICAL FORMULAE OF THE RABBIS OF CAESAREA

QUESTION: The Mishnah says that a window in the wall between two Chatzeros must be at least four by four Tefachim in size, and must be within the first ten Tefachim of the height of the window, in order to be considered a Pesach (opening) and allow the Chatzeros the choice of joining together with one Eruv. What do the dimensions of the window have to be if the window is "round"? Rabbi Yochanan made a statement that if the window is round, it "must be 24 Tefachim in its circumference, and two Tefachim (plus 4 Tefachim) and a bit of the window must be under ten Tefachim in the wall, so that if a square was inscribed in the circle a part of it would be within ten Tefachim of the ground." That is, Rabbi Yochanan is asserting that a circle drawn around a square with sides of 4 Tefachim (which has a perimeter of 16 Tefachim) has a circumference of 24 Tefachim. The Gemara concludes that Rabbi Yochanan's mathematical calculations were based on the theorem of the Rabbis of Kesari. They said that the circumference of a circle inscribed inside of a square is 25% less than the square's perimeter, and the circumference of a circle circumscribed around the outside of a square is 50% more than the square's perimeter. Accordingly, the circumference of the circle drawn around the 16-Tefach perimeter of a square is 50% larger, or 24 (that is, take 50% of 16 and add it to 16). As the Gemara in Sukah (8a) points out, this theorem is clearly incorrect, as can be seen with a cursory glance. The actual relationship of the perimeter of an inscribed square to the circle around it, according to Chazal, is 3π (1.4 * π), when 3 is used for pi (Eruvin 13a) and π = the length of a side of the square. (The relationship between the side of a square and its diagonal -- which is also the diameter of the circumscribed circle -- is 1:1.4, according to Chazal). If so, the circumference of a circle circumscribed around a square with sides of 4 Tefachim is $3(1.4 * 4)$, or 16.8 -- and not 24! How did the Rabbis of Kesari make such a mistake, and why did Rabbi Yochanan follow them? ANSWERS: (a) TOSFOS (DH v'Rebbi Yochanan) answers that the Rabbis of Kesari were not giving the relationship of the "perimeter" of the inner square to the "circle" around it. Rather, they were giving the relationship of the "area" of the inner square to the "outer square" that is drawn around the circle which encloses the inner square. This is what they meant by saying that "when a circle is drawn around the outside of a square, the outer one's (i.e., the outer "square's") perimeter is 50% larger than the inner one's." (See the picture printed in Tosfos in our Gemaras, which is slightly misleading; in the picture that appears in the TOSFOS HA'ROSH, reproduced in our Graphics section, the inner square is shifted so that its sides are at a diagonal to the sides of the outer square. This is more demonstrative of Tosfos' point). The area of the inner square is exactly half of the area of the outer square. According to Tosfos, Rabbi Yochanan misunderstood the Rabbis of Kesari and made his Halachic statement regarding the relationship of the circumference of a circle to the perimeter of a square based on his misunderstanding. (b) The RITVA explains that the Rabbis of Kesari and Rabbi Yochanan are correct. When he mentioned a "round" window, Rabbi Yochanan did not mean a circular window with an imaginary square inscribed within it. Rather, he was referring to a window made in the shape of a four-leaf clover; that is, a square with four semi-circles protruding from each side (see Graphic section). In such a case, the perimeter of the window (i.e. the arcs of the four semi-circles) indeed add up to 50% more than the perimeter of the square around which they are drawn. In order to make sure that the square inside the clover-shaped window reaches to within a height of ten Tefachim from the ground, at least 2 Tefachim and a bit of the "radius" of the bottom semi-circle must be within ten Tefachim (since the radius of each semi-circle is 2, or half of one side of the square, which is four). Alternatively, 2 and a bit Tefachim plus four Tefachim of the perimeter of the semi-circle must be under 10 Tefachim from the ground (as Rashi explains on bottom of 76a), since the total perimeter of each semicircle is 6 Tefachim. (c) RASHI does not explain how to justify the formula of the Rabbis of Kesari and how to understand Rabbi Yochanan. He seems not to have any difficulty with them. Perhaps Rashi held that the Rabbis of Kesari were proposing a Halachic stringency: when determining a value (such as the circumference of a circle) by using the diagonal of a square, we Halachically consider the diagonal to be equal to the sum of the two sides of the square or rectangle between the ends of the diagonal (since the lines of those two sides go from one end of the diagonal to the other). The reason for this is to prevent people from confusing the diagonal and the sum of two sides. (Thus, if the sides of inscribed square are each 4 Tefachim, then the diagonal is viewed to be *8* Tefachim. The circular window around that square, then, must have a diameter of 8 Tefachim, which means that its circumference must be *24* Tefachim, and not 16.8 which is what it would be based on the "actual" diameter of the square.) If this is why Rashi is not bothered by the formula of the Rabbis of Kesari, then it could be that Rashi is consistent with his opinion elsewhere (Shabbos 85a, Eruvin 5a, 78a, 94b), where Rashi seems to count the diagonal of a rectangle as the sum of the two sides between the two ends of the diagonal. TOSFOS in *all* of those places argues with Rashi, but Rashi may hold that such a Halachic definition is applied, and may be relied upon entirely, both as a leniency and a stringency, with regard to Rabbinic rulings. (d) Perhaps it is possible to propose an entirely new explanation. The Rabbis of Kesari and Rabbi Yochanan are perfectly correct. Perhaps Rabbi Yochanan's statement that there "must be 24 Tefachim in its circumference," does not mean that the "circumference" must be 24 Tefachim, but that there must be 24 Tefachim "inside" the circumference -- in other words, the "area" of the circle must be 24 Tefachim! The area of a circle that is drawn around a square which is 4 by 4 is calculated by multiplying pi by the radius squared. The radius of the circle around a square which is 4 by 4 is half of the diagonal (5.6), which is 2.8. Let us use the Halachic estimate of $\pi=3$. Then: $3 * (2.8)(2.8) = 23.52$, or ~24. This is what Rabbi Yochanan meant when he said that the circle must have within its circumference an area of 24 (he rounded up to 24 as a Chumra)! What did Rabbi Yochanan mean that there must be 2 and a bit within a height of ten? 24 Tefachim

is the area of the circle. Within that area is an inscribed square of 4 by 4, which has an area of 16 Tefachim. What is the area of the four arcs that are outside of the square? Since they are the difference between the area of circle and the square, altogether they add up to 24-16=8, and thus each one has an area of 2 Tefachim. That is exactly what Rabbi Yochanan meant when he said that in order to get the inscribed square of 4 by 4 Tefachim below a height of ten Tefachim, at least 2 Tefachim and a bit of the "area" of the circular window must be below ten Tefachim! (According to this approach, it is no longer necessary to say, as Rashi (76a) suggests, that when it says "two and a bit" it means two and a bit in addition to "four") (M. Kornfeld)

79b A MINOR BEING "MEZAKEH" TO THE MEMBERS OF A MAVOY QUESTION: The Mishnah describes how a Shituf is made. The Mishnah says that one person may be Mezakeh the contents of a barrel to all of the members of the Mavoy. He may be Mezakeh it to them by having his grown children, or a Jewish slave or maidservant, make an acquisition on their behalf. One may not have his children who are still below the age of adulthood be Mezakeh it to them. It seems that one may not have a minor be Mezakeh because he does not have the ability to make an acquisition to others. If so, why does the Mishnah say that a Jewish maidservant (Shifchah) can be Mezakeh, if a maidservant is "always" a minor (because once she has signs of maturity, she goes free)? ANSWER: TOSFOS (DH u'Mezakeh) explains that with regard to Shituf Mavoy's, there is a unique leniency allowing even minors to be Mezakeh to others, since the Shituf is only mid'Rabanan. When the Mishnah says that one's child who is a minor cannot be Mezakeh, it means specifically one's "own" child, who is dependent on his father's support, cannot be Mezakeh the Eruv. Such a minor is like an "extension" of his father and one cannot be Mezakeh his father's objects to others just as one cannot be Mezakeh his own objects to others (but must have someone else be Mezakeh it to them for him). Someone else's child, though, can be Mezakeh the food.

80b FORCING A PERSON TO JOIN A "SHITUF" QUESTION: Shmuel states that we may force a person to join a Shituf against his will (such as by having his wife join the Shituf on his behalf) if his obstinacy is preventing the Shituf from being made. The Gemara attempts to prove this from a Beraisa that says that we may force a person to agree to have a Lechi or Korah erected at the entrance of a Mavoy. The Gemara responds that the two cases are not comparable, because "in that case, there are no Mechtizos." What does that mean, and what does it have to do with forcing a person to join the Shituf or to erect a Lechi/Korah against his will? ANSWERS: (a) RASHI explains that without a Lechi or Korah, the Mavoy is vulnerable and exposed ("Megulah"; the Ritva's text of Rashi reads "Megunah" or unmanfully). Therefore, one can be forced to join in erecting a Lechi or Korah, in order to provide physical protection (or aesthetic enrichment, according to the Ritva's Girsas) to the Mavoy. When it comes to Shituf, though, the Mavoy has valid Mechtizos around it, so there is no pressing need to force him to join the Shituf. The Rishonim question this explanation, asking how a Lechi or Korah can make a Mavoy any less Megulah or Megunah? (b) TOSFOS (DH Sha'an) suggests that a Lechi or Korah enables carrying "inside" the Mavoy. Making a Shituf Mavoy's allows carrying "from the houses" and Chatzeros to the Mavoy. Without a Shituf, the residents are still able to carry in the Mavoy itself, and therefore the need to make a Shituf is not as pressing as the need to erect a Lechi or Korah. (c) RABEINU TAM's text of the Gemara reads that Lechi and Korah are different because they "are" Mechtizos. That is, the Lechi and Korah are by definition Mechtizos, so they work against the person's will -- whether he wants them there or not, they serve as Mechtizos. Shituf, though, requires the person's consent to give his portion of the Mavoy to the collective ownership of the Shituf (see Eruvin 49a, with regard to Eruv), and therefore there it will not help if it is done against his will.

ADDING TO THE FOOD OF AN ERUV The Mishnah states that if the food comprising the Eruv diminished, then one may add to the food without informing the residents of the Chatzer. In the end of the Mishnah, Rabbi Yosi says that the remains of the food of an Eruv ("Shiyurei Eruv") have no minimum requirement. If any amount of food remaining from an Eruv will suffice, then why did the first part of the Mishnah talk about "adding" to what is left, when it is diminished? ANSWERS: (a) The MAHARSHAL inserts into the words of Rashi that "Rebbi Yosi argues with the Tana Kama." The Tana Kama maintains that the remains of an Eruv require a Shi'ur, and Rabbi Yosi argues that they do not require a Shi'ur. Although the early manuscripts and printings of Rashi did not have these words, the RAMBAM (Perush ha'Mishnayos) and BARTENURA do say clearly that Rabbi Yosi argues with the Tana Kama. (However, if Rabbi Yosi is arguing, the text of the Mishnah should have been "Rebbi Yosi Omer." "Amar Rebbi Yosi" implies that he is adding something new and not arguing with the previous statement.) (b) RABEINU YEHONASAN MLUNIL explains that the first part of the Mishnah refers to when the food decreased "before" Shabbos, in which case it must have a Shi'ur at the time that Shabbos enters. Rabbi Yosi is referring to when the food decreased on Shabbos, in which case it is sufficient if "any" of the food remains. (This explanation of Rabeinu Yehonasan is noted by the BACH (#8) on the Rif, and in his commentary on TUR OC 368.) (c) Alternatively, the Tana Kama does not mean that one has to add food to the Eruv. Rather, it means that if one "wanted" to add to the Eruv, he may do so without informing the others. Why would a person want to add to the Eruv? One would want to add to the Eruv in order to ensure that if the "rest" of the original Eruv gets lost, the Eruv will still be valid due to the part that he added. (CHIDUSHEI MAHARALBACH & BACH OC 368) (d) Rabbi Yosi says that the remains of the food of an Eruv are still considered a valid Eruv even if only a small bit is left because there is already a Shituf Mavoy's, and the Eruv is made only in order that the concept of Eruvin not be forgotten from the children. If so, the first part of the Mishnah might be discussing a case when there was no Shituf, in which case the food of the Eruv "would" need a Shi'ur. (MAHARALBACH, MAGEN AVRAHAM)

HALACHAH: The SHULCHAN ARUCH (OC 368:1,4) says that whether or not the remainder of the Eruv needs a Shi'ur depends on whether the food of the Eruv became diminished before Shabbos or after Shabbos (like (b) above). With regard to (d) above, the BI'UR HALACHAH asserts that even if there was "no" Shituf, b'Dieved one may rely on the opinion that any amount that remains from the original Eruv is sufficient.

Mordecai Kornfeld |Email: kornfeld@netmedia.co.il| Tel:(02)6522633 P.O.B. 43087 | kornfeld@virtual.co.il|Fax:9722-6536017 Har Nof, Jerusalem,ISRAEL| kornfeld@write.com|US:(718)520-0210

