

BS"D

To: Parsha@YahooGroups.com
From: crshulman@aol.com

INTERNET PARSHA SHEET ON MATOS MASEI 5762 - 5762

To receive this parsha sheet in Word and/or Text format, send a blank e-mail to parsha-subscribe@yahoogroups.com or go to <http://groups.yahoo.com/group/parsha/join> Please also copy me at crshulman@aol.com For archives of old parsha sheets see <http://groups.yahoo.com/group/parsha/messages> For Torah links see <http://groups.yahoo.com/group/parsha/links>

From: RABBI YISSOCHER FRAND [SMTP:ryfrand@torah.org]
Sent: Thursday, July 04, 2002 7:06 PM Subject: Rabbi Frand on Parshas Mattos-Masei

Special note: Last week, we announced that Parshas Pinchas would be our last Dvar Torah until Parshas Shoftim. However, Mesorah Publications / ArtScroll has granted permission for us to use the summer parshios from the book "Rabbi Frand on the Parsha". As a result, for the first time ever, the RavFrاند shiur will continue through the summer without interruption.

This Dvar Torah is reprinted with permission from Mesorah Publications / ArtScroll, from "Rabbi Frand on the Parsha". Order "Rabbi Frand on the Parsha" direct from the publisher at a 10 percent discount, and ArtScroll will donate a portion of your purchase to Torah.org. Please follow this link: <http://www.artscroll.com/linker/torahorg/link/Books/frph.html>

Listen to the Mussar

And Moshe said to the people of Gad and Reuven, "Your brothers will go to war and you will remain here?" (Bamidbar 32:6)

The first Gerrer Rebbe was the Chiddushei HaRim. The second Gerrer Rebbe, the Sfas Emes, was not his son but his grandson. The Sfas Emes' father passed away when he was a child, and his grandfather raised him. He was an illui, a prodigy, the apple of his grandfather's eye. One night, when he was still a young boy, the Sfas Emes learned with his chavrusa straight through the night. He nodded off right before Shacharis, resting his head on the Gemara. After a few minutes, he awoke with a start. He washed his hands and hurried to the shul, but he was already a little late.

After Shacharis, the Chiddushei Harim called him over.

"What's this with coming late to Shacharis?" he said in a sharp tone. "It's bad enough for yourself, but think how it will affect others. If the grandson of the rebbe can come late, what kind of example is that for other boys? Or even men! It's a Chillul Hashem (desecration of G-d's Name), no less!"

The Chiddushei Harim went on in this vein for another few minutes, but the Sfas Emes did not say one word in his own defense. He could have argued that it had been an accident, that he had stayed up all night learning Torah and that sleep had overcome him at the end for just a few minutes. But he remained silent.

A little while later, the chavrusa of the Sfas Emes asked him, "Why didn't you say anything to defend yourself? You were innocent! Why were you silent?"

"When a great man gives you Mussar [ethical advice or rebuke]," said the Sfas Emes, "it is worthwhile to listen, even if you don't deserve it, even if you are completely innocent. I wanted to hear my grandfather's Mussar.

"I have a proof to this from the Torah. Moshe Rabbeinu [our Rabbi Moses] gave the tribes of Gad and Reuven a strong tongue-lashing. He accused them of cowardice. He told them they were demoralizing the people just like the spies did. He went on

and on for nine verses, and they remained silent. They never mentioned that they had intended all along to participate in the conquest. Why? Because it is always worthwhile to hear the Mussar of a great man."

Most original transcriptions by David Twersky - DavidATwersky@aol.com Professional editing by Mesorah Publications - info@ArtScroll.com Technical Assistance by Dovid Hoffman - dhoffman@torah.org This write-up was adapted from the hashkafa portion of Rabbi Yissocher Frand's Commuter Chavrusah Torah Tape series on the weekly Torah portion. Tapes or a complete catalogue can be ordered from the Yad Yechiel Institute, PO Box 511, Owings Mills MD 21117-0511. Call (410) 358-0416 or e-mail tapes@yadyechiel.org or visit <http://www.yadyechiel.org/> for further information. "Rabbi Frand on the Parsha" may be ordered from Mesorah Publications / ArtScroll at a 10 percent discount by accessing:

<http://www.artscroll.com/linker/torahorg/link/Books/frph.html> . Torah.org depends upon your support. Please visit <http://torah.org/support/> or write to dedications@torah.org or donations@torah.org . Thank you! Torah.org: The Judaism Site <http://www.torah.org/> 122 Slade Avenue, Suite 203 Baltimore, MD 21208 (410) 602-1350 FAX: 510-1053

http://www.torahweb.org/torah/2001/parsha/rwil_matos.html
Torahweb [from last year]
RABBI MORDECHAI WILLIG
AHAVA AND TOCHACHA

The ability of a husband to annul his wife's vows (Bamidbar 30:14) places a great responsibility upon him. His silence is considered an agreement to the vow. Therefore, he bears her iniquity, as if he had compelled her or duped her to sin (Sforno 30:15,16).

Similarly, all of Israel incurred Hashem's wrath when they did not protest against those who sinned with the moabite women, and especially Zimri who sinned openly. Hashem's anger abated when they didn't protest when Pinchos killed Zimri either (Sforno 25:4,11). Apparently, Bnei Yisrael's silence in the face of contradictory events indicates their apathy or timidity rather than their concurrence, and it sufficed to halt the plague.

Even Moshe Rabbeinu delayed rebuking Am Yisroel until just before his death, fearing that it would be counterproductive. Moreover, he began with indirect criticism out of respect (Rashi, Devarim 1:1,3).

These three lessons, gleaned from the three parshiyos read between Shiv'a Asar B'Tamuz and Tish'a B'Av (Bein HaMetzarim - the "three weeks"), highlight a perennial issue which has particular relevance as we mourn the Churban. After all, Yerushalayim was destroyed because its citizens did not rebuke on another (Shabbos 119b).

Rabbonim are required to protest even if the people may not accept the criticism. Yet, if it is clear that a rebuke will be ignored, it is better that the people sin unintentionally (Shabbos 55a, see Tosafos). Clearly, many judgement calls must be made, including, inevitably, mistakes in both directions.

A prerequisite for bringing people closer to Torah is love (Avos 1:15). This love, exhibited by disciples of Aharon Hakohen whose descendants bless us with love, must extend to all creatures (b'riyos), especially those who have strayed and require kiruv. Indeed, imitatio Dei requires that we rebuke those whom we love, as Hashem does (Mishlei 3:12), out of concern for their welfare.

In order to succeed, this love must be mutual. We are advised to love rebuke and the person who offers it. The existence of tochachah in the world leads to blessing and the elimination of evil in the world (Tamid 28a, see Rosh).

In a world full of evil, including the crisis in Eretz Yisrael, and at a time that the Churban is on our minds, we can help by offering and accepting appropriate toachachah, given and received with love. The reversal of Sin'as Chinom and 'Lo Hochichu Ze Es Ze' which caused the Churban will reverse the course of history and bring us the Geula Shleima.

From: Rabbi Riskin's Shabbat Shalom List
[SMTP:parsha@ohrtorahstone.org.il] To:
Shabbat_Shalom@ohrtorahstone.org.il Subject:
Shabbat Shalom: Parshiot Matot Masei by RABBI SHLOMO
RISKIN

Shabbat Shalom: Parshiot Matot Masei (Numbers 30:2-36:13)
Efrat, Israel - One of the most agonizing conversations I have ever had was with an American oleh (immigrant) to Israel whose twelve year old daughter had just been murdered by a terrorist attack. When I arrived at the bereaved home, I found the mother lying in bed - looking as though she had been rolled up into a foetal ball - in a state of what appeared to be mute shock. At length she acknowledged my presence, and said: "You know what frightens me the most, what fills me with such unspeakable guilt that I can't even begin to function? My mother is on the way from Florida, and the first thing she'll do is hurl the accusation at me that she warned me all along not to place my children at risk in such a dangerous country!" All of us with children and grandchildren in Israel - where the home, the school, the shopping center, the road have turned into front lines of battle, grist for the mill of suicidal homicide bombers - must ask ourselves this same question. I believe the answer may be found in a careful reading between the lines of a thrice-repeated dialogue found in this week's portion.

Chapter 32 of the Book of Numbers - 42 verses long - deals with a request of the tribes of Reuven, Gad and half the tribe of Menashe to remain on the eastern side of the Jordan River, which had excellent grazing fields for the multitude of cattle which they had. Since this would mean that they would not be obligated to join in the major battle with the seven indigenous nations for the heartlands of Israel, Moses castigates them with repeating the sin of the Scouts who were afraid to fight a war. "Will your brethren go out to war while you remain here?", he challenges. (Numbers 32:6)

The tribes desirous of remaining in Trans-Jordan modify their request: "We will build sheep fences for our cattle here and cities for our children. And we will be pioneer warriors in front of the children of Israel... We will not return to our own homes (in Trans-Jordan) until every member of the children of Israel inherit his land" (Numbers 32:16-19)

Seemingly, they respond to Moses' charge and agree to participate in the war before inhabiting the Trans-Jordan. Nevertheless, what follows are two more dialogues between Moses and the tribesmen until the great leader is satisfied (Numbers 32:20-27, 28-32). What did Moses find disturbing in their attitude after they agreed to join in the battle?

A careful reading of the text indicates three problematic qualities which still remained in the presentation of the 2 tribes, two of which were attitudinal and the third which pertained to policy. Reuven and Gad couched their initial request to remain in Trans-Jordan as emanating from their desire to "build sheep fences for our cattle here and cities for our children." Moses corrects their order when, in his second dialogue, he re-formulates their request, telling them that as long as they participate in the war, they may "build cities for your children and fences for your sheep" (Numbers 32:24). He is gently but undeniably chiding them for prioritizing their cattle before their children; our children must be our prize possession, concern for whom must come before concern for material wealth or animal livestock. They learn their lesson, and so they respond - in this second dialogue - "Our children, our wives,

our cattle and our animals will remain there, in the cities of the Gilad" (Numbers 32:25) - with their children coming before their cattle.

In a similar vein, Reuven and Gad agree to be "pioneer warriors in front of the children of the children of Israel." Once again, Moses deems it necessary to correct their language, because phraseology reflects philosophy: "And Moses said to them, if you will do this thing, if you will be pioneer in front of G-d in the war" (Numbers 32:20) - the battle is to be fought in front of, and for the sake of, G-d, even more than in front of, and for the sake of, the children of Israel. The importance of the land of Israel is not merely in providing material sustenance and protection for the nation of Israel; the importance of the land of Israel is to provide a model society for the world based upon ethical monotheism, universal values of freedom, peace and equality for all. The battle for Israel is first and foremost a battle for the sake of heaven. And here again the Israelites "get the message;" in the second dialogue, they declare: "And every pioneer among your servants shall pass in the army before G-d to wage war just as my master has spoken." (Numbers 32:27).

However, from Moses' perspective there still remains one point of contention even by the end of the second dialogue; Reuven and Gad still expected to first deposit their children and cattle safely in Trans-Jordan, and then go out to do battle with the rest of the Israelites (Numbers 32:26,27). Here, they are making a policy decision: the children's lives are not to be placed at risk. Moses must then open a third dialogue, in which he once again establishes the only acceptable proper order: first you must fight, and only then can you - together with your children and your possessions - settle in Trans-Jordan. (Numbers 32:29,30). The tribes finally acquiesce, declaring, "we will pass over as pioneers (warriors) before G-d into the land of Canaan, and with us will be the possession of our inheritance (our children and cattle) from the other side of the Jordan" (Numbers 32:32). The children must share in the danger - together with the rest of the Jewish people.

The Torah is teaching a critical lesson in this segment to all subsequent generations - including our own. To be a Jew means that you belong to a "high-risk" profession: there are certain values for which you must be willing to sacrifice your lives and even the lives of your children. Indeed, we learn from the binding of Isaac the great paradox of Jewish history: only if you are willing to place the life of your future at risk for the sake of G-d, His Torah and His people, will you be worthy of having a future, a future in which the G-d of Justice and compassion will be seen not only by Israel but also by the entire world.

In Israel today we are waging a war for Jewish future, an extension of our War of Independence; in Israel today we are waging a war for world Jewry, barely five decades after the Holocaust struggling under blatant European anti-Semitism; in Israel today we are waging a war for every free human being against the terror of suicidal homicide bombers targeting innocent women and children. Such a war is necessary for human survival and those of us in Israel - men, women and children - feel the necessity of responding to the call of history.

Shabbat Shalom.

You can find Rabbi Riskin's parshiot on the web at:
<http://www.ohrtorahstone.org.il/parsha/index.htm> Ohr Torah Stone
Colleges and Graduate Programs Rabbi Shlomo Riskin, Chancellor
Rabbi Chaim Brovender, Dean To subscribe, E-mail to:
<Shabbat_Shalom-on@ohrtorahstone.org.il>

From: Shema Yisrael Torah Network
[SMTP:shemalists@shemayisrael.com] To: Peninim Parsha
Subject: PENINIM ON THE TORAH BY RABBI A. LEIB
SCHEINBAUM

PARSHAS MATOS

Pens for the flock we shall build for our own livestock and cities for our small children. (32:16)

Rashi explains that Bnei Gad and Bnei Reuven indicated a shortcoming in their priorities. They placed the needs of their sheep before those of their children. Moshe Rabbeinu criticized their implication that sheep take precedence over children. We wonder why they would so misplace their priorities. Why would anyone think, even for a moment, that sheep have greater significance than children? Toras Yechiel submits that this alludes to the future, when -- in regard to the area of shidduchim, matrimony -- people will disregard the quality of the young man or woman and focus rather on the amount of money either party brings into the shidduch. Those who fall prey to this dementia, which is founded in insecurity and nurtured in avarice, have misplaced their priorities. First, one should consider the quality of the proposed shidduch. Only afterwards, when the individual's virtue has been unequivocally established, should they discuss the finances. Regrettably, Moshe's admonishment did not move many people, as we continue to see centuries later. Today the problem of mistaken priorities has reached epidemic proportions. As Moshe explained to that generation, however, it is all in the hands of the Almighty Who determines everyone's livelihood. This has not changed either. Hashem is still the only factor in the success of each individual.

A child's educational development should be foremost in the minds of his parents. In truth, the most effective and enduring way to educate a child is for the parents themselves to serve as proper role models. In a thesis on education, Horav Moshe Aharon Stern, zl, focuses upon several other ways to ensure success in raising a child to be a G-d-fearing Jew. First, is prayer. A successful parent entreats Hashem regularly that his children should neither sin nor behave improperly.

A parent once came to the Steipler Rav, zl, and asked for a blessing that he be successful in raising his children in the derech, path, of Torah. The Steipler responded, "It is crucial that you yourself pray! Do you think that a simple blessing will suffice? I myself still pray for my son every day!" This incident occurred when Horav Chaim Kanievsky, Shlita, the Steipler's son, was fifty-two years old and was reknown as a Torah scholar whose encyclopedic knowledge was without peer and whose yiraas Shomayim, fear of Heaven, was a standard for others to emulate. Likewise, the Brisker Rav, zl, once said, "Indeed, the Chazon Ish, zl, composed special prayers for success in raising one's children."

Rav Stern cites a classic statement from the Chasam Sofer who writes, "One who works to strengthen the observance of his fellow Jews will merit to raise his own children successfully in the ways of Hashem." The Brisker Rav supplemented this, saying, "I do not know how to advise people with regard to their children's education. I have seen, however, that those who devote themselves to the spiritual development of others have good children."

Jewish children have received an education throughout the millennia that has conformed with ruach Yisrael sabah, the spirit of Yisrael of old. In other words, the traditional approach may be supplemented by contemporary methods which relate to today's youth. It would be a tragic mistake, however, to ignore the traditional approach that has been an integral part of us for years.

A Belzer chassid once came to consult with the Rebbe Yissachar Dov, bringing along his young son. The boy was not dressed in chassidic garb, which apparently bothered the Rebbe. The Rebbe alluded to this when he repeatedly asked the man, "Is this your son?" The chassid was quite aware of this issue, and he attempted to legitimize his actions lamenting, "It is impossible to raise children like they did in the old days."

The Rebbe turned to the chassid and said, "Until now I never understood the order of certain pasukim in the second paragraph of the Shema Yisrael. In between the verses which deal with Tefillin

and Mezuzos, a pasuk appears which enjoins us to teach our children Torah. What is the connection between them?

"I now have the answer. We know that in order for a Mezuzah or Tefillin to be kosher, the scribe must write it exactly as it was transmitted to us at Har Sinai. Every letter must conform to the way Chazal interpreted the halachah. One cannot say that today it is difficult to write a

Mezuzah as they did in yesteryear. For, if he altered it one iota, it is pasul, invalid. The mitzvah to teach Torah to our children is placed where it is in order to teach us that just as it is forbidden to make changes in the writing of Mezuzos and Tefillin, likewise, the education we impart to our youth must follow the dictates that we received from our forbears and sages, who accepted the Mesorah, tradition, from Sinai."

A child's first classroom is the home, where his parents are his mentors by virtue of one example they manifest. After Horav Sholom Schawadron, zl, married the sister of Horav Shlomo Zalman Auerbach, zl, his father-in-law, Horav Chaim Yehudah Leib Auerbach, zl, said to him, "You should know that when your wife was a baby, we did not have enough food in the house, and she would cry incessantly from hunger. I would rock her stroller for hours on end, during which time I reviewed entire Mesechtos, Tractates, of Talmud. This had a profound influence on her."

Rav Stern related the following story to demonstrate the impact a proper education has on a child. A wealthy patron of Yeshivos, Rav Y. Dynes, lived in a certain Russian city. He merited to have two sons-in-law that were giants in Torah, Horav Avraham Yitzchak Bloch, zl, Rosh HaYeshivah of Telshe and his brother, Horav Eliyahu Meir Bloch, zl who later co-founded the Telshe Yeshivah in America together with his brother-in-law, Horav Chaim Mordechai Katz, zl. As years passed, Rav Dynes' business ventures suffered. Eventually his empire collapsed. He was wont to say, as he pointed to his two sons-in-law, "Of all my wealth, only these two diamonds remain."

Horav Elchanan Wasserman, zl, explained what merit Rav Dynes possessed to have been deemed worthy of having two such remarkable Torah scholars as sons-in-law: It was in the middle of the winter, and Rav Elchanan was making his rounds, attempting to raise necessary funds for his yeshivah. Paved roads in those days were but a dream, so it was no surprise that Rav Elchanan's shoes became muddied. He did what he could to scrape off the top layer of mud, but his shoes still remained filthy. The next stop on his list was Rav Dynes' house. Not wanting to soil the elegant rugs that surely graced the foyer of his house, Rav Elchanan used the side entrance. When the children saw the illustrious visitor who stood at the door, they quickly ran to call their father.

Rav Dynes was mortified to see Rav Elchanan standing by the side entrance, and he quickly welcomed him to his home. He was shocked that due to a few rugs, the great Rosh Hayeshivah was deterred from entering his home in the proper manner. "Rebbe, I implore you to enter my house with your dirty shoes. Disregard the rugs. I will not permit my children to think that a few expensive rugs take precedence over the honor due a gadol b'Torah, Torah giant. I have always made an attempt to impart to them the overriding importance of kavod ha'Torah, the honor due the Torah and its disseminators. You must walk on the rugs with your muddy shoes, or else my influence upon them will be undermined."

Because Rav Dynes taught his children that all of the wealth in the world is valueless if it conflicts with the honor due a Torah scholar, he merited sons-in-law who exemplified Torah scholarship at its zenith.

Masei Aharon HaKohen went up to Har Hahar and died there. (33:38)

Moshe and Elazar were the only family members to be present when Aharon left this world. They were the only ones present as he

was buried. Indeed, as the Midrash relates, when the people saw Moshe and Elazar coming down from the mountain alone, they queried them as to the whereabouts of Aharon. Moshe responded that he had died. A number of the usual rabble-rousers contended that this was impossible, since Aharon had previously stood up to the Angel of Death and stopped the plague that was decimating the people. They did not know that Aharon had died as a result of a kiss from Hashem, rather than by the Angel of Death directly striking him. These people had the gall to argue that Moshe had killed Aharon - out of jealousy at his popularity. Some even felt that Elazar had performed the deed, so that he could assume the Kehunah Gedolah, the High Priesthood. Moshe Rabbeinu prayed to Hashem to spare Elazar and himself from suspicion and show the people Aharon's deathbed.

His prayer was answered, and a Heavenly eulogy was then heard.

Yalkut Shimoni adds that when Miriam died, no one came to her burial. Moshe and Aharon eulogized her. Moshe ultimately exclaimed, "Woe is me! Of my entire family, I alone remain. Who will come to my funeral?" Hashem then consoled Moshe and told him that He Himself would attend to arranging his funeral.

We wonder why Klal Yisrael's greatest and most distinguished leaders did not have large funerals, in which they would be properly eulogized and appreciated. At first glance, we may suggest that individuals who attained such eminence as Moshe, Aharon and Miriam cannot be fathomed, let alone eulogized as any other mortal. They were in a league all of their own that transcended anything known to Klal Yisrael. It would take someone of their own caliber to appreciate them thoroughly. Alternatively, I feel that there is a deeper reason for this anomaly. Perhaps the greatest fear that has plagued the Jew throughout his tumultuous history, has been the fear of dying alone and not being buried in a Jewish cemetery. This has been a real fear in light of the millions of Jews who perished Al Kiddush Hashem, sanctifying Hashem's Name, in pogroms, inquisitions, holocausts, and terrorist disasters. Are we to ignore these neshamos and relegate them to obscurity? We are taught by this Midrash that when someone dies alone, he is not really alone. Hashem is with him

Our blood soaked the soil of Europe as Jews were murdered and their bodies left in mass graves or left to rot in no graves. These Jews were not alone; Hashem buried them, just as He buried Moshe Rabbeinu. A terrorist attacks a building and thousands are buried beneath the rubble. Hashem personally buries each body. We will not find it. The person might be identified only by his DNA, but Hashem knows where the body is, and He will attend to it.

Our greatest Jewish leaders died alone. This should serve as some small consolation to those that grieve for their lost family members who did not reach kever Yisrael, Jewish burial. They did - Hashem saw to it.

From: ohr@ohr.edu[SMTP:ohr@ohr.edu] To: weekly@ohr.edu Subject: Torah Weekly - Matot/Masei
* TORAH WEEKLY * Highlights of the Weekly Torah Portion
Parshat Matot/Masei For the weeks of 26 Tammuz / July 6
Sponsored by the Kof-K Kosher Supervision www.kof-k.org | info@kof-k.org

Left at the Third Cactus

"If a man takes a vow to G-d" (30:3)

This week we complete the synagogue reading of the fourth of the Five Books of the Torah, Bamidbar - "In the Desert."

What is the theme of The Book of Bamidbar?

The captivity of the Jewish People in Egypt was more than just physical bondage. On a deeper level Egypt represents the enslavement of the power of speech. Egypt not only enslaved the bodies of the Jewish People, it put in chains the major weapon of

the Jewish People - speech. Thus, the Torah writes that the Jewish People "cried out" to G-d. It never writes that they "prayed." For in Egypt, speech itself was bound.

The power of speech is synonymous with the power to lead, to give direction. A leader directs through speech. When the Jewish People left Egypt, they went straight into the desert. There's something special about the desert - it's very difficult to give directions there. "Turn left at the third cactus" will not get you very far. In Hebrew, the word desert is midbar which is from the root mi dibur - "from speech" - because the desert is the place which is separated and removed from speech. Since the desert is the maximum place of non-speech, of non-direction, it is the ideal place to re-build the power of speech from the ground up.

And that's what the Jewish People were to do in the desert. When the Jewish People left Egypt, they had to re-build this power of speech which had been in exile with them.

If we look back over the book of Bamidbar, the book of "In the desert", we will notice that the vast majority of sins committed by the Jewish People there were sins of speech: those who complained about the manna; Miriam speaking slander about Moshe; the spies speaking defamation about the Land of Israel; the rebellion of Korach - (a rebellion about who should lead the Jewish People - who should be its 'speaker'); Moshe striking the rock instead of speaking to it.

The power of speech is the essence of the Book of Bamidbar. And what is the climax of Bamidbar? The concept of nedarim -vows. The English word "vow" is an inadequate translation of the Hebrew word neder. A neder means that a Jew has the ability to change the physical reality of the world through speech.

And where do we go after the rebuilding of the power of speech? To the Book of Devarim - literally "The Book of Words."

More next week.

Bli neder ("without a vow").

Sources: Heard from Rabbi Chaim Zvi Senter in the name of Rabbi Moshe Shapiro

Written and compiled by Rabbi Yaakov Asher Sinclair To subscribe to this list please e-mail weekly-subscribe@ohr.edu To unsubscribe e-mail weekly-unsubscribe@ohr.edu Check out our web site and subscribe to our new AvantGo channel - see www.ohr.edu for details. (C) 2002 Ohr Somayach International - All rights reserved.

From: RABBI JONATHAN SCHWARTZ [SMTP:jschwartz@ymail.yu.edu] To: internetchaburah@yahoo.com Subject: [internetchaburah] Internet Chaburah -- Parshat Matos maasei

Prologue: Following the battle with the Midyanites at the beginning of Parshat Matos, Elazar HaKohein warns the soldiers that they must perform Hagala and Tevila on the utensils that they captured, before the Keilim can be purified. The commentaries inquire as to why Elazar specifically offered to teach this lesson and why specifically to the soldiers?

Rav Zalman Sorotzkin suggests that the lesson of war is so traumatic, often things that are not normally allowed become Mutar during war. This includes the ability to eat meat of Nevailla. Notwithstanding the Heter to eat, the meat was not Mutar. It was incumbent upon the soldiers to realize that their pots would become Treif if they cooked the Neveila in those pots. It was the job of the chief chaplain, the Mashuach Milchama, to inform the soldiers of this difficulty, requiring them to do Hagala on the pots that they had eaten from. Pinchas, who was the Mashuach, chose to demonstrate his respect for his father Elazar, the Kohein Gadol and asked him to teach the message to the soldiers in his place. Hence the lesson from Elazar and to the soldiers.

What often appears to be clear, is, upon further examination often grainy and murky. This is especially true when that which is being discussed can be evaluated under the prism of glass. This week's Chaburah examines that prism. It is entitled:

Looking through the Glass

The Torah requires us to take our Keilim to the Mikvah when purchased from a Goy. The Torah's command seems to be limited to Keli Matechos (Metal utensils, Bamidbar 31:21-23). What is the story with glass? Do the obligations of Tevilat Keilim (Mikvah immersion) apply to them as well? Is that obligation Biblical or Rabbinic?

The Talmud (Avodah Zarah 75b) notes that according to Rav Ashi, glass utensils, by virtue of their quality of being able to be fixed, are like metal utensils. Rashi explains that when glass breaks it can be reborn and refashioned into a Keli so a repair job can be completed on it. Based upon this text, new glass utensils would need Tevila when purchased from a Goy.

In regard to Tumah, the Talmud (Shabbos 15b) compares glass Keilim to those of earthenware (which do not need Tevilas Keilim) since both come from the ground. The Gemara notes that in regard to Tumah, Tevilah will not help glass Keilim for this reason (See Sefer HaYashar 67:3, Rambam Keilim 1:5). Rashi is consistent with the text in Avodah Zara. How then are we to understand Rav Ashi's statement? Is glass like earthenware or like metal?

The Meiri (Avoda Zara 75) notes this difficulty and quotes unnamed opinions who suggest that because of the dual characteristics of glass one should do Tevila on them without a Beracha. The Meiri himself disagrees with this solution noting that Rashi notes that it needs Tevila (and thus it should be with a Beracha) and that there is no challenge to Rav Ashi in the first text. Moreover, the Raavad (on Avodah Zara) notes that there is a textual difference in the conflicting texts in the Talmud. The text in Shabbos is only relevant to Tumah-related Mikva, not for Tevilas Keilim from a Goy. (See Raavad to Hil. Keilim 1:5 where his opinion becomes more difficult to reconcile).

The Tosafos HaRosh to Shabbos (15b) offers a different approach. He suggests that we do not extend the comparison to metals in the case of real Tumah in order to prevent the proliferation of Tumah articles on the basis of a Chumrah.

The Vilna Gaon (Glosses to Yoreh Deah, 120:19) explains that glass is really caught in the middle. Therefore, there are instances where we compare it to earthenware as the comparison is logical. However, when that comparison is impossible, as in the case of Tevilas Keilim of glass where an earthenware parallel does not exist (you may not Toivel earthenware) then the similarities to metal Keilim must be utilized. This novel idea that allows glass to be Toiveled in a Mikva appears in the Rash (Keilim 30:2) as well.

Sefer Issur V'Heter He'Aruch (58:50) notes the conflicting Gemara texts and adds that we are Machmir in both cases. He notes that Chumra means that glass needs Tevila but can't have Hagala if it becomes Treif. The implication of Chumra is that one would not recite the Beracha when taking the Glass utensil to the Mikva. Not so, says the Issur V'heter (58:82). He holds that one makes a Beracha on glass that is brought to the Mikva. One might suggest that he holds L'chumra means that the Halacha is that glass needs Tevila. If it needs Tevila then a Beracha can be recited.

The Aruch HaShulchan (Yoreh Deah 120:25) offers a different understanding. He notes that like glass, all metal utensils find their source in the ground. The difference between metal and earthenware is that somehow metal changes through a chemical change whereby its properties and bonds are strengthened. Accordingly, heat and heat alone can affect a change in the shaping of the metal Keli. Clay Keilim can dry without fire and extreme heat and that will form the Keli. The Earthenware Keli has

the same properties as it had when it was earth. Metal is not in its same form. Therefore, earthenware stays with the properties of Adama even though metal does not. Glass too, changes properties through heat, so it needs the Chumra of metals because (as the Gemara says,) it can be reformed by heat. Notwithstanding, its original source is earth (like metals). Thus, glass takes on the special properties of metal in regard to Tevila even if it doesn't when Hagala is the issue. The understanding is one of Chumra: When the issue is Tumah, the Keli is an earthenware one and we have no reason to be Meikil on it, so it has no Takana. However, when Tevila is the issue, there is no textbook case of earthenware that is relevant - earthenware Keilim do not enter the discussion of Tevila - so we are Machmir and require it for glass.

L'Halacha, the matter of being Toivel glass seems to be recommended by most Poskim. Despite the theory originally advanced by the Meiri, most seem to suggest that this Tevila should be done with a Beracha (See Chochmas Adam 73:1; Shut Rashbash, 468; Aruch HaShulchan Y.D. 120:22). There are those who disagree (Siddur HaShaleim, Eshkol). Notwithstanding today, one would recite a Beracha on Tevila of glass Keilim. The only catch is that if one is planning on Toiveling both metal and glass Keilim, it is recommended that he recite the Beracha over the metal Keilim first (Pri Megadim Orach Chaim, 8, Eishel 15).

***** Battala News

Mazal Tov to Rabbi and Mrs. Eliezer Zwickler and the West Orange community upon their appointment of Rav Zwickler as Assistant Rov.

Mazal Tov to Tova and Noam Herrmann upon the birth of a baby boy.

Mazal Tov to Ari and Yael Rosenthal upon the birth of a baby boy.
Mazal Tov to Mr. and Mrs. Ira Leon Rennert and family upon Tammy's recent engagement.

From: chrysler[SMTP:rachrysl@netvision.net.il] Sent: Thursday, July 04, 2002 6:43 AM To: Midei Parsha Subject: MIDEI SHABBOS BY RABBI ELIEZER CHRYSLER

Parshat Matos-Masei
Eiver ha'Yarden

The Or ha'Chayim comments on the Pasuk where Moshe, speaking to Reuven and Gad, refers to the West Bank of the Jordan River as 'the land which G-d gave to the tribes'. Based on a Sifri, he explains that Eiver ha'Yarden (the East Bank) was not part of the land that G-d gave to Avraham, but land which they took by themselves.

In addition, he cites a Medrash which declares Eiver ha'Yarden ineligible to contain the Beis-Hamikdash or for the Shechinah to rest there (even before Yerushalayim was designated for that purpose), because it had less Kedushah than Eretz Yisrael proper. And this probably explains, he says, why Moshe had no intention of distributing it to the tribes, until Reuven and Gad approached him with their request (despite the fact that Yisrael had already captured it and were living there, as the Torah records at the end of Chukas).

The Or ha'Chayim elaborates further in Devarim. He interprets the Pasuk there (3:13) "that is what was called the land of the Refa'im" (which was promised to Avraham) to mean that it was only called by that name, though that is not what it really was. Interestingly, the Ramban there (2:10) argues with Rashi over this very point.

And he points out that, although Sichon was King of the Emori (one of the seven nations promised to Avraham, since in effect, he actually captured the lands in question from Mo'av - as the Torah specifically records in Chukas), it was not part of the land that G-d promised to Avraham (at least not yet).

He relents however, suggesting that perhaps this was indeed part of the land promised to Avraham, since after all, the Refa'im are synonymous with the Chivi, one of the seven nations that Yisrael was destined to capture. He qualifies this however, by referring to it as booty or to a place that was to remain desolate, but was not meant for habitation.

And he extrapolates this from the Pasuk in Ki Savo (in connection with Bikurim), which implies that it is only Eretz Yisrael proper that G-d gave us to live in. This precludes the lands of Amon, Mo'av and Edom (even though they were promised to Avraham Avinu), and the same applies to the lands of Sichon and Og (refer to the Eitz Yosef, later in the article).

Finally however, he concedes that even lands that were not given to Avraham, were subject to the Kedushah of Eretz Yisrael through their capture at the hands of the majority of Yisrael, as was the case with the land currently under discussion.

The Torah Temimah in Parshas Chukas (21:26), cites the Mishnah in Maseches Yadayim (4:3) where Chazal decreed T'rumos and Ma'asros on Amon and Mo'av, like Eretz Yisrael (which is min ha'Torah). And he explains that this is restricted to those parts of Amon and Mo'av which Yisrael did not conquer from Sichon and Og, which Chazal gave the Din of Eretz Yisrael because of their proximity to it. But the parts that they captured are considered Eretz Yisrael proper, and are subject to T'rumos and Ma'asros min ha'Torah.

Indeed, that is how the Bartenura interprets the Mishnah in Yadayim.

The Eitz Yosef too (on the Medrash Tanchuma in Parshas Matos, Parshah 7) considers Eiver ha'Yarden part of Eretz Yisrael, but he cites the Mishnah in Bikurim (1:6), which obligates bringing Bikurim and reading the Parshah with regarding fruit that grew there. In fact, even Rabbi Yossi Hag'lili only exempts them because the area does not fit the description 'a land flowing with milk and honey' (a criterion for the bringing of Bikurim), but not because they are not considered part of Eretz Yisrael.

And what's more, he says, Rashi in Sanhedrin connects this to the fact that the Omer (and the Sh'tei ha'Lechem) can be brought from there. Indeed, the Mishnah in Keilim (1:6), when listing the ten Kedushos, presents the first Kedushah as 'Eretz Yisrael, from which the Omer, Bikurim and the Sh'tei ha'Lechem may be brought'. It is unclear why the Tana does not add to the list the obligation to bring T'rumos and Ma'asros, which seems to belong to the same category, but that is another matter. And, the Eitz Yosef adds, Tosfos in Megilah (10a) learns like Rashi in Sanhedrin too. And he therefore wonders at the Maskil le'Eisan in Rosh Hashanah who assumes that the Omer cannot be brought from Eiver ha'Yarden. And the Eitz Yosef brings a final proof for his opinion from the fact that Moshe would never have agreed to settle Reuven, Gad and half of Menasheh in an area that did not have the Kedushah of Eretz Yisrael, and that was Patur from some of the Mitzvos.