



INTERNET PARSHA SHEET
ON PINCHAS - 5777

To: parsha@parsha.net
From: cshulman@gmail.com

BS"D

In our 22nd year! To receive this parsha sheet, go to <http://www.parsha.net> and click Subscribe or send a blank e-mail to parsha-subscribe@yahoogroups.com. Please also copy me at cshulman@gmail.com. A complete archive of previous issues is now available at <http://www.parsha.net>. It is also fully searchable.

Sponsored anonymously in memory of
Chaim Yissachar z"l ben Yechiel Zaydel Dov

To sponsor a parsha sheet (proceeds to tzedaka) contact
cshulman@parsha.net

from: torahweb@torahweb.org
to: weeklydt@torahweb.org
date: Tue, Jul 11, 2017 at 10:21 PM
subject Rabbi Mordechai Willig - Zeal and Peace
Rabbi Mordechai Willig
Zeal and Peace

I Pinchas turned back Hashem's wrath from upon B'nai Yisrael, when he was zealous, displaying Hashem's zeal in their midst, and he was given Hashem's covenant of peace (paraphrase of Bamidbar 25:11-12). Rashi interprets "bekan'o - when he was zealous" as "benokmo - when he avenged", emphasizing Pinchas' action, i.e. killing Zimri and Cozbi (25:8, 14-15), rather than his zeal.

Toras Chaim (Sanhedrin 82a) explains that it was Pinchas' anger which led him to act immediately when he saw the chilul Hashem. Had he waited until the sinful deed ended, his killing of the perpetrators would be an act of murder and a capital offense. Thus it was his zeal which enabled his vengeful act.

Perhaps it was Pinchas' zeal itself which turned back Hashem's anger. In effect, Pinchas' anger substituted for the anger Hashem should have expressed (Rashi 25:11), thereby ending the anger and the plague (25:8).

Since zeal and anger can often be expressed inappropriately and lead to unwarranted divisiveness, Hashem gave Pinchas His covenant of peace.

II One who cohabits with a gentile woman, zealots may kill him (ibid 81b). If the sinner is not killed by zealots, his punishment is kares (ibid 82a, based on Malachi 2:11-12). Even for zealots, the license to kill such a sinner is limited to a cases where the sin is committed publicly (b'farhesya) (Avodah Zara 36b).

The Ran (Sanhedrin 82a) suggests that the punishment of kares is also limited to when the sin is committed in public. It is the chilul Hashem, not the sinful act itself, which warrants kares. It was precisely the chilul Hashem which aroused Pinchas' ire.

The gemara (ibid 82a) interjects the story of the burning of Yehoyakim's skull in the middle of the discussions of zealots killing a public sinner. Ostensibly, it is an unrelated story, told by R' Chiya ben Avuya, whose previous statement deals with one who cohabits with a gentile woman. Perhaps there is a deeper connection than merely being stated by the same amora. Yehoyakim violated the laws of the Torah publicly (Yerushalmi Pe'ah 1:1). It is not the severity of the sin for which he is singled out, but the insolence to sin without shame (Rambam Hilchos Teshuva 3:11). In this way, Yehoyakim's public sin and gruesome punishment is related to one who cohabits publicly with a gentile woman, who is punished by kares if not killed by a zealot.

III How should one react nowadays to one who sins publicly, proudly, and without shame? Vengeful acts are unthinkable, forbidden and counterproductive. Egregious sinners were eliminated at a time of open miracles and clear Divine Providence (see the halacha of moridin, Avodah Zara 26b) to prevent others from being swayed by a small minority of sinners. Today, however, such actions would be viewed by the majority as outrageous thuggery. Vigilantism of this sort is counterproductive and prohibited (Chazon Ish Yoreh Deah 2:16).

While we dare not imitate Pinchas' actions, we also dare not ignore his emotional reaction. Equanimity in the face of chilul Hashem betrays a lack of zeal. In our analysis, it was the zeal itself which turned back Hashem's anger and stopped the plague. Our visceral reaction to public, shameless sin, especially in sexual relationships, such as those reacted to by Pinchas, should contain a measure of zealous outrage.

Zeal and anger, in word as in deed, can be expressed inappropriately and lead to unwarranted divisiveness. In striking a balance between zeal and apathy, we must pray to be given Hashem's covenant of peace in the spirit of Pinchas.

More divrei Torah, audio and video shiurim from Rabbi Willig
More divrei Torah on Parshas Pinchas

Copyright © 2017 by TorahWeb.org. All rights reserved.

Weeklydt mailing list

Weeklydt@torahweb.org

http://mail.torahweb.org/mailman/listinfo/weeklydt_torahweb.org

from: Shabbat Shalom <shabbatshalom@ounetwork.org>
reply-to: shabbatshalom@ounetwork.org

date: Fri, Jul 14, 2017 at 12:14 AM

Altruism or Nepotism / A Jewish Leader Needs More Than Just G-d Given Talent

Yad Yechiel Never Miss Subscription

These divrei Torah were adapted from the hashkafa portion of **Rabbi Yissocher Frand's** Commuter Chavrusah Tapes on the weekly portion: CD #995 – The Mitzva of Shiluach Hakain: Do We Make A Bracha? Good Shabbos!

Moshe's Request to G-d: Altruistic Or A Touch Of Nepotism?

In Parshas Pinchas, Rashi says that Moshe Rabbeinu now knew that he was not destined to go into Eretz Yisrael with the Jewish people and as such, he needed to make sure that they would have a proper leader following his passing. Rashi speaks about the altruism of Moshe Rabbeinu's request to the Almighty under these circumstances: "This is stated here to inform you of the praiseworthiness of the righteous. When they take their leave from the world, they put aside their own concerns, and deal with the concerns of the public." [Rashi on Bamidbar 27:15]

Moshe continues his request, delineating the desirable attributes of a worthy Jewish leader: "May Hashem, G-d of the spirits of all flesh, appoint a man over the assembly who shall go out before them and come in before them, who shall take them out and who shall bring them in; and let the assembly of Hashem not be like sheep that have no shepherd." [Bamidbar 27:16-17]

However, despite what Rashi wrote in pasuk 15, as quoted above, Rashi says something in his comment on the very next pasuk, which seems to contradict his earlier remarks about Moshe's altruism. Rashi writes in pasuk 16: "Once Moshe heard the Omnipresent say 'Give Zelophehad's inheritance to his daughters,' he said, 'The time has come that I should claim what I need (i.e. — that I should think of my family) that my sons should inherit my high position.'" How do we reconcile what seems to be an apparent contradiction in Rashi? Was Moshe being altruistic or was he looking out for the needs of his own family?

The sefer Avir Yosef, in connection with this question, references the Sefer HaChinuch's explanation of why the Torah instituted a section regarding laws of inheritance. Why is it that the Torah legislates that when a person dies all of his property and all of his possessions go to his children? The Chinuch writes that we all come down to this world with a mission that the Almighty has in mind for us. All the things He provides for us in this world are tools to complete our designated mission. After a person leaves this world, sometimes his mission is incomplete. Even if it is complete, he wants people to build on what he has accomplished thus far in carrying out his mission.

Therefore, the Chinuch writes, the person (people) who is (are) usually most appropriate to carry on the father's mission in life is (are) his child (children). Genetically, emotionally, and in terms of talents children often get their strengths and talents from their parents. Children are obviously not clones but they certainly are similar to their parents in many ways. Therefore, if there are people in the world that are typically "fit" to carry on the mission of their parents, it is indeed their children. For that reason, the Chinuch says, the Torah legislates that children should take possession of their parent's tools to carry on their mission.

If the person now leaves the world and he expects his children to carry on his mission, they in fact need those worldly possessions to be able to carry on their father's work. If that is the case, it the reason Moshe Rabbeinu asked that his children inherit his position may not be that he was interested in nepotism or that he was looking for a job for his kids. Moshe Rabbeinu was way beyond that and way above that.

Moshe Rabbeinu's mission in life was to be the teacher of Israel, the master of all the prophets and the leader of the Jewish people. He felt that his children were best suited to carry on that mission. They were, after all, his children. It was certainly within the realm of possibility that they would be the ones destined to carry on that mission.

Obviously, the Almighty had different plans. He told Moshe "this is not what I had in mind." "It is appropriate that Yehoshua now take the reward for his years of service. He was your faithful disciple who never left your tent." About this, Shlomo HaMelech wrote, "he who guards the fig tree will eat its fruit." [Mishlei 27:18]

Therefore, we see that Moshe Rabbeinu was not totally off the mark. For as his loyal disciple and servant of many years, Yehoshua had become the individual most suited to carry on Moshe's mission in life. However, this was never about the position that one's children would have in life. This is indeed, as Rashi says, about Klal Yisrael — the future of the Jewish people and the qualities of the future leader of the Jewish people. That was Moshe Rabbeinu's motivation.

Moshe's motivation was always the welfare of the people. There was no personal agenda. That is why Rashi introduces this teaching of Chazal by saying "Look at the greatness of the righteous. They are not concerned about their own needs. They are concerned about the community." In that context, Moshe felt that the people most suited to carry on his mission were his children. Therefore, with the good of the people in mind, he said, "It is now the time that my children should assume my position of leadership."

The Almighty felt that Moshe Rabbeinu was mistaken about who was most appropriate to assume leadership in Klal Yisrael at this historical juncture. In His Eyes, Yehoshua should have this job. However, this does not diminish from the fact that Moshe Rabbeinu's only concern was indeed that the people should have the proper leader.

A Jewish Leader Needs More Than Just G-d Given Talent

My next comment relates to the very next Rashi following the one we just discussed. On the pasuk "May Hashem, G-d of the spirits of all flesh appoint a man over the assembly" [Bamidbar 27:16], Rashi comments about the peculiar title "G-d of the spirits" (Elokai ha'Ruchos): "Why is this stated? Moshe said before Him, 'Master of the World! The personality of each individual is revealed before You; they do not resemble each other. Appoint a leader who can put up with each individual according to his personality.'"

A myriad of personalities exist within the Jewish nation. Klal Yisrael never was a monolithic body. The Rabbis tell us "Just as no two people look alike, no two people have exactly the same opinion" [Brachos 58a]. People have different personalities, different opinions, different approaches, and differing emotional makeups. Therefore, a Jewish leader needs to tolerate and suffer with all these personality types according to each one's own quirks and temperament. This was Moshe's request to Hashem. He must appoint someone who could handle the whole spectrum of personalities found within the Jewish nation.

I saw an observation made by Rav Simcha Zissel, the Rosh Yeshiva of the Chevron Yeshiva in his sefer, Saam Derech. He calls attention to the fact that the Torah says in the subsequent pesukim "Take to yourself Yehoshua son of Nun, a man in whom there is spirit, and lean your hand upon him... You shall place of your splendor upon him, so that the entire assembly of the Children of Israel will pay heed." [Bamidbar 27:18; 20]

This means that a person cannot just step into being the leader of Klal Yisrael. The leader needs to be invested with Divine Spirit and be inspired — not just from Moshe Rabbeinu, but from the Ribono shel Olam. This placement of the hands whereby Moshe Rabbeinu gave "semicha" to Yehoshua symbolized the fact that Moshe Rabbeinu was a conduit. The Master of the Universe passed on these talents — the wisdom and the intuition necessary to lead the people — through Moshe to his Divinely chosen successor.

No person is born with the talents required for leadership of Klal Yisrael. He does not come to such talent on his own. It requires S'yata d'Shmaya [Help from Heaven]. Only the fact that the Almighty gives those people the necessary tools to do the job enables them to succeed. If that is the case and indeed it was all going to be a gift from the Ribono shel Olam, then why was it necessary to appoint someone who could (to use Rashi's expression) "tolerate the personality of each and every individual?" If the Almighty provides all the wisdom and strengths necessary for the job to the leader anyhow, why does it matter who He chooses? Let Him take absolutely anybody for the job and then give him the necessary tools!

Rav Simcha Zissel explains that the talents the Almighty can grant a person fall into the realm of intellectual capabilities: Knowledge of Torah, Divine Help, intelligence, the skills required to lead people in battle, and organizational and bureaucratic skills. The Almighty could indeed provide all these. However, there is one thing that the Ribono shel Olam cannot give to a person — those are his middos tovot — his personality traits, the type of mensch [person] that he is — that a person needs to achieve on his own. That cannot be a gift from Hashem. Hashem does not take a person who has a temper and who has no patience and is irritable and suddenly make him into an accepting and tolerant person.

Therefore, as a prerequisite for the job, Moshe Rabbeinu says to the Ribono shel Olam — it must be a person who suffers the quirks of each and every member of Klal Yisrael. Yes, Hashem can give him the intellectual capabilities and the organizational skills. He can give him all those talents. However, the middos, the character traits, the type of mensch the person is that is cannot be a gift. The person must work on himself and earn them during his lifetime. He must be the type of person that has worked on his personality and has perfected his character to the degree that he can now tolerate all types of personalities and "suffer" (be sovel) the entire spectrum of human idiosyncrasies. These are not G-d given talents. They are things a person develops on his own.

Moshe Rabbeinu sought this type of person as his successor when he addressed "the G-d of all spirits".

Transcribed by David Twersky; Jerusalem DavidATwersky@gmail.com
Technical Assistance by Dovid Hoffman; Baltimore, MD dhoffman@torah.org
This week's write-up is adapted from the hashkafa portion of Rabbi Yissochar Frand's Commuter Chavrusah Series on the weekly Torah portion. A listing of the halachic portions for Parshas Pinchas is provided below:

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.

To Support Project Genesis- Torah.org
Rav Frand © 2017 by Torah.org.

from: Shabbat Shalom <shabbatshalom@ounetwork.org>

reply-to: shabbatshalom@ounetwork.org

date: Fri, Jul 14, 2017 at 12:14 AM

Influence & Power

Britain's Former **Chief Rabbi Lord Jonathan Sacks**

Knowing that he is about to die, Moses turns to God and asks him to appoint a successor:

Moses said to the Lord, "May the Lord, God of the spirits of all mankind, appoint a man over this community to go out and come in before them, one who will lead them out and bring them in, so the Lord's people will not be like sheep without a shepherd." (Num. 27-15:17).

It is a farsighted, selfless gesture. As Rashi comments: "This is to tell the praise of the righteous — that when they are about to leave this world, they put aside their personal needs and become preoccupied with the needs of the

community.” Great leaders think about the long-term future. They are concerned with succession and continuity. So it was with Moses.

God tells Moses to appoint Joshua, ‘a man in whom is the spirit’. He gives him precise instructions about how to arrange the succession:

“Take Joshua son of Nun, a man in whom is the spirit, and lay your hand on him. Have him stand before Elazar the priest and the entire assembly and commission him in their presence. Give him some of your authority so the whole Israelite community will obey him... At his command he and the entire community of the Israelites will go out, and at his command they will come in.” (Num. 27:18-21).

There are three actions involved here: [1] Moses was to lay his hand on Joshua, [2] have him stand before Elazar the priest and the entire assembly, and [3] give him some of your authority [me-hodecha]”. What is the significance of this threefold process? What does it tell us about the nature of leadership in Judaism?

There is also a fascinating midrash about the first and third of these gestures: “And lay your hand on him – this is like lighting one candle with another. Give him some of your authority – this is like emptying one vessel into another.” (Bamidbar Rabbah 21:15)

Beneath these enigmatic words is a fundamental truth about leadership.

In *L’esprit Des Lois* (1748), Montesquieu, one of the great political philosophers of the Enlightenment, set out his theory of the “separation of powers” into three branches: the legislature, the executive and the judiciary. Behind it lay a concern for the future of freedom if power were concentrated in a single source:

Liberty does not flourish because men have natural rights, or because they revolt if their leaders push them too far. It flourishes because power is so distributed and so organised that whoever is tempted to abuse it finds legal restraints in his way.

Montesquieu’s source was not the Bible – but there is, in a verse in Isaiah, a strikingly similar idea:

For the Lord is our judge; the Lord is our law-giver; the Lord is our king; he will save us. (Isaiah 33:22)

This tripartite division can also be found in Devarim/Deuteronomy 17-18 in the passage dealing with the various leadership roles in ancient Israel: the king, the priest and the prophet. The sages later spoke about “three crowns” – the crowns of Torah, priesthood and kingship. Stuart Cohen, who has written an elegant book on the subject, *The Three Crowns*, notes that “what emerges from the [biblical] texts is not democracy throughout the political system, but a distinct notion of power-sharing at its highest levels. Neither Scripture nor early rabbinic writings express any sympathy whatsoever for a system of government in which a single body or group possesses a monopoly of political authority.”

The three-fold process through which Joshua was to be inducted into office had to do with the three types of leadership. Specifically the second stage – “Have him stand before Elazar the priest and the entire assembly and commission him in their presence” – had to do with the fact that Moses was not a priest. His successor had to be formally recognised by the representative of the priesthood, Elazar the High Priest.

Power and influence are often thought of as being the same kind of thing: those who have power have influence and vice versa. In fact, though, they are quite different. If I have total power and then decide to share it with nine others, I now have only one-tenth of the power I had before. If I have a certain measure of influence and then share it with nine others, I do not have less. I have more. Instead of one person radiating this influence, there are now ten. Power works by division, influence by multiplication.

Moses occupied two roles. He was the functional equivalent of a king. He made the key decisions relating to the people: how they should be organised, the route they were to take on their journey, when and with whom they should engage in war. But he was also the greatest of the prophets. He spoke the word of God.

A king had power. He ruled. He made military, economic and political decisions. Those who disobeyed him faced the possible penalty of death. A prophet had no power whatsoever. He commanded no battalions. He had no way of enforcing his views. But he had massive influence. Today we barely remember the names of most of Israel’s and Judah’s kings. But the words of the prophets continue to inspire by the sheer force of their vision and ideals. As

Kierkegaard once said: When a king dies, his power ends; when a prophet dies, his influence begins.

Moses was to confer both roles on Joshua as his successor. “Lay your hand on him” means, give him your role as a prophet, the intermediary through whom God’s word is conveyed to the people. To this day we use the same word, *semicha* (laying on of hands), to describe the process whereby a rabbi ordains his disciples. “Give him some of your authority [me-hodecha]” refers to the second role. It means, invest him with the power you hold as a king.

We now understand the midrash. Influence is like lighting one candle with another. Sharing your influence with someone else does not mean you have less; you have more. When we use the flame of a candle to light another candle, the first is not diminished. There is now, simply, more light.

Transferring power, though, is like emptying one vessel into another. The more power you give away, the less you have. Moses’ power ended with his death. His influence, though, remains to this day.

Judaism has an ambivalent attitude towards power. It is necessary. Without it, in the words of Rabbi Hanina, deputy High Priest, “people would eat one another alive” (Avot 3:2). But Judaism long ago recognised that (to quote Lord Acton), power tends to corrupt and absolute power corrupts absolutely. Influence – the relation of prophet to people, teacher to disciple – is altogether different. It is a non-zero-sum game. Through it, both teacher and disciple grow. Both are enhanced.

Moses gave Joshua his power and his influence. The first was essential to the political and military tasks ahead. But it was the second that made Joshua one of the great figures of our tradition. Influence is simply more enduring than power.

From: Mordechai Tzion toratravaviner@yahoo.com [ravaviner] ravaviner-noreply@yahoogroups.com Date: Tue, Jul 11, 2017 at 2:16 PM Subject: [ravaviner] Thought for the Beginning of the Three Weeks - Hashem Hiding His Face [1 Attachment] To: ravaviner@yahoogroups.com
Yeshivat Ateret Yerushalayim From the teachings of the Rosh Yeshiva **Ha-Rav Shlomo Aviner Shlit"א**

Prepared by Rabbi Mordechai Tzion Visit our blog: www.ravaviner.com
Thought for the Beginning of the Three Weeks
Hashem Hiding His Face

Question: Why do we say that Hashem hides His face in the world (Hester Panim) when Hashem is everywhere?

Answer: Hashem can be found everywhere, but He sometimes hides; He is here but we cannot see Him. This means that everything which occurs in the world is under Divine direction, even strange events such as destructions, but Hashem is hiding. The Torah says: "I will surely hide My face" (Devarim 31:18). "I will hide" – He is there but we cannot see Him. "He was standing behind our wall, observing through the windows, peering through the lattices" (Shir Ha-Shirim 2:9). The Shechinah (Divine Presence) is always there but there are different levels. For example, Pirkei Avot says (3:6): If ten people learn Torah the Shechinah rests among them...and where do we learn that even five?...and where do we learn that even three?...and even two?...and even one? If the Shechinah is found with one person learning Torah, then why does the Mishnah have to begin with ten people? Go directly to one person. Answer: there are different levels of intensity by which the Divine Presence is found in a particular place. There is a level of the Shechinah dwelling when we are in our Land during the Redemption. There is a level when we are in Exile which is called "Shechinta Be-Galuta – the Shechinah in Exile." When the Temple is standing, the Divine Presence rests among us more, and when the Temple is not standing less so. Hashem is now slowly returning His Divine Presence to Zion. We are in an intermediate stage. He is hiding His face, because there is suffering and pain, and it is impossible to say that we have reached the complete Redemption. But we are not in Exile – pursued, plundered and murdered. In the Haggadah of Pesach, we say: "The day is approaching which is neither day nor night" (from the song "U-ve'chain Va'yehi Ba-chatzi Ha-liela" at the end of the Seder). It is like twilight, there is both darkness and light at the same time. Even though we are certainly waiting for the day which is completely “day,” we know that the Redemption comes "slowly, slowly."

View attachments on the web

Posted by: Mordechai Tzion toratravaviner@yahoo.com

from: **Rabbi Berel Wein** <genesis@torah.org>
to: rabiwein@torah.org
date: Wed, Jul 12, 2017 at 4:47 PM
subject: Rabbi Wein - Zealotry for the Good

Parshas Pinchas
Zealotry for the Good

In the midst of the sadness and angst that envelops us yet here in Israel and throughout the entire Jewish world, the story of Pinchas, the righteous zealot, rewarded by Heaven for his act of zealotry and violence, intrudes. We are still reeling from the killings and rockets and losses that we have so recently suffered. So, what are we to make of this most puzzling incident recorded for us in our holy Torah?

The Talmud teaches us that it was only through miraculous Heavenly interventions that Pinchas was able to slay the Midianite princess and the Leader of the tribe of Shimon and escape with his own life still intact. And the fact that the Lord, so to speak, extends His Divine hand of friendship, priesthood, peace and position to Pinchas, certainly shows God's acquiescence to Pinchas' act.

Yet the Talmud and Jewish tradition are of the opinion that only Pinchas' act of zealotry is to be admired. All other acts of unilateral zealotry in Jewish society in later generations are to be shunned. The prophet Elijah, who in Jewish tradition is identified somehow with Pinchas, is chastised by Heaven to moderate his zealotry and despair regarding the acknowledged evils of Jewish behavior in his time. Instead, he is assigned to be present at all circumcision ceremonies, Pesach sederim and to be the prophet of Jewish redemption and reconciliation.

He becomes the witness to Jewish loyalty and continuity. In effect, his zealotry is to be rechanneled into positive energy and eternal goodness. Elijah becomes thereby the fulfillment of God's commitment to Pinchas of peace, nobility and eternal greatness. It is this redirection of zealous energy to positive force that lies at the heart of God's commitment to Pinchas.

The Talmud teaches us that we cannot exist as human beings in this world by attempting to eliminate completely our negative instincts – our yetzer hara. Our task, rather, is to redirect those instincts and forces that define us as human beings into positive and productive activities and behavior.

One of the fundamental weaknesses of other faiths has been their attempt to completely negate the natural impulses that are part of all human nature. Celibacy and long states of meditation are not the tools of lasting spiritual enhancement and human continuity. Engaging our instincts and energy and channeling them into positive projects and holy endeavors is the wish of the Torah.

The zealotry of Pinchas and Elijah should be exploited for good causes – the priesthood and public service, compassion for others and a sense of Jewish unity, eternity and holy mission. It is the transformation of Pinchas from the man of violence to the man of peace that is the message of the Torah in this week's parsha. The story of Pinchas is recorded for us in the Torah to teach us that such transformations are possible and indeed necessary for the ultimate good of the Jewish people and humanity generally. The Jewish story is that Pinchas becomes Elijah and Elijah becomes the harbinger of Jewish redemption and eternity.

Shabat shalom

Rabbi Berel Wein- Jewish historian, author and international lecturer offers a complete selection of CDs, audio tapes, video tapes, DVDs, and books on Jewish history at www.rabiwein.com

from: **Chanan Morrison** <ravkooklist@gmail.com>
reply-to: rav-kook-list+owners@googlegroups.com to: Rav Kook List Rav-Kook-List@googlegroups.com date: Wed, Jul 12, 2017 at 3:53 AM subject: [Rav Kook Torah] Pinchas: Offerings of Bread, Fire and Fragrance

Pinchas: Offerings of Bread, Fire and Fragrance
The Torah uses a series of almost poetic metaphors to describe the daily Tamid offering:

“Be careful to offer My offering - My bread-offering, My fire-offering, My appeasing fragrance - in its proper time.” (Num. 28:2)

What is the significance of these four descriptions: offering, bread, fire, and fragrance?

Four Characteristics

These descriptions correspond to four basic characteristics that are common to all Temple offerings. They are particularly relevant to the Tamid, however, as this communal offering aspires to integrate holiness into the daily life of the nation.

“My offering.” In Hebrew, *korban*. The word *korban* comes from the root *karov*, meaning “close” or “near.” Temple offerings are an expression of the soul's underlying yearnings to draw close to God in all aspects of life.

The Tamid offering, representing the entire people, expresses these yearnings in the soul of the nation.

“My bread.” In Hebrew, *lachmi*. The Temple service reveals the inner harmony between the nation's material and spiritual realms.

Why does the Torah use the metaphor of bread? Bread has the remarkable ability to bind the soul to the body and its physical powers. The Hebrew root *lechem* also means “to solder together.” The offerings are a kind of Divine “bread,” cultivating the connection between the nation's natural and holy qualities.

“My fire-offering.” In Hebrew, *ishi*. Fire is a source of tremendous energy, capable of igniting and activating physical matter.

Offerings reflect the fundamental truth that the Divine aspect of the nation's soul is not limited to the intellectual and emotive spheres, but is also expressed in the physical realm.

“My appeasing fragrance.” In Hebrew, *rei'ach nichochi*. The Temple offerings foster a sense of pleasantness and sweetness, both for the individual and the nation as a whole. This sweetness is a result of Israel's special connection to God, and the nation's corresponding lifestyle of sanctity and meaning.

(Adapted from *Olat Re'iyah* vol. I, pp. 128-129)

from: Shabbat Shalom <shabbatshalom@ounetwork.org>

reply-to: shabbatshalom@ounetwork.org

date: Fri, Jul 14, 2017 at 12:14 AM

Teamwork and Leadership

Rabbi **Dr. Tzvi Hersh Weinreb**

“Alone we can do so little; together we can do so much.” “Teamwork is the fuel that allows common people to attain uncommon results.” I believe that most of us will enthusiastically agree to these two dictums, the first by Helen Keller, and the second by Andrew Carnegie. We have all seen instances of the effectiveness of teamwork in our personal lives, in our careers, and in the realm of politics.

Despite our conviction that teamwork is a good thing, we certainly have our doubts about how to achieve it. We are all familiar with groups getting together to try to build a team, only to discover that dissension and disagreement make it impossible for the team to even get off the ground. When we analyze the reasons for their failure, we discover that there are two schools of thought regarding the most effective composition of teams. There are those who believe that the most effective teams are composed of individuals who are very much alike, both in terms of their temperament and their opinions and beliefs. Others insist that, on the contrary, the most effective team is one that is heterogeneous; that is, the members are quite different from each other and bring different styles and skills to bear on the tasks at hand.

My own research and reading on this subject has led me to conclude that studies about the effectiveness of teams often omit one very important factor: team leadership. The talents of the leader are crucial if the team is to be successful. His or her skills are especially important if the team is a heterogeneous one. Working together with individuals who differ from each other can be quite challenging, but the truly adept team leader knows how to utilize the differences within the group to maximum advantage.

One leader who was particularly successful at forming a team of individuals who were not only different from each other, but who were in conflict with each other, was Abraham Lincoln. His ability to guide the members of his cabinet in a manner designed to achieve his own ends was remarkable. It is described in A

Team of Rivals, a fascinating book by Doris Kearns Goodwin. This book has become required reading not only for students of American history, but for all those who are interested in understanding how groups function best, and who can appreciate the role that leadership has in achieving effective teamwork.

This week's Torah portion, Pinchas (Numbers 25:10-30:1), provides us with much food for thought on the subjects of teamwork and team leadership. The team in this case is not a small group, but rather the entire Israelite nation. Aside from the myriad difficulties which all leaders face, the group leader in our parsha has the additional, perhaps insurmountable, challenge of following in the footsteps of none other than Moses, our teacher.

I refer, of course, to the following text: "Moses spoke to the Lord, saying, 'Let the Lord, God of the spirits of all flesh, appoint someone over the community... So that the Lord's community not be like sheep that have no shepherd.' And the Lord answered Moses, 'Single out Joshua, son of Nun, a man with a spirit in him... Invest him with some of your authority...'"

This seemingly straightforward text offers commentators a basis for many interesting observations. I will draw upon two commentators, both of relatively recent times. I refer to two 20th century rabbis, both trained in the great pre-Holocaust yeshivot of Lithuania. One is Rabbi Yechezkel Abramsky, and his contribution is drawn from a collection of his edited writings, Chazon Yechezkel. Rabbi Abramsky passed away in 1976. The second is Rabbi Zalman Sorotzkin, author of a most insightful commentary on all five books of the Torah, entitled Aznayim L'Torah.

Rabbi Abramsky is concerned with the phrase "spirits of all flesh." "All flesh" is best understood as a phrase indicating "each and every individual." The question arises, "Does each individual have many spirits?" Rabbi Abramsky begins his lengthy discussion of this verse with a passage in Maimonides' Guide to the Perplexed, in which the great medieval sage describes the human being as a "social creature;" that is, a creature who requires relationships with others.

Rabbi Abramsky then shares with his readers the Talmud's observation that just as no two people look exactly alike, so do they differ in their personalities and attitudes. He finds it paradoxical that a creature designed to live in relationship to others should be inescapably surrounded by others who are very different from himself. Does that not lead to inevitable conflict and strife?

Rabbi Abramsky suggests that the ultimate purpose of each individual is to combine his personality, with all of its contradictions and complexities, with the personalities of others. Thereby, the group will be composed of a multitude of individuals whose stark differences result in a harmonious and well-functioning group. "Each one of us," he writes, "is composed of a balance of opposites: mercy and cruelty, pride and humility, courage and fear, love and hate, self-control and lust, diligence and laziness. Yet, the mature person is able to find harmony in these inner opposites. So too, the group, even the national group, reaches its greatest potential when the opposites within the group achieve harmony."

He goes on to say that just as the individual achieves this harmony with his internal "leader," that being his intellect and self-discipline, so too can the group achieve its harmony through its leader. This is the function of leadership, and this is the reason that the Almighty chose the person of Joshua, a man who had "spirit within him," to guide the Children of Israel after Moses' death.

Rabbi Sorotzkin also finds teachings about leadership in our text, and they well supplement—one might even say enhance—the observations of Rabbi Abramsky. Quoting a close relative of his who was murdered in the Holocaust, Rabbi Hirshovitz, Rabbi Sorotzkin notes the manner in which Moses approaches the Almighty as he asks Him to find a new leader to replace him. Normally, when we approach the Almighty in prayer, we do not begin with our requests. We begin with words of praise and adulation for the Almighty. We first attempt to gain entrée, so to speak, into His divine presence. Only then do we dare ask Him to address our worldly needs.

However, in our text, Moses does away with words of praise for the Almighty. He utters no special requests for His mercy. Rather, he goes straight to the point. He "speaks to the Lord;" and the Hebrew word for "speaks" here is *veyadaber*, which connotes a strong and demanding type of speech. And without hesitation, he cuts to the chase: "Let the Lord appoint someone over the community!" Rabbi Sorotzkin finds an important lesson here: When one is acting on his own behalf and asking the Almighty for His intercession, then one

must preface his request with words of praise to the Master of the Universe. But when one is in a leadership capacity and addressing a request to the Almighty for the benefit of the greater public, the *tzibbur*, then one must eliminate words of praise and "demand" the Almighty's response. This is one aspect of the responsibility of leadership.

This week's Torah portion is replete with fascinating texts. They range from the drama of Pinchas' zealotry to the picturesque scene of the daughters of Zelafchad bringing their case before Moses. The latter half of the parsha is dedicated to details about the sacrifices to be offered in the Sanctuary for various holy occasions. In the midst of all of this rich material, we can very well lose sight of the few verses that we just explored, which draw upon rabbinic commentators of a very recent generation.

Let us not forget that our Torah is designed to teach us everything that human beings need to know. We certainly need to know how to lead and how to follow, how to create communities and how to work together constructively and harmoniously. In this week's Torah portion, we have an excellent opportunity to learn about some of what the Torah has to say about leadership and about teamwork.

Rabbi Kaganoff <ymkaganoff@gmail.com> Sun, Jul 9, 2017

Reply-To: kaganoff-a@googlegroups.com

To: kaganoff-a@googlegroups.com

Parshas Pinchas is the only parsha that mentions specifically the *korbanos* offered on Shabbos, thus, providing a reason to discuss the laws of Shabbos.

Bleaching or Laundering?

By Rabbi Yirmiyohu Kaganoff

Question #1: Bleaching or laundering?

"Is the name of the melacha bleaching or laundering?"

Question #2: Painting white

"If someone whitewashes his wall or paints something white, what melacha has he performed?"

Question #3: Threading a thread

"What could possibly be wrong with moistening a thread on Shabbos?"

Among the 39 melachos of Shabbos listed in the Mishnah is *melabein*, which I will translate and define shortly. It is the second of the thirteen melachos involved in manufacturing a garment, which is referred to as *sidura debegeg*. In order, they are: *Gozeiz* (shearing), *melabein*, *menapeitz* (carding or untangling), *tzovei'a* (dyeing), *toveh* (spinning thread), *meisach* (warping, a step in preparing to weave), *oseh batei nirim* (creating a heddle, a further step in preparing to weave), *oreig* (weaving), *potzei'a* (undoing a weave), *kosheir* (tying), *matir* (untying), *tofeir* (sewing), and *korei'a* (tearing).

Bleaching or laundering?

The *rishonim* dispute what is the definition and the proper translation of *melabein*. According to *Rashi* (Shabbos 73a), the correct translation of the melacha is *laundering*. The *Rambam* (*Hilchos Shabbos* 9:10) disagrees, contending that the actual definition of the *av melacha* is *bleaching*, which means removing the color from a fabric or fiber. Although the *Rambam* agrees that *laundering* on Shabbos is prohibited *min haTorah*, in his opinion, *laundering* is a *toladah*, or subcategory, of the melacha of *melabein*, not the *av melacha*, or primary category.

A question that one would ask on this ruling of the *Rambam* is why *bleaching* is not considered the same melacha as *tzovei'a*, *dyeing*, which is also concerned with changing the color of a fiber. Since *melabein* is *bleaching*, which changes the color of an item, and *tzovei'a* is *dyeing*, which changes the color of an item, why are these two separate melachos?

The answer appears to be that whereas *tzovei'a* adds color to the fiber, *bleaching* removes color from the fiber. In the *Rambam's* opinion, a distinction is made between adding color to an item, which constitutes *tzovei'a*, and *bleaching* it, which removes the color and constitutes *melabein*. *Laundering*, which removes impurities from the cloth that detract from its appearance, is therefore a *toladah* of *melabein*.

An advantage to the *Rambam's* approach is that *melabein* shares its root with *lavan*, which means white. (As a curiosity, the Modern Hebrew word for *bleaching* is *malbin*, derived from the same root, *lavan*. The word *malbin* is used

in the Mishnah [Nega'im 4:4], although there it has a different meaning from the modern word. In the Mishnah the word means turning white. [See a similar usage in Parah 2:5.] Since Rashi understands that the av melacha melabein means laundering, it is strange that the Mishnah did not call the melacha mechabeis, which means laundering.

It should be noted that there is a rishon who appears to hold that bleaching is not included under melabein at all, but is forbidden because of tzovei'a (see Tosafos, Bava Kamma 93b s.v. ha). This approach follows Rashi that melabein means laundering, but restricts laundering to actions that clean, and does not extend it to those that change the material's color. Any activities that change an item's color are considered tzovei'a, according to this opinion.

Clean or color?

This dispute between Rashi and the Rambam reflects different ways of understanding the concept of the melacha. According to Rashi, the focus of the melacha is the cleaning of cloth, whereas the Rambam understands its focus to be changing the cloth's appearance. Laundering is included, according to the Rambam, because it changes the appearance of the cloth, albeit by removing dirt rather than by removing color.

There are halachic differences that result from this dispute, although I am unaware of any that affect us today. When the Beis Hamikdash is rebuilt, bimheira biyameinu, there will be questions regarding offering korbanos chatos that will be affected by the dispute between Rashi and the Rambam.

Notwithstanding their dispute, both Rashi and the Rambam agree that all forms of laundering are prohibited on Shabbos. In the modern world, most laundering is performed by dropping clothes into a washing machine, adding detergent, and turning the machine on to its appropriate cycle. However, prior to the invention of the washing machine, mankind was familiar with the different stages involved when laundering clothing. There are numerous questions germane to the details of how one launders clothing that affect the halachic application of melabein.

Several stages

There are several stages involved in laundering. First, one soaks the clothing or fiber, which loosens the grime. Then, one scrubs the clothing or fiber, which separates the loosened grime from the fibers of the material. One then wrings out the water, which removes much of the dirt. Finally, one rinses out the material, which washes away the remaining dirt residue. Thus, the standard way of laundering clothes involves four different steps: soaking, scrubbing, wringing, and rinsing. Let us now understand some other halachic ramifications of these steps.

Soaking

The Gemara teaches that throwing a kerchief into water violates Shabbos min haTorah as an act of laundering (Zevachim 94b). As we will see shortly, this is prohibited not only if one soaks the cloth, but even if one only moistens it (Rashi, Shabbos 142b).

The rishonim disagree as to whether one violates melabein if one soaks cloth that one is not trying to clean. There is also a dispute whether soaking or moistening cloth is prohibited if one does it in a way that one is soiling the cloth, such as by mopping up a spill with a piece of cloth or a rag on Shabbos.

Because of space limitations, we will need to discuss these topics at a future time.

Rashi (Shabbos 142b) notes that pouring a small amount of water onto cloth similarly violates laundering. For this reason, one must always be careful not to place even a small amount of water or spittle on a stain on Shabbos. This is prohibited min haTorah even if one is concerned that the stain will set and ruin the garment.

Moistening a thread

The Yerushalmi (Shabbos 7:2) rules that moistening a thread in one's mouth on Shabbos, such as what one would do to thread a needle, violates a Torah violation of soaking the thread. It is unclear whether the Yerushalmi considers any moistening of a thread, even with water, to be laundering, or if the concern is only because one is using saliva, which has a special ability to launder, something that was well-known in the days of Chazal (Mishnah, Niddah 9:6).

Here is an interesting ramification of this ruling. Someone sewed a button onto their garment shortly before Shabbos. On Shabbos, he noticed that there was extra thread dangling from the button of a garment. The logical, short-term solution for this problem is to moisten the offending extra thread and wrap it

around under a button. However, halachically, doing this presents a serious problem. According to the above-quoted Yerushalmi, moistening the thread in order to facilitate this winding is prohibited min haTorah!

Squeezing

One of the steps in laundering clothing is that one wrings the dirty water out of the clothing. Wringing out cloth is a kind of squeezing. This sometimes creates confusion, because, the laws of Shabbos recognize two types of squeezing, what I will call (1) extracting and (2) wringing. The first type involves extracting juice or oil from fruit, such as grapes or olives, which is prohibited on Shabbos but has nothing to do with the laws of laundering. According to most rishonim, this type of squeezing is a violation of the melacha of dosh, threshing. The melacha of dosh is violated when one breaks the natural, physical connection between two items that are dissimilar in their use, thus creating a product that can be used easily. Further discussion of this type of squeezing, extracting, is beyond the scope of this article, whose topic is laundering.

Wringing

Wringing cloth to clean it is a different type of squeezing, and this is involved only when one squeezes out something that can be laundered, such as cloth or fabric. According to all opinions, it is forbidden min haTorah to squeeze water out of cloth. The rishonim debate whether this melacha is violated when one wrings out a cloth to remove absorbed wine, beer, oil or other liquids that are not customarily used for cleaning. Rabbeinu Tam contends that squeezing these liquids out of cloth is not prohibited min haTorah unless one wants to use the liquid (in which case it would be prohibited because it is considered extracting), whereas his nephew, Rabbeinu Yitzchok (whose name is usually abbreviated to R'Y), ruled that it is prohibited min haTorah (Tosafos, Kesubos 6a s.v. Hei, and other rishonim ad locum; Sefer Hayoshor #283; Tosafos, Shabbos 111a).

Because of space considerations, further discussion on this subtopic will be left for a future article.

Brushing a garment

According to many authorities, one can violate melabein even without use of water by brushing out a garment, at least under certain circumstances (Rema, Orach Chayim 302:1; Bach, Elyah Rabbah, Mishnah Berurah, Biur Halacha). For this reason, one should refrain from brushing clothes on Shabbos. The Mishnah Berurah (302:6) rules that one should be careful on Shabbos to place his clothes in places where they will not fall into dust or dirt, so that he does not come to brush the clothes.

At this point, we can answer the three questions that we posed at the beginning of our article:

Bleaching or laundering?

"Is the name of the melacha bleaching or laundering?"

Actually, it is a dispute among rishonim whether the melacha should be defined as

bleaching or as laundering, although for our contemporary purposes there may not be a halacha lemaaseh difference.

Painting white

"If someone whitewashes his wall or paints something white, what melacha has he performed?"

The answer is that he violated the melacha of tzovei'a, dyeing, not of melabein.

Threading a thread

"What could possibly be wrong with moistening a thread on Shabbos?"

Indeed, it might be prohibited min haTorah to do so, because it is considered that one laundered the thread.

We will continue our discussion of meleches melabein in three weeks.

from: Shlomo Katz <skatz@torah.org>

to: hamaayan@torah.org

date: Thu, Jul 13, 2017 at 10:29 PM

subject: Hamaayan - The Feeling that Unites

Parshas Pinchas

"Pinchas, son of Elazar, son of Aharon, the Kohen, turned back My wrath from upon Bnei Yisrael, when he zealously avenged Me among them." (25:11) Midrash Bemidbar Rabbah comments: Hashem said, "It is only fitting that he (Pinchas) should receive his reward. 'Therefore, say – Behold! I give him My

covenant of Shalom / peace' (verse 12)." The "Shalom" that was given to Pinchas is a great thing, for it meant that the entire world will act peacefully. [The "Shalom" that was given to Pinchas was more than the absence of conflict; it was a promise of reconciliation with the family of Zimri, the sinner that he killed (Etz Yosef).]

The Midrash continues: The Torah is entirely Shalom, as is written (Mishlei 3:17), "Its ways are ways of pleasantness and all its pathways are Shalom." When a person comes in from the road, we say, "Shalom." In the morning, we say, "Shalom." In the evening, we say, "Shalom." When we recite Shema, we conclude the blessings afterwards with, "He spreads a tent of Shalom over His nation." When we recite Shemoneh Esrei, we conclude with "Shalom." Birkat Kohanim ends with "Shalom." Rabbi Shimon ben Chalafta says, "There is no vessel that can hold a blessing other than Shalom, as is written (Tehilim 29:11), "Hashem will give might to His nation; Hashem will bless His nation with Shalom." [Until here from the Midrash]

R' Shlomo Mehr z"l (late 19th century; rabbi of Braila, Romania) writes: Regarding the quoted verse from Mishlei, commentaries explain that there are two types of ways—a well-traveled, public thoroughfare and a more private road. The first is called in Hebrew a "derech"; the second is called a "netiv." (R' Mehr cites the Zohar for this distinction.) Each of these types of roads has advantages and disadvantages. On a derech / busy thoroughfare, it is hard to concentrate on one's thoughts and one is constantly buffeted by other travelers. Such a road is not particularly "pleasant" to travel on. The advantage of a busy road, however, is that one is unlikely to be ambushed by highwaymen there. A private road, on the other hand, is more pleasant, but it is more dangerous because fewer people use it. It lacks "Shalom."

(Not so the Torah, says Mishlei: "Deracheha / Its ways are ways of pleasantness and [also] all netivoteha / its pathways are Shalom." It has the advantages of both types of paths.)

R' Mehr continues: When the Midrash says "It is only fitting that he should receive his reward," it means that most people have no claim of entitlement to reward. After all, what does G-d owe us?! However, one who goes beyond the letter of the law, beyond his obligations—as Pinchas did in risking his life for Hashem's honor—can claim entitlement to reward.

When Pinchas stood alone to kill Zimri, he chose the less-traveled path alluded to in the quoted verse in Mishlei. As such, he was in danger, without Shalom. (We now understand, notes R' Mehr, why the author of the Midrash connected the verse in Mishlei with our verse.) He didn't have risk his Shalom; he was going beyond the letter of the law. It is only fitting, therefore, that his reward be "Shalom." (Divrei Shlomo)

"It was after the plague — Hashem spoke to Moshe and to Elazar son of Aharon the Kohen, saying, 'Take a census of the entire assembly of Bnei Yisrael, from twenty and above, according to their father's houses, all who go out to the legion in Yisrael'.

"Moshe and Elazar the Kohen spoke to them in the plains of Moav, by the Jordan near Yericho, saying, 'From twenty years of age and above, as Hashem had commanded Moshe and Bnei Yisrael, who were coming out of the land of Egypt.'" (26:3-4)

Regarding the need for this census, Rashi z"l comments: A parable—It may be compared to the case of a shepherd whose flock was infiltrated by wolves, and he counted the sheep to discover the number that was left. [So, after the plague, Hashem counted those that remained.] Another explanation: When Bnei Yisrael left Egypt and were entrusted to Moshe's care, a specific number were entrusted to him. Now, when Moshe was close to dying and had to hand back his 'sheep,' he counted how many he was returning. [Until here from Rashi]

R' Yehuda Gruenwald z"l (rabbi of Szatmar, Hungary; died 1920) wonders: Hashem told Moshe to count Bnei Yisrael "according to their father's houses," yet those words are omitted when Moshe repeats the command to Bnei Yisrael! He writes: This difference between Hashem's command and Moshe's repetition of it can be explained by the existence of two reasons for the census, as Rashi notes. In Hashem's love for Bnei Yisrael, He wanted to know how many had perished in the plague. (Of course, notes R' Gruenwald, Hashem knows everything. Nevertheless, ordering a census is an expression of His love.) Expressing Hashem's love for each and every Jew required taking a detailed

census by family, so that Bnei Yisrael would notice that those who died in the plague were from the families of the tribe of Shimon that had sinned; this shows that Hashem acts justly and also mercifully. However, when Moshe repeated the command to Bnei Yisrael, he wanted to convey the second purpose as well—that he had to account for the nation that had been entrusted to him. For this purpose, only a total number was necessary. [In the actual implementation of the census, Moshe did, of course, follow Hashem's command, as the succeeding verses make clear.] (She'eirit Yehuda)

A Torah Tour of the Holy Land

When one sees cities of Yehuda (Judea) in their state of devastation, one says (based on Yeshayah 64:9), "Your holy cities have become a wilderness," then he tears his garment. (Shulchan Aruch, O.C. 561:1)

This applies only to cities in Yehuda, not to cities in the rest of Eretz Yisrael, which are not as important. Even if the cities in Yehuda are inhabited by Jews, if they are ruled by Ishmaelites, they are considered devastated. (Mishnah Berurah 561:1-2)

When one sees Yerushalayim in its state of devastation, he says (the continuation of the above verse), "Tziyon has become a wilderness; Yerushalayim, a wasteland," then he tears his garment (Shulchan Aruch, O.C. 561:2)

R' Yechiel Michel Tukachinsky z"l (1872-1956; Yerushalayim; author of Gesher Ha'chaim on the laws of mourning, and other works) writes: This should be done when one reaches a place from which he can see the Old City, for example from Har Tzofim (Mount Scopus) to the northeast, and similarly from other directions. (Ir Ha'kodesh Ve'ha'mikdash 17:2)

How does this Halachah apply today, when Yerushalayim is under Jewish control? Contemporary Halachic authorities differ.

R' Moshe Feinstein z"l (1895-1986; Russia and New York) writes: It seems logical that even though we have not yet been redeemed due to our many sins, one should not tear his garment when he sees Yerushalayim because, thank G-d, it is beautifully built-up and is not under the control of foreign nations. One would still tear his garment when he sees the site of the Bet Hamikdash. (Igrot Moshe O.C. IV No. 70:11)

R' Shlomo Zalman Auerbach z"l (1910-1995; Yerushalayim) disagrees. He writes: I think that as long as we see foreign houses of worship and cemeteries of idol worshipers in the Holy City, and we cannot uproot them, it is still considered "devastated." We lift our eyes to Heaven that we may soon see the Divine service in the Bet Hamikdash; then we will delight in Hashem and rejoice in His eternal salvation. (Minchat Shlomo No. 73)

To Support Project Genesis- Torah.org Hamaayan © 2017 by Torah.org. Do you have a question or comment? Feel free to contact us on our website. Join the Jewish Learning Revolution! Torah.org: The Judaism Site brings this and a host of other classes to you every week. Visit <http://torah.org> to get your own free copy of this mailing or subscribe to the series of your choice. Need to change or stop your subscription? Please visit our subscription center, <http://torah.org/subscribe/> – see the links on that page. Permission is granted to redistribute, but please give proper attribution and copyright to the author and Torah.org. Both the author and Torah.org reserve certain rights. Email copyrights@torah.org for full information. Torah.org: The Judaism Site Project Genesis, Inc. 2833 Smith Ave., Suite 225 Baltimore, MD 21209 <http://www.torah.org/> learn@torah.org (410) 602-1350

Esplanade Capital jeisenstadt@esplanadecap.com

Fri, Jul 14, 2017 at 12:25 AM

Rabbi Yisroel Reisman - Parshas Pinchas 5769

The name Pinchas is commonly spelled Pei Nun Ches Samach, however in the Chumashim it is spelled Pei Yud Nun Ches Samach. Maybe someone knows why there is a missing Yud in the name of Pinchas?

After Chamishi in 28:1 begin the Korbanois. The first eight Pesukim discuss the Korban Hatamid. Rebbi pointed out that although the Siddur

has a long list of Davening that is called Korbanois, that many people say, however, many people don't say it because it is a lot. If you do say Korbanois, then continue to say them, if you don't say Korbanois then at least say these eight Pesukim and the five Pesukim of the Ketoires. These are the main parts of Korbanois. (Rebbi mentioned this in Parshas Ki Sisa as well.)

The Korban Tamid is said as Korbanois before Davening. Shemoinei Esrei is also said K'neged Timidim Tiknu. Shacharis is K'neged the Tamid Shel Shacharis and Mincha is K'neged the Tamid Shel Bein Ha'arbaim. If Shemoineh Esrei is K'neged the Tamid then why do we also say the Parsha of the Tamid? Which one is the real Tefilla that is K'neged the Tamid? It could be the Aruch Hashulchan who says, the Amira of the Tamid before Davening is K'neged the Shechitah of the Korban Tamid and Shemoinei Esrei is K'neged the Zerika of the Dam of the Korban Tamid. That is what is Mechapeir. What we gain with this is that we can answer a question of the Noide B'Yehuda.

There is a Teshuvah Noide B'Yehuda in Cheilek Rishoin, Teshuva Daled. He was asked, why by every Shemoineh Esrei that is K'neged a Korban we say the Nusach of the Korban in the Shemoinei Esrei, and why by Shacharis don't we mention the Korban Tamid? According to this it is good. We already mentioned the Korban Tamid by Korbanois which was Bish'as Shechitas Hakorban. Later in Shemoneh Esrei is only the Zerikah where we are not required to mention what type of Korban it is.

On Yom Tov by Mussaf we say the Korban. Every Korban has 3 parts: 1) the animal, 2) the Menachois, which is the flour, and 3) the Nesachim, which is the wine that is poured onto the Mizbaiach. Isn't it strange that we say Uminchasam Kimdubar and the Menachois we have a whole Arichois where we spell it out? By the wine, we didn't spell out how much wine it actually is? We do it because that is the way the Torah says it in this week's Parsha. For an example, look in 28:17 - 28:25 where the discussion revolves around the Yom Tov of Pesach, the Menachois are spelled out and it says Viniskoi without spelling out the wine libation. Our Davening just mirrors the Torah. Why the Torah says it this way is a Kasha that needs a Teretz. Rosh Chodesh is the only place where the Torah spells out the Nesachim. Rebbi doesn't know the reason for this.

It says in 28:2 (קִרְבְּנֵי לֶחֶם לְאִשִּׁי), which means my bread. It must be understood B'derech Mashul that Kaviyachoil it is Hashem's bread. Rebbi saw in the Meshech Chochmoh on page # 90 and in the Hameik Davar from the Netziv that the word Lechem really means that which connects the Neshama to the Guf. That which sustains the body. This reminded Rebbi of something that Rav Pam once said. Rav Pam once said that just like the Beracha of Boirei Minei Mizoinois Paturs all food B'dieved, except for water, so to Hamoitzi Lechem Min Ha'aretz Paturs all food B'dieved including drinks and fruits. He brought a Raya from Sefer Shmuel Perek Yud Daled, where there is a story of Shaul going to battle. In Posuk 24 Shaul says (הַעֲרֹב-יֹאכַל לֶחֶם עַד-אַרְוֵר הָאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר). That no one should eat until the battle is over. In Posuk 27, (שָׁמַע-וַיִּזְנְתֵן לֵאמֹר, וַיִּשְׁבְּ יְדוֹ אֶל-וַיִּטְבַּל אוֹתָהּ בְּעֶרְת הַדְּבַשׁ, קִצְהָ הַמָּטָה אֲשֶׁר בְּיַד-וַיִּשְׁלַח אֶת הָעַם-אֶת עֵינָיו וַתִּאָרְגֶה וַתִּרְאֶנָּה) Yehoinason has some D'vash (honey) and Shaul said he is Chayuv Misah and the people spoke on Yehoinason's behalf to save him. However, Shaul had said (הַעֲרֹב-יֹאכַל לֶחֶם עַד-אַרְוֵר הָאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר), Rashi says Lechem means all kinds of food.

Rav Pam had said that that is a matter of Halacha. Here both the Meshech Chochmo and the Noida B'Yehuda learn, that Korban Lachmi means connected, which means the Korbanois keep Hakadoish Baruch Hu connected to us in this world.

Every one of the Mussafim has a Sa'ir L'Chatas except for Shabbos. Shabbos is the only time there is no Chattas at all. Why is Shabbos different in that it has no Chattas? The Pachad Yitzchok has a beautiful thought. Rav Hutner writes, the first time we have Ein Mukdim U'muchar B'Toira is in Parshas B'reishis. B'reishis starts with the first day, second day, third day... then after the sixth day, Vayichulu Hashamayim and the

description of Shabbos. This is out of order because the original Cheit of Adom took place on the sixth day. Shabbos is spoken about before the Cheit even though the Cheit took place earlier. Why is that so?

Rav Hutner writes that Shabbos is a day of Kedusha where a Yid has an ability to connect to the Ribboinoi Shel Oilam that is L'maylo Min Hacheit. The day of Shabbos has a level of D'veikus with Hashem that makes it K'ilu there never was a Cheit. If the Cheit of Adom was written first and then Shabbos, it would be a Shabbos that was L'achar Hacheit. Shabbos is really L'mayla Min Hacheit. If someone uses Shabbos properly he can connect to Hakadoish Baruch Hu. Shabbos is special in that Hashem is with those people who are M'aneig on Shabbos. The Zohar compares it B'derech Mashul to a father who gets down on his hands and knees and plays with his child. Since Shabbos is L'mayla Min Hacheit, it has no Korban Chattos. Chattas is a Korban that can only come after the Cheit. That is Pshat in what we say in Mussaf, Tikanta Shabbos Ratzisa Korbanoiseha, that Hashem established Shabbos and found favor in its offerings. The reason the Korban of Shabbos is special, is because Shabbos doesn't have a Korban Chattas. Normally a Korban Chattas is offered first to be Metaheir and only then is the Korban Oilah brought. Here by Shabbos, there is no Korban Chattas brought and we go straight to the Korban Oilah. Rebbi ended by saying that he hopes that we who are in the working world now are using Shabbos properly in our Avoidas Hashem, and we should be Mekareiv our children in the Ahavah of the Yoim Hashabbos to see the Kedushah of the Yoim Hashabbos.