

B'S'D'
INTERNET PARSHA SHEET
ON BO - 5761

To receive this parsha sheet in Word and/or Text format, send a blank e-mail to parsha-subscribe@yahoo.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]
"RavFrand" List - Rabbi Frand on Parshas Bo -
Dedicated This Year Le'eluy Nishmas Chaya Bracha Bas R.
Yissocher Dov - In memory of Mrs. Adele Frand
An 'Inspiration From Below' Can Trigger A 'Response From On High'

At the beginning of the book of Shmos, the Torah mentions an attribute of Moshe Rabbeinu, which, in part, qualified him to be the leader of the Jewish people. "And Moshe grew up, and he went out amongst his brethren and he saw their suffering" [Shmos 2:11]. The Medrash comments that Moshe saw their suffering and cried: "How my heart goes out for your suffering! If only I could die for you, to spare you your suffering." The Medrash says that Moshe removed his princely garments and went out into the field to try to help his brethren make the bricks and mortar, just so that he could be a part of their pain. G-d, according to Medrash, said to him: "You left your comforts to participate in the pain of Israel as an equal, I will leave the company of the Higher Ones so that I may speak with you."

This Medrash says that Moshe merited communicating with the Divine Presence of G-d because he made himself a partner to and physically participated in the pain of Israel. Moshe was unable to stand idly by in the palace while his brethren were suffering. He felt the urge and the need to join them.

Rashi says on the words "And he saw their suffering", that Moshe did not merely see their suffering and then continue his daily business. Moshe "put his eyes and his heart to the matter" - he would constantly envision his brethren's suffering in his mind. When one can constantly visualize such suffering, he does not sit idly by; he becomes an active participant. This was Moshe's great attribute - the ability to psychologically participate with his brethren in the time of their suffering.

The Alter of Kelm (1824-1898) says that there is an even greater insight here. An earlier verse says that "G-d saw, and G-d knew" [Shmos 2:28]. And there Rashi uses virtually the same expression as he did concerning Moshe: "G-d placed his eye upon them and did not remove his heart from them."

The Alter of Kelm explains that G-d was inspired - as it were - by the actions of Moshe. It was Moshe's own similar actions that triggered G-d's looking at and taking to heart, so to speak, the troubles of the Jewish people.

In Kabbalah there is a concept called "inspiration from Above" and there is another concept called "inspiration from below". "Inspiration from below" means that sometimes we, down here, take an action that prompts G-d above to react. Moshe's personal, emotional, participation in the pain of Israel was an act of "inspiration from below" which caused G-d to respond from Heaven to the point that G-d too now participated emotionally in the suffering of the Jewish people.

This teaching of the Alter from Kelm is saying that if we can participate and feel pain when the Jewish people are in a time of trouble, that elicits a similar response from G-d. When one Jew worries about

another - when he cannot sleep well because another Jew is not sleeping well - then that prompts G-d to take note.

The pasuk [verse] tells us in Parshas Va'era [6:14] "These are the heads of the houses of their patriarchs" (and the pasuk then lists the descendants of Reuven). The Torah uses the same expression by the tribe of Shimon. But when it reaches Levi, the Torah merely says, "These are names of the sons of Levi". The Shlo"h haKodesh (1560-1630) explains that there was something special about the names of the children of Levi. Levi felt bad that he was not part of the enslavement (the Tribe of Levi, as a whole, was excused from slavery). The Tribe could not live with the idea that their lives should go on normally while their brethren were experiencing a time of trouble. Therefore Levi gave each of his sons names that impressed upon them the idea that they were, in fact, in exile. Gershom - I was a stranger (Ger) there (Sham) in a foreign land. Kehas - Their teeth were blackened and knocked out (Keehu Shenaihem). Merari - Because everyone has it so bitter (Merirus).

Levi felt the responsibility to participate in the larger trouble confronting Israel. He felt the need to participate. Life cannot go on as usual when the Jewish people are experiencing a time of trouble.

During World War I, the Chofetz Chaim's (1838-1933) wife woke up in the middle of the night to find her husband not in his bed. She went looking for him and found him sleeping on a bench. She asked for an explanation. He responded: "The Jewish people are in the middle of a war. There are people who have lost their houses. Whole communities have been dispersed. There are many Jews out there tonight who do not have beds. How can I sleep in my own bed under such circumstances?"

I am not necessarily suggesting that we all should not sleep in our own beds tonight. [Rabbi Frand delivered this class during the 1991 Persian Gulf War, when Iraqi missiles were falling on Israel. It is sadly apropos today as well.] I do not believe that we are on the level of piety of the Chofetz Chaim. But we have to do something to participate in the trouble facing the Jewish people. We all have to give up something. We all have to do something physical and concrete indicating that our lives tonight and tomorrow and perhaps for the next few days cannot be the same as they have been. Even if what we give up is merely a token, at least symbolically we must do something to feel the pain that our brethren the house of Israel are feeling at this very minute.

Let me close with the words of this week's Haftorah. The Haftorah speaks of a great battle between Nevuchadnetzar King of Babylon, and Egypt. The prophet refers to a period in history where the two great powers of the world will do battle with each other and the Jewish nation will have to sit there, worrying - what will happen to us?

The whole world is fighting and the Jewish nation is worried about what will happen to it. The words of the prophet are "You shall not fear, my servant Jacob, said the L-rd. For I am with you. For I will make finished with all the nations that I have dispersed you thereto. But you I will not destroy. I will punish you with justice, but I shall not destroy you utterly." [Yirmiyahu 46:28].

There may be suffering. There may be losses, the prophet warns us. But it will be for judgment - it will serve as atonement and will be instructive. We will never be destroyed.

Transcribed by David Twersky; Seattle, Washington twerskyd@aol.com Technical Assistance by Dovid Hoffman; Baltimore, MD dhoffman@torah.org These divrei Torah were adapted from the hashkafa portion of Rabbi Yissocher Frand's Commuter Chavrusah Tapes on the weekly portion: Tape # 268, The Consequence of Dropping Sefer Torah or Tephillin 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. Torah.org: The Judaism Site <http://www.torah.org/> 17 Warren Road, Suite 2B learn@torah.org Baltimore, MD 21208 (410) 602-1350 FAX: 510-1053

<http://www.kby.org/torah/parsha/bo61.html>

Parshat Bo

Miracles and Nature

Rosh Hayeshiva RAV MORDECHAI GREENBERG shlita

Parshat Bo begins (Shemot 10:1-2):

Hashem said to Moshe, "Come to Pharaoh, for I have made his heart and the heart of his servants stubborn so that I can put these signs of Mine in his midst; and so that you may relate in the ears of your son and your son's son that I made a mockery of Egypt ... that you may know that I am Hashem.

Miracles are the foundation of belief. Thus, G-d opened the Ten Commandments with the declaration, "I am Hashem, your G-d, Who has taken you out of the land of Egypt." (Shemot 20:2) We find, however, an apparent contradiction regarding the issue of miracles.

There are times that we are told to sit by passively and not to do anything, but rather to rely on miracles. For example, at the splitting of the Red Sea Bnei Yisrael were told, "Hashem shall make war for you, and you shall remain silent." (Shemot 14:13) Similarly, Gideon was told in his war against Midian that there were too many soldiers with him, "lest Israel aggrandize itself over Me, saying, 'My own strength has saved Me.'" (Shoftim 7:2) He maintained only three hundred men, and through them Israel was saved. In the same way, King Hezekiah said, in contrast to previous kings, "I do not have the strength neither to kill, nor to chase, nor to sing [praise]. Rather, I will lie on my bed and You will do. G-d said, 'I will do,' as it says, 'An angel of Hashem went out and struck down the Assyrian camp.'" (Midrash Rabbah Eichah 4)

On the other hand, we find that in the battle of Ai Yehoshua was required to take action and to employ military tactics. Similarly, we are familiar with the rule, "We do not rely on miracles." (Pesachim 64b)

Rav Kook zt"l explains that the resolution to this issue depends on the spiritual state of the nation. When Bnei Yisrael are on a high spiritual level and are firm in their belief in G-d, there is no need for overt miracles. The opposite is true; the greatest demonstration of faith is when one follows a natural course of human hishtadlut (endeavor) and Divine help accompanies him in whatever he does. The Ran writes this same idea in his Drashot, on the pasuk, "Remember Hashem, your G-d; that it was He that gave you strength to make wealth." (Devarim 8:18) The pasuk does not say that G-d makes the wealth for you while you sit idle, but rather all the doing is yours and Hashem supports you and gives you the strength to make the wealth!

In this vein, Chazal comment (Shabbat 118b), "One who recites the Hallel every day disgraces and blasphemes," because in doing so he bases belief only on overt miracles alone. However, true belief is recognizing the Divine assistance that is always present in all courses of nature. This is what we say in davening, "On your miracles that are with us every day, and on your wonders that are at every moment."

However, when the nation falls from its spiritual stature -- when it is preoccupied with materialism and does not see the hand of G-d in everything -- man's hishtadlut will not lead to belief. Just the opposite! The more he expends human effort, the more he will think, "My strength and the might of my hand made me all this wealth." (Devarim 8:17) In such a situation, it is necessary to increase the performance of miracles and to minimize human attempt and effort.

In the period of Egypt and the Wilderness, when the nation was young, there was a need for overt miracles in order to establish belief in Yisrael. However, when they entered Eretz Yisrael and were already accustomed to miracles, it was possible to rely on human effort and to see G-d's hand evident in it. In contrast, in the time of Gideon the nation had already sunk to a low spiritual level. The same was true in the times of Hezekiah, after his father, Achaz, tried to abolish the name of G-d from Yisrael. Thus, there was a need to refrain from human initiative and

to rely on a miracle in order to strengthen belief.

The ultimate redemption can come in one of two ways. The first is miraculously, "As in the days when you left Egypt I will show it [=the nation] wonders." (Micha 7:15) The second is in a natural manner, "little by little." The superficial view is that if we are worthy we will merit overt miracles; if not, the redemption will come about through natural means. However, according to what we explained above, the opposite is true. In the ideal situation there is no need for miracles, and only if the nation declines will there be a need for miracles.

The Gemara in Yoma (29a) compares the miracles of Egypt and of the first Temple to night and Esther to dawn. "Just as dawn is the end of the night, so too Esther is the end of all miracles." When the dawn breaks there is no longer any need for a candle and it is possible to extinguish it. In the ultimate redemption there will be no need for miracles since there will be a great light, and the Divine Providence will be recognized also in the course of nature.

<http://www.shamash.org/tanach/tanach/commentary/mj-ravtorah/bo.ravtorah.96>

From jr@novell.com Wed Jan 24 02:37:19 1996 [OLD] Subject: shiur harav on parshas Bo

Shiur HaRav ZT'L on Parshas Bo

"And each woman shall ask from her neighbor and house mate silver vessels and gold vessels (V'sha'ala Isha M'shchenta Umigras Baysa)" (Shemos 3:22).

"Please speak to the people that each man should ask from his friend... ('Vyishalu Ish Ma'ais Ray'ayhu)" (Shemos 11:2-3).

The Rav ZT'L explained the different terminology used in these verses, in the first verse neighbors and house mates and in the other a person should request from his friends.

The term She'ayla throughout Tanach means to request or to demand something, not (in the simple definition) to borrow. When Hashem tells Moshe that a woman should request FROM her neighbors and a man should request FROM his friend, the connotation is to demand and take something away from them. When the Torah discusses the laws of a borrower (Sho'el, Parshas Mishpatim) the term Ma'im (from with) is used. This connotes borrowing with an obligation to repay or return the item as the original owner retains his rights to the object.

Apparently the intent of Hashem was that the objects taken by Bnai Yisrael should be given to them without reservation (Matanah Gemurah, see Rashbam, Shemos 11:2). Why was it necessary for Bnai Yisrael to demand these things? Another obvious question is why did Hashem have to bring the 10 plagues on Egypt and Paroh when He could easily have forced Paroh to let Bnai Yisrael go much more readily and quickly?

The Rav explained that Hashem was manifesting the concept of "Kophin Oso Ad Sheyomar Rotzeh Ani", we apply force to someone until the individual in question comes to the self realization that what is demanded of him is correct and he expresses his desire to comply. Hashem wanted Paroh to recognize on his own the need to send the Jews out of Egypt and to comply with the demand of Hashem. As Paroh said "Arise and leave from among my people, also you and also all of Bnai Yisrael" (Shemos 12:31). However the question remains: why did Hashem prolong the stay of Bnai Yisrael? Could Paroh not have been made to realize this in a shorter interval?

The Rav further explained that Hashem wanted Paroh not only to allow Bnai Yisrael to leave Egypt, but to come to respect them as well. As long as they were slaves, Paroh thought of them as sub-human. Chazal say on the verse of "Who is Hashem that I shall listen to him" (Shemos 5:2) that Paroh searched through his chronicles and was not able to find the name of Hashem the Gd of Israel mentioned anywhere. What Chazal intended to indicate was that Paroh did not consider Bnai

Yisrael a bona fide nation, therefore he saw fit to enslave them. The 10 plagues were intended to show Paroh that Bnay Yisrael were a great nation, more so than to punish him and Egypt. Paroh was made to realize that they were not a bunch of insignificant Hebrews, rather they were a great national entity. As the Torah says "And afterwards he shall send you out" (Shemos 11:1). It does not say I will take you out, rather Paroh will realize that you are a great nation and a significant entity and he will send you out.

Property ownership is an extremely important and fundamental right and principle according to the Torah. This is best illustrated by the law that one may defend his home and property from clandestine thieves (Ba B'machteres), and to struggle to protect them even to the extent of taking the life of the thief. Property, material possessions, gives a man self esteem and self value. It also commands respect from others. On the other hand, a slave has no property of his own, for whatever he acquires belongs to his master. Hashem told Moshe that "When you shall leave, you shall not leave empty handed" (Shemos 3:21). Had Bnay Yisrael left Egypt without material possessions and wealth, they would have still been looked on as slaves. Therefore Hashem asked them to demand from the Egyptians items of value as payment for their years of service. These items were to be taken from their neighbors and house mates, for they were the ones who had taken away their property and self dignity in the first place. (The Rav noted that when the Jews were liberated from the concentration camps after the Second World War, they went to the surrounding towns to retrieve their stolen property from the local populace who so eagerly took it from them.)

"And I will give the favor of this people" etc. (ibid) The Egyptians will come to see you as a nation, a people with dignity and no longer look upon you as slaves. Some might have thought that the Egyptians chased the Jews out of Egypt because they had become lepers. The Torah tells us just the opposite: that they left with tremendous self respect and dignity. One aspect of this self respect was their departing with great material wealth, Rechush Gadol. "V'nitzaltem Es Mitzrayim" (Shemos 3:22): Rashi explains V'nitzaltem as derived from the verb to save. That is to say that you shall save something for yourself when you leave: you shall save your dignity and earn great respect in the eyes of the Egyptians. As it says that Moshe gained great respect in the eyes of the Egyptians and the house of Paroh (Shemos 11:3).

The Rav explained the different terminology between neighbors and house mates in one verse and friends in the other. The Gemara teaches us that the term 'Ray'ayhu' applies exclusively to a Jew. Hashem wanted the Jews to share the wealth among themselves. A Jew living in a more affluent Egyptian neighborhood would take more wealth from his neighbors than the Jew who lived in a less affluent area. Hashem wanted the Jews to distribute the wealth more equitably. This was an extreme act of Chesed, charity, that bound the people and demonstrated their sense of a common destiny. Similarly, the Rambam writes (Matnos Aniyim 10:2) that "would not a brother take pity on his brother". If Jews do not look after their own brothers and take pity on them, who will? The different terminology reflects the desire that each Jew take possessions from their Egyptian neighbors and that they in turn should redistribute the wealth among themselves so that all Bnay Yisrael would enjoy equivalent wealth.

After the Jews left Egypt, Hashem asked them to give up a part of their wealth to build a Mishkan for Hashem (V'yikchu Li Trumah) (Shemos 25:2). A freed slave, who has had nothing of his own, finds it extremely difficult to willingly give up any part of his newfound possessions. To show that they were truly free men and women, Bnay Yisrael had to demonstrate their willingness to give up some of their own wealth for a higher cause. Bnay Yisrael answered this call, particularly the women, who were most eager to part with their finest jewelry for the sake of building the Mishkan of Hashem. As it says that the women came forward with greater zeal than the men, "Vayavou

ha'anashim al h'nashim" (Shemos 35:22).

(c) Dr. Israel Rivkin and Josh Rapps, Edison N.J. Permission to reprint and distribute, with this notice, is hereby granted. These summaries are based on notes taken by Dr. Rivkin at the weekly Moriah Shiur given by HaGaon HaRav Yosef Dov Halevi Soloveichik ZTL over many years.

From: Yeshivat Har Etzion's Israel Koschitzky Virtual Beit Midrash[SMTP:yhe@vbm-torah.org] yhe-sichot@vbm-torah.org
SICHOT61 -15: Parashat Bo

SICHA OF HARAV YEHUDA AMITAL SHLIT"A Pharaoh's Lack of Free Will Summarized by Matan Glidai Translated by Kaeren Fish

"In order that you will tell your son and your son's son of that which I PERFORMED in Egypt, and of the signs that I showed them, that you may know that I am G-d." (Shemot 10:2)

Rashi and the Ramban explain the phrase, "I performed in Egypt" (hit'alalti be-Mitzrayim), as meaning, "I played with Egypt," i.e. I toyed with them. Thus the verse defines two things which a person must tell his children: a. How G-d "played" with the Egyptians, and b. the signs and wonders which G-d performed in Egypt, demonstrating His power. A study of the Pesach Haggada reveals that in fact we discuss only the second point ϕ we give thanks to G-d Who saved us from Egypt with signs and wonders, and we praise His strong arm. There is no mention in the Haggada of how G-d "played" with the Egyptians. Therefore we are led to ask what exactly this "playing" refers to, and what its purpose was.

Another question that arises from our parasha and the previous one concerns Moshe's running back and forth to Pharaoh. Moshe engages in negotiations with Pharaoh in which inter alia he proposes a limited three-day journey, and the question concerns who will go and who will remain. Why does Moshe need to engage in these negotiations? Does the Holy One really need Pharaoh's agreement in order to take Bnei Yisrael out of Egypt? "And it happened when Pharaoh sent out the nation..." ϕ why the emphasis that Pharaoh sent them out? Why could Bnei Yisrael not have left Egypt quietly and peacefully during the plague of darkness, during which the Egyptians were unable to move?

To answer this, we must understand that Pharaoh had put himself in an unprecedented position: he saw himself as a god, doing as he wished, without being answerable to anyone. He believed that he had created himself ϕ "The river is mine, and I have made myself" (Yechezkel 29:3). During the first five plagues he hardened his heart and refused to let Bnei Yisrael go, although he saw that he was unable to stand up to the power of G-d. This phenomenon in itself is most interesting, and Rav Charlap once asked Rav Kook how it is possible for a person to reach a situation of "knowing his Master and nevertheless intending to rebel against Him." To deny G-d is one thing, but how can a person recognize G-d and have experienced His power, and nevertheless rebel against Him and refuse His discipline? Rav Kook's answer was that a person's free choice can bring him even to this: if a person reaches a situation where his morality is perverted, then his logic likewise is affected and he will act in an illogical manner. Even if Pharaoh had capitulated and decided to let Bnei Yisrael go, this would not have contradicted his ideology: he would have claimed that no one had forced him to send them out, but that he was his own master and that he had made his own decision at his own discretion. In order to prove that Pharaoh had been wrong and that no one can rebel against the Holy One and be his own master, it was necessary to harden Pharaoh's heart during the last five plagues, withholding his free choice so that he would act in accordance with

G-d's will and not in accordance with his own. This is the meaning of the "playing" with Pharaoh, and this explains the negotiations with him and the running back and forth to him over and over: G-d wanted to show him that he was nothing more than a pawn in the Divine plan, and that G-d was able to remove the free choice from someone who had undertaken to rebel against Him. The Rambam, in the last chapter of his "Shemonah Perakim," writes as follows:

"And if you ask why he (Moshe) asked of him (Pharaoh) to send out Israel time after time, but he (Pharaoh) was prevented from doing so and the plagues befell him but he was steadfast in his refusal... surely there was no point in asking him (Pharaoh) something that he was unable to do! But this too was done out of G-d's wisdom, to show him that if G-d chose to cancel his free choice, then He would do so. He said to him, 'I will demand of you to send them out, and if you were to send them out you would be saved. But you will not send them until you are destroyed.' And he had to agree to this in order to prove thereby the claim of the prophet that he was prevented from agreeing, and was not able to. This was also a great sign for all of humanity, as we read, 'In order that My Name be told throughout the land' (Shemot 9:16) ϕ that it is possible for G-d to punish a person by preventing him from being able to do something, and for the person thereby to know and to be unable to bring himself back to that choice."

This was an important lesson that was also learned from the exodus. It is not mentioned at the Seder since it is not connected to the salvation of Am Yisrael, but it is important in its own right. We learn from this that a person who degenerates morally can deteriorate from the level of a man to the level of an automaton. He may perform illogical actions and lose control of his own conduct; in fact, his free choice has been removed from him.

(Delivered on leil Shabbat parashat Bo 5753 [1993].)

Yeshivat Har Etzion's Israel Koschitzky Virtual Beit Midrash is on the world wide web at <http://www.vbm-torah.org> Yeshivat Har Etzion Israel Koschitzky Virtual Beit Midrash Alon Shevut, Gush Etzion 90433 E-mail: Yhe@vbm-torah.org or Office@etzion.org.il

From: RABBI BEREL WEIN rbwein@torah.org Subject: Rabbi Wein - Parshas Bo

A great military leader is reputed to have once said that the only thing more dangerous than defeat is victory. By that he meant a military or even political victory rarely settles the matter. It only provides an opportunity to the victor to come up with a plan how to best exploit that victory and convert it to a more permanent accomplishment. This point is well made in the entire story of the Exodus that reaches its climax in this week's Torah reading. The fact of the Exodus itself would be sufficient cause for celebration for the generation that experienced deliverance. But, by itself, it would mean little if nothing to later descendants and generations. The Jewish people, exiled and physically defeated many times over in its long history, would hardly commemorate a victory as temporary as the Exodus if it did not lead to a more permanent and lasting triumph. It would be comparable to the Confederate States of America-the South- continuing today to celebrate its victory at First Bull Run! And yet it is the Exodus that remains as the centerpiece of all Jewish history, and the Pesach seder which commemorates it remains the most observed ritual in Jewish life. So, it is obvious that the Exodus must be about more than the departure from Egyptian bondage alone.

When Moshe encounters the G-d of destiny at the burning bush at Sinai at the beginning of his mission, the Lord informs him that the purpose of his mission is to bring the people of Israel to Mount Sinai, there to serve G-d and accept the Torah. The Exodus is the necessary preparation for the acceptance of Torah at Sinai. But the Exodus is the means to the end, not the end in itself. The Exodus without Sinai is the

First Bull Run. It would have been a temporary and unexploited victory, an even that would dim and disappear in time, losing relevance and meaning to later generations. For only the spirit lasts and gives permanent meaning to physical and temporal occurrences. And for Jews, spirit and spirituality are permanently meaningful only if they are based in Torah and Jewish tradition. Thus the Lord's message to Moshe that when Israel is redeemed they will "worship me at this mountain" is the essence of the entire meaning of the story of the Exodus.

The Jewish people has experienced abysmal defeat and destruction in this, the bloodiest of all human centuries. We have also been witness to great and unpredictable triumphs and successes. We have somehow been able to survive and rebuild ourselves, personally and nationally, after the defeats and destruction. But we have as yet been unable to truly exploit the triumphs and successes of this century. The State of Israel, the crowning Jewish physical achievement of our time, is still embroiled in a conflict for its soul and direction and purpose. This struggle is as important as is the physical struggle to survive and prosper, for without meaning - spiritual, Torah meaning-the Israeli War of Independence and all of the subsequent victories can, G-d forbid, become as First Bull Run. The test of wills, the search for national meaning, the unexpressed but omnipresent inner disappointment and emptiness of Israeli life, are the underlying causes for the divisiveness and political turmoil that characterize current Israeli life. As of yet, there is no Sinai to give meaning to our modern Exodus. The wondrous Exodus of our time has not as yet been translated into terms- ritual, spiritual, traditional terms- that are truly transmittable to later generations. Only when this goal is finally accomplished will a sense of "normalcy" be achieved in Israeli and Jewish life. And it is this task and goal that is the order of the day for all segments of the Jewish People. By creating Sinai to accompany the Israeli "Exodus" we will be guaranteeing the permanent blessing of the Land of Israel in the lives and hearts of the people of Israel.

Shabbat Shalom. Rabbi Berel Wein

Rabbiwein, Copyright $\mathbf{1}$ 2001 by Rabbi Berel Wein and Project Genesis, Inc. Project Genesis: Torah on the Information Superhighway learn@torah.org 17 Warren Road, Suite 2B <http://www.torah.org/> Baltimore, MD 21208

From: Ohr Somayach[SMTP:ohr@ohr.edu] To: weekly@ohr.edu Subject: Torah Weekly - Bo
* TORAH WEEKLY * Highlights of the Weekly Torah Portion
Parshat Bo For the week ending 10 Shevat 5761 / February 2 & 3, 2001
BOOGY - WOOGIE

"Stretch forth your hand toward the heavens, and there shall be a darkness on the land of Egypt, and the darkness will be tangible." (10:21)

Nothing is more frightening than nothingness. As young children, our last request at bed-time is "Daddy, don't close the door!" And what if the door accidentally closes and we find ourselves alone and in the dark? What is the fear that lurks in the darkness? Some vast and hideous monster two inches from our face? Some huge slimy insect hiding under the bed? Or worse -- the remnants of last night's midnight feast?

Maybe it's something much more fundamental that frightens us.

Even when we grow to adulthood, we never quite lose our fear of the dark. If we no longer fear it as we did when we were children, it's because we have the means to restore the light. We know we can get out of bed and flick the switch. We're in control. But if we were placed in a darkness over which we had no control, if we were powerless to restore the light, all those primordial youthful fears would immediately take hold.

Why is the dark so frightening? More than large furry spiders or the

famous, but rarely-spotted, Boogy man, what really frightens us about the dark is that we are in a world where nothing exists outside ourselves. Nothing exists. Only the sound of our own breathing. The thump, thump of our heart. And after a few minutes of silence, the low whistling of the blood flowing in our ears. The sound of nothing. In Hebrew the word for darkness is connected to the word "to withhold." ("And you have not withheld your son, your only son from Me." -- Bereishet 22:12)

Darkness is the absence, the withholding, of the world outside.

In this week's Parsha, the Torah records the penultimate plague inflicted on the Egyptians -- the plague of darkness. Ostensibly, this was a very benign plague. No blood turned to water. No-one suffered excruciating boils. Just darkness. A darkness that at first prevented you from seeing someone even if they were right in front of your face, and then it became even thicker until it literally froze people. How can darkness freeze someone?

The answer is that, in the dark, I perceive that there is nowhere outside of me. I have nowhere to go. If I extend my little finger, it will vanish. There is nothing there. No place, no space outside.

I often think that our present situation in Israel is rather like those Egyptians in the plague of darkness. We are paralyzed, incapable of action. We are living in a world of darkness. A world where the Boogy man wears an Arab kafia on his head and has a permanent three-day stubble on his face. A world where G-d is so hidden from us that we feel that if we move at all we will simply vanish into nothingness -- like some medieval sailor's nightmare of sailing off the edge of the world.

One of G-d's names is Hamakom. "The Place." The mystics teach that G-d doesn't exist in the world -- The world exists in G-d.

G-d is the place of the world. He is the place of all existence. He causes existence.

The nations of the world repeat the same message to the Jewish People down the ages: "You have no place in this world." You are trying to Judaize the Haram el-Sharif. You don't belong here. You stole the land. Your destiny is to wander, to be the Wandering Jew of Christian mythology.

In every lie, there is a grain of truth.

It is true that the Jewish People have no place in the world -- in the natural order of things. We are an anti-historical people. By all the "laws" of history and probability, the Jewish People should have faded out long ago. One of historical theory's biggest problems is our survival. Because we shouldn't be here. We have no place in the world. Our biggest problems start when we think that we belong here, when we want to play at being a nation just like any other nation.

G-d didn't make us that way; we are a supernatural people. We are His "inheritance," His "portion" in this world. Our entire existence is only in Him. It is only when we realize that our place in this world is to be in Hamakom -- to be in the Place of the world -- we will emerge from our paralyzing darkness to a world of light and security.

(C) 2001 Ohr Somayach International - All rights reserved.

From: Rabbi Riskin's Shabbat Shalom List

[SMTP:parsha@ohrtorahstone.org.il] To:

Shabbat_Shalom@ohrtorahstone.org.il Subject: Shabbat Shalom: Parshat Bo by RABBI SHLOMO RISKIN

Shabbat Shalom: Parshat Bo (Exodus 10:1 - 13:16) By Shlomo Riskin

Efrat, Israel - Who is to be considered a wicked child - and how are we, the parents of the community, to relate to him/her?

A major Biblical commentary, the author of the Passover Haggadah (to be more precise, the Midrash Mechilta) provides a fascinating response to our questions. Our Biblical portion reads: "When you come to the land that G-d will give you as He promised, you must also observe

this service. And when your children will say to you, What is this service to you? You shall say It is the Passover service to G-d." He passed over the houses of the Israelites in Egypt when He plagued the Egyptians (by killing their first-born). He saved our homes". (Exodus 12:25-27)

The Author of the Haggadah, in the fascinating aspect of the Passover seder highlighting the four children, calls the questioner in this sequence "the wicked child." Why? What is there in his question which would make us think that he is wicked? The first reason, which the Haggadah itself emphasizes, lies in the questioner's exclusion of himself from the family ritual: "What is this service to you." And so the Haggadah explains: Saying you, he excludes himself and because he excludes himself from the group, he denies a basic principle of our faith." From this perspective, wickedness as a Jew happens when one excludes oneself from the Jewish ritual-familial experiences.

There are other more subtle give-aways that tell us the wicked nature of this questioner. The Torah often prefaces a question with a phrase like "when your child will ask you tomorrow saying." In this instance, the child doesn't ask his parents, he tells his parents: "And it shall come to pass when your children shall say unto you" (Exodus 12:26). An honest question reveals a willingness to learn, but a statement implies a certain superiority, as is the wicked child, who sees himself above the tradition, is not really interested in answers - only statements.

To add another discordant note to the rebellious music behind the words of this child, the Biblical response is v'amartem (verse 27), you shall say it", without the expected continuation "to him," a pronoun which would identify who it is that is being addressed. The answer thereby becomes a general, open-ended statement - giving the impression that the questioner asked and ran, was interested in telling what he thought but not in hearing what the parent had to say. From all of this we could logically conclude that a wicked child excludes himself from family traditions and traditional explanations - its not that he disagrees, he simply isn't interested.

What might be our response to such a child? It is fascinating that the Bible itself gives one response, - "It is the Passover service to G-d. He passed over the houses of the Israelites in Egypt (when he slew the Egyptian first-born) and He saved our homes" (Exodus 12:26, 27), - and the author of the Haggadah gives another - "you cause his teeth to be on edge, and say to him Because of this has G-d done for me when I went out of Egypt" (Exodus 13:8). Why the difference, and what is the specific message of each? After all, it is critical that we know how to at least try to respond to this most difficult child!

Let us begin with the Biblical response.

The Netziv (Rav Naftali Tzvi Yehuda Berlin 1817-1893) teaches that the wicked child's statement reflects his belief that the Passover service is an anachronism, has no significance or relevance now that we've left Egypt behind generations ago. After all, he argues, perhaps in Egypt there was a need for the paschal lamb in that it reflected the reality of the blood of the Jewish sacrifice being placed on the door-posts as a sign to save the Jewish first-borns. But now that we've arrived, sitting here at a Seder so many hundreds (if not thousands) of years after the original events, is there any rational reason for retaining such an old-fashioned and outmoded service.? The Biblical answer in our Torah reading is that it is a Passover sacrifice to G-d who saved our homes - and families.

We must remember that there are two central pillars in Judaism: family ties and togetherness as well as Divine laws and directions. The covenant with Abraham emphasized our family - nation - homeland while the covenant at Sinai emphasized our G-d - laws - service. On Passover we achieved our national freedom, and the Jewish nation was developed from the matrix of the first Jewish family. A family as well as a nation have shared experiences which are repeated over tables of celebration which are passed down from generation to generation, in order to weld the individuals together, provide fundamental continuity

between past and future. The family has been an important Jewish value from the very beginning of our history, when Abraham is told that he is distinguished and loved by G-d "so that he command his children and his family after him that they do righteousness and justice". (Genesis 18:19) And when Pharaoh's servants agree to allow Moses to leave Egypt - but only with the males - Moses and Aaron respond, "We shall go with our young and with our old, with our sons and with our daughters." (Exodus 10:9) It's a family affair.

Hence, the Bible tells this wicked child that the Passover sacrifice is a reminder of a critical occurrence at a crossroads of Jewish history, a Divine miracle which preserved the Jewish family. It is precisely the kind of family ritual which is crucial for familial continuity.

The author of the Haggadah goes one step further. He cites another verse: "And it will be when the Lord brings you to the land, which He swore to your fathers to give to you You shall do this service on that month And you shall tell your child on that day saying, Because of this has G-d done for me when I went out of Egypt" (Exodus 13:5,8).

The Bible pictures a situation many generations after the Egyptian exodus. Nevertheless, parents are commanded to tell their children: G-d took me out of Egypt so that I continue to perform these rituals. I am my past; my past formed and informed me. To deny my past is to deny my truest essence; to consciously forget my past is to will oneself into a state of Alzheimer's.

The key words here are "done for me." The continuity of the generations requires the ability to transform past history into one's own existential and personal memory. The initial Biblical answer emphasizes the importance of familial experiences for familial continuity; the author of the Haggadah adds that without incorporating past into present there can be neither meaningful present nor anticipated future! I am my past.

The author of the Haggadah has yet another message. Despite the fact that the wicked child has denied his roots (Kafar b'ikkar), we dare not tear him out of the family. He may want to remove himself from historical continuity, but it's the family's job to bring him back, to welcome him into the Seder celebration.

The Haggadah instructs us to set the teeth of the wicked child on edge. The phrase in Hebrew is hakhai et shinav. It doesn't say hikah which means to strike, to slap him in the teeth, but rather hakaih, (heh, kuf, heh, heh) from the language of the prophet Ezekiel, "The fathers eat the sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge." (Exodus 18:2) The prophet is here expressing the fundamental unfairness in the fact that the parents have sinned, but their children must suffer the pain of exile. Indeed, children do suffer for the sins of their parents - always. Anyone who comes from a difficult or dysfunctional home will bear the burden.

There is a new yuppie term, dinky - double income no kids yet. But there is something else which is just as bad: dimka, double income many kids already but nobody to take care of them except a professional caregiver. Children need nurture, children deserve parental time and concern.

The author of the Haggadah is therefore reminding each parent that just as the child has responsibility to his past, the present has responsibility to the future. Are we certain that the wicked child's teeth are not set on edge because of the sour grapes we, the parents, have eaten?

Have we lovingly demonstrated the beauty and the glories of our traditions, have we been there to hear his questions when he was still ready to ask them and to listen to answers, have we been the appropriate models for him to desire continuity within our family? The Author of the Haggadah subtly but forthrightly reminds both parents and children of their obligations to each other, to past and to future.

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

From: Jeffrey Gross[SMTP:jgross@torah.org] Subject: Weekly Halacha - Parshas Bo - CORRECTING THE BA'AL KOREH
By RABBI DONIEL NEUSTADT Rav of Young Israel of Cleveland Heights

A discussion of Halachic topics related to the Parsha of the week. For final rulings, consult your Rav.

CORRECTING THE BA'AL KOREH

Every adult male(1) is obligated to hear a portion of the Torah read from a kosher Sefer Torah every Shabbos. While this is an ancient obligation dating back to the days of Moshe Rabbeinu,(2) it is considered a Rabbinical mitzvah.(3) Initially, there were various customs as to the length of the portion to be read every Shabbos,(4) but eventually it became universally accepted to complete the entire Torah each year, beginning from Shabbos Bereishis and ending on Simchas Torah.(5)

The reader must read every single word of the weekly parshah. Even if one word was omitted, the reading must be repeated.(6) This is true even if the missing word did not in any way alter the meaning of the phrase or verse.(7)

The ba'al koreh should read each word clearly, with the proper accentuation (mileil and milra), vocalization (nikud) and cantillation (trop). In order to read the Torah properly he must prepare thoroughly(8) so that the reading will "flow out of his mouth." The reading itself should not be hurried, lest he swallow a word or a letter.(9)

The reader must be careful to read every word from inside the Torah, and not recite any words from memory. But as long as he saw every word, it does not matter if he did not look inside when actually reciting each word.(10)

CORRECTING THE READER'S MISTAKES

It is important for the ba'al koreh to read carefully so that he makes no mistakes, not even small, insignificant ones. But if he did make a mistake, there is a difference of opinion among the Rishonim if he must be stopped and corrected or not. The Tur(11) is of the opinion that as long as the word was recited, even if it was seriously mispronounced, it does not matter and the reading is valid. There is no requirement to go back and correct the mistake, and indeed it may be prohibited to do so since it will needlessly embarrass the ba'al koreh who will appear incompetent or ill-prepared. Rambam, however, disagrees and maintains that even the smallest mistake should be immediately corrected.

Shulchan Aruch seems to make a compromise between the two views. Whether or not the ba'al koreh needs to be corrected when mispronouncing a word depends on the type of mistake he made. A "major" mistake requires correction while a "minor" mistake does not; therefore, the ba'al koreh should be publicly corrected only for a "major" mistake. Privately, however, the reader is rebuked for his lack of preparedness or inattentiveness to detail.(12)

The issue to decide, therefore, is what constitutes a "major" mistake and what is considered a "minor" mistake. Rama maintains that if the mistake alters the meaning of the word it is considered "major", but if it only affects the trop or the nikud then it is considered "minor". The latter authorities debate what, exactly, the Rama meant, as there are various opinions as to what constitutes an altered meaning and what does not. In the final analysis there are three groups of mistakes: major, minor and midsize. Major mistakes include: When a word is completely misread; e.g., bereishis is read berushies or barshyas, etc. When the nikud of a word is pronounced in a manner which alters the translation of the word. For example, the word chalav with a komatz (milk) is read with a tzeirei (fat), or the word ya'aseh (he should do) is read yie'aseh (it should be done). When the trop is completely wrong, to the degree that the reader combines two unrelated words or phrases, or separates two words or

phrases which should be read together. The trop indicates not only the musical note on which the syllable or word should be sung, but also the punctuation of the pasuk, as the Torah has no punctuation marks. For example, one could read all of the constants and vowels of the first pasuk in the Torah correctly, and still mangle the trop so that the pasuk would read: In the beginning created, Hashem the, heaven and earth.(13) According to some opinions, when the mileil or milra is read completely wrong, to the degree that it alters the meaning of the word; e.g., the word bahah (milra) means 'she is coming,' (present tense) while the same word accented bahah (mileil) means 'she came' (past tense).(14) Similarly, the word binah can mean either 'understanding' or 'perceive', depending on which syllable is accented, binah or binah.(15)

But several contemporary poskim maintain that this type of mistake is not considered a major mistake. In their view, the exact meaning of the word is decided by the context in which it is written; the meaning is not altered by the improper accentuation of the word.(16)

As stated earlier, Shulchan Aruch and most poskim(17) rule that major mistakes should be rectified immediately. The ba'al koreh, therefore, is stopped mid sentence - even if he said the Name of Hashem(18) - and told to correct his pronunciation.(19) Even if the mistake is realized after the aliyah is over, or even after the entire parshah is finished [but before the final blessing over the Torah is recited],(20) the word must be repeated and corrected.(21)

This ruling of the Shulchan Aruch is the accepted practice in most congregations. Note, however, that several poskim(22) disagree with the Shulchan Aruch and rule in accordance with the Tur that once a mistake was made, even if the meaning of the word was altered, it need not be corrected.(23) Minor mistakes include: Misreading of vowels which does not alter the basic meaning of the word, e.g., the word "eis" with a tzeirei under the aleph instead of segol (es); the word "kol" with a cholom instead of kal with a kamatz; the word "lecha" with a kametz instead of lach with a sheva(24); the word "aretz" with a kame tz under the aleph instead of ertz with a segol. There are many more such examples, and they account for most of the errors that the average ba'al koreh commits. Misreading of the trop which does not alter the basic meaning of the verse. e.g., failure to stress the revii note over the word v'hartz in the second pasuk of this week's parshah. The procedure concerning minor mistakes is clear: all of the poskim are in agreement that the reader is not corrected; he is allowed to continue.(25)

We have mentioned earlier that when there is no requirement to correct mistakes, it may very well be prohibited to do so, since correcting the ba'al koreh publicly embarrasses him. It is puzzling, therefore, why many congregations do not conduct themselves properly and correct even minor mistakes when they should not do so. There are two possible explanations (limud zechus) for their behavior: 1) The ba'al koreh has made it clear to the rabbi or officers of the shul that he does not mind being corrected and does not consider it an embarrassment; 2) If the ba'al koreh is paid for his services, it may be permissible to correct him for even minor mistakes since he is hired to do a perfect job.(26) Midsize mistakes are significant changes in the pronunciation of the word or even in its exact translation, but not to the degree that it alters the basic meaning of the phrase or the verse. These include(27): When a letter is omitted, e.g., the name Aharon, which contains the sounds of an aleph and a hay, is read as Haron (with a patach), omitting the aleph.(28) When a letter is added, e.g., the word Mitzrim (Egyptians), written with one yud, is read as if it were written with two yuds (Mitzriyim). While these two words are pronounced slightly different, they have the same meaning. When a letter is added as a prefix, e.g., the letter vov is added to a word, "v'im" (and if) instead of "im" (if). When two letters are inverted but the mistake does not alter the meaning, e.g., the word keves is mistakenly read as kesev. Both words refer to a sheep.(29) Regarding these types of mistakes there are two views. Some are of the opinion that they are not significant and do not need to be corrected. The ba'al koreh

may continue reading [though he is rebuked privately].(30) Others maintain that these types of mistakes must be corrected immediately and one must follow the same procedure as when a major mistake is made.(31) While individual shuls may rely on the first view and allow such mistakes to go unchecked, many congregations have adopted the second, more stringent view. It is left to the rabbi and officers of each shul to establish their own standard for Kerias ha-Torah.

FOOTNOTES:

1 While some authorities maintain that women are also required to hear Kerias ha-Torah, the accepted custom is that listening to the Torah reading is not a woman's obligation; Mishnah Berurah 282:12; Aruch ha-Shulchan 282:11. See Halichos Bas Yisrael 2, note 77*. 2 Rambam, Tefilah 12:1. 3 Mishnah Berurah 282:2. 4 See Megilah 29b that in Eretz Yisrael the custom was to finish the Torah once every three years. See Emes l'Yaakov, ibid. for the apportionment of the weekly reading segments based on a three-year cycle. 5 Rambam, Hilchos Tefilah 13:1. See Igros Moshe O.C. 4:23 and 4:40-5 who explains that once this became universally accepted, it has turned into a full-fledged obligation. 6 O.C. 137:3 and 282:7. 7 Beir Halachah 142:1. 8 Even a ba'al koreh who is familiar with the parshah should review it at least twice; Aruch ha-Shulchan 139:2. 9 Mishnah Berurah 142:6. 10 Harav S.Z. Auerbach (Halichos Shelomo 12:8). See Igros Moshe O.C. 3:19.

11 O.C. 142. The Tur quotes this view in the name of the Ba'al ha-Manhig, and according to most opinions, this is the Tur's view as well. 12 Rama O.C. 142:1. While Rama does not specify the details of how the ba'al koreh is rebuked, the Tur and Beis Yosef imply that the rebuke should not take place publicly so as to not embarrass the reader. 13 Mishnah Berurah 142:4. 14 As explained by Rashi, Bereishis 29:6. See Aruch ha-Shulchan O.C. 690:20 (concerning Megilas Esther) who mentions this example. 15 Reb Chaim of Volozhin in Keser Rosh (40). 16 Harav Y. Y. Kanievsky (Karyana D'igra 1:138); Harav Y. Kamenetsky (oral ruling quoted in Emes l'Yaakov O.C. 142:1); Harav S.Z. Auerbach (written responsum quoted in Halichos Shelomo 12:24). See Dikdukei Shai, pgs. 160-165, for an explanation of this view. Note, also, that all the major poskim who discuss the laws of correcting a ba'al koreh do not mention this type of mistake as one that must be corrected.

17 Chayei Adam 31:31; Mishnah Berurah 142:4 and Beir Halachah; Aruch ha-Shulchan 142:3-4; Kaf ha-Chayim 142:2. 18 Chayei Adam 5:2; Mishnah Berurah 142:4; Sha'arei Rachamim on Sha'arei Efrayim 3:18. See Tzitz Eliezer 12:40 and Halichos Shelomo 12, note 79. 19 Preferably, he should start again from the beginning of the pasuk or - at the very least - from the beginning of the phrase (within the pasuk), see Mishnah Berurah 64:5 and Tehillah l'David 64:1 (concerning Kerias Shema). See also Igros Moshe O.C. 5:20-32 (concerning zeicher and zecher). 20 Chayei Adam 31:31 and Beir Halachah 142:1.

21 See Mishnah Berurah 142:2 and Sha'ar ha-Tziyun for the correct procedure. 22 Bach O.C. 142; Eliyahu Rabbah 142:2; Siddur Derech ha-Chayim (15); Da'as Torah 142:1. See also Aruch ha-Shulchan 690:20. 23 While this view is not the accepted practice, the poskim rely on it if the mistake was realized after the final blessing on the Torah was recited. 24 Most often this depends on where in the verse the word appears and/or what the trop is. There is no alteration of meaning. Sometimes, however, lach is written for a nekeivah and lecha is written for zachar; in that case the meaning is altered. 25 As mentioned earlier, he is reprimanded in private. 26 See Eishel Avraham O.C. 142 who suggests a similar idea.

27 Based on Mishnah Berurah 142:4 and Beir Halachah. 28 See Pri Megadim 142:1 who writes that the same applies to reading Avraham instead of Avram or vice versa. 29 See Mishnah Berurah 143:26. 30 Mishnah Berurah 142:4 and all the poskim mentioned earlier who rule in accordance with the Tur against the Shulchan Aruch. 31 Pri Chadash 142, Beir ha-Gra 142, Chayei Adam 31:31, Aruch ha-Shulchan 142: 3-4; Kaf ha-Chayim 142:2. Mazel Tov to Shui & Chavie Bressler on the birth of a daughter, and to grandparents, Rabbi & Mrs. Doniel Neustadt. May they be zochah l'gadlah l'Torah, u'l'ben Torah, u'l'chupa, u'l'maasim toviim!

Weekly-Halacha, Copyright © 2001 by Rabbi Neustadt, Dr. Jeffrey Gross and Torah.org. The author, Rabbi Neustadt, is the principal of Yavne Teachers' College in Cleveland, Ohio. He is also the Magid Shiur of a daily Mishna Berurah class at Congregation Shomre Shabbos.

The Weekly-Halacha Series is distributed L'zchus Doniel Meir ben Hinda. Weekly sponsorships are available - please mail to jgross@torah.org . Torah.org: The Judaism Site http://www.torah.org/ 17 Warren Road, Suite 2B learn@torah.org Baltimore, MD 21208 (410) 602-1350 FAX: 510-1053

From: Kollel Iyun Hadaf[SMTp:kornfeld@netvision.net.il] RABBI MORDECHAI KORNFELD INSIGHTS INTO THE DAILY DAF brought to you by Kollel Iyun Hadaf of Yerushalayim daf@dafyomi.co.il, http://www.dafyomi.co.il SOTAH 41 (7 Shevat) - This day's Daf has been dedicated by Danny Schwartz, l'Iluy Nishmas Yochanan Shabsai ben Yair, Z"L, whose Yahrzeit is today. SOTAH 42 - This Daf has been sponsored through the generous donation of Rabbi Heshy Wolf of Brooklyn N.Y. SOTAH 43 - Sponsored by Martin Fogel of California, for a Refu'ah Sheleimah for Hendel bas Chava, and Hava Rivkah bas Hendel. SOTAH 44 - dedicated by Marcia and Lee Weinblatt to Jeri and Eli Turkel, with Mazal Tov wishes for Tamar's marriage to Netanel Casado. *** Please send your D.A.F. contributions to: *** D.A.F., 140-32 69 Ave., Flushing NY 11367, USA

Reuven and Ruth immediately follows the Gemara that discusses how Leah thanked Hashem when Yehudah was born.

37b THE OBLIGATION OF "ARVUS" OPINIONS: Rebbi Shimon says that for every one of the 613 Mitzvos in the Torah, 48 covenants were made, multiplied by the number of people (603,550) who left Mitzrayim and received the Torah, for a total of 17,758,855,200 covenants. The number 603,550 is taken from the verse in the Torah (Shemos 38:26, Bamidbar 1:45); it represents the count of the Jewish men capable of going to war ("Anshei Tzava"), men between the ages of 20 and 60 who left Mitzrayim.

Does this mean that the obligation of Arvus is limited to the Mitzvah-observance of men between the ages of 20 and 60? What about Gerim and Nashim, who were not included in the count of 603,550?

(a) GERIM. RASHI in Nidah (13b) cites a view that explains that the Gemara's statement that Gerim cause suffering to the Jews means that some Gerim are not sincere and the Jews must bear the burden for their sins. Rashi rejects this explanation, saying that the obligation of Arvus does not apply to Gerim. The Jews are not responsible for the sins of Gerim, and therefore the Jews do not suffer for the sins of Gerim. Rashi proves this from the number cited in our Gemara (603,550). If Arvus includes Gerim, the number should be much higher, because it should reflect the people of the "Erev Rav" as well.

TOSFOS there questions Rashi's statement. The number chosen by our Gemara might have been chosen simply because it is the only number that is specified by the Torah. It is not meant, though, to exclude any people that were not included in that count. It is obvious that men under 20 and over 60 would also be included in Arvus, even though they are not included in the count of 603,550. Hence, the Erev Rav should also be included in the obligation of Arvus.

Tosfos answers that the Gemara knew the number of people included in the Erev Rav (according to the Mechilta, which says that they were double the number of people who left Mitzrayim). Therefore, the fact that the Gemara does not include their numbers in the obligation of Arvus, even though their numbers were known, shows that Gerim are not included in Arvus.

Alternatively, the men younger than 20 and older than 60, and women, are all secondary to those who were counted, and therefore the number 603,550 alludes to them as well. The Gemara is saying that there are covenants for each individual of the group from which 603,550 were counted. The number of covenants, though, indeed include the other people as well. The Erev Rav, in contrast, have no reason for being secondary to the men of the Jewish people who were counted, since the Erev Rav were just as capable Anshei Tzava as those who were counted. Therefore, if the Gemara does not allude to their numbers, it means that they were not included in the obligation of Arvus.

(b) NASHIM. The ROSH in Berachos (3:13) writes that the reason why a man who ate only a kZayis may exempt a man who ate his full is because of the concept of "Arvus" -- "responsibility:" every Jew is responsible to see that every other Jew fulfills the Mitzvos (see Rashi, Rosh Hashanah 29a, DH Af Al Pi she'Yatza). The Torah thus allows one man to exempt another man even if the first one ate *nothing*. The Rabanan, though, instituted that in order to exempt another man, he must at least eat enough to obligate himself to recite the blessing mid'Rabanan.

Women, on the other hand, do not bear group "responsibility;" they have no obligation to see to it that every other Jew fulfills his obligation of Birkas ha'Mazon. Therefore, unless a woman's obligation to recite Birkas ha'Mazon is on the same level as a man's (i.e. mid'Oraisa), she cannot exempt him from his obligation.

The DAGUL MEREVAVAH (OC 271:2) refers to the MAGEN AVRAHAM (271:1) who says that if a person Davens the Shemoneh Esreh of Ma'ariv on Shabbos night, he fulfills his Torah obligation to recite Kidush (although he must still fulfill his obligation d'Rabanan to recite Kidush over a cup of wine). The Dagul Merevavah writes that according to this, even though a woman normally has the same obligation of Kidush as a man has, if a woman recited Ma'ariv on Shabbos night she cannot exempt a man who has not Davened. Since her obligation is now only mid'Rabanan (because she already fulfilled her d'Oraisa obligation), she cannot exempt a man's d'Oraisa obligation, because women are not in the category of "responsibility" that would enable her to exempt another person even when she herself is not obligated. The Dagul Merevavah then questions whether a man who already Davened Ma'ariv may exempt a woman who has not Davened Ma'ariv. Perhaps just like a woman does not have responsibility of Arvus for a man, a man does not have responsibility of Arvus for a woman (and thus he cannot exempt her if he is obligated in Kidush only mid'Rabanan).

The Rosh and the Dagul Merevavah seem to infer from our Gemara that only men accepted the responsibility of Arvus, since the number 603,550 only included men.

REBBI AKIVA EIGER (Teshuvos 1:7) responds that when the Rosh writes

Sotah 37 THE NAME OF YEHUDAH QUESTIONS: The Gemara says that Yehudah performed an act of public Kidush Hashem when the members of his Shevet walked into the Yam Suf first, before anyone else, with the trust in Hashem that He would split the Sea. Because of this act, the four letters of Hashem's name were incorporated into Yehudah's name.

(a) Why should Yehudah receive this reward of having the letters of Hashem's name placed into his name because of what his great-grandson, Nachshon ben Aminadav, would do at the Yam Suf? Nachshon himself should have received the reward!

(b) What does the Gemara mean that Yehudah was rewarded by having his name include the letters of Hashem's name? His name was given to him by his mother, Leah, upon his birth (Bereishis 29:35), because she wanted to thank Hashem ("Odeh Es Hashem"), long before his descendant performed the act of Kidush Hashem! How can a person receive reward for a deed before performing that deed? Since a person has free choice, it is possible that he might not perform that deed!

ANSWERS: (a) The Gemara earlier (10b) also cites the statement that Yehudah's name incorporated the name of Hashem because he was Mekadesh Shem Shamayim, but with reference to another act of public Kidush Shem Shamayim that Yehudah performed. The Gemara there discusses Yehudah's public admission that Tamar was right and that he had acted improperly. The MAHARSHA there points out the contradiction and answers that both Gemaras are correct: he was called Yehudah both because of the incident with Tamar and because of the act of his descendant Nachshon.

This can be explained further as follows. Yehudah set the precedent for public repentance for one's sins when he confessed in the incident with Tamar. The Gemara earlier (7b) tells us that when Yehudah confessed, teaching the concept of repentance, Reuven learned from there how to repent for his sin.

Yehudah's momentous act instilled in future generations the ability to lead the way and to be Mekadesh Hashem when necessary. This is what gave Nachshon the ability to jump into the Sea when everyone else was hesitating. Therefore, it is Yehudah's name which incorporates the name of Hashem.

(b) The RIF in the Ein Yakov (10b; see also MAHARSHA there) explains that Yehudah was named based on the future. We find in Berachos (7b) that sometimes a person's name can hint to major events from his life. Ruth was called such because of David who came from her, who "satiated (Riveyhu) Hashem with his praises."

However, this concept is more difficult to apply in our Sugya. Ruth's name only hinted to the concept of "Riveyhu," satiated, which does not have an inherently positive connotation; it could have meant that he satiated Hashem with Mitzvos, or the opposite. In contrast, the fact that Yehudah's name incorporates the name of Hashem seems to be inherently positive, as the Gemara implies.

The comparison to the Gemara in Berachos is particularly problematic according to the Girsas of our Gemara earlier (10b), that says that because of Yehudah's Kidush Hashem he "merited" to have the entire name of Hashem incorporated into his entire name. This implies that this was a reward for his act.

Perhaps the Gemara means as follows. Yehudah was not the first person to teach the concept of Kidush Shem Shamayim. His mother, Leah, already taught that concept when she chose the name for Yehudah, like the Gemara says in Berachos (7b), where it says that Leah was the first to express gratitude to Hashem for the gifts that He gave. Because she was Mekadesh Shem Shamayim by publicly thanking Hashem, therefore Hashem put into her mind the idea to call her son Yehudah (rather than Odeh; see MAHARSHA) and to incorporate the name of Hashem into his name. This instilled in Yehudah, and in his descendant Nachshon, the strength and courage to lead the way with Kidush Shem Shamayim (in the incident with Tamar, and in jumping into the Yam Suf), and his descendants eventually became the kings of Klal Yisrael, leading the Jewish people.

The Gemara might mean that because Leah attained this trait of Kidush Shem Shamayim when she gave birth to Yehudah and she prayed that Yehudah should embody this trait, she instilled in Yehudah the merit to have the name of Hashem in his name and to always find the strength to be Mekadesh Shem Shamayim publicly.

This might also be the idea behind the Gemara in Berachos that says that a person's name can influence his future. It means that if the mother embodies a certain trait and she gives her child a name in the hope that the child will also embody that trait, it can influence the child. That is why, when Ruth called herself "Ruth" in the hope that she would have a grandchild who would sing praises to Hashem, David eventually came from her. When Leah gave birth to Reuven, she prayed that he should not be envious of his brothers like Esav was (see Berachos 7b), and her prayers bore fruit. That is why the Gemara that describes the name of

that women are not bound by group "responsibility," he does not mean that they are *never* responsible for another Jew's fulfillment of the Mitzvos. Rather, a woman is not "responsible" only when it comes to a Mitzvah that she is not obligated to perform herself. With regard to a Mitzvah that she, too, is also obligated mid'Oraisa to perform, she does have "responsibility" for other Jews, and other Jews have responsibility for her. Therefore, she *could* exempt a man from his d'Oraisa obligation to recite Kidush.

Rebbi Akiva Eiger's understanding is consistent with what Tosfos writes in Nidah, that the only reason the number of women who left Mitzrayim was omitted was because their numbers were unknown; they were, nonetheless, included in the obligation of Arvus.

According to the Rosh in Berachos, however, and according to Rashi in Rosh Hashanah, who say that one Jew may exempt another Jew in the obligation of Birkas ha'Mitzvos because of Arvus, even though the one reciting the blessing is not performing the Mitzvah himself, there is a problem. How can a Ger be Motzi a Jew, or vice versa? We learned that Rashi in Nidah (13b) writes that Gerim were not included in Arvus! Accordingly, we should conclude that a Ger cannot be Motzi a Jew and a Jew cannot be Motzi a Ger!

The Rosh himself might follow his opinion in the TOSFOS HA'ROSH in Nidah (13b), where he rejects Rashi's suggestion that Gerim are not included in Arvus. According to Rashi, however, who does exclude Gerim from Arvus, how can a Ger be Motzi another Jew, and vice versa?

The answer is that Rashi in Nidah is referring to Gerim who did not convert wholeheartedly and returned to their earlier ways. These are comparable to the Erev Rav who joined the Jews to leave Mitzrayim but later returned to their earlier ways of idol worship. Such Gerim are not included in the Arvus, and Jews bear no responsibility for their acts (since their eventual defection shows that they never converted wholeheartedly in the first place; see Rambam, Hilchos Isurei Bi'ah 13:16). However, a Ger who converts wholeheartedly is certainly included in the obligation of Arvus, and therefore he can be Motzi a Jew and a Jew can be Motzi him. (If he later sins, then the Jews do bear responsibility for his actions. This is evident from Shavuos 39a.)

(c) KOHANIM. According to what we wrote above, women are not included in Arvus, at least not for Mitzvos in which they themselves are not obligated. Nevertheless, our Gemara says that every one of the 603,550 Jews was responsible for every other Jew's observance of the 613 Mitzvos, which implies that a Yisrael is responsible for the Aveiros that a Kohen performs, even though the Yisrael has no Mitzvah to refrain from those acts! What is the difference between women, who are exempted from the Arvus of Mitzvos in which they are not obligated, and Yisraelim, who are not exempt from the Arvus of Mitzvos in which only Kohanim are obligated?

The answer is that women were exempted from certain Mitzvos because the Torah did not want to give them the responsibility to observe them because of their obligations to their families and children. That same reason would exempt them from the responsibility to see to it that others keep those Mitzvos, since they cannot be available at the time that others are supposed to do those Mitzvos. However, Yisraelim were not exempted from the Mitzvos of Kohanim; rather, the Torah simply did not give those Mitzvos to Yisraelim, but gave them only to Kohanim because of their extra Kedushah. Hence, there is no reason to exempt the Yisraelim from the Arvus of those Mitzvos. (See AVNEI NEZER, YD 352, cited by YOSEF DA'AS.)

Sotah 39b HALACHAH: WHO CALLS OUT "KOHANIM" FOR BIRKAS KOHANIM QUESTION: The Gemara says that the "Korei," the one who calls "Kohanim," is not allowed to call them up until the Tzibur finishes saying "Amen" to the previous Berachah. The Sifri (Parshas Naso) and the Yerushalmi cited by Tosfos (38a, DH I'Shnayim) say that the "Korei" who calls up the Kohanim refers to the "Chazan."

Who is the "Korei" or "Chazan" who calls up the Kohanim to recite Birkas Kohanim?

(a) RASHI here (and end of 38a) explains that it is the Shali'ach Tzibur who calls up the Kohanim. This is also the ruling of the RAMBAM (Hilchos Tefilah 14:8).

(b) However, RABEINU TAM (cited by Tosfos in Berachos 34a, Tosfos DH Lo Ya'aneh, and by Tosfos ha'Rosh here) rules that it would be an interruption for the Shali'ach Tzibur to call up the Kohanim to Birkas Kohanim in the middle of his Shemoneh Esreh. Therefore, someone else should call "Kohanim."

Rabeinu Tam finds support for this from the wording of our Gemara, which says that the "Korei" calls out "Kohanim," while the "Shali'ach Tzibur" recites "Sim Shalom," implying that they are two different people.

Regarding the Sifri that says that the "Chazan" calls out "Kohanim," Rabeinu

Tam asserts that the word "Chazan" does not refer to the Shali'ach Tzibur, but rather to the "Chazan ha'Kneses" (the "Shamash," or the one who takes care of synagogue matters and other public matters; see Mishnah on 40b). Rashi apparently distinguishes between Chazan ha'Kneses, which does not refer to the Shali'ach Tzibur (Rashi in Ta'anis, beginning of 15b) and "Chazan," which does refer to the Shali'ach Tzibur (like the Aruch writes in Erech "Chazan," and which is evident from Rashi in Ta'anis 16b, DH Zeh ha'Ma'amid Chazan).

The ROSH (Megilah 3:21) rules like Rabeinu Tam.

(c) RABEINU YEHUDAH HA'CHASID (Berachos 34a) suggests a compromise. Our practice is for the Shali'ach Tzibur to say "Elokeinu... Barcheinu va'Berachah ha'Meshuleshes..." when there are no Kohanim present. The reason the Shali'ach Tzibur may say that prayer and it is not considered an interruption in his Shemoneh Esreh is because it is a Tefilah (prayer) and not just a "Keri'ah" (announcement). Hence, even when there are Kohanim present, the Shali'ach Tzibur may say "Elokeinu..." quietly as a Tefilah, and when he gets to the word "Kohanim," he says it out loud in order to call up the Kohanim. It is not considered an interruption because it is part of the Tefilah.

This was the practice of the MAHARAM M'ROTENBURG as cited by the Hagahos Maimoni (Hilchos Tefilah 14:7).

HALACHAH: The BEIS YOSEF cites sources that the Maharam himself changed his practice and ruled that there is no point for the Shali'ach Tzibur to say "Elokeinu..." when there are Kohanim present. The only reason the Shali'ach Tzibur says it when there are no Kohanim present is in order to take the place of the "Yehi Ratzon" prayer which the Kohanim say before reciting Birkas Kohanim. Since the Kohanim themselves are saying the prayer of "Yehi Ratzon," there is no point for the Shali'ach Tzibur to say it as well. Therefore, the SHULCHAN ARUCH (OC 127:10) rules like the Rambam, that the Shali'ach Tzibur calls out "Kohanim."

The REMA, however, mentions the custom for the Shali'ach Tzibur to say "Elokeinu" quietly until the word "Kohanim" and to say "Kohanim" out loud. The practice of the VILNA GA'ON, though, was like the opinion of Rabeinu Tam, that someone else should call up the Kohanim and not the Shali'ach Tzibur (Ma'aseh Rav #168). Many Ashkenazic synagogues in Eretz Yisrael follow the practice of the Vilna Ga'on.

Sotah 40 HALACHAH: "MODIM D'RABANAN" OPINIONS: The Gemara asks what the Tzibur is supposed to say when the Shali'ach Tzibur recites the blessing of "Modim." A number of Amora'im are quoted who give various phrases of praises to say. Rav Papa says that it is appropriate to say all of them. The BEIS YOSEF (OC 127) writes that because of this we refer to the prayer that the Tzibur says as "Modim d'Rabanan," which means the prayer of "Modim" that was composed by many Rabanan.

Is one supposed to add a Berachah ("Baruch Atah...") at the end of the prayer of "Modim d'Rabanan" or not?

(a) Our Gemara indeed implies that no Chasimah should be said at the end of the prayer. This is consistent with the teaching of the Gemara in Berachos (46a) that one only ends a praise with a Berachah ("Baruch Atah...") when it also starts with a Berachah ("Baruch Atah...").

This is the ruling of the RAMBAM (Hilchos Berachos 9:4).

(b) However, the Yerushalmi (cited by Tosfos here, DH Al) does include a Berachah at the end of Modim d'Rabanan: "Baruch Atah Hashem, E-I ha'Hoda'os." (The RASHBA in Berachos (34a, end of DH Rava Kara) explains why the Yerushalmi says that Modim d'Rabanan ends with a Berachah even though it does not start with a Berachah.) This was the practice of the ROSH as cited by the Tur (OC 127), with which the Darchei Moshe concurs.

(c) However, the TALMIDEI RABEINU YONAH in Berachos (32a of the pages of the Rif, DH u'v'Yerushalmi), regarding a similar contradiction between the Bavli and the Yerushalmi (whether or not the blessing of "Borei Nefashos" ends with a Berachah), make a compromise and write that one should end with a Berachah but omit the words "Atah Hashem."

This is our practice, both we regard to the blessing of Borei Nefashos and with regard to Modim d'Rabanan, as the Shulchan Aruch (OC 127) writes. (The Rema does not protest this ruling.)

40b BLESSINGS IN THE BEIS HA'MIKDASH QUESTION: The Gemara says that in the Beis ha'Mikdash, the person reciting the blessings would conclude the blessing with the words, "Baruch Hashem Elokei Yisrael Min ha'Olam v'Ad ha'Olam..." The people would respond "Baruch Shem Kevod Malchuso..." after the blessing. The Gemara explains that the reason was because "we do not respond 'Amen' in the Beis ha'Mikdash." Why did they recite a different Chasimah to blessings, and give a different response to blessings, in the Beis ha'Mikdash?

ANSWER: The MAHARSHA here explains that only in this world do we pronounce the name of Hashem with the name of "Adnus." In Olam ha'Ba, Hashem's name will be pronounced the way it is written (Pesachim 50a). In the Beis ha'Mikdash, they said "Ad ha'Olam" (lit. "until the world") to show that only until the end of this world will we use the name "Adnus" to refer to Hashem. After this world, the Name will be revealed in its entirety. That is why in the Beis ha'Mikdash "Baruch Shem Kevod... *le'Olam va'Ed*" ("*forever*") is the refrain. Since in the blessings uttered in the Beis ha'Mikdash we allude to the Tetragrammaton as it is *spelled*, we proclaim that it is *this* name that will be used "for eternity," i.e. in Olam ha'Ba.

The Maharsha continues and says that we respond "Amen" after blessings because the word "Amen" alludes to both names of Hashem -- the way that it is written (which has a Gematria value of 26), and the way that it is pronounced (which has a Gematria of 65) -- which have a combined value of 91 (the same value as "Amen"). We do not say "Amen" in the Beis ha'Mikdash because we want to emphasize the eternity of the ineffable Name and we do not want to allude to the finite quality of this world (which is represented by the Holy Name as it is pronounced). We therefore say instead, "Baruch Shem Kevod... le'Olam va'Ed" (which alludes only to the Holy Name as it is spelled). (MAHARSHA, DH Minayin sh'Ein)

HA'GAON RAV YITZCHAK HUTNER zt'l (Pachad Yitzchak, Yom Kipur) adds that it is for the same reason that we say "Baruch Shem Kevod Malchuso..." after the verse "Shema Yisrael..." Normally, we only have in mind the concept of Hashem's Adnus, His sovereignty, when we mention the name of Hashem in a blessing or in our prayers (see OC 5). When we say Shema, though, we must also have in mind the ineffable Name, as it is written (Vilna Gaon, *ibid.*). Since we allude to the spelling of that name, we say immediately afterwards, "Baruch Shem Kevod... le'Olam va'Ed" -- that is, "this is the name that will last forever!"

RECITING VERSES OF THE TORAH BY HEART QUESTION: The Mishnah says that after the Kohen Gadol reads Parshas Acharei Mos (Vayikra 16-18) and the verses from Parshas Emor that discuss Yom Kipur (Vayikra 23:26-32), he reads by heart the verses in Parshas Pinchas (Bamidbar 29:7-11) that deal with Yom Kipur.

Why is it permitted for him to read verses by heart? The Halachah states that it is prohibited to read by heart verses which are written in the Torah (Gitin 60b)!

ANSWERS: (a) The RITVA (70a) explains, based on the Yerushalmi, that the prohibition applies only to reading verses from the Torah for which there is an obligation to read publicly ("Chovas Keri'as Tzibur"). The prohibition does not apply to reading verses for the sake of reviewing the Torah, or for the sake of giving praise to Hashem. When the Kohen Gadol reads the Torah by heart on Yom Kipur, it is permissible because there is no obligation to publicly read these verses; rather, they are read just to review the topics relevant for the day. (This is in contrast to the explanation of Rashi, who says that there is an actual obligation to publicly read the verses. According to the Ritva, there is no obligation, but it was done merely to review the verses dealing with Yom Kipur.)

(b) The TOSFOS YESHANIM (70a) says that there is no *prohibition* to read verses in the Torah by heart; rather, it is a *Mitzvah Min ha'Muvchar* (the choicest way of performing the Mitzvah) to read the verses from the Sefer Torah. On Yom Kipur, the Rabanan permitted the Kohen Gadol to read part of the Torah by heart in order not to trouble the Tzibur gathered there to wait as he rolled the Sefer Torah to the proper place. The Rabanan permitted him not to do the Mitzvah in the choicest way for the sake of the honor of the Tzibur.

(c) The TALMIDEI RABEINU YONAH in Berachos (9b) explain as follows. There are certain verses which the Torah requires an individual to read, but does not require that he read them from a Sefer Torah. For example, the Torah requires each person to recite the Shema, but it is permitted to recite it by heart. The Torah does not expect every person to read the Shema twice each day from a Sefer Torah. The same is true regarding the verses of Birkas Kohanim recited by Kohanim each day when they bless the people. Similarly, the Gemara in Ta'anis (27b) says that when the Beis ha'Mikdash is not standing, by reciting the Parshah of Korbanos it is as if one brought the Korbanos. Certainly, the Torah does not require that the Parshah of Korbanos be recited from a Sefer Torah.

Since the Torah revealed that any of these Parshi'os may be recited by heart, then even when one is *not* performing a Mitzvah when reading them, one may read them by heart. For this reason, the Kohen Gadol may read these verses, which deal with the Korbanos of Yom Kipur, by heart.

It may be added that these three answers of the Rishonim appear to be arguing about the reason for the requirement to read verses from a Sefer Torah and not by heart.

The first reason offered is that if one reads verses by heart, he might make a

mistake. This reason is consistent with the explanation of the Ritva (a), who says that it is necessary to read from a Sefer Torah only when there is an obligation to publicly read the verses. In order for the Tzibur to fulfill the obligation, the reader must not make a mistake. However, when reading verses for the sake of giving praise to Hashem, if one makes a mistake it does not matter because he is not attempting to fulfill any obligation.

The second reason given for the obligation to read verses from the Sefer Torah and not by heart is cited by the BEIS YOSEF (OC 49), and by the RITVA in Gitin (60b) in the name of the RAMBAN. The written word which one sees when reading the verses contains certain elements and meanings which one does not see when he recites those verses by heart. The advantage of reading the verses with those extra meanings, though, is only a Mitzvah Min ha'Muvchar; one certainly fulfills his obligation if he does not have access to those deeper meanings. This is consistent with the answer of the Tosfos Yeshanim (b).

The third reason is offered by the KOL BO. If one was reading from the Sefer Torah and then recites verses by heart, the people might think that those verses are not part of the Torah. Therefore, one must always read from the Sefer Torah. This reason is consistent with the answer of the Talmidei Rabeinu Yonah (c). If verses are normally recited by heart in the course of a Mitzvah, everyone knows that they are in the Torah and that they are recited by heart only out of necessity. No one will err and think that they are not written in the Torah. (M. Kornfeld)

The *D*AFYOMI *A*DVANCEMENT *F*ORUM, brought to you by Kollel Iyun Hadaf Write to us at daf@dafyomi.co.il or visit us at <http://www.dafyomi.co.il> Tel(IL):02-652-2633 -- Off(IL):02-651-5004 -- Fax(US):603-737-5728