

INTERNET PARSHA SHEET  
ON SHMOS - 5759

See instructions below on subscribing to individual lists. Thank you to M. Fiskus and S. Gunsburg for distributing in JE. To receive this formatted parsha sheet in WP 6.1 file (readable by Word), please e-mail me at CRSulman@Aol.com (with copy to CSulman@Cahill.com).

**SOME INTERNET DVAR TORAH LISTS** [VirtualJerusalem](mailto:VirtualJerusalem): E-mail to: listproc@jerl.co.il In msg type: subscribe <listname> Your\_Name" Some of lists: DafYomi (by Ohr Somayach); Parasha QA (by Ohr Somayach); Weekly (Ohr Somayach on Parsha); YS-Parasha (from Shaalvini); YTTorah (Young Israel); Camera; ShabbatZomet; hk-nebenzahi (by Rabbi Nebenzhai); Machon\_meir; Yossi (parsha comics). Send command "lists" for lists. [Yeshiva Har Etzion](mailto:YeshivaHarEtzion): E-mail to: lists@vbm-torah.org In msg type: subscribe <listname>". Some of lists: Yhe-UndHalakha; Yhe-halac; Yhe-IntParsha; Yhe-Sichot (Rav Lichtenstein and Rav Amital); YheJewhpi; Yhe-Yar; Yhe-Parsha (by YHE rabbis & yhe-par.d); Tsc-parsha & tsc-par-new (by Rabbi Leibtag); Tsc-navi (by Rabbi Leibtag). Send command "lists" for lists. [Shamash](mailto:Shamash): E-mail to listproc@shamash.org In message write "sub 'listname' <yourname>" Bytetorah (Zev Itzkowitz); Enayim (YU parsha); Daf-hashava (London); mj-RavTorah (Rav Soloveichik on Parsha). Send "lists" for list. [Project Genesis](mailto:ProjectGenesis): E-mail to majordomo@torah.org with "subscribe listname <your email address>" in message. Lists include: WeeklyHalacha (by Rabbi Neustadt); DvarTorah; Halacha Yomi; Mahara; Rambam; Ramchal; RavFrاند (by Rabbi Yeshachar Frand); Tefila; Drasha (by Rabbi Mordechai Kamensky); Hamaayan (by Shlomo Katz); Mikra (by Rabbi Eitshalom); Perceptions (by Rabbi Winston); Business-halacha; Haaros (by Rabbi Yaakov Bernstein); Olan-shabbos (by Rabbi Hoffmann); Rabbis-Notebook (by Rabbi Aron Tendler). Send "lists" for complete list. [Schema Yisrael](mailto:SchemaYisrael): E-mail to: listproc@jen.co.il In msg type: subscribe <listname> Your\_Name" Some of lists: Peninim (on Parsha by Rabbi Scheinbaum); Hear (from Rabbi Weber); Midei (Rav Chryser); YTTorah. Send "lists" for complete lists. [Daf Yomi](mailto:DafYomi): E-mail to: listproc@jen.co.il In msg type: subscribe <listname> Your\_Name" Lists include: dafinsights, dafidiscuss, dafbackground, dafreview, daf-points and daf-hebrewreview. By Rabbi Kornfeld. [Chabad](mailto:Chabad): E-mail to listserve@chabad.org. In subject write: subscribe me. In text write: "Subscribe <code> E.g.: code of W-2 is Likutei Sichos On Parsha. Send "lists" for complete list. [Israel News](mailto:IsraelNews): To: Listserv@pankov.inter.net.il Subject: Subscribe Listname <your name> Type "Subscribe <listname> <your name>". Lists include "Israie" and "Israel-mideast". Must confirm w/i 48 hours by sending to same address msg "OK xxxx" with xxxx the code receive in confirmation. Also listproc@ploni.virtual.co.il has Arutz 7. [Jonathan Schwartz's](mailto:JonathanSchwartz) Internet chabura. (Private list.) Send e-mail to sametre@biomed.med.yale.edu

**WORLD WIDE WEB (Not updated as frequently as above lists)** - Shamash - <http://shamash.org> & <http://shamash.org/tanach/dvar.html>; Shamash Search - <http://shamash.org/tanach/search.html>; Shamash Tanach Commentary - <http://www.shamash.org/tanach/tanach/commentary>; Rav Soloveichik archives - <http://www.shamash.org/tanach/tanach/commentary/mravtorah> & <http://shamash.org/mail/jewishrov.html>; Rabbi Haber - <http://www.shamash.org/tanach/tanach/commentary/ravhaber>; Virtual Jer Parsha - <http://www.virtual.co.il/depts/torah/parsha.htm>; Virtual Jerusalem Torah - <http://www.virtual.co.il/torah/torah/6.htm>; Maven - <http://www.maven.co.il>; Maven Torah Links - <http://www.maven.co.il/subjects/dix119.htm>; Yeshiva Har Etzion - <http://www.vbm-torah.org>; Rabbi Leibtag Tanach Center - <http://www.virtual.co.il/torah/tanach>; OU - <http://www.ou.org/torah>; OU Torah Insight - <http://www.ou.org/torah/ti>; OU parsha listing - <http://www.ou.org/torah/shabbat/author.htm>; NCSY Torah tidbits - <http://www.ou.org/torah/ti/default.htm>; NCYI Weekly - <http://www.youngisrael.org/dt.htm>; Ohr Somayach - <http://www.ohr.org/il/thisweek.htm>; Chabad - <http://www.chabad.org>; JCN - <http://www.jcn18.com>; Project Genesis - <http://www.torah.org> (see also [ftp.torah.org](http://ftp.torah.org) for more archives); Project Genesis Advanced - <http://www.torah.org/advanced/noframes.html>; Rav Frand - <http://www.torah.org/learning/ravfrand/5759/>; Shama Yisrael - <http://www.shemaysrael.co.il/parsha/index.htm>; Rabbi Kornfeld Parsha Page - <http://www.shemaysrael.co.il/parsha/kornfeld/>; Rav Zev Leif - <http://www.shemaysrael.co.il/parsha/leif/index.htm>; Aish Hatorah - <http://www.thewall.org>; Rabbi Mordechai Eilon - <http://www.internet.co.il/mv/parsha.html>; YOSS Drasha - <http://www.yoss.org/windex.htm>; Eymayim LTorah - <http://www.yu.edu/riets/torah/enayim/thisweek/thisweek.htm>; REITS Torah - <http://www.yu.edu/riets/torah/index.htm>; Jewish America - <http://www.jewishamerica.com>; Parsha Pearls - <http://www.jewishamerica.com/parshape.htm>; Chicago Kollel - <http://www.cckollel.org/parsha.shtml>; Nechama Leibowitz - <http://www.yerushalayim.net/torah/nechama>; Shabbat-BShabbato - <http://www.zomet.co.il/shabto.htm>; My link page - <http://members.aol.com/CRShulman/torah.html>; Hebrew fonts - <http://www.virtual.co.il/education/yhe/hebfont.htm>; Jer Post Rabbi Riskin Columns - <http://www.jpost.co.il/Columns>; Torah Net - <http://www.torah.net/eng/index.htm>; Green Torah Links - <http://www.mispress.com/judaism/chapter17.html>; Shaalvini Parsha - <http://virtual.co.il/education/shalvini/parasha.htm>; Barlan Parsha - <http://www.bia.ac.il/JH/Eparasha>; Torah Fax Cyber - <http://www.netavis.qc.ca/torahfax>; Torah Tots Parsha - <http://www.torah tots.com/parsha.htm>; Children - <http://www.pirchei.co.il>; Innernet Mag - <http://www.innernet.org.il>; Yahoo Judaism Teachings - [http://www.yahoo.com/Society\\_and\\_Culture/Religion/Faiths\\_and\\_Practices/Judaism/Teachings](http://www.yahoo.com/Society_and_Culture/Religion/Faiths_and_Practices/Judaism/Teachings); MIME decoder - <http://www.people.virginia.edu/~ben9q/dwnldm2.html>

ravfrand@torah.org Rabbi Frand on Parshas Shemos These divrei Torah were adapted from the hashkafa portion of Rabbi Yissocher Frand's Commuter Chavrusah Tapes on the weekly portion: Tape # 176, Shalosh Seudos in Shuls: Is There a Problem? Good Shabbos! Dedicated by Melany and Mordecai Solomon in honor of Ruth and Rabbi Sidney Solomon and Ida and Max Katz, on the birth of their grandson Meir Yehuda.

Parshas Shemos What is the Reason for the Removing One's Shoes in a Holy Place? In the Halacha portion of the shiur we began with the Medrash on the pasuk [verse] "Remove your shoes from your feet" [Shemos 3:5]. We learn from this pasuk that it is forbidden to wear shoes in any place where the Divine Presence is revealed. The Medrash further comments that we find the same concept by Joshua and by the Kohanim in the Temple: they removed their shoes when in a place where the Divine Presence was revealed. We understand that from a Halachic perspective this is a manifestation of the Awe of the Temple (Morah Mikdash), but what is the reason behind this? Why are shoes removed in the Beis HaMikdash? Wouldn't walking barefoot seem to indicate a lack of decorum? The Shal"oh quotes a fascinating concept in the name of his Rebbi, the Maharsha"l. In earlier times, people recited each of the morning blessings independently at various stages of getting dressed and prepared for the new day. When one put on his clothing, he recited the blessing "who clothes the naked", and so forth. [Nowadays, our custom is to recite all of the blessings at once as part of the morning service.] The Shal"oh comments that one of these blessings, "Blessed are You... who provides me with all my needs," is meant to be recited when a person puts on his shoes. The Shal"oh explains that there are four levels of existence: Inanimate objects, plant life, animal life, and -- at the top of the pyramid -- living creatures that can speak (i.e. -- human beings). The Maharsha"l says a Jew must understand that the human being is on top of this pyramid for a purpose and that everything below him is there to serve him. He is in fact "master of the universe" and can use inanimate, plant and even animal life for his own purpose, which is to serve G-d. In

other words, the way G-d set up creation was that plants and animals should serve human beings. The Maharsha"l says that the way this is symbolized is by putting on shoes, made of leather (the skin of animals). The message to man is "You are on top of everything -- you are in charge." This is not a license to abuse or to waste. Man must act responsibly, but it was all created for him. For this reason, when a person puts on his shoes he recites the blessing "for You have created for me all my needs." Wearing shoes demonstrates that I am in control of even the highest form of animal life. Therefore, the Be'er Yosef says, when one is in the Presence of the Divine, he must remove his shoes. If wearing shoes demonstrates to man that he is "in charge", then we obviously understand why it becomes incumbent on him to remove that symbol in the manifest Presence of G-d. In the Presence of the Shechina, there is a Higher Force and man must clearly recognize that he is no longer "in charge". He demonstrates this recognition by removing his shoes.

Yael's Killing of Sisera Was an Act of Kindness The Medrash says, "from here we learn that one who accepts upon himself a certain mitzvah, that mitzvah will not cease from him." If a person makes an effort to garner a particular command, and its associated reward, will remain with him and his descendants for generations after. Where do we see this? Moshe Rabbeinu was a fugitive from justice, running away from Pharaoh. Yisro welcomed Moshe into his home, fulfilling the mitzvah of hosting guests. Yisro put himself out for the mitzvah of Hachnosas Orchim. How do we see that the mitzvah of Hachnosas Orchim remained with the descendants of Yisro? Yisro's granddaughter was Yael, wife of Chever haKeni [Shoftim 4:17]. She too performed the mitzvah of Hachnosas Orchim by welcoming Sisera into her tent. As any good hostess she gave him to eat and to drink and even to sleep. But as we all know, he woke up one head shorter! Yael killed Sisera. And this is the end of the Medrash. What kind of Hachnosas Orchim is this? The Beis Av gives a very true insight which people today often fail to appreciate: Hachnosas Orchim means to do kindness with people who need a kindness. Sometimes giving a person to eat and to drink and to sleep is performing kindness. But sometimes kindness has to be performed by chopping off a person's head. Sisera was the commander of the army of Canaan, which had oppressed the Jews for twenty years with his army of 900 iron chariots. The recipient of the kindness to which the Medrash is referring is not Sisera. The Jewish People were the recipients of Yael's kindness. One must not be shortsighted. There was an act of Hachnosas Orchim and Chessed over here. It was directed, however, not at Sisera, but at the Jewish People. The way this kindness was accomplished was by cutting off someone's head. To Sisera it was not a kindness. But it was a kindness to the Jewish People. Sometimes to be kind and compassionate requires what appears to be an act of cruelty. Sometimes the biggest act of cruelty is in fact the biggest act of kindness. The biggest act of murder can be the biggest life-saving act. Waging a war can sometimes be an act of saving life rather than an act of causing loss of life. [Imagine if someone had had the opportunity to kill Hitler y"svz.] This is what the Medrash tells us. The true master of kindness (ba'al chessed) can look beyond his nose, beyond the here and now, and analyze the true act of kindness that is required. There is a concept that is popular in psychology called "tough love". Sometimes acting tough is ultimately a manifestation of love if that is what the situation requires. Sources and Personalities Shal"oh -- Acronym for Shei Luchos HaBris: Rav Yeshayahu Hurwitz (1560-1630); Poland, Prague, Frankfurt, and Jerusalem. Maharsha"l -- Moreinu HaRav Shlomo Luria (1510-1573); Poland. Transcribed by David Twersky; Seattle, Washington twerskyd@aol.com Technical Assistance by Dovid Hoffman; Yerushalayim dhoffman@torah.org Yad Yechiel Institute, PO Box 511, Owings Mills MD 21117-0511. Call (410) 358-0416 for further information. Rabbi Yissocher Frand: In Print <http://books.torah.org/RavFrand>, Copyright (c) 1999 by Rabbi Y. Frand and Project Genesis, Inc. Project Genesis: Torah on the Information Superhighway [learn@torah.org](mailto:learn@torah.org) 6810 Park Heights Ave. <http://www.torah.org> Baltimore, MD 21215 (410) 358-9800 FAX: 358-9801

<http://www.jpost.co.il/Columns/> January 7, 1999 19 Tevet 5759 Jan. 07 SHABBAT SHALOM: Too modest By RABBI SHLOMO RISKIN "Now Moses was tending the sheep of Jethro his father-in-law, the priest of Midian, and he led the flock to the edge of the wilderness, and came to the

mountain of God, unto Horeb." (Ex. 3:1) In this week's Torah portion, the Almighty tries to convince the shepherd Moses to assume leadership of the Israelites. Moses is clearly the best choice, from the Divine perspective. After all, did he not, even as prince of Egypt, prove his commitment to the children of Israel by taking the life of an Egyptian taskmaster in order to avenge the life of a Hebrew slave? But Moses himself extracted the opposite message from that incident. When, shortly afterwards, he tries to stop two Hebrews from fighting, his previous involvement is scorned: "Who made you a ruler and judge over us?" (Ex 2:14) Moses has understandably concluded that being the leader of the Jewish people will bring him only criticism and heartache. And so he tells God that he is not interested. The entire dialogue is a "textbook case" of finding ways of saying "no" to God, concluding in the extreme Divine reaction: "The anger of God was kindled against Moses..." (Ex. 4:14). Indeed, the midrash deduces that the Almighty punished Moses, removing the priesthood from his shoulders and transferring it to Aaron. As the verse proceeds: "Was it not Aaron your brother the Levite whom I chose to be your spokesman...?" - Aaron was initially slated to be the Levite and you, Moses, the Kohen, but I, God, shall now switch the honors. (Ex. 4:14, Rashi ibid) But why is the Almighty so angry? Cannot the hesitations of Moses be seen as a declaration of modesty which is to be praised? We discern four stages in God's attempt to get Moses to accept leadership. Moses initially declines by claiming that he is not the right person for such a formidable task. "Who am I, that I should go unto Pharaoh, that I should bring forth the children of Israel..." (Ex. 3:11) God explains that it's not a problem. "I will be with you..." He declares, and is thus teaching that true self-identity and worth is inextricably linked to one's relationship to God. To stand alone with God is to stand with a majority of One. But Moses remains unconvinced. His next qualm is that since the worthiness of the agent is bound up with the God who sends him, the people will demand to know more about that God. "What is His name, they will ask." God informs Moses that there are two aspects to His Name: "I will be what I will be," which fundamentally teaches that the Divine is the God of becoming and not just of being, the God who must continually be sought. Moreover, this God has already proven Himself to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob and has revealed to them His ultimate plan to redeem the Hebrew slaves from Egypt. At this point Moses should have surrendered, accepting the wisdom of God's choice. But no, he continues, there is the simple fact of credibility. The Israelites might well accept God, but they will not necessarily accept Moses. The Almighty still does not lose patience; He gives Moses two signs or symbols. God instructs Moses to throw his staff on the ground and it miraculously turns into a snake. "Grasp onto it" orders God, and it miraculously becomes a staff again. And then the second sign: "Put your hand into your bosom... and when he [Moses] took it out, behold his hand was leprous, as white as snow." But when Moses again removes his hand from his bosom, the hand is healthy flesh once again. Let's look closer at the nature of the two signs. I'd like to suggest that they reflect what's at the heart of leadership. God is telling Moses: If you want people to believe in you, you must first believe in yourself. Know that in your hand is the staff of leadership - a mastery you earned when you smote the Egyptian taskmaster. Remove the staff of leadership from yourself, refuse to assume your rightful position, and it will turn into the serpent, symbol of Egyptian tyranny and hedonism. In this world you either lead or you will be led. Now grasp the tail of the serpent - and you will once again be grasping the staff of leadership. It depends on you! The second sign is a continuation of the first. Placing one's hands in one's bosom is a symbol of inaction, of paralysis. But leprosy for the biblical mind is not merely an illness; it is a Divine punishment for slander (Numbers 12:10).

Of what slander is Moses guilty? Allow me to recall a story about the late Rav Yisrael Meir Kagan, known as the Hafetz Haim because of the work he wrote in the beginning of the 20th century against the evil of slander. World famous as he was, it was still possible then for a Jewish hero not to be recognized even by his seat-mate on a train. And this is how it happened that the great Sage, seated on a train next to a Jew dressed not very differently from himself was conversing with his couchmate about the great and holy Jews of the era. The couch-mate immediately began to praise the Hafetz

Haim; the Sage, in harmony with his humble nature, immediately protested, "He's not so great, believe me." The couch-mate disagreed, vehemently holding out the Hafetz Haim as the greatest Torah scholar of the generation, and the Sage just as vehemently denied the appellation. Finally, the exasperated couch-mate became so fed up with the insolence of his neighbor that he punched him in the face. When the train arrived in Radin, a crowd had gathered to meet the Sage. When the man on the train realized the identity of the person he had struck, he begged the great rabbi for forgiveness. "No: you must forgive me," remonstrated the Sage. "You taught me a most valuable lesson. I always believed that it was merely forbidden for an individual to speak slander against others; you taught me that it is equally forbidden to speak slander against oneself."

God is telling Moses that a leader dare not denigrate himself. Shabbat Shalom

---

weekly@vjlists.com] \* TORAH WEEKLY \* Highlights of the Weekly Torah Portion Parshas Shmos <http://www.ohr.org.il/tw/5759/shmos/Shmos.htm>

The Book Of Names "And they will say to me: What is His Name?" (3:13) This week we start reading the Book of Shmos, the "Book of Names." Really, however, the entire Torah is a Book of Names. The Torah existed before the creation of the universe. In its primordial form, the Torah's "letters" were black fire on a "parchment" of white fire. When G-d dictated the Torah to Moshe, Moshe wrote it like a scribe copying an ancient text of fire. Until this dictation, the Torah only existed as a series of letters in a sequence which could have been broken up into different words and different sentences, with an entirely different meaning. Thus, the primordial Torah was the "DNA of existence," containing every potential existential scenario. The Torah that Moshe wrote down was the scenario that was actualized. Something else: The entire Torah from its beginning -- "In the beginning" -- until its final words -- "before the eyes of all Yisrael" -- is no more than names of G-d, one after the other after the other. How can G-d have a name? A name defines. Definition limits. This cannot be that. Something with a name is by definition separate from everything else. Isn't saying that G-d has a name an impossible contradiction to His Oneness? The Torah is the blueprint of creation. Really, however, it is more than the blueprint. It is the means by which things exist. An architect's blueprint is inanimate. The Torah is dynamic. The source of all existence is rooted either explicitly or covertly in the Torah. On the infinite level, G-d has no name. When we talk of G-d having names, we mean that His names are the way that He relates to His creation. The Torah is the life-source of everything that exists because it is the names of G-d. The Torah, the blueprint and the dynamo of creation, necessarily must consist of G-d's names, for nothing can exist unless He wills it to exist; and His connection to this world is through His names. Nothing can have existence unless it is written in the Torah, which is no more than G-d's names, one after another...

A Jew By Any Other Name... "And these are the names of the Children of Israel that came to Egypt" (1:1) There was once a Jew who wanted very much to join a certain golf club. The only problem was that this golf club didn't accept Jews. Undeterred, he took every conceivable precaution to conceal his Jewishness and even changed his name. A week after he submitted his application, he was very disappointed to receive a polite but firm rejection from the club. "I don't understand," he complained to a friend. "My name doesn't sound Jewish. And on the application form, under where it said Religion, I even wrote 'non-Jew!'" One reason that the Jewish People deserved to be redeemed from Egypt was that they didn't change their names. Why was this so important? The name of a thing defines its essence. When Adam gave names to every creature, he understood that creature's individual essence and was able to express this in a name. Similarly, later in this week's Parsha, when G-d commands Moshe to lead the Jewish People out of Egypt, Moshe says to G-d "They will say to me 'What is His (G-d's) Name?' What shall I answer them?" In other words, if they ask me to define the essence of the Creator, what His name is, what do I answer? G-d is above definition. Man can have no concept of the real

essence of the Creator. We can only know that there is a Creator. And that is precisely what G-d answered Moshe: "I will be that which I will be." My essence is the fact that I exist, I have always existed and I will always exist. That is My essence. That is My Name. That's what "not changing their names" means. The Jewish People didn't change their essence. They didn't lose their identity. Even in the depths of exile they never stopped feeling that their essence was Jewish. Right at the beginning of the Book of Shmos, the Torah tells us "These are the names of the Children of Israel..." With these names they came, and with these names they left, their essence and their identity unaltered in any way.

The Singer Not the Song "He kissed him" (4:27) Rabbi Chaim Shmuelevitz, one of the great Torah leaders of the previous generation, disliked eulogies which contained stories about the deceased. "It's the man that makes the story, not the story that makes the man" he said. Even the simplest actions of the great bespeak volumes. In this week's Parsha, G-d tells Aharon to go out and meet his brother Moshe. The Torah reports "He kissed him" without telling us who kissed whom. Nachmanides tells us that it was Aharon who kissed Moshe. Although Moshe hadn't seen Aharon for many years and wanted to embrace his brother, yet Moshe, the humblest of all men, did not want to be so presumptuous as to initiate the embrace. Moshe was 80 years old, yet when it came to Aharon, he still saw himself as nothing more than Aharon's younger brother. The S'forno agrees with Nachmanides that it was Aharon who kissed Moshe, but for a different reason. He says Aharon kissed Moshe because Moshe was holy, just as one would kiss a Torah Scroll. A simple story of a simple kiss. An event that happens every day. It's the man that makes the story, not the story that makes the man.

Little Things That Count "Moshe was shepherding the sheep of Yisro." (3:1) There's no such thing as a small action by a great person. The smallest action of someone great reveals his greatness. Moshe was a shepherd. One day, a lamb from his flock was weak from lack of water. Moshe picked up the lamb and carried it on his shoulders until he reached the spring. He placed the lamb down and gave it water from the spring. Moses was alone in the wilderness. No one was watching. No one to applaud his kindness to the lamb. The way a person acts when no one is watching shows his essence. Moshe's essence was compassion. If Moshe showed such compassion for an animal, how much more would be his compassion for the Jewish People! Thus, Moshe merited to be the shepherd of the Jewish People.

Sources: \* The Book Of Names - Ramban, Sefer Bereishis 1:1 \* A Jew By Any Other Name - Rabbi S.Y. Zevin \* The Singer - Not The Song - Rabbi Mordechai Perlman \* Little Things That Count - Rabbi Mordechai Perlman

Written and Compiled by Rabbi Yaakov Asher Sinclair General Editor: Rabbi Moshe Newman Production Design: Eli Ballon Prepared by the Jewish Learning Exchange of Ohr Somayach International 22 Shimon Hatzadik Street, POB 18103 Jerusalem 91180, Israel Tel: 972-2-581-0315 Fax: 972-2-581-2890 E-Mail: info@ohr.org.il Home Page: http://www.ohr.org.il

parasha-qa@vjlists.com \* PARSHA Q&A \* In-Depth Questions on the Parsha and Rashi's commentary. Parshas Shmos http://www.ohr.org.il

Recommended Reading List Ramban 1:10 Politics of Genocide 2:2 Certainty of Moshe's Rescue 3:5 The Burning Bush 3:8 Qualities of Eretz Yisrael 3:12 Moshe's Concerns 3:18 The Code Word for Redemption 4:10 Moshe's Speech Impediment 4:13 Moshe's Humility 4:19 Moshe's Family as Proof Sforno 2:10 Moshe's Name 2:11,13,17 Reactions to Injustice Kli Yakar 2:2 Light and Three Months 2:7 Prophecy of Miriam 2:13 Striking Words Q&A's All references are to the verses and Rashi's commentary, unless otherwise stated 1. Why does the verse say "And Yosef was in Egypt?" 1:5 - This verse adds that despite being in Egypt as a ruler, Yosef maintained his righteousness. 2. Why did Pharaoh specifically choose water as the means of killing the Jewish boys? (Two reasons.) 1:10,22 - He hoped to escape Divine retribution, as Hashem promised never to flood the entire world. Also, his astrologers saw that the Jewish redeemer's downfall would be through water. 3. "She saw that he was good." What did she see "good" about Moshe that was unique? 2:2 - When he was born the house was filled with light. 4. Which Hebrew men were fighting each other? 2:13 - Datan and Aviram. 5. Why did the Midianites drive Yisro's daughters away from the well? 2:17 - Because a ban had been placed on Yisro for abandoning idol worship. 6. How did Yisro know that Moshe was Yaakov's descendant? 2:20 - The well water rose towards Moshe. 7. What lesson was Moshe to learn from the fact that the burning bush was not consumed? 3:12 - Just as the bush was not consumed, so too Moshe would be protected by Hashem. 8. What merit did the Jewish People have that warranted Hashem's promise to redeem them? 3:12 - The merit that they were destined to receive the Torah. 9. Which expression of redemption would assure the people that Moshe was the true redeemer? 3:16,18 - "I surely remembered (pakod pakadeti)." 10. What did the

staff turning into a snake symbolize? 4:3 - It symbolized that Moshe spoke ill of the Jews by saying that they wouldn't listen to him, just as the original snake sinned through speech. 11. For how long did Moshe refuse to be the redeemer of the Jewish People? 4:10 - Seven days. 12. Why didn't Moshe want to be the leader? 4:10 - He didn't want to take a position above that of his older brother, Aharon. 13. "And Hashem was angry with Moshe." What did Moshe lose as a result of this anger? 4:14 - Moshe lost the privilege of being a kohen. 14. How many names did Moshe's father-in-law have? 4:18 - Seven. 15. What was special about Moshe's donkey? 4:20 - It was used by Avraham for akeidas Yitzchak and will be used in the future by mashiach. 16. About which plague was Pharaoh warned first? 4:23 - Death of the firstborn. 17. Why didn't the elders accompany Moshe and Aharon to Pharaoh? How were they punished? 5:1 - The elders were accompanying Moshe and Aharon, but they were afraid and one by one they slipped away. Hence, at the giving of the Torah, the elders weren't allowed to ascend with Moshe. 18. Which tribe did not work as slaves? 5:5 - The tribe of Levi. 19. Who were the: a) nogsim b) shotrim? 5:6 - a) Egyptian taskmasters; b) Jewish officers. 20. How were the shotrim rewarded for accepting the beatings on behalf of their fellow Jews? 5:14 - They were chosen to be on the Sanhedrin.

Written and Compiled by Rabbi Reuven Subar General Editor: Rabbi Moshe Newman Production Design: Eli Ballon Prepared by the Jewish Learning Exchange of Ohr Somayach International 22 Shimon Hatzadik Street, POB 18103 Jerusalem 91180, Israel Tel: 972-2-581-0315 Fax: 972-2-581-2890 E-Mail: info@ohr.org.il Home Page: http://www.ohr.org.il

yje-parsha-return@vbm-torah.org Yeshivat Har Etzion Israel Koschitzky Virtual Beit Midrash (Vbm) Parashat Hashavua Dedicated in memory of our Grandmother, Szore bath Simon Leib Weinberger, whose Yahrzeit is on the 18th of Tevet. The Yeshiva and the VBM wish a very warm mazal tov to Rav David Silverberg (madrikh of the foreign students and VBM translator) and Brigitte Saffran on their engagement. Tizku livnot bayit ne'eman be-Yisrael!

PARASHAT SHEMOT By Rav Yonatan Grossman The List of Those Descending to Egypt as an Introduction to Sefer Shemot

This Shabbat marks the beginning of the reading of the Book of Shemot. The Netziv, in the introduction to his commentary to this sefer ("Ha'amek Davar"), cites the various names with which the "Ba'al Halakhot Gedolot" entitled the five books of the Pentateuch: Bereishit is referred to as "Sefer Ha-yashar" ("Book of the Upright"); Vayikra is named "Sefer Kohanim" ("Book of the Priests"); Bemidbar is called "Chumash Ha-pekudivim" ("The Book of Counting"); and Devarim is given the title "Mishneh Torah" ("The Review of the Torah"). Our sefer, the Book of Shemot, receives no special title. Rather, the "Behag" refers to it simply as "Sefer Ha-sheni" ("The Second Book"), a title relating to its place among the other books but not at all to its content or character. The Netziv asks the obvious question: why did the Behag differentiate between Shemot and the other four books? Either all five sefarim should be entitled based on their location in the sequence of Chumash, or the Book of Shemot should follow the pattern of the other books by having a unique title, relevant to its theme and overall content. The Netziv's answer is most intriguing: This comes to teach us that this book is, first and foremost, second to the book involving the beginning of creation, as it constitutes the second half of this book. Thus, according to the Netziv, the Book of Shemot must be viewed as a direct continuation of Sefer Bereishit, as it introduces neither a new time period nor a new theme. Rather, it merely continues the evolving story of Yaakov's family in Egypt through their Exodus and departure into the wilderness. Is there anything, then, that distinguishes it from Sefer Bereishit?

Sefer Shemot opens with the list of Yaakov's children who descend with their father to Egypt. It seems to me that in this brief listing lies a subtle yet profound allusion to the unique character of this sefer as a continuation of the lengthy saga already introduced in Bereishit, only from a totally different perspective. When we read the opening verses of the Book of Shemot - the listing of Yaakov's children who descend with him to Egypt - a parallel set of verses immediately comes to mind: the list of the members of Yaakov's family who accompany him to Egypt, which appears in parashat Vayigash. A careful comparison between these two listings reveals a rare similarity between them, which more than suggests that these two lists are to be viewed as essentially one census, presented twice in the Chumash. The listing in the beginning of Sefer Shemot does not present new information, but merely recounts that which had already been told earlier. Both sections open with a similar introduction: "These are the names of the sons of Israel who came to Egypt with Yaakov, each coming

with his household" (Shemot 1:1); "These are the names of the sons of Israel who came to Egypt" (Bereishit 46:8). Just as the two introductions correspond, so do the sum totals presented towards the end of each list: "The total number of persons that were of Yaakov's issue came to seventy" (Shemot 1:5); "Thus the total number of Yaakov's household who came to Egypt was seventy persons" (Bereishit 46:27).

It would seem, then, that these two listings are, in fact, one and the same. It appears first upon the family's actual migration to Egypt and is repeated in the beginning of our parasha. In truth, the list in Bereishit presents a detailed counting of all those who descended to Egypt, arranged according to Yaakov's various wives, whereas our parasha lists only Yaakov's sons themselves. One may thus argue that the two lists are not to be equated. However, the rest of the immigrants are accounted for in Shemot with the phrase, "each coming with his household." In other words, each of Yaakov's sons arrives in Egypt together with his family. Since this expression includes all Yaakov's grandchildren and great-grandchildren, we should not expect the Torah to list them all individually as it had done in Vayigash. To the contrary, the shorthand employed in this list can be more clearly understood in light of the fact that this section serves merely to repeat the list in Sefer Bereishit. Specifically for this reason, the Torah sees no reason to repeat the lengthy detail outlined earlier, sufficing merely to remind the reader of that which he had already encountered in parashat Vayigash. Why does the Torah suddenly recall this listing as it introduces Sefer Shemot? We have already learned of the experiences of Yaakov's family in Egypt ("Thus Yisrael settled in the country of Egypt, in the region of Goshen; they acquired holdings in it, and were fertile and increased greatly" - Bereishit 47:27), we have read of Yaakov's death, his children's journey to his burial in Canaan and their subsequent return to Egypt, and we have even come across Yosef's passing ("Yosef died at the age of one hundred and ten years" - the final pasuk in the Book of Bereishit). Why does the Torah see fit to present a chronological about-face and once again inform us of the names of Yaakov's sons who migrated with him to Egypt?

Rashi cites the comments of Midrash Tanchuma to deal with this problematic repetition: "Although it counted them by name during their lifetime [in parashat Vayigash], it counts them again upon their passing, to inform us of their love [before the Almighty]." Rashi, the grand educator (and not necessarily an exegete in this context), stresses the element of God's intense love for His people as the basis for the redundancy. Rashi here follows his general pattern at the beginning of each sefer of citing midrashim relating to God's love for Benei Yisrael. However, on the level of "peshat" - the straightforward understanding of the text - the problem remains unresolved.

It would seem that the simplest answer lies in the comments of the Ramban to the opening verse of the sefer: The reason for [the repetition of] "These are the names" is that the Scripture wishes to trace the subject of the exile from the time of the descent of [Yaakov and his sons] to Egypt... Therefore, the Scripture returns to the beginning of this subject, from the verse, "...and all his children he [Yaakov] brought with him to Egypt" (Bereishit 46:7). This verse is followed by the verse, "These are the names of the children of Israel who came to Egypt," the same verse with which our sefer opens. Although these are two books, the story is combined by things which follow each other.

According to the Ramban, whose approach we will adopt here, the Torah's repetition of the names of those who descended to Egypt serves to ensure the narrative's flow from the moment of the first wave of migration to Egypt through the Egyptian slavery depicted in Sefer Shemot. Repetition for this purpose is certainly not uncommon in the Chumash. (For example, see Shemot 6:10-2 and Shemot 6:29-30.) It becomes clear, then, why the Torah presents this list for a second time. The purpose of this citation relates specifically to the earlier section, in an effort to maintain the narrative's flow from this point onward. Therefore, we should not expect any discrepancy whatsoever between the two lists. Specifically for this reason, we are doubly surprised by a glaring discrepancy between

the two lists, with regard to the order of the presentation of Yaakov's sons.

The section iParashat Vayigash lists the sons in the following manner: Leah's sons: 1. Reuven 2. Shimon 3. Levi 4. Yehuda 5. Yissakhar 6. Zevulun The Sons of Zilpa, Leah's Maid: 7. Gad 8. Asher Rachel's Sons: 9. Yosef 10. Binyamin The Sons of Bilha, Rachel's Maid: 11. Dan 12. Naftali

This list is constructed according to the central division in Yaakov's family - Leah and her maid (1-8) followed by Rachel and her maid (9-12). This list, then, expresses the basic tension within the very fabric of Yaakov's household: Leah on one side, Rachel on the other. The listing of the children thus corresponds to, and thereby reflects, this domestic struggle.

By contrast, the list opening the Book of Shemot presents a drastically different arrangement of Yaakov's children:

Leah's Sons: 1. Reuven 2. Shimon 3. Levi 4. Yehuda 5. Yisachar 6. Zevulun Rachel's Sons: 7. Binyamin (Yosef's name is omitted, as he was already living in Egypt.) The Sons of Bilha, Rachel's Maid: 8. Dan 9. Naftali The Sons of Zilpa, Leah's Maid: 10. Gad 11. Asher

Apparently, this list is built according to the genealogical stature of the various children: the sons of the wives first (1-7), followed by the children of the two handmaids (8-11). In all likelihood, Bilha's children precede those of Zilpa because Rachel's children were just mentioned, and the Torah would rather flow naturally from Rachel's sons to those of her maidservant. The list then concludes with the sons of Zilpa, the maid of Leah, whose own children were listed first. The structure of this list follows the chiasmic style, which should most likely be seen as simply a literary technique. The critical question is, of course, why does the Torah change its method of ordering Yaakov's children from the first list to the second? The difficulty compounds in light of our previously stated assertion that this list must be seen as merely a repeat of the initial list in parashat Vayigash. Why does the Torah conspicuously allude to a parallel between these two lists, thus suggesting their identification one with the other, and then proceed to order the sons differently? Recall the Ramban's view that the entire purpose of this list is to bring the narrative back to the point of the first listing of parashat Vayigash and to continue the story from there. If so, the discrepancy is all the more baffling. If this list serves merely to remind the reader of the previous section, should the ordering not remain consistent in both accounts?

It would seem that the answer lies in the Netziv's aforementioned comments. Unquestionably, the Book of Shemot constitutes a direct continuation to Sefer Bereishit. Therefore, at the very outset of this sefer, the Torah repeats the event in Sefer Bereishit of primary significance for the purposes of this second sefer - Yaakov's sons' descent to Egypt. The Chumash then proceeds to trace the series of events from this point in history. However, concurrent with this continuation of the narrative, the Torah alludes to a fundamental change of perspective with regard to the experiences of Yaakov's children in Egypt. In effect, the difference between the order of listing in Vayigash and that in Shemot signifies the distinction between a family and an entire nation. Sefer Bereishit depicts the descent to Egypt of a family unit. In this sense, their migration fits perfectly within the rubric and general environment of the Book of Bereishit, which is the story of the family of Avraham. Quite understandably, then, the ordering of the sons appears on the basis of the domestic tension, which had pervaded Yaakov's home - the tension between Leah and Rachel, a conflict perpetuated by their children. The Book of Shemot, by contrast, introduces us, for the very first time, to the "Nation of Israel" in the true sense of the term. The Egyptian monarch utters the fateful pronouncement, "Look, the NATION of Benei Yisrael are much too numerous for us" (Shemot 1:9). Suddenly, Yaakov's family has been transformed into the Nation of Israel. The twelve "individual" sons have developed into a nation on the threshold of bondage, suffering, and ultimately redemption through the direct, supernatural involvement of the Almighty and His choosing them as His special nation. The indication of this change of perspective emerges from the change in the order of Yaakov's children as presented in the beginning of Sefer Shemot. Here the

Torah does not divide them according to the family strife, but rather according to the national hierarchy: first the children of Leah and Rachel, and then the children of the maidservants. Reuven and Shimon, two of Leah's sons, most likely felt a stronger personal kinship with Gad and Asher, the sons of their mother's maid (and for this reason they generally appear together throughout Sefer Bereishit). Nevertheless, from the general, national perspective, the personal tendencies and feelings of the brothers themselves are simply irrelevant. The Torah arranges their listing according to the nation's overall hierarchical social structure. Interestingly, in other contexts as well, the order generally employed when listing Yaakov's sons in Sefer Bereishit follows the family unit, as it appears in Vayigash. (See also the order employed by Yaakov when blessing his sons in Parashat Vayechi.) From Shemot on, however, the order generally corresponds to the national structure (as is the case in the beginning of the book). The various exceptions must be treated independently, a topic beyond the purview of our discussion. This, therefore, is how we must open Sefer Shemot. We recall and then continue to develop the event already recounted in Bereishit (the descent of Yaakov and his family to Egypt). Only now, this historical process assumes a different character. The Chumrah has shifted to a new angle - the national perspective as opposed to that of the family, which had characterized the narrative of Sefer Bereishit. (Translated by Rav David Silverberg.) <http://www.vbm-torah.org/thisweek.htm> Shiurim may be dedicated to various occasions - yahrzeits, semachot, birthdays, etc. Please e-mail [yhe@vbm-torah.org](mailto:yhe@vbm-torah.org) for an application. Orthodox Union (<http://www.ou.org>) Copyright (c) 1998 Yeshivat Har Etzion.

shabbat-zomet@vjlists.com] Shabbat-B'Shabbato - Parshat Shemot  
**A MITZVA IN THE TORAH PORTION:** "They Did Not Change Their Clothing" by Rabbi Binyamin Tabori. The above is one of the ways that Yisrael kept apart from the Egyptians, so that "anybody who saw them recognized that they were descended from Avraham, who sanctified the Holy Name." [Ritva, commentary on the Hagada]. However, when Moshe arrived in Midyan he did not act this way, as can be seen from the fact that Yitro's daughters described him as "an Egyptian man" [Shemot 2:19]. Are we required to wear special clothing, different from that of the Gentiles? At first glance, this would seem to be a halachic requirement, as is written by the Rambam: "It is forbidden to act in the ways of the Gentiles, and one should not be like them, neither in dress nor in hair style ... But the one from Yisrael should be different from them and recognizable in his dress ... One should not wear their special clothing." [Hilchot Avoda Zara 11:1]. In fact, according to the Talmud, one should allow himself to be killed in order not to transgress even such a small sin as tying a shoelace in the same way as the Gentiles (Sanhedrin 74a). Rashi explains that the Talmud is referring to the Jewish custom to dress modestly, and in spite of the fact that this is only a custom it is still required to accept death instead of violating it. On the other hand, the Kesef Mishneh writes, based on the detailed wording of the Rambam, that it is only for a mitzva that one should allow himself to be killed and not for a custom. Thus, according to his interpretation, the reason that one can be killed instead of changing the way his shoelaces are tied is because the matter of dress is a mitzva and not a custom, from the verse, "do not follow the laws of the Gentile" [Vayikra 20:23]. According to Daat Yera'im, the prohibition is limited to acting in a way similar to the seven nations which lived in Canaan or to the actions of Egypt (paragraph 313, 88). This would mean that there is no prohibition to wear modern men's clothing. Another reason for leniency is given by the Meiri, who says that the prohibition only involves being similar to the Gentile in matters of idol worship: "It is forbidden to be like them in their special dress, their hair style, and the other things which are unique to their priests ... in order to stay away from them and from their gods." [Sanhedrin 52b]. This is also written by the Rama: "All of this is only prohibited in ways which the Gentiles acted in order to act in a degenerate way ... or in matters which they do without any reason, since it is possible that these are the ways of the Emori, and that

it is rooted on idol worship from the past. But a custom which has a reason ... is permitted." [Yoreh Dai'ah 178]. This may all be very well, but it is still written, "And it will be, on the day of sacrifice to G-d, I will deal with the ministers and the children of the king, and on all those dressed as Gentiles" [Tzefania 1:8]. On the other hand, while "it is forbidden for one to claim that he is a non-Jew in order that he will not be killed ... it is permitted to change one's dress in order not to be recognized as a Jew in times of evil decrees, since in this case he is not explicitly claiming to be a Gentile" [Yoreh Dai'ah 157:2].

[weekly-halacha@torah.org](mailto:weekly-halacha@torah.org) Subject: Parshas Shemos - Kiddush: Proper Halachic Conduct Weekly-halacha for 5759 Selected Halachos Relating to Parshas Shemos By Rabbi Doniel Neustadt A discussion of Halachic topics related to the Parsha of the week. For final rulings, consult your Rav.

**BAR MITZVAH KIDDUSH: PROPER CONDUCT A SPECIAL EDITION IN HONOR OF THE BAR MITZVAH OF NOSSON NEUSTADT**

**KIDDUSH** Kiddush is recited over a cup of wine or grape juice which holds a revi's (3.3. fl. oz.). At least a cheekful (approx. 1.7. fl. oz.) must be drunk(1). There is no requirement for anybody but the person who makes Kiddush to taste the wine. As long as the listener intended to fulfill the mitzvah of Kiddush and heard every word of the blessing, he fulfills the mitzvah. It is, however, desirable (a mitzvah min ha-muvchar) to partake of the Kiddush cup(2). For this reason, many people make certain to drink some wine when attending a kiddush in shul. Doing so, however, can lead to a problematic situation regarding the correct blessing for any other beverage which will be drunk at the kiddush. Let us explain: The blessing of Borei pri ha-gefen automatically includes any beverage which is on the table or which will be brought to the table during the kiddush. No shehakol is recited on soda or juice, etc. that will be drunk during the kiddush(3). Even those who did not actually recite Borei pri ha-gefen but heard Kiddush from another person do not recite a shehakol on other beverages. This rule applies only if one drank a melo lugmav (a cheekful) of wine or grape juice. If one drank some wine or grape juice - but less than a melo lugmav - and wishes to drink another beverage, it is questionable(4) if he needs to recite a shehakol on the other beverages. It follows, therefore, that those who listen to someone else's Kiddush and partake of the wine and then want to drink another beverage, must do one of the following(5): Drink at least a cheekful; Recite a shehakol on a food item; Listen to a shehakol recited by another person.

**KIDDUSH ON SCHNAPPS** It is a common practice to recite Kiddush Shabbos morning over a 1 oz. cup of schnapps [or liqueur(6)]. Although many poskim(7) object, as Kiddush must be recited over a cup which holds at least a revi's and at least a cheekful must be drunk, still there are poskim(8) who defend this minhag Yisrael(9). They reason that schnapps is different from wine since it is normally consumed in much smaller quantities and is therefore subject to a different set of measurements(10).

Those who rely on this leniency and recite Kiddush over schnapps, must also recite a Borei nefashos over the schnapps, even though only a small amount was drunk. Although one does not recite a Borei nefashos unless he drinks 3.3. fl. oz. of a beverage(11), schnapps - according to this view - is an exception and requires a Borei nefashos even on a much smaller amount(12).

When no wine or grape juice is available, there is a way of reciting Kiddush over schnapps which will satisfy the opinions of most poskim: Recite Kiddush on a revi's of schnapps and drink a cheekful, but instead of swallowing it in one shot, sip it slowly, for a period of up to 3-4 minutes(13). When even this is not possible, a next best option is to share the cheekful with others who are listening to the Kiddush(14).

**KIDDUSH B"MAKOM SEUDAH** Kiddush must always be followed by a seudah (meal). Most poskim(15) maintain that mezonos eaten at a kiddush is considered a "seudah" for this purpose(16). After making Kiddush, at least a k'zayis (approx. 1.1 fl. oz.) of mezonos must be eaten within a span of 3-4 minutes. One who failed to do so must repeat Kiddush at home before his meal. A mezonos kugel is considered full-fledged mezonos

in regard to this halachah(17). On Pesach or other times when mezonos items are not available, the preferred method is to eat the seudah immediately after reciting Kiddush. If that is difficult, one should drink an additional revi'is (3.3 fl. oz.) of wine or grape juice. If one has no other wine or grape juice, he can rely on the revi'is of wine he consumed for Kiddush(18). There are poskim(19) who maintain that even l'chatchilah, one may eat fruit or shehakol items after Kiddush is recited if there are no mezonos items available. But then, Kiddush must be repeated at home before the meal. Other poskim(20) allow this practice only under special circumstances, such as the case of a person who is weak and needs to eat and has no mezonos available.

There is no need to repeat Kiddush at home if the requirements for Kiddush were met earlier in shul or at the simchah hall, unless there are other people at home who did not yet hear Kiddush. One who made Kiddush on schnapps should preferably repeat Kiddush at home over wine or grape juice(21).

**CHOLENT** The proper blessing over cholent depends on the ingredients: A cholent which contains beans, potatoes and small pieces of meat or chicken requires only Borei pri ha-adamah. It is considered a

"single entity mixture" since the entire mixture is eaten together in one spoonful. Because the ha-adamah ingredients constitute the rov (majority) of the cholent mixture, they determine the blessing for the cholent - ha-adamah(22). Even if the cholent has a soupy consistency, no shehakol blessing is required. The berachah acharonah is Borei nefashos. When kishke is served along with the cholent, the kishke requires a blessing of Borei minei mezonos. Since the kishke is generally not eaten in the same spoonful as the cholent, its blessing does not exempt the rest of the cholent from the blessing of ha-adamah(23), and so two blessings are required. The other type of cholent is the kind which contains barley in addition to potatoes, beans and small pieces of meat or chicken. This kind of cholent requires only a mezonos blessing. Since it is a "single entity mixture" which contains a member of the five species of grain (barley), the barley assumes the halachic status of ikar (a preeminent ingredient), even if there is less barley than beans and potatoes(24). The mezonos said over the barley exempts all the other ingredients in the cholent. In order for the barley to be considered the ikar, the following two conditions must be met: The barley must be added to the cholent to enhance its taste. If it is added to the cholent just as a binding or thickening agent(25), or to give it color or aroma(26), a mezonos is not said over the barley [or the cholent]; The taste of the barley must actually be noticeable in the mixture(27). In most cases when barley is added to the cholent, the above two conditions are met. The proper blessing, then, is mezonos. No other blessing should be made over the other ingredients(28). If, after reciting a mezonos on the barley, one recites another blessing, such as ha-adamah on the potatoes or shehakol on the meat, he may be reciting a blessing in vain (berachah l'vatalah)(29). If one recites ha-adamah or shehakol before the mezonos, he may be reciting an unnecessary blessing(30) (berachah she-einah tzerichah). An exception to the above rules is when the cholent contains large pieces of meat and chicken which are not eaten together with the rest of the cholent(31). In that case, a shehakol is said over the meat or chicken after the mezonos has been recited over the cholent. The berachah acharonah on barley cholent depends on the amount of barley consumed. If one eats a k'zayis of barley (approx. 1.1 fl. oz.) in 3-4 minutes or less, Al ha-michyah is said. No Borei nefashos is required(32). If less than that amount of barley is eaten, a Borei nefashos is said over the rest of the cholent. The preferred method when eating a barley cholent at a kiddush is to recite a mezonos over the cake at the beginning of the kiddush while having in mind the cholent as well(33); this obviates the need for a blessing over the cholent. The Al ha-michyah recited over the cake will include the cholent also, thus making it unnecessary to estimate the amount of barley eaten and the time span within which it was consumed. Note, however, that when barley cholent is served there is no need at all to eat cake, as one may fulfill his obligation of Kiddush b'makom seudah by eating a k'zayis of barley from the cholent(34).

There is no need to repeat Kiddush at home if the requirements for Kiddush were met earlier in shul or at the simchah hall, unless there are other people at home who did not yet hear Kiddush. One who made Kiddush on schnapps should preferably repeat Kiddush at home over wine or grape juice(21).

**CHOLENT** The proper blessing over cholent depends on the ingredients: A cholent which contains beans, potatoes and small pieces of meat or chicken requires only Borei pri ha-adamah. It is considered a "single entity mixture" since the entire mixture is eaten together in one spoonful. Because the ha-adamah ingredients constitute the rov (majority) of the cholent mixture, they determine the blessing for the cholent - ha-adamah(22). Even if the cholent has a soupy consistency, no shehakol blessing is required. The berachah acharonah is Borei nefashos. When kishke is served along with the cholent, the kishke requires a blessing of Borei minei mezonos. Since the kishke is generally not eaten in the same spoonful as the cholent, its blessing does not exempt the rest of the cholent from the blessing of ha-adamah(23), and so two blessings are required. The other type of cholent is the kind which contains barley in addition to potatoes, beans and small pieces of meat or chicken. This kind of cholent requires only a mezonos blessing. Since it is a "single entity mixture" which contains a member of the five species of grain (barley), the barley assumes the halachic status of ikar (a preeminent ingredient), even if there is less barley than beans and potatoes(24). The mezonos said over the barley exempts all the other ingredients in the cholent. In order for the barley to be considered the ikar, the following two conditions must be met: The barley must be added to the cholent to enhance its taste. If it is added to the cholent just as a binding or thickening agent(25), or to give it color or aroma(26), a mezonos is not said over the barley [or the cholent]; The taste of the barley must actually be noticeable in the mixture(27). In most cases when barley is added to the cholent, the above two conditions are met. The proper blessing, then, is mezonos. No other blessing should be made over the other ingredients(28). If, after reciting a mezonos on the barley, one recites another blessing, such as ha-adamah on the potatoes or shehakol on the meat, he may be reciting a blessing in vain (berachah l'vatalah)(29). If one recites ha-adamah or shehakol before the mezonos, he may be reciting an unnecessary blessing(30) (berachah she-einah tzerichah). An exception to the above rules is when the cholent contains large pieces of meat and chicken which are not eaten together with the rest of the cholent(31). In that case, a shehakol is said over the meat or chicken after the mezonos has been recited over the cholent. The berachah acharonah on barley cholent depends on the amount of barley consumed. If one eats a k'zayis of barley (approx. 1.1 fl. oz.) in 3-4 minutes or less, Al ha-michyah is said. No Borei nefashos is required(32). If less than that amount of barley is eaten, a Borei nefashos is said over the rest of the cholent. The preferred method when eating a barley cholent at a kiddush is to recite a mezonos over the cake at the beginning of the kiddush while having in mind the cholent as well(33); this obviates the need for a blessing over the cholent. The Al ha-michyah recited over the cake will include the cholent also, thus making it unnecessary to estimate the amount of barley eaten and the time span within which it was consumed. Note, however, that when barley cholent is served there is no need at all to eat cake, as one may fulfill his obligation of Kiddush b'makom seudah by eating a k'zayis of barley from the cholent(34).

There is no need to repeat Kiddush at home if the requirements for Kiddush were met earlier in shul or at the simchah hall, unless there are other people at home who did not yet hear Kiddush. One who made Kiddush on schnapps should preferably repeat Kiddush at home over wine or grape juice(21).

**FOOTNOTES:** 1 Based on the shiur of Harav M. Feinstein. A cheekful is a little more than half a revi'is. 2 O.C. 274:14. There is a minority view (Brisker Rav quoted in Mo'adim uZemanim 3:243) that holds that on Shabbos morning one must partake of the kiddush cup in order to fulfill the

mitzvah. The poskim, however do not agree with this stringency - see Yechaveh Da'as 5:20. 3 O.C. 174:2. Note, though, that Harav S.Y. Elyashiv is quoted (Vezos ha-Berachah, pg. 267) as ruling that only a Borei pri ha-gefen over wine exempts all other beverages; when it is recited over grape juice it does not exempt other beverages. 4 Derech ha-Chayim rules that it is sufficient, but Beur Halachah 174:2 questions that. See Yechaveh Da'as 5:20 and Minchas Yitzchak 8:19. 5 Beur Halachah 174:2. [It is not sufficient to have specific intention that the blessing over the wine should not cover other beverages; Harav S.Y. Elyashiv, quoted in Vezos ha-Berachah, pg. 100.] 6 Minchas Yitzchak 10:22. 7 Mishnah Berurah 272:30; Aruch ha-Shulchan 272:13; Minchas Shabbos 79:29; Ketzos ha-Shulchan 89:5. 8 Ktzei ha-Mateh (Mateh Efraim 625:99); Eishel Avraham 272:6; M'harsham 1:175; Chelkas Yaakov 1:94. 9 Because the practice was defended (in part) due to the scarcity and expense of wine, some poskim suggest that nowadays, Kiddush should be made over wine or grape juice only, see Nimukei Orchos Chayim 273. 10 This is based on the view of the Taz O.C. 210:1, which is rejected by the latter poskim; see Mishnah Berurah 190:14. 11 O.C. 190:3. 12 Har Tzvi O.C. 159. It follows therefore, that those who follow the majority view and do not recite kiddush on schnapps, do not recite a Borei nefashos when drinking an amount of schnapps less than a revi'is. 13 Mishnah Berurah 271:68. No talking should take place until the minimum amount is drunk. 14 Mishnah Berurah 272:30. 15 Mishnah Berurah 273:25. 16 A notable exception is the view of the G'ra, who maintains that kiddush can be made only when a seudah of bread follows. His view is quoted by the Beur Halachah 273:5 without comment. Aruch ha-Shulchan 273:8 considers this to be the preferred method. The general custom, however, follows the view of most poskim. 17 Shemiras Shabbos K'hilchasah 54:22; Az Nidberu 8:31. See Me'or ha-Shabbos, vol. 2, pg. 576. 18 Mishnah Berurah 273:25, 27. 19 Igros Moshe O.C. 4:63. See also Ein Yitzchak O.C. 12; B'tzeil ha -Chochmah 4:2; 5:115. 20 Mishnah Berurah 273:26. 21 To satisfy the view of the majority of the poskim. 22 O.C. 208:7. Mishnah Berurah 204:57; 207:7; 212:1. 23 Aruch ha-Shulchan 212:2. 24 Mishnah Berurah and Aruch ha-Shulchan 212:1. This is true even if the taste of the barley is not the preferred one. 25 O.C. 208:2. 26 O.C. 204:12. 27 Mishnah Berurah 208:49; Beur Halachah 208:9; Sha'ar ha -Tziyun 212:6; oral ruling from Harav M. Feinstein (quoted in Guide to Practical Halachah, vol. 2, pg. 204). 28 Note that a dissenting opinion (Chayei Adam 51:13; 54:9; and Kitzur Shulchan Aruch 54:5) maintains that when each item is recognizable, a separate berachah is made over each. Mishnah Berurah and Aruch ha-Shulchan, however, do not agree, and Harav S.Z. Auerbach (Vezos ha-Berachah, pg. 94) and Harav S.Y. Elyashiv (V'sein Berachah, pg. 63) rule that one need not concern himself with the dissenting view. 29 Mishnah Berurah 168:43. 30 This depends on a disagreement among the Poskim - see Sha'arei Teshuvah 212:1; Shulchan Aruch Harav 249:4; Sha'ar ha-Tziyon 212:15. 31 Aruch ha-Shulchan 212:2; Harav S.Y. Elyashiv (quoted in Vezos ha-Berachah, pg. 109). 32 O.C. 212:1; Mishnah Berurah 208:48; Igros Moshe O.C. 1:68. 33 The blessing is valid even though the cholent has not yet been served. 34 See O.C. 639:2, Mishnah Berurah 15 and Sha'ar ha-Tziyun 35.

Weekly-Halachah would like to wish a hearty Mazel Tov to Rabbi & Mrs. Doniel Neustadt on the occasion of the Bar Mitzvah of their son, Nosson, n"y. A special mazel tov is also extended to the grandparents Rabbi and Mrs. Neustadt and Rabbi and Mrs. Kamenetzky.

The Weekly Halachah Discussion Volume 2 on Vayikra, Bamidbar and Devarim is published and on sale in your local bookstore! Weekly-Halachah, Copyright (c) 1999 by Rabbi Neustadt, Dr. Jeffrey Gross and Project Genesis, Inc. 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-Halachah Series is distributed L'zchus Doniel Meir ben Hinda. Weekly sponsorships are available - please mail to jgross@torah.org. The series is distributed by the Harbotzas Torah Division of Congregation Shomre Shabbos, 1801 South Taylor Road, Cleveland Heights, Ohio 44118 HaRav Yisroel Grumer, Marah D'Asra. Project Genesis: Torah on the Information Superhighway learn@torah.org

yhe-rav-return@vbm-torah.org Subject: RAV -11: Torah and Humility YESHIVAT HAR ETZION ISRAEL KOSCHITZKY VIRTUAL BEIT MIDRASH (VBM) INTRODUCTION TO THE PHILOSOPHY OF RAV SOLOVEITCHIK LECTURE #11: Torah and Humility based on a lecture by Rav Joseph B. Soloveitchik zt"l [As a prelude to our discussion of catharsis of the intellect and of the religious experience, and as a continuation of our discussion of catharsis of the emotions, I am distributing a summary of an address by the Rav. This lecture was originally delivered in 1971, on the fourth Yahrzeit of Rebbeztzin Tonya Soloveitchik zt"l. It has been adapted by Rav Ezra Bick. A shorter adaptation of this lecture appears in Shiurei Harav.]

A We, the harb ingers of Torah Judaism to the non-Torah Jewish community, are under strict scrutiny from a moral point of view. Precisely because we place the study of Torah at the center of our existence, the topic of humility is very relevant, as the explosion of knowledge in the modern world can and does result in human arrogance. The WORD plays a unique role in the world-outlook of the Torah. Through the word, the boundless cosmos was created. Through the word, God revealed Himself to man in his role as a spiritual being and charged him with a singular task and assignment. God spoke to Avraham and then to Moshe, and urged them to establish a covenantal community, and later addressed Himself to that community and exhorted it to achieve the exalted heights of a "kingdom of priests and a holy people." First, order was imposed on the cosmos - this word is the source of truth, unalterability, identical with natural law. This was the order of Bereishit. When directed to man, the word imposes another order, not that of necessity and causality, but that of freedom and human dignity. When addressed to covenantal man, the word is the fountainhead of kedusha, sanctity. In short, the word creates three orders: necessity, the cosmic order; freedom, the human order; and kedusha, the covenantal order. That the fountainhead of kedusha is the word of God is expressed in Halakha through the distinction between objects that are "gufan kadosh" (intrinsic, inherent and substantive holiness) and "tashmishi kedusha" (peripheral, incidental holiness, defined by the relationship with a sacred object). [A Torah scroll is gufan kadosh; the Torah covering is tashmishi kedusha.] The holiness of something which is gufan kadosh is an integral part of the object, whereas for tashmishi kedusha it is an external part of its relation, not part and parcel of its existence. The gemara states that the tefillin straps, no matter how indispensible they are, are only tashmishi kedusha; however the battim, the boxes in which the sacred texts are placed, are gufan kadosh. The reason is because "Shin shel tefillin halakha le-Moshe mi-Sinai" (the letter

"shin" embossed on the box is a law given to Moshe at Sinai). We see that the criterion of *gufan kadosh* is the presence of the word. The geometric configuration is somehow the source of *kedusha*. What this means is that the source of all *kedusha* is the Torah, the word of God. Wherever a letter appears, the Torah appears, and we find inherent sanctity. Where there is no letter, there is no intrinsic sanctity. We have a written Torah and an oral Torah. The written Torah has its *kedusha* crystallized in the tangible, physical written word. What about the oral Torah? There the word is not objectified in a scriptural form. God, in His infinite wisdom, wanted the word to be interwoven in an abstract thought system, and not in a sign system alone, as in the written Torah. Can Torah she-be'al peh, the oral Torah, pass on *kedusha*? How does the unwritten word hallow, in the sense that Torah she-bikhtav sanctifies tefillin, mezuzah, the Torah parchment, etc.? It would be folly to conclude that Torah she-be'al peh is inferior in this respect. The answer is that the oral Torah operates in a more subtle manner, transmitting sanctity through study and its relation to the mind of the student. Apparently, Torah study, aside from being an intellectual, educational endeavor, enlightening the student and providing him with the information needed to observe the law, is a redemptive cathartic process - it sanctifies the personality. It purges the mind of unworthy desires and irreverent thoughts, uncouth emotions and vulgar drives. The parchment of talmud Torah is the human mind, the human heart and personality. Indeed, a new dimension is added to human experience through the study of Torah: sanctity. We have now discovered a new understanding of the term "writing" - it means not only the physical performance of drawing letters, but also the process of soul-arousal and heart-sensitizing. A scribe writes the Torah on parchment; the rebbe, the great teacher, writes the Torah she-be'al peh on the living mind, on the sensitive human heart. The old halakhic equation that every Jew is a sefer Torah (scroll) is, in this light, fully understandable. The living Jew is a sefer Torah of the Torah she-be'al peh. The gemara (Sota 13b) states: "R. Eliezer HaGadol said: Over twelve square miles, the area of the camp of Israel (in the desert), a heavenly voice proclaimed: Moshe, the great scribe of Israel, has died." Although Moshe did indeed write a sefer Torah, the word "scribe" here does not refer to the mechanical art of writing. If it did, what would be the meaning of the adjective "great?" How would this phrase, "the great scribe of Israel," do justice to the greatness of Moshe Rabbeinu? Did Moshe have a beautiful handwriting? R. Eliezer the Great was referring to a different kind of script, to the art of writing God's living word on the passionate vibrant human heart, and impressing God's image on the receptive and questing human personality. Moshe was a scribe in the same way that Sefer Yetzira calls God a scribe: "The world was created through three things: sofer, sefer, sippur (scribe, book, and a story)." We have arrived at the equation: writing = creation = education. The teacher is God's collaborator in *ma'aseh bereishit*, in the creation of the world. *Kedusha* is generated only by closeness to God. Who is holy? Whoever is touched by the Holy One, by God's hand. But, the question arises, how can man exist in the proximity of God? The gemara (Ketubot 111b) asks, "Is it possible for man to cleave to the Holy Presence? Is it not a fire devouring fire?" The gemara answers that we should associate with *talmidei chachamim*, with Torah scholars. How can one feel the hand of God resting on one's shoulder, feel the breath of eternity on his face? - through the Torah! Halakha does not favor mystical union, in which one's identity is negated. How can one get close to God and yet preserve the full sense of personality, of encounter? The answer is through knowledge, the study of Torah. How does the study of Torah unite man with God, the human being with his Maker? How can it bring together finitude and infinity, temporal transience and eternity? The Rambam develops the idea of "achdut ha-maskil ve-hamuskal" (the unity of knower and known, the subject and the object of knowledge). This is found not only in the *Moreh Nevuchim*, but in the *Yad Ha-chazaka* as well (*Hilkhot Yesodei Hatorah*, and, by implication, in *Hilkhot Teshuva*). The *Sefer HaTanya* writes about this doctrine of the Rambam that "all the sages of the Kabbala have agreed with him." I will not go into the philosophical explanation of this principle now, but we may immediately draw one conclusion. If the knower and the object known are merged into one, then two knowers whose minds are concentrated on the same object are also united. If  $a=c$ , and  $b=c$ , then  $a=b$ . People with common thoughts cannot long remain strangers, indifferent to each other. Wherever there is unity of thought, purpose and commitment, there is also personalistic unity. The Rambam (Commentary to Avot) concludes that the highest form of friendship is the unity of knowledge - "chaver le-dei'a." In a like manner, when man becomes completely absorbed in God's thought, in His *revWORD*, then he is indeed united with God; there is friendship between man and God. The Tanya writes, "When a man understands with his intellect, and comprehends and digests the infinite and inscrutable will of the Almighty, there is the most marvelous union between God and man." The link between man and God is thought. God is the originator of thought; man embraces it. This is the great bond uniting man and God, finitude with infinity. But now there is a dilemma. Knowledge, all knowledge, is essentially esoteric; it is not equally available to all. What about the dull people, the sluggish people, the intellectually slow; are they to be denied the companionship of God? Religion cannot be esoteric. The experience of God, to hear His whisper, is a basic elementary right of every human being. Without religion there is no salvation, without faith there is no redemption, and everyone is entitled to salvation. But if the link between God and man is the intellectual Torah gesture, how can the experience of God's companionship be achieved by all? There is another doctrine of unity - *achdut ha-ohav ve-ha-ahuv* (the unity of the lover and the beloved). To love means to share an identity, a common destiny. Now if the lover and the beloved are united, then two persons who are in love with a third party are also united. The love between a husband and wife is strengthened and deepened with the birth of a child. In fact, love in common is a stronger bond than thought in common; the link of hearts is stronger than that of minds. On the verse, "He shall cleave to his wife and they shall be one flesh" (*Bereishit* 2:24), Rashi explains that the "one flesh," the unity, is realized by the creation of a child. The love of the couple, originally an erotic, selfish drive, changes into a more spiritual, exalted love through a shared creation, a common goal. Unqualified love of a child unites the parents, brings them closer to each other. Their love becomes more truthful, more intimate and sincere. Two people, father and mother, are welded together into one. All their concerns and aspirations are concentrated on a new center, which becomes the emotional bond linking both of them; indeed, it becomes the existential focus of their lives, about which everything revolves. Depressed by the absence of love from her husband, Leah responds to the birth of her first child by saying, "Now, my husband will love me." She hopes that a missing element in her relationship will be filled by the little baby. God loves

His word, crystallized in the Torah, as though it were His daughter. In *Mishlei* (the Book of Proverbs), the Torah is called the darling child with which God plays daily. "I shall be for Him a disciple, and I shall be an amusement every day, playing before Him all the time" (*Mishlei* 8:30). Man too can embrace Torah. *Mishlei* (2:3) calls Torah the mother of man - "Call understanding your mother" (*Mishlei* 2:3). We find the expression "baneha shel Torah" (children of Torah), which does not refer only to scholars. The relationship between us and Torah is that between a child and his mother. We identify with Torah, we cherish her, we are committed to her, like a little child who identifies with his mother and cannot distinguish between his own identity and hers. In this way, a bond is created between God and man: not only man who studies, but all those who love Torah and feel awed by her. The Bach explains that the blessing we recite in the morning, "la'asok be-divrei Torah" (to engage in the words of the Torah), is more embracing than "lilmod Torah" (to learn Torah). The berakha, recited by all, including the great scholar, is not for the esoteric intellectual experience of Torah, but rather for the exoteric love of Torah and for the *kedusha* that results. The entire Jewish community is a Torah community, and hence a holy one, including both the aristocrat of mind and spirit, and the simple anonymous individual. "Torah tziva lanu Moshe, morasha kehillat Yaakov." The Torah is the inheritance of the entire community of Israel.

B Knowledge does not naturally contribute to humility. Normally, the greater the intellectual achievement, the greater the sense of arrogance. But Chazal demand that the acquisition of Torah be associated with humility - pride and Torah are mutually exclusive. The transition from Torah to humility is effected by the idea of *kedusha*. *Kedusha* logically should be associated with pride; it is rooted in human greatness, the potential for man to come close to the Almighty. How does the experience of being close to God lead to the experience of humility and human abnegation, which is man's remoteness from God? What is the bridge between these two contradictory states of mind? The bridge is defeat, which inevitably must accompany *kedusha*.

*Kedusha* is ceaseless in its motion, in its spreading, searching over the vastness, yearning for the infinite. There can be no final fulfillment in the quest for *kedusha*, because perfect union is not possible; it can never be realized. Man wants to be more, not for the sake of his own honor, but in order to reach out further, to understand more. The unique character of the "masmid" (diligent Talmud student) is based on this ideal - the incessant pursuit of an unattainable goal, of a fugitive vision, which springs not from intellectual curiosity but rather from the *kedusha* imbedded in the human personality. The yearning for God can never be satisfied. *Tehillim* (2:3) asks, "Who shall climb the mountain of God?" (not "who shall climb to the top of the mountain" - "mi ya'aleh le-har HaShem"; but "mi ya'aleh BE-har HaShem") - man is engaged in climbing the mountain but never reaches the peak. This interminable quest for *kedusha* is portrayed in *Shir HaShirim* (the Song of Songs), a never-ending search for "that which my soul loves," searching and not finding. *Kedusha* is a hierarchy, a pyramid, which many can enter at the base, but whose apex no one can reach. The drive is never terminated until man is finally defeated. Every man, no matter how great and powerful, must experience frustration, even - no, especially - in the battle he most wants to win. Even Moshe had his most ardent desire denied him. The Sages explain that had Moshe entered the Land of Israel, it would never have fallen to its enemies, the Temple would never have been destroyed. In other words, Moshe's crossing of the Jordan would have ushered in the messianic era, and Moshe would have been the *mashiach*. He would have succeeded in climbing to the apex of *kedusha*, combining the crowns of Torah, kingship, and priesthood (*keter Torah*, *malkhut*, *kehuna*) in their fullest expression, with nothing left to achieve. But that can never be. Moshe had to be defeated. God told him, No. You must stop. You will remain the greatest leader of Israel, the standard of Torah scholarship, but you will not be crowned with the crown of the *mashiach*. You are human, you must lose. You must be defeated. Now we understand how *kedusha* and humility merge into one. In the very movement where *kedusha* exults, "I am near God, I am a great being," it decrees its defeat. Being close to God awakens in me the desire to be closer yet, and that itself informs me that complete fulfillment of my desire is impossible, because I am but a small being. I am near God because I am great; I am not as near as I would want to be, because I am small.

C The awareness of defeat, the path to humility, has five steps. The first is the feeling of dependence. A ben-Torah must realize he is dependent on the advice, guidance, and instruction of someone who has come a few inches closer to the summit of the mountain. The more one knows, the greater the perplexity; the closer one is to one's Creator, the clearer the awareness of one's inadequacy and failure. Someone else will know more than I. Sometimes it will be a great scholar, sometimes even a small child or a pupil. If you ask me, "Who may lay claim to *kedusha*?" I will answer, "One who feels the need for a teacher, one who says, 'Make for yourself a teacher and acquire a companion'" - and a teacher can be even a little child. When Korach said, "For the entire people is holy, and God is in their midst" (*Bemidbar* 16:3), he was correct. But when he continued, "So why do you (Moshe and Aharon) elevate yourselves above the people of God?" he committed a fatal error. He thought that since everyone was sanctified, endowed with *kedusha*, there was no need for Moshe, for a teacher. Actually, precisely the opposite is true. Because they are endowed with *kedusha*, there is need for a teacher, for a master guide. The awareness of dependence is expressed through gratitude and loyalty. Judaism believes that man is never self-sufficient; he always needs help, not only from God, but from his fellow man. Tanakh gives us the figure of Naval HaCarmeli (*I Shemuel* 23). When Naval denied David's request, he said, "Shall I give MY bread, and MY water, MY slaughter that I have slaughtered from MY flocks, and give to men whom I know not?" He is expressing the mentality of a man who thinks everything is his by virtue of his own unaided efforts, the self-made man. He feels he owes nothing to anyone. The Torah begins the story of Avraham, in contrast, when he is seventy-five. We want to know more about Avraham, how he discovered the eternal truths, why he was chosen. Instead, the Torah tells us about his kinsman Lot. Why is the story of Lot narrated in such detail? It is not because he was a history-making or destiny-shaping individual. The story of Lot tells us that Avraham's main virtue was loyalty and gratitude. When Avraham told the Egyptians that Sarah was his sister, the Sages point out that Lot did not betray him. Avraham is committed to Lot, is going to save him even after Lot has turned his back on Avraham, because Avraham's central virtues were loyalty and gratitude. The humble man is indebted to his fellow. To whom should we give loyalty? To many. Firstly, to parents. Secondly, to teachers. My students owe me loyalty, though I can get along without it. A student should not close the door after the final exam and

walk out. Loyalty to teachers, gratitude, is an essential part of Torah, because it is the basis of humility. Thirdly, we owe loyalty to the countless generations of Torah scholars, to the chain of thinkers and dreamers who formulated the methodology, analyzed the ideas, interpreted the difficult tracts, and communicated all this in a living personal way to us. You owe loyalty to Jewish history, to those who sacrificed temporal things to the eternal masora (tradition). The second step is intellectual circumspection and caution. A talmid chacham is careful in the rendering of halakha. Only ignorant and arrogant people think that all questions are answerable. The humble talmid chacham does not proclaim high-sounding theories, sweeping statements about ethics and philosophy. The humble person will not boast that Judaism is commodious enough to embrace any theory, any trend in modern culture. A new idea, a new problem, must be treated with circumspection, carefully, and with trepidation. The third step is ethical modesty. There is not only intellectual dependence, but moral inadequacy as well. Moral complacency, so repugnant in a proper framework of kedusha, is all too prevalent in the Orthodox community, both in the diaspora and in Israel. A talmid chacham is very wary of such "pious" people, who condemn and judge mortal man from a position of assumed moral supremacy. Here too, the endowment with kedusha must be accompanied by a sense of inadequacy and modesty, a readiness to admit errors and understand the view of others, rather than one of self-satisfaction. The fourth step is called "tzimtzum." The humble man must know how to recoil, to retreat; he must know the art of self-contraction, even when not required by the letter of the law. This is true first all in the physiological sphere - the Rambam describes in Hilkhot De'ot (ch. 5) the necessity for a wise man to control his appetite, to forego many common pleasures, even though they are not strictly forbidden.

Indulgence in luxury manifests pride and vanity. This continues in the social arena as well; he does not attract attention to himself. The attribute of tzimtzum belongs, according to the Kabbala, to God Himself. Here too, we are commanded to imitate God, about whom it is written, "Truly You are a God who hides" (Yeshayahu 45:15). This is expressed in dress and public behavior. It applies to his emotions as well - when he succeeds, the talmid chacham praises God, but does not boast or brag to others. The more one succeeds in the realm of kedusha, the less the outside world will know of it. If he is in distress, he will pray to God, but not cry out loud hysterically. The greater the wise man, the more he controls, limits, his emotions. Torah, thought, must be spread to others; emotions are not meant for others. Here, retreat is called for. My father, Rav Moshe zt"l, referring to the verse, "The covering shall separate the Holy from the Holy of Holies," explained that man's intellect is his Holy, but the emotional life, his love, pity, compassion, anguish, exultation, joy and sadness, is his Holy of Holies, and no one is allowed into the inner sanctum. Emotional life should remain the secret of the Torah personality. The fifth and final step is "chesed," generosity. We are interdependent. The same way I expect and depend on others to help me, I must extend help to others. I must open myself up to embrace the other. When man steps out of his egocentric solitude, chesed is realized. Kedusha cannot be expressed only by acquisition. To give to others is the necessary counterpoint to the receiving of love. Chesed is an overflow of kindness, love, enthusiasm, which cannot be contained within, like a river which overflows its banks and inundates the environs. A father's desire for a child is usually based on his fear of death; it is a desire for continuation, for immortality. A mother wishes to have a child out of a desire to love, to give love. Chana, childless, goes to pray to God. The verse says she was "middaberet al liba" (lit., speaking ON her heart). Chazal explain the phrase to mean, "about matters of the heart." She wanted someone upon whom she could center and focus her love, her capacity to care and give. Prophecy, too, is described as bursting forth to others, incapable of remaining in the mind of the prophet. Yirmiyahu says, "The word of God was a fire within my bones." The wise man must turn not only to those who are above him, but also to those who are below who require his teaching. He has no choice; he is overflowing. It is a condition of learning that we give a hand to those below even as we climb higher ourselves. It is just as dignified to teach aleph-bet as to teach Talmud. Chazal say that children who die before they have begun to receive an education are taught by God. Here too, we must imitate God. Kedushat HaTorah is based on the certainty that all the congregation of God is holy, that all can achieve sanctity. The Rambam writes that the Torah guarantees that the Jews will repent and come closer to God. The humble, generous ben-Torah must have confidence and faith in Klal Yisrael, the Jewish community as a whole. He cannot belong to a sect, concerned only with itself. Every Jew has the capacity for kedusha and a desire for sanctity, even if he is unaware of it, and none shall be expelled. We shall never give up on a single Jew, we have faith in "the lost in the land of Edom and the oppressed in the land of Egypt," the assimilated and the downtrodden, even as we believe in the words of the prophet, "Peace, peace, says God, to the far and the near, and I shall heal them."

For questions or comments to the instructor, please write to [parsha-insights@torah.org](mailto:parsha-insights@torah.org) or [parsha-insights@etzion.org.il](mailto:parsha-insights@etzion.org.il) Yeshivat Har Etzion's Israel Koschitzky Virtual Beit Midrash is on the world wide web at <http://www.vbm-torah.org> Internet & e-mail list hosting for the VBM provided courtesy of: The Yerushalayim Network (<http://www.yerushalayim.net>) a Centennial Project of the Orthodox Union (<http://www.ou.org>) Copyright (c) 1998 Yeshivat Har Etzion. All rights reserved.

[parsha-insights@torah.org](mailto:parsha-insights@torah.org)

This week we begin the Sefer {Book} of Shmos. "V'eleh shmos Bnei Yisroel haba'im Mitzraim {And these are the names of Bnei Yisroel that came to Egypt}... Yosef, his brothers and the entire generation died. [1:1,6]"

The descent to Mitzrayim was related to us in Breishis -- why is it repeated again at the start of Shmos? The Ramban explains that this is the Book of Galus {Exile} and Geulah {Redemption}. The descent is reiterated now since this is the very inception of the galus. The Kli Yakar offers an additional explanation. He asks why the new sefer begins with the word "And". He explains that after Yosef's death, the Egyptians had a completely different attitude to the Jews. Even though the Jews had already been there for a while, this change of attitude made them feel as if they had just come. "And these... came." They came before but now it seems that they came again. What brought about this marked change of attitude? "And a new king arose in Mitzrayim who didn't know Yosef [1:8]." The Medrash understands that it was actually the same Paroah. As the Jews began to multiply and fill the land of Mitzrayim, the people approached Paroah and demanded that he find a solution for this Jewish problem. Paroah responded angrily to them: "Fools! It is only through them that we've been

eating and now you want to turn against them?! Were it not for Yosef we wouldn't be alive!" When they saw that Paroah wouldn't comply, they removed (impeached) him from the throne for three months. When Paroah told them that he'd do as they wished, he was reinstated. This 'new king' acted as if he didn't know Yosef. However, to understand that our difficulties arose as a result of an internal Egyptian power struggle would be very superficial. The Nation of Hashem cannot be touched by the whims of other nations. They can only be the pawns who inadvertently bring about the fulfillment of the Divine Will. The Medrash continues and teaches that when Yosef died, Bnei Yisroel "canceled" bris milah {the covenant of circumcision}, saying: "Let's be like the Egyptians". Hashem then took the love the Egyptians had for the Jews and turned it into hatred. The Beis HaLevi asks the obvious question. How could it be that this holy generation, coming right after the generation of the Tribes themselves, cast off the mitzvah of milah? Furthermore, he says, the Medrash teaches later on that when the Jews were circumcising their sons, the Egyptians tried to convince them not to. "Don't circumcise, your children would be like the Egyptian children and the oppressive slavery will be lightened." The Jews responded: "Our forefathers, Avrohom, Yitzchok and Yaakov didn't forget their Father in Heaven, and neither will we. We therefore see that the mitzvah of bris milah was adhered to and performed throughout the period of slavery. How can this be understood in light of the Medrash above which stated that they canceled bris milah? The Beis HaLevi explains that the Bnei Yisroel knew that they'd be enslaved in Mitzrayim for a long, arduous four hundred years. With the death of Yosef, they knew it would soon begin and they were frightened. How would they survive? They thought that if they'd get close to the Egyptians and lessen the differences between them, then the animosity and the severity of the enslavement would in turn be lessened. The only mitzvah {commandment} they had was bris milah. This caused a physical difference between them and the Egyptians -- the type of difference that they were concerned about. They therefore decided to perform the bris milah as commanded but to immediately afterwards stretch the remaining skin thereby concealing the fact that the bris had been performed. This, they felt, would cover all bases. The mitzvah had been performed but the harmful repercussions of that performance would be avoided. Although there was no actual transgression in doing this, nevertheless the results of this plan could have been disastrous. Without a recognizable difference between them and the Egyptians, the Jews were in danger of being assimilated into the degenerate society of Mitzrayim. One aspect of bris milah is that we should be, and remain, apart from the societies which accept and display standards that are very foreign to us. How did Hashem deal with and prevent this danger?" And a new king arose in Mitzrayim who didn't know Yosef [1:8]. Hashem planted a hatred toward us in the hearts of the Egyptians. This wasn't a punishment as we hadn't done anything wrong. It was a safeguard that Hashem deemed necessary to ensure our unique role and destiny in the course of mankind. As long as we were differentiating ourselves from the Egyptians, they didn't have this hatred -- it wasn't necessary. Once we were looking to break the barriers between us and the Egyptians, Hashem produced a different type of barrier. Ultimately, at the time of the redemption when we separated ourselves from the Egyptians by sacrificing the korban {sacrifice} Pesach and by openly performing the bris milah, we then found favor in their eyes. I heard in the name of Rav Chaim Volzhiner that if a Jew doesn't make kiddush {the benediction on wine said on Shabbos and holidays} then the gentile makes havdalah {the service said at the end of Shabbos, separating between Shabbos and the weekdays}. If a Jew doesn't sanctify (kiddush) himself but rather, tries to melt into the society of the gentiles, then those gentiles will decide to exclude him, keeping him separate (havdalah). No Jews allowed in this country club... Unfortunately, we often see things in a backward and twisted manner. We see someone openly displaying his Judaism and we feel uncomfortable, thinking that such behavior only brings hatred against us. In fact, as we've learned from the Beis HaLevi, the exact opposite is true. Rav Avrohom Twersky, who dresses in Chassidic garb, was once approached by a very irate Jew. "What's the matter with you?! Why do you insist on prancing around in that medieval get-up? Don't you realize how ridiculous you look? You bring scorn and derision onto all Jews!" "I don't understand thee and what thou hast said," Rav Twersky responded. "For you see, I am Amish and this is the mode of dress that we've maintained throughout the generations." "I beg your forgiveness," pleaded the quickly back-pedaling Jew. "I didn't realize that you were Amish. You should know that I only have the utmost respect for you and your people -- keeping your ways without bowing to society's whims of the day." "Well, in fact, I'm Jewish," Rav Twersky informed the now thoroughly confused fellow. "Why can you respect in others what you can't respect in yourself?" May we recognize the unique role we are meant to play and understand that it's only our firm commitment to being who we are that enables us to play that role. Good Shabbos, Yisroel Ciner

Parsha-Insights, Copyright (c) 1999 by Rabbi Yisroel Ciner and Project Genesis, Inc. Rabbi Yisroel Ciner is a Rebbe [teacher] at Neveh Zion, <http://www.neveh.org/>, located outside of Yerushalayim. Project Genesis: Torah on the Information Superhighway [learn@torah.org](mailto:learn@torah.org) 6810 Park Heights Ave. <http://www.torah.org/> Baltimore, MD 21215 (410) 358-9800

[dafyomi.com](http://www.dafyomi.com) The Weekly Daf #256 Yoma 2-8 Parshas Shmos <http://www.ohr.org.il/yomi/yomi256.htm> Two Lessons in Speech "And He called to Moshe and Hashem spoke to him from the Tent of the Assembly for him to say to others." (Vayikra 1:1) Our Sages derive two important lessons in human relations from this very first passage of the Book of Vayikra. The fact that Hashem first called to Moshe before speaking to him is support for Rabbi Chanina's counsel that one should not address his fellow man before first calling him to attention. Maharsha notes that this means he should call his intended listener by his name just as Hashem called Moshe by name before addressing him. Another lesson deals with the issue of confidentiality. Our Sages warn us that anything heard from someone may not be repeated to any other party without the permission of the person who is the source. The proof for this would seem to be, as Maharsha notes, from the fact that Hashem had to give Moshe instructions to say to others what he had heard from Him. Rashi, however, has another interpretation based on the makeup of the Hebrew word "leimor" which translates as "say unto others." This word can be broken into two shorter Hebrew words "lo emor" which translates as "do not say unto others," an implied ban on revealing anything heard until permission is granted. This second lesson is mentioned as a matter of halacha by Magen Avraham in Shulchan Aruch (Orach Chaim 156). He adds that if the person divulging the information explicitly demands the listener's confidentiality, the listener may not repeat that information to others even if the statement was made before others, giving the

impression that it was not classified. \* Yoma 4b <http://www.ohr.org.il> Written and Compiled by  
Rabbi Mendel Weinbach General Editor: Rabbi Moshe Newman Production Design: Eli Ballon  
Prepared by the Jewish Learning Exchange of Ohr Somayach International