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ALTHOUGH THE LINEAGE of the Jewish people is generally traced back to ארבעים אבות, there is one individual in ענבי who preceded him in the role of ancestor. שם יהודה, although not counted as one of our three אבות, is the original forebear of ישראל, who even today are frequently referred to amongst other nations as “Semites”.

Who was שֵׁם יהודה, that he merited this fathering of a nation? The Torah itself tells us certain things about שֵׁם יהודה and his life. חורלים, however, refer to שֵׁם יהודה in other contexts as well, such as the idea of וּשְׁכַבֶּן תְּפֵרוֹ and the identification of שֵׁם יהודה as the מַלֵּךְ זְדַנֵךְ מֶלֶךְ שָׁלֹמָו שֵׁם. A close study of the פסוקים that discuss שֵׁם יהודה will give us insight into his character and shed light on his role as viewed by חורלים.

The first time that שֵׁם יהודה is mentioned is בָּרָא, when the Torah records the names of the children of שֵׁם יהודה. This is the opening of a new פרשה in the Torah, which indicates the beginning of a new topic. Instead of telling about the lives of שֵׁם יהודה, however, the following פסוקים describe the sins of theבָּרָא and the שֵׁם יהודה:

וּלָא בֵּין האלֹהִים אֲשֶׁי בָּנֹת הָאָדָם כִּי נִבְוַת הָגוֹ נְזִיקוּת לְהוֹ הַיָּם מִכָּל אֶדֶר בָּהוֹ

(וּב).guard.

explains that the sin of the שֵׁם יהודה went beyond their physical attraction to beautiful women. He says they went as far as forcing these women into marriage, and even chose “wives” for themselves who were already married. The sin of the שֵׁם יהודה was also related to גֹּלָל תֶּרֶס and according to נִפְלֵי שֶׁפֶר חָוָה נְפֶלֶת מִנְיָה שֶׁפֶרֶת חָוָה נְפֶלֶת נִפְלֵי שֵׁם יהודה נִפְלֵי שֶׁפֶר חָוָה נְפֶלֶת מִנְיָה שֶׁפֶרֶת חָוָה נְפֶלֶת. Although it is unclear whether or not שֵׁם יהודה and his brothers actually took part in these sins, the juxtaposition of their birth with these פסוקים seems to indicate that they were at least influenced by their surroundings.

As a result of the mass corruption in the land, God decided to destroy all of his creations. Only שֵׁם יהודה is described as מִצַּא וּבְעָנָי אֶל (וּב)•, implying that

— The “Fourth אב?”
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the children of נֵּ הָּ did not find favor in the eyes of God. Similarly, the beginning of the children of נֵּ הָּ states: אֵלָה גְּדוֹלָה, נֵ הָּ אֵשׁ דָּני. To explain why נֵ הָּ’s children are not mentioned immediately following the words דָּני, נֵ הָּ answers that while נֵ הָּ himself was a דָּני, he was unable to transmit this trait to his children. The beginning of נֵ הָּ states: כָּלָה שְׁתֵּיָה פְּעִמָּהּ נֵ הָּ: נֵ הָּ שָׁהוּ בִּי רָצִיקִים מַמְוָהּ.

The ambiguity of the nature of נֵ הָּ and his brothers is also reflected in the comment of כַּדְי אִשׁ רְדֵיקִי (רמב”ם), who gives two possibilities as to why the נֵ הָּ were saved from the מְבּוֹל. They were either spared, he says, only in the merit of their righteous father נֵ הָּ, or they too were also spared and merited salvation on their own accord. The dual and contrasting nature that וּרְדֵיקִי attribute to נֵ הָּ and his brothers hints to the possibility that they were in fact both רְדֵיקִי and וּרְדֵיקִי. As the story of the מְבּוֹל unfolds, however, it becomes clear that the נֵ הָּ were not people who vacillated between righteousness and corruption. The difference between their contradictory characteristics is rather the difference between two different eras of their lives.

Before God commanded נֵ הָּ to build a נִחֹּה in preparation for the flood, the Torah describes the horrific state of the world. These פָּסְקָה are once again preceded by the names of נֵ הָּ, a repetition that can be understood as suggesting that they were involved in the same activities. פָּסְקָה states: נֵ הָּ יִנְחַתַּת, כִּי יִנְחַתַּת כָּל בָּעֵר אֶל דָּרֵכֵו נַחֲרָא.

While the sin of the מְבּוֹל is clearly stated as being דָּני, a type of robbery, there is also a large emphasis on their sin of סִפּוּר. The literal translation of this sin is perversion or corruption, and it is frequently used in the context of sexual misconduct. For example, כַּדְי, the son of כַּדְי who was forced to marry נֵ הָּ in order to bear children for his deceased brother, was killed because of his sin described as סִפּוּר. רֵעֵש explains that כַּדְי behaved in this specific manner during his intimacy with נֵ הָּ in order to prevent her from becoming pregnant. The word סִפּוּר is also used to describe the various sins of נֵ הָּ during the מְבּוֹל (see סִפּוּר לֵבָב רֵשִׁי נִחֹּה נִנְחַת וְעֶבְדָה רוּחַ נִחֹּה (שמואל ל’ כ’). In addition to their primary crime of סִפּוּר, the nation was also guilty there of סִפּוּר (גוֹלְיוֹ רֵעֵית נִחֹּה), a sin that was already made widespread by the נֵ הָּ. The commandment for נֵ הָּ to build a נִחֹּה further supports the view

Shem Ben Né — The “Fourth”
of that mesh and his brothers were counted amongst the mesh before the flood. Although his children were saved along with him, only he received the word to save himself. "The mesh נשת נמי ומר" emphasizes the word פסוק דינה, for you. He similarly promises only that God will establish a covenant with him, emphasizing the word פסוק. However, despite the fact that all of his children were entering the flood.

The listing of the men and women separately, says miesz, indicates an obligatory prohibition for mesh’s family while in the mesh. Because of the widespread sin that existed before the flood, and the possibility that mesh and his brothers partook in this sin, their time spent in the mesh needed to become a teshuvah for this sin. In order to do complete teshuvah for their sins, the mesh had to first abstain from any acts of intimacy. Although there is no clear account about what went on in the mesh during the forty days of the flood, mishna look at the pesukim that describe the end of the flood to attempt to discern whether or not mesh and his sons kept true to their obligations while in the mesh. After God wiped out the mesh, the Torah states: "ויוכר אליהם את נא צא הכל החיה ואת הבתים אשר צאパンה. (תהלים א) Based upon the omission of mesh and his sons from the list of people and animals that God remembered, it is possible to conjecture that they indeed were unable to abstain as required from physical activity in the mesh, and therefore did not merit being remembered by God on their own account. The mishna confirms this assumption in relation to mesh, based on later pesukim which give a negative portrayal of him: "ותמי והמשiani יהוה רב שטרא ומשショ בנה..." יתימ ומש. By way of contrast, were in fact able to refrain from intimacy, thereby doing teshuvah for any previous sins or influences related to mishnah. In spite of mesh’s possible laxity regarding this prohibition, they seem to all be treated equally upon their return from the mesh. While the men and women were mentioned separately when they were commanded to enter the mesh, upon being told to leave they are listed together: "ואים כל החיה ואת הבתים אשר צאパンה — יתימ ומש. mesh explains that at this point they were once again permitted to partake in teshuvah, after the mesh for their tisha had already successfully taken place.

— The “Fourth mesh?”
After the transition from כין חנoca to רעישות בישען occurred in the תพฤศจิกายนו, the now merited to be blessed along with their father. One of the missions given to ישען and his brothers was to repopulate the land through פסוק חיות. The מדרש הגדול uses this to explain why in פסוק חיות when relating that חנoca and his family actually left the יתב, the men and women are listed separately again, despite their having already been granted permission to partake in הניעת. He says that they continued to abstain from any physical activity until God commanded them how and for what purpose they were permitted to behave with their wives.

Following the переход to multiply and the commandments that followed, God spoke toCha's children (together with their father) for the first time (ד')⁹. While and and view this as an indicator that ישען and רכבי, נביאות were on the level of רכבי, נביאות is of the opinion that God only spoke to בני חנoca through the merit of their father. Perhaps the reason is focusing on the חווט נביאות נביאות חנoca in the plural form is repeated several times in various ways. The repetition of the names חנoca and the seemingly superfluous description of them as commemorates also stresses the point that they now merited inclusion in the הונח, as a result of the behavior they practiced in the יתב.

The subsequent פסוקות, however, provide a basis to the positive portrayal of חנoca and the מדרש המלך in בני חנoca and and the נביאות חנoca in the plural form is repeated several times in various ways. The repetition of the names חנoca and and the seemingly superfluous description of them as also stresses the point that they now merited inclusion in the הונח, as a result of the behavior they practiced in the יתב.

Not all of חנoca's children, however, remained מדרש הגדול. The ultimate test of יתב is not merely abstention and separation from חנoca, but rather behaving in an appropriate way when put into the same situation again יתב. The first to stumble once the יתב had ended was חנoca (ד'⁹), as indicated by the fact that the הונח was to be with the sons of חנoca as well. The phrase בני חנoca in the plural form is repeated several times in various ways. The repetition of the names חנoca and and the seemingly superfluous description of them as also stresses the point that they now merited inclusion in the הונח, as a result of the behavior they practiced in the יתב.

Although חנoca told his brothers about the nakedness of חנoca and his own вод and they were able to withstand the הונח. They instead chose to cover their father with a form of clothing, and they took extra precautions not to look directly at חנoca. This action of חנoca and was clearly their final יתב for any previous sins, and clearly separated them from חנoca. Why is it then that only חנoca was chosen to have מדרש הגדול descend from him and that he received a better reward than his brother did?
A careful understanding of this episode will reveal the personality of שמעון ויתך את הchureל והישם: לפסק נכתב. Although both שמעון and הchureל played a part in covering בָּשָׂר, the word שמעון is written in singular form. Because שמעון is mentioned first, He explains that שמעון was the one who took the initiative in this עשה, and he therefore merited a greater reward: אמרו על שמעון, ממעון, and he therefore merited a greater reward: שמעון הח襲. The focus on שמעון’s descendants reflects his previous mission of שמעון ויתך את הchureל והישם.
as does the emphasis on שֶׁ֥֚שֶׇׁ בּ֨֜נֶֽח as does the emphasis on שֶׁ֥֚שֶׇׁ בּ֨֜נֶֽח and בּ֨֜נֶֽח and שֶׁ֥֚שֶׇ at two different times. After each child is named, the phrase "וּלְדֵ֖ן בּ֥שֶׇׁ בּ ֖בּ֥נֶֽח" is repeated, a sign of the fact that שֶׁ֥֚שֶׇ בּ֨֜נֶֽח fulfilled his obligation to repopulate the land. In addition to the promise that שֶׁ֥֚שֶׇ בּ֨֜נֶֽח would be served by nations descended from שֶׁ֥֚שֶׇ בּ֨֜נֶֽח, שֶׇׇוּאֶֽבְעָ֖ר also blessed שֶׇׇוּאֶֽבְעָר with the dwelling of the שְׁכֵנָֽה in his tents שְׁכֵנָֽה. Although the descendants of שֶׇׇוּאֶֽבְעָר and שֶׇׇוּאֶֽבְעָ֖ר are also listed, the children of שֶׇׇוּאֶֽבְעָר are mentioned two different times. After each child is named, the phrase "כְּכֶֽלֶ֗כְלִֽי נַֽעְרָר כְּכֶֽלֶ֗כְלִֽי נַֽעְרָר כְּכֶֽלֶ֗כְלִֽי נַֽעְרָר כְּכֶֽלֶ֗כְלִֽי נַֽעְרָר כְּכֶֽלֶ֗כְלִֽי נַֽעְרָר כְּכֶֽלֶ֗כְלִֽי נַֽעְרָר כְּכֶֽלֶ֗כְלִֽי נַֽעְרָר כְּכֶֽלֶ֗כְלִֽי נַֽעְרָר כְּכֶֽלֶ֗כְלִֽי נַֽעְרָר כְּכֶֽלֶ֗כְלִֽי נַֽעְרָר כְּכֶֽלֶ֗כְלִֽי נַֽעְרָר כְּכֶֽלֶ֗כְלִֽי נַֽעְרָר כְּכֶֽלֶ֗כְלִֽי נַֽעְרָר כְּכֶֽלֶ֗כְלִֽי נַֽעְרָר כְּכֶֽלֶ֗כְלִֽי נַֽעְרָר כְּכֶֽלֶ֗כְלִֽי נַֽעְרָר כְּכֶֽלֶ֗כְלִֽי נַֽעְרָר כְּכֶֽלֶ֗כְלִֽי נַֽעְרָר כְּכֶֽלֶ֗כְלִֽי נַֽעְרָר כְּכֶֽלֶ֗כְלִֽי נַֽעְרָר כְּכֶֽלֶ֗כְלִֽי נַֽעְרָר כְּכֶֽלֶ֗כְלִֽי נַֽעְרָר כְּכֶֽלֶ֗כְלִֽי נַֽעְרָר כְּכֶֽלֶ֗כְלִֽי נַֽעְרָר כְּכֶֽלֶ֗כְלִֽי נַֽעְרָר כְּכֶֽלֶ֗כְלִֽי נַֽעְרָר כְּכֶֽלֶ֗כְלִֽי נַֽעְרָר כְּכֶֽלֶ֗כְלִֽי נַֽעְרָר כְּכֶֽלֶ֗כְלִֽי נַֽעְרָר כְּכֶֽלֶ֗כְלִֽי נַֽעְרָר כְּכֶֽלֶ֗כְלִֽי נַֽעְרָר כְּכֶֽלֶ֗כְлִֽי נַֽעְרָר כְּכֶֽלֶ֗כְלִֽי נַֽעְרָר כְּכֶֽלֶ֗כְלִֽי נַֽעְרָר כְּכֶֽלֶ֗כְלִֽי נַֽעְרָר כְּכֶֽלֶ֗כְלִֽי נַֽעְרָר כְּכֶֽלֶ֗כְלִֽי נַֽעְרָר כְּכֶֽלֶ֗כְלִֽי נַֽעְרָר כְּכֶֽלֶ֗כְלִֽי נַֽעְרָר כְּכֶֽלֶ֗כְלִֽי נַֽעְרָר כְּכֶֽלֶ֗כְלִֽי נַֽעְרָר כְּכֶֽלֶ֗כְלִֽי נַֽעְרָר כְּכֶֽלֶ֗כְלִֽי נַֽעְרָר כְּכֶֽלֶ֗כְלִֽי נַֽעְרָר כְּכֶֽלֶ֗כְלִֽי נַֽעְרָר כְּכֶֽלֶ֗כְלִֽי נַֽעְרָר כְּכֶֽלֶ֗כְלִֽי נַֽעְרָר כְּכֶֽלֶ֗כְלִֽי נַֽעְרָר כְּכֶֽלֶ֗כְלִֽי נַֽעְרָר כְּכֶֽלֶ֗כְלִֽי נַֽעְרָר כְּכֶֽלֶ֗כְלִֽי נַֽעְרָר כְּכֶֽלֶ֗כְלִֽי נַֽעְרָר כְּכֶֽלֶ֗כְלִֽי נַֽעְרָר כְּכֶֽלֶ֗כְלִֽי נַֽעְרָר כְּכֶֽלֶ֗כְלִֽי נַֽעְרָר כְּכֶֽלֶ֗כְלִֽי נַֽעְרָר כְּכֶֽלֶ֗כְלִֽי
of מַלְכִּים עָצָּם, through serving him wine and bread. אֲבֹרֶם אָבָּנָה לְךָ, a representative of God. This reflects 's representation of God and explains why the possessive form is used by the phrase אֲבֹרֶם לְךָ.

Although הוא appears most clearly in his encounter with שֵׁבָת שֶׁבֶר, he plays an equally significant role through his teachings in שֵׁבָת שֶׁבֶר. The three most well known places where שֵׁבָת שֶׁבֶר is mentioned are in relation to יָשָׁב אֲבֹרֶם פָּסָק כְּכָכָהוּ, עֲקַבָּה וְרָכָּה, and עֲקַבָּה וְרָכָּה. Following פָּסָק כְּכָכָהוּ states יָשָׁב אֲבֹרֶם פָּסָק כְּכָכָהוּ, עֲקַבָּה וְרָכָּה, and עֲקַבָּה וְרָכָּה. The omission of this פָּסָק כְּכָכָהוּ leads to question the whereabouts of יָשָׁב אֲבֹרֶם פָּסָק כְּכָכָהוּ. יָשָׁב אֲבֹרֶם פָּסָק כְּכָכָהוּ explains that עֲקַבָּה וְרָכָּה went to learn Torah from עֲקַבָּה וְרָכָּה. יָשָׁב אֲבֹרֶם פָּסָק כְּכָכָהוּ’s entire life was changed through the עֲקַבָּה וְרָכָּה, when he became, in the words of יָשָׁב אֲבֹרֶם פָּסָק כְּכָכָהוּ, an עֲקַבָּה וְרָכָּה. His whole being now needed to exist to serve God. At this focal transition point in his life, עֲקַבָּה וְרָכָּה went to learn from his ancestor הוא, who had much experience in this area.

After experienced trouble with her pregnancy, the Torah describes her attempts to “seek God”: יִתְנַחֲל לְדַרְשׁ אֶחָד דָּוִד. The של של of בְּכֵי מְדַרְשָׁה רַבָּה וּמְדוֹרָשָׁה רַבָּה לְתַקְּרֵי וְרַקְּסָה נַעֲקָב הָזָא. יִתְנַחֲל לְדַרְשׁ אֶחָד, when he became, in the words of יִתְנַחֲל לְדַרְשׁ אֶחָד. יִתְנַחֲל לְדַרְשׁ אֶחָד’s entire life was changed through the עֲקַבָּה וְרָכָּה, as well as to prepare her for the transition into being an עֲקַבָּה וְרָכָּה. יִתְנַחֲל לְדַרְשׁ אֶחָד. יִתְנַחֲל לְדַרְשׁ אֶחָד’s entire life was changed through the עֲקַבָּה וְרָכָּה, as well as to prepare her for the transition into being an עֲקַבָּה וְרָכָּה. יִתְנַחֲל לְדַרְשׁ אֶחָד.

The third and most well known place where שֵׁבָת שֶׁבֶר is mentioned is when was running away from the house of שֵׁבָת שֶׁבֶר. This is perhaps the biggest transition of all, since it involved leaving שֵׁבָת שֶׁבֶר, as well as going to a place where no Torah was to be found. Perhaps this explains why in the יִתְנַחֲל לְדַרְשׁ אֶחָד מְדוֹרָשָׁה רַבָּה וּמְדוֹרָשָׁה רַבָּה on the words יִתְנַחֲל לְדַרְשׁ אֶחָד, מְדוֹרָשָׁה רַבָּה מְדוֹרָשָׁה רַבָּה which studied with שֵׁבָת שֶׁבֶר for fourteen complete years. שֵׁבָת שֶׁבֶר was not only a representative of God, he was also the master of making successful changes and instilling these lessons into his descendants.

Although is not included among the three יִתְנַחֲל לְדַרְשׁ אֶחָד, his role and influence on שֵׁבָת שֶׁבֶר can be viewed as equally important. His early involvement with, or at least connections to שֵׁבָת שֶׁבֶר allowed him to undergo a thorough cleansing process of שֵׁבָת שֶׁבֶר. It also resulted in his high levels of modesty and his כְּכָכָהוּ for others. שֵׁבָת שֶׁבֶר not only succeeded in repopulating the land after the מְדוֹרָשָׁה רַבָּה, he was also able to pass on his teachings to his descendants through his רַקְּסָה. The יִתְנַחֲל לְדַרְשׁ אֶחָד looked to שֵׁבָת שֶׁבֶר as a teacher and role model. We too must take to heart the lessons and examples set forth to us by our ancestor, שֵׁבָת שֶׁבֶר.
Fathers and Sons:
An Analysis of the Personalities of the Ēbenim

Arielle Fenigstein

THROUGHOUT THE GLORIOUS triumphs and devastating pitfalls in the history of the Jews, the Jews have always remained dedicated to their heritage and prepared to face the uncertain future. Perhaps this tenacity in the face of hardships springs from the numerous trials confronted in the past, or possibly, their firmness reflects the lessons they have learned from their ancestors in and throughout Jewish history. At the forefront of this history stand the twelve Ēbenim, who each faced their challenges with a perspective unique to that tribe. The individual characteristics of each Ēben do not readily appear in the Ēbenim, but a deeper analysis of the given to the brothers by their father and later to the Ēbenim in conjunction with these Ēbenim, can provide an understanding of each Ēben’s persona and special qualities, as reflected through the generations. In the following essay, we shall analyze these various sources for the purpose of arriving at this understanding.

Although Ēben’s blessing to ראנון appears at first glance more like a כלות, a closer examination in contrast to ראנון elucidates the meaning. On his deathbed, chastised, The incident to which he referred occurred in יובל ראנון וישב את בלה פעל נにする, when. Interestingly, the commentators agree that in reality, ראנון only moved his’s bed, and did not actually have indecent relations with his father’s wife. Yet for this minor act, performed with the best of intentions, ראנון received a severe rebuke. ראני explains the phrase כלות, saying that although ראנון could have attained (three advantages reflected by the three praises of their father and these gifts no longer belonged to him, because of his rashness and impetuosity. Affronted on behalf when established his primary residence in his father’s tent, ראנון angrily and recklessly
disordered his father’s bed, and at the same time, the habitually rested there. This action reflected an unthinking hastiness and light-headedness that seemed unsuitable for a person. He therefore compared his habitually rested there with the habit of his father, which defines as “the habit of his father’s name” to the habit of the name. The natural, therefore, established as a person capable of greatness and every advantage, but liable to lose these privileges on account of his unthinking and impulsive behavior.

Bahur’s character, however, differs significantly from the portrait portrayed. declared: “Since you have prayed for the inclusion of his name and that of his sons, despite his previous sin, and therefore his name appears first in the litany of the heavens, Bahur understands this verse as unrelated to his portrait. He believes that it refers to the battles fought, in the hopes that the would return home with the same amount of men as when they left. Thus, although received a rebuke in , blessed him and spoke of , as well as success in battle. This contrast reveals another aspect of ’s personality: he repented willingly and genuinely, and he fought battles as a warrior.

adopted this brave and praiseworthy deed was congruous with superior nature, and exemplified ’s statement of . Yet in , recklessly offered his two sons’ lives as a guarantee for safe return from Egypt. This well-intentioned promise reflects the aspect of — for what grandfather desires the death of his grandsons as a collateral for a son? Despite this rashness and impetuosity, often displayed the more positive traits of . In chosen to dwell in , but swore not to dwell there until they assisted in conquering . In , the tribe participated in building an altar as testimony to the common worship of the . And fittingly, praised the in her song as , meaning “those who are resolved at heart,” or “heart-searchers,” for such a description conveys the unique character of , both the individual and the tribe.

also received a from particular to his actions and character. addressed him and said simultaneously, and declared: "the heavens of the" ( ). The label becomes especially apropos, as the siblings were often “brothers” in council. For example, together
they killed and his entire city in an act of rage, and they then attempted to kill, as it says: "...they killed and his entire city in an act of rage, and they then attempted to kill; they described and as angry, willful people, capable of trickery and injustice, as he said of them as more than their tools, but their very essence. As a result, cursed their anger, and punished them with dispersion among . The character portrayal of seems entirely negative; the seem treacherous and murderous.1

Significantly, writes that to request that his name remain separate from his descendants' future sins — namely, from those of , for such were natural offshoots of .

's seem to follow this line of thought in regard to , for his name does not appear in the litany of blessings. Most offer innocuous explanations for 's absence; for example, claims that 's blessing contains a reference to who dwelled among them. believes that intentionally omitted , in order to maintain the number 12 when substituted for . However, suggests that the omission of resulted from their sin at , where they were the primary sinners. Indeed, the only explicit story of speaks of their iniquity, when the leader of the tribe, , sinned publicly with a Midianite woman. This immoral action from the role model of the implies an indecency and wickedness of the tribe as a whole. Significantly, though, records the immense amount of land and conquered, for his military might sprang from his violent nature. Once again, we see that characteristics that are often negative can be used for positive purposes. Indeed, describes as befitted their stormy and virulent personality. The therefore gives an accurate portrayal of 's violent character traits, which mirror the of and .

On the other extreme, 's to is contrasted greatly from 's. declared: "...because did not "recognize" their family at , but killed the sinners regardless, they deserved to become teachers (who did not recognize favorites). applies the to the laws regarding
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and, which still must follow today; even the death of a relative can often not cause the Cohen to become impure. The therefore acted as ’s guides and teachers, as they followed ’s commandments, and they maintained the correct perspective of (as explains). Additionally, they had no to distract them from the focus of . The tremendous praise and blessings which applied to reflects the immense transformation underwent since ; not only was , teacher, and , but he also possessed the ability to do heartfelt .

A descendent of best reflected the duality of ’s nature. In , could not tolerate ’s public desecration of ’s name, and he immediately killed him. Inherent in this action was the rash violence of , as seen in , , and the continued to follow while the rest of sinned, mostly , mostly returned to rebuild the whereas the remainder of remained comfortably in . Thus, the personality of underwent a major change since , but remained true to form throughout .

In his blessing to , unequivocally declared the personality traits which comprised ’s character, and caused him to be . Although translates this verse to mean that small (meaning “cub”), and understand the verse to mean that will start as a small leader, like a cub, but will become strong and powerful like a lion. The depiction also symbolized his character, for ’s kingship would be small (meaning “cub”), and of describes: As a result, kingship will never depart from .

’s blessing to focused on his leadership qualities and mightiness. ’s benediction likewise emphasized ’s bravery, as he said:

ואת לוודוה ויאמר שמעת ולוודוה ולא ימען יד ויד ועה מרתי

which explains the expression of to mean that this is the special quality of ; he willingly went to war, and successfully conquered his enemy. further explains to mean that the parallels that of . In addition to his warrior qualities, strongly believed
in Hashem; when he entered the front of the battlefield, Hashem listened
for his prayers. For Hashem, Hashem, who capably handled his mission, and in distress, relied
only on Hashem to help him. The following two elements in Hashem’s character: his willingness to do genuine and life-transforming deeds. Many
commentators, such as Rav and Rav, juxtapose the blessings of Hashem and
Rav, to show that both confessed their wrongdoings (or perhaps, that Hashem forced Rav to confess as well). This highlights a principle part in Hashem’s character — his ability to do deeds and help others do so as well, as befits a
leader.

These two personality traits specific to Hashem manifest themselves throughout.
For example, in , Hashem demonstrated the influence he held over his brothers, as he convinced them to sell Jacob instead of killing him, saying: „. It takes a natural
leader to convince people not to follow their passion, and give a persuasive
argument without necessarily revealing the true motive of objection. Hashem was such a leader, confident and convincing. Yet he also could humbly declare himself at fault, as he publicly did in . When Hashem intimated that Hashem fathered her children, he declared immediately, „, thereby acknowledging himself in the wrong. Hashem’s descendents similarly exemplified these two inclinations. For example, Chazal teach that , the descendent of Hashem, initiated by fearlessly jumping into the sea until it reached his neck — at which point Hashem split the sea.

Similarly, in , a king who descended from Hashem, became the paradigm of Hashem when he said „ as soon as Rebuked him. Another descendent from Hashem, also repented publicly after others discovered his sin; he said: „. Both and professed their repentance from their hearts before Hashem, just like their ancestor and leader.

The personality of becomes clear from the book of . and explain this as meaning he is “a strong-boned donkey”, in the sense that he is capable of “carrying the burden” of Torah. Like a donkey that rests briefly and toiled day and night at Torah, and rested quickly before arising, refreshed with his load. explains the phrase in accordance with ‘s steady, capable character; he realized that it is better to dwell in the tranquility of study, rather than travel all over the world like does. As a result, paid taxes from their pleasant land rather than leave it to participate in wars ( ).
concluded the blessing saying: "וְיַעֲבֵר אֶלֶף אֵלֶּה אֶלֶּה לְכֶם עֶבֶד," for he bore his load so sturdily and firmly, that he evolved into a teacher of Shahar. His personality as depicted by the commentaries calls to mind a capable, firmly-rooted man, steady in his learning and constant in his toil.

Indeed, successfully learned Torah, as points out; over the years, became and in other verses explains that the imagery of an represents comfort and security in the land, and adds that would sit in their tents, observing the excellence of their welfare. The peaceful, quiet and purposeful life of which evoked mirrors the portrait he drew of his learned son.

This perception becomes further visible from texts in . In , thus depicting as a competent follower and listener. Similarly, the describes the tribe as they were the wise, hard-working and wise, hard-working as depicted in and 's blessings.

and depicted as an individual with unique personality traits as well. In , declared: that they would earn their living as traveling merchants, and they therefore lived by the seashore until , a port city famous for exchanging wares. Significantly, explains, based on , that ensured that could always learn Torah by providing him with sustenance. 's business therefore became his personal form of כּ, and he also received the merit of 's learning.

also focused on this quality which possessed as he declared: כּ. The commentators point out that this mirrors that of understood that would live as a merchant by the seashore, so he blessed to rejoice in his missions and journeys. In a different, less popular approach, writes that refers to happiness in going to battle. Perhaps this aggressive element in 's character may be supported from instances in . For example, in , incited the to join him in battle against . Likewise, described them in her song as כּ, thereby depicting as a brave and mighty nation, willing to risk death in a battle for ה. Significantly therefore, portrays כּ — intrinsic warriors. This view may qualify the previous view of כּ; both as a soldier and a merchant, lived adventurously and eagerly dedicated his life for the sake of G-d.
depicted as a different ilk in his generation. He proclaimed: "I have prepared my sons as ambushers for my enemies. Like a snake, which hides in its surroundings before striking out alone, I killed many suddenly, without warning, by myself. The fighting tactics of my ancestor were similar; I hold that the text refers to the strategy of, who defended himself against the nations who pursued them in the battle. This image seems to manifest a warrior-like quality in \( \gamma \), as well as a certain aloofness and craftiness.

The commentators gave quite a different description of \( \gamma \), as he called him "\( \gamma \) (דב עמק). The traits particular to a serpent differ considerably from those of a lion; to \( \gamma \), may have been a crafty and dangerous loner; but \( \gamma \) viewed \( \gamma \) as a strong and kingly tribe. One could suggest that this contrast represents a transformation in the character of \( \gamma \), similar to \( \tilde{\gamma} \); however, the commentators strive to resolve the two extremes, thus making this possibility less likely. For example, explains the lion imagery to mean that \( \gamma \) preyed on his victims, much like a snake does. Similarly avoids majestic imagery, and claims that just as lions only attack when they are certain of their prey, \( \gamma \) similarly ensured his triumph over his enemy. \( \gamma \) evidenced a strong personality; he competently and confidently followed his own path, like a \( \gamma \).

The descendents of \( \gamma \), as seen throughout \( \tilde{\gamma} \), possessed corresponding qualities. praises an individual from \( \gamma \) as \( \gamma \) for his valor and skill. This description recalls another man from \( \tilde{\gamma} \), who became the sole assistant to in constructing the temple. In battle \( \gamma \) fought competently and alone, striking an unsuspecting victim suddenly, as seen in the text. In whatever capacity he chose, as artisan or warrior, \( \gamma \) acted alone and well; he fulfilled the projection of and his qualities.

also seemed to live up to the cast which and molded for him. , which parallels to the character of like a swift gazelle, and brought home news of \( \gamma \)’s victory in wars. explains that became soldiers as swift as gazelles, and brought home news of \( \gamma \)’s victory in wars. Happy tidings followed him, just like an which carries the message of good news. explains that became soldiers as swift as gazelles, and brought home news of \( \gamma \)’s victory in wars. content, eager personality thereby came to fruition in \( \gamma \’s blessing.

paralleled \( \gamma \’s \) in this respect. He proclaimed that \( \tilde{\gamma} \’s land
fulfilled all of its inhabitants’ desires, because they happily and swiftly fulfilled their wishes. This eagerness to serve may also be seen in the descendants. In similar fashion, the king who risked his life on the battlefield is praised for his swift and just actions. Similarly, in the records of the king who initiated the battle cry, for he sincerely and freely acted for the sake of the kingdom, both in the times of peace and war.

The king’s personality as depicted in the king’s blessing also remained the same throughout the generations. The king stated: “Let the king and his son be blessed, and thereby establishes his son’s character. This represents a blessing of God; they will wage many battles and vanquished and pursued their enemies. This fearlessness follows immediately in order to juxtapose their opposing character traits. Whereas this struck his enemy alone and surreptitiously, the king fought his battles in the open, with an army. He courageously progressed without consideration for numbers or intimidation.

This fearless quality of the king additionally manifested itself in the kingdom’s benediction. Compared to the land of the king’s blessing, the land of this king is blessed. This expalances that the king fought whole-heartedly and successfully, and as a result, he controlled extensive land. In fact, this points out that the king fought for his land, as opposed to the other king. The king also possessed the traits belonging to a leader — he rose to a position of leadership.

This warrior-like quality of the king demonstrated itself in the nation’s blessing. When this king chose to live in the land, he fought for his own land and that of his people as well. He also displayed this personality trait, as the king describes him as a leader, and he led the nation in many battles. Thus, both the individual and his tribal descendents evidenced the qualities noted by the king and his blessing.

The king’s personality as noted in the king’s blessing needs clarification. The extra letter of the land of the king’s blessing refers to the land of the king, whose olives gave forth oil like a fountain. This adds that their land was so richly blessed, that the king provided the kingdom’s delicacies, as well as the oil used to anoint him. These explanations, however, do little to reveal his true nature.

The king’s blessing, on the other hand, provides insight into the king’s personality. This declared: “Blessed be the king, who offered an offering in the land, whose sacrifices were more blessed that the other sacrifices. The king draws examples for this extra benediction from the king’s future advantages. Therefore ascertains that “their
children became writes that although family relations usually envy one another’s success, For although triumphed financially and personally (as holds that ”means that his daughters would marry and kings), he happily gave of his wealth to those around him. The portrait illustrated depicted as a successful, content businessman, eager and willing to spread his wealth to those less fortunate.

The accuracy of this portrayal may be seen through s actions throughout a did not expel the gentiles from his land. Here as well, we see how the same trait can have negative and positive applications. Although should have exiled the as as commanded, his inaction reflects an inability to perform a violent or cruel action. (After all, noted that inclined toward farming, not war). supported this perception in her song, as she declared: ”remained peaceful in his land, rather than join in battles. Thus, a combination of ’s and blessings reveals the essence of ’s personality: he was a sanguine, prosperous person heartfelt in sharing his joy and fortune with others.

The imagery used to accurately portray evokes a clear representation of his character. translated as the ”who impressed and attracted everyone he met. offers a different explanation: symbolized the extremities of a tree, which never lose their life force. He was a fruitful son, as beautiful and youthful as a budding tree by a spring. Although those surrounding him dealt with trickery and animosity, — he refuses to take revenge. Instead, stood firm and determined in his mission, until he became second to the king ( ). He overcame his difficulties and triumphs, and he emerged — strong and powerful. In fact, granted the title; he remained separate from his brothers ( ), and rules over them ( ). The qualities that manifested intimiated his strong and magnetic character, as he stood determined in his goals and uninfluenced by those around him.

These character traits, which additionally separated from his brothers, appear in as as an officer over his brethren” — a role played not only by him, but by his descendent who possessed the strength and beauty of an ox.
applies the term to himself, whose leadership abilities come only second to his father, just as a shadow follows only before an object. Because of his unassailable tenacity in his belief of what was correct (as seen with his approach to the lost calf, which he returned to its home — a strong contrast to his father, who faltered and listened to his advice), The strength of character and determination of his father, which he inherited, provides a glimpse into his personality.

These qualities evidence themselves through the life of his father and his tribe. In the Torah, the story of his family is introduced with a phrase: "In the days of Jephthah, when he was 70, Jephthah declared that unlike any of the other tribes, judges before his mother, to protect her beauty from his lascivious eyes. Such bravery and dedication on his part reveals a slice of his character. One can also comprehend his determined and magnetic qualities in his lifestyle at his house. Although he entered the house as the lowliest slave, he ascended the career ladder, as the text describes him as the son of a poor and humble man (Jeremiah 1:8). These same character traits are perceptible in his descendent's, such as his son, who was warlike and a belligerent wolf. However, the symbol of a wolf denotes a reserved, hidden nature — he fought quietly, and celebrated his victories out of the limelight. The night and day imagery supports this portrait for him, like a wolf, he spent much of his time behind the scenes and his triumphs occurred quietly and out of public notice.

An examination of his descendent's reveals a similarly taciturn yet capable nature. Saul, the first king of Israel demonstrated both the qualities of an ideal leader. When he came to appoint him as king, the text describes him as the son of a great and a humble man, and as a great warrior. His many victories proved this statement correct. Simultaneously, Saul displayed a quiet, modest nature which caused him to declare: "I will not take the head of a poor or humble man, because it might be said, I have slain Saul. However, he seemed to consider his tribal origin to be a reason for his initial refusal to accept Saul's request — as a
member of the family, he refused the public office and king. Indeed, during his public coronation ceremony, he hid among the barrels! For aside from his character as a man of valor, he also possessed a modest and reserved personality.

Another leader of the family, one of the first to come from the family successfully outwitted and murderedMalchus and Zevulun. Significantly, the entire episode occurred in private; he killed and fled his chambers, so that even the kings’ servants remained unaware of his death. Indeed, throughout his lifetime, the label of Malchus’ son remained intact (as it says in ). Yet in every instance that a member of the family rose to leadership, his time of glory paled in comparison to other leaders, for only thrived in a private setting. Thus, and his nephew effected the primary only at a time of .

, however, ignored this aspect of his character. Rather, simply stated: As a cherished “friend” of Hashem, dwells securely, with Hashem’s presence in his land always. In fact, the man and his tribe basked in Hashem’s love and glory, for they themselves eschewed glory. They fought valiantly and courageously, but without pride or public veneration. And throughout reveals this quiet and modest bravery which and praise.

At the conclusion of , the Torah testifies:

understood that each of his children possessed a unique personality with character traits specific to each one’s soul. As a result, (and ) blessed the befitting each individual. Perhaps with this realization, we can gain an understanding of the nature of . Often, a blessing is given ubiquitously and accepted blindly. Yet, if we truly understood the deep impact and personal relevance of a , we could reform our lives. }
challenge to follow in our ancestor’s footsteps, to utilize and improve the qualities inherent in us and employ them solely לפש שמיים.

1 רמב"ם, however, explains "אחיה" as "אחיה", identifying their actions as positive.
2 חכミ, however, writes that לאויה ווהנימ receives the קשת despite, not because of, testing קשת.
3 The commentators understand this statement in various ways since kings from other שבטיה ruled various times in Jewish history. רמב"ם, for example, believes that the scepter will never depart from היהודת ווהנימ until the splitting of the kingdom in the time of יהודת ווהנימ. רמב"ם explains that although individuals from other שבטיה may become king, the rulership will never devolve from the tribe of יהודת ווהנימ.
Who Was והוה?

Tamar Melmed

1. Roles

AGAINST THE SECONDARY roles of והוה, והנה, and even God, one lonely figure stands out against the surreal backdrop of והוה והנה והוה. One played the tragic lead; he fell due to the conniving and sly characters of the other players, as well as his own personal struggles in seemingly unfair situations. But in order to understand והוה’s downfall, we must first examine the catalyst: his beloved והוה. Who was she? What was her purpose in being created? What was the nature of her relationship with והוה? What were her motivations for her actions, and how do her punishments directly affect the nature of her sin? One must analyze the roles as well as the characters in order to shed some understanding onto this complex and fascinating saga.

As mentioned above, the story of והוה revolves around והוה. He was God’s lone human creation, the singular master over the rest of God’s creations. But God said: והוה must not live a solitary existence, and God gave him an another🍺. This term describes the purpose behind והוה’s creation.

Most agree that והוה was created in subservience to והוה. The explains that והוה was an "". R’ Chavel’s footnote here explains:

"נэтому והוה מי משמשול נגון ממוש. והוה מתביבה (ניגון) והוה שהוה העור זוהי אובל לא שוה ולכברי."

and could not be equal, ומפורש explains, because והוה האמין ש弁א והוה והוה שמאל והוה אמין. In a partnership of two equal individuals, one cannot serve the other, and this equal partnership would not befit the role והוה was created for.

explains similarly to והוה. составляет והוה in order to והוה. He says that man is greater than animal because where male animals have no control over their female counterparts, והוה does have control.
Who Was "הוהי"?

Whereas the ורדך and שפט describe "הוהי"'s subservience, אברכים describes "הוהי"'s evil nature: "שעפע השאה היא شأنיה נד האדות ומקת" "לכנד" nature, and will make her into an усп.

John Milton in his famous “Paradise Lost” describes "הוהי"’s subservient position.

From this Assyrian garden, where the fiend
Saw undelighted all delight, all kind
Of living creatures new to sight and strange:
Two of far nobler shape erect and tall,
Godlike erect, with native honor clad
In naked majesty seemed lords of all,
And worthy seemed, for in their looks divine
The image of their glorious maker shone
Truth, wisdom, sanctitude severe and pite,
Severe but in true filial freedom placed;
Whence true authority in men; though both
Not equal, as their sex not equal seemed;
For contemplation he and valour forced,
For softness she and sweet attracitive grace,
He for God only, she for God in him:

2. Sin

From the explanations of the above ורדך, one can conclude that "הוהי"'s subservient role in being created was שפט atד" and to serve him. This understanding of the nature of "הוהי", “The Created”, clarifies the motivations for "הוהי", “The Sinner”.

When tempting "הוהי" to eat, the ורדך said:

כי יודיע אלכוס כי בים וכלכוס ממע נמקחת עיניים והויים וכלכוס ודע טעב

The ורדך’s petition tempts "הוהי" to disobey her husband and sin: ורדך explains שפט, "כאלכוס" means שפט, ורדך all agree that כאלכוס means שפט. ורדך
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— a fulfillment of knowledge and creativity. Yes, however, offers the most interesting explanation: "which unto you," Creators. From והוה’s perspective, the possibility of rising to the level of Creator from the seemingly trivial level of Server was worth the sacrifice of all else. According to all explanations, it is clear that she wanted more. She wanted to raise herself out of her natural role of subservience into a position of control, power, and creativity. And so, due to the seductions of therimon, she sinned.

תותרא האישה כי טוב מנה לפמאלר כי תהא היא עלינו ויתמך הדין فالשבת ותקח

מפרשים ותאכל ותאכל וב לאשה עמה ויאכל. (נ”י)

3. Punishment

This disturbing perspective of the sin can be somewhat justified through an analysis of והוה’s punishment.

אל האישה אמר הרהנה ארבה עצמך והיוןך ביעע תולדי בינך ואל Ashton תשכדו

והוה משלא ב” (נה”י)

by thy conception; children thou shalt bring
In sorrow forth, and to thy husband’s will
Thine shall submit, he over thee shall rule.

There is a dual aspect to והוה’s punishment. Not only will she have pain in childbirth, but והוה תשמל ב”Suddenly, God’s punishment reverted והוה back to her original role of subservience. God placed רבים, once again, in control. She was placed in a natural role of subservience, was thus motivated to sin in order to achieve power, control, and creativity, and then, through God’s ענשה, she was reverted back to subordination.

God sent her “back to her place” in a sense, but not before she had made an attempt at “redeeming” herself. And alas, והוה’s efforts were not in vain. Her punishment regarding the pain in the bearing and raising of children directly correlates to her motivation in sinning. The tempted her with the ability to create, as this capability would liberate her from her subjection to control. God granted exactly that which she asked for. Through the gift of childbirth God gave והוה the ability to create. But she must accede to the suffering. The pain serves as a התשע for her future female offspring must remember and pay for the שיג א’àם.

There are also some who do not hold the aforementioned views
regarding והיה’s subservience. He describes that there are many different types of men with different
natures and characters. The woman is the one through her “opposite” nature. As he elucidates in
"היה and המין, man’s and woman’s differences create the הנקמה" "יוסף" character traits that form an
aspects of marriage, but it is the הנקמה "יוסף" complementary aspects of the partnership create a positive
relationship. The complementary aspects of the partnership create a positive healthy relationship. Later, in
יוסף ונקמה בראשית: הוהי אדם ובעבר. yibrur אתו ויקרא אתו ימים אדם ביכר.

Where was תitus during this critical moment of Mankind’s history? The סDER says כי. Was he really with her? If so, why didn’t he stop her? What
exactly transpired that afternoon in נהר? רדיק explains:

After she ate, she brought the fruit to אדם and then ate again, together
with him. רדיק explains כי expresses existentially. She knew she had committed a grave
sin, and wanted to bring אדם down with her. She wanted him to be כי in life and in death. She succeeded in causing him to betray the value system he
was committed to and violate a commandment directed specifically to him
by God, his Creator.

It is also interesting to note the ease with which והיה seemed to be able
to convince him. There is no record of a conversation or argument between
them when she informed him of her לשון and entreated him to eat with her. Suddenly, the roles had switched, והיה’s dominance emerged, and
was powerless against her control. בא שמעתי: כי גורם in יבנ indicates this role switch: לא לקול ולא עשה... לא יהי שוגג על גורם
God blamed אדם for the switch in his obedience from God to mortal
והיה. One might even suggest that אדם loved more than God, and that this
was his בור.

Milton describes והיה’s possible psychological reasoning after her sin,
and her conviction to bring אדם down with her:

...But to Adam in what sort
Shall I appear? Shall to him make known
As yet my change, and give him to partake
Full happiness with me, or rathernot,

But keep the odds of knowledge in my power
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Without my copartner? So to add what wants
in female sex, the more to draw his love,
And render me more equal, and perhaps,
A thing not undesirable, sometime
Superior; for inferior who is free?
This may be well: but what if God have seen,
And death ensue? Then I shall be no more,
And Adam wedded to another Eve,
Shall live with her enjoying, I extinct;
A death to think. Confirmed then I resolve,
Adam shall share with me in bliss or woe:

Though many suggest that גוֹזָה was created, in some ways, subservient to her husband, this disquieting analysis of her role is countered by the explanation that, from the beginning, גוֹזָה was given childbirth capabilities, and thus had a distinct power that אָדָם did not. However, instead of seeing this as a creative capability, an individualized faculty that not only gave her a sense of supremacy over her husband, but — more importantly — made her in a sense אתל欲しい (which, as explained, was the very root of her sin), גוֹזָה chose to focus on the “negative” dynamic in her relationship with אָדָם. She rejected the power she held in the face of an otherwise dominant husband.

In this light, one might say that her punishment wasn’t that she was granted with pain the capability of childbirth, the Godlike nature that she wanted so badly. If this had been the case, why would God grant her request through punishment? Rather, we can now suggest that her punishment was that the very capability that she already had, but had neglected to recognize, now must come with צעירה עופר עשבון. Her sin can now be seen in the tragic light of one who is driven to desperate measure to attain something that he already has, but doesn’t see.

גוֹזָה, as אָבָם כָּל חַי, is our universal mother. Her punishment can thus teach us a clear universal message of opening our eyes to the gifts and capabilities attributed to us by God, as well as focusing on the positive aspects of relationships and situations surrounding us.
The Unactualized Halachah

Atara Sendor

THIS UNUSUAL raises several important moral dilemmas: how could parents ever be told to kill their child, no matter what the circumstances? What did this particular son do that was so bad? Is this law moral?

In addition to these difficulties, however, there is an even greater enigma. The "法律规定 regarding the law of הום:"

The position of הום or הום leads to an additional perplexity: if the case of הום could never actually occur, then why does the law exist? Why would the הום give us a law that can never be actualized? What purpose does it serve?

In the coming essay, we shall examine both aspects of this mystery. We will first examine several classical סўיע, to get a better understanding of the nuances of the text of the הום, and see if the סўיע seem to address the moral question in their סўיע, but they do not seem to say anything about whether it ever happened or ever could happen. Perhaps, however, it may be possible to infer their opinion from their statements. In order to understand why they do not address it, it will be important to examine what they
do address and how their comments are consistent with their respective exegetical styles.

In terms of the broader meaning of the law of מִיתוּת, we will see that describes how the law of מִיתוּת serves as a reminder of the proper perspective of man’s place in the world. Beyond that, Rav Hirsch shows that this law, which seems to promote the antithesis of morality, really reinforces the functioning of a moral society. Finally, in relation to the opinion that the law is purely theoretical, Rav Soloveitchik gives a stimulating view of man’s purpose in following מִיתוּת, which practically necessitates the existence of a law that could never be fulfilled in this world.

I. פְּרָשָׁה

In order to understand מִיתוּת’s approach to our מִיתוּת, it is crucial to remember his general approach towards Biblical exegesis:

ואני לא באהתי אל מנשה על מנשה, ולאגדת המימיים מבيري המנשה
(פרושת מיתות לבראשית ג:א)

often uses a מדרש to bring out what he feels are the underlying themes of the text. In this case, מיתות extracts the theme of the first three laws of ח البرلمان from two מדרשים, and suggests why these sections of the מיתות may be juxtaposed.

He adopts מיתות’s view of the סמיכות פְּרָשָׁה of these sections: מיתות, and then מיתות. The first case discusses a soldier who desires a beautiful woman, and the second describes the inviolable rights of a first born, even if his father hates the mother. מיתות says:

לא דברה תורה אלא Güncו יי רבה, שם או חדות בהר חודה, שם מיתות, שמא באמר, אם הלוח מלוח, שאמור(Camera, שמא הלוח מלוח, שמא אמר, שמא הלוח מלוח, שמא מאמר, שמא הלוח מלוח, שמא הלוח מלוח) הלוח

He claims that the מיתות presents these three laws in this fashion to teach us the principle of מיתות: one sin leads to another. מיתות clearly integrates this theme that he derives from the מדרשים into his explanation of מיתות.
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Rashi's explanation of the words "שופר וומר" is a classic example of a situation in which he chooses to explain the text without the aid of מדרש ספרי (ר"ח). For example, he could have chosen to bring down the view of דיבור נביאות "שופר" and "ומר" means against, whereas סבר "שופר" and "ומר" means he rebels against. On its simplest level, this explanation works because it explains why there are two different words to describe the son's behavior.

Furthermore, thehekım bey in Türkiye shows how this explanation could fit the actual words of the פסוק. Commenting on the verse, "rapidzn on the verse, '.." שמש בן 모סר "פותש" means he rebels against, whereas סבר "שופר" refers to the study of תורה (for a man teaches his son תורה) whereas סבר "שופר" refers to how to be a proper human being — for that is what the mother imbues within the child. Thehekım bey connects this with הניא because they, like a mother, teach מנהל מנהגים שונים الشريفת הענישים. Therefore we can connect סבר "שופר" diálogo שמעוני that is מדברי האב and מדברי האמה is the same root.

But is this פסוק? Apparently רashi does not think so, presumably because there are too many steps in the process. Instead, he explains the words סבר "שופר" in a more literal way: סבר "שופר" means מדרש and סבר "שופר" means מדרש מדרש מדרש מדרש מדרש. Thehekım bey says: מדרש מדרש מדרש מדרש מדרש. The definition of מדרש מדרש מדרש מדרש מדרש is those who מדרש מדרש מדרש מדרש מדרש. The book "סבר" זו לשון של רashi that סבר מדרש מדרש מדרש מדרש מדרש. However, it is inter-

How did he come up with these definitions? Interestingly, they correspond to the definitions in the ילקוט שמעוני הך."שופר וומר" (sv. מדרש" שופר וומר" in the Brown- Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon ("BDB" — sv. מדרש" שופר וומר" means מדרש מדרש מדרש מדרש מדרש. The definition of מדרש מדרש מדרש מדרש מדרש is those who מדרש מדרש מדרש מדרש מדרש. Thehekım bey says that רashi "borrows" his definition from ביבי מדרש מדרש מדרש מדרש מדרש, who translates the word מדרש מדרש מדרש מדרש מדרש. However, it is inter-

In other words, רashi is the definition of מדרש מדרש מדרש מדרש מדרש says that רashi "borrows" his definition from ביבי מדרש מדרש מדרש מדרש מדרש, who translates the word מדרש מדרש מדרש מדרש מדרש. However, it is inter-
esting to note that רבишא translates here as "dates," not as "days! They both mean more or less the same thing, but רבишא uses the word from elsewhere versus the word יפקות uses here. Perhaps רבишא is not specifically reacting to יפקות's translations and is not even receiving his terminology from him. רבишא has successfully defined המורה in a way that fits into the words and explains the difference between the two verbs.

On the words י.GetEnumerator, י piger chooses to quote the gemara:

ינוך עותי, מת Hornets ב cup שולושה המלכתי אוותי. (סנחרדיני נ Brooke). ב经开区 on the words י enumerator, י piger chooses to quote the gemara. יEnumerator's motivation to quote from the gemara is to identify the subject of המורה — who does the action. According to יenumerator, it could not be the parents chastising him as יenumerator thinks, because it would specify so, as it does in the next יenumerate, with the act of יenumerator. Therefore, based on this, יenumerator goes beyond the literal translation of the text and uses the interpretation of יenumerator also says the source is י Enumerator, but יenumerator uses the exact language of the text there in יenumerator, so it seems more logical to suggest that he is actually quoting the text.

After establishing why יenumerator chooses to quote י Enumerator here, one must still uncover what motivated י Enumerator to accept a specific Talmudic explanation; it is not his style to choose a random opinion. Here, יenumerator points out that as יenumerator shows on יenumerator, there is a "tradition that similar words in different contexts are meant to clarify one another." יEnumerator accepts the יEnumerator that here there is the word יenumerator, and when the יenumerator states the laws of lashes (25:2) the word יenumerator also appears. Just as there the punishment discussed is lashes, so too here the punishment is lashes. יenumerator takes this one step further with another יenumerator with the word יenumerator. In יenumerator, יenumerator answers whom the subject of יenumerator is: יenumerator. יenumerator has opened up a new issue now, though, and he will have to clarify several more points. First of all, there is no concrete sin described here. What exactly is his sin in going off the path and disobeying his parents that would make him worthy of lashes? These difficulties motivate us to bring additional יenumerator. י Enumerator explains the stringency of his sin: he is a thief.

ב קרור המורה אריא יחיב דע שגונב יאלל תרטימבר בשור Wichita והלי לוןriterion, שטאת.

ולל וסובא (סמך כ) ואמר: אלא חיה ביסוכיא יין בזילי בשור למו (畀אם כככ)
Why do we hear about the reason for his punishment here, not in פסוק כ, which states his final punishment? Because we can now ask a serious question – he gets lashes for being a thief? Since when does a thief receive lashes? Normally a thief must only pay double the amount he stole! In other words, how is this legal? To answer this, רשי invokes the general theme he has defined for the entire section: the ploy of מraud here addresses the ניגהל מraud's ploy of עבירה מraud נעירה. He paraphrases מraud בֵּית אָמוֹ — this is not the end of his sins, only a foreshadowing of the decrepit life such a boy would lead. He would eventually שפתיו tarnishes, מלתשך את הברה, which translates as murder. Presumably, this is why he first gets the lashes, to try to deter him from continuing this behavior. If he continues to disobey after his court warning, בֵּית אָמוֹ — his parents should take him to court and he will be stoned. He gets stoned and not just killed with a sword as he would normally be if he actually committed murder, because the most extreme punishment he could be liable for would be if he killed on ליל שבת, in which case he would be כפולה נלכָּת מ求め.4

This also answers an additional question that might arise from the original statement. Why is he warned before three people, not the normal two? Because בֵּית אָמוֹ is different — he is not punished for his current sin but על שם טוב כל מות. More proof is needed against him to take such a drastic action in בֵּית אָמוֹ.4

Still, even if the case is made harder to prove, it is quite difficult to explain the morality of judging someone on his possible future actions. Perhaps it is not just possible but inevitable that if a person conforms to these extremely specific requirements, tightly constricted by הדחה, this will happen. The הביא說明 warns not to try to disprove this idea from the case of יראשה who was judged only on the basis of his current actions, not on his presumed future.5 יראשה really was innocent at the time he was judged, even if he was destined to immorality.

It is now clear that רשי faithfully follows his mission statement in this section: he brings פדו only when he has no way of explaining the text in a literal way, or in order to express an underlying theme. Still, any פדו he brings does not contradict the פדו, even if it does add ideas not found explicitly in the text. No matter what, there is always concrete technical basis for the רשי פדו. It seems from this case that רשי only addresses issues that relate directly to the פדו, and he follows through in explaining the details of his idea, even if it seems like he has entered an unrelated tangent.

What about addressing whether בֵּית אָמוֹ happened or not? Based on what was stated above, there is no room for such a discussion in רashi's commentary. He is interested solely in explaining the text before him through
and through almost every case, and perhaps he did not see anything in the text that would lead to that question, as fascinating as it may be. Similarly, in relation to one of the other cases the טוּרָה says never did and would never occur, that of דֵּבָּרֵי פֶּרֶק י"ט (עינ הנשבה), he does not address the issue. There, too, he quotes from ספֶּרֶי חַסְדָּיִין and that solve the various technical problems in the פסוקים.

This explanation, coming from בֵּין תורָה, seems quite strange. Presumably, he is addressing the use of double terminology. What does מָזוֹרָה "מָזוֹרָה" teach that מָזוֹרָה does not, and vice versa? One would expect from בֵּין תורָה a technical differentiation between these two terms, but instead he gives this "midrashic" type of explanation!

It is important to note, however, that BDB does say that מָזוֹרָה ה"מָזוֹרָה" means being "stubborn, rebellious" (usually against ה). Therefore, one could say that technically, מָזוֹרָה means rebelling against ה, and מָזוֹרָה against his parents. His parents must be ה, because if they are acting inappropriately, then he is not rebelling against them, only against God, in which case he is not a ב. מָזוֹרָה.

On the word ב. מָזוֹרָה once again seems to deviate from his rules:
If כוּבִּי is such a grammatical פָּשִׁיט, what leads him to this definition? It does not appear to be פָּשִׁיט! How does the והשה והשה reinforce his definition?

On the כוּבִּי והשה in פָּשִׁיט את כוּבִּי, והשה does not appear to be כוּבִּי! How does the כוּבִּי from כוּבִּי reinforce his כוּבִּי?

On the כוּבִּי in כוּבִּי, כוּבִּי comments:

If כוּבִּי is such a grammatical כוּבִּי, what leads him to this כוּבִּי? It does not appear to be כוּבִּי! How does the והשה והשה reinforce his כוּבִּי?

On the כוּבִּי והשה in פָּשִׁיט את כוּבִּי, והשה does not appear to be כוּבִּי! How does the כוּבִּי from כוּבִּי reinforce his כוּבִּי?

On the כוּבִּי in כוּבִּי, כוּבִּי comments:

Saying כוּבִּי means כוּבִּי and כוּבִּי means כוּבִּי. As noted above, כוּבִּי defines כוּבִּי as “be stubborn, rebellious (usually towards Hashem),” and כוּבִּי means “be contentious, refractory, rebellious.” This slightly different formulation reflects the difference between not doing כוּבִּי versus doing a כוּבִּי. Contentious rebellion is through actively breaking a כוּבִּי. Not doing a כוּבִּי is a passive act vis-à-vis actively violating a כוּבִּי.

In the same vein, כוּבִּי translates כוּבִּי as כוּבִּי — general rebellion — and כוּבִּי as כוּבִּי — refusing, not listening.

According to his introduction to his כוּבִּי, כוּבִּי does not need to record the כוּבִּי, although he clarifies that he accepts כוּבִּי unconditionally. On the words כוּבִּי כוּבִּי, כוּבִּי cites כוּבִּי, instead of his usual grammatical analysis:

If כוּבִּי is such a grammatical פָּשִׁיט, what leads him to this פָּשִׁיט? It does not appear to be פָּשִׁיט! How does the והשה והשה reinforce his פָּשִׁיט?

On the כוּבִּי והשה in פָּשִׁיט את כוּבִּי, והשה does not appear to be כוּבִּי! How does the כוּבִּי from כוּבִּי reinforce his כוּבִּי?

On the כוּבִּי in כוּבִּי, כוּבִּי comments:

Saying כוּבִּי means כוּבִּי and כוּבִּי means כוּבִּי. As noted above, כוּבִּי defines כוּבִּי as “be stubborn, rebellious (usually towards Hashem),” and כוּבִּי means “be contentious, refractory, rebellious.” This slightly different formulation reflects the difference between not doing כוּבִּי versus doing a כוּבִּי. Contentious rebellion is through actively breaking a כוּבִּי. Not doing a כוּבִּי is a passive act vis-à-vis actively violating a כוּבִּי.

In the same vein, כוּבִּי translates כוּבִּי as כוּבִּי — general rebellion — and כוּבִּי as כוּבִּי — refusing, not listening.

According to his introduction to his כוּבִּי, כוּבִּי does not need to record the כוּבִּי, although he clarifies that he accepts כוּבִּי unconditionally. On the words כוּבִּי כוּבִּי, כוּבִּי cites כוּבִּי, instead of his usual grammatical analysis:

If כוּבִּי is such a grammatical פָּשִׁיט, what leads him to this פָּשִׁיט? It does not appear to be פָּשִׁיט! How does the והשה והשה reinforce his פָּשִׁיט?

On the כוּבִּי והשה in פָּשִׁיט את כוּבִּי, והשה does not appear to be כוּבִּי! How does the כוּבִּי from כוּבִּי reinforce his כוּבִּי?

On the כוּבִּי in כוּבִּי, כוּבִּי comments:

Saying כוּבִּי means כוּבִּי and כוּבִּי means כוּבִּי. As noted above, כוּבִּי defines כוּבִּי as “be stubborn, rebellious (usually towards Hashem),” and כוּבִּי means “be contentious, refractory, rebellious.” This slightly different formulation reflects the difference between not doing כוּבִּי versus doing a כוּבִּי. Contentious rebellion is through actively breaking a כוּבִּי. Not doing a כוּבִּי is a passive act vis-à-vis actively violating a כוּבִּי.

In the same vein, כוּבִּי translates כוּבִּי as כוּבִּי — general rebellion — and כוּבִּי as כוּבִּי — refusing, not listening.

According to his introduction to his כוּבִּי, כוּבִּי does not need to record the כוּבִּי, although he clarifies that he accepts כוּבִּי unconditionally. On the words כוּבִּי כוּבִּי, כוּבִּי cites כוּבִּי, instead of his usual grammatical analysis:
pensation) must be correct. Similarly here — does the subject of which refers is to which posits that the compensation parents must meet to be able to bring their son to such a trial, similar to those in. For some reason, does not elaborate on this. Perhaps he thinks the reader already knows this or could easily look it up. He did say in his introduction that he sees no benefit to quoting long passages of. Maybe meant that he looks at this in a completely different way. It is fascinating that the speaks is one of many that lists specific requirements the parents must meet in order for it to be a for them to do this. Is subtly expressing that he finds these requirements necessary in order to understand? If so, why? Perhaps he thinks that because of the the case could never occur, but as he says regarding, it is theoretically the appropriate punishment. Still, he does not explicitly bring up the issue of whether it ever did or could happen.

also says:

ולל, מפורש הוה שולש איש, וק הו שכס כלל לוות בככ שיתאווה כל מה שבואק ומעון, וmoid, מרדב לשתה ויוו ומשתכר. והנה כו וספרו, וכ לא יבשק于此 שלש הזה, כי אם לשתון בככ מני ממלי ושתתה.

differentiates between the details of the and the general message the conveys. Here, he reacts to a minor technical detail in the text. says he reacts to the lack of words modifying; it does not say specifically, because the (on its level) is reproaching any gluttonous or heretical behavior. The is less interested in how the person is gluttonous than in the fact that he is a glutton — someone who indulges in his desires — and therefore a heretic, because someone who is constantly drunk obviously does not care about the consequences of his actions. Belief in God necessitates caring about consequences; when one cares about consequences one is compelled to follow God’s commandments because one understands the results of disobedience. Indirectly, addresses how it could be moral for such a person to be punished so harshly — his actions represent a much broader problem of attitude. It is also possible that when he says the rebellious son breaks that this is a metaphor for. He does not literally break all of the in order to be considered a, but he has a false sense of God, which is as if he broke all the laws.

also alludes to the halachic details of the court process and for what he would be convicted, yet elaboration on the is not his main
concern. Why he alludes to the halachah at all here remains unclear and requires further analysis.

The Unactualized Halachah explains the halachah in a similar way as the halachah that cites, yet his idea is slightly different. One can always question what motivates to accept or reject a certain halachah because he was concerned with figuring out which halachah aid the understanding of the text and which do not. This is not his concern. Further, he does say in his introduction to the halachah that he does not like quoting halachah.

The Unactualized Halachah explains that explains that this section is connected to the halachah, but not necessarily through the halachah's introduction. His point is that this shows that the root of the son's problem is his mother's unconnected past. He proves this concept from the halachah's introduction of the anonymous man who cursed with God's name. In both cases, the records the name of the mother to show how the position or actions of the sons stem from the mother. Regarding the , , the says:

The Unactualized Halachah says in this , , the secret to the which reveals to us: , , the tribe of kingship. Therefore, had heritage from both sides, heritage that affected them greatly. Otherwise, why would the need to mention that was sister? However, , had bad heritage: his mother who apparently was not a respectable woman. A could only come from such corrupt ancestors. Similarly here, a could come from bad heritage such as having an for a mother.

It is possible that views the halachah as merely thematic, with no effect on the actual case or the determination of whatsoever. Through its theme, it uncovers yet another moral message in this passage. A person's roots impact him significantly.

We can now understand why he does not address the question of whether or not the case actually did or could happen. It is clear from his comments that the point of his halachah here is to uncover the themes that emerge from the technicalities. If it did happen, knows that competently formulated the halachah. If it did not happen, it does not matter — the concept itself is for not to disobey their parents, and to lead
a moral life of belief in God and self-control. Therefore, from a\textdagger's perspective, the question is irrelevant.


drum

Drum has three main questions on the section. His first issue is, who exactly is this person (the \textdagger) and what exactly is his sin? He must answer this question before he can address his main concern: why the son is punished so severely. Finally, Drum discusses an issue that disturbs him throughout: whether this is a new 


drum

Drum paraphrases based on the word \textdagger: "...iness, stars in the violins. The offender is not quite a man, but certainly above thirteen, which makes him obligated to obey the and punishable if he sins. He is punished on account of two sins—the first that he is \textdagger, and the second that he is \textdagger. Drum does not differentiate between the terms as \textdagger and \textdagger; to him these words describe one general sin of \textdagger. In other words, \textdagger means which fits well into the text.


The boy's second sin, \textdagger, says, means violating the commandment and \textdagger.

Now that Drum has identified who this son is and what he has done, the question still remains: why is he punished so severely? Drum answers that his current sins are not enough to justify such a penalty. First, he agrees with that he is killed for what he is destined to do in the future, but there is a two-step reason for why he is stoned. Someone who is barely a man but already responsible for his sins, who is acting in such a disgraceful manner, he is not heading towards a fruitful life. He has not committed an atrocious sin yet, but he is killed. The main reason he can be judged based on his future actions is because the purpose here is showing others how not to act, so that he will not mislead others. That is why — an integral part of the process of punishment is for the entire community to be fully cognizant of what happened.

This is an interesting point, because in recent years, American society
has debated a very similar question: does capital punishment really work as a
deterrent? Many Americans argue that it does not, and that even if it did,
that would not be enough of a reason to take another person’s life. But
morality is objective morality, and cannot be subjected to the historical whims
of mankind. Perhaps the idea of capital punishment could not work in a
democratic society like America because it contradicts the general attitude
of “every man for himself, with his own set of moral laws”. But the
morality is based on other principles. Within a moral society, capital punishment would
ideally work.

is not the only case where the judges extra harshly to
teach a lesson; says the cases of המר ומ amended have the
same purpose. In each of these cases, one could ask why capital punishment
is appropriate. The clearly says that the need for a deterrent in specific
cases justifies capital punishment.

Rav Hirsch also discusses the function of public execution and points
out like the connection between the cases, as well. They are all public ex-
ecutions. Therefore, as cites, these are the four cases which need a pub-
lic declaration by the court. (Rav Hirsch paraphrases the on
this concept:

So the motive for giving the greatest publicity is not the preven-
tion of the same crimes in these two cases [specifically
, which have such limited possibility of occur-
rence], but by these frightening intimidating examples, to drive
home in general the seriousness of educating our children, and
children’s obedience to parents, and obedience to the traditional
verbally handed-down and its teachers and exponents.8

Some suggest that these four cases reflect four crucial parts of society:
one who entices others to go astray corrupts the religious aspect, false wit-
tesses corrupt the judicial, the rebellious son corrupts the familial, and the
rebellious elder corrupts the legislative. These cases act as deterrents to pre-
serve the stability of society. In this day and age, such ideas that comprise
objective morality are not in vogue. But a halachic Jew must take a stand
and accept the rich tradition of his ancestors.

discusses one more topic here, a topic he discusses often through-
out: is this a new or one that has already been commanded?
In his introduction to posits that in expounds upon those necessary for the generation entering to hear. There are a few new
and, and they would come only here either
because they are only applicable in ארץ ישראל, or because they are not frequent, so meshes only teaches them to those who are inheriting the land. For example, inפסחים it discusses the laws of war. These were not necessary for them to know until now, as they prepared to fight for their land.

In this case, רמ��י is not even sure whether the meshes is new or expounding upon the meshes of רמ��י. If it is new, although Rav Hirsch does not say this, perhaps it fits into his category of infrequent פָּדוּת.

Rav Hirsch cites סנהדרין ע: On the declaration of the parents: "And it was said... the Gemora says that sentence may not be pronounced on the basis of the excessive gorging at occasions where eating is a meshes, but also not if the food consumed consisted of prohibited foods, as pork or shrimps of treifa meat, etc., for the accusation is "he would not listen to OUR voice," and THIS is not listening to GOD’S voice.”

In other words, he is a אֶלֶף בְּשָׁאוּל בְּשָׁאוּל. The root of his sin, his concrete sin, is that he disobeyed his parents. The Gemora does not say, " ScrollViewbm but rather "ScrollViewbm הַיּוֹם לְעָלֵי בְּשָׁאוּל". His parents accuse him first of בְּשָׁאוּל, and only then do they add on that he is Bְּשָׁאוּל.

The fact that he is Бְּשָׁאוּל is not a light, simple matter; he is violating a קדיש תחיה of meshes אֹהֶל קדיש תחיה, which encompasses every meshes in the world and beyond. קדיש תחיה are meshes בְּשָׁאוּל, and they are the specific meshes which he transgresses.

The קדיש תחיה of meshes Bְּשָׁאוּל follows after the command קדיש תחיה, are the first laws in the world אֹהֶל קדיש. From this Rav Hirsch claims that קדיש תחיה is the first step towards קדיש תחיה. It trains the child to be obedient, and the child can then apply this obedience to all areas of life and lead a life of self-control. But fear of God precedes fear of parents, which is why קדיש תחיה comes next, for the purpose of checks and balances. “This gives the one limitation which exists to the obedience which a child must accord his parents.” It serves as an example of all the laws in the world, since it is the greatest testimony of our subservience to God. One can learn from here that if someone’s parents tell him to transgress any law of the world, he cannot obey them because nothing comes before fear of God, not even fear of the physical beings that brought him into existence. Rav Hirsch emphasizes the use of the plural form in this תָּנָכָר, תְּסַמָּרָה:ScrollViewbm. He learns from this that "it is not only by the
single individuals themselves that these two fundamental institutions of Jewish breeding are to receive homage, by and the whole Jewish national character receives its stamp.” They are the “pillars of the holiness of Jewish life…”12

It is interesting to look at the definition of קדושה תחתו. One might look at the concept of אםת תואר — that if a man is at war and desires a woman, if he has her perform a certain ritual she is permissible to him — and seriously question the morality of this procedure. The first step, though, to understanding this baffling law is to put it into the societal context. One must understand that this was actually an improvement from how men would normally treat such a woman. By the woman’s law, he is forced to let her mourn and actually have feelings!13 But in the context of ע”י definition of קדושה תחתו and the concept of being a וו Bride תואר עד כל כך, בשת תחתו’s concept of erhalten a completes this. There are certain cases where the woman will allow certain reprehensible actions within a tightly controlled context. It tells us how to direct our desires. But one may not think that he has the right to decide what is moral on his own; that is solely woman’s domain.

 şפם does not address whetherbben or woman ever did or could happen. However, he discussed the details of the law (as did and), and it becomes clear that the case has extreme importance in defining the moral structure of the nation.

II. The Moral Message

What if been or woman never occurred and never could occur? Why would it be in the woman? Why would the woman dedicate several pages of a tome to it? Why would the woman have a whole chapter in about the qualifications and judiciary process? The woman certainly derived moral standards from it, but is that enough to explain the existence of a law that can never be enforced?

 şפם and Rav Hirsch directly address the issue of whether been or woman did or could happen. However, şפם suggests that who not only disagrees with the assertion that been or woman could never occur, but claims to actually have “sat upon the grave” of one who had been executed may disagree with the first opinion, or perhaps he also accepts it, and when he says that, he does not mean he actually saw a. Rather, he meant that he had seen someone like who rebelled against his father but did not fit into the specific halachic category of a. Therefore
The Unactualized Halachah

asks,

Mordechai asks, "... The Unactualized Halachah

Characteristically, Mordechai derives a strong ethical message from Mordechai’s appearance in the Torah. He describes explicitly a point that was implicit in the comments of Rav, Rav, and Rav — the notion of objective morality:

Man’s job in this world is to do , to the point that any feelings towards humans are insignificant by comparison. Thus a stand must be taken: a person who rebels against God, however one looks at what his exact sin was, and whatever semantics one uses, does not deserve to exist in this world.

This concept may be difficult for the modern mind to accept. Contemporary standards of morality seem to put the individual above all other concerns. The Torah, however, apparently feels differently. For example, would say it is pure heresy to care more about one’s self than about God. In , says (2:4). According to Jewish belief, the world is theocentric, not anthropocentric. History proves this as well — the definition of morality in the secular world has changed throughout history. But morality is objective morality. One of its rules is that the action must lead to a close connection with God. Disobedience, gluttony, and heresy do not.

Rav Hirsch also does not think that Mordechai happened or could happen. Similar to Rav, and as seen above, he thematically and characteristically brings a pedagogical, moral message out of the text. His style is basically:

... it could never come to a concrete case considering all the factors which would be necessary to establish it. But nevertheless, or rather just on that account, it forms a rich source of pedagogic truths and teachings, studying which, will richly repay parents for their business of bringing up children.
The case is limited in this fashion to show that he can only be stoned if there are no outside factors that made him the way he is; he must be inherently bad. The conditions necessary in order to accuse a son of being a בֵּן סְדָרָה מְתוּרָה are not only to make the case impossible to occur in reality, but also to teach the ideal relationship between the mother and the father, and the mother and father with the son. He fits many of the comments of the הָמוּרָה מְמוּרָה into the פֹּסָקִים in light of this view of the purpose of the case. For example, from the word בֵּן, the הָמוּרָה מְמוּרָה (69a) learns that the son is within his first three months after his בֵּן מְתוּרָה. Says Rav Hirsch, “it is in the first three months after attaining בֵּן מְתוּרָה that the הָמוּרָה sees the critical time for the decision over the moral future of a boy.”

Rav Hirsch says further on the words，则וּבַה כָּמָכוּ, “at the time a Jewish boy matures to youth and should turn with enthusiasm to the ideals of spirituality and morality, he shows himself surrendered to ‘gorging and guzzling.’ His moral and spiritual welfare is dependent on the way his parents educate him. Rav Hirsch shows this through the פֹּסָקִים in light of the הָמוּרָה as well. From the description of the parents, the הָמוּרָה derives that if the parents are crippled, the case cannot occur. The physical health of a child’s parents has severe influence over his own psychological being. More importantly, though, the main influence over a child is the way his parents relate to each other. Rav Hirsch writes:

. . .only if, as it says in v. 20 אַאיֶנֶה שְׁמוֹעַ כָּמָכוּ, the father and mother have one voice, both treat him with the same seriousness, both stand over him in equal authority, in equal dignity, and above all, in the same agreed ideas and wishes, only then can they say to themselves that it is not their fault if their son is a failure. If any of these factors is missing, where, above all, there is not complete agreement between the parents in bringing up their children, then the failure of the child is no proof of the moral badness of his nature. Under a truly better system of education on the part of father and mother, the child might perhaps have been different, and where the parents failed, life and experience might succeed in bettering.

That is the message of the הָמוּרָה’s stipulation that the parents must both want to prosecute their son, and more emphatically why “the pronouncement of the sentence [is] dependent even on the equality of the parents in the impression which their appearance makes.” (See סְמָרוֹרָה עֲבָא, quoted above.)
III. The Ultimate Brisker Adventure

Whereas and Rav Hirsch extricate moral and pedagogical messages from this text as a way of understanding, Rav Soloveitchik elaborates on the whole concept of the existence of a purely theoretical law. He thus sheds light on the very nature of והוד and man’s purpose in the world. He says that a gap exists between והוד as recorded in the הלכה and carried down through תחיל הלכה, and the way it is practiced in the world. This ontological gap is a result of the ontic gap that exists between the physical world and the abstract world it reflects. The point of halakh is to transcend the barriers by bringing as much of the ideal Halakha down into this world as possible. The Rav writes:

The essence of the Halakha, which was received from God, consists in creating an ideal world and cognizing the relationship between that ideal world and our concrete environment in all its visible manifestations and underlying structures. There is no phenomenon, entity, or object in this concrete world which the a priori Halakha does not approach with its ideal standard.

Halakhaman is not at all grieved by the fact that many ideal constructions have never been and will never be actualized. What difference does it make whether...the rebellious son existed or didn’t exist in the past, will exist or won’t exist in the future? The foundation of foundations and the pillar of halakhic thought is not the practical ruling but the determination of the theoretical Halakhah.

It is important to remember that Halakhic Man’s ideal is to actualize Halakha in this world, yet by the same token he would certainly not want a case likeベンසור to have to occur in this world! Connection to God occurs when man succeeds in “...bringing down that eternal world into the midst of our world.” The significance of a case likeベンס is not only for its moral message but for its representation of Halakhic Man’s approach toward דווש תוס公園. The more he understands the ideal world, the closer he is to God because the more he can actualize the ideal in the real world.
The Rav’s theory can further explain the moral deficiency of a man. If man’s goal is to become close to God, he must imitate Him. Just as God created, so too must man be a creator. “Creation means the realization of the ideal of holiness… If a man never creates, never brings into being anything new, anything original, then he cannot be holy unto His God.” A man achieves nothing, the antithesis of holiness, according to the definition of the Rav. A man is not being creative; he is not going beyond the letter of the law.

The concept of the Halakhic Man also sheds light on what the Rav, Hirsch, and others meant by the word זָדָה. The Rav discusses the role sincere repentance can have in changing a person. In the realm of repentance, the usual law of causality does not apply. Normally, cause leads to effect, but with repentance, the effect can retroactively change the cause:

The cause is interpreted by the effect, moment a by moment b. The past by itself is indeterminate, a closed book. It is only the present and the future that can pry it open and read its meaning …. There can be a certain sequence of events that starts out with sin and iniquity but ends up with mitzvot and good deeds, and vice versa …. This is the nature of that causality operating in the realm of the spirit if man, as a spiritual being, opts for this outlook on time, time as grounded in the realm of eternity. However, the person who prefers the simple experience of unidimensional time — time, to use the image of Kant, as a straight line — becomes subject to the law of causality operating in the physical realm.

Here as well, the Rav’s philosophical framework can help us to understand the ethical explanations given by the earlier Rishonim. In this exceedingly specified case, the Rabbis tell us that one sin will lead to another in a downward spiral that will not be reversed because this boy chooses a unidimensional perspective of time. He will not allow his future actions to “undo” his previous actions, so sins will not lead to anything positive. He no longer has any self-control physically or spiritually: “event a tyrannizes over event b, the past is all powerful and the future must perforce follow in its wake.” Rav Soloveitchik’s philosophy also fits beautifully into this section vis-à-vis Rav Hirsch’s understanding of the roots of the commandment of כְּפָר אֶת אָנָח. Parents are responsible for the continuation of the mesorah, and they are honored for doing this colossal task. The Rav talks about how a Jew must be time-conscious in relation to the history of his entire nation, not only within himself:
The masorah, the process of transmission, symbolizes the Jewish people’s outlook regarding the beautiful and resplendent phenomenon of time. The chain of tradition, begun millennia ago, will continue until the end of all time... The consciousness of halakhic man, that master of the received tradition, embraces the entire company of the sages of the masorah.

Not so with a boy, who denies tradition. Otherwise he would take responsibility to use his creativity. Moreover, he is a threat to society’s healthy continuity. Therefore, such a person does not understand time and does not understand the cosmic ramifications of his actions, or lack thereof. He cannot be emulated.

The Bavvya ha’Rav, Rema, Yechezkel, Rav Hirsch are paramount examples of the clear fulfillment of the Torah. Every parsha, in his own way, approaches the Torah with this same thirst for the most honest explication. Each one unravels the layers of the text to connect to God through his own mind. There is not much significant between Bavvya, Rema, and Rav Hirsch here. They each use different methodologies and focus but ultimately the message is the same. That is the creativity of the Torah. The fact that the case could possibly never occur did not deter them from theorizing. Technically, one could say that Rav Hirsch would say that only because of technicalities must the actual remain in potential, but the messages can and must be actualized in this world. Certainly Rav Hirsch must have seen the case as a halakhic possibility — if not in this world, then certainly in the ideal world. His kula meshan Torah includes in its entirety: “And with the same precision and the same rigorous standards that he used in determining the law in the case of a man who lent money to his fellow... he also treated the order of the service of the high priest on the Day of Atonement, the laws of the Passover sacrifice . . . etc., etc.”

We will now leave the world Brisk for a moment, and swing over to the “other side of the camp”, to the magical world of Breslov. But the travel in this case is not too far, because Reb Reb records almost the exact same idea he heard from his Rebbe, in Lekhut Moshev, I:15. The difference, of course, is in semantics. The difference, of course, is in semantics.30 When He turned the potential into actual, a duality emerged: now there is the קְדוֹשָה, הָדוֹרָה, צְדָרָה, אָמָת, אֵמוֹת, אָמָת, אֵמוֹת, אֵמוֹת...
To combine Breslav and Brisker terms, halakhic man attempts to bridge the gap between the ideal world, i.e. theREAL, and the actual world, i.e. the Realm. How? Through Halakha, which is based on the ideas of לוחות, מעבר, אמת, ווקודש.

There is a real danger to the duality, though, because as man should strive towards achieving the ideal, the שקר can drag a person down fast. The Rav says that this is the result of spiritual confusion in the rapture of longing towards the ideal: “A soul overwhelmed by religious longings may, at certain times, stray amid the paths of secular knowledge.” Many secular philosophers have picked up on the duality in the world and created systems around it. The primary examples are Plato with his world of ideas and shadows of being, and Kant with his numena and phenomena.

There is truth to ideas such as these, but ultimately, what בכס הבכ says remains true: יופי בה יופי בה לכל לב (פרקי אבות, המה). The danger is that often the ideas that develop from secular systems can be heretical, and dangerously morally corrupt. The Rav actually first released the book Halakhic Man during the end of a catastrophic result of such a philosophy, in 1944. Freidrich Nietzsche had developed a theory of an ideal “superman” for man to create. Unfortunately, Hitler perverted this idea and created a Holocaust. Rav Soloveitchik juxtaposes the “Man of God” with “superman.” Man can choose in which direction he wants to curb his duality. Judaism could never develop a “superman” because as close as one hovers around God, one never completely reaches Him. The Rav writes, “when a person reaches the ultimate peak — prophecy — he has fulfilled his task as a creator.”

If a rift exists between the concrete world and the ideal world, then those ירא שמים who have a greater understanding of the ideal should be the soul trustees of the halakha; they, through דרש כלו שקר are closer to the ideal. The Rav did not stop at אביו עוזר אתי, as, הר סיני והוריו stresses in his introduction. Especially when a modern moral dilemma arises, we must not discard tradition, but rather turn to the Rabbis. One might not see a precedent to follow, but they will. It is crucial to maintain a proper objective perspective, the תורה perspective.
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ON תשמ"ח, אייר ה (May 15, 1948), David Ben Gurion declared before the National Council that after close to 2,000 years, the Jewish people once again had control and sovereignty over their homeland. Permission for this had been granted to them through a majority vote in the United Nations, which had declared some six months earlier that after undergoing the destruction of the Holocaust and World War II, the Jews deserved a homeland. This day, אייר ה, is known today in Israel as ליום העצמאות.

In June (June, 1967), Israel was attacked on all fronts by its Arab neighbors. During a six-day period, the Israeli army miraculously captured much land including the Golan Heights, the Sinai Peninsula, the Gaza Strip, Judea and Samaria, and the Old City of Yerushalayim. June 7, כ"ח אייר, was the day when Yerushalayim was recaptured. This date is now celebrated as ליום ירושלים.

Torah-observant Jews must relate to days such as these from a halachic perspective. A major debate has arisen among the במסכת regarding how one must mark these days. Some are of the opinion that nothing out of the ordinary should be done, while others feel that מלחמה occurred on these days, and thus we must, in some way, express our thanks to אייר.

Why are some במסכת opposed to recognizing ליום העצמאות וליום ירושלים as holidays? There are several reasons. First of all, we must consider what is the halachic significance of our presence today in the land of Israel. רמב"ן, in his addendum to מסכת, suggests that מלחמה neglected to include the תריאים מלחמה ישוב ארץ ישראל of מצות as one of the הדורות המצרי. In other words, רמב"ן considers living in ארץ ישראל to be a מצות applicable even today, whereas apparently does not. The מסכת, a on the מסכת, refutes this position, claiming that מלחמה purposely omitted this because he held that it was only considered to be a מצות during the days of מלחמה and will be again in the days of מלחמה. However, since it is impossible for...
one to keep all of the praise given by those living in אָרָץ יִשְׂרָאֵל only applies during the days of the week. מסכת חומת קנים קי-כ"א.

The above is then expounded upon through a story in which states that, since making אָרָץ יִשְׂרָאֵל no longer applies.

There is a similar idea found in the אָרָץ יִשְׂרָאֵל had made, but was not being successful. He came to órgão וו for advice, which he asked for in the form of a riddle: "He whose mother degrades him, but whose father's wife (i.e. his stepmother) honors him, where should he go?" The mother referred to here is אָרָץ יִשְׂרָאֵל and the stepmother is אָרָץ יִשְׂרָאֵל. The mother took the words literally and answered, "He should go to the one who honors him." When órgão וו was informed of órgão וו's subsequent question by órgão וו, he said, "How could he have gone back to órgão וו without asking my permission?" órgão וו was told that this had been órgão וו's way of asking his permission. There is no new response given to órgão וו's question by órgãos órgão וו. Therefore, one can assume that even after órgão וו realized what he had been asked, his not refuting it meant that he was in agreement with órgão וו's actions.

All of the above sources may indicate that there is no obligation الجسم הווה live in אָרָץ יִשְׂרָאֵל. Furthermore, they might even suggest that Jews should not — in this time period — attempt to resettle there. If this is true, then there is perhaps reason to question the significance of the modern State of Israel, and in turn of celebrating the days associated with its founding and expansion.

In addition to opposing our return to אָרָץ יִשְׂרָאֵל and acknowledging the State of Israel as a positive development, many have raised halachic objections to the idea of creating new holidays. In מסכת ראש העשה יי it says that
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The Halachic Ramifications of Ḥalakah on the holidays mentioned in Ḥalakah have all been nullified, except for Ḥanukkah and Purim. If those who came before us have declared these days (which commemorated various events) null and void, can those who come after add to them? Do we really have the right to create a Ḥanukkah in our days to commemorate a miracle?

Furthermore, many people are also disturbed by the mere fact that the modern return to the Land of Israel is occurring through the agency of non-religious Jews. The Bavli says that this must be considered an incomplete redemption, since it is lacking the religious aspect. He says that it is possible for this to occur; yet it is undesirable. It would be preferable for a state to suffer through the lengthy exile in order to eventually enjoy the complete Ḥolocaust.

Rabbi Ahron Soloveitchik, in his book Logic of the Heart, Logic of the Mind, also acknowledges that many people point out that the end of this Ḥalakah can only be achieved through Ḥasidism. The Zionist movements, though, appear to contain no semblance of repentance. He adds that there are also those who argue that since the State of Israel came into being through natural processes, and not through a Ḥolocaust, it cannot have anything to do with Ḥolocaust. According to them, any part of the Ḥolocaust must happen supernaturally.

Rav Soloveitchik refutes the contention that the accomplishments of non-observant Jews are of little, if any, note. First, he points out that there is an incident in Melches Be’Yomah, where lepers, sinners, saved the people of Israel from starvation. Additionally, he recalls another account in Melches Be’Yomah, in the story of Yisroel son of Yitzchak (Melches Be’Yomah). In this account Yisroel is called a sinner, but he was responsible for enlarging the borders of Isra’el.

How could an idolater such as Yisroel — certainly no more worthy a man than Ben Gurion — merit to conquer a great expanse of territory? One can ask why, during the reigns of Be’Ezra’el and Shlomoh, when all of Israel worshipped idols, were the borders not as extensive as they were in the times of Yisroel, when most of the Jews living in Ere’Israel worshipped idols?

The answer to this question lies in the search for a Jewish Homeland. During the reign of Be’Ezra’el, had the borders of Isra’el not been delivered, they could have been destroyed. However, in the times of Be’Ezra’el and Shlomoh, Be’Ezra’el were not in any such danger. In the past, no matter how bleak their situation, Be’Ezra’el have been able to survive, without the need for a Jewish state. However, Rav Ahron says, after the Holocaust, it became apparent that Be’Ezra’el could survive no longer without a land of their own. Isra’el, therefore, worked through the historical process to insure that Be’Ezra’el would survive, and a Jewish Homeland was created.

In order to refute the idea that the Ḥolocaust cannot happen through natural means, Rabbi Soloveitchik explains that the Ḥolocaust can come in two forms:
The Halachic Ramifications of מִדְרֶךְ, hidden, or גָּלֶל, apparent. The מִדְרֶךְ will be hastened and apparent if כְּזֵן מְשָׁאֵל. However, if they do not, then it will come in its time and will be hidden. The final מִדְרֶךְ will transcend nature, but the events leading up to it do not have to. We see this from the juxtaposition of two פסקים: one from וְרָכִיָּה, and the other from דְּרוּת הָיוּ. The פִיסְמָן in פסוק כְּזֵן מְשָׁאֵל, referring to the מְשָׁאֵל, states that the מְשָׁאֵל will come quietly, יִדְבֶּכֶל עַל הָמוּר, riding on a donkey. In contrast, the פִיסְמָן in פסוק המְשָׁאֵל, also referring to the מְשָׁאֵל, states that he will נָאֵר עַל גְּנַי שְׁפָאִים זְכֵר אַשִּׁי הוָה, “come with the clouds of heaven, looking like a son of man”. This פסוק, כְּזֵן מְשָׁאֵל, in its description of a supernatural מִדְרֶךְ, seems to contradict the description in מְשָׁאֵל of a natural מִדְרֶךְ. In order to answer this apparent contradiction, Rabbi Soloveitchik brings down the explanation of Rabbi Alexandri, recorded in פִיסְמָן מְשָׁאֵל. If the Jews deserve it, he says, מְשָׁאֵל will “come from the clouds”, meaning in a supernatural way. If they do not, he will come anyway, but “riding on a donkey” — gradually, and through natural processes.

The settling of מְשָׁאֵל by the מְשָׁאֵל could certainly be seen as leading gradually toward the מִדְרֶךְ. The מְשָׁאֵל came to a land that fulfilled the prophecy in וֹסְפִיטַי אֵין אֲתָא וֹסֶפֶד מַעֲמֹאָל עַלְּאֶה יַוֵּכָּם (וֹקֶרֶא כְּלוּב): פֶּרֶשׁ בַּבָּחָן, and converted it into the fulfillment of the מְשָׁאֵל in שִׁירֵאל מַעֲפָסֶה תַּתָּו וֹרֶפֶסֶכֶר מַעֲפָסֶה רוּפֵי שִׁירֵאל כְּמַרְבּ כַּלוֹד. When the מְשָׁאֵל came to מְשָׁאֵל, it had been desolate since the time of the Roman occupation. However, in just a short period of time, they were able to make the land green once again.

These sources seem to indicate that, indeed, there is something greatly significant about the modern return to Zion. However, we must now discuss the “three oaths” that were mentioned above. These, as mentioned, have often been cited as proof of the impermissibility of our settlement of the מְשָׁאֵל. Upon closer examination, though, it becomes clear that this is not necessarily the case.

The הָתְנָר (כתבות ק"י: כְּרִיאָ) הַנֵּרָה says that כְּזֵן מְשָׁאֵל were required to accept two oaths at the time of the מְשָׁאֵל. The first oath was that we promised not to come to מְשָׁאֵל by way of force — שֶׁלֶךְ עַלּוֹד תָּבוּכַת. We never violated this oath. As mentioned above, the nations of the world (represented in the UN) agreed to allow the Jewish people to return to ארץ ישראל.

The second oath was כְּזֵן מְשָׁאֵל — שֶׁלֶךְ מְרֵדַה נָבְאָהוּ הָתוּלָךְ. We never swore not to rebel against the nations of the world. We have kept this oath as well. Jews have always been loyal citizens in all the different lands of the Diaspora. Sometimes, unfortunately, to the detriment of our people, we have even assimilated.

But the third oath mentioned in מְשָׁאֵל is one that the other nations were required to accept. It states, שֶׁלֶךְ שֶׁתַּכְבּוּת בּוֹרְבּ יְישָׁרָאֵל וְחָרָא מַדְאָרָא,ם וְיוֹם הַיּוֹם וְיִסְתְּמַאֵת.
— the nations of the world are not to oppress more than what is just while they are in this world. Certainly the Holocaust was a blatant violation of this third oath, and therefore the oaths as a whole are now nullified. It would thus be permissible for Jews to fulfill the commandment to defend themselves, and permission would even be granted for mass killing.⁴

Since we have now established that the establishment of the Halakhic is not against the rules, and that it may also be one of the signs of the approaching messianic era, and that it was truly miraculous, one must address how to relate to its being a sign. An appropriate response to a sign is to recite . In order to evaluate whether that would be fitting here, we must first know when is said, when it is not, and what the reasons behind its recitation are.

The states: “On 18 days in the year, the individual worshipper completes the ; these are the eight days of , the eight days of , the first day of , and on ; and in the Diaspora, is recited on 21 days.”⁶

This is repeated in , where it elaborates on the conditions that require the recitation of on the eight days of , the eight days of , the first day of , and on the Diaspora; and in the Diaspora, is recited on 21 days.

This is repeated in , where it elaborates on the conditions that require the recitation of on the eight days of , the eight days of , the first day of , and on the Diaspora; and in the Diaspora, is recited on 21 days.

This is repeated in , where it elaborates on the conditions that require the recitation of on the eight days of , the eight days of , the first day of , and on the Diaspora; and in the Diaspora, is recited on 21 days.

The asks: “Who originally recited ?” The final answer is that the ordinance that should recite at every important event, and upon being redeemed from misfortune. In such an instance of miraculous redemption from troubles, we are not merely permitted to recite ; rather, we have an obligation to do so. It can be argued that and mark two such occasions when Jewish communities have been delivered through

Why is the not recited on the last six days of ? Why, instead, do we recite merely an abridged version of ? How is different from ?

The addresses this issue. The explains what the key differences are between and . The major difference, it says, is that on , the same are brought every day, whereas on , different are brought each day. Since new are brought each day, a new is required each day to sanctify them. However, since is a day when an abridged version, we do recite on the last six days of .

If these days mentioned for the recitation of are fixed, then how could we possibly add any new dates? Would one not, by doing so, violate the prohibition against adding to the , known as?
The Halachic Ramifications of Ïω on Ïω

(ד"ר א. ר. דב) On this Rav Moshe Tzvi Neriah says that when reading through the dates mentioned in Ïω, the majority have nothing to do with any type of miracle. The explains that the nullification of Ïω mentioned by the refers only to those which had a connection to the Ïω, but not to those which do not. Therefore, he says, if a certain community would experience a miraculous deliverance, they would not only be entitled, but even obligated to establish Ïω, and to sing a song of Ïω for the purpose of commemorating it. This would not violate the prohibition of adding a holiday as specified in Ïω, nor would it violate the prohibition of adding Ïω to the Ïω, since the Rabbi told us that we should recite Ïω on every occasion on which we have been saved from imminent danger.

How often, though, can one recite Ïω before it becomes blasphemous? It says in Ïω that if one were to say the Ïω constantly, beyond the number of days that were deemed appropriate by the Rabbi, he would be transforming this sacred song into a simple song, which, if it became too common, would be considered blasphemous. Thus, one could object that by adding the days of Ïω as new days for saying Ïω, we may be violating this principle.

The explains that Ïω was instituted in order to recognize certain miracles for which we praise Ïω for His omnipotence and for His ability to change the course of nature. If one says Ïω constantly, then it appears as if he is scoffing, for he makes no differentiation between the natural and the supernatural, and by doing so, he is questioning Ïω’s ability to change the laws of nature. One is also taking the risk of becoming confused with when is the appropriate time to recite Ïω.

However, reciting Ïω on two additional days in the entire year can hardly be considered the same as someone who would say Ïω every day. Rather, this is an example of saying Ïω to commemorate the occasions upon which Ïω, in His might, saw fit to intervene in the natural flow of historical events, in order to bring a weaker and smaller army to victory over a much stronger and larger one.

In order to fully understand the conditions behind saying Ïω, we must also understand exactly why we do not say Ïω on such days as Ïω, Ïω, and the first days of Ïω, and the first days of Ïω, so too Ïω is distinguished by its ידוע! The in Ïω explains; unlike those days, Ïω is not con-
The Halachic Ramifications of וָיָּשָּׁלָם on וַיַּעֲמַתּוֹ מִלֵּל

sidered a מָעָרָד, therefore its status is not the same as theirs is, and we do not say מַעָרָד.

Why then, is וָיָּשָּׁלָם considered a מָעָרָד, which is called a מָעָרָד, and which is distinguished by its קְרִבָּתָה, not specified as a time for the recitation of מַעָרָד? The ספָח answers: on בְּשֵׁבוֹת, מָעָרָד, and there are prohibitions against labor. However, on וָיָּשָּׁלָם, there are no such prohibitions.

But why then, is מַעָרָד not recited on the מַעָרָד which is called a מָעָרָד, and which is distinguished by its מָעָרָד, not specified as a time for the recitation of מַעָרָד? The answer is: on מָעָרָד, מָעָרָד, and מָעָרָד, there are prohibitions against labor. However, on מַעָרָד, there are no such prohibitions.

But why then, is מַעָרָד not recited on מַעָרָד, which are distinguished by their מָעָרָד, and which are called מָעָרָד, and which do have prohibitions against labor? The answer is, "Is it appropriate that when the King of Judgment sits on His throne with the books of those destined to live and those destined to die open in front of Him, that מַעָרָד should sing songs? This is the reason we do not recite the מַעָרָד on מַעָרָד or מַעָרָד מַעָרָד.

If, to be able to say מַעָרָד, a מָעָרָד has to be 1) called a מָעָרָד; 2) distinguished by its מָעָרָד and 3) have a prohibition against labor, then why should we say מַעָרָד on מַעָרָד, which fulfills none of these conditions? The answer is that the מַעָרָד of מַעָרָד is recited solely to mark the miracle. What is the difference between מַעָרָד and מַעָרָד, in that we do not say מַעָרָד on מַעָרָד? The holiday of מַעָרָד was established for the same reason as מַעָרָד, to mark a מָעָרָד. Why then do we not celebrate it in the same manner?

There are three answers given to this question in מַעָרָד מַעָרָד. מַעָרָד answers, "Because מַעָרָד is recited for a miracle that occurred outside מַעָרָד. מַעָרָד says, "מַעָרָד can only be said when מַעָרָד are ruled by מַעָרָד. But when they are still ruled by מַעָרָד, מַעָרָד were still ruled by מַעָרָד. מַעָרָד answers, "The reading of the מַעָרָד takes the place of מַעָרָד.

How did the מַעָרָד determine that it should be a מָעָרָד to read the מַעָרָד answers in the name of מַעָרָד: "If for being delivered from slavery to freedom we chant a hymn of praise, should we not do so all the more for being delivered from death to life?" We therefore commemorate this tremendous מַעָרָד through the reading of the מַעָרָד. "But," the מַעָרָד then asks, "if that is the reason, then since we say מַעָרָד on מַעָרָד, surely we should say מַעָרָד on מַעָרָד!?" It then proceeds to answer this question with the three answers mentioned in מַעָרָד מַעָרָד.

How can the מַעָרָד possibly compare מַעָרָד to מַעָרָד? Were not the מַעָרָד involved in each event totally different? The מַעָרָד performed at the מַעָרָד were plainly the hand of God at work, since they transcended the normal laws of nature. But the מַעָרָד that caused מַעָרָד to be saved from מַעָרָד were not מַעָרָד מַעָרָד. Indeed, they were accomplished through the efforts of מַעָרָד מַעָרָד and מַעָרָד.

There is a very simple answer to this question. There are two types of
miracles. There is a a apparent, such as that of ḥolēl, which transcends the laws of nature. There is also a hidden, one that is accomplished by ‘s hand working through human agents to accomplish unusual feats. The story of ḥolēl is a prime example of a hidden, where the laws of nature remained constant, and yet we were able to overcome tremendous odds and emerge from this incident unscathed.

Obviously, according to the הָלֹל, as far as ḥolēl is concerned, there is no difference whether the being commemorated is a hidden or a hidden. If there was, the הָלֹל could never have made a connection between and פֶּרֶש. We see that there is no difference between a supernatural, miraculous event, and one that occurs through apparently natural means. Besides this, we see from this הָלֹל that were it not for the answers given, would indeed be recited on הָלֹל, based on the הָלֹל argument explained above.

Earlier, we said that according to the הָלֹל, should be recited whenever Jewish communities are delivered from imminent danger. According to the elaboration of the principle, should be recited not only at the time of the deliverance, but in the future, in commemoration of it. There are two types of danger. There is spiritual danger, such as כְּכַנֶּגֶד experienced in מִדְגָּלוֹן, and there is physical danger such as we experienced in Egypt as well as at the times of פֶּרֶש.

In the הָלֹל we recite,

Our sages explain that the slavery of which the הָלֹל is speaking was not merely a physical enslavement, but a spiritual one as well. They teach us that the deeper meaning of this passage is that had not redeemed us from slavery in Egypt when He had, we would never again have been able to redeemed. When כְּכַנֶּגֶד lived in Egypt, they slowly sank into the depths of impurity. This happened because after a while they had started worshipping the Egyptian gods, and behaving as the Egyptians did. The only thing that was left of their original faith was that they still gave their children Jewish names. However, we learn, that had they stayed in Egypt any longer, not even this would have been enough to redeem them.

As we have shown, there was a very real spiritual danger which כְּכַנֶּגֶד were subject to in מִדְגָּלוֹן. Upon their redemption, they were saved from this imminent danger and therefore recited הָלֹל. We therefore say הָלֹל in commemoration of this event. Furthermore, as we see in the הָלֹל argument explained above, all festivals are memorials of the Exoduses from Egypt. There-
fore, the recited on פסח, as well as the recited on פסח, is in commemoration of an event when we were delivered from imminent danger.

There is also the other type of deliverance from danger, which was experienced on והנה נאם and והנה נאם, as well as on והנה נאם.

On והנה נאם were delivered from physical danger; when men were chasing והנה נאם and והנה נאם and delivered them by drowning והנה נאם and his men in the והנה נאם. However, the hakham points out that the והנה נאם was not established as a permanent obligation. Although it was a deliverance from spiritual danger, it was also a case of deliverance “from death to life”. He realized that this point could create several inconsistencies which would make it difficult for the to use its reasoning of והנה נאם to explain the of reading the והנה נאם. He therefore confirmed that והנה נאם here meant והנה נאם, which was afterwards established by the prophets as a permanent obligation. The hakham, according to his understanding, then drew a והנה נאם from this and asked why we do not recite והנה נאם as well as read the והנה נאם, since the hakham of והנה נאם comes from the והנה נאם that is recited on the first day of והנה נאם. However, he answers that והנה נאם does not qualify for the recital of והנה נאם, based on the three answers brought down in והנה נאם.

, based on this והנה נאם, tells us a והנה נאם based on this והנה נאם, that if one does not have a והנה נאם to read from on והנה נאם, he may recite the והנה נאם in its place, but without a . However, if there is an entire והנה נאם that did not have a והנה נאם to read from, they may say והנה נאם with a . Therefore, we see that this is exactly like והנה נאם, except for the fact that we always say והנה נאם on והנה נאם with a , since it fulfills the three conditions from והנה נאם.

It would then appear that והנה נאם and והנה נאם are similar to והנה נאם, as they fulfill all three conditions: 1) they took place in והנה נאם, 2) we are independent from the rule of others, and 3) we have no והנה נאם to replace — therefore it makes sense that we should say והנה נאם itself.

An additional proof may be found in והנה נאם, where it says that one must recite a והנה נאם when coming to a place where a personal והנה נאם has occurred to him, even if it was not a והנה נאם. If so, the same should apply to saying והנה נאם, even with a .

There is, however, some dispute over whether or not we should say the והנה נאם. Rabbi Ovadiah Yosef rules that the והנה נאם should be recited without a והנה נאם, because since there were many people who died to secure these victories, it is not proper that we have complete joy, and therefore we should recite והנה נאם without a והנה נאם. However, this can be challenged by an examination of the והנה נאם of והנה נאם. On והנה נאם, we recite והנה נאם with a והנה נאם, even though many people died to secure the victory.

There are many modern-day והנה נאם who have addressed the question.
of reciting \( \text{מ"ד} \) on \( \text{מ"ד} \). Among them are Rabbi Meshulem Roth, former Chief Rabbi of Israel Rabbi I. Y. Unterman, and Rabbi Shaul Yisraeli. Rabbi Roth feels that the legitimacy of saying \( \text{מ"ד} \) on \( \text{מ"ד} \) can be easily and conclusively proven through the use of the mentioned above, that if, for an instance of “from slavery to freedom” one recites \( \text{מ"ד} \), how much more so, should one recite \( \text{מ"ד} \) for an instance of “from death to life”. He also refutes those who refuse to say \( \text{מ"ד} \) based on the contention that those who do transgress the prohibition of \( \text{מ"ד} \). He does this by quoting the who clearly states that the of lighting candles on \( \text{מ"ד} \) is not a problem with \( \text{מ"ד} \), since it was instituted in order to commemorate a miracle, which, as he says, even an individual is allowed to do, and certainly an entire community.

The uses the from the to prove conclusively that it is permissible for both an individual and for an entire community to establish a \( \text{מ"ד} \) for an instance of “from slavery to freedom” to commemorate a deliverance from danger. Rabbi Roth uses this as further proof that \( \text{מ"ד} \) is a perfect example of a case where a community established a \( \text{מ"ד} \) in order to commemorate their deliverance from danger.

Rabbi Roth then brings down a question from the , who asks: “Why do we light eight candles on \( \text{מ"ד} \), if the only lasted for seven days?”

The answers that the lighting of the first night commemorates the night that occurred on \( \text{מ"ד} \), the night of the . From this Rabbi Roth proves that the \( \text{מ"ד} \) is used to justify both the lighting of the first candle, and the recitation of \( \text{מ"ד} \) on \( \text{מ"ד} \).

Therefore, since the military victory of \( \text{מ"ד} \) is reason enough to light one candle and to say \( \text{מ"ד} \) on the first day, so too, the military victory should be adequate to justify saying \( \text{מ"ד} \) on \( \text{מ"ד} \).

Rabbi Unterman quotes a in where the refer to as being a \( \text{מ"ד} \). Rabbi Unterman therefore holds that since we have no \( \text{מ"ד} \) to read from on \( \text{מ"ד} \), it is important for us to publicize the miracle by reciting \( \text{מ"ד} \). He then proceeds to quote from by , who writes, “It is the will of the Almighty that we should publicize every miracle and praise the name of heaven in public.”

Rabbi Yisraeli holds that the \( \text{מ"ד} \) cannot be used as a justification for the lighting of the \( \text{מ"ד} \) since this requires, in his opinion, a stronger sense of authority than a \( \text{מ"ד} \). He therefore cites the who finds a \( \text{מ"ד} \), who writes, “Go tell
to cease grieving at not having brought an offering for the 

temple. In the future I shall bring about through his descendants another inaugura-
tion — one that will be entirely in their hands. Through the sacrifices I will
affect wondrous things for the Jewish people, leading to an inauguration that
will come to be known as the temple. On that occasion, they will
kindle the lights, which is a greater mitzva than offering sacrifices. For, while
sacrificial offerings are brought only when the Temple is standing, the
lights will be lit throughout all generations — even when there is no 

Rabbi Yisraeli also points out that in the verse משלו יד מופみました
where it says — “and they did not add”, it is talking about the
alone. It does not refer to

Since we have argued that the establishment of the State of Israel is
not against mitzva, and is also one of the signs of the ית
by reciting the mitzva on the days which commemorate these events, namely
and וינב מיתנה
This is especially true if the community is brought
“from death to live.” In 1948 and 1967, the Jewish communities in Israel
were in mortal danger, and our enemies wanted to drive us into the sea. A
further demonstration of the necessity to say is the remarkable fact that
has survived so long as a state with so many forces constantly
trying to destroy it. It is therefore proper for us to thank
for saving us and to recognize His hand’s presence by saying

See below for a more detailed discussion of these oaths and their ramifications
regarding the modern State of Israel.
It is significant to note that the תnivel in כנasma, who prophesied during the reign
of ירושלים, was the first one given, whereas this תenville in כנasma, which was prophesied
soon afterwards, during the reign of the next king of ירושלם, came later. The
reason that the תenville of מנה רidding on a donkey was given first, may be because
it is the one which is more likely to happen; that is to say, will probably
not reach a level of purity high enough to deserve the honor of a supernatural
deliverance.
Since they were meant to be kept as a single unit, a violation of any one effec-
tively nullifies the entire unit.
These three oaths are derived from the redundancy found in, all of which say

The events commemorated can especially be considered part of
The Halachic Ramifications of Pesah on Chanukah and Purim

The additional three days are the second days of Pesah observed outside of Israel, i.e. the second day of Pesah, the second day of Shemini Atzeret, and the second day of Hoshanah. The laws for the second days of Pesah are always the same as the laws for the first days. Since the Pesach was transcribed outside of Israel, its discussion of the laws of Chanukah also deal with the laws as they pertain to those living outside of Israel.

Even though we do say Chanukah on the second day, it is an abridged version, as we have said earlier, and the Chanukah in Jerusalem does not consider this Chanukah. In fact, it is a custom, which over time has become known as Chanukah. But this essay does not deal with that Chanukah. We are only speaking about the Chanukah, the full Chanukah.

As we have seen before, Chanukah is often referred to as a song. This is because of the wording in the Pesach from which we learn that we have an obligation to say "You shall have a song, as in the night when feast is hallowed; and gladness of heart, as when one goes with a flute to come into the mountain of the Lord."

There is a large volume of discussion on the subject of exactly which of the two events of Pesach—the event of the oil and the event of the military victory—we are commemorating with Chanukah. Some of these discussions will be mentioned further on in this essay.

This is referring to the miracle of Pesach.

This is a prime example of a stringency. Logic dictates that if a lenient case has a stringency, then the same stringency applies to a stricter case. Another way of putting it, is that the laws can be derived from less obvious situations and applied to more obvious ones.

Indeed, throughout the Passover, not once is the name mentioned. And yet, the sages teach us that whenever it says the word "darkness" in the Passover, it refers to the hand of God directing the course of events.

According to Rabbi Ahron Soloveitchik gives a very simple answer to this question. “The attainment of a great military victory is without significance if people do not use it as a starting point for building. If Israel had attained all its victories but had refrained from declaring its independence — as the U.S. State Department urged at the time — then I am afraid that all of the victories would have been futile.”

Some say, however, that only the first day may recite the Hallel for Chanukah, and the rest of the seven days should be recited with his name.

He holds that since there was sufficient oil for one day, there was only a day for the seven extra days on which it continued to burn.

There is a definite problem here. Pesach was the day on which Israel declared its independence. The military victories all came later. Rabbi Ahron Soloveitchik gives a very simple answer to this question. “The attainment of a great military victory is without significance if people do not use it as a starting point for building. If Israel had attained all its victories but had refrained from declaring its independence — as the U.S. State Department urged at the time — then I am afraid that all of the victories would have been futile.”

Rabbi Ahron Soloveitchik gives a very simple answer to this question. “The attainment of a great military victory is without significance if people do not use it as a starting point for building. If Israel had attained all its victories but had refrained from declaring its independence — as the U.S. State Department urged at the time — then I am afraid that all of the victories would have been futile.”

The way not to profane God’s name is to make a bracha with his name, and the way to make a bracha is through Pesach, and the way to make a bracha is through Chanukah and Purim.