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INTRODUCTION

In Parshat Eretz, Hashem told Moshe to propose that Bnei Yisrael become His memfinal ע סגולה. Moshe obeyed, and the Torah states, "ויענה כל הענשה לאברים את אלהים אשר זועם. והביא משה ויקרא зло לאזני הענשה והלאה אנא את פניה ויבא משה ויקרא зло" (ו:שם יט). The first approach only the זקני הענשה. The Chumash then relates the response of בני ישראל: "יחדו ויאמרו כל אשר" והענשה הלך אנא את דבר הענשה והלאה אנא את פניה (ח:שם יט). The סף seems puzzling and redundant. Once we are told "ויענה", why is it necessary to add "ויאמרו"? If כל יאמרו, why add the word "יחדו"?

Initially, when Moshe approached only the זקני הענשה, the people felt excluded. They took this to mean that the תורה was only for those who have special spiritual and intellectual characteristics. It was not for the common people. Their desire to be included encouraged them to speak up. They thought that their enthusiasm and unity would help them get a portion in תורה as well. The word "יחדו" shows that the Jews discussed among themselves whether or not to accept the תורה. After they unanimously determined they would do things together, the סף says, "יחדרו". They decided to do Moshe's will as a united group. The word "יחדה" demonstrates that the decision to accept תורה was made by כל יאמרו as a whole.

This year at MMY, we have, in a sense, chosen to reaccept the תורה upon ourselves. Like בני ישראל, we have uttered "נעשה ונשמע": we will do whatever is necessary in order to serve Hashem in the best way possible. Every student came to learn of her own volition, bringing excitement and enthusiasm to all of her learning. As the year progressed we watched the love of תורה exhibited by our זקני, our teachers, and we struggled to imitate them. Over the course of the year, we conversed among ourselves and turned to our teachers, asking them that they transmit תורה to us, both as individuals and as a group. Each article in this journal represents an individual's ז奪 on a specific topic. However, together, the articles signify a unanimous decision made by our entire מדרשה to join in the Jewish creative historical process of understanding and contributing to the מסורה of thousands of years.

Racheli Davies, Editor-in-Chief
Yonina Schnall, Editor
MMY, תשל"ט

(תהלים קיב:מ"ז המ אבליהם תורה כל היום היא שיתית).
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תנ”ך
Looking at תנ"ק, one might conclude that Judaism is a religion full of dominant male figures. It is the men who are the kings, priests, heroes, etc. The women, on the other hand, seem to take a secondary role. Playing the part of someone’s sister, daughter, or mother, they are kept behind closed doors, humbly following the paths of their male leaders.

However, this is a superficial view of תנ"ק. As one looks deeper into its pages, one discovers just how active the women were. The women of תנ"ק led their husbands, sometimes subtly sometimes less so, pushing them in the directions that would lead them to their destinies. For example, אביגיל and רבקה prove that the men in תנ"ק were often under the influence of women, even when those women were not independent and the men still dominated. Women stopped men from making fatal mistakes and they helped them gain security along their many journeys.

רבקה appears several times in the תנ"ק, her first appearance being when she drew water for her family at a well (בראשית כד:טו). Her actions made her seem the perfect wife for יצחק. The most dramatic event in which she took part was when she told יעקב to pose as אשים so he would receive the ברכה that was rightfully his. This is the last time רבקה appears in תנ"ק, while appearing in a few places in the תנ"ק, only plays a part in one scene. In ויקרא רבה כג:י, we learn that דוד stopped from taking revenge against her husband, מנת, who refused to pay דוד and his men for guarding him. דוד was so astounded by her actions that he, at the end of the פרק, took her as a wife.

אביגיל and רבקה both appear in the context of their families. Both were living in a negative environment, which, by contrast, made their goodness stand out. רבקה was a descendant of אברהם's family. However, אברהם's family was being strengthened spiritually, his brother’s family was sinking lower in every way. While אברהם's family grew increasingly great and powerful, the side of נחór, preoccupied with pettiness, sank into moral decay. רבקה, the daughter of בתואל and the sister of לב, is understood by ל"ר Romance as “the daughter of a scoundrel and the sister of a scoundrel” (ייקרא רבה כ). She grew up in a home that knew the meaning of cheating and hypocrisy. Instead of succumbing to this corrupt society, רבקה reacted to her environment and became the person that changed
the history of רבקה can be viewed as the “white sheep” in her family, standing alone for what she believed in. She continued this role later in her life. As the story of the ברכות indicates, there was a large communication gap between her and יצחק. Tricking יצחק and אשו was a sacrifice רבקה had to make in order to fulfill her role as a mother of Israel.

רבקה is introduced to us as the wife of נבל. While she is described as “טובת כל ויפת תאר, אביגיל was able to retain herシェל and stay in the correct path, even while under the influence of נבל’s home. Still, why was she married to him if he was so evil? One possible answer is that she was forced to marry him. Like רבקה, she had to remain as an isolated figure in her surroundings.

רבקה appears at different stages of her life, and she remained consistent throughout. She spoke and was active, rather than acted upon. אביגיל, who appears less regularly, also acted independently. Both women played vital roles in the lives of the men around them, ultimately saving them from fatal mistakes.

When רבקה was pregnant, she received a נבואה that predicted "ורב יעבד" (כג:בראשית כה) Therefore, she took matters into her own hands, stopping יצחק from giving the ברכה to אשו. רבקה saw something that the men did not. She understood that דוד would put his reign in jeopardy by reacting emotionally and spilling innocent blood (כג:בראשית). She related a prophecy that "הו י_die his enemies for him (כט). Both women acted boldly based upon their נבואה. רבקה risked the and ותם of her house stood on when she told יצחק to trick his father. As soon as אביגיל heard that דוד was coming, she immediately went out to meet him. The word "ותמהר" is repeated several times in this passage (מב, כג, יח). Both women are characterized by their courage and confidence. רבקה risked her home life and the loss of respect from her husband and children. אביגיל did not hesitate to run out and meet an army of angry men. Despite their humility, they were able to see the big picture at times when the men were unable to do so. This seems parallel to other women in "תנ" who took action based on a wide perspective.

Neither woman was overpowering or domineering. רבקה’s humility is reflected in the fact that she covered herself with a veil the first time she saw יצחק (בראשית ד:רמב"ם). She saw that he was special, and respected that uniqueness. She only reverted to tricking him when she saw that there was no other way to stop his mistake. אביגיל, too, did not overpower. We are told twice that she fell before דוד in humbleness: יותפל על עיניים (כג) meaning, "I will bow upon my face. This repetition emphasizes the way she willingly lowered herself for דוד’s sake. This could be seen as
אביגיל and רבקה.

A parallel to רבקה’s (בראשית כד) “ותפל מעל הגמל.” She too physically lowered herself out of respect for the man before her. Thus, אביגיל appeased דוד, lowering herself to beg for his forgiveness. Instead of trying to force him, she earned his admiration and he therefore chose to listen.

While רבקה bowed due to awe for צחקי, אביגיל did the same thing in order to appease דוד. She spoke to him, and begged for his forgiveness. She humbled herself, saying (בראשית כד) “בי אני אדני העו,” and referred to herself constantly as his maidservant. This calmed דוד and caused him to listen to her. She told him not to bother with נבל as he is a revolting person, unworthy to be part of דוד’s thoughts. Here, אביגיל was being cleverer than it seems. At this point, she was both appeasing דוד and rebuking him at the same time. Why was he occupying himself with such an insignificant and disgusting person? Further, her statement in פסוק כד, “בי אני אדני העו” might also be read as a rhetorical question – “does the sin lie with me?” Is it my fault? Do I and my innocent family deserve to die? In addition, by calling him “אדני she was reminding him that he was not yet מל, and therefore did not yet have the authority to wage war for the sake of revenge.

Despite these similarities, there are many differences in the paths they took to achieve their goals. רבקה had to revert to tricking her husband, much as אביגיל had to hide her actions from her husband (שמואל יט-יח:א כה). Yet, אביגיל also adopted a more direct and straightforward approach. She spoke to דוד directly, and she made sure to send him peace offerings beforehand.

When she realized that she had his attention, she revealed that she was sending a message from המל. In פסוק כו, she mentioned המל twice, and did so regularly throughout the rest of her argument. She described a religious reason not to attack נבל. She told him to only fight battles that are entirely for the sake of המל, but not for revenge or for personal reasons. דוד hinted that דוד was going to be king, and an ideal king would not fight wars like this one. This argument ultimately stopped דוד from making the mistake of attacking נבל. Aקרב can bring atonement for sin, but אביגיל stopped him from performing the sin to begin with. If דוד had spilled innocent blood, he would not have been able to build a בית נאמ (כח) for המל, which was his ultimate goal. In addition, as king how could he give advice and sit in judgment after performing such a rash and unjust action?

Aביגיל ended her speech by blessing that המל should kill his enemies so that he will be able to become a leader over Israel without
“shedding innocent blood (לא-ל). This blessing came true in the פסוק לט ה""ויג את נבל וימת לזכור נבל הוים. He died because of his wife’s actions (לז). When דוד found out about the death, he blessed אביגיל and realized the truth of her words, which prompted him to offer marriage to her (לט). Just like רבקה, אביגיל remained consistently humble. She bowed before דוד again and proclaimed herself unworthy (מא). Despite the major roles these women played, they constantly remembered that it is all from otro and He is the One to thank for helping their plans succeed.

Another contrast between the two women is the way they used their physical gifts. רבקה from the very beginning modestly hid behind her veil. Throughout her attempt to arrange that יעקב receive the ברכה, she remained behind the scenes, pushing and prodding those around her. She did not let her part in the plan be obvious. She let יעקב appear to be working alone, so that איש would not take revenge against her. אביגיל, however, played a somewhat different role. We are told that the four most beautiful women in מצלה (שרה, רחב, אסתר, and אביגיל) were ספירות, אשתו, רצבה. Instead of hiding herself, אביגיל used her beauty in a positive way. She arranged to meet דוד face to face, hoping, perhaps, that her beauty would help convince him to stop the battle.

With all the similarities and differences between רבקה and אביגיל, they both succeeded in leading the men in their lives to higher achievements. יעקב was the right son to receive the ברכה, and דוד’s future dynasty was saved through אביגיל’s actions. יעקב not only saved from receiving the wrong ברכה, but she perhaps saved the entire nation of בני ישראל from going on the wrong path under the influence of איש. Similarly, אביגיל saved her family, דוד’s lineage, and indirectly the history of בני ישראל. With their dual roles as mothers of their families and protectors of בני ישראל, they acted not only for reasons personally important to them, but were constantly looking after and protecting the path of all of בני ישראל.
A Reading of מגילה אסתר

Dali Balaban

The Ramban once stated in order to explain how so many differing explanations of the "שביעי פניס לחרותך" coexist that open to interpretation, so that many lessons could be extrapolated and learned from each event. Since the "שביעי פניס לחרותך" once came into existence, its stories have been studied and analyzed by experts and novices alike. מגילה אסתר is a classic work telling the story of the salvation of the Jewish nation. A superficial reading of the מגילה would point to coincidence as the cause of the events. However, we are better off exploring the different themes and characters using psychological and political considerations, which will reveal the story in a new light. The story is perfect – each personality had his or her specific role based on traits and tendencies – and through them God was able to execute His will while keeping Himself hidden.

אחשורוש is the first character to appear in the מגילה. His essence is portrayed in the way he is described when he is first introduced. This introduction discusses אחשורוש's reign, and then proceeded to illustrate his ostentation by describing the lavish parties he threw in the third year of his reign. Through the introduction it becomes apparent that אחשורוש is characterized by his major weakness: his paranoia. Throughout the מגילה, this was the driving force behind his actions. Perhaps the basis for this paranoia was "דלא הוה חзи למלכותא" (מגילה יא ע). He simply was not fit to be a king, especially not of such a vast empire, which he had conquered by his sword (מלבים על א. ה:מלבי). In order to ensure that everyone would recognize his power, אחשורוש threw two magnificent parties. The purpose of the first, which lasted 180 days, was to display his riches to all the officers and servants of his immense kingdom, in order to impress upon them the image that all the wealth in the world belonged to him. The second event lasted only seven days, and all the citizens of שוש, the capital, were invited. Only then were the noblemen invited, for in the eyes of אחשורוש every citizen was equal, that is a servant to the king. As מלביש says "יודו התבסס מי בחרית, המشبיח השמש על משהים עשת משמית לכל על משהים, להותיר ככזז וודו יהודא אצלו." (מלבים א. ח) ככזז עבדי.
Being insecure, אחשורוש exercised his power in order to minimize that of others. This is why he put limitations on the grandeur of אסתר’s party, which took place during his seven day party. He wanted to show his subjects that she was only queen by his grace. According to מלבים, he limited her party "באהמר משוריון שניהם א炣 יות מלכות המשימה, קי יות יתלא שוה אסתר (מלבים אשתו המלכה).

At the party, אחשורוש attempted to display his supremacy as he commanded אסתר to appear before all of his guests. He wanted to show off her beauty in order to prove that he married her for her magnificence, not for her power (as she was the daughter of בלשצר). As מלבים explains, he told her not to wear the crown until she appeared before him, thus proving that she only wore the crown due to him, and not due to her lineage (מלבים אстер רל פנין הפך). Aware that the foundation of the commandment was completely false, אסתר refused to appear. Instead, she publicly refuted his claim and replied, “You stable boy of my father! My father could drink as much as a thousand men could guzzle and not get intoxicated, whereas you get drunk after just a little wine!” (בגילה יב ע"ת). Enraged, אחשורוש called in his advisors to decide the fate of his rebellious wife. אסתר needed to be dealt with, for through her refusal to appear and her reaction to his summons, she became a serious threat to his power. Not only did she endanger אחשורוש’s position by publicizing that he was not the heir to the throne, but she also defied her important husband over trivial matters, an act which would surely lead women throughout the kingdom to defy their less important husbands over much more significant matters. For that reason a royal edict declared, "אстер לאーバו ווחי לן מלך אחשורוש מלכותה ית חמלק (אסתר אשתו, לירוגה הח.JPanel Hàng"). Following the rebellious episode אחשורוש was faced with a new problem: he needed a new wife who would not threaten his reign as אסתר had. As he had tried to prove with אסתר at the feast, he would need to marry someone purely for her attributes, and not for any external factors that could seem beneficial to him in the eyes of others. יד א"ת י_fence על אשתו מון אחשורוש מלח, יוכמל ב:אחשורוש ושתיה מ eaxתו, יוכמל ב:אחשורוש ושתיה מeahתו, יוכמל ב:אחשורוש ושתיה מeahתו. More importantly, she would need to be completely submissive to his laws and rules. Thus, אסתר was chosen as the perfect queen. From when she was first introduced until after she became queen, she was completely passive. The פסוקים describe primarily what was done to her. Never did she do anything on her own. The first information written about her is that she was raised by מרדכי, her cousin. Then she was brought to אחשורוש’s palace, where she took only what was given to her. Finally, she was chosen as queen. This trait of passivity
made her a perfect candidate for the throne. In addition to her submissiveness she was the one of the world’s four most beautiful women (אשağıת ואップי), a quality that could serve as sure proof that אחשורוש married her for her beauty alone. For these reasons she immediately found favor in אחשורוש’s eyes and was made his queen.

Not long after אחשורוש was crowned, the worst of אחשורוש’s fears was confirmed – conspiracies were being plotted against him and revolt was imminent. גַּמַּה and תשיט were revealed as traitors plotting against their king, and were immediately put to death. This event only increased אחשורוש’s already overblown paranoia. He now had proof that his crown was not sitting securely on his head. It was more like a trophy waiting to be won by someone else. In response to this episode, security was stepped up within the palace gates. אחשורוש promoted מרדכי, and used him to implement loyalty tests in order to prevent any further danger to himself. As Rav Soloveitchek explains, no sane monarch would tolerate a brute like מרדכי. Only a sick, terrified king desperately needs such imaginary protection.¹

מרדכי had his own plans. The first time he is explicitly written about is at his promotion. First, the פָּסְקָיו establish his lineage. He was a descendent of עמלק 카ָפָל אֶלֶך, whom שאול had wrongly left alive after being commanded to destroy the entire nation (ט:שמואל א טו). Next comes a description of how he established his own power. All the servants of the king within the king’s court were expected to bow to him as commanded by the king. Everything was going well until one lone man, מרדכי, refused to comply, for his religion did not permit him to do so. Instead of reporting the one rebel to the king, מרדכי decided to use his newfound power to put a final end to his historical vendetta with the מַרְדָּכָי. As long as he was able to control אחשורוש, מרדכי could become a most powerful man, and finally rid himself and his nation of their greatest enemy. His reaction perfectly defines his egocentricity. Because he thought so highly of himself, מרדכי’s refusal angered him so much that he was driven to extend punishment to מרדכי’s entire nation.

מרדכי understood אחשורוש’s weakness, his fear for his throne, and used it to his benefit. מרדכי needed אחשורוש to reinforce his plans, and the only way to succeed was through deceit. He presented his allegation to

A Reading of

the king: "Every nation of the land and all its inhabitants lived in fear of you. They were a unique people, dispersed among the nations, and their ways were different from the rest in the kingdom. There was nothing inherently worrying about any of your accusations. Persia was a gigantic empire made up of all different peoples, but expertly presented things in a way that would increase Ahasuerus’s fear, while hiding two details that would have prevented Ahasuerus from approving of his request. He explained that if these unusual people would choose to rebel they would do so with unity, and because they were dispersed, they could spread their rebellion throughout the empire and utterly destroy the king’s sovereignty. According to Mordecai, he did not mention that these people were the Jews, well known for being wise and intelligent. He also did not mention that he planned to murder all of them, for that would have jeopardized the possibility of his success. "Ahasuerus was not informed of the identity of this man, one who did not inform him of his identity and his wisdom, who were famous among the Jews, he did not hear of his counsel...but in his calculation, only the first two things, Ahasuerus’s strategy was so clever that Ahasuerus gave his consent immediately, without giving the situation any thought or asking any questions.

According to Maimon, he quickly put his plan into action. He sent letters to all states of the kingdom to inform the ministers that the Jews were to be destroyed on the 13th of Adar. Mordecai, being in the king’s court, quickly heard what happened and started mourning. According to the Midrash, he understood that saving the Jews was Esther’s mission. Mordecai quickly went to notify her of the sad news. Through Esther’s servant, the queen told all about the decree to annihilate the Jews, and explained that the nation could only survive if she went to Ahasuerus to beg him on their behalf. Esther’s response marked the first time she acted pro-actively rather than passively: "Tell him, and let him do as he wishes. The Midrash (注重ד) was about to embrace her active role as heroine of the story. She informed that she could not go before Ahasuerus because it would probably cost her her life. This was not an acceptable reply. Mordecai knew that Esther would ultimately be the savior of the Jews, so it was imperative that she act soon. So he returned to her, saying: "I return to you in a time of your grief. The queen expanded her statement: "I return to you in a time of your grief. The queen expanded her statement: "I return to you in a time of your grief. She agreed to go, but not without a plan of..."

2Ibid.
action. She requested that the nation gather, fast, and pray for her success, and their survival.

On the third day, she finally approached אחשורוש. She found favor in his eyes, and he allowed her to come before him. This action made אחשורוש suspicious because it was out of character for אסתר to approach him. She was usually so passive, acting only in response to others. אסתר’s action was part of her strategy. Just like møn, she knew אחשורוש and his personality. She understood that she could not simply plead for her nation, as møn had suggested. The only way to end møn’s decree would be to control אחשורוש more effectively than møn, by feeding אחשורוש’s paranoia. Thus, in response to אחשורosh’s questioning (אסתר ה:ד), she made a modest request for the king and møn to join her for a banquet. אחשורוש agreed, but did not understand why she wanted to meet with him and møn. He started to question møn. Was something occurring between אסתר and møn that he didn’t know about? Did אסתר have a confession to make?

Once at the banquet, more anxious than before, אחשורוש again demanded to know what was on אסתר’s mind. Yet again, אסתר requested that אחשורוש and møn attend another banquet the following day. This was a brilliant move on her part, for the two would have the entire night to think and agonize about the nature of her request. Her plan worked like a charm. אסתר had been clever as she stayed true to her passive character. She allowed each man to come to his own conclusions instead of outwardly accusing møn, a move that ultimately led her to success.

אסתר’s request affected møn’s mind. Not only had he succeeded in gaining influence over אחשורוש, but he was also being summoned by the queen for a second time. What greater honor was there than to be grouped with the king and queen? אסתר obviously held him in very high esteem, and was about to bestow greatness upon him. Nothing could make him happier; his life was going as planned. Due to his haughtiness, however, he let down his guard. He allowed his imagination to get the best of him. He could already taste his success, and could not imagine anything that could possibly foil his plans. møn’s overconfidence caused his downfall.

His self-confidence pushed him to react wrongly to the sight of מרדכי disobeying him. Had he been in a rational frame of mind, this sight would not have bothered him. Instead, it sparked intense anger within him. "לא קא่อน את מרדכי בשער המל (אסתר ה:ק), He ran home to tell his family about his great fortunes. He was so irrational that he decided, "כל זה איננוشمل ממון מרדכי הHugh, is about to bestow greatness upon מרדכי. He
needed to kill Mordecai at once, instead of waiting until the fateful day, the 13th of Adar. He would hang him the following day on a giant gallows, just in time to make it to Esther’s banquet. He realized that he would never be able to maintain Ahasuerus’s trust and retain his power if he hanged Mordecai without permission. Thus, in the middle of the night, he ran to the palace to speak to the king.

Ahasuerus was unable to sleep (אחורוש 2:אסתר ו), because he was feeling apprehensive about Mordecai even since Esther came to speak to him. After the first banquet with Mordecai, and the request for another banquet the next day, the king was convinced that something bad was going on. Esther had been deceiving him all along, and was only pretending to be loyal. Was Mordecai trying to usurp the throne?!

Trying to allay his fears, Ahasuerus asked for his history books to be brought to him, hoping that the truth would be contained in their depths. Inside he found the story of how Mordecai had saved him from Haman and his conspiracy. Perhaps he had been deceiving him all along, and was only pretending to be loyal. Was Mordecai trying to usurp the throne?!

Tryingly, none other than Mordecai was there, coming to ask Ahasuerus if he could hang Mordecai’s suspicions kept growing. Why was Mordecai lingering in the courtyard in the dead of night? Still hoping he was wrong, Ahasuerus had brought in and asked him (אסתר ו:hammer ו:אסתר ו). When he heard this he was delighted. Not only did Ahasuerus agree to see him at night, but he sought him out in order to reward him! Getting carried away he answered that the man should be dressed as the king and paraded through the city on the king’s horse. Upon hearing this reply Ahasuerus hurried to get Mordecai out of his palace, for he no longer trusted him enough to keep him around. Mordecai hadn’t rewarded Esther from his conspirators, which may mean that he, too, was part of the conspiracy. In addition to that, Mordecai’s suggestion indicated that he had his sights set on the crown.

This set the stage for Esther to accuse Mordecai of high treason. She had planted ideas in the heads of Mordecai and Ahasuerus and they managed to play everything out themselves. All she had to do was put herself in the picture and the battle would surely be won. The second banquet arrived

\[\text{Ibid.}\]
and both אחשורוש and המ were present, in much lower spirits than they had been the previous day. His esteem had been degraded by having to honor his enemy, and אחשורוש was preoccupied with worry over his throne. When אחשורוש again asked what she wanted, it was finally time for her to confess everything she had been hiding. Just as המ had done, she told her story to אחשורוש in a way that would cause him to take her side.

"כי נמכרנו אני ועמי להשמ ולש就来看看 נמכרנו החרשים כי אי יד להרוג ולאבד ואני לעבדי/memm final ויהי כן ומלך (אסתר ז:2) הצר שוה בנזק המלך (ד:אסתר ז).

אחשורוש, already suspicious, became increasingly worried, for his life was not the only one at stake, his queen was also in danger. So it was that when אחשורוש finally accused המ, the king was furious, for she finally confirmed that he was being controlled by a traitor. Roles immediately reversed, so אחשורוש stormed out to contemplate the situation.

So it came to be that המ gained control, without actually having exercised any power. המ came to אחשורוש and begged her for help, pleading with her to save his life. אחשורוש returned to find המ on אסתר's bed and accused המ of trying to seduce the queen now had proof of המ's intent, for he was acting just as אבשלום had acted when rebelling against דוד. המ demonstrated his rebellion by sleeping with דוד's concubine (שמות ב טז). Thoroughly convinced that המ had been tricking him the entire time, אחשורוש had him hung on the gallows that was prepared for מרדכי. Esther succeeded in saving the Jews from their imminent destruction, and as a reward for opening המ's eyes, he now put all his trust in her and מרדכי (ב:אסתר ח). Order was restored to the kingdom, and the Jews were once again spared from their enemies.

God was really in control of these events. The setting and characters of the מגילה were vital to the accomplishment of המ רצו. The personalities of the characters fit together perfectly so that one was able to pick up where the others left off, leading to the climax of the מגילה, the triumph of the Jews. Without proper investigation, this story would seem like a completely natural event. The true intent could only be revealed through exegesis and devotion. The story took place at the beginning of the long period of המastery. It would be easy to lose sight of Who was really in charge, because the story makes so much sense on the surface. Only through deep analysis of the personalities of the characters and the setting in which they lived can the truth be uncovered.

19
The Internal Struggle

These commandments demanded of both to go against the יצר, the force from within. In the story of עד ג, the חוה represents the יצר הרע. It enticed her to eat from the tree, causing her to violate 'ציווי ה אברעך. אברעך, on the other hand, had a two-fold יצר from within. First he was commanded to give up his only hope for his future, "כי בי צח קי קר אלי" (יב:כא). In addition, אברעך had successfully preached monotheism and the principles of morality, including the particularly serious prohibition against killing. אברעך was commanded to violate the most basic law of morality.

The Call

There is a fundamental difference between the response of אברעך and that of חוה to God’s second statement to each of them. When the
called to while he was bound on the

and

responded, "I am ready to do whatever God demanded."

In contrast, when "I called upon in order to challenge him about eating the fruit, " heard, but unfortunately did not listen.

The Actions

A close analysis of the two stories reveals that the same verbs are used to show the directions chosen by each character. In both stories, characters saw:

""/

"/

"/

In both stories, characters took:

"/

"/

The climax arrives in of both stories, where the results of each action are described, both times using the term "/

When character saw the tree, she discovered that,

When character prepared for the sacrifice on the mountain,

In both cases, the eyes foreshadow the action. The snake explained that after eating from the tree, " While was punished " while was rewarded "

In both cases rounding around and listening, and the reward and punishment were a direct result of listening or not listening. As was punished, " while was rewarded, "

In fact, that is not what happened. After eating, " In contrast, when approached the mountain,
The snake enticedحوّلة.Adam to eat from the tree claiming that she could become more like God. When he used her eyes to sin, the consequence was that her eyes could no longer see the potential sanctity in the profane.

In contrast, אבר midterm used his eyes to perform the מצוה which ‘ה had commanded. Not only did he see the המקו, the place where he was commanded to fulfill his task, but he also saw, God Himself, and the importance of carrying out the commandment. Instead of seeing his son as הקרב, he now had the merit of seeing the איל which he would sacrifice instead of his son. Through this vision, made the חול into something קדוש.

The nature of ידיעת ה is also presented differently in both stories. According to the snake, the reason for the prohibition of eating from the tree is that God knows that when she eats from it she will gain knowledge like His. This preposterous statement implies that man has the possibility of acquiring the same knowledge as God! The snake’s delineation of ידיעת ה is clearly a false misconception!

In contrast, the מלא who came to אבר midterm told him that he must not sacrifice his son because ירא כי ידעתי עתה את אלהי (ב:כב). אבר midterm had successfully passed the test and the angel’s delineation of ידיעת ה is clearly a proof that God approved of אבר midterm’s actions.

Summary

When God tests us, we are in a position to choose our path. Although man is faced with internal conflicts and external temptations it
is his responsibility to choose God’s way. If he does, he will be able to use his senses for the right things, focus his actions towards the proper goals, and ultimately reap the benefits for doing so. Abrahim and his wife clearly did not withstand temptation, did not keep the commandment of God, and were therefore doomed to be cursed and to be exiled from Paradise. The parallels between the two stories emphasize the contrast between the path chosen by Abrahim, a path that one can and should take, and that of his wife and himself. Perhaps the Bible is suggesting that the sin of Abrahim and his wife was the sin of Adam and Eve. If we chose to ignore God’s command we must realize that "The fruit of the tree in the Garden of Eden" (ב:ג). Choosing this path will result in blocking our access to "The fruit of the tree in the Garden of Eden," the ultimate good. Choosing this path will result in blocking our access to "Heaven, The ultimate good." Following God’s path, no matter how difficult, will allow us to rise to the level of a "Goy great and mighty" in both a literal and spiritual sense. "Hebrews" (in both a literal and spiritual sense) will allow us to rise to the level of a "Goy great and mighty. The choice is in our hands!"
By virtue of being a translation, of course, a commentary. Examining the subtleties in his translation can teach us a great deal about how he understands . This paper will use the story of , found in , as an example. When the people complained to and had no water to drink. " and commanded them to speak to the rock which would produce water. But chastised , explaining that he had not sanctified His name in this incident of .

translates , the place in where were encamped, as . lists as one of the cities in . It seems unlikely that this is what is referring to, as had not yet reached the of . However, in its discussion of the possible explains that , and concludes that refers to the rock and the water. However, it seems that is referring to Petra in southern Jordan.

In this the first two exceptions. However, there are . Also, translates as a "gathering" or "assembly." translates as , which means a "gathering" or "congregation." Based on these translations, there does not seem to be a great difference between the two terms. For example, translates the same way that he translates that of .

Notice that the term is used in both places in reference to , and his reaction to . Perhaps by referring to , and , were indicating that they were not viewing them as a typical congregation of people, for whom would have been a better term. Perhaps were complaining that and were not treating them properly. This could explain the 's account of their

1. .
2. Translations from Aramaic are based on Jastrow’s dictionary.
complaint. They did not mention the water until the end."

"זאול היה ethics in משכ על את האור. ויבר לע יכמש את האור לבר ולע נכנ עון זאול חכダウン המלה הבאה.

Another point of note is the two different ways that אונקלוס translates the words "בא" and "לבי" as either "אתא" or "על".  "ע" in 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>לע</th>
<th>אתא</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) הלמה הבאה את קהל ידיד ואל</td>
<td>הלמה הבאה את קהל ידיד ואל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) הלמה אושחת ואל</td>
<td>הלמה אושחת ואל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) הלמה אושחת ואל</td>
<td>הלמה אושחת ואל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) הלמה אושחת ואל</td>
<td>הלמה אושחת ואל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) הלמה אושחת ואל</td>
<td>הלמה אושחת ואל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) הלמה אושחת ואל</td>
<td>הלמה אושחת ואל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) הלמה אושחת ואל</td>
<td>הלמה אושחת ואל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h) הלמה אושחת ואל</td>
<td>הלמה אושחת ואל</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the weekly publication שה部委י on לשכת שבת for פרשת נשא of ד"תשס, הר"ה הרב ד.פ. רפאל בנימי explains the distinction between the two different translations.

This translation explains פסוק א, where宝石 ביהי arrived in the desert. Similarly is understandable. However, two questions arise: 1) Can the definitions of לע for פסוק ב be applied to the causative לע as well? 2) What can we learn from the discrepancy between the_versions of פסוק כ in the Bar-Ilan Responsa Project versus that of the מקראות גדולות?

According to the פרש של בר אילן, which translates פסוק ד as יבי, it seems that "בא" means "arrived" in the sense of "גיעה" as well. Therefore, the word "לבי" in
reference to “ישראל” in the response is a reminder that they have not yet entered their promised land.

According to the הגרסא in the מקראותגדולות, we should read פסוק ד differently. The people’s question is, “Why have we been taken to enter this desert in the first place?” This could be repeating a regular theme in ז’Brien Israel complaints, i.e. the ever-present resentment about having been taken out of מצרי, and a stated desire to return.

Finally, a translation that could be easily overlooked is that of “/nunfinal יע” in פסוק יב, in which הtold משה and אהרו their punishment. This implies that משה is translated as an “exchange.” This applies to not only a punishment, but an exchange for their sin, following the pattern of מידה כנגד מידה.

Another example will support this explanation of אונקלוס’ translation of “/nunfinal יע”. In כ:במדבר יא, they complained about the מ and they were punished. This is why מ is more severe than מ in the same מ, which provides a fascinating translation. In this example, we see a direct correlation between their sin of / לא.setMessage and their punishment of /tsadifinal י and the reason why they were forbidden from taking בני ישראל into ישראל is the location in which בני ישראל are capable of becoming אור לגויי. Perhaps this is why מ did not see fit for משה and אהרו to be leaders there. If they failed to sanctify God’s name in the presence of only בני ישראל, they might not be able to take on the responsibility of sanctifying His name in ארץ ישראלי before the קדמוהי of the world?

One should read אונקלוס’ translation carefully. He is not merely providing help for native readers of Aramaic. He is a brilliant commentator, and we need to beמדיק in each and every word he uses. In this example, his commentary helps us explain where events took place, how משה and אהרו related to בני ישראל, and how an_bnish could short the leadership of משה and אהרו.
The section of the Torah describing חטא העגל has been talked about by all the Rishonim. It was such a drastic event that its impact is still felt today. Usually we analyze this tragic failing in reference to its effect on our people. However, I would like to look at the חטא from a different perspective, analyzing its effects on רבי משה.

Immediately following the description of the sin, 'ה commanded Moshe, "Go, descend from your position of greatness. I only granted your leadership for the sake of Yisrael. And now, after Yisrael sinned, what need have I for you?"

According to this מראג, 'ה sentenced Moshe to a demotion. בנים ישראל had sinned and thus Moshe leadership was no longer necessary. Until now, Moshe had been functioning as a messenger for 'ה. Now, with Moshe himself sinned, the mission had been aborted.

Yet, there are other places where 'ה employs the terminology of "רד" (ב:שמות יט, for example). What makes this "רד" different than the other ones, and propels אלעזר ר to see beyond the literal meaning of the text? What makes this descent more than just a physical one?

Textually, I think the answer lies in what appears after the command to descend. In the other places, the command is followed by a command to do something. For example, in the case of ב:שמות יט, Moshe was commanded to prevent the people from going up to הר סיני. Here, however, the motive for Moshe's descent is merely "כי שחת עמי". No plan of action or command follows. This descent seems more final, the result of the plan to obliterate the Jewish People. אלעזר ר sensed this, and he therefore offered his more deep explanation.

1 Translation, as well as much of the substance of this essay, are taken from R. Joseph B. Soloveitchik, “Go Descend: The Test of Moses’ Leadership,” in Derashot HaRav, Ed. Arnold Lustiger, Ohr Publishing, 2003
The Metamorphosis

משה: The Metamorphosis
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אלעזר ר.

continues in the

גמרא

picking up on yet another phrase.

“מיד שאמר. תשש כחו של משה ולא היה לו כח לדבר

נunftal /', וכיו memfinal / ממני ואשמיד pefinal / ט), 'הר memfinal / יד:דברי memfinal /. דבר זה תלוי בי: אמר משה memfinal / "מיד עמד ונתחזק בתפלה ובקש רחמי ."

Immediately Moshe’s strength ebbed and he lacked the strength to speak. However, as soon as [G-d] said, 'Leave Me be and I will destroy them,' Moshe said [to himself]: This matter depends on me! He immediately arose, strengthened himself in prayer, and pleaded for mercy.”

The words

"הר memfinal / that the

גמרא

quotes are comparable to the

words "הניחה לי memfinal / that

'ה memfinal / uses in our

פסוקי memfinal /.

This matter depends on me! He immediately arose, strengthened himself in prayer, and pleaded for mercy.”

The words

"הר memfinal / that

'ה memfinal / uses in our

ינוסי memfinal /.

This matter depends on me! He immediately arose, strengthened himself in prayer, and pleaded for mercy.”

The Rav identifies a linguistic switch in 'ה’s words to Moshe. The speech begins with

"דברים memfinal /, a term that generally connotes a harsh tone (ג:י שמות יט"רש).

God’s words continue with

"ויאמר memfinal /, a softer more delicate

tone used in reference to the words

"הניחה לי memfinal /.

'ה was angry at בני ישראל.

Although 'ה expressed to Moshe His desire to wipe out His people, there was mercy hidden behind the anger. By changing tones, 'ה hinted to Moshe that he should see beyond the surface of 'ה’s anger. 'ה hinted that if Moshe would act perhaps the Jewish People could still be saved.

This idea answers another of Rav Soloveitchik’s questions. What did 'ה want from Moshe? If 'ה wanted to save the Jewish People, He could have said so. If, however, 'ה wanted them destroyed, where did Moshe find the brazenness to confront God?

It seems that there was more to rectifying גל העחטא than just the people’s response. The leader needed to react, as well. If 'ה’s goal was to save בני ישראל, the most effective way would have been to tell Moshe to assemble the people, lead them in repentance, divvy out the punishments, etc. By merely hinting, 'ה meant not only to save the people, but to help to bring the leader to a higher level. The Rav points out that 'ה demoted Moshe before hinting that he should take control of the situation. Moshe was being tested to see whether or not he would take the lead. Would he sense his obligation, his awaiting role? Would Moshe take on the task not only of a God-appointed leader, but a self-appointed leader as well? Until now Moshe had been the one whom 'ה had sought out. From the beginning, Moshe did not want the leadership role (שמות ז-כ). Moshe is even referred to as as عدد המה) "עבד ה memfinal /, one whose essence was to accept God’s commands. By first demoting Moshe, God gave Moshe a chance
to seek, to take initiative, to acquire something for himself, to actively take himself to the next level. This does not, of course, mean that משו should generally have acted without 'ה's authority. Rather, 'ה's hint gave משו an extra push to take his own initiative.

The Rav continues, explaining that all growth requires sacrifice. משו, in this case, sacrificed the possibility that 'ה would make a nation out of him alone. משו lost this chance, but he committed himself even further to בני ישראל. Perhaps 'ה hinted at this need to sacrifice his own advancement for the sake of the people, when He referred to as מוש לעולמלɟרמר. The Rav points out that we refer to the as מוש, because משו acquired the when he fashioned the second set of לוחות. Perhaps, the term מוש, similarly, hints that משו had acquired the nation through the sacrifice that he had made. משו achieved a new level of greatness in his relationship to בני ישראל. The explain that upon hearing God's command to descend, מיו יורד. Not only did he descend, but he descended transformed.

The word מוש may refer to another way in which משו was transformed. As מוש descended the mountain, with the Divine לוחות in his hands, משו became as close as possible to following the Ways of God. Reacting just as מיו did, מוש (compared לborn to שות לבי; מוש שותלבי) followed the precept of imitating מיו.

It might seem that by demolishing the first לוחות, משו was also smashing the intimate and direct connection that the people had been waiting to experience with the Almighty. Yet for the sake of the higher goal, and the people achieved a higher status. משו came as close to The Author Himself as possible. Indeed, משו was commended by 'ה for breaking the לוחות, (ד"ב מובא ברש"ש, 'ה קשת טב). The word מוש was on the mountain with the second לוחות, the לוחות specifically mentions that משו did not eat or drink. This only accentuates the almost incorporeal state that משו achieved after the incident of the עגל. The glow that משו acquired after these experiences mimics that of God's infinitely intense light which is masked in this world.

The ultimate level that משו achieved is that of mystique, of mystery. The need to hide is the essence of קדושה, 'הקל הגדול הגבר והנורא.

2 Also see the בית הלוי, which argues that בני ישראל achieved a higher status through the second לוחות.
also remains hidden, more hidden than anything else. Through the thick, dense night, He conceals Himself, creating a mystique and a gap that lures us ever closer, tempting us to meet Him there, in the mystery, in His privacy. It is the "קול דממה דקה" that can be heard ever so slightly, and that we must sensitize ourselves to notice. It is constantly everywhere, all around us, in every atom of creation, and inside our very selves, whispering His secrets to us. When מִשְׁה glowed, illuminated by Divine light, this required him to retreat into privacy with God. מִשְׁה became as Godly as possible, for it is then that he became like Him. "וְכִלּוּ ה' אֶל מִשְׁה" (שמות ל:ב) מִיָּם אֵל פְּנֵי ה' אֶל כְּלָל הָאָדָם (שמות ל:ח) (mem final) מִיָּם אֵל פְּנֵי ה' אֶל כְּלָל הָאָדָם. (mem final)
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memfinal  מוכיחות ששני התהליכים
memfinal  הלפסח ופרשת ימי המלואי
nunfinal  פרשת קרב
memfinal  דומה, דומי
memfinal  שמטרת "והיא , משוו
memfinal  לקדש אות
memfinal  למה מקריבי
memfinal  קשורי
memfinal  שני התהליכים
memfinal  בי
memfinal  הפר , ההבדלי
memfinal  ואילי
memfinal  לעומת ( בימי המלואי
nunfinal  הפסח)שה
memfinal  ישראל, ולמקריב ( בקרב
memfinal  ובניו לעומת כל ע
memfinal  יש התייחסות . אהר
memfinal обытиי
memfinal  ללבוש כתנות, המסוימת להכנת ה�גד
memfinal  צריכי
memfinal  הכהני,
memfinal  'אפודי
memfinal  ולקראת הקרבת קרב
memfinal  צריכות להיות חגורות, הפסח,
memfinal  והמקלות מוכני
memfinal  אחרי שחי. הנעליי
tafinal  החור הקרב
memfinal  שוריפתו הפסח)או צלייתו ( בימי המלואי
nunfinal  התייחסות לאשר יש לעשות , באש( בקרב
memfinal  יש ג
dofinal  אל יסוד המזבח. ע
memfinal  את שארית הד
caffinal  יש לשפו
memfinal  אותו על , בימי המלואי
memfinal  בפסח יש לשי
dofinal  . שתי המזוזות ועל משקופי הבתי
memfinal  בעובדה שיש לאכול סוג של לח
memfinal  יש ג
pefinal  המס
nunfinal  דמיו
memfinal  הקרבת הקרב
memfinal  ומצות בפסח, ככר
memfinal  ( ת)חק"ה
memfinal  לעול
dofinal  את נצחיותו של האירוע, בשני ההקשרי
nunfinal  כדי לציי.
memfinal  נאמר " על ימי המלואי
memfinal  והיה לאהר
memfinal  מאת בני ישראל
memfinal  הפסח נאמר, "ולבניו לחק עול
dofinal  שאר הדוגמאות, על קרב
memfinal  אתו "בי
memfinal  וחגת
memfinal  תחגהו' לה
memfinal  חקת עול
memfinal  "לדרתיכ
memfinal  ,  כמו כ
memfinal  שבעה ימי
memfinal  נמשכי
memfinal  "שני התהליכים
memfinal  שבעת ימי
memfinal  מצות תאכלו"לעומת " תמלא יד
memfinal  ויש " (שבעת ימי
nunfinal  אסור לזר לאכול מהקרב
memfinal  בשני המקרי
memfinal  את מה שנותר
pefinal  לו, המאחד
nunfinal  כ
memfinal  למצב  . את שתי הפרשיות הוא מטרת
memfinal  המובילי
memfinal  יש תהליכים
memfinal  בשניה
memfinal  של התעלות
memfinal  זה מתבטא בהתקדשות הכ
memfinal  פע
memfinal  בהיות לע
memfinal  ופע
memfinal  כפרת
memfinal  ביצירת הברית , הני
kaffinal  הי
dofinal  לק.
memfinal  אי לכ
memfinal  לא זהי
memfinal  רב ישנו. הפרטי
nunfinal  . דמיו
memfinal  לשני המקרים, י"ע
memfinal  לא עניין את צעיפות של האוניב.
memfinal  על ימי המלואים אך זכר "חום
memfinal  כלים לח עול מאי בינ ישראל"ו, לע קרבי הפרת עאמר, בי שם ההומוא
memfinal  והסמבתיה ולח ד"דحيح חות עול התנור. כמי, טו השהילוים מסכים שובע הים (שבועת ים
memfinal  הפסח "שבועת ים מצעת זכאל"), בסי המדור אוסר לח הלácil ממקורב שיש לש
memfinal שולך את המ שנותה.
תפכידות השונים של אליהו ואלישע:

המכם ורבי电视机

געמי פרצסבי

ספר מקilver היה ספר על פמלייה שירואל יהודה. הספר מתחלתו במקרא ויד שניים של מבית יואש, וממשיכו בשרים אלים מזו Rahmen מבית יואש (בראש אלישע) ושל אבירים שונים. הספר התמקד בחסקותיו של אליהו, العليון של אלישע, עליון קיים של ההבדלים בין אלישע ואלישע, על קורות חייו של אליהו, על הבדלים בין אלישע ואלישע, ועל קורות חייו של אלישע. הספר מתמקד בחסקותיו של אליהו, العليון של אלישע, עליון קיים של ההבדלים בין אלישע ואלישע, ועל קורותحيיו של אליהו, על הבדלים בין אלישע ואלישע, ועל קורותחייו של אלישע.
הוא היה, כשאלישע שמע את השמועה. האישיות המנוגדי הרבה על מבני, אבל תגובת אלישע היתה הפוכה מזו של אליהו. לא:ב ו"מ

 Vaughan נלכה נא עד הירדן (. ב-א:ב ו"מ)" ויעל אליהו בסערה השמי באופ, כי כעת מחר אשי כנפש אחד את נפש

 Vaughan, 'אליהו הצליח לתקשר רק ע

 Vaughan, אחרי לימוד יסודי של חייה מתוארי שהשל Vaughan. רבי, סיפוריה

 Vaughan, על מיתת אליהו. סיו קח נפשי' הויאמר רב עתה ומלכה רשעי

 Vaughan,-'לאליהו היתה מטרה בתפקידו כנביא אלקי יודע כי אתה אלקי שפט עליו היו יעמדו ראש אלישע ב

 Vaughan, ו '@/א ב אוהולב אדניו אחריו

 Vaughan, זכרו לחיות(.לב:ב ו"מ)" אדניו אחריו ויאמר כה יעשה ל" הוא הצהיר

 Vaughan, מפני קנאותו לה. בחרב ואותר אני לבדי ויבקשו את נפשי לקחתה'

 Vaughan, "אלישע gating להסיר את ראשי ראו כבא המלא אתו בדלת הלוא סגרו הדלת ולחצהו זה דוגמא נוספת לכ

 Vaughan, ו鸷ו דוגמא נוספת לכ מאד טבעי ומקושר למציאות. אלישע חי ע, לכל מקו Vaughan, עמל בן ויאמרו בני הנביאי

 Vaughan, ואת הנביאי על ידי מל Vaughan על של אליהו החמיר עד כדי כ Vaughan הוא ביקש להתאבד

 Vaughan, במשה, 'חמץ מי שמע ע ד כמה חמור המצב הכלכלי. ג Vaughan

 Vaughan, והיה מעורב בחיי אחרי Vaughan, לעול Vaughan, לפני Vaughan, ירא את ה והרגני ועבד'

 Vaughan, רק ה-'alendar נוסע לבד על פי רוח ה. יבוא את ידיעת ה(. לו:א יח"מ)" מנערי' ימצא

 Vaughan, אבל אלישע עסק בעול, אבל אלישע עסק בעול, אבל אלישע עסק בעול

 Vaughan, זה Vaughan, 'הוא רצה להפי

 Vaughan, ויאמר כה יעשו אלהי או שהע

 Vaughan, הוא לא הרגיש לבד בעול, מחוץ לו ויחולו את ידיעת ה(. לו:א יח"מ)" ישבי Vaughan ואלישע ישב בביתו והזקני

 Vaughan, ואלישע, ומגבלות שנבעו מאישיות Vaughan אחרי Vaughan Vaughan Vaughan Vaughan. אנו לא לומדים Vaughan חייה

 Vaughan, ומתייחס אליה, אבל 'אליהו נוסע לבד על פי רוח ה. יבוא את ידיעת ה(. לו:א יח"מ)" מנערי' ימצא

 Vaughan, אבל אלישע עסק בעול, אבל אלישע עסק בעול, אבל אלישע עסק בעול

 Vaughan, 'הוא רצה להפי

 Vaughan, ויאמר כה יעשו אלהי או שהע

 Vaughan, הוא לא הרגיש לבד בעול, מחוץ לו ויחולו את ידיעת ה(. לו:א יח"מ)" ישבי Vaughan ואלישע ישב לביתו והזקני

 Vaughan, ואלישע, ומגבלות שנבעו מאישיות Vaughan אחרי Vaughan Vaughan Vaughan Vaughan. אנו לא לומדים Vaughan חייה

 Vaughan, ו撶ה' אליהו היה ( כ:יג Vaughan "אנט אנטי" יא:ב ו"מ)" כב' Vaughan,_REPEAT

 Vaughan, 'הוא רצה להפי
מְכַדְּמִים וְתוֹאֵלָה הָיוּ לְאֵלִישָּׁע, אִישׁ חָבָרִי, יָהּ נָזַקְתָּלוּת יָלִין חָבָרִיָּיו, וַאֲלִישָּׁע אֵלִיוֹן.

ָאָלִישָּׁע אֵלִיוֹן יָדְרַר קָוָם בְּפִיו, לְשׁוֹנָהוּ כְּחֶטֶא שִׁפְיָהּ נָזַקְתָּלוּת הָיוּ לְאֵלִישָּׁע.

לְשָׁלוֹשׁ לָחֶץ אֲלִישָּׁע הָיָה מָשָּׁה עַל לְגָּלְגֶלָה אֶחָד, אֶלֶּה עַל בּוֹש, אֶלֶּה עַל בּוֹש אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ עַל אֶל יָהּ הָיָה אֵלִישָּׁע אֵלִיוֹן, אִישׁ חָבָרִי, יָהּ נָזַקְתָּלוּת יָלִין חָבָרִיָּיו, וַאֲלִישָּׁע אֵלִיוֹנָהוּ.
ספרה נא לי ואלו כל הדלעות אשר עשוה יאשה" \(\text{מלב: לוב.2). יאשה, הצל יתמו, היה לכלי}

ל텐ับ נין הקדוש לחול-ريح, נין \(\text{לעך ישראל, דכר שית מדא קרש שיאוה לעשתו.}

)

וינן הלומדים ואלו חוני נין יאוה לאלישע позволит שני עדלה של מנהיגים ו tong-

מקובל ורב חכם. אלאוה יהו כי המkills הוהו הוא \(\text{וחי כאדום פוזה, והוה פולס}

את את הדוח על ישראלי בים. אלאוש היה כי בחר חסידי \(\text{- חומך חומך חסידי, והווה ספל}

את הדוח בחרם. כל אחביי ויחייה וחלמה מילא את הלק במשימה המשותפת.

של הנאת דעת \(\text{הרייעול, בשלום.}
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מהרשバ ומעשה
Doctors: God's Creation or Man's Creation?

Adina Lifschitz

In today’s world everyone has at least one doctor with whom he consults. Trips to the doctor are expected, and no one is frowned upon for receiving medical treatment. In fact, medical examinations are often required when filling out various applications for schools, camps, and jobs. However, within ההלכה the legitimacy of a human doctor requires further investigation and analysis. Should patients be encouraged to go to doctors? Should physicians be encouraged to treat patients? Or is the notion of a human doctor some kind of בדיעבד?

The גמרא addresses these questions, citing פסוקי in פסוקי פרשת משפטי:

ונפל למשכב או באגר והכה איש את רעהו באב אנשי , וכי יריב יקו בחו ורפא ירפא והתהל על משענתו ונקה המכה רק שבתו ית

When one injures his friend, he is liable for loss of time and for medical costs. The ברייתא comments, רשות לרופא לרפאות

ורפא teaches that the תורה allows for a doctor to heal. ירש elaborates and explains that one does not say ‘ה strikes and ‘ה heals.’ In other words, one does not rely on ‘ה to cure.

It is evident from the גמרא that one might think that the תורה would prohibit healing, and the ברייתא therefore needs to state that that is not the case. It is unclear from the גמרא whether medicine and healing are ideal, or whether man simply has “permission” to heal. Inנו הרחב in ברchos, רב אחא of the opinion that human doctors are not the ideal. Since this is accepted practice, however, it is permitted.

ץ"רש explains that according to רב אחא man should not be involved in healing. Rather he should seek mercy from ‘ה.

אביי responds, quoting the above cited ברייתא which allows man to heal. What is אביי’s opinion, and what is the nature of the dispute between the two אמריאי? Does אמריאי mean that human medicine is part of טבע, in which case there is a fundamental dispute between אמריאי and אמריאי? Or, perhaps אמריאי is not disagreeing with אמריאי, but expanding on his point. Does אמריאי states that man is only involved in medicine because such is the accepted practice, and אמריאי makes explicit that the תורה gives man permission to follow the accepted practice.
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It seems to follow the latter interpretation of the events. He cites two reasons why practicing medicine is permitted. The first reason is that the doctor may be concerned that he will make a mistake and cause the death of the patient. The second reason, which seems to correspond to the second reading of the Gemara above, is that the doctor might say that he does not want to heal an illness caused by God. The Torah, therefore, has to give permission to the doctor to perform his task.

The Torah’s general reliance on doctors comes out in a Mishna in Yoma (6:1). On כיפור a sick person is fed if an expert doctor says so. If no experts are available, then we rely on the patient to determine if food is necessary. This implies that doctors are reliable and that medicine is indeed legitimate.

In ב טז memfinal יב:דברי הימים however, אסא is condemned for seeking out doctors instead of God. Similarly, שמות שמח says that if God is in the hands of doctors, then why does the Torah give permission for doctors to heal?

רמבן, himself a physician, has a different approach to the matter. In his commentary on יא:ויקרא כו, he writes that when בני ישראל are on this high level, God treats them directly. When בני ישראל are on this high level, 'ה Himself removes sickness and there is no need for doctors to watch one’s health. He quotes the above cited פסוק in שמות as proof that 'ה heals directly only when בני ישראל act in accordance with 'ה’s will. Thus, according to רמבן, during the time of the prophets, and consequently, the Torah gives permission for a doctor to heal.

Similarly, ז”ט (הרorda יי:ירוש שהים) explains that the ideal occurrence of medicine is due to the request of רחמים, since 'ה is the real source of רחמים. Man, however, is not entitled to true healing. Therefore he must rely on the Torah which nature, as mediated by doctors, provides. 'ה gives permission for humans to heal.
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One another because He knows that man will not always be worthy of רפואה, since this is the natural course of events and lives depend on it.

In his commentary on שemoth, suggests a variation on the theme. When a person follows the ה' rules over his רפואה, then his רפואה rules his ה'. Hence, one who is faithful to ה' has no reason to be scared of sickness and has no need for רפואה. אָבִי, a physician as well, believes that when one observes ה', there is no need for רפואה.

However, רמב"ם (again, a physician), who generally minimizes the place of miracles and divine intervention in Judaism, believes that the world runs primarily through nature. He offers advice on maintaining physical health, as he explains that if one is hungry, sick, or aching, then he cannot properly focus and understand חכמות רפואה, which is to be done according to ה', is a means toward the end of properly performing ה' s will.

If אָבִי holds that ה' is the real healer, then the condemnation of אָבִי seems strange. Perhaps אָבִי, in seeking out doctors, forgot that a healthy body is only a means, not an end. He put his sole reliance on these doctors and eliminated the ultimate goal from the picture. רמב"ם, based on א"גמרא, writes that before a patient undergoes bloodletting, he should say a תפילה in which he asks ה' for successful treatment: "לפני אתה ה"אלהי שיהיה זה לי לבראשך ואלך וראתי רופא חולי." By doing such, one will not lose sight of the fact that the purpose of his healing is so that he can serve ה'.

The question of whether doctors should exist in the ideal world remains subject to debate. We are not living in the days of ה', nor are we living in a time when everyone observes ה'. It therefore seems that even according to רמב"ם we are obligated to consult doctors. If we choose רמב"ם's approach, then when seeking medical advice we should keep in mind that ה' is the real healer. We should all strive to reach the day when doctors will no longer be necessary. If we choose רמב"ם's approach, we should always remember our ultimate goal in receiving medical treatment. Everything we do in this world is for a greater purpose. We should build up our strength and maintain health so that we can perform ה' s will to the best of our abilities. In either
case, when consulting doctors, we have to remind ourselves that there is a bigger picture that lies beyond our personal health and well-being.
As a member of such a small nation, the Jew can hardly lose the sense that other religious groups are simply enormous. Acutely aware of both the internal and external conflicts created by dueling religious peoples, the Jew also learns of the historical significance of these other religions. רמב"ם, who lived in the 12th century, seeks a way to understand the roles of the two most significant peoples relative to Judaism, and their respective contributions to the historical task of revealing of God’s name to the world. רמב"ם seems to take Christianity and Islam most seriously, as they prove closer to the ways of truth than other world religions. רמב"ם draws fascinating distinctions between the two peoples, explaining how their existence paves the way for the ultimate purpose of the world.

The מצוות בני נשואות include the requirement to set up a legal system, as well as the prohibitions of cursing the Lord, worshiping false gods, murder, having illicit sexual relationships, theft, and eating from a live animal. Together, these commandments form the foundation of any sort of moral culture and legal system for all of humanity, from the time that ש"ה arrived in the Garden of Eden through the revelation of God’s will at הר סיני (תלמוד מיליס טא: הלכות מלכי). רמב"ם not only affirms the authority of these commandments in משנה תורה, but adds other details as well. For one thing, ignorance is no exemption from penalty under the law. Consequently, if a man knows that a woman is married but is unaware of the prohibition of having relations with a married woman, he is guilty and deserves death if he sleeps with her (תלמוד מיליס טא: ששים). If a non-Jew follows all of these commandments, he becomes a candidate for the status of גר תושב. Most astoundingly, רמב"ם requires that the non-Jew’s motivation be pure. One must follow מצוות בני נשואות not because they are just and moral, but because God commanded the children of נח, as it says in the ש"ה that was revealed to משה. If one who keeps these commandments out of הכרע הדעת, some kind of human moral reasoning, he is considered neither a גר תושב nor one of the חסידי אומות העולם. This striking claim places quite a tough obligation upon the non-Jew. It is not enough to merely
behave in a certain manner. The gentile must behave this way based on the understanding that these commandments come from the God of the Jewish people!

This indicates that God who is the authority over the Jewish people is also authority over the peoples of the world. Ultimately, the peoples of the world must recognize their obligation to serve Him. In a lecture entitled “Maimonides on Judaism and Other Religions” Prof. David Novak expressed the relevance of these commandments in their historical context.

Before the giving of the Torah at Sinai, the Jews themselves were Noachides, and as such were bound by Noachide law…

Thus, the Noachide law was not exchanged for or overcome by the Mosaic Torah; it was a necessary preparation for it…

As regards to the relation of Noachide law to the Mosaic Torah, Maimonides sees Noachide law as the first installment, as it were, of the full Torah…and it indicates that every true Noachide is a potential Jew.¹

Novak indicates that, according to Maimonides, these commandments are not only universal, but they are also the foundations of God’s system to help man relate to Him truthfully. Furthermore, if Novak is right that “every Noachide is a potential Jew,” it seems that Maimonides might look favorably upon any religion with Jewish foundations.

What then, is that status of the Christian and the Muslim in the Jewish eye? One can immediately elevate Christianity and Islam above any of the plethora of religions because of their foundations in Judaism. Yet neither, of course, reaches the level of Judaism. Both Christianity and Islam have positive and negative characteristics. Christianity is founded on the basis of the trinity, a multi-faceted divinity that leans dangerously toward the side of workaholism. Islam remains monotheistic. Christianity accepts the idea that Jews were once the chosen people, even if it claims that God breached His covenant with the Jewish people. Islam claims that Jews were never the chosen people.

Halachically, these distinctions between the religions are enough to change the way that the Jew relates to each of them. Prof. Daniel Lasker quotes the prohibition of an idolater to learn Torah (other than the seven mitzvot), explaining that this would apply to Christians because they are

As Rambam explains, “This Christian nation, which advocates the messianic claim in all their various sects, all of them are idolaters...and all restrictions pertaining to idolaters pertain to them” (Hilchot Melchim and Erez Hakodesh 8:2). On the other hand, Novak quotes a responsa of the Rambam which says the opposite: “It is muttar to teach the commandments to notzrim and draw them to our law. But it is not permitted to teach anything from it to Muslims because it is known to you about their belief that this Torah (of ours) is not from God... and if one can convince the Christians of the correct interpretation of Scripture, it is possible that they might return to what is good.” (Responsa Kamea 188). It does not seem immediately possible to justify these various statements with one another. In any case, these texts indicate the tensions between the desire to remain distant from other religions and the desire to draw them to truth.

Given this background, we are left with unanswered questions. Do Christians and Muslims fit into the framework of following the שבע מצוות based on the acceptance of Jewish principles? If the שבע מצוות were a pre-Sinai preparation, how do Christians and Muslims relate to them today? Further, according to the 9th מצוה in Rambam’s list of Positive Commandments, a Jew is obligated to “proclaim the true faith to the world.” So, should a Jew attempt to teach the rest of the non-Jewish world his faith and turn Judaism into a proselytizing religion?

Remarkably, according to the newly released uncensored Frankel edition of the הלכה דינית, the Rambam presents yet another new view, that “All of the words of Jesus the Christian and that Islamic man who came after him are only to lead the way to the Messiah and to do tikvah in order to worship ‘ha’ together.” So when all is actually said and done, Rambam sees the value in both Christianity and Islam.

It is difficult to understand just what רמבם holds regarding the value of the non-Jewish religions. רמבם does not seem to be consistent in addressing the issue. As the modern world attempts to rediscover the רמבם through his unedited writings, it is quite possible that it will discover quite a different story than the Christian censors intended to have presented. The question of whether the Christian and the Muslim is equivalent to the average Noachide becomes impossible to determine. Yet through the confusion, רמבם will continue to remain an authority on all matters of Jewish thought, regardless of whether one can discover a consistent theory.

A Fork in the Road

Sally Abraham

As I am walking along a trail in the Golan Heights while on an MMY סייל, I find myself surrounded by a maze of trees. The bus is still a long way off, and I realize that the only way to insure survival is to stay en route and be sure not to wander along the wrong path at a fork in the road. The best way to do that is to fill in the footprints that the person in front of me had engraved in the ground. Too many times I had gotten momentarily lost on a טיול by straying on the wrong path, simply because the person in front of me was too far ahead, and I had no one to follow.

This reminds me of our מסורה. You need to stick to our מסורה and make sure you are not wandering in the wrong direction, because that will take you much further from your destination. However, today, when there are so many paths being opened up for us, how do we know which is the correct one? How do we know which one is the הנותן? ברייאר between the opinions of the various groups have divided us, and we find ourselves in a position where we identify with one group of people more than another. Is there still a way to be one ישראל despite all of these subdivisions?

“שמעון הזрюournemouth על שלושה דברים עולם... על שלושה דברים עולם напשים... שמעון המזרחי, in his commentary on this משנה, explains that these are the three aspects of our religious development. Regarding תורה, he explains that "לפי יד התורה ואינו כאכזר על מ绻 דברי התורה. Learning Torah gives us perspective. It influences our understanding of the world, affects our attitude to life, and dictates what we perceive to be right and wrong. As a person grows, the wisdom he receives matures. The wisdom of the תורה Enlightens him with its clarity and introduces him to his Creator. In short, it transforms man from an insignificant part of nature to a creature who gains importance from standing in the presence of God.

Whereas תורה involves learning your path in life, عمل involvess actively doing it. We do the מצוות in order to emulate our Creator and build a relationship with Him. ל"ח מרים says, "על יד עבדיו, הוא שומר היחס בין הקוג" ידraits. Your Work sustains an awareness and connection with ה. As humans we have the capacity for relationships, and by giving us
deeds, יְּהוָה gives us an opportunity to draw close to Him. For example, we pray three times a day in order to enter into conversation with the Almighty on a regular basis.

Finally, we must develop a relationship with others through גימולות חסד. We should befriend others and build mutual feelings of belonging, whether to family, community, or friends. As מַלְשָׁנְנוּ says, "עַל יְּהוָה גימולות שֶׁאֱלֹהִים וְלֹא שֶׁאָדָם בָּנֵי אָדָם יִלְכְּדוּ עָלֵי עֵדָם וּדְאָלֵי עֵדָם וְלֹא שֶׁאֱלֹהִים תָּמָּן עָלֵי עֵדָם וּדְאָלֵי עֵדָם." We were created with others around us. We were not put on this world solely for self-gratification. Rather, we have מַצְוָה וּמַעָּהלָה לְאָדָם לְהַנְּחָלָה, which perfect us and ensure an ordered and just society. The three pillars on which the world stand can be divided into three parts, כִּפְלַל, פִּשָּׁע, וּשְׁפִיכָת דְּמִי. Each one is parallel to a pillar.

מַלְשָׁנְנוּ draws a parallel between these three pillars and the three sins which are מַעְסֶק הַיּוֹם, נִנְיָה עַיְּנִית, מַמְסָרָה דְּמִי: namely עָבְרֵי מַעְסֶק, עָבְרֵי נִנְיָה, עָבְרֵי מַמְסָרָה. If the mind does not have מַתּוּרָה, it is chaotic. Without מַתּוּרָה we are lacking direction and self-awareness. The act of הרוח is an inner confusion about what the world is and how it came to be. Lack of מַתּוּרָה leads to lack of understanding, which is part and parcel of עָבְרֵי מַעְסֶק.

נִנְיָה עַיְּנִית is a misrepresentation of our connection to יְּהוָה and the world. These acts make the body טמא instead of doing עָבְרֵי מַעְסֶק to sanctify the body. שפיכת דמי is the opposite. A person takes control of another’s life. He gains his importance and security through murder. Instead of building himself through giving, the murderer destroys himself and his victim through jealousy and violence.

In essence, the three sins destroy the three pillars on which the world stands. Our ultimate purpose is to perfect all three aspects of our relationship with man and with God. Various schools of thought and political movements in יִשְׂרָאֵל try to develop one aspect more than the others. In truth the three should be found in balance. As individuals, we may need to find a community of similar people, but as long as we are not neglecting עָבְרֵי מַעְסֶק, עָבְרֵי נִנְיָה, עָבְרֵי מַמְסָרָה we can be sure that we will make progress in our goal of becoming כִּפְלַל and completing the purpose for which God created us. We see that the subdivisions in יִשְׂרָאֵל are not as bad as they might appear. There are different communities focused on one aspect of our relationship with יְּהוָה more than another. Together
they compliment one another. By walking in the footsteps of מסורות that are engraved in the ground before us, will we be able to arrive at our destination.
At the heart of every Jew is the dream to live a life devoted to full-time Torah study. Throughout Jewish history special provisions were made for those whose “trade” was Torah, and they often received public support so they could continue to learn without worrying about mundane concerns. TheGemara (ב”מ ג”א מ) even defines a large city as one with at least ten Torah learners all day.

Today, however, this issue has become a source of contention in the Orthodox Jewish community. Some of those who work are shocked at the increasing number of men who are capable of work, but choose instead to devote their time to study at ישיבות andכוללי. They are exempted from many community obligations and are supported byצדקה. The question that arises is whether or not Torah should be a full time “trade” or whether there is room for a balance between work and Torah study.

The source of both sides of the debate can be found in”תנך. “ונתתי ויצרתי ותרפו מעתי יורה ומלקוש ואספת דגנ מטר ארץך (יא:דברי). The pasuk identifies gathering grain as something positive. This seems to contrast with the pasuk inיהושע, which reads, “ובלילה והגי בו יומך ולא ימוש ספר תורה זה מפי וילה. How can people “gather their grain” and at the same time be immersed in Torah “day and night?”

Theברכותגמרא relates aמחלקת betweenRabbi Ishmael andRabbi Yochai. According toRabbi Ishmael, work must be combined with study. Otherwise, one will become dependent onצדקה and neglect תורה study. Rabbi Yochai disagrees. He says that if people busy themselves with their work, they will not have time forTorah. Instead, when בני ישראל do what ליהוה wants their work will be performed by others. When they do not follow ליהוה they will have to do their own work and even the work of others.

This attitude seems consistent. Theגמרא שבת relates that after learning in a cave for twelve years,י”רשב emerged and saw workmen andfarmers sowing, plowing, and harvesting. Shocked at the way they were abandoning Torah, a flame broke out wherever he looked. Aבת קול demanded that he return to the cave before he destroyed God’s creation. After twelve months, he emerged once again only to witness the same situation as before. However, this time he realized that not everyone can be an undistracted scholar. He saw an old farmer collecting...
his harvest for שבת and he realized that people must be allowed to be ḥasidic in their own way.

ךך states that תורה must be combined with work, meaning employment. He explains that if work is not accompanied by study, the idleness will cause sin. According to رب מילואים, work is a necessary element to succeed religiously. When combined with study, each is strengthened.

This opinion is also supported by רבי צדוק, who says that one should not support oneself through learning. The words of תורה must remain pure, pursued only for their intrinsic value and not as a tool to sustain oneself.

In the and in his commentary on this Mishnah, follows the position of רבי צדוק. He says that anyone who only learns and is supported by צדקה "defames his name, cheapens the Torah, extinguishes the light of faith, causes himself ill, and removes himself from עילום היהום." People should work, though they should remember that work is the foundation. concludes on an extreme note, saying that anyone who brings proof to the contrary is "insane and confused."

's position was not universally accepted. responded by saying that was a prominent doctor in his generation, and therefore did not need to live on his Torah. What about those rabbis and חכמים who are not in that position? "Are they supposed to die of hunger, demean their honor, and remove the yoke of Torah from their backs?" He concludes that this is not the intent of Torah.

work to provide a precise definition of a scholar. He says that a scholar is someone who sets regular times to study and never cancels except “for his maintenance.” It is impossible for him to learn without maintaining himself. After all, "As one who does not suspend the words of Torah except to fulfill a מצוה, i.e. to seek after their food and their sustenance and the sustenance of their household and their food" were exempted from taxes.

The ז’ט, in contrast, feels that Torah can only be sustained by undistracted studying. The demands of livelihood are too disruptive. He even says that a חכם who has the money to support himself is still permitted to take צדקה, since the financial needs of raising sons to be
scholars and daughters to marry scholars, are great. Rav Moshe Feinstein seems to agree with this general approach. He states that a scholar should not distract himself with other things or take part in business, except for the minimum he needs for survival. If there is no other choice, he should support himself through שדוק.

The חלק, ד”יו, אגרות משה says that many תלמידי חכמה were workingmen. Still, they always saw their תורה as primary and their work as secondary. However, this is only for a scholar whose life was mainly תורה. For an average householder this does not apply. He is only obligated to be מחלק, ו, to dedicate specific times for תורה study. The השולח, ע רו says that many התלמידי חכמה were workingmen. Still, they always saw their תורה as primary and their work as secondary. However, this is only for a scholar whose life was mainly תורה. For an average householder this does not apply. He is only obligated to be מחלק, ו, to dedicate specific times for תורה study. The השולח, ע רו says that many התלמידי חכמה were workingmen. Still, they always saw their תורה as primary and their work as secondary. However, this is only for a scholar whose life was mainly תורה. For an average householder this does not apply. He is only obligated to be מחלק, ו, to dedicate specific times for תורה study. The השולח, ע רו says that many התלמידי חכמה were workingmen. Still, they always saw their תורה as primary and their work as secondary. However, this is only for a scholar whose life was mainly תורה. For an average householder this does not apply. He is only obligated to be מחלק, ו, to dedicate specific times for תורה study.

Rabbi David Schnall expands on this example in his book ב the Sweat of Your Brow. He says that the מפרשים are troubled by two stories in regarding יששכר and זבולו. In יעקב’s final ברכה to his children, and in מפרשים the elder יששכר, זבולו, and his descendants dealt in business while יששכר and his descendants studied תורה and were supported by זבולו.ו received part of the spiritual reward for the תורה study he supported. The תורה ignores their birth order, and gives priority to the business man over the scholar.

This issue has been debated for centuries, and the question is as important today as ever. As we have seen, there are many Talmudic and Rabbinic sources in support of those who favor a balance between work and study, and in support of those who think there should be a life exclusive to תורה learning, at least for the select few. Whether one learns and earns or just learns, each Jew’s life should revolve around תורה, and his goal should be to worship ה.

---

1 Rabbi David Schnall, By the Sweat of Your Brow, New York, 2001, p. 89.
כבוד אב ואם

Judith Gorelick-Feldman

This is the first mention in the Torah of the fifth commandment, the מצוה of כבוד אב ואם. This paper is not to expand upon the laws of כבוד אב ואם, but to relate to the philosophy behind the מצוה. How is this מצוה related to יהוה? Why is it so central that it is listed in the עשרת הדברות? Why is the care for this particular commandment a long life? Why does God care if we honor our parents?

The second place in the Torah where כבוד אב ואם is mentioned is in קהלין יד, י:ו. This raises similar questions. How does the second half of the פסוק relate to the first half? What is the connection between our relationship with our parents, the commandment to keep שבת, and the declaration that יהוה is our God. Parents are human, earthly, physical beings, while God is the most Heavenly creature. How are the two connected?

There are three partners in man’s creation: God, his father, and his mother. Since all helped to form man, when man honors one of the three, he honors the other two as well.

This beautiful, well-known גמרא provides an explanation of the מצוה of כבוד אב ואם, but it does not completely solve the problem of relating our parents to יהוה. How can one practically and tangibly honor God while honoring his parents? One must stand up when one’s father enters the room, serve him food whenever he requires it, and attend to his every request. How does that honor God? And what happens when a father’s request contradicts that of God, like a הלכות or מצוה?
In his commentary on Shmot Chayim, Rav Hirsch suggests a connection between our parents and God. Judaism was founded, he claims, on historical events: מץ ויום ייצא עם פורים and תורה עם מת. These events, witnessed by millions of people, prove that ה' is our God who created the world. But how do we know these events are true? How can we trust enough to base our entire faith on them?

We trust because we have מסורה, telling us that these things are true. Where do we get the מסורה from? We get it from the previous generation, from our parents. “Tradition depends solely on the faithful transmission by parents to children and on the willing acceptance by children from the hands of their parents.” Judaism depends on each generation listening to the previous generation. God created parents as His messengers, to bring His תורה to His children. Parents are not merely humans who physically create their children. As God’s messengers, they create their children spiritually as well. Even more than parents deserve honor for providing their children’s physical needs, parents deserve honor for bringing their children closer to God. He commanded בני ישראל to honor their parents because He transmits His תורה through them.

In an ideal situation, all parents would follow תורה ומצוות and their children would learn by example. But contradictions arise when, unfortunately, God’s messengers transmit His תורה either incorrectly or not at all. On the one hand, we are commanded to listen to our parents. On the other hand, the other מצוות are dedicated to ‘עבודת ה. What happens when the two conflict?

Rav Hirsch answers this question in his commentary on ויקרא יט. Why is Sabbath mentioned in the second half of the פסוק? Rav Hirsch cites תורת כהני on this פסוק: "אמר לו אביו ואמו attraversו על אחת מכל המצוות האמורות בתורה ושמע לה אביו ובכבודי. Why is כבוד אב ואב mentioned in the second half of the פסוק? Rav Hirsch cites תורת כהני on this פסוק: "אמר לאמו ולאברהם عليه יעבוד ושמור יראתי. Why is the Sabbath mentioned in the ultimate contradiction between כבוד אב ואב and ‘עבודת ה, when one’s parents tell him directly to violate הלכה? You might think that out of כבוד you should listen to them. Hence, the second half of the פסוק teaches that God says that He is the ultimate ruler over both the child and the parent. Just like a child must obey his parents, the parents must obey God. Though God granted parents a lofty status as His messengers, He still rules over them. When they abuse the power He gives them, the children are obligated to answer directly to God.

We should honor our parents as messengers of God. We should grant them more for the spiritual gifts they have given us than the material ones. We honor them, stand for them, put their will before our
own, respect them as our teachers, and as the ones who bring us closer to God. But there is a limit: when parents tell their children to violate ההלכה, they must not listen.

Life often does not present us with clear-cut situations. What does one do if parents do not observe the מצוות, even if those parents do not ask directly to violate ההלכה? Conflicts are likely to arise, and they must be treated carefully. In those situations, a child must still honor his parents. One must remember the physical gifts from his parents – his life, his food, his clothing, etc. For that alone, parents deserve our complete respect. These children must also acknowledge the spiritual gifts. Even if one’s parents are not שומר תורה ומצוות, God created them as parents. They are a link in the chain of מסורה even though they may not have dedicated their lives to teaching תורה to their child. They brought him to where he is, enabling him to learn תורה, even if they did not teach him directly. Though it may be hard, they deserve his כבוד.

Rav Hirsch adds that מורה toward parents is a prerequisite to achieving קדושה. As evidence he cites the fact that פסוק in ויקרא appears in פרשת קדושי among other מצוות focused on achieving קדושה. By learning to put one’s parents’ needs first, one submits to them, just like one should ultimately submit to God.
The prohibition of "לא תבשל גדי בחלב אמו" is mentioned three times in the Torah ( Exodus 23:19, Leviticus 20:27). There is both legal and ideological significance to this איסור. I will attempt to discuss the philosophical underpinnings of this איסור.

 Jinping Theban: adopt two basic approaches in trying to explain the reason for this prohibition. ספורנו and רמב״ם are of the opinion that it was an ancient pagan practice to cook a kid in its mother's milk during fertility festivals. ספורנו explains that "ל抻ב בשותי פעברה חיה... כפעברה מד". Similarly, רמב״ם explains in the מורה נבוכים that "ייאן בחבר גאומק מוד עירוב חיה" (ᔪעי). It was the belief of these idolaters that this ritual would assure a fruitful harvest. The function of the איסור is to counter this idolatrous practice.

יהוא ורבי עזרא have a completely different approach. ספרון, רמבר and רבי עזרא have a completely different approach. רמי: "ברימ אתיה יבשא עוזו ומשה ממק קביר" (דרש). Similarly, רביה עזרא 'ם סקינוס: "אינו היה יזימ אכזרי שנחלב את האם ואתיה הקבל במעדו" (と思いました). They hold that the איסור exists to weaken our impulse of cruelty. It is morally repulsive to cook a kid in the very thing that provided its sustenance, its mother's milk. But the animal itself (mother or kid) does not suffer. We are not primarily concerned with the feelings of the animal. Rather we behave in this way for our own sake, in order to ingrain רחמות in our personalities. For if we become accustomed to treating animals in a cruel way it will easily spill over into how we treat our fellow man. The central focus of the איסור is to cultivate a certain behavior in man.

פסוקים פרשיות: Interesting, this prohibition appears twice in an identical פסוק. (שמות כנ: י: ויהו יברך אברט ביבי ויבי יאוך אל ובשל מיה יברך מיה). What is the connection between the איסור בשר בחלב and the בגדרי הבכור which was brought on שביתות?

In the time of harvest, people become extremely insecure regarding the success of their crops. They have put a lot of effort into plowing, planting, etc. But ultimately things like rain, which are beyond
human control, can ruin the crop. This can be scary and frustrating. This insecurity causes people to turn to things other than God, like superstitions or idolatry, in order to feel some sense of control. Further, when the harvest is gathered, it is easy to take too much credit for the success. A person might not acknowledge the role of God in his success.

The connection is now clear. Both the agricultural significance of these holidays. Pesach is called "شهر האביב"; Shavuot is referred to as "יהודת חצירה", and Succot is described as "חודש האסי" (שמות כג).

The connection is now clear. Both the agricultural significance of these holidays. Pesach is called "شهر האביב"; Shavuot is referred to as "יהודת חצירה", and Succot is described as "婵 ויאסיפי" (שמות כד:טו).

Other people explain the context of this prohibition differently. Exodus teaches that the prohibition of מכהו makes another association. The verse there explains, "וירא אהרן אסרו... לא תבשל גדי בחלב עמו' כי עלא אל" (חרב ירמיהו). Exodus wants to understand the connection between being a holy nation and not eating בשר בחלב. He explains that this prohibited food is not something disgusting in the culinary arena. It does not inherently repulse us. And yet we are prohibited from eating it to make us קדושי /memfinal. Exodus teaches that prohibitions of מאכלות אסורות facilitate קדושה by creating restraint and limitation on our bodily desires.
We see that the prohibition of בשר בחלב is more than just a technical prohibition about what to eat or not to eat. It teaches us lessons about how to live well and how to properly relate to God, the land, and ourselves.
Much is known about Rabbi Soloveitchik’s use of Maimonides in the sphere of ההלכה. Indeed, Rabbi Soloveitchik touchingly describes the formative experience of watching his father, Rav Chaim Soloveitchik, defend משנה תורה ז租车מ from its critics. If one looks beyond Rabbi Soloveitchik’s שיעורים to his philosophical writings, one can clearly discern the impact Maimonides had on the Rav in this arena as well. Yet, Rabbi Soloveitchik did not merely quote Maimonides. He reinterpreted רמבות to complement his own unique philosophy.

An overarching theme in Rabbi Soloveitchik’s works is the primacy of ההלכה as the a priori ideal. This means that ההלכה reins supreme above other realms, including the moral, ethical, and rational spheres. ההלכה is the unique and autonomous source of religious meaning, through which we can categorize and classify what we observe. Maimonides, on the other hand, was an Aristotelian rationalist who believed that reason, rather than ההלכה, was the prism through which the world and religion must be viewed. This irreconcilable philosophical difference consistently influenced Rabbi Soloveitchik’s interpretation of Maimonides.

Take the example of their respective understandings of the concept of imitatio dei, the command to walk in God’s ways. Maimonides and Rabbi Soloveitchik agree that man is only granted special השגחה when he elevates himself above the rest of the species through imitatio dei. “I believe in this lowly world… divine providence watches only over the individuals belonging to the human species and that in this species all the circumstances of the individuals and the good and evil that befall them are obsequent on their desserts” (מורה נבוכי 3:17). However, “Divine providence does not watch in an equal manner over all individuals of the human species, but providence is graded as their human perfection is graded” (מורה נבוכי 3:18). Maimonides and the

1 "ברוך التطף ד"ר שלוחוביץ, הנקשתו מעשה" בהור איזה וחלות, pp. 230-232.
The A Priori Ideal:

Rav differ, however, on what constitutes imitatio dei: reason or creation. According to Maimonides, imitatio dei involves rational cognition. The way in which a person imitates God and becomes deserving of השגחה is by increasing his knowledge of God. According to Rabbi Soloveitchik, however, man fulfills the commandment to walk in God’s ways by utilizing his creativity and performing creative acts. “The man who has a particular existence of his own is not merely a passive, receptive creature, but acts and creates”. The ultimate act of creation is creating one’s self via הלכה. “When a person creates himself, he ceases to be a mere species man, and becomes a man of God, then he has fulfilled that commandment which is implicit in the principle of providence.” Man has now become “a partner of the Almighty in the act of creation, man as a creator of worlds” (Halakhic Man, p. 99). The Rav replaces rational cognition with halachic creativity as the factor influencing Divine providence.

The Rav also addresses Maimonides' notion of negative attributes. מרכם argues that since it is impossible for finite beings to know the infinite God, those striving to know God can never say what God is, but only what He is not. Man’s knowledge of God is purely negative: I know God is not cruel, God is not corporeal, etc. This is known as the principle of negative attributes. Maimonides holds that knowledge of God is the ultimate goal of man. He also holds, however, that direct and positive knowledge of God is ultimately impossible.

According to Prof. Zev Harvey in חכם על הרב סולובייציק והפילוסופיה הרמב', the Rav explains that according to Maimonides's position the recognition of God through negative attributes is true cognition because it is all that is possible. In order to negate, man needs to have affirmative cognition from which to negate. That is, man learns about the world in order to conclude that God is not like the things in the world. Although it might seem that this cognition of the world will lead to religious negation, in Halachik Man Rabbi Soloveitchik adds that this process of negation is only possible for a “halakhic man”, and not a “cognitive man.” “Halakhic man” learns for the sake of knowing God, while “cognitive man” examines the world in order to further his own knowledge. He will not take the next step of negation. Without הלכה, according to Rabbi Soloveitchik, cognition is religiously ineffective. For

---

3 חכם על הרב סולובייציק והפילוסופיה הרמב', בנות אבות הנוסעים של לפיד הקדש, ירושלים.
Maimonides, however, cognition of nature is the critical cognition. Rabbi Soloveitchik has not contradicted Maimonides, but modified his philosophy, insisting on the primacy of הלכה above all other spheres.  

Another example of Rabbi Soloveitchik reinterpreting Maimonides to conform to his own philosophy is found in the issue of prophecy. According to Maimonides, prophecy is the highest level of achievement possible for man, when he taps into the Divine overflow. This level can only be achieved after achieving the highest possible degree of knowledge. The Rav, however, says that prophecy can be achieved by following the example of prophets in their morality and good deeds, “a binding ethical ideal… an act of self-creation and renewal” (Halakhic Man, p. 134). Prophecy is the result of action – the creation of oneself to model the prophets by following הלכה. Again, the Rav places creativity in the center in place of Maimonides rationalistic approach.

Walter Wurzburger, in “The Centrality of Creativity,” speculates that these differences between Rabbi Soloveitchik and רמבם, may in part be due to the Rav’s theory of knowledge, which emphasized the “creativity of the human mind.” While Maimonides followed Aristotle by defining knowledge as “noetic identification with the object known,” Rabbi Soloveitchik followed the neo-Kantian theory of knowledge by viewing cognition as “a construct of the human mind, not a copy of external reality.” Knowledge means using humanly constructed categories to make sense of what is observed. Knowledge is inherently a creative act. This apposes the more static theory of knowledge posited by the Aristotelian Maimonides.

In his introduction to מורה נבוכד, Maimonides says that the “perplexed” of his title are those who cannot reconcile the Divinely revealed תורה with what they know to be philosophically true. Maimonides explains that the purpose of מורה נבוכד is to rationally and philosophically explain seemingly irrational passages in the תורה. Because of this, and despite his use of many of Maimonides’ tenets, the Rav ultimately dismissed מורה נבוכד in an address to the YU Rabbinic Alumni on March 1, 1956. “The truth is that there is no real synthesis in the world. If there is a contradiction between תורה and secular endeavor, then synthesis is not possible… In synthesis no one succeeds. Even our great teacher Rambam did not succeed in his attempts at synthesis.” Rabbi Soloveitchik did not attempt apologetics. He felt no need to prove

the rationality of תורה and its compatibility with philosophy, unlike Maimonides, who felt compelled to reconcile תורה and philosophy in מורה נבון.

Indeed, the Rav felt that “Rambam, the halachic scholar, came nearer the core of philosophical truth than Maimonides, the speculative philosopher.” Rav Soloveitchik explicitly rejects Maimonides' notion of סتقدم המצוות, as presented in the מורה נבון. Maimonides adopts a "causal method" in explaining the mitzvot, arguing that the commandments are designed to accomplish certain goals. The Rav prefers a different approach, which he sees in the תורת משנה. There, the Rav attempts to "reconstruct" the subjective correlative of the commandments, i.e. the internal experience of the person fulfilling the commandment. This is far superior to the "causal method of the philosophical guide" (Halakhic Mind, p. 94). According to Rabbi Soloveitchik, the position in the מורה נבון makes הלכה subordinate to an external principle. halachah is made to serve ethics or morality or rationalism - a higher truth beyond הלכה. For the Rav, this is unacceptable.

Thus, there are cases where Rabbi Soloveitchik tries to make positive use of רמב"ם's philosophy, as in the cases of השגחה, negative attributes, and prophecy. In these cases, the Rav can fit the primacy of הלכה into רמב"ם's statements. However, on the issue of סتقدم המצוות, no reconciliation is possible, and Maimonides's position in the מורה נבון is completely dismissed. Rabbi Soloveitchik's belief in the halakhic ideal takes precedence over all, including the philosophical position of the man he called his "one friend." Maimonides.

---

Someone who receives a unique and valuable present would keep it closely guarded and be hesitant to share it with others. So too, according to many sources, the Torah is a precious gift that was received from י‘ה which we must guard and secure from others. The Torah symbolizes ישראל בני’s uniqueness. It is something sacred and reflects the intimacy between י‘ה and His chosen nation. Sharing it with others would be violating the exclusiveness of that relationship.

In the following essay I will discuss the sources for the prohibition of non-Jews learning תורה, the extent of this prohibition, and suggest reasons for the prohibition.

The Torah was given as an inheritance specifically to ישראל בני. The Gemara explains that this פסוק indicates that תורה is an inheritance for Jews, but not for others. Indeed the Gemara compares the bond between ישראל בני and the Torah to a bride and groom. The Torah is betrothed to us, and therefore is forbidden to anyone else (ל sklearn新鲜). According to this Gemara, a gentile who engages in Torah study is comparable to a person who takes another’s bride and commits the sin of adultery. The Gemara (ל sklearn新鲜 להלכות) goes so far as to say thatologically לехал ורב▾ גביה תורה מיתר: The Torah was accepted by ישראל בני before they knew the details involved. Their acceptance was not based on an understanding of the Torah’s logic. Thus, keeping the Torah is a statement of ישראל בני’s allegiance to הקבר and an acceptance of His commandments irrespective of the dictates of reason. At הר סיני, all of ישראל בני accepted ‘ה by proclaiming נעשה ונשמע: we will implement before we rationalize. It was a statement that ישראל בני had complete faith in ‘ה, and accepted everything He relayed, regardless of their understanding of it. Perhaps this explains the prohibition of a gentile studying תורה. If motivated merely by intellectual curiosity, the gentile might misunderstand the way in which Jews accept תורה simply as God’s word.

Non-Jews are prohibited from learning תורה and therefore, according to some sources, Jews are forbidden to teach them תורה.
conclude that a Jew who teaches a gentile Torah is liable for the gentile’s transgression as well as his own transgression of "فاقرأ ולא ת诔 תוספות" (הנANTE Также י"ע, ייחריא מוסריים תחת מכשף).

Ideally, ל פה שבעתורה was meant to be orally transmitted from רב to תלמיד, through מסורה. This system emphasizes the exclusive relationship between 'יהו and ישראלבני, and deters other nations from getting hold of the תורה שבכתב because without the תורה would be solely for בני ישראל. Yet, adverse historical circumstances forced one to write it down. From that point on, verbal מסורה was no longer relied upon exclusively and תורה was preserved through writing. Although תורה became more accessible to Jews after it was written down, it also became available to gentiles as well.

There are debates as to whether תורה שבכתב is also included in this prohibition. Most פוסקי feel that תורה שבכתב is permissible. The ניציב explains that since 'יהו commanded יהושע to write the תורה שבכתב in seventy languages it must be permissible for everyone (ש"תצנים ז"ב). He makes a דיקוק in the גמרא (משנה, הש"ג), which describes the prohibitions as "עוסק". The prohibition forbids a non-Jew from “delving” into the תורה, but since it is only possible to “delve” by learning התורה שבכתב, the תורה שבכתב would seem to be permissible.

On the other hand, the historical tragedy of תורה שבכתב may contradict this belief. תורה שבכתב is an event in Jewish history in which seventy great Torah scholars were placed in separate, isolated rooms and commanded by the Greeks to translate תורה שבכתב. Miraculously, all the scholars amended the same words so as to not provide the Greeks with the precise translation of the תורה (ת"ב עב). This might indicate that even teaching תורה שבכתב to gentiles could be catastrophic.

The contradicting approaches regarding תורה שבכתב can be reconciled. The intentions of the non-Jew studying תורה שבכתב would determine whether he may study. The מאירי, commenting on the המאה in מסכת ו"א, says that "a non-Jew may study תורה שבכתב if he does indeed intend to fulfill the precepts which he studies, but is deserving of punishment if he studies solely in order to acquire knowledge of our Torah and our Talmud." Hence, תורה שבכתב may be studied as long as it is done with the proper motives. In the situation of the התורה שבכתב, the Greeks wanted the תורה to be translated as a means of using it to condemn and destroy the Jews.

Following this logic, it might be that gentiles who learn תורה for valid reasons might well become better people and develop a better understanding of what Jews stand for. The מאירי continues, explaining that gentiles might study תורה in order to be able to impersonate Jews and thereby sell foreign beliefs to non-suspecting Jews. Jews might mistake the imposter for a real Jew and be led astray by his erroneous beliefs. This provides an additional understanding of the prohibition of gentiles learning תורה.

There are, however, instances where a gentile may be permitted, or perhaps obligated, to study תורה. All non-Jews are obligated to observe the מצוות בני נחבע and they are allowed to study these laws from the תורה (תנ"ן). Non-Jews must be thoroughly familiar with these laws in order to be able to observe them properly. As the מעשה in סנהדרין explains, in this circumstance it seems almost crucial for a gentile to learn תורה. A non-Jew’s תורה learning may make him aware of ה' s glorious miracles, and thus cause him to reject his pagan beliefs and accept the צוות בני נח שבע. Thus we see that non-Jews may study the sections of תורה that are relevant to him.

Furthermore, Rav Moshe Feinstein holds that non-Jews may listen to sermons, either by attending שיעורי given by Rabbis or by sitting at a שבת table. But Rav Moshe cites a גמרא in which גמליאל רב’s servant טבי became an exceptional scholar as a result of his presence during his master’s discussions. Rav Moshe clarifies that Jews are forbidden to teach specifically to a non-Jew; it is only permitted if non-Jews are present at a lesson intended for Jews.

In order to maintain peace between Jews and gentiles, the issue of non-Jews relation to תורה must be handled with extreme sensitivity. It is crucial to understand that, according to these sources, the תורה was given to בני ישראל to learn and live by. The תורה must be revered and reserved, and we must be cautious before exposing it to anyone to whom it was not given.
Rav S.R. Hirsch’s Critique of the הָדְסָם

Inbar Gabay

In every place in the world a set of המצות sits on the shelves or lays open on the tables, admired and studied by those who wish to understand the essence of התורה. It is the backbone for every halachik decision. Its contents are the life-force of Jewish existence, surging from the mouth of God, to the minds of the Rabbis, and into the souls of the Jewish people. The transcription of שבעל פהתורה, initiated by רבי יהודה הנשיא, was an attempt to preserve the truth of the laws of משה, which were in danger of being forgotten in the age of exile. Yes, רבי יהודה הנשיא’s actions helped to preserve the מסורה, but the מסורה also became tied to a specific text and lost some of its oral quality. It was now concise, arranged mnemonically, and working under the premise of presumed knowledge. The living, breathing תורה became words on a piece of paper. It became less human and more fixed.¹

As the physical and political oppression of the Diaspora intensified, it became difficult for Jews to dedicate themselves wholeheartedly to תורה and its study. Although Jews perceived their Judaism as a birthright, an average Jew did not have the opportunity to study and understand the מצות deeply. During much of Muslim middle-ages, in which oppression was relatively eased, there was time, ability, and desire to delve more systematically into התורה, but not every student found what he was looking for. Minds that found Judaism lacking turned to Arab and Greek philosophy to answer the great questions of how and why. Because Arab/Greek philosophies fundamentally conflict with Jewish concepts of life, these individuals found themselves caught in a rift between two worlds. It was Rav Hirsch who created the bridge between these distinct worlds while still preserving ההלכות. He justified the Arab/Greek philosophies to Judaism, while adhering to the letter of the law. But in doing this, Rav Hirsch purports that the הגדסם lost the spirit of Judaism. He no longer approached Judaism from within, but rather from without, from the eyes of the Arab/Greek philosopher.

In non-Jewish schools Yisrael’s youth trained their minds in independent philosophical inquiry. From Arab sources they drew the concepts of Greek philosophy. Their quickening spirit put them at odds with Judaism, which they considered to be void of any spirit of its own. It is to this great man alone that we owe the preservation of practical Judaism...and yet...his trend of thought was Arab-Greek, as was his concept of life. Approaching Judaism from without, he brought to it views he had gained elsewhere, and these he reconciled with Judaism...The practical, concrete deeds became subordinate...None of them were conceived as rooted in the eternal essence of things...One ought to ask himself: Moshe ben Maimon, Moshe ben Mendel [Mendelsohn] – are they in fact Moshe ben Amram?... These theories are not correct, are not founded upon a comprehensive understanding of the mitzvah as a whole but are imposed on it from without (Nineteen Letters, pp. 264-271).

The Aristotelian view of life was adopted and then adapted by...in his attempt to develop his own philosophy. The introduction to...writes: "I often quote at length from non-Jewish sources without citing them. He does not find anything wrong with this, because quoting sources is long and cumbersome, and might alienate some traditionalist readers.

Rav Shimshon Refael Hirsch maintains that this perspective affected...life asserted that to understand a concept is the ultimate accomplishment. Action is only as means toward the end of understanding. This theory is contrary to the traditional Jewish notion that action is central. As it says in..."...Rav Hirsch maintains, transformed the Aristotelian ideal into Jewish definitions: the mitzvah is simply a means to an end, the prime objective being knowledge of God.
promote philosophical purposes….He [רמב''ם] himself states
that, in analyzing the mitzvos as to their underlying ideas, he
disregards their details – those very details which, together,
give the complete picture of the מצוה (Moreh נבוכים 3:26, 41).
(Nineten Letters, pp 265, 271)

Rav Hirsch warns against the danger of attributing these kinds of
reasons and explanations to the Divine commandments. It could be the
beginning of the loss of the מצווה and the end of the Jewish people.

One may claim that the warnings of Rav Hirsch are unfounded due
to the very fact that he lived some 700 years after רמב''ם. Judaism had
survived thus far, creating thousands of communities steeped in תורה
values throughout the Diaspora. Thus, Rav Hirsch continues his
argument. He claims that Moses Mendelssohn espoused רמב''מ's
Aristotelian ideals. “[Followers of Mendelsson said,] If that view of life
that considers perception of the truth to be man’s cardinal mission
should be true (and who could venture to doubt it, seeing that
Maimonides had declared it to be so)… then, indeed, the many folios of
the Talmud contain nothing but nitpicking subtleties” (Nineteen Letters,
p. 270). Since the time of Mendelssohn, the idea that מצוה are a means to
an end, possessing no inherent value, has made headway in the Jewish
nation, in grotesque deviation from the intentions of רמב''ם. For instance,
if the idea of שבת is that God rested, and if one adopts one’s own
concept of rest, one may follows one’s own whims. The intricate laws of
בורר, בישול, and other מלאכות disappear. If society cannot identify with the
concept of קורבנות, then one might claim that we should abolish them.

His [Mendelssohn's] followers contented themselves with
eagerly furthering the study of Tanach along philosophical
and aesthetic lines, studying the Moreh but, at the same time,
adding and expanding the study of humanities…If, for
instance, the sole intent of the prohibition of labor on
Shabbos is to enable man to rest and recover from the toil of
the week, through cessation of physical activity, in order give
some scope to the mind as well (and who could doubt that this
is the intent, since both Moseses interpret it thus [Maimonides
and Mendelsohn])…is it not strange, indeed, to declare the
writing of two letters of the alphabet – surely an intellectual
occupation – a capital sin? (Nineteen Letters, p. 270)

This approach misuses the basic philosophical tenets of the רמב''ם,
thereby threatening the very foundation of קנסים ורשאים.
Thus, Rav Hirsch’s complaint against the philosophy of the Talmud revolves around the issue of "טעמי המצוות," i.e. attributing logical reasons to the commandments of God allows room to eventually dismiss ההלכה, and in so doing, lose the very essence of Judaism. Rav Hirsch joins the camp that questions the value of providing "טעמי המצוות." He quotes the commentators on the word "חקי," explaining that "חקי" are the commandments that the evil inclination and the nations of the world wrongly force בני ישראל to give reasons for, like not eating pig or refraining from wearing a mixture of wool and linen. In fact, there are no reasons for these commandments. They are "simply decrees of the king, and edicts placed upon his servants." Along these lines, קוהשת ויהיה, commenting on the פור הכתוב, says that there are no logical explanations or reasons for this מוץ. He quotes the ו.GetById, commenting on the פסוק, says that there are no logical explanations or reasons for this מוץ. He explains that the entire החקה, the whole kingdom, is a חק, a rule. Nechama Leibowitz, in her article, "Mystery of the Red Heifer," on פרשת חק writes "The heathen required a rational explanation, appealing to his common sense... It is the commandments that purify the human soul. Let us not be among those who seek for rational explanation for those things, to which the laws of reason do not apply." The המץ discusses the sin of שלחמה שפלת המאי, which understood that the reason for the restrictions placed upon the king was to stop him from particular sins. Since he thought that he would not fall prey to them, he considered himself exempt from the prohibition. Nonetheless, the wisest of all men did transgress; no man is above the warnings of the Divine. We see, then, that Rav Hirsch was deeply critical of הידמה philosophy. He was critical not only of הידמה’s approach to particular philosophical and theological problems, like "טעמי המצוות," but of his method, which tried, according to Rav Hirsch, to explain מיץ in the categories of Greek philosophy. Rav Hirsch understood the historical need for such an approach, at a time when Jews were being led astray by the supposedly rational wisdom of the gentiles, but he could not accept it as a proper understanding of God’s word. Rather, he said, should be explained from within, not from without.

Are People Inherently Evil?

Tami Benmayer

When he offered sacrifices after the מבול, י"תר final said: "יתאם לב האדם ויו"ה final מפורים רבי ורבכון (בראשית ח:א) מפורים to mean "from when man is born", implying that humans are born evil. רבי רישי suggests another explanation. It means "from the people around him", i.e. nurture and not nature.

How can we explain this? Does it mean that I can never be good? Does it mean that inherently I am evil, even if I do good? Or, do our surroundings influence us in bad directions? Where does evil come from to begin with? Didn’t God create the world in order to bestow His goodness on His creations? How can He do this if He created us evil? In order to attempt to understand this, we must look at a number of different sources, beginning with the beginning!

When ה created the world, he made the הד ע ת טוב ור ע final ע (ט:בראשית ב). What was this tree? Does this mean that there was no knowledge of good and evil before אדם ate from the tree? (בראשית ב:ד) רבי explains that before the sin there was no real sense of choice. אדם did what he was supposed to do in a natural and unselfconscious way. After adam ate from the tree, it became difficult for him to make decisions and distinguish right from wrong. Whereas before it had been obvious what wasאמת and what wasשקר, as a result of the sin it was no longer obvious. Good things would be disguised as evil, and vice versa.

This יournal 적용 המים also gained a sexual desire. It says ויודע כי ערומ (ז:בראשית ג). Didn’t they know this before? The answer is that they knew before that they were naked, but they did not realize the implications of this fact. Now that they had gained this יournal, they understood nudity for what it was. They were therefore embarrassed, which is why they then covered themselves.

This can be understood alongside the ל:דברי, where it says, י"ך אלקים אלהי אדם מצים א"ל שניאור, י"ך א"ל כלב אח א"ל ניאור א"ל. רבי explains that at the time of the אמא’s sin, the world will go back to how it was before אדם’s sin. The people will not have the desire to do that which isn’t fitting for them.
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...
by a place of idol worship, עשו would try and push his way out. When she walked past a yeshiva, עשו would. This seems to imply that certain tendencies exist even before a baby is born. This seems unfair. Rather, they had different kinds of יצר הרע. The Torah is emphasizing the fact that עשו had this strong desire for עבודה. If he would channel his personality the wrong way, he would turn into a רע. It also seems obvious that ‘יהו would create each person’s nature differently. He gave each person different genes, and hence a different יצר הרע. This challenges us to reach our individual potential, rather than imitating others.

At the time of their birth, both brothers had the same potential to achieve great things, each in his own unique way, with his own abilities and talents. The problem, according to Rav Hirsch, was that their parents brought them up in exactly the same way. רבקה was told that she carried two nations in her womb who would represent two different kinds of social group. When they were little, they were given exactly the same education. The great law of education, "לנער על פי דרכו" (משלי כב), was forgotten, which led to disaster. If they would have looked at עשו’s strength, ability, agility, and courage, had they helped him use these talents in the service of God, he would have become a hero instead of a villain. Their parents should have recognized each one’s uniqueness, and treated them differently.

The difference between יצחק’s and רבקה’s approach to their children also had an affect on the twins. Rav Hirsch explains this based on the "attraction of opposites." יצחק naturally preferred to withdraw from the bustle of the world and עשו was the exact opposite: a lusty, active type. His father saw in עשו a force that he himself had lost. But רבקה, says Rav Hirsch, loved יצחק, since she saw in him a picture of an ideal life, to which she was not privy from her own father’s house. We learn from here that parents must love their children equally, and not allow their own pasts and hidden desires to influence how much they love their children.

If we examine human history, we discover that human beings can reach the lowest levels imaginable. From Nazis to bloodthirsty terrorists, we see examples of individuals and cultures that emphasize hatred, murder, and pain. Perhaps this is the potential that ‘יהו was describing when He said "רע מנעריו נברא מברא שמו". The גמרא in נו›ערובי says "לעבוריי נברא שמו לאלים של אהרן וגו". Is man really so evil that it would have been better had there been no one in existence? Rav Hirsch say that it is referring to עשו. It is preferable that...
people who do not use their talents for good would never have been created. But the גמרא continues.

No one can change the fact that we’ve been created, so we must “examine” or “feel” our actions. “Examine” refers to looking at our actions and evaluating what we should and perhaps should not be doing, in accordance with ‘ה’s will. “Feel” involves studying even our good actions to see if they involve any negative elements as well.

Each person is faced with a יצר הרע. But it is possible to overcome and rule over the יצר הרע and not fall into sin during a moment of diversion, when they lost their focus due to the musings of the snake. How much easier is it for us to get diverted from our goals, in our world of almost infinite material distractions? If we want to achieve perfection, we have to be strong and rise above our יצר הרע. Perhaps then we can reach the level of ראש הרשון, which we could have reached so long ago.

In conclusion, man is not created evil, but we are all created with the potential to become evil. Yet, we are also created with tremendous potential to overcome evil and achieve goodness, if we work hard at it. No one said life would be easy!!!
Are Women Allowed to Study תורה?

Eliana Diamond

In the mishnah in Pesachim (ב:ד) states, "וַלְמָדְתָּ. The passage specifically uses the word "לְמָדְתָּ" to teach that a father has an obligation to teach his sons תורה but not his daughters (_sv. בדיבר מ). The Talmud in Derech Eretz, however, concludes that in order to be taught תורה, one must be obligated to learn Torah. Since a woman is not obligated to learn תורה, therefore, her father is not obligated to teach her Torah.

The Talmud in Bava Batra discusses the obligation to learn and teach Torah. The Talmud concludes that in order to be taught תורה, one must be obligated to learn Torah. Since a woman is not obligated to learn Torah, therefore, her father is not obligated to teach her Torah.

The Gemara in Bereishit discusses the obligation to learn and teach Torah. The Gemara concludes that in order to be taught Torah, one must be obligated to learn Torah. Since a woman is not obligated to learn Torah, therefore, her father is not obligated to teach her Torah.

The Talmud in Shabbat states: אֶלָּא מַעֲשֵׂיָּבָא אָבָא לְמַעֲשֵׂיָּבָא לְבֵיתוֹ לֹא תִּלְבָּשׁ. The Talmud explains that even if she is guilty, her punishment can be delayed up to three years if she has צוות. What is the צוות referring to? The Talmud in Derech Eretz (ב:א) explains that צוות are the צוות that protect her, although they only protect her temporarily. The Talmud in Derech Eretz, however, is able to protect her for a longer period of time.

The Talmud continues: בַּעַד הַיּוֹם לָלוּא קָדוֹשָׁב. The Talmud explains that a father must teach his daughter Torah because if she was taught Torah she would understand that the מי בם did not kill her right away because of her צוות. The Talmud explains the statement of מי בם to be referring to other women. If they had learned Torah, they would know that the words of the מי בם are true and that the מי בם will eventually take effect.

The Talmud continues and quotes the following: מֵלֶלֶד בְּתוֹנָה וּמְלֶלֶד בְּתַלְוָה. According to the opinion of מי בם, if a father teaches his daughter Torah, it's as if he taught her מצוות - "מלמדת" - stupidity. מי בם follows this statement: יַסְחֶר שְׁאֵלֶד זָרָה מִלְּשׁוֹנַי. מי בם follows this statement: יִשָּׁשׁ שְׁאֵלֶד מִלְּשׁוֹנַי. מי בם follows this statement: יָשֶׁר שְׁאֵלֶד מִלְּשׁוֹנַי. מי בם follows this statement: יִשָּׁשׁ שְׁאֵלֶד מִלְּשׁוֹנַי. מי בם follows this statement: יָשֶׁר שְׁאֵלֶד מִלְּשׁוֹנַי. מי בם follows this statement: יִשָּׁשׁ שְׁאֵלֶד מִלְּשׁוֹנַי. מי בם follows this statement: יָשֶׁר שְׁאֵלֶד מִלְּשׁוֹנַי. מי בם follows this statement: יִשָּׁשׁ שְׁאֵלֶד מִלְּשׁוֹנַי. מי בם follows this statement: יָשֶׁר שְׁאֵלֶד מִלְּשׁוֹנַי. מי בם follows this statement: יִשָּׁשׁ שְׁאֵלֶד מִלְּשׁוֹנַי. מי בם follows this statement: יָשֶׁר שְׁאֵלֶד מִלְּשׁוֹנַי. מי בם follows this statement: יִשָּׁשׁ שְׁאֵלֶד מִלְּשׁוֹנַי. מי בם follows this statement: יָשֶׁר שְׁאֵלֶד מִלְּשׁוֹנַי. מי בם follows this statement: יִשָּׁשׁ שְׁאֵלֶד מִלְּשׁוֹנַי. מי בם follows this statement: יָשֶׁר שְׁאֵלֶד מִלְּשׁוֹנַי. מי בם follows this statement: יִשָּׁשׁ שְׁאֵלֶד מִלְּשׁוֹנַי. מי בם follows this statement: יָשֶׁר שְׁאֵלֶד מִלְּשׁוֹנַי. מי בם follows this statement: יִשָּׁשׁ שְׁאֵלֶד מִלְּשׁוֹנַי. מי בם follows this statement: יָשֶׁר שְׁאֵלֶד מִלְּשׁוֹנַי. מי בם follows this statement: יִשָּׁשׁ שְׁאֵלֶד מִלְּשׁוֹנַי. מי בם follows this statement: יָשֶׁר שְׁאֵלֶד מִלְּשׁוֹן.
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The definition of the word תורה שבעל פה or תורה שבכתב

The king is commanded to read certain sections of the תורה before all of the nation. Women were also included in this מצווה, implying that it is permissible for women to hear תורה שבכתב from the king.

However, the ז”ט wonders if this proves that תורה שבכתב is not considered to be תפילות. If so, why did the הרמב”ם explain that תורה שבכתב should not be studied by women לכתחילה? The ז”ט explains that there are two methods in learning תורה שבכתב. One method is the simple study of the text, "פוספי תורה". This is completely permitted. The other method is the analytical processing of the text, which is prohibited.

Women’s obligation in studying מצות that apply to them

The א”רמ in יורה דעה comments that women have an obligation to learn the מצות that apply to them (זר). Similarly, the ספר חסידי comments that a father is obligated to teach his daughter the מצות and things like פרקי אבות. The ק”סמ concurs that women must learn the מצות that apply to them. But, unlike boys, they are not required to be involved in the details and the grammar when studying תורה. Thus, according to all three commentators, women do have an obligation to study certain areas of תורה.

ברכות התורה

Given a woman’s limited obligation in Torah study, are women obligated to recite ברכות תורה? The הרמב”ם explains that women must recite ברכות תורה, (זר), and quotes the ל”מהרי, who indicates that women must recite the ברכות תורה because they too study תורה. The א”גר, however, cites a source that disagrees. Women
Are Women Allowed to Study הָתוֹרָה?

cannot recite the בְּרָכָה because they were not commanded, and therefore cannot use the word "וצוינו. The א"גר concludes, however, that women do say the בְּרָכָה, just as they say a בְּרָכָה on others, just as they say a בְּרָכָה on others, just as they say a בְּרָכָה on others, just as they say a בְּרָכָה on others, just as they say a בְּרָכָה on others, just as they say a בְּרָכָה on others. א"גר (שבו ושָׁם וְצָוֹם מַגְּזֵה וְפָרְשָׁת, like א"גר.)

Limits to the Prohibition

The בית הלוי was unable to accept the opinions that seem to contradict the גמרא which states that women are exempt from the מצוה of studying הָתוֹרָה. He explains that there are two types of הלומד הָתוֹרָה: a) study of הָתוֹרָה, and b) knowledge of הָתוֹרָה. Women are exempt from studying הָתוֹרָה, but they are still obligated to "know" the מצוה that apply to them. Of course, in order to know the relevant laws she has to study, but once a woman is familiar with the laws that apply to her, she has no more obligations in studying הָתוֹרָה. The א"גר explains that is an act that is not a מצוה in itself, but is a prerequisite to the fulfillment of a different מצוה. In order for her to fulfill her obligation of knowledge of הָתוֹרָה, she must first study הָתוֹרָה.

The פרישה explains that המדרש says פָרְשָׁת א"גר's statement concerning women and הָתוֹרָה was directed to most women, who were not to be taught because they would turn the words of the הָתוֹרָה into nonsense. In the event that a woman learned הָתוֹרָה in a serious way on her own, she would be permitted to study הָתוֹרָה and would even get שכר. However, a father cannot predict how his daughter will react. Therefore, he may not teach his daughter הָתוֹרָה because he is not aware of what is in her heart. The פרישה agrees that המדרש refers to the majority of women, but claims that the minority of women who are motivated may study and be taught הָתוֹרָה. It seems from these sources that when המדרש implies that a minority is permitted to study הָתוֹרָה, and should perhaps be encouraged to do so.

Contemporary Sources

There is virtual unanimity among contemporary sources that women should be permitted, and even encouraged, to study at least certain areas of הָתוֹרָה. The most famous of these sources is the חָפ. It would seem to me that this [prohibition] is only at those times of history when everyone lived in the place of his ancestors and the ancestral tradition was very strong for each individual, and this motivated him to act in the manner of his forefathers as it is written. ( בראשית לֹא: "בָּשָׂל אֶבֶן יְהוָה." Under those circumstances we can say that a woman may not study הָתוֹרָה.
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Many contemporary פוסקים following this lead. For example, Rav Ben Zion Firrer explains that “Today, the question is not whether or not a woman should study תורה, but rather should a woman study תורה or should she study other subjects which are unrelated to the תורה. An obsession to pursue the tree of knowledge has taken hold of all people, women as well as men... If a modern woman does not study תורה, she will certainly study תפילה.”

Similarly, according to Rav Shemuel ha-Nagid, “Modern woman plays a significant role in society, engaging in scientific research, filling the universities, managing offices and businesses, participating in government and political affairs. Surely רבי אליעזר would now waive his ban on teaching women even תורה שבעל פה, so that they might carefully observe all the laws of the תורה affecting their activities and employment. Furthermore, we must intensify their uprightness, and serve as an antidote to their evil inclination.”

Others do not want to go quite this far, retaining some ambivalence about תורה שבעל פה. “Our age differs from earlier ages. In the past, Jewish homes followed the ערכות, and one could learn the entire תורה from experience. There was no need to teach Jewish girls תורה from text. Now, however, our sins being many, many homes are totally divorced from many מצוות and laws of the תורה. Indeed, Jewish girls coming from such homes to attend a religious school are almost like converts, and consequently they must be taught the fundamentals of Judaism and the essentials of practice... Not only is it permitted to teach תורה to girls in our generation, it is an absolute duty. It is a great מצוה to found schools for girls and to inculcate in their hearts pure faith and knowledge of תורה and מצוות. We may have certain reservations as to

1 נטע כרכר טעמד כלא.
the Oral תורה, but there should be no hesitination about teaching Scripture” (משנה למשנה חוליא סテーマ).

Conclusion

There is clearly a difference between a man and woman’s חיב in תלמוד תורה. Men are obligated to study תורה on a larger, broader scale, while women are obligated to study the תורה that applies to them. However, just because women do not have the same חיב as men do, does not mean that it is אסור or unnecessary for them to study what they are not obligated in studying. On the contrary! When women study תורה that they are not obligated in studying, they are considered like an אינו מצווה ועושה, and unquestionably receive a שכר for what they studied. Women should study even things that do not translate directly into practice.

Secondly, one could mount an argument that women should be studying תורה שבעל פה as well. If a woman has obligation to study the תורה that applies to her, it is understood that she should excel in that before studying תורה that she’s not obligated in knowing. In order to master something, it requires learning the topic from beginning to end. Therefore, a woman who wants to know the מצות that apply to her would have to study the תורה in depth, from the קמרא through the משנה ברורה. There may be some who argue against this method of study, claiming that it is sufficient to study only the bottom-line הלכה would be unnecessary. Personally, however, I believe that when I study הלכה starting with the קמרא, not only does it help me remember what I have learnt, but helps me to have a much clearer and stronger understanding of what I am studying. Furthermore, קמרא is the primary source of הלכה, and it seems fitting to start studying הלכה from its beginning, its foundation.

In conclusion, I think that our goal as Jews is to serve and feel connected to יה. There are certain requirements and obligations that each person must fulfill in order to serve יה correctly. However, there are many ways that a person can find a connection with יה. If one finds a connection through חסד, then that should be an emphasis. If one finds this connection through studying תורה, then that might get higher priority. There is not one set prescription that every Jew can follow in order to find this personal connection. Therefore, one should concentrate on fulfilling ones obligation in תורה, and then move on to find those ways that help to personally connect with יה.
The Torah regulates a justice system, but it is difficult today to live up to the Torah’s high standards. What do we do when a Jew murders (God forbid) and is taken to a secular court? Does a Jew have the right, or perhaps obligation, to testify against another Jew in front of a secular court? Is a Jew allowed to defend another Jew when he committed a crime, particularly if that crime is also prohibited by the Torah? These issues will have to be closely examined.1

Rav Herschel Schachter, Rosh Yeshiva of Yeshiva University, in an article he wrote for *Journal of Halacha and Contemporary Society*, states that there is no איסור of מסירה under these circumstances.2 A Jew is allowed to testify against another Jew because the general courts are the only available justice system today. For the sake of law and order, a Jew may even be required to testify against his fellow Jew. The one restriction Rav Schachter mentions is that in order for a Jew to testify, the Jewish criminal had to violate an איסור from the Torah. The witness, however, has no היתר to lie; he must tell the complete truth.

The Gemara in א"פד ע-ב"ב בא מנייא פג ע tells a story of Rav Eliezer who agreed to arrest thieves for the Roman government. Rabbi Joshua reprimanded him, telling him that he is giving over a fellow Jew to be executed by the Romans. This Gemara addresses the two conflicting sides of the issue: a) In order to fulfill the מצוה of בבערת הרע מקרב (י:ג memfinal ו:דברי), sometimes we have to follow the only justice system available. This was Rav Eliezer’s point, when he said, "אני מכלה מ." b) Testifying against a fellow Jew and giving him over to the hands of non-Jews is highly problematic, as Rabbi Joshua strongly stated when he rebuked his colleague, telling him to leave those thieves in the hands of ה. What is this telling us? Who is right, Rabbi Eliezer or Rabbi Joshua? The Rashba in his חידושי on this Gemara explains that for a ג蕊 like this, it is improper to

---

1 This article is largely based on Rabbi Michael J. Broyde, “On the Practice of Law According to Halacha,” *The Journal of Halachah in Contemporary Society*, 20.
work for a gentile government (not simply discouraged), but for most people nowadays, it would not be a problem.

The states explicitly that it is to hand a Jew to the hands of idolators, even if he is a . Anyone who violates this does not have a in . Rabbi explains that the prohibits one from testifying against a Jew only to an unjust government, but if the government is fair then it is .

wrote a regarding a person who wanted to work as a financial auditor for the government. The individual realized that if he discovered any financial misconduct, he would have to report it even if the criminal was a . explained that there is no problem with this because even if the Jew did not take this job, there would be someone else in his place finding the same wrongdoings, and any Jew who acted illegally would be caught in any case .

explains that the means that a government has the right to enforce laws, and Jews have to abide by these laws. We can infer, therefore, that Jews can also help enforce the laws.

We have seen that it is not necessarily a problem for a Jew to testify against another Jew. However, is a permitted to defend another Jew who is accused of violating the law of the land and a law of ? First, let us examine if a Jewish criminal would be allowed to plead not guilty himself. According to , if a Jew was to plead guilty in front of his testimony would not be accepted without two like any other case in a Jewish court . From this we can conclude that a Jew is not required to plead guilty, even if he is guilty. adds that proof is required both in Jewish and secular law, and therefore, it is the court’s responsibility to find the necessary evidence, not the defendant’s.

There is an interesting that discusses a group of people who were suspected of murder. They asked to defend them. declined but advised them to go and hide. There is a dispute between and . says that he declined because it is . says that is saying that it is only to defend a criminal if defending the criminal is prohibited according to the secular law. Otherwise, it is completely . say that refused because he was afraid that he would get punished for defending murderers, but that it is permitted to defend them. According to this, being a defense attorney is completely permitted. If we follow the of
Rabbi Broyde brings an appealing twist on the logic, explaining how this fulfills the mitzvah of 'וּבֵעֵרֵת הָרֵעַ מִבְּכֵרָה' according to American law. Even a criminal has the right to representation in court. Without a lawyer (if he desires one), there can be no conviction. In fact, a defense attorney makes it possible to convict the criminal. Therefore, it is always permissible to defend a criminal. Rav Schachter disagrees. Based on the teachings of 'חכמה שלמה' and 'רבי עקיבא איגר', he says that defending a criminal is only permissible if the lawyer is not 100% sure that he is guilty. If he is sure, then it is forbidden because every Jew has the mitzvah of 'וּבֵעֵרֵת הָרֵעַ מִבְּכֵרָה', even lawyers. There is, however, general agreement among the halachic authorities that a lawyer may not lie in defending his client. He may only make claims that he thinks might be true. If a lawyer, for example, knows that the client is perfectly sane, he may not mount an insanity defense.

Although we see through all these sources that it is permissible both to testify against a Jew and defend a guilty Jew in court, we must always keep in mind that it is not permissible for us to cheat and lie. There are many limitations regarding what a lawyer can and cannot say. But that is a topic for another article. May God help us live in a world of true justice, according to the 'ה'צ ו'ץ ה'.
Faculty Articles
There are three that are beyond me: the way of an eagle in the heavens; the way of a snake upon a rock; the way of a ship in the heart of the sea” (משלי יח: כ). comment that these three – the eagle, the snake, and the ship – represent respectively מצה, ממרור, מ该项, i.e. the three central מצוות of the Seder night.

I would like to raise two questions. First, what couldn’t the נשר understand about these three phenomenon? Second, how did the מל understand these three with מצה וממרור? I suggest that what perplexed the mind of שלמה המל is כלל ישראל and its survival throughout history.

I.

The נשר is an endangered species in most parts of the world. It never flies low. It is either soaring above all creatures, or trudging on the ground. When one sees it on the ground, the eagle looks clumsy, unable to fly. But, suddenly it zooms up to the heavens. The נשר symbolizes כלל ישראל.

כ<u> nostro</u> <u>tempio</u> יורד עד למטה, וכ<u> nostro</u> <u>tempio</u> עלי כ<u> nostro</u> רוקיע. When they are low, they reach the depths; when they are up, they soar to the skies.

Our People reached a low during the Holocaust. During that horrible period we were tortured, murdered, humiliated and trampled upon. Yet, a mere three years later, our People established their own independent State in ישראל. And less than twenty years later, we experienced the amazing miracles of the Six Day War.

This נשר phenomenon is also true in the spiritual realm. In our time, we have witnessed, thank God, an incredible increase in כ٬ şiוחה standards and מצה שמורה. We have seen the proliferation of ישיבות. We are “עד לרקיע.” But, at the same time, we are witness to a plague of intermarriage and מץ which threatens to cut off major branches of the tree of our people. This is “עד למטה.”

This פסח dramatizes this fact. One day we were被打, brutalized, and humiliated. Overnight we became נפרד: free, independent, and proud. Our People experienced a dramatic transition in the spiritual arena as well.
From just one generation – there was a change from worship of idols to the belief in, and love of, One God. This is the paradoxical nature of the Jewish People, symbolized by the "דָּרֶךְ ָאָנָּה בְּלֵב יִשְׂרָאֵל".

II.

We can also explain the "allaxia" in a related fashion. The snake thrives on a minimal diet – "עליה צור". For over two centuries in מצרי, Jews lived on "עוני וניה". For forty years in the desert they survived on מַזָּלֶת גְּבָרָה (שמות יב: יחقوانين). Throughout the גלות we lived like the ו shalt we. This is the paradox that engaged the mind of שלמה המלך!

When the מטה of Moshe was cast to the ground it became a dangerous נחש. But when Moshe was told "אחז בזנבו", handle it with tenderness, "ויהי למטה" it became the מטה which led to גאולה (ד-ג:שמות ד). Yet, He has consistently redeemed us with great חסד and the tender affection of a loving mother.

The נחש also requires wit to survive. It represents cunning. It is the " מכל חית השדה"ערו (א:בראשית ג). The Jew has survived due to his "Yiddishe kop." There is a story told about Moshe Montefiore. He was summoned to the palace of the king for an emergency meeting on Shabbat. Following the meeting, the king offered him a cigar as a gift. The king lit the cigar, but Montefiore refused. When the king asked why, Moshe responded, "Because a gift from my king is too precious to let go up in smoke!" מצה, the bread of affliction, the עוני לח, stresses the idea of חיפזו, quick wittedness and the ability to survive.

The Sachachaver Gaon said the following. Normally סור מרע comes beforeעשה טוב. First we should cleanse ourselves from חטאי and then sanctify ourselves with מצות and then קבלת עדת חכמים. But, during יציאת מצרי, God did not wait for the cleansing process. He redeemed us בחיפזו. That is why קדש comes before ורח on ליל הסדר. Sanctification (עשה טוב) should be before purification (שסר מרע).

III.

דרך אנוהי כבל ש"ל שלמה המלך also wondered about the "למַּה". Imagine the picture of the helpless and lonely sailboat in the face of a storm. Artists used to bind themselves to the mast of sailboats to experience the fury of a typhoon. The crew might become discouraged, but not the seasoned captain. He knows that the hurricane pushes the עמי closer to shore.
The bitterness of “מרור” represents the furious storms of “גלות” and the situation of the lonely אניה. But, ממרור often drives the אניה of our people closer to the shore of “גאולה.” In our days we are experiencing bitterness of ממרור. Our People is as lonely and as the battered “אני ה בלוב יי.” We hope and pray that the fury of the storm of hatred will hasten us to the shores of “גאולה” and “ישועה.” Amen!
משה קבל תורה מסיני
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