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INTRODUCTION

Balancing priorities is a skill. Often, people struggle to create or maintain a healthy equilibrium of values in their lives. Such a concept can be seen in the failed relationship of עקיב ועשו. According to רב שמשון רפאל הירש, the reason that עקיב, and not עש, ultimately received the ברכה is because 'рבי ורבקה, רבי ורבקה both knew that עקיב, in the future, would be able to produce offspring that were capable of attaining a perfect synthesis of working in different arenas in order to achieve the goals of תורה.

Because of his bent towards physicality, עש’s inclinations towards evil were strong. The תורה teaches that עש’s marriage to an אשה חתית caused his parents much pain and grief. In hopes of bringing his son, even partially, onto 'דרך ה, רבי ורבקה, רבי ורבקה decided he would give his son a blessing that would provide him with a push toward remaining on the path of Torah observance.

Of יצחק’s two sons, each had his own purpose to fulfill in this world. שוע was destined to be an איש יודע ציד איש שדה while עקיב was destined to be an איש תם יושב אהלים; therefore, עקיב was meant to receive the ברכה - a spiritual, תורה-oriented ברכה. Nonetheless, because יצחק understood the importance of the physical aspects of this world, he prepared a גשמי-oriented ברכה to give to שע. Ergo, because יצחק understood the necessity of merging these two qualities, physicality and spirituality, into the ideal symbiotic partnership, he organized two separate blessings, accordingly, in hopes of creating the ultimate Übermensch. Ideally, שע was meant

---

1 בראשית כז
2 בראשית במדבר
3 דברים כז
4 בראשית לבר halka
to use his knowledge of hunting and fields, that is to say physicality, to support him in his עֲקֵב, that is to say, spirituality.  

If this is the case, if these were יצחק’s intentions, how could רבקה doubt her husband, and why was she opposed to receiving a ברכה in the first place? One could suggest that because she, as a mother, knew that her sons were polar opposites, she knew that עֲקֵב could not deserve the ברכה. Yet, יצחק, knowing that his eldest son’s spirituality was lacking, planned to give her ברכה.

The אור החיים posits that was completely aware of his son’s shortcomings, and the ברכה was tailored as an extra spiritual boost especially for him.  

רב הירש explains that a functional symbiotic relationship, as seen in the relationship of יששכר וזבולון, only works when both parties value תורה and spirituality. עֲקֵב not only lacked spirituality as יצחק had initially believed, he was both a manipulator and a trickster because he felt too empowered by his physicality. With his lack of balance between physical and spiritual elements, עֲקֵב did not value תורה at all. This was the stem of רבקה’s apprehension.

Unfortunately, because a symbiotic relationship could not exist between עֲקֵב and רְבּוֹת, the ברכות were not split between the two brothers as originally intended; instead, both were bestowed unto יששכר, whose sons would be able to achieve the correct balance. The relationship between בני ישראל ובני לוי, similar to that of יששכר וזבולון, was that of perfect symbiosis: one tribe spent all day learning תורה while the other tribe spent most of the day working to support himself and his partner. This agreement enabled many יִמְרַדָּים to be bred and many merchants to become יְי יִרְאֵי שַמְּיָה.
Nowadays, being a citizen of the world is necessary; however, doing so entails a constant struggle to maintain balance. Balance, though – in any aspect of life – is elusive and hard to attain. This is true in regard to וַעֲקָב אֶל as well. We were placed on this world to worship ה and achieve higher levels of spirituality. Yet we must live in the physical world and participate fully in all of its aspects. These two priorities seem to contradict one another, yet if one understands the struggle that וְעַקְבֵּי undertook after he received both parts of the blessing, one can appreciate the challenge and beauty of this noble struggle.

We dedicate this year’s קול מבשרת journal to חיים בן יהודה ז”ל, a grandfather of one of our תלמידות, and an admirable man who exemplified the idea of living a balanced life בָּשָׂר. He was a man who persevered through the Holocaust, helped build ארץ ישראל, and battled Parkinson’s, all without breaking his אמונה for even a moment. Although his struggles were in the physical realm, his aspirations and goals remained intangible. He exemplified the notion that inner strength, hope and perseverance are life’s most important tools to realize dreams, to overcome challenges, and to defy life’s obstacles. He was able to both create and execute the perfect equilibrium between perseverance and placidity. It is for his balance, conviction, determination, and sheer earnestness that this year’s קול מבשרת journal is dedicated to חיים בן יהודה ז”ל.

We thank all the passionate contributors for their enlightening articles. We thank Elana for all of her patience and hard work. Last but definitely not least, a huge thank you to Rabbi Haber without whom this journal could not have been successful.

Rachel Benaim
Chana Sinensky
תנ"ך
Sibling Rivalry
A Behind the Scenes Peak
at the Story of קין והבל

The narrative of קין and והבל is perhaps one of the most puzzling stories in all of התנ"ך. A number of questions can be raised regarding this passage and קין’s character as depicted therein:

The never explicitly states that קין was a רשע nor that he was the type of person who would brutally murder his brother; one can thus ask, if there is seemingly no mention of קין’s negative qualities, why was his קרבן not accepted by הללו in the first place?

Furthermore, after rebuked קין regarding his attitude about his rejected קרבן, why did neglect to do והשבה?

What led to קין’s jealousy and hatred for his brother, והבל, which ultimately caused the first murder in human history?

Additionally, after the murder, why did answer קין with the famous words, והשמר אתني אנכי? What is the meaning of this response?

Moreover, when said קין why was this a sincere declaration and commitment to do והשבה? Or was this comment perhaps a sarcastic and cynical reaction to the punishment ה had just given him?

In this essay, we will examine the interpretations of רש"י, ק"רד, ר"רמב, and . We will see that they all attempt to provide answers to these perplexing questions, and through their

1 תב"א:בראשית ד:א-ט
2 תב"א:בראשית ד:ט
3 תב"א:בראשית ד:יג
different interpretations of the text, several different understandings of this story and קֵין’s true nature emerge. In addition to serving as a case study of the methodologies of different פרשנים, these understandings will help us answer the looming questions enumerated above.

Let us begin with רש"י. In his commentary, he provides crucial background details that help clarify many ambiguities in the text. For instance, we know that חָבֶל was a shepherd and קֵין a farmer. רש"י tells us that the reason חָבֶל separated himself from working the land and turned to sheep instead, was because the land had been cursed as a result of אדם’s sin. As the תורה clearly expresses, the land was cursed because of him. However, קֵין did not do as his brother did and separate himself from working the land.

In the following the verse explains that קֵין gave a קָרְבָּן to חָבֶל. רש"י explains that the קָרְבָּן was from the worst of קֵין’s produce. (רש"י’s understanding of the פסוק can be explained by the fact that the next פסוק describes קָרְבָּן with the usage of positive adjectives, thereby portraying the sacrifice’s triviality.) Likewise, קָרְבָּן contained a personality, aspects of himself that he was donating to חָבֶל. When describing חָבֶל’s sacrifice, the פסוק says צאנו, emphasizing that it was his flock, whereas when describing קֵין’s, there is no such description.
It thus seems that from the very beginning, י"רש depicts קין as a negative persona – a man with no redeeming qualities. As the story unfolds, this characterization continues. קין reacted very strongly to the rejection of his קרבן. He was jealous of his brother’s worthy קרבן, when, in reality, he had no right to be. ה responded to קין’s irrational anger by asking him למה חרה לך ולמה נפלו פניך; then told קין that if he changed his attitude he would be forgiven; however, if he failed to do so, he would continue to sin, and he would not have the power to rule over his temptations. As it says ת רבץטאלא תיטיב לפתח ח הלוא אם תיטיב – if you do well, you will be lifted up, and if you do not, sin will crouch upon you.

From י"רש’s understanding of these פסוקים, the reader is given a clearer picture of his view on קין’s character. י"רש views קין as a person with a strong יצר הרע, driven by impulse and desire. He did not strive for excellence in serving ה, yet ה gave him an opportunity to do so. Even so, in the next פסוק, it appears that קין did not take ה’s message to heart; he murdered his brother הבלי.

What caused קין to completely disregard ה’s warning and kill his...
brother? ירומש explains that the enigmatic word ויאמר in the פסוק refers to a quarrel between קין and הבל, which gave קין a pretext to kill הבל. ירומש adds that this is the simple reading of the פסוק, but there are also many דרשים. He does not, however, indicate which דרשים he is referring to.

In בראשית, there are many interpretations of the events that triggered קין’s murder of הבל. One interpretation says that קין and הבל were having a conversation about dividing the world between them. The דרש narrates the conversation: קין said “one of us will assume the position of ruling over the land and one of us will rule over the chattel,” to which קין replied, “you are standing on my land,” and then responded, “what you are wearing is mine!” This caused קין to get up and kill his brother. Conversely, רבי יהושע in the name of רבי לוי says that they were fighting about where the בית המקדש was going to be built. Since they could not agree about whose land the בית המקדש would be built in, קין got angry and killed הבל. A third opinion suggests that קין and הבל were fighting about their sister that was born to them. The argument proceeded as such: “give her to me, because I am the older one,” to which הבל responded, “she was born with me, so she belongs to me!” This angered קין.
and caused him to kill ר"ב. According to רבי יוחנן, ר"ב was overpowering קין, ר"ב, and קין said to ר"ב, "what will you tell our father if you kill me?" קין then had mercy on קין and let him go. קין took this opportunity and overpowered ר"ב, consequently killing him. The common denominator of all of these ideas is that the quarrel was motivated by mutual jealousy and rivalry, of which ר"ב was also guilty. קין, though, acted on his emotions and killed ר"ב.

After this episode transpired, ר"ה asked קין a rhetorical question: "אי הבל אחיך?" ר"ה explains that ר"ה initiated a conversation with קין, in the hope that this would trigger קין's repentance; however, קין disappointed ר"ה and answered: "השומר אחי אנכי, לא ידעתי." ר"ה interprets this as a question of bewilderment, indicating that קין did not take responsibility for what he had done.

Consequently, ר"ה punished קין who responded: "גדול עוני מנשא". קין indirectly told ר"ה, "You are the ruler over the higher and lower realms, can You really not tolerate my sin?" From ר"ה's interpretation of these פסוקים, clearly, קין remained unrepentant to the end.

רש"י's פירוש on these פסוקים is very interesting, and typical of his approach of clarifying the פסוקים, and using מדרש as a tool to solve textual problems. For example, he uses the מדרש in

---
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24 בראשית רבה, שם "ויאמר קין אל ר"ה - ויאמר קין אל ר"ה מגוון עלמקוםעלותולעתיםותאתהRowAt. "למשל אין אתה מטול".

25 קר"ה, בראשית רבה, שם "ואני לא באתי אלא לפשט של מקראולאנדרהמשנהたりרבדורקיא".
Leah Frenkel

To explain that קין's קרבן was from the worst of his crops. Additionally, רashi quotes מדרש תנחומא,27 which elucidates that he brought flax seed as his קרבן. These מדרשים help us understand why 'ה accepted קין's קרבן, but not קין's קרבן. Without the usage of these מדרשים, one would not understand why קין's קרבן, which was from the "fruit of the ground," was not accepted by 'ה.

Yet, in explaining 'ויאמר קין אל הבל אחיו רashi alludes to the מדרשים but does not quote them. Apparently, he felt that his explanation of the simple meaning of the text was sufficient, and he did not need the מדרשים to aid him. Perhaps, רashi did not quote the מדרש not only because it wasn't necessary on a purely textual level, but also because it was not needed even on a deeper, philosophical level. In this case, according to רashi, the מדרש isn't needed since the details of what led up to the climax of the murder are trivial. The most important detail of the story is that קין did not do תשובה, did not listen to 'ה, and his יצר הרע overpowered him, triggering his murder of הבל.

ר"ד's approach to this topic is fundamentally similar to רashi's but differs on some nuances. He holds that קין and הבל learned from אדם that bringing קרבנות was a symbol of gratitude to thank 'ה for the blessings He had bestowed.29 Like רashi, he explains that קין's קרבן was of poor quality, or – based on the מדרש תנחומא – that his קרבן came from the leftovers of his crop. קין's קרבן was given in a despicable manner, which is why 'ה was not willing to accept it.

ר"ד adds that קין's קרבן was not from the ביכורים as was that of הבל ר"ד. He then elaborates on the nature of the קרבן of הבל.
was brought with כבוד. Not only was it from the הביכורים, but it was also from the best of his flock. Since כהן רבי והבל was appropriate, and given with good intentions, רבי accepted the donation; however, regarding קין’s sacrifice, רבי knew that he had ulterior motives, and rejected the offering. As a result, קין became angry, resentful, and embarrassed, just like אדם after he committed his sin. Up until this point, רבי’s view is very similar to רashi’s.

Then, in ו, תuum ו רבי spoke to קין enlightening the path of תשובה. רבי explains that any sinner can attain כפרה if he does a complete, wholehearted תשובה. He defines להוא אם תטיב אתך to mean that if קין would be willing to change his ways, then he would achieve כפרה and would be elevated from his prior state. If not, רבי warned him that his sin and temptation to sin would never leave him; his inclination to evil would be a constant stumbling block. Through this conversation, רבי imparted to קין a fundamental message that was not only for him, but for the rest of the world and the future generations as well. When רבי said ואתה תמשל בו, he explained to קין that he had Victoir. If he wished to repent and conquer his inclination, he had the power to do so. This is the first time in the תורה that anyone has been given the chance to do תשובה. Nevertheless, קין did not take heed to רבי’s advice and warning. רבי states that that he did not have any sense of remorse or regret; he failed to do תשובה, and continued down the path of sin.

רבי then gives several possibilities regarding what קין could have said to והבל before he killed him. One possibility is

---
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that told what had just said to him, and accused of being the cause of all his misfortune. However, did not get up and kill right then and there out of fear of his father. He waited until they were both alone in the field, at which point he provoked .

also quotes the aforementioned in that provides other possibilities regarding the events that led to the murder. After killed , spoke to , which, according to , was meant to teach that he is unable to hide from . Moreover, this was meant to teach that every single action of man is known by Him. thought that by being in an isolated field whilst he murdered his brother, he could hide just as had — however, he believed that his seclusion would work, unlike his father’s had. Likewise, just as asked a rhetorical question of , here too asked a question of a similar nature. He asked him, 

says that since didn’t specifically ask, he thought that did not know what had happened; he denied it by responding. — I do not know where he is; he went to go do his work, and I went to do mine; do I watch where he goes with his flock?

contrasts to his father. was not deceitful in his response to , since he knew that is omniscient. Although said , which may have implied that did not know what had just done, He said to reveal His knowledge of man’s sin, and to give the chance to explain his action. The only reason that hid was because of his tremendous feelings of embarrassment.
In contrast, קין did not fully realize 'ה omniscience; therefore, when 'ה asked him איה البل אחיך, he responded condescendingly and did not own up to his sin. He truly believed that he could outsmart 'ה.

After 'ה gave קין his punishment, קין responded condescendingly and did not own up to his sin. He truly believed that he could outsmart 'ה.

Rędկ explains this to mean, my punishment is too great for me to bear. He goes on to say that קין did do רשבה; he experienced regret for what he had done, and he asked 'ה to lessen his punishment. Here Rędך differs somewhat from רשביה. Whereas רשבי views קין as unrepentant to the end, according to רנדך, he ultimately did תשובה.

Rędך’s methodology seems to be a combination of both a פשט understanding of the text as well as a דרש understanding; in his פירוש, he incorporates many מאמרי חז”ל.

His usage of both פשט as well as מדרש can be seen regarding his understanding of קין, which says וית.Auto, א ב ל קין, תשי"ט, where explains what exactly קין said to блו. The first gives a פשט-oriented answer, and says that קין told блו the rebuke he just received from 'ה. Then, Rędך goes on to quote the מדרשים in בראשית רבה. Within one פסוק, he gives two very different answers to solve the question of what קין may have told блו.

From the very beginning, רמב”ן’s commentary differs from that of רש”י and רנדך. The רמב”ן comments that קין was born after the sin of אדם וĽוה. According to רמב”ן, when said קניתי איש את ה, she meant that when she and אדם died, he would be the person who would serve 'ה in their place. From the outset, רמב”ן is painting a positive picture of קין as one who possessed the potential to be an עבד ה as well as a ירא שמים.

Interestingly, רמב”ן does not comment on whether the קרבן of קין was of lesser or greater quality than that of блו's.
in fact, his קָרָבָן was not accepted. Rather, רָמִי introduces a tremendous כָּל in his פִּיאָר which may perhaps shed light on the actual story itself. רָמִי explains[46] that קָרָבָן understood the power of קָרָבָן, as did ה. He brings in the כָּל, which says that even קָרָבָן brought a קָרָבָן and קָרָבָן understood that giving קָרָבָן would cause ה to display נחת רוח towards them.

Here, רָמִי explains that this פִּיאָר proves those who misunderstand the nature of קָרָבָן. He is referring to קָרָבָן in קָרָבָן, who says that the purpose of the command for קָרָבָן was because the other nations were serving animals as כָּל וְדָוִד, so commanded ל to give animal sacrifices to ה in order to separate His people from the כָּל. Yet, רָמִי indicates that there is clear evidence that both קָרָבָן and קָרָבָן gave קָרָבָן when there was no trace of כָּל anywhere in the world; therefore, רָמִי’s assertion of the reason why ה commanded קָרָבָן cannot be accurate. רָמִי seems to skip over the part of the story that discusses ה’s favoring קָרָבָן. Perhaps the reason רָמִי does not comment on this is because it is clear that the point of bringing the קָרָבָן was to praise ה and cause Him to display נחת רוח. If so, because the text openly describes קָרָבָן’s offering as not worthy of being accepted, it must mean that its poor quality did not allow it to fulfill its purpose.

When ה only accepted קָרָבָן, the embarrassment and jealousy mounted in קָרָבָן, his brother. ו then asked to him why he was jealous of his brother—utilizing the words כָּל וְדָוִד and קָרָבָן tells קָרָבָן, if you can act in your brother’s ways, then you will rise to an even higher level than he, because you are the בָּדֵר and you have a

[46] והבל הביא גם הוא" "ויבא קין מפרי האדמה מנחה לה":בראשית ד:בראשית ד
[47] גמרא עבודה זרה
[48] מורה נבוכים
[49] בראשיות ד: "יהלא אם טוב שראה"
greater potential." However, 'יה then explained to 'יה that if he would choose not to change his ways, then not only would 'יה dominate, but 'יה would be present at all times, working hard to get 'יה to fail in everything he does. Finally, 'יה told 'יה that if he would be able to conquer his evil inclinations, he would rule over his evil inclinations, and he would be forgiven.

Thus maintains that the root of 'יה's sin was based on the fact that he felt embarrassed in front of his brother, and he became jealous of him. further explains that he disagrees with the opinions of , regarding what said to before he killed him. Focusing on the words, he explains that 'יה told 'יה to come into the field, a place they would be alone, and then killed him. 'יה took 'יה into an empty field to murder him so that no one could prevent 'יה from carrying out his plan.

explains that after 'יה accepted 'יה's and not 'יה's, became worried and was left to assume that the descendants for the rest of the world would come from because he, in essence, had been "accepted." As a means of preventing this, 'יה killed 'יה. In other words, according to , the murder was premeditated, and not merely a spontaneous act of rage.

further disagrees with regarding the meaning of . Unlike , who quotes and says that this was a sarcastic statement made by towards and , maintains that, according to the , this was a statement of , one of . quotes the and explains that when 'יה said these words, he realized the severity of his sin, and 'יה forgave him. 'יה also asked 'יה not to add anything else to his punishment. elaborates that 'יה pleaded with 'יה and said to Him, "my sin is too great to be forgiven," 'יה, Your judgment is just, even though You have punished
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me harshly. From now on I will be a wanderer, I will not have a place to rest, Your face will be hidden from me, and I will no longer be able to pray and give a קרבן or a מנחה before You. In your kindness, You have spared me from death, but please do not make me suffer more than I already will be suffering, please give me protection so that the wild animals do not kill me.” Like רבי קין views קרבי as ultimately repentant. Whereas רבי קין maintained that קין’s response was triggered by remorse over his punishment, רבי קין asserts that קין first considered his sin too great to endure, and then reflected on the ramifications of his deed—one of which is longer being connected to ה’.

The fact that רבי קין’s commentary is heavily focused on רבי קין’s commentary as seen in this particular ענין where the רבי קין quotes רבי יר㮄 in a great deal of his writings. These quotations are indicative of the fact that רבי קין wanted his פירוש to serve as a dialogue with רבי יר㮄’s commentary. This phenomenon is actually consistent throughout his entire פירוש on תורה.

The fact that רבי קין does not comment on a large portion of the פסוקים in this section is quite perplexing. For example, רבי קין does not comment on י-פסוקים ט, which discuss the murder and קין’s response to the query אי הבל אחיך. Perhaps רבי קין intentionally leaves these few פסוקים unexplained. He stated earlier that the root of קין’s sin was embarrassment, jealousy, and threat. Perhaps קין lied and said המר אחיך because he was unable to control his feelings of embarrassment. After he killed הבל, he was even more embarrassed and ashamed of his actions. However, רבי קין leaves this section ambiguous and unclear because he feels that in truth no one besides ה’ can understand why קין denied his actions.

רב שמשון רפאל הירש employs his unique method of etymological analysis and comparison of the שורשים of various words to ascertain their connotations, and arrives at a very different
perspective on this episode. He first comments on the words of חוה;52 when naming her son קין, she said,\(^53\) כנני איש את ה.\(^54\) רבי הירש explains that from the very beginning of their existence, the תורה highlights the differences of personality between קין and הבל. The first usage of the word קנה is defined as an acquisition by strength and power. חוה, in essence, pronounced that by the expenditure of her strength, and with ה’ s cooperation, she had acquired a son. One might have hoped that after having given birth to the first son in the history of the world, חוה would have acted more graciously towards ה’; instead, she seemed to attribute much credit to herself. From this understanding of the פסקים, it is possible to assume that חוה influenced קין with her “tendency of character.”\(^55\) קין’s name alone highlights the fact that חוה, the child’s first influence, imprinted feelings of egotism and self-centeredness onto קין, which were the root of his later character flaws.

Regarding the words וקין היה עובד אדמה,\(^56\) רבי הירש explains that the different occupations chosen by the two brothers reflects on their personalities and characters. קין was an עבד אדמה. Working the land demands that one devote his entire life to his physical existence. רבי הירש says that just as קין’s mother, חוה, displayed traits of ego-centrism, קין also fell prey to the possibility of becoming an עובד אדמה in the most literal sense - a slave to his field as opposed to an עבד. This comes with a risk; one who is a farmer and slave to his field may forget that ה’ controls this world and the fruits of the land. רבי הירש posits that life of a shepherd is more elevated; his entire spirit is not as involved in his labor, and thus he remains more open to Godly values.

---
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Therefore, Reb Hirsch infers that perhaps the reason ‘ה did not accept קין’sקרבן had nothing to do with the quality of theקרבן, rather it had to do with the person giving theקרבן. Reb Hirsch’s attitude when giving theקרבן was unsatisfactory, hence hisקרבן was deemed unpleasing to ‘ה. He also comments on the words גם הוא and says that this seemingly superfluous phrase teaches that one should not have expected ‘ה to bring aקרבן. Reb Hirsch clarifies that קין, theבכור, did not only bringקרבנות for himself, rather he brought them on behalf of his entire family; therefore, ‘ה did not have to bring aקרבן at all.

Reb Hirsch observes thatibreven notwithstanding thisקרבן either because he did not feel adequately represented inקרבן קין, or because קין was too “caught up in his egoism,” and therefore קין did not want to includeibreven when he brought the sacrifice. Reb Hirsch explains that thisקרבן was a silent protest, a questioning of קין’s worthiness in being theבכור. By acceptingibrevenקרבן instead of קין’s, ‘ה confirmedibreven’strue worthiness of being theבכור and left קין feeling unworthy and depressed. However, in פסוק ז, Reb Hirsch expresses words of comfort to קין.

According to Reb Hirsch’s explanation, ‘ה asked קין, “why does this depress you and why do you feel so hopeless? It was onlyלפי שעה that I acceptedibreven’sקרבן!” It was not a reflection of the fact that קין did not deserve to be theבכור. Reb Hirsch focuses on theword וישע, and explains that this means a “momentary turning towards,” as opposed to the wordפנה which means a stronger, more permanent turn. ‘ה told קין that if he used his privileges as the firstborn appropriately, and if he utilizes his occupation of working the land in a positive manner, (in order to develop human civilization thus elevating his physical associations) he would no
longer feel downcast. Ultimately though, the choice was in קין's hands.

Then explains that קין does not explain what קין said to ריבל before he killed him; however, he assumes that קין told what he had just told him: that ריב ש LinearLayoutManager was just temporary. ריב compares the words ויקם אל, to the story in ספר שמואל, where ריב told his men that they were not to attack שאול, and states שאול, In this story, the attack was unexpected as seen by the descriptive language used and ויקם אל שאול. This literally translates as to go towards the other, which leads ריב to conclude that קין and שאול were not within close proximity of one another. Each was engaged in his own individual activity, when suddenly the idea came into קין's head to kill ריב.

When ריב asked קין the rhetorical question, אי הבל אחיך, the response from קין was “it is not my duty to know the whereabouts of my brother or to look after him!” ריב explains that קין, at the root of his being, was filled with the “every man for himself” attitude. After ריב gave קין the punishment, ריב comments that "my sin is too great to be forgiven," rather it means, “my sin is greater than I can bear.”

Kין just realized, that through his paranoia of not being accepted and his קנאה of his brother's קרבן, he was brought to kill his brother. Thus, he severed all ties between himself and the earth upon which he worked, as well as the ties between himself and ריב. He realized that he had forfeited everything because of this crime and now needed to face the consequences.

However, קין came to this realization not by thinking about the murder he committed, but rather after conceptualizing what
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he had indirectly done to himself. Not only did he murder his brother, but he murdered himself. One could therefore assume that he did not recognize the sin against his brother as much as he recognized his destructive acts towards himself. One could therefore assume that he did not recognize the sin against his brother as much as he recognized his destructive acts towards himself. One could therefore assume that he did not recognize the sin against his brother as much as he recognized his destructive acts towards himself.

This may have been twofold: it could be considered both repentance motivated by fear and repentance motivated by love. According to the Talmud, Rabbi Shimon Bar Yochai explains that Kinnor had a deep sense of regret for his sin and did not merely state that he was wrong and ask for a smaller punishment, rather he first realized that by sinning he had permanently lost his connection to Him and yearned to reestablish this bond.

According to Rabbi Shimon Bar Yochai, Kinnor sincerely regretted his sin and desired to come close to Him. According to Rabbi Shimon Bar Yochai, Kinnor sincerely regretted his sin and desired to come close to Him.
When explaining the importance of a witness in a capital case giving an accurate and faithful testimony, theMegillah quotes the י:בראשית ד פסוק י: קול דמי אוחי צועקים אל מ זרעים. There she exclaims to ל: Ms: משנה פסוק ד: קול דמי אוחי צועקים אל מ זרעים – the sounds of your brother’s bloods are screaming out to Me from the ground. TheMegillah asks why ל: Ms: משנה פסוק ד why did the used the word דמי as opposed to the singular דם? TheMegillah then answers that ה:משנה סנהדרין ש it is used to teach that not only did כין kill שלל, but he also “killed” all of כין’s future descendants by preventing them from ever being born into the world: כין אçon דא אדם לא דרי אדם, דחי זרעים וידיעתי:6

TheMegillah continues to impart to the העדים the significance of each and every person in the world, and then explains that every person was created individually by ה. Not only do the witnesses learn the importance of every individual life, but they are also infused with the powerful message of ה’s greatness. Unlike a human who produces every single coin exactly the same as one another, ה has the power to create every single being in the image of אדם־ראשון, yet also guarantee that each person will be a complete individual; כל מלך מלכי המלכים הקדוש ברוך הוא פתח ב MANUAL משלו בשמהו בחותמו אחר ומלא כתום כי לו כל כף מלך מלכי המלכים הקדוש ברוך הוא פתח ב MANUAL משלו בשמהו בחותמו אחר ומלא כתום כי לו כל כף מלך מלכי המלכים הקדוש ברוך הוא פתח ב MANUAL משלו בשמהו בחותמו אחר ומלא כתום כי לו כל כף מלך מלכי המלכים הקדוש ברוך הוא פתח ב MANUAL משלו בשמהו בחותמו אחר ומלא כתום כי לו כל כף מלך מלכי המלכים הקדוש ברוך הוא פתח ב MANUAL משלו בשמהו בחותמו אחר ומלא כתום כי לו כל כף מלך מלכי המלכים הקדוש ברוך הוא פתח ב MANUAL משלו بشמהו בחותמו אחר ומלא כתום י:בראשית ד פסוק י: קול דמי אוחי צועקים אל מ זרעים.6

Perhaps from this message one can learn that because ה created each person as an individual, there are countless individual ways to do תשובה. The story of כין produces several models, and there may be others as well. Each individual has the power to choose the best, subjective way to do תשובה, and strengthen his or her connection with ה. If one’s תשובה is sincere, and if one has a genuine desire to constantly connect with ה, then regardless if one’s תשובה is מאהבה or מיראה, it will be accepted. As theMegillah says,
because each and every person is extraordinary, everyone is obligated to say בשבילי נברא העולם the world and everything in it was created for me. It is therefore man’s obligation to use all that נ has created in order to enhance life on earth while strengthening our relationship with נ everyday.
The perplexing narrative of מגדל בבל contains many textual and philosophical issues that are in need of explanation. Different סרטיים provide answers to many of the textual problems, which allows for the reader to better understand the philosophical issues and the larger picture in which this story takes place.

The story begins with the description of the people in the “whole land”. It says that they shared one language and one idea, traveled East, and found a place to settle. They made material for building a city and a tower and said to each other, 'הוֹ נִבָּנָה עִירָּוֹ וּמִגְדָּלָה וּרְאָהָו בְּשָׁמֶם וּנִשָּׂאָו לְפָנָי נָפָא בְּאֶרֶץ כָּל הָאָרֶץ'

The רָאָה what they were doing and mixed their languages so they could not understand one another. He then spread them out all over the land so they could not continue to build the city.

From the very first פסוק, questions arise. What is the significance of the דברים אחדים, ה"singular speech" of the entire world? Furthermore, why is the פסוק not written in singular, as דבר אחד? Also, what does וימצאו בקעה – they “found” a valley – mean?

The process by which they approached building this tower seems very strange as well. They said that their reason for building the tower was to establish for themselves a name, but what do those two things have to do with one another? The words והלאה אָתָה מְלֹא הָאָרֶץ.
are also very troubling. Why is it that ה “came down?” ה knows everything, even without “coming down!” The interesting term ה is used twice, and this too must be explained. Also, what exactly was their punishment? Why is this story in between two long lists of generations? These are just some of the problems found among the text.

In addition to these questions, there is one overarching philosophical problem that exists. What did they actually do that was so wrong? What was their sin? Just from reading the text, their sin does not seem to be so offensive. Therefore, this story needs to be explained in order to find a deeper understanding. Many rishonim try to answer these questions in hope of finding larger messages in this story. We will now examine a few of these.

י"רש begins by describing the language of these people: he interprets this as "language of the heavens." Of course then, י"רש does not miss an opportunity to comment on the puzzling words דברים אחדים, which is a very strange phrase. He provides three answers, each of which suggests a nefarious motivation they may have had for building the tower.

1. They felt ה had no right to rule the upper worlds (עליונים) alone so they built a tower up to the sky to wage a war with Him.
2.他们的 words were "against the unique One"; in other words they wanted to worship שבעה ויהוה.
3. They theorized that the מבול had occurred because once every 1656 years the sky collapses. They wanted the tower to serve
as a support for the sky so it would not collapse again, and there would be no repeat of the שֶׁבֶל.

The sheer quantity of answers given by י”רש, let alone the answers themselves, are very puzzling and require further explanation. Why does י”רש bring three answers?

The ספר היימן says there are really two issues being addressed here. The first is the plural language used, implying that there is more than just “one thing.” The second is the use of a ו in the פסוק stating שֶׁפֶת אָצַה כְּרֵי אֲדָמִים instead of a ב before the word דברים. He says that a ב would imply that this is one language that intrinsically expresses a singular idea. The ו that is used depicts not only their one common language, but also one common idea.

The משכיל לדוד comments on why י”רש brings three answers. When י”רש gives more than one answer, he usually does so because each answer has some sort of problem and does not fully solve the questions. Here, the first answer is not satisfying since there is no clear reference in the פשט to the people doing something wrong. The second and third do in fact have support in the פסוקים. However, the second answer given is problematic because it does not solve the textual problem of the plural word דברים. The third answer is equally unsatisfying because it is a bit far-fetched. Because none of the solutions are so strong, י”רש brings all three. Each opinion represents something a little different. The first was a desire for equality with ה. The second was a denial of ה’s Oneness. The third explanation was a clear rebellion against ה and effectively a belief that everything was in their hands. The link between the three is clear—each, is in some way, shows some negativity towards ה.
continues to explain how they traveled. He says that they set out from the East to a place that had enough room for all of them and they found no other place than a valley. When in פסוק ג, כָּלָה, there, the word הבּוּס says that as a כּלוּס, the word הבּוּס means to get ready for a plan of action. That is what they were doing. Since when building, people usually use stone, they had to ready the materials. There were no stones in a valley; therefore, they had to go through the whole process of burning straw to make bricks. Furthermore, from י”רש’s comment on the words פָּנֵי נַפְעָצ, we see that they wanted to live all together – they didn’t want to bring a מָכָה on them that would disperse them.

Regarding the anthropomorphism used to describe the events: how could ה say He “saw” or “went down”? ר Semiconductor comments that ה was doing this to teach judges not to convict someone without first seeing and investigating the matter. Then answers the question of why the פסוק specifically says that they were בני אדם. He explains that these words symbolize the connection they had to אדם הראשון. Just as אדם was ungrateful to ה for what He gave him, so too, these people were ungrateful to ה by rebelling against Him.
These people were good to a degree, showing their unified strength, yet because the strength was a means to rebel against 'יהוה', it was viewed negatively. This provides extra insight into the people who sinned. The פסוק continues with the phrase לא יבצר מהם א.ל.א.raham explains that 'יהוה' was "saying" this as a question, in astonishment – are they really going to battle with 'יהוה'?

According to רש"י, the way 'יהוה' punished the people and how the תורה describes the event are also striking. He says that the use of הבאה again is different than the previous usage. Here, 'יהוה' is consulting the בית דין של מעלה, which shows His attribute of ענוה. The nature of the perpetrators' punishment, according to רש"י, is a result of their building an unauthorized tower. 'יהוה' confused their language, so that they would not understand each other, leading to a fight. This punishment is measurable, רוז"ע seen from the word הבאה used yet again. (They used this language to rebel, and then 'יהוה' used it to punish them). This מידה כנגד מידה was used again because 'יהוה' punished the sinners with what hurt them most—they did not want to be dispersed but ultimately, their biggest fear came true as a result.

He says that דור המבול did not oppose fundamental principles of faith, while דור הפלגה did. דור המבול had corrupt desires, but those desires were not against the fundamental
principle of ה’s oneness in the world. Although רוֹד הָפְלָגָה’s rejection of fundamental truth is worse, רוֹד חָגי was completely eliminated because they lacked unity.

According to י”ר, the sin of רוֹד הָפְלָגָה was a war of faith. They had a problem with ה and the fundamental principles of religion. They were really rebelling against ה – showing a complete lack of respect. Jews, as God-fearing people, are supposed to subjugate themselves to serve ה because He is the creator of everything. This group of people was doing the exact opposite.

The ר”שב has a very different take on the entire story. He comments that their sin was not that they wanted to build a tower up to the sky.22 Rather, it was that they refused to spread out as ה had commanded them to earlier in the תּוֹרָה. They chose a place to stay and wanted to multiply, creating a huge nation there instead of dispersing like ה wanted. They said פָּנָן נֶפֶשׁ – lest we scatter; therefore, ה punished them with the same language of צְרָה. Similar to י”ר, the ר”שב shows the same and parallel language used in the פסוקים, presenting textual proof for his idea. ר”שב’s opinion of their sin is clear. They did not do wang ה, and were punished for it.

ר”ל’s interpretation mirrors the ר”שב’s in certain regards – the major difference between their two opinions is that the ר”ל comments on the entire section and gives a different explanation to each part of the פסוקים, whereas ר”שב had concentrated his commentary into a single remark. Like י”ר, the ק”ר starts out explaining their language and the phrase דברים אחדים. He says the same thing as י”ר: that their one language was לשון הקודש. He then

22 ברארשיט א"ר "הבחנה בין נלאנו וגו" - "לפי הפשט מתהא רוֹד חָגי? הסיך? וא הפשיט dinheiro, א"ר "ר"ל, דברי נולדה וגרות בשטח, אלא כ"ש הוא בדרי שים א"ר, והם בהרי הלם לוכסנתו שהקרובים פנים.="לפי הפשט ממעין נגרות, נוגע בין נלאנו ל"ו מ"ו פנים, "לפי הפשט ממעין נגרות, נוגע בין נלאנו ל"ו מ"ו פנים, "לפי הشدد" ולא י”ר א"ר "ויהי קל חזיר" - "כל בין האור והשינה אתח, כל 어느 לרון אתו וי"ד מדברים, כלмежду ליגו לשה מעשה" כמוכטבב

23 ברארשיט א"ר "ויהי כל חזיר" - "כל בין האור והשינה אתח, כל 어느 לרון אתו ויד מדברים.
explains that דברים אחדים means a common agreement – they were in complete accord. They wanted a spacious spot big enough for all of them, so they could all live there without having to scatter and remain there as a big nation.24

He explains that נח and his sons were not part of this agreement. Just as אברהם אבינו understood that ‘ה הוא the creator of the world, so too did נח. Others did not see this and did not understand that ‘ה הוא the one and only who controls everything. These people wanted to nullify the oneness of ‘ה and build a tower, which represents something much greater.

Kard explains that they found a flat piece of land between two mountains (שנער) that met their needs. The phrase בנסעם מקדם is very significant because they were going from the East, where אדם primeiro אברם was from, which was the beginning of civilization.25 The people had a very thought out plan to accomplish their goal of not dispersing. The language of הבה, continues קד, serves as advice and not a command.26 They went through the whole process of making bricks out of clay in order to build the tower because there
were no stones in the valley—thus showing the thoroughness of their plan.

continues his commentary in 27 The describes that they were building a city and tall tower. 28 says here that they wanted the to be tall so that they can see far into the distance and watch what was happening with the cattle etc. His interpretation of the strange phrase , is that their intention was to establish a permanent abode, so as not to be spread out. They wanted to literally make a name for themselves so that if any of them got lost, people would know where to direct them.

then, similar to , provides an interpretation of the anthropomorphism used in 28 By using the of seeing and going down, the teaches that even though is so high, he still has a with lowly creatures. Often, when wants to investigate, this is utilized to show that rules over everything, including lowly beings. By writing the , the teaches that the perpetrators were humans following their own desires. 29 They were taking control and ignoring because they did not want to spread out: they want to nullify . He notes that in the case of the,

27 28 29
they want to nullify רצה. He notes that in the case of the מבול, the לשון is not used because everything that happened there was on a large scale and was publicized. This terminology is used here and also regarding סדום, because these instances were in one specific area; not on a large scale.

In ו, says כ ו כ אלמלאים. Here, comments י' ו כ אלמלאים. He notes that in the case of the מבול, the לשון of ירידה is not used because everything that happened there was on a large scale and was publicized. This terminology is used here and also regarding סדום, because these instances were in one specific area; not on a large scale.

In ו, says כ ו כ אלמלאים. Here, comments י' ו כ אלמלאים. He notes that in the case of the מבול, the לשון of ירידה is not used because everything that happened there was on a large scale and was publicized. This terminology is used here and also regarding סדום, because these instances were in one specific area; not on a large scale.

In ו, says כ ו כ אלמלאים. Here, comments י' ו כ אלמלאים. He notes that in the case of the מבול, the לשון of ירידה is not used because everything that happened there was on a large scale and was publicized. This terminology is used here and also regarding סדום, because these instances were in one specific area; not on a large scale.

In ו, says כ ו כ אלמלאים. Here, comments י' ו כ אלמלאים. He notes that in the case of the מבול, the לשון of ירידה is not used because everything that happened there was on a large scale and was publicized. This terminology is used here and also regarding סדום, because these instances were in one specific area; not on a large scale.
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the letters ב and כ, from בלשון בילבול, meaning confusion. The ב that is added is to demonstrate that everything comes from 'ה and He punished them by spreading them out over the land.

A very different view is given by Rav Shimon Raphael Hirsch. From the beginning, he differs from Rashi, Rambam, and the Rosck in that he interprets the שפה אחת as various dialects of one language (they had sameness of speech) and the דברים אחדים as a spiritual, mental agreement.34 Rav Hirsch bases this off the idea that the word דבר at its basis means "a concept made of several thoughts in order to have one complete idea." This idea reflects the fact that all the people were in unison of good and bad. The phrase בנסאם מקדם וימצאו בקעה provides a comprehensive understanding of the agreement. These words teach that they were voluntarily moving – getting away to a more attractive place was the object. They wanted something better for themselves. The use of the word ינדע instead of ינדע represents this idea.35

Rav Shimon Raphael Hirsch describes what occurred when they started building the tower. According to Rav Hirsch, the שון of הבה שון used has a very friendly connotation.36 He says that they said to each other "come, give!" They wanted to build all together; they therefore had the mindset of "I'll contribute, and you'll contribute." This is represented by the נ used throughout פסוק ג, which provides textual support for this theory. The people found a plain where all building materials were at a lack. They wanted to prove that they could produce something out of nothing. In order to attain their goal, they would burn whatever they could because they want to show they are independent. All construction materials were man-
made products as opposed to natural because a primary goal was to master nature. This was the start of ה’s anger at the people.

According to רב הירש, the real sin is found in the words וונעשה让我们 שם. This three word phrase represents their want of power of the community over power of the individuals. It is said that individuals die while unions live on, but that is only true if the community is serving ה to the extent that an individual would. רד הפלגה did not want this. It is not easy for an individual to realize what he or she is lacking, but the negative energy generated by a community is even more blinding. They rationalized that the community was the purpose of their existence, thus allowing them to ignore ה. This idea is represented in the word لن. This was a call to themselves, and not ה because according to them, the goal of an individual is to serve the community. They wanted the community to be the end goal of all of life. This convoluted logic, the flawed use of a community, led to their ultimate demise. They said כש השני because they were scared of not being able to continue their communal goals throughout the generations. This was a major sin because they had the ability through their unity to influence many later generations to serve ה, yet they misused their gift.

When the פסוק states that ה “went down and saw”, comments that this can mean looking into the situation before judging. If this is true, the tower itself was not the sin. Rather, the sin lies in the purpose for which it was built. As previously discussed, the goal of the people was to establish the endless value of the community through individual subjugation. This was clearly an attack on every individual, implying they have no worth, but it is also an attack on ה because He is the ultimate divine rule they should be serving. Now that everyone is being called to serve the community (by making a name for themselves) and not He, ה
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interfered. The word וירד appears in places that ה is trying to prevent the gap between heaven and earth. Here, ה was doing just that—he interfered to see” the building because He couldn’t let this continue. ה was testing the purpose of the building.

There, ה said, and... This further depicts how a positive attribute was utilized for negative purposes, despite ה’s slightly different interpretation of the phrase לא יבצר מהם. ה’s understanding of their punishment separates him from י”רש further but provides more insight on the topic. The result of ה’s וידעה was the drying up of language. He caused their language to wither. A common misconception of this idea is that ה mixed up the languages; however according to ה this is not exactly what happened. The פסוק describes their language as דברים אחדים, which in this case is defined as literally one language.

According to this logic, ה concludes that ה’s וידעה punishment to דור הפלגה was a division of language. The root of this comes from נבל (like it says ונבלה) and not בלל. This division though, stemmed from something known as בול. This means that something came into the language and influenced a change in it. This is exactly what happened here – ה came down and this caused the language to become separated from its original source. Until then, they had שפה אחת and דברים אחדים (a common state of mind) which they hoped would be passed down throughout the generations.
According to רבי יהודה, the only thing that could have stopped this would have been individuals realizing the unique value they possess as individuals, separate from their value within the community. This is exactly what happened in פסוקי ה ו. They started to realize that everyone has free will. This is what it refers to when it says: וַהֲקַלּוּ, וַיְהִי הוּא יְדֵי ה. They started to have their own opinions and ways of looking at things. This drove people apart and they eventually became so different from each other because they each were influenced by their surroundings. From this moment on, they lived by the idea that a community has value, but an individual has value to himself as well. One must serve ה through both these positions and glorify Him instead of the community.

Rabbi Yehuda is the only one that now answers why there is a long list of generations following this story. The פרק finishes with the generations from שם until אברהם. אברהם represents the exact opposite of what the דור הפלגה represented—he led the nation that calls out to ה and not to themselves. Rav Yehuda believes that the major sin was the glorification of the community instead of ה. They could have used their unity in a positive way, but instead, they used it negatively.

We have seen four different perspectives of one story. Each one has its own way of reading the פסוקים in order to understand the bigger picture underlying this story. They had some similarities and some differences but in the end, the bigger picture that each created gives us a slightly different perspective on the story and its lessons.
Dwelling With 'וד
An Analysis of the מחנה

There is an unusual feature in the beginning of the second פרק of ספר במדבר that ultimately helps to underscore the theme of the לפרק. Instead of the usual אל משה' וידבר ה, this פרק dealing with the order of camping and traveling in the מדבר opens with אל משה ואל אהרן' וידבר ה. The obvious question is why was אהרן also charged with the task that is about to be presented?

אבן עזרא answers that it is because אהרן and his sons would be the ones responsible for supervising the carrying of the holy vessels of the המשכן by the קהתים. At first glance, this answer is problematic; after all, what relevance does אהרן's task regarding carrying the vessels of the המשכן have to do with arranging the layout of בני ישראל's camp?

ל ידו answers the question related to הלכה. In the הלכה a הלכה is taught regarding the protocol of honoring people while traveling. The law is that one

1 א:במדבר ב
2 "וענשו אל משה ואל אהרן" - יז:במדבר ב
3 ל ידו  איש עונסע אהל מועד מחנה הלוים בתוך המחנות כאשר יחנו כן יסעו - יז:במדבר ב
4 " Negro אל משה ואל אהרן והם התוקדו לפני משה ובית ישתבעו יהיה בה התוקד'", יז:במדבר ב
5 " ואת נפשי מה הוא להカラー תחתון במשנה בית ענשה כהן" - יז:במדבר ב
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only shows honor to others in a place that is worthy of honor, like at the gate of a house or other important structure. While traveling, there is no requirement to allow those deserving of honor to travel in front. Perhaps one even should not do so as it could cause inconvenience or even danger to other travelers. Yet, here, the manner in which בני ישראל camped and traveled seems to be according honor to some tribes more than others, which appears to be unnecessary or even inappropriate. Why is this so?

A single approach with a common theme, supported also by other commentators, can answer both of these questions. The thrust of the אבן עזרא's statement appears to be that he is emphasizing the centrality of the משכן in this פרק. Even during the time of travel, אהרן and his sons would be the ones to oversee the care for the משכן, therefore,ארון too is recognized as playing a key role in this matter.

Similarly, the sür הכהן answers his question by pointing out that בני ישראל’s journey in the מדבר was different than ordinary...
Dwelling with ה: An Analysis of the מַcompareTo

travel. At this time, ה has placed Himself firmly and unyieldingly in their midst, thus, in order to demonstrate reverence for this reality, the tribes camped in an orderly manner. The normal rules of “travel” did not apply to this momentous situation.

אֶפְּכַּל, on the phrase, איש על דגלו, similarly elucidates that the need for this mandate was for the purpose of encouraging order – each man had to be commanded to remain with his flag, so that the שְּבֵּטים could not be merely a mass of random names and faces. Clearly, the arrangement of מַ.CompareTo is important, but how?

Already in פרק א, the ה had expounded that the מַGetMethod was to be placed in the center of the camp with the לֵוִיִּים immediately surrounding the מַGetMethod.10 In פרק ב, the camp of the בני ישראל was organized: to the east, שבט יהודה led יששכר and זבּוּלון; this was the first group to travel.11 To the south, ראובן led שְּמֶעוֹן and גד, and they were the second group to travel.12 To the west, אֲפִרֵים led מנשה and בנימין, the third group.13 Finally, to the north, Дан led אשר and נְפָתָלִי; this was the final travel group.14

When studying the commentators’ explanations of these groups, we can discern three separate approaches to explaining them: some explain the placements based on technical consider-
ations, some on spiritual ones, while a third group views the camps as strategic military placements.

We shall begin with ש”י and אבנ”ז.

The phrase איש על דגלו.OrderBy15 is a critical one. In order to better understand ש”י and אבנ”ז’s understanding of each שבט’s placement in the campsite, we will briefly examine each tribe’s flag and assignment. ש”י16 explains that each שבט was assigned a literal flag that was different from all the others – each flag being colored the hue of the tribe’s stone on the הון. Similarly, אבנ”ז17 quotes a tradition that said each flag contained an image reminiscent of something in that tribe’s history, or of י’hak’ blessing to that שבט or that related to the שבט in some other way.

on the other hand, gives a logical, technical explanation of where each שבט was placed. He explains there were four sides to the משכן and twelve שבטים on the outside of the camp;
therefore, logically, they should have been grouped evenly in clusters of three. Subsequently, חזוני explains that the sons of לאה should be grouped together, the sons of רחל should also be grouped together, and finally the sons of the concubines should be grouped together.

This was the first group to travel.

The third group was comprised of בני רחל, and since the בכורה of יוסף was transferred to אפרים, he was the leader of his group. Lastly, דן, as the הבכור and son of רחל’s maid, was appointed as leader, and as the שבטי of the descendants of the concubines, this group came last.

חזקוני simply views the individual merits and qualities of each שבט as the prime factors in determining placement on the מחנות.

The רבן quotes the commentaries of רש”י and ابن עזרא, and then, significantly, adds a few seemingly insignificant lines in which he states that the אהל מועד was in the center and that the מחנה of the לויים surrounded the אהל מועד.

At first glance, this
sentence seems superfluous; however, the verse does indeed reveal how רמב“ן (as well as אבן עזרא) views the rules behind the ordering of the camp. To רמב“ן, the spiritual group dynamic of the three שבטים together is the controlling principle.

then quotes a detailed מדרש to explain the reason for שבט’s placement. רמב“ן, master of kingship, was placed in the east, the first direction by which the sun rises, for his rulership would bring light into the world. Along with רמב“ן were the other masters of achievement – יששכר, and זבולון, the master of wealth, as it is written the group containing the would travel at the head.

The next group, ראובן, was positioned in the south, from where dews and rains of ברכה fall. ראובן, the quintessential בעל תשובה,

הודגלו הסמכויות והלאה עם בצורת הרצייה,鹉לה ואצל ברחבת עולם

בככ שמקגו ביום ויום ה-. שמקגו ביום ויום ה-

שמקגו ביום ויום ה- שמקגו ביום ויום ה-

וועלו שמקגוי ביום ויום ה-

וועלו שמקגו ביום ויום ה-

וועלו שמקגו ביום וيوم ה-

וועלו שמקגו ביום ויום ה-

"וכל השמחת בתפיש קדושת".
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merited the enjoyment of this רברכה, for it is the מידה שאחריה which brings כרכה to the world.

And, too, was a master of a good מידה; he is called a בעל גבורה. ששתים was placed between both of them as an atonement for him to cancel out the sins he committed when he used his מידה in a negative way.

ראובן’s group was second to travel since ששתים is second to תורה. In the west, מנשה, אפרים and בנימין were united because all the harsh weather conditions – snow, hail, cold, and heat come from the west, and these three exemplified the מידה of גברות and could, therefore, withstand the harsh weather. Furthermore, בנימין was promised,24 דואר בים ויבש נ旅י – the Divine Presence would always reside with and protect him, so he is granted a place in the west, the resting place of the of the שכינה. The מידה of תורה and רשות of ששתים must be backed by גבורה so that a person may overcome his or her יצער הרע.

The שבטים of דן,אשר and נפתלי were last, to the north. The reason for this was that דן, who led the group, would bring darkness to the world in the future through the idol worship of his descendant ירבעם בן נבט,25 and the north is the darkest direction since the sun is always in the south. To counteract this, however, אשר and נפתלי dwelled alongside him – אשר, who would illuminate the darkness, and נפתלי, the בעל ברכה, would bring ברכה to the group. Still, though, they are the last to travel since anyone who serves idols must come last as a mark of dishonor.

By examining these four groups and their dominant characteristics, one can see an underlying pattern. The שבט of יהודה traveled first because יהודה was integral to הנדב, which is stated26, מלחמה לפני לו, וה attività, מלחמה לפני לו. See also דברים לגない, מַלְכֵי וּאֵוִים, and ונהב ביא.24
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Contrasting this is שבטי דן, the last to travel. דן, too, had royalty descending from him, but instead of promoting דן, his descendants opposed Him by worshiping עבודה זרה. Consequently, השבטים last. דן, though, was still given the honor to lead a group. This honor comes out of respect for the fact that his tribe did, indeed, contain royalty, albeit tainted.

Dan’s group also paralleled the group of ראובן, שמעון, and גד that was positioned on the directly opposite side of the camp. Despite Dan’s follies, his group was given נפתלי, the one who embodied ברכה. This phenomenon is similar to ראובן’s evil deeds being neutralized by the characteristics of שמעון and גד, resulting in the group receiving the dews of מחנה and the rains of ברכה. Likewise, אפרים, מנשה, and בנימין constituted the group of רפאל – they had the same שמעון, yet conversely, they received the “stores of snow, the stores of hail and cold and heat” rather than the “rains and dews of ברכה.” Here, though, the entire group was strong, and also was given extra protection by the שכינה.

Perhaps when ابن עזרא cites the Midrash that describes the various images on the four flags, his intent is that having one flag per group, each with a symbol on it which represents that group’s leading שבט, is to demonstrate how the group, rather than its individual components, is the central idea. הרב שמשון רפאל הירש and רב אליהו דסלר support this concept in a similar vein. They each see the combination and results of the various groupings and the arrangement of the מחנה as a whole as having critical spiritual influences for the betterment of עם ישראל.

In מכתב מאליהו, the מחנה of בני ישראל is used as the paradigm for the highest level of order, which is – סדר לשם התאחדות הפעולה order for the sake of unity of function. Without every individual part
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contributing in its own way to the function of the whole, this highest level of order does not operate. Every group is needed to have its own position and group in order to maximize the potential of the strengths of each one so that the could function all together.

Accordingly, an east-west and north-south parallel emerges. An east-west and north-south parallel emerges. רבעון's and אפרים's groups represent spiritual and physical protection. אפרים's and יהודה's groups were founded on commitment to 'ו, and רבעון's and אפרים's groups require two שבטים of ברכה to counteract a weakness in the third שבטים. At the same time, that were placed next to one another connected as well. יהודה and אפרים shared similar qualities, as did ראובן and אפרים.

אברבנאל, on the other hand, views the arrangement of the camp as serving a practical military function. Why else, he asks, would the תורה repeat the amounts of people in each שבטים when the census had taken place in the previous פרק? He first explains why the tribes were grouped as they were. His explanation can be viewed as a sort of combination of the interpretation of חזון and ideas similar to those encountered in the מדרש brought by רמב"ן. He says that the groups were divided according to their maternal lineage, except for גד, who, as mentioned earlier, was placed among בני לאה, because of the absence of יששכר. לוי and זבולון stood under יהודה, the leader of both the מחנה and his group, since they were younger than he; yet, spiritual considerations were taken into account as well. יששכר's wisdom and זבולון's willingness to sacrifice his life for meaning, his creating and spreading of literature, and
his own desire to be in the company of kings were factors in the decision to place these two brothers alongside יהודה. The sons of רחל were together and אפרים was the leader since he inherited the בכורה from יוסף. Finally, דן merited to lead the בני השפחות because of his strength.

ארבנאל understands that the census has relevance in the פרק and that the purpose of the arrangement is for military security. The group with the largest population was in front and the slightly smaller group in the back, the two places where enemies might attack. Any attacks in the middle most probably would be by petty criminals, so theResponseType with the smallest numbers were placed there.

אברבנאל offers an unusual interpretation which also supports this military perspective. Instead of focusing on the flag as a rallying point, אברבנאל defines על ידו לדגליהם as "center," meaning "each man at his station," as soldiers in formation for battle. Both אברבנאל and רס"ג see the command to organize the camp as a military matter.

At the end of the first פרק, the לויים were instructed to camp around the נמשכ so that there will not be wrath (ולא יהיה קצף) on the congregation of Israel, and the לויים will guard the משכן העדות. Both י"רש and ابن עזרא explain that this reason (ולא יהיה קצף) is placed here with the requirement for the לויים to guard the משכן as to inform us how the peace of the camp is predicated on compliance with the prescribed standards for camping and not drawing too close to barred zones.
suggests that the two purposes of the in the center of the camp are to symbolize 's presence within the camp and to remind constantly of their divine purpose, and therefore, even when they enter the נחלות, the אפרים, ראובן, יהודה, and Дан still surround the שכינה, which is now in the נחלות of שבט בנימין, which is no coincidence. This proves that meaningful, purposeful structure is necessary when living in the immediate presence of 'ו.

There are many parallels between the story of חנוכה and the story of ספר שופטים in דעון.

First of all, both stories involve an incident with a מזבח meant for דעון. In מזרה’s case involved him destroying a מזבח to the בעל.1 Similarly, in the חנוכה story, מתתיהו killed a Jew who offered a sacrifice to the Greek gods, which is what sparked his revolt.2

Secondly, both stories featured a miraculous victory against a much greater military force.

Third, both stories contain a process of “weeding out” soldiers. מתתיהו tested his soldiers by famously exclaiming (according to popular tradition), מי לה' אלי,3 in order to make it clear that only those who believed in 'ה and were on His side could join him in his fight. Similarly, דעון filtered down his soldiers by first sending home any man who was afraid,4 and then dismissing any soldiers who participated in מזרה.5

Finally, in both stories, the victory and state of peace were short-lived; both ended with the later generations’ corruptions.

---

1 ספר נביאים א:במ
2 ספר נביאים א:במ
3 שמות לב:כ
4 ספר נביאים כג
5 שופטים ז:27-28 - "ויאמר האל לדוד כל אשר ליקלبولו מון מנה הוה ליקלNil הוה אנה:לשתהו. והיה מה - "אשי גאתי לברך לשתהו". והיה מה - "אשי גאתי לברך לשתהו. והיה מה - "אשי גאתי לברך לשתהו". והיה מה - "אשי גאתי לברך לשתהו. והיה מה - "אשי גאתי לברך לשתהו. והיה מה - "אשי גאתי לברך לשתהו. והיה מה - "אשי גאתי לברך Lonne.md".
The similarities are both abundant and striking.

Therefore, the question is not whether or not these two disparate incidents are connected, but rather what is the significance or these parallels? What does the story of גדעון have to do with the story of the חשמונאים?

The answer has several components. First, we should focus on the verse quoted earlier, ויאמר מי לה' אלי ויאספו אליו כל בני לוי. This phrase, adopted by מאתתיהו, was originally said by משה following חטא העגל. It is no coincidence that this event also surrounds an incident of עבודה זרה, and that the dramatic beginning of מאתתיהו's rebellion is associated with the earlier act by משה רבינו.

It is clear from the start of ספר שמות that משה's mission was to be בני ישראל's first שופט. He first encountered this responsibility when he found himself acting as the "judge" between two Jews who were fighting. Just prior to this, he had played a similar role when he witnessed a מצרי attacking a Jew. These incidents became prototypes for משה's life mission, which was twofold: to help save בני ישראל politically from the oppression of the non-Jews, and to help בני ישראל achieve their spiritual potential and destiny by leading them to מתן תורה and teaching them to follow the laws they received.

This was also the mission that מאתתיהו staked out for the חשמונאים. They fought to free the Jews politically from the rule of the Seleucids and they did eventually gain political independence,
yet this was not their primary motivation. Their main goal was to help combat the severe Hellenism and assimilation that plagued the Jews at that time. (It is interesting to note that at this time, the defence of true worship of ה' was led by members of שבט לוי, just as had happened at חטא העגל.)

גדעון also had the same goals as the שופט of בני ישראל. He accomplished his political goal by defeating the מדינים in the miraculous battle. Spiritually, he fought against עבודה זרה, and in fact was named ירבעל in honor of his heroic deed of destroying the מזבח of the בעל. So we can see that גדעון and מתיתיהו were each inspired by the example set centuries earlier by משה; they fought wars that had both political and religious aims.

Furthermore, both stories also had some sort of selection process (as did the earlier incident of חטא העגל, because both stories also had a religious component, and, as a result, it was imperative that the soldiers be fully dedicated to ה'). Rabbi Berel Wein\textsuperscript{12} says the message of the חנוכה story is not about the oil or the miraculous war. Rather, the message is that the only way to be successful is to have full אמונה in ה'. When מתיתיהו yelled out מי לה' אלי and when גדעון sent home the cowards and the idolaters, this is what they were insuring: that everyone had full and unwavering faith in ה'. This again connects back to משה. During the war against עמלק, it was only when משה raised his hands to השמים and בני ישראל recognized ה' that they could win the war.\textsuperscript{13}

This insight highlights what changed when future generations became corrupt. אבימלך was called אבימלך because in his mind, his father גדעון was the king, and it was through גדעון – not from ה' – that salvation came. A similar thing happened to the descendants of the חשמונאים. They attributed the success of the Jews to their own talents, and did not realize that it was only

\textsuperscript{11} "ויקרא לו ביום ההוא ירבעל לאמר ירב בו הבעל כי נתץ את מזבחו" - לב :שופטים ו

\textsuperscript{12} Echoes of Glory, pp. 67-68

\textsuperscript{13} יא:שמות יז
because of ה that they had any victory. Instead, they attributed everything to themselves and became corrupt.

Once this is established the question becomes what went wrong? How could the legacy that בֵּית הַשֵּׁתֵה and חִדֵּד left fall so far? Regarding חִדֵּד, it seems that the seeds of this corruption were rooted in חִדֵּד himself. He had been instructed to minimize his army to such a degree that he was left with only 300 men, in order to clarify to all the miraculous nature of the victory that would follow. However, חִדֵּד’s brilliant strategy made the numbers seem greater and thus wound up minimizing the effect of the miracle. Furthermore, the construction of the אֲפֻנִי, which חִדֵּד built as a monument for ה, became misconstrued and was used by later generations as a site of עבודה זרה. Perhaps the downfall of the חשמונאים was also linked to the emphasis they placed on the wars and victories of their ancestors.

There is a message in this for us today as well. We often face the risk of going through life without recognizing ה and the miracles He does for us. Early generations of Zionists and Israelis looked to the חשמונאים for inspiration, and also attributed those earlier victories to human talent and initiative – not to Hashem. For example, the popular חנוכה song מי ימלל גְּבוּרָה יִשְׂרָאֵל contains a number of heretical references explicitly attributing victory to human action as opposed to ה. A generation raised on messages like these can be in danger of falling into the same pattern as in the times described above. The generation which witnessed the spectacular victory of the Six Day War and ingathering of the exiles may not fully grasp their absolutely miraculous nature.

We must learn the lessons of history. Just as in the days of חִדֵּד and the חשמונאים, our present military victories come from ה and must be used to increase our devotion to Him. Only with this realization can we avoid repeating the mistakes of the past.

14apist 1801, המשורר הchemyל, מפגש ברכתי (1968-1899).
The second half of פסחא רביעי, following the story of חטא המרגלים, is devoted to a series of הלכות. This series of laws divides the narrative of the מרגלים from the story of קרב that follows. Inserted inside this group of laws is the very brief narrative regarding the מקושש עצים. At first glance, the story seems very simple: someone violated שבת and then בני ישראל inquired as to what the appropriate punishment is and punished him according to the word of 'ה. However, upon further reflection, a few questions arise:

It seems that there was potential for many people to violate the תורה while in the מדבר, so why was this individual’s sin singled out?

- What exactly was the man’s sin?
- What is the meaning of the strange word מקושש?
- Why wasn’t it clear to בני משה ואהרן what his punishment should be?

Finally, why is this narrative inserted here, in the middle of a collection of laws, right before the מצוה of ציצית?

The פרשה begins ויהיו בני ישראל במדבר ויהי ישבא במדבר ומקושש עצים פרשיה. This opening seems unusual considering that normally the תורה only specifies the location of בני ישראל when telling us that they actively traveled from one place to another. The reader wonders why the תורה needs to go out of its way to mention that the Jews were in the מדבר, given that this was already known.

---
1 COMMENTARIES FROM
2 COMMENTARIES FROM
3 COMMENTARIES FROM
According to אבן עזרא, the story of מקושש עצים is not in chronological order; it occurred before the story of חטא המרגלים while the Jews were still in מדבר סיני, so the 토ורה here is explaining that it is referring back to when בני ישראל were in מדבר סיני before the מרגלים were sent from פארן, and it was recorded here because of a thematic connection to the מצוה of ציצית.

However, רמב”ן explains that the story is written in chronological order, and appears after the חטא המרגלים as a consequence of that sin. Since there had been a decree for בני ישראל to stay in the מדבר for forty more years, events such as this began to occur. The story of the מקושש עצים is the first narrative told after חטא המרגלים. There is, therefore, an emphasis put on this story by introducing it with הביאו בני ישראל Ba נמרס כל תקן וע себ as a reminder that this new post-marvel situation was a direct outcome of that sin, and the resultant extended stay in the מדבר.

The תורה continues with ויהיו בני ישראל במדבר. What exactly was this person doing on יום השבת? חזוני mentions three possibilities, based on the גמרא in מסכת שבת:

1. He carried the sticks for a distance of four אמות in רשות הרבים.
2. He cut the wood off of a tree.
3. He gathered the sticks together and made them into bundles. According to אברבנאל, however, the man’s sin was that he cut large branches into smaller ones.

"תורה אב" דוכן
"נמרס כל תקן וע себ אברבנאל דוכן
"היהו בני ישראל במדבר: כותב נמרס הנמרס כל תקן וע себ"".

[4] "במדבר" שם
[5] והזכיר דבר המקושש כי עשה ביד רמה "" כי תבואו אל ארץ מושבתיכם" אבן עזרא במדבר טו
[6] ומרב חמלת השם על ישראל שם הציצית לזכר שלא יעשה האדם ביד רמה או שלא ישכח "" כי תבואו אל ארץ מושבתיכם אבן עזרא במדבר טו
[7] ומרב חמלת השם על ישראל שם הציצית לזכר שלא יעשה האדם ביד רמה או שלא ישכח "" כי תבואו אל ארץ מושבתיכם אבן עזרא במדבר טו
[8] ומרב חמלת השם על ישראל שם הציצית לזכר שלא יעשה האדם ביד רמה או שלא ישכח "" כי תבואו אל ארץ מושבתיכם אבן עזרא במדבר טו
[9] והיוהו בני ישראל במדבר אברבנאל שם
[10] ומרב חמלת השם על ישראל שם הציצית לזכר שלא יעשה האדם ביד רמה או שלא ישכח "" כי תבואו אל ארץ מושבתיכם אבן עזרא במדבר טו
[12] ומרב חמלת השם על ישראל שם הציצית ל-resource לא שיתני אברבנאל שם
Why is the Torah not clear in describing this man’s actions? Why does it use an ambiguous term that leaves the nature of his crime uncertain? It seems that the focus less on the man’s actions and more on the reaction of בני ישראל. They found him, and they did not know what to do with him. This is emphasized by the fact that they brought him אל משה ואל אהרון. Furthermore, we are told ויניחו אותו במשמר כי לא פרש מה יעשה לו. It’s important to point out that their question was not exactly “what to do with him”, as they had previously been told that the penalty for חילול שבת was מיתה. They knew he needed to be put to death, but they did not know which form of execution to use.

It’s important to point out that their question was not exactly “what to do with him”, as they had previously been told that the penalty for חילול שבת was מיתה. They knew he needed to be put to death, but they did not know which form of execution to use.

Furthermore, we are told ויניחו אותו במשמר כי לא פרש מה יעשה לו. It’s important to point out that their question was not exactly “what to do with him”, as they had previously been told that the penalty for חילול שבת was מיתה. They knew he needed to be put to death, but they did not know which form of execution to use.

Noticing this parallel, we can compare our narrative regarding the מקושש עצים to the rather similar story of the מקלל. There are some strong similarities between the stories, but some important differences exist as well. The stories are similar in that

10 לֹא כְּבוֹד אָלֶיה: בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, וְלֹא כְּבוֹד אָלֶיה: בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל.
11 לֹא כְּבוֹד אָל: בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל.
12 וְרָאָם רֹאשׁ בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, וַחֲזַקְוִי שָמַר בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל מְלֹא מִשְׁפָּט שָׁם בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל.
13 כִּי לֹא נֶאֱמָר לָהֶם נִפְלָא בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, וְלֹא נַעֲשָׁה בֶּן יִשְׂרָאֵל מֵעָן נִפְלָא בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל.
14 וְלֹא נֶאֱמָר לָהֶם נִפְלָא בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, וְלֹא נַעֲשָׁה בֶּן יִשְׂרָאֵל מֵעָן נִפְלָא בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל.
both are narratives of an individual’s sin, in both cases the names of the sinners are not mentioned, both sinners were placed in detention because מִשְׁאָל did not know how to punish them, ultimately both punishments were the same (stoning by the עָדֶה outside of the camp), and both narratives are inserted within groups of מִצְוָות.

Yet the stories are different because the story of the מִכְלָל focuses on him as an individual: his lineage is specified, his sin is explicitly stated, he was brought privately to מִשְׁאָל, and the story follows with הָלְכָה specifically connected to his sin. The story of the מִכְשֶׁש, however, is vague and focuses on בני ישראל’s reaction. The מִכְשֶׁש was brought to everyone (אֲלֵהוֹ וְאֵל אֵלֵהוּ וְאֵל כָּל עַדֶּה) and after the events of the מִכְשֶׁש, the תּוֹרָה moves on to the topic of צְיצֵי and doesn’t seem to relate to the narrative in the laws that follow.

The differences between the two stories helps to explain the uniqueness of the story of the מִכְשֶׁש עצים. In the case of the מִכְלָל, there was a need to explain and clarify the הָלְכָה, but with the story of the מִכְשֶׁש עצים, they knew that he needed to be sentenced to death, and only the exact form of the punishment was unknown. Because they knew what needed to be done, מַה’s response was to the point. There are no details given about who the מִכְשֶׁש was and where he came from,15 in contrast to the מִכְלָל whose background is given. The חָטָא of the מִכְשֶׁש עצים is also not clear compared to that of the מִכְלָל. This is because, as opposed to the מִכְלָל, where the sin itself is the primary element in the story, the sin of the מִכְשֶׁש עצים is not the main point. In the case of the מִכְשֶׁש עצים, the words “those who found him” is mentioned twice in addition to the phrase “all of the congregation.” From these multiple references to the nation as a whole, perhaps it can be postulated that the events of the מִכְשֶׁש עצים were not considered the sin of an individual, but rather of a group of people. They are all held accountable for the misdeeds of this one person.

15 לָּא בִּפְנֵי עֵדֶת, מִכְשֶׁש עָצִים. אֶלֹהִים תַּשְׁלֵם שָל מִכְלָלָה. אֲלֵי מִכָּל עַדָּה.
But there is a flip side to this as well. יְיִיֵּנָךְ שְׁמַעָה יְיֵיִת explains that the opening words of this narrative, וְיַחְדָּךְ נִשְׁאֲרוּ רב יְיִיִית, emphasize the initiative of the people, the actions of בני ישראל and their involvement for the sake of הוהי and His תּוֹרָה. 16 He points out that the Torah does not say וְיֵצַא איש וְיַקְשֵׁשׁ עֵצֶם בוֹן הַשָּׁבָט, but rather איש מקושש עץ וְיִמְצָאוּ בני ישראל ויהיו. So what can be learned from רבי יששכר חכמים introduced וּשְׁמַא נֶקֶשׁ עֵץ in this narrative? וְיֶמֶּשׁ אִשָּׁה נֶקֶשׁ, according to the רבי יששכר, shows that the appointed watchmen and that these watchmen were the ones who found him. 17 The הרואה then continues with the phrase, יְיִיֵּנָךְ שְׁמַעָה יְיֵיִית.

רבי יששכר quotes the וְיֶמֶּשׁ אִשָּׁה נֶקֶשׁ that says the second mention of “finding him” indicates that he was warned to stop but he continued to be מקושש. In other words, there were watchmen present, making sure that בני ישראל were keeping השבת. Not only did they find him, but they also attempted to stop him from continuing to sin. The contrast between this incident and the חטא המרגלים is striking. In the case of the המרגלים, it was בני ישראל as a whole who were branded as sinners. They were consequently punished. Now, regarding the מקושש עץ, they, as a קהל, tried to keep the מצוות and follow הוהי’s תורה. It was important to them that each individual upholds the standards of the קהל, keeping the מצוות of הוהי. They realized that one man’s failure is really the failure of the entire people.

Finally, why is the מצוה of ציצית presented immediately after the ענין of המקושש עץ? According to דעת זקנים מבעלי התוספות, 19 this was מַכְוָא אֲחָא מַכְוָא. מַכְוָא אֲחָא מַכְוָא.
a response to a plea of חטא המרגלים. He pointed out that during the week, we have the מצוה of תפילין to remind us to follow the תורה. However, we do not wear תפילין on שבת, and וְיָשָׁה לְגָּלֶל wondered what would have happened if the מקושש had been wearing תפילין; perhaps he wouldn’t have sinned. In response, ה' gave the מצוה of ציצית which is also designed to remind us to follow the תורה and applies even on שבת.

It turns out, then, that the story of the מקושש עצים really is the antithesis, and the correction, of חטא המרגלים. Instead of allowing the entire nation to be led astray by the actions of a small group of people, the nation as a whole reacted to correct one individual’s mistake, and as a result, received additional safeguards to ensure that they continued to uphold the תורה.
De Já Vù – Take Five

The Usage of the Phrase

Throughout

The phrase ‘ויהי בימי’ is used in the Tanakh, this implies a language of regret. Throughout the Tanakh, the phrase is mentioned five times:

1. ויהי בימי אמרפל
2. ויהי בימי שפט השפטים
3. ויהי בימי אחז
4. ויהי בימי יהויקים
5. ויהי בימי אחשורוש

In each of these five stories a tragedy occurred, and as a result, the Jewish people contemplated destroying the Jewish people and in some cases, the whole world. This article will examine each of these events in order to uncover common themes.
The first of the five incidents took place during the days of אפרים מלך שער, a contemporary of אברהם אבינו, and the war was the war between the Four and Five Kings. During the war, the Four Kings tookLot captive when they attackedסדום. When the news reached אברהם, he fought to defeat them and rescueLot. The Midrash explains that though the kings planned to kill אברהם during the war, they changed their minds at the place named צער and קדש (which the Midrash interprets as hints to this event) and decided to spare his life. They realized that 'ה' had only showed mercy on the whole world as a result of אברהם's choice to be thrown intoכבשן האשand sacrificehis life forקידוש השם. They therefore spared אברהם's life to keep 'ה' from destroying them.

To illustrate the logic behind the Kings' actions, a parable is brought regarding a king who favored one citizen in the land. One day this beloved citizen was taken captive and was going to be killed. The people of the city began to worry that without the king's loved one, the mercy of the king would diminish. In the parable, the king is 'ה' and the citizen is אברהם.

The second story emerges from מגילת רות, beginning with the phraseויהי בימי שפט שופטים,8which hints to the harsh famine inארץ ישראלat that time. The famine was brought about as a punishment forבני ישראל's impudence towards theשופטים of the time; the people would go to be judged, but would dislike the judge’s

---

8 א:רות א

9 לאוהבו של מלך שהיה שרוי במדינה ובשבילו המלך נזקק למדינה וכיון "אסתר רבה פתיחתא יא
שבאו ברברין ונזדווגו לו אמרו ווי אין המלך נזקק למדינה כמות שהיה עושה כך אברהם אבינו
ה "ונברכו בך כל משפחות האדמה ובזרעך ובשבילו היה הקדוש ב( ב"בראשית י)ה "אוהבו של הקב
וישובו ויבאו אל עין משפט היא קדש לא בקשו להזדווג אלא ( ד"שם י)ד "נזקק לכל עולמו הה
אחא הוא כתיב ' לגלגל עינו של עולם עין שעשתה מדת הדין בעולם בקשו לסמותה היא קדש אמר ר
ה וירד לכבשן האש כיון שראו הכל שבאו כל המלכים ונזדווגו לו "הוא שקידש שמו של הקב
Began צווחין ווי ויהי בימים אמרפל"
sentence and completely disregard the verdict. The deeper meaning of the famine is also explained by use of a השם. There was once a nation who owed taxes to their king, who sent an officer to collect the money. The people audaciously seized the tax collector, hanged him, beat him to death, and stole the money the tax collector had gathered in the name of the king. This reflects the state of the Jewish people at the time of the השם when they turned against the judges, their leaders, who had been placed in power at their request to serve them. As a punishment for the embarrassment inflicted on its judges, sent punishment that would cause embarrassment, when people are hungry, they behave shamefully for a scrap to eat.

In the third story, the evil king constantly scorned ה, his kingship thus warranted the introduction of the השם. The terror that shaddowed the nation in that time was punishment that would cause embarrassment, a רעב; when people are hungry, they behave shamefully for a scrap to eat.
rid the world of 'סנכנ ה' שכם. He did this by attempting to prevent children from learning 'תורה so that ultimately, ignorance would prevail, the people would have no relationship with ה' and He would no longer dwell among the people.

The Maor explains the basis of this logic with a parable. A king gave his son to a teacher who hated him. The teacher knew that if he killed the child, he would be sentenced to death by the king; therefore, he thought that if he pulled his pupil away from his wet nurse, the child would die and he would not be blamed.

This is the basis for אחז’s flawed logic which ultimately led to the downfall of his kingdom. On that note, אחז thought that if there would be no young children studying 'תורה, then ultimately there could not be any older children studying either. As such, there would not be any תלמידים, and as such, there cannot be any זקונים. Finally, if there would not be any זקונים, then there would not be any חכמים, and without חכמים, the people could not exist, which would mean that the שכינה of 'תора could not rest in this world. These evil designs were thwarted by the war.

The fourth example discusses the reign of יهوיקים, which warranted the introduction of יהי בימי as well. יهوיקים was the last of the kings of יהודה before the חורבן הבית. The תלמוד ירושלמי states:

"אין לו חלק לעולם הבא ...allee שמעたら בהרי תורה בפרהסיא, כגון יאני מלך יהודה. אלעזר אמר למהו 'הונא בשם ר' צור תעודה חתום תורה בלמודי ר( 'שם ח)ד "להתעסק בתורה הה" אחא שמע לה מן הדין קרא ר אבאstär ריעקב ב' נקרא שמו אחז שאחז בתי כנסיות ומדרשות ר(שם)דכתיב
המסתיר פניו מבית יעקב וjectoryלו אין לך שעה שהייתה קשה לישראל ' וחכיתי לה
ואנכי הסתיר אסתיר את פני ביום ההוא על כל הרעה אשר עשה ( א"דברים ל)כאותה שעה שנאמר
הנה אנכי ( 'ישעיה ט) מועיל ומאותה שעה קויתי לו דכתיב כי לא תשכח מפי זרעו ומה את' וגו
והילדים אשר נתן לי
לאותות וلومירתים בישראל וכי ילדיו היו והלא לא היו תלמידיו אלא 'יה
מכאן שתלמידו של אדם נקרא בנו וכיון שראו הכל שאחז בתי כנסיות ובתי מדרשות התחילו
אומרים ווי ויהי בימי אחז"13"
During his reign, יהויקים, he recalled the days when בני ישראל strayed from ה. Sadly, ה recalled followed in His footsteps and lamented, ירמיהו הנביא.

The מדרש gives a מִשָּל of a king who sent letters to all of his subjects in faraway lands. When the letters arrived, the recipients would hug and kiss the letters and stand up and tremble while reciting the letter’s contents. However, when the letters arrived to the king’s own land, the recipients would read them, rip them up, and burn them.

The מִשָּל refers to the “letters” that were sent from ה to His king, יהויקים. When was sent letters containing the first few פסוקים of איכה, he tore them up and burned them, because he refused to oblige and try to bring בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל back on the right track, the path of ה. Hence, ה decreed devastation opon בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, resulting in the גָּלוּת and the חורבן הבית.
The final story is the most commonly known of the five; it is the introduction of the Megillah, namely, מגילת אסתר, המגיד בימי אחשורוש. In the time of אחשורוש, he threw a party for 180 days which was attended by many Jews. The Jewish party guests, sinned by fraternizing with non-Jews and drinking with עובדי עבודה זרה. These sins caused a צרה to befall the nation: ויהי בימי אחשורוש מַג́יִלָת אָסֵטְרָה. These sins caused a צרה to befall the nation. Here, too, the מגילות provides a מִשְׁלָה to explain why ויהי was worse than all of the שונאים who preceded him. A King enters a vineyard with three of his adversaries, each attempting to harm him in escalating degrees. The first began to pull off the small grapes from the vines. The second stole entire clusters, while the third began to uproot entire vines. The second stole entire clusters, while the third began to uproot entire vines.

These three adversaries parallel בני ישראל’s enemies throughout history up until this point. Their first enemy, killed the newborn boys, a small step in destroying the Jewish people. Next, destroyed the בית המקדש and sent the די חכמים into an early exile – a slightly larger step in destroying the nation. Finally, ויהי, the third and most dangerous enemy, requested to kill and destroy all of the Jews, בקש להשמיד ולהרוג כל היהודים, which would have been the final step in ridding the world of the Jews.

In each of the five cases, ויהי was one step away from destroying בני ישראל as a result of their own actions, yet each time they were saved from their fated destruction. Sometimes the nation’s salvation came immediately; at other times, the redemption only came after
a number of years. By demonstrating this pattern contained in the seemingly innocuous words ויהי בימי, the מדרש is teaching a way to look at history. Nothing happens by accident; everything is controlled by 'יה in response to our actions. Yet even when all appears lost, there is still time to do הרשיה and avert evil decree.
מאשך ומאשרת
Is it – יד מהש?

On Anthropomorphisms in הקור

Many times one wishes that one could be in two places at once, however, this task is deemed impossible, for human beings are restricted and finite. When the mainstream Orthodox Jew considers ה’s “appearance,” he will typically perceive ה as incorporeal, or formless. For how can ה be in two places at once? Who is simultaneously in every place across the universe during every moment, possess a limited body or form? This belief has become the conventional way in which one perceives ה, mainly due to the writings of the רמב"ם. Although he and many other ראשונים and רבניים do believe that ה is indeed incorporeal, there is actually room to suggest that some medieval rabbis believed that ה does actually hold a form of some sort. In fact, it could even be that ה may have believed in the corporeality of ה, although many believe that this was not so.

The ראשונים who most famously viewed ה as incorporeal was undoubtedly the רמב"ם. The רמב"ם brings down in his קור.
that one of the most basic principles of faith is that הוהי has no form. The רמב"ם elaborates and says that if הוהי had a form, He would be bound by space and time; He would be limited. Every knowledgeable, religious Jew agrees that הוהי’s strength and power is limitless, therefore, the רמב"ם feels one must say that He lacks any sort of form.

The רמב"ם then quotes the פסוק, למי תדמיוני ותשוו, פסוק, כ - to whom can I be compared. He reasons that it’s impossible to say that הוהי has a body, because then He would be comparable to man. However, the פסוק says למי תדמיוני ותשוו to whom can I be compared and Fbe equal. This פסוק is not saying that Hashem is intrinsically incomparable, rather, if one were to contrast הוהי to anything, הוהי would constantly exceed that to which He is compared. Therefore, one may suggest that הוהי does have a form, and can be compared to people; however, the רמב"ם does not read the פסוק in this manner.

Because of the רמב"ם’s belief that הוהי lacks form, he is forced to explain what is meant when the תורה uses language such as ליהו-אצבע או or היד הindicating that הוהי is corporeal. The רמב"ם explains this by saying that the תורה speaks in לשון בני אדם – language people can easily comprehend. When the תורה uses bodily terms to describe הוהי, they are not literal, but only serve as references. In support of his conclusion, the רמב"ם highlights the manner in which הוהי reveals himself to נביאים.

He emphasizes the fact that each
On Anthropomorphisms in הוהי

Consequently, human beings cannot possibly understand יהוה’s appearance from these visions.

Since יהוה lacks a body, He does not undergo events that humans experience. יהוה does not sit, move, or breathe. Furthermore, nothing about יהוה changes because there is no event in the world that would force Him to change. Accordingly, יהוה lacks emotion, because there is no occurrence that would generate a happy, sad, surprised, or angry feeling within יהוה. This fits adequately with the manner in which man perceives יהוה, for it makes Him seem supernatural, and He is. Perhaps this is the reason why the רמבם’s view is most widely accepted.

In the משנה תורה 3 there is a well-known מחלוקת between the רמבם and the ראב”ד regarding the status of those who consider יהוה to be corporeal. There, the ראב”ד lists the five people who he considers �秣נים, or heretics. One of the individuals which the רמבם lists is האומר שיש שם רבון אחד אבל הוא בעל גוף ובעל תמונה – one who says that there is one God, but that He has a body. By labeling this person a �秣ין, we see that the רמבם views יהוה’s lack of form as a fundamental principle of faith.

The ראב”ד agrees with the רמבם regarding יהוה’s lack of corporeality. However, the ראב”ד believes that people who do not agree with this statement are not heretics. He recognizes the fact that there were великיו who believed that יהוה is corporeal. Although himself does not believe יהוה has a physical form, he seems to have more tolerance for those who hold that view then רמבם does.

ירש”ד’s approach on יהוה’s corporeality or lack thereof is unclear and highly ambiguous. His commentaries on certain פסוקים in חנ‎ך seem to indicate that he did in fact believe that יהוה possess a

משנה תורה הלכות תשובה ג: רמבם משם 3
form or body, while others seem to suggest that the use of anthropomorphic phrases are merely a
משל, inserted into
ך"תנ, for human
understanding. In the Hakirah Journal, Rabbi Natan Slifkin analyzes
"ישר"s commentaries on
ך"תנ, and the
תלמוד, and entertains
the possibility that
ירש may have been a corporealist.

In ספר שמות, ה told שמעה to ask פרעה for release
from slavery. In מִדְּתֵיהוֹן וּמִדְּתֵיהוֹנָא, בּוֹא יִשְׂרָאֵל from. He says
טְבֵּרַע תֹּבֵרַע, יי as a hand, with
which to smite the מִצְרָיִם. This יי seems to explicitly state
יי possesses bodily features (or at least a hand!).

Rav Moshe Ben Haim, who sought to avoid this “heretical”
idea, interprets יי to mean that ה created a huge hand
with which to destroy the Egyptians. ה created this hand as a
separate creature. Rav Ben Haim views this hand as similar to
the hand that wrote on the wall at בלשאצר‘s party.

Another place in יי’s commentary that indicates that
he believed in the corporeality of ה is during the creation of
man in בראשית. ה (and the מלאכים) created man "בְּﬠֵצֶלנוּוּ", which יי explains to mean בדפוס שלנו,
in our mold. Rabbi Marc Shapiro explains that man’s physical body is akin to ה’s.

Rabbi Natan Slifkin, "Was Rashi a Corporealist?", Hakirah, the Flatbush Journal of
Jewish Law and Thought. Volume 7 (Winter 2009), pp. 81-105

Rabbi Moshe Ben-Chaim, “God’s Hand,” Jewish Times, vol. IV no. 16 (January 21, 2005)

Rabbi Marc Shapiro. The Limits of Orthodox Theology. Oxford: Littman Library of
Jewish Civilization, 2004, p. 57
However, the tradition understands this in a different way. They feel is saying will create man with the mold that He previously destined for man – in the mold that He created, not in His mold. Consequently, they indicate that was not a believer in the corporeality of ָה.

In , the punishment for eating from the blood of is stated. There says He will turn His face to the person who eats the blood, as it says. There, overtly asserts that refers to ָה’s attention; will turn His attention from all else in order to deal with this sinful individual. Here explains, to mean “My anger,” as opposed to a literal face. Although he says that ָה has no form, seems to declare that does experience emotions, thereby insinuating that does possess some anthropomorphic features. claims that here seeks to avoid the suggestion that ָה has any anthropomorphic features, let alone a face. According to the of , it seems as though he, like the , rejects the idea that ָה may be corporeal.

suggests a solution to this seeming contradiction in . He says that the places in which explains the form in a figurative manner come because they help the reader understand what the meant in that place, but they do not serve as proofs of ָה’s lack of corporeality. However, does not explicitly claim that believed that ָה is corporeal.

One who studies is aware of his frequent use of . However, insists that he only comes to explain .

---

11 יפשת אונקלוס
12 סבר ויקרא
13 ראה Slifkin, p. 86.
Therefore, whenever מדרש רashi contain a מדרש, there must be an explanation, or a greater purpose for the use of the מדרש.

For example, יɾש uses a מדרש when explaining the פסוק in יב:שמות טו, which states, נטית ימינך תבלשו ארץ – whenever ה ה tilts
His right hand, enemies fall, for everything given into ה’s hand falls when He tilts it.

יɾש’s use of this מדרש seems to indicate that ה possesses a form, or at least a hand. Rabbi Slifkin points out that יɾש quotes other מדרשים that suggest ה is corporeal. Furthermore, there are places where theךתנ does not mention anthropomorphisms, but يɾש introduces them by quoting מדרשים. One such example is when אבר submissive to give himself a ברית מילה.
There, יɾש cites the מדרש说道 that אבר was old, and felt incapable of giving himself a ברית, therefore, ה stretched out His hand, and held the foreskin with אבר.

Why would יɾש quote this מדרש? It certainly does not facilitate an explanation of the פסוק. Rabbi Slifkin asserts that it may be possible to suggest that the reason יɾש quotes this מדרש (in addition to others) is to point out that ה may possess certain anthropomorphic features. Rabbi Slifkin explains that ה’s features are sometimes described figuratively, because although ה possesses form, He is not subject to human weakness. Explaining ה’s features in a non-literal manner helps stress this fundamental, crucial point.

Then again, there is one place in his commentary onךתנ where explicitly states that the words in the פסוק describing

---

14 שמות יב.
15 ראוהו סלייק.
16 ברธา שושנ_teams.
17 מדרש רבה סלייק.
18 ראוהו סלייק.
On Anthropomorphisms in יהוה

יהוה’s form are metaphorical. In בחרת אפרים, בני ישראל, שירת הים says that this does not mean that יהוה’s nostrils release smoke, but the here is speaking in a manner in which man can understand, כי לחשופי און הבריות כפי יהוה סיווה ולבניו. But how can this contradiction in יש"ר be solved? In some places, he seems to suggest that יהוה does possess anthropomorphic features, while here he explicitly states that He does not. Rabbi Slifkin says that here, the פסוק is describing יהוה’s anger, while other פסוקים describe יהוה’s actual features. Here the emphasis is placed on the smoke emanating from Him. יש"ר is not saying that יהוה does not have nostrils, but that His nostrils do not release smoke.

As shown, there is room to suggest that יש"ר viewed יהוה as corporeal. However, at the close of his article, Rabbi Slifkin clarifies that even if יש"ר did feel this way, we are not allowed to say this today.

The difference between the views of יש"ר on רמב"ם and יש"ר, מ"ס on רמב"ם involves a great amount of philosophical elements. Given this information, it makes sense that the רמב"ם adamantly refuses to entertain the possibility that יהוה may be corporeal. On the other hand, יש"ר lived in Northern France, a place where individuals believed יהוה was corporeal. Unlike the רמב"ם, יש"ר did not need to assert that יהוה is incorporeal.

Rabbi Akiva Tatz adds a nice twist to help explain יהוה’s corporeality, or lack thereof. He says that when the תורה mentions attributes of יהוה such as a hand, the תורה refers to המנהג של יהוה – His

19 שמות רג: י
20 ראו p. 104 של סלביתין.
actions and conduct within this world. For example, when the תּוֹרָה describes הָוָה’s “eyes,” it is expressing that הָוָה sees what happens in this world. Descriptions of הָוָה’s “hand” describe הָוָה’s ability to act in this world.

However, throughout לְכַלְכַל, there seems to be an implication that הָוָה actually has a hand. How can this be a mere reference to הָוָה’s actions in this world? If the תּוֹרָה states that הָוָה has these features, He must possess them, even above the finite world. But how can this be possible? Is it possible that הָוָה has anthropomorphic features? Rabbi Tatz continues and states that הָוָה’s hand is real, and the human hand is a מַשָל, created to help them understand הָוָה’s hand. This explanation allows us to say that, indeed, הָוָה possesses a “literal” hand (or other “body parts”) and yet to maintain that He is absolutely incorporeal.  

Nowadays, it is deemed heretical to say that הָוָה is corporeal. Yet as we have seen, it was not always so and indeed appears that some ראשונים – maybe even רש”י – held that view. Nevertheless, it is important to recognize that even according to those who said הָוָה is corporeal, His “form” is not like a human body, and He is not limited by human-type frailty. Human beings lack the ability to understand הָוָה’s attributes described in הָוָה. Whether they just serve as a מַשָל, or actually describe הָוָה’s “appearance,” foremost in every person’s mind must be that הָוָה is אחד, and the Ruler of this world.

---


"The World Parallels Its Root", pp. 57-68.
ברכת המזון

which is an independent part of the order of תפילה. The way ברכת המזון connects to תפילה provides an important perspective that one should keep at the forefront of one’s mind when reciting it.

The ספר החינוך explains that a person has an obligation to bless and thank ’ה for the food he has just eaten because ’ה is the source of this food. The reason for this, he elaborates, cannot simply be praising ’ה since ’ה has no real need for praise and ברכה. Rather, he says, based on the central principle that ’ה created the world in order to provide for ’ברכת המזון, הבן ישארא is a clear reminder that all blessing and goodness come exclusively from ’ה alone. That knowledge and realization will lead ’ה to bestow even more prosperity on His nation in the future.

ברכת המזון and תפילה are thus fundamentally similar (in both form and purpose) in that they both express the basic belief that all fortune comes only from ’ה.
One should recite ברכת המזון with a mindset of thanking 'ה for everything He provides. Ideally, one should not need to be commanded to say ברכת המזון; the desire to do so should come naturally.

רב שמשון דוד פינקוס gives a משל to explain the purpose of ברכת המזון. A mother does not stop to ask her crying baby what he or she wants. The mother, knowing what is best for the baby, places a bottle into the baby's mouth. So too, one must pray to 'ה in order to enable Him to respond and supply what they need. One must recognize 'ה as the source of everything in order to receive their needs and grow closer to 'ה.

Quite similar to תפילה, ברכת המזון emphasizes the fundamental truth that everything comes from 'ה.

The גמרא in ברכות describes the four ברכות of ברכת המזון, and says that each was composed by (or modeled after the תפילות of) different individuals. It says that the first ברכה (regarding nourishment and food) was written by מרים after the המן came down from שמים. The second ברכה (for ארץ ישראל) was written by יהושע after entering the land. The third ברכה (regarding the establishment of ירושלים) was written by דוד and שבטים after the construction of ירושלים, their capital, and the בית המקדש. The fourth ברכה (regarding all of the good acts of 'ה) was written by רבén גמליאל when the bodies of the fighters killed in ביתר did not decay and received proper burials.
raises the following question: shouldn’t the land be mentioned before the food because, after all, that is the natural progression of the world? In ברכת המזון, the opposite appears to be true. We first thank ה for the food and only then for the land.

explains that the ברכות show Israel’s increasing relationship with ה as each ברכה becomes more directly related to בני ישראל. First, we thank ה for giving food to the world, then for bestowing blessing specifically upon the people of ארץ ישראל, and finally for blessing the people who remember מקום השכינה.

It is important to live by ה’s word and not only through the consumption of food: כי לא על הלחם לבדו יחיה האדם כי על כל מוצא פי ה. בְּני ישראל do not live on food alone, but also on being ה’s nation, on ארץ ישראל, and on following the word of ה.

Since ברכת המזון is an expression of thanks to ה for providing His nation with everything, the Maharal of Prague explains a few other aspects of ברכת המזון derived from the four ברכות. First, he writes that in ברכת המזון we thank ה for the increasing levels of goodness which He provides. The first ברכה thanks ה for creating people to have the need for food. The second thanks ה for providing the land that fulfills the requirement for food, and grows even more than needed. The third ברכה shows gratitude to ה for supplying the source of all blessing and שלמות in the world – ירושלים and the בית המקדש. The Jewish people are worthy enough to accept the first three ברכות based on their own merits. The fourth ברכה, however, is the ברכה praising ה for the overflow of goodness He imparts on His nation even without their being deserving.
The Maharal’s explanation depicts 'ה’s role in every detail of the inner workings of the world. 'ה created all situations, every need and every fulfillment of said needs, in order to shower the children of Israel with goodness.

Another way the Maharal elucidates the blessings is that each blessing is stronger than the preceding one in terms of recognizing 'ה in this world. The first blessing displays appreciation to 'ה for nature, and for the subtle way in which 'ה controls the environment. The second blessing recognizes 'ה’s bestowal of spirituality to the world and making His presence clear. The third blessing offers thanks for the evident and obvious manner in which 'ה displays His hand in the world. This is an example of how the world should be viewed. Even if a gift does not obviously appear to be from 'ה, or if something is not immediately recognizably from Him, one must always seek Him out and remember that everything stems from His goodness.

In addition, the Maharal divides the blessings in a third way: the first blessing discusses the people accepting 'ה’s blessings in the land; the second discusses 'ה giving blessings from above; the third discusses the connection between the heavens and the earth; the fourth discusses the building of a third temple.

According to this explanation, the first three blessings are because they convey a permanent relationship with 'ה. On the other hand, the fourth blessing expresses the hope and prayer for the rebuilding of the Holy Temple and the transitory wishes. The Gemara mentions the story of Beit Ritz to point out the good that 'ה does for His nation, even when they lack the Holy Temple and are in exile. This is because the situation...
is temporary. When ** Bris ha-mekdash ** is rebuilt, the situation will become permanent, and there will no longer be a need for this ברכָּה. This division and explanation of the ברכות illustrates the different levels of the relationship between **יִהוֵו** and **בֵּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל** during times of **גַּלְוָה** and **גַּאֹולה**.10

The explanations of the meaning and order of the ברכות of **ברכת המזון** exemplify the extreme importance of doing **יִהוֵו**’s will, creating a relationship with Him, and understanding that everything originates from Him. This idea is vital to **בֵּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל**’s religion and beliefs: this understanding creates the perspective in which the world should be approached. If **בֵּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל** comprehend the fact that **יִהוֵו** controls the cosmos, and is the source of the world, a more positive attitude is sure to follow. And all of this can be accomplished simply through a few ברכות recited after eating lunch!
Shunning the New Believers: Converts Confronting Prejudices in the Orthodox Community

Rachel Delia Benaim

Avrahamavin was the first convert.\(^1\) The rabbis teach that, his father, was an idol worshiper and that Avraham discovered 'יה' by himself and took the Kirkegaardian leap of faith (albeit preceding Søren by a number of centuries). It would seem, then, that those who follow in his footsteps, embracing the true faith and joining the community of Avraham’s descendents, should be admired and accorded great honor. Unfortunately, though, this is not always the case.

Why is the topic of conversion so disconcerting among great Rabbis of past and present generations? Why does הוה stir so many emotions within the Jewish community? Perhaps these issues are caused by concern about insincere converts, such as ומכ הוה at ייצא מצרים, or people who want to convert for marriage purposes. Regardless, the topic of this essay is neither to discuss ומכ הוה nor false converts, but rather to discuss sincere, genuine converts who are belittled, albeit not purposely, by contemporary Orthodox society. Few issues of הוה generate the emotional response that הוה provokes.

הוה is described in sublime terms by some, reviled by others. This polarization is reflected in the הוה. In מסכת פסחים the הוה states לא היגלה הקדוש ברוך הוא את ישראל לבין האומות אלא כדי שיתאספו אליהם גרים – לא מנהל המקוש ברוך היא אתי ישראל לבן האומות אלהי גר檫 אליהם גר檫 – the

\(^1\) סוסי וינט: "נני עם עם עולם עם עם 어לוה אברום אברום אברום אברום אברום אברום אברום אברום אברום אברום אברום"
nation of Israel was exiled among the nations exclusively to increase the number of converts existing in its ranks. However, in the Gemara depicts the value of converts in stark contrast to the positive impression created by the previous source: — converts afflict us as boils would.

At first, this apparent contradiction in the Gemara appears quite perplexing; however, the bewilderment is reconciled by Tosafot who clarify that the indicting comparison actually refers to עם ישראל as a whole, and not to specific converts. Tosafot explain that because עם ישראל cannot hold back from transgressing the negative commandment of פוגר לא תונה, not oppressing converts, the punishment they receive has the sharpness of being stricken by boils.

This insight of Tosafot to explain the juxtaposition of ideas brings forth a significant psychological insight. According to רבי יהודה טולדנו, the dislike and distrust many Jews feel toward גרים is self-inflicted and projected: since Jews do not trust their own ability to follow the Biblical imperative to love converts, Jews attempt to attribute an illusory dishonesty to them, so that Jews as a nation are vindicated in their criticism of converts.

The biblical commandment to love the גר is unusual in that תורה explains the reason for the מצוות. In 'משה's description of ח''ט's qualities, he indicates that He "is supreme over all judges, Who does not show favor and cannot be bribed .... who loves the

---

2 פסח: פ. 345 ב. 3 יבמות: מ. 461 ג. 4 שמות: ב. 367 ד. 5 מיילר, ה. ה' שבט תשכ"ו, שיחה אישית. 6 ר"א שבט, שלהי על שם שם שלם"ע.
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convert ... [and therefore] you shall love the convert because you were strangers in the land of Egypt."

Moreover, even though this love is included in the command רַב יָדוֹ, the רמב"ם points out that the additional commandment to love גֵּרֵי מִנְיָמִין shows that יְהֹוָה's own love for the גֵּר is especially great, as he accepted הָוֻה out of his own volition and not by birth.

Furthermore, because of this giant leap that converts make, יְהֹוָה protects converts. He deems the decision to convert a great compliment on the convert’s behalf. The convert relinquishes all ties with his family and his father’s house to join the ranks of בני ישראל; therefore, יְהֹוָה on His part will command respect and love for all those who do the same for Him.

Similarly, the ספר החינוך adds that יְהֹוָה intentionally gave the Jewish people an additional commandment to love converts. Furthermore, the ילקוט שמוני states that a convert who converts for the sake of יְהֹוָה is likened to a לוּי before Him, meaning that he has an elevated holiness apart from the rest of the nation.
Why then, are converts referred to as גרים, literally translated as strangers? If, as derived from the גמרא, one is supposed to fully accept a גר צדק, why are גרים still referred to as such – strangers, outsiders, almost pariahs? Furthermore, since it is forbidden to mock a גר or remind him of his past, due to the principle גר נתגייר כקטן שנולד דמי, why do many people insist on practically violating this rule by referring to גרים as what they once were?

When asked this question, our teacher רב אליעזר לרנר responded that this distinction is not meant to be read with the negative connotation of “stranger,” rather it should be read with a praiseworthy twist – these people were strangers, they were not a part of the chosen people, yet they chose to join עם ישראל’s ranks and leave everything they knew behind to become a part of ה’s chosen people.

 חז”ל derive from קבלה that ה very first act of creation was ten ספירות, that is to say intellectual powers, through which every subsequent act of creation would be channeled. The names of the lower seven ספירות appear in דברי הימים 14. Converts are placed in the last ספירה, מלחמת, that of מלכות, kingship, is epitomized by ה המלך. Ironically, his heritage lies in the fields of מואב along with his grandmother, a righteous convert, רות, who sincerely accepted the ways of the Jewish people. Seeing
how the quintessential convert is the grandmother and progenitor of the quintessential king, it is only fitting that ‘ר reward and those who follow in her path with the elevated status in the קפורה of המלכות.

‘ר’s objective in the creation of the world was to have His name revealed in every aspect of His creation. Just as the principle מַעֲשֶׂה יְהֹוָה, last to be created but foremost in mind, is said regarding ז’ ‘ל, so too too high place in the category of המלכות because the creation of the world was in fact calculated.

Throughout Rabbinic literature, the expression used by חז”ל to describe a potential convert was גוי שבא להתגר, and not גוי שבא להגר. As רב שמואל טולדנו זצ”ל used to quote, the גאון וילנא explained that a גוי will never be a Jew because when ‘ר gave the תורה, the nations of the world turned it down. To become a Jew means that his soul was already that of a future convert. The רמב”ם illustrates the status of converts in the Jewish hierarchy by positing that converts should recite ברכות with the terms אלהינו ואלהי אבותינו והבדילנו מן הטועים, even though their ancestors were not necessarily God-fearing.

A similar tradition is passed down from the גאון וילנא describing that, while the reward for the תורה one does will only be obtained in the world to come because of the תורה’s elevated spiritual level, גרי צדק are granted the privilege to see their reward both in this world and the next.

In his book, And From Jerusalem His Word, our teacher רב חנוך טלר recounted a discussion he had with רב שלמה זלמן אויערבאך זצ”ל. רב טלר asked רב שלמה זלמן for advice regarding a שידוך in which the girl
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17 נַעֲשֶׂה יְהוָה לְרַבִּד לַמַּעֲשֶׂה יְהוָה
18 מַעֲשֶׂה יְהוָה לְרַבִּד לַמַּעֲשֶׂה יְהוָה
19 אֲדֻרַת אֲדֻרַת וְרַבִּד לְרַבִּד
20 אְדֻרַת אֲדֻרַת וְרַבִּד לְרַבִּד
was a woman and wanted to know when to inform the boy of the girl’s "unfortunate" news. The rabb’s answer was unequivocal: "On the contrary! Do you understand how fortunate this boy could be? Tell him he would have the privilege of fulfilling the mitzvah of ‘באתם את הגר’ every single day of his life…. I don’t understand your concern of חיסרון!" Since then, 해فَ(272,273),(660,292) feels that he cannot harbor any more misgivings towards converts because of the staunch, strong, unyielding answer of 해UEL. Thus, one can see that the hold sincere converts in high esteem, and that this attitude is supported by many Rabbinic sources.

The relates the story of the Roman general Nero who chose to convert to Judaism rather than destroy ירושלים, in fact, is his descendent. was also a descendent of וירדיה, and he molded much of Jewish tradition. Similarly, students of גאולא, and were who subsequently became prominent teachers of אמי. Moreover, the who saved the two spies in פסוק ידיים, saw the incredible power and greatness of הַבָּרוּך and converted. Because of her own greatness, she merited marrying יוחנן, the leader himself. Together, they merited זרע צדיקים וنبيים including ברוך, נריה, שריה, מחסיה, ירמיהו, חלקיה, חנמאל, חולדא. And of course,
as previously mentioned, the grandmother of the messiah, was a convert.

Shunning the New Believers also shows how beloved members are in the eyes of . Once had set her heart on converting, she was placed in the same category as . As a consequence of the distinctive status enjoy, royal and messianic families will come from them. The of Prague explains that when wants to bring a new element into existence, He must truly create a new entity, entirely different from the entity it succeeds. Therefore, ' created the concept of in a way that created a new element, specifically out of the non-Jewish nation, and the furthest away from perfection. That is why ' started with and ; there were no nations further away from morality and perfection than they were.

Because of that, they were the ideal source for 's new creation.

However, the Jewish people are not nor can be fools. Individuals interested in conversion must be thoroughly investigated. Their motives must be sincere. For instance, one cannot merely convert for marriage.
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skepticism does come into play. The general populace is unsure how sincere converts are, thus people are apprehensive about fully accepting converts into their midst.

One must realize, however, that once someone has undergone an Orthodox conversion, he or she was already thoroughly investigated by multiple rabbis. Effectively, these rabbis are on a much higher level than the average Orthodox Jew in the street who harbors many prejudices. If people are comfortable asking their “local orthodox rabbis” questions on ההלכה about everything from כשרות, to raising a family, to critical life decisions, logically, why would such people mistrust the conversions that these rabbis perform? This seems inconsistent.

Why then, do Jews in modern times have skeptical views towards converts? If, as seen above, converts are considered diamonds among the nation and the highest ranking citizens in הナ’s eyes, why is the Jewish community so cynical?

Most would argue that Orthodox Jews are welcoming toward sincere converts and are not doubtful. The converts are accepted with open arms since, after all, מסכת גרים attests אלו יראי שמים, these [sincere converts] are God-fearing. Ideally, that is true, and may even hold true for a percentage of Jews, but the fact remains that many communities discriminate against converts.

For example, the Syrian community in Brooklyn instituted an edict (תקנה) in 1935 prohibiting converting people, marrying converts, or letting them live in the Syrian community. The תקנה “proclaimed that no male or female member of [their community] has the right to intermarry with non-Jews; this law covers conversion, which [they] consider to be fictitious and valueless...” A 1946 clarification added specifics: “the rabbi will not perform Religious Ceremonies ... for such “illegitimate” couples. The
Congregation’s premises will be banned to them for use of any religious or social nature… After death of said person, he or she is not to be buried on the Cemetery of our community…”

Granted, the edict was proclaimed at a time when intermarriage within the Syrian community was prevalent and the rabbis wanted to save their community, but it has been renewed every decade or so – even in the past decade! The Syrian Rabbinic Council met a number of years ago and reinstated the תקנה yet again. This seems to be a clear violation of וגר לא תונה; they will not perform conversions even to their own standards and they refuse to accept a convert into their midst no matter how impeccable his or her credentials may be.

Likewise, many people of the young generation have similar views. In an unscientific, anecdotal survey taken of ten teenage girls, when asked if they would marry a full kosher convert, four replied, “in theory there is nothing wrong with it but … I just don’t know,” (an anonymous girl whose response encapsulated the entire group’s feelings), four were adamantly against marrying an orthodox convert, and only two answered with an emphatic “yes!”

As we have seen, it is prohibited by the תורה to harbor such feelings towards a genuine convert, and ר’ שלמה זלמן אוירבך said that one should consider it a privilege to marry one. Nevertheless, there are many prejudices that seep into one’s consciousness which ultimately mold one’s weltanschauung. Hopefully, our clarification of the sources will help correct this unfortunate situation.

Free Will and פרעה

The story of יציאת מצרים raises significant questions regarding the principle of בחירה חופשית – free will. Throughout פרשת בא ובשלח apparently, פרעה lost his free will while he contemplated releasing מצרים from שארית עם ישראל. If פרעה’s free will was actually removed as the תורה implies, how can anyone argue that ה grants mankind free choice? Could other factors have been involved in this situation? Is it possible that although בחירה חופשית is a gift from ה, there are times when this privilege is removed, in order to teach a lesson, or provide one an opportunity for self-improvement?

Perhaps the question about the hardening of פרעה’s heart will prove helpful in order to better understand the concept of בחירה חופשית. The first incident which causes us to question whether or not פרעה had free choice was when ה spoke to משה at the סנה. He told him¹ that ה would not submit to משה's request for a three-day holiday for בני ישראל. After פרעה's initial refusal but prior to the start of the מכות,² ה warned warned משה that He would harden the heart of פרעה. משה and אהרן were to appear before פרעה one more time and present a taste of the upcoming plagues. Unmoved by the miracle of the staff, פרעה remained adamant that he would not release בני ישראל. Here, the תורה says ויחזק לב פרעה.³ With that, the מכות began, and the phrase ויחזק לב פרעה (or the similar והכבד את לבו)⁴ is repeated after each
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¹ שמوت ג: יט "ואני ידעתי כל אלך ויאמר זאת פסחך כי כל ארץ מצרים יכירו"  
² שמوت ח: יג "ואני אpaque את לב פרעה"  
³ שמوت ח: יג  
⁴ שמוט ח: יג  
⁵ שמוט ח: יג"א, יג, ט"א: "הcplusplus דבר בפרעה"
one. Time after time, plague after plague, מְשַׁעֵת肾脏 pleaded with יְהוָה to free His people, but he continued to reject יְהוָה’s appeal. Only when struck with מֵכֶם מִבְּחוֹרָ וּמְשַׁעֵת’s own life was in jeopardy, did he liberate בני ישראל.

Throughout this trying time, it seems that יְהוָה’s heart was hardened without his consent, and this seems unjust. If בְּנוֹי יִשְׂרָאֵל is part of the natural world and is seemingly a human right, how could it be removed?

The רמב”ן gives two explanations for why יְהוָה hardened the heart of פרעה.

His first answer is that יְהוָה needed his heart to be hardened in order to invoke justice for all the pain that he caused בני ישראל. He paraphrases רש”י who comments that יְהוָה only interceded in the hardening of פרעה’s heart with the last five plagues.

After each of the last five plagues, the text says יְהוָה hardened his heart. However, after the first five plagues, the scripture only writes: וַיִּחְזֶק ה’ את לֵב פרָעָה. never mentioning יְהוָה, implying that until then, יְהוָה never interceded with the choice that יְהוָה made to withhold בני ישראל. The harshness of the second round of מַכָּות begins to soften יְהוָה’s heart, and he almost allowed בני ישראל to leave. Instead, though, יְהוָה interceded and hardened his heart. In essence, therefore, this explanation claims that יְהוָה really did have free choice and יְהוָה hardened his heart only in order to enable him to do that which he really wanted to do.

In his second explanation, רמב”ם quotes the רמב”ם who lists some fundamental principles that relate to free will. Included in
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6 שמות כג, י”א ה”א לע פּוֹרֵי"ת
7 שמות כג י”א ה”א לע פּוֹרֵי רָפֵאִים
8 שמות כג י”א ה”א לע פּוֹרֵי רָפֵאִים
9 שמות כג י”א ה”א לע פּוֹרֵי רָפֵאִים
10 שמות כג י”א ה”א לע פּוֹרֵי רָפֵאִים
the concept that ה knows what sin a person will commit before he commits it, yet ה does not take away one's chance to decide for himself. Because ה exists in a world without any restriction of time, ה, in essence, has a picture of the puzzle and the pieces that make up the world.

Another puzzling idea discussed in the רמב"ם is the method employed by ה to judge and administer reward and punishment. Specifically in the realm of punishment, one has no right to assume that one is being punished for a specific sin unless they are רשעים. As far as punishments go, the worst is the elimination of the possibility of תשובה. In the case of 'פרעה's free will, ה only took away his free will after he had a chance to do תשובה, but failed to do so. The first few provided a window to do so, but he did not take advantage of the opportunity. As punishment, ה took away his ability to do תשובה at the moment that he most wanted to. Effectively, ה actively hardened 'פרעה's heart.

Similarly, רמב"ם in his הלכות תשובה explains that sometimes a person comes to a point where he does so many sins and so much evil that ה prevents him from doing תשובה. He strengthened the heart of 'פרעה to the point where he was repaid for all the evil he had committed toward בני ישראל.

רבי שלמה אבינר writes that there must have been a reason that ה prevented 'פרעה's назадה and hardened his heart; otherwise there would have been no need for all the מכות.

---

11 הלכות תשובה ג': "אפשר שלמה מה נוה גמל ממה שישב הוא רבי יẠI ולא ששהים חותא הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה רבי יגט מה ש文化传媒 פגע חטאו של הוה Рabi שלמה אבינר writes that there must have been a reason that ה prevented 'פרעה's назадה and hardened his heart; otherwise there would have been no need for all the מכות. מחנה ור' אשרBruins explains that
presented the plagues as testimony of His own existence to בְּנֵי ישראל for generations to come. This is the reason why תָּמַם took away the free will of פרעה. It was not a punishment for פרעה, and in fact was not about reward or punishment at all; the sole purpose of the полות was to make בְּנֵי ישראל begin to recognize that ה הוא the Creator and that everything natural and supernatural is in His control. At the cost of מצרים’s suffering, בְּנֵי ישראל were able to witness miracles that had never occurred in the history of the world.

The ספרי תקוני, however, disagrees with the above מפרשים and explains that ה ‘s goal was to send the בְּנֵי ישראל a message – ה wanted them to recognize that they needed to do תשובה, and in doing so, transcend their immorality. Therefore, פרעה’s heart being hardened was critical for this task to come into action. Had he seen even one מכה in his natural state, he would have sent בְּנֵי ישראל free without giving the rest of his people a real chance to do complete תשובה. According to this view, one man’s בחירות was removed in order to provide an entire nation with the ability to make real choices.

In his מכתב מאליהו, רב אליהו דסלר attempts to learn from these ideas in order to shed some light on the topic of בחירות חפשית. He writes how, when used properly, בחירות חפשית can bring humanity to elevated levels of success and goodness. רב דסלר expresses the importance of developing and protecting one’s free will, and of working to control it.

In his מכתב מאליהו, רב דסלר furthers his point by quoting רבינו ירוחם who stresses the importance of putting oneself in a good situation where a positive decision is likely. One could compare this to someone who is on a diet. When he goes grocery shopping, the person has two options as to how to fill his cart: either he can fill it with healthy, low-fat food, or with the least healthy, fat-filled foods. If he chooses the first grocery list, he is setting himself up in a good situation.
If however, he decides to give in to his cravings, he is just maintaining and “feeding” a bad habit. Similarly, one should set up his or her life so that his or her free choice is likely to be to serve ה. 

Rabbi Dessler then quotes the ס"א. As ה’s ultimate creation, man is privileged with the gift of free choice. One is expected to use this gift, to serve ה. A Jew should not put himself in a situation in which he is tempted to sin. Ultimately, by staying out of trouble, the Jew only allows himself to be found in situations in which there is opportunity for growth and improvement.

Rabbi Dessler explains that this can be accomplished through community involvement. After all, in Judaism, the relationship between man and his neighbor is almost as important (if not equal to) the relationship between man and ה. When one comes to honestly love his fellow person as he loves himself, then he has one goal in mind – following the will of ה for the greater good of society. This common goal will cause him to overcome his own selfish needs and the needs of the community will come before his own. This is another way that free choice can become limited.

Pharaoh was habituated to independently harden his heart toward בני ישראל and eventually, this stubbornness became automatic for him so that he no longer had the בחור to choose another course of action. Although the תורה says that ה hardened his heart, this was really a natural consequence of having hardened his will on his own for an extended period of time.

Accordingly, we are expected to use our free will to accept and observe the תורה. The תורה is a guide for life and teaches how to overcome challenges and face adversity. Often, בחורleads a person to face challenging decisions, but by living a life of תורה, any obstacle can be defeated.
Gambling With Health

Medical Risk-Taking in halakha

There is an obligation for every Jew to take care of his health, as the Torah states רֹן השמֵר לְךָ וְשָׁמְרוּ נְפֶשֶׁךָ. This obligation is considered extremely important, and at times, even takes precedence over other mitzvot. The verse in ויקרא states 'בָּהָם אני הושמרתם את חָקֵיָּיו ואת סְמֻכֲיוֹן אשר יעשה בהם האדם וְחי. The Gemara learns from this פסוק that one should לְשׁוּחַ בהם וַאֲלֹה שימות בהם, live by them, don’t die by them. Saving a life overrides every מצוות, except for murdering, committing adultery, and idolatry. Clearly the concept of life preservation is integral to the תורה.

Following this logic, one may assume that undergoing elective surgery is not endorsed by the תורה. In fact, the שולחן ערוך says that a person may not actively harm himself by engaging in dangerous activities or hazardous situations. Additionally, there is a specific איסור to inflict one’s self or another with a חבלה, a wound. Surgery can often be considered a dangerous activity, and in any case, even in the most ideal situation, it would fall under the category of חבלה.

---
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Also, the גמרא in יומא 6 discusses a case in which a person is trapped under a fallen wall on שבת. The גמרא explains that a spectator must break שבת in order to try to save this person, even if the person will most likely die. Even if, by rescuing him, the injured man will only live a fleeting life, he still must be rescued. If the Torah commands any action be taken to preserve a fleeting life, logically, one cannot risk his own fleeting life. If undergoing surgery risks a potential consequent death, should a person be allowed to risk that?

The גמרא in_workah_zera_7 speaks about the prohibition of using idolatrous doctors, based on the concern that the doctor may try to kill a Jewish patient. The גמרא exclaims – if the patient is in a condition where there is a doubt if he will live or die, use of a pagan doctor is not allowed; however, if the patient will definitely die, one is allowed to use such a doctor. His reasoning is that there is no concern for ephemeral life.

 Mahar elaborates that although the pagan doctor may kill the Jewish patient, one is allowed to be treated by the pagan in a fatal situation. In this case, since death seems inevitable, the chance of the pagan doctor saving the patient outweighs the risk of him killing him.
The Gemara uses a story in 'Melachim B' to prove this point and derive another key concept regarding medical risk taking: At the time when the Aram army enforced a siege on Yerushalayim, inflicting the city with a famine, there were four Mitzarim outside of the city gates. Because they knew they were condemned to death – either at the hands of the Aramim or by starvation, the Mitzarim decided to surrender to the Aramim in hopes that the enemy would spare their lives. Here too, when faced with definitive death, a great risk was taken in order to possibly be saved. This Gemara is considered the primary source for taking life-risking actions in order to potentially save a life.

As Tosefta comments on the words הני ולא חיישן, every individual has the responsibility to ensure that his actions are in the best interest of the patient. At this point, what is yet to be determined are the parameters of what is in the best interest of a patient – thus what is allowed.

The first question that must be discussed is the amount of risk one is actually allowed to take; in other words, how likely must survival be for the procedure to be deemed permissible. According to the Shi'ur HaChametz, the Chatam Sofer and the Zik'at Eliezer, the situation must be at least a ספק שקול – a fifty percent chance that the surgery will be successful. Rabbi Yitzchak Shoji Gershon, author of the Tashbetz, however, says that even greater risks are allowed. He reasons that the words חיישינן שעה לאלחיי have no qualifications;
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therefore, one is allowed to take any risk necessary in order to save one’s own life.

Rabbi Meshana Mistsra"13 quotes both opinions, and favors the opinion of the Mishnah because the piske mea nihyeh states in a piske mea nihyeh (assumedly a piske shekhelah situation), medical attention from a pagan must be an equal risk. Since, in the case of certain death, this medical attention is allowed, it must be that the same general risk allowance is present, namely a fifty percent chance of survival.

Rabbi Meshana Mistsra" comes to this conclusion despite his explanation of the words piske. He explains that there are two types of pagan doctors: some will try to kill a Jew at any cost, while others’ greed or desire for prestige outweighs their hatred for Jews. The piske shekhelah is what type of doctor the pagan is; therefore, it is apparent that he is commenting on the situation in which the pagan doctor will definitely try to kill the Jewish patient. Nevertheless, despite Rabbi Meshana Mistsra"’s preference of the Mishnah’s explanation, he says that anyone who wishes to take a greater risk can rely on the opinion of the Yerusha.

The next question that must be addressed is the definition of hiti shehah – ephemeral life. What is the definition of this term, and conversely, how can lasting life be measured?

Yerusha15 defines hiti shehah as living one or two more days. Yerusha16 extends hiti shehah to at least six months. His logic is based on the notion that conceptually two days is no different than six months in regards to potentially saving a life – any reasonable
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person would just as easily risk six months as two days to save their own life.

Rabbi Moshe\footnote{לו: אגרות משה יורה דעה ג} notes that did not state six months as a limit, rather the number was just the case on which he was commenting. Rabbi Hayim Ozar\footnote{רב חיים עוזר} takes the reasoning of Rabbi Hayim Ozar and extends six months to a year—but no more than that. Rabbi Abraham Zich Kein\footnote{רב Araştırma זיך שם קך} agrees with the one year standard based on the concept of סירפל. In six months, the definition of a סירפל is an animal whose ailment will cause it to die within the year. Rabbi Kein\footnote{רב研究报告 זיך שם קך} uses this reasoning as a proof for defining ישן יוד as up to one year.

In his book, \textit{Bioethical Dilemmas}\footnote{ראה Bleich, J. David, “Hazardous Medical Procedures”, Bioethical Dilemmas II Southfield, MI: Targum Press, 2006, p. 258-261}, Rabbi J. David Bleich argues that even a year is not the definite risk limit because everything is dependant on circumstance. He gives the example of a Leukemia patient given 13 months to live. If the patient receives a bone marrow transplant, his life span will be dramatically increased. Obviously the patient does not need to wait a month (making him within the one year span in which the פוסקים allow a risky surgery) to undergo the transplant if in that time patient’s condition will deteriorate.

Rabbi Bleich quotes a precedent from the \textit{תפארת ישראל}\footnote{ג: תפארת ישראל בועז יומא ח} that allows a smallpox inoculation despite the fact that the patient will most definitely live more than a year. He also attacks Rabbi Kein’s reasoning of סירפל because there are circumstances in which a סירפל lives more than a year. Furthermore, many life-threatening illnesses are not considered סירפל at all; therefore, it does not make sense to base the definition of ישן יוד on סירפל.
Rabbi Chaim Jachter, in his article “High Risk Medical Procedures,”²¹ postulates that even רב משה would allow the bone marrow transplant in the case above since a bone marrow transplant is not considered a risky procedure. He explains that it is possible to argue that the less dangerous a procedure, the longer amount of life one is allowed to risk in this cost-benefit analysis.

Likewise, because there are many opinions regarding what is allowed in this realm of medical risks, the patient must play a role in the decision making process. Usually a person is obligated to undergo medical treatment.²² But in the case of medical treatment that is potentially life threatening, both רב משה and the תפארת ישראל state that one is not required to risk his or her חיי שעה.²³

However, רב משה continues this thought asserting that if there is an overwhelming probability that the medical treatment will succeed, one is required to do undergo the procedure because of the obligation to save one’s own life.

Rabbi Bleich²⁴ posits that the amount of risk one is obligated to take is discretionary based on the temperament of each individual. One who is more risk-averse may be more reluctant to undergo risky procedures, while someone more risk-accepting may be more willing to undergo the same procedure. Because the decision is subjective, both are examples of being properly prudent concerning the obligation to guard one’s health.

---


²² עיון דורות תשכ”ח - והלך ההלכה מתמטctaוAlexander Wolf והז”ד בתראקוף מאית אונסמה פוגפוניק און קמאו ומקראים

²³ עיון דורות תשכ”ח - והלך ההלכה מתמטctaוAlexander Wolf והז”ד בתראקוף מאית אונסמה פוגפוניק און קמאו ומקראים

²⁴ See Bleich, J. David Bioethical Dilemmas II, pp. 256-257.
On a separate note, the exploration of what procedures and surgeries are allowed to save a person’s life must be addressed. This situation comes up often – whether it is pain alleviating surgery, life extending surgery, or simply elective surgery.

רב משה strongly advocates against surgeries to alleviate pain and deems them completely אסור. He gives an example of someone who would live many years without surgery but would be confined to bed in the interim. רב מוה שמץ rules that one cannot endanger himself just for convenience.

Rabbi Bleich quotes הרב יעקב עמדן saying that undergoing a risky procedure that will alleviate the extreme pain of kidney stones or gallstones is קרוב לאיסור. According to Rabbi Bleich, being as it is קרוב לאיסור the procedure is not prohibited; therefore, Rabbi Bleich finds room for a פסק that the surgery is potentially permissible. He argues that the מצוה of ורפא ירפא applies even when the patient’s life is not yet threatened. Because every medical treatment has an element of risk, a certain amount of risk can be taken to treat medical problems.

Rabbi Bleich also discusses an opinion of the א"רמ who states that one is allowed to amputate a limb to alleviate pain. Rabbi Bleich understands this to mean that considerable risk is allowed to be taken to alleviate pain even if, as was the case in the time of the א"רמ, the procedure is standard yet risky.

The ציץ אליעזר takes a different approach to this issue. He allows morphine to be given to a very sick patient to alleviate pain.
despite the risks involved. He gives a few reasons for this. First of all, extreme pain may hasten death, which obviously must be avoided. Secondly, the procedure is still considered in the realm of הַצָּאָר. Thirdly, he quotes the דְּבָּק הָבִית who discusses the possibility of a person being allowed to kill himself if he knows he will be subjected to torture. דְּבָּק הָבִית refers to וּרְחֵי מְשָׁא, who allowed themselves to be thrown into a burning furnace בַּיָּרָה, who killed himself in battle with the פָּלֶישִׂים rather than be captured and tortured by them. Even though the דְּבָּק הָבִית questions whether those cases were even permitted על פי הָלָכָה, the דְּבָּק הָבִית says that based on those הָלָכָה, there is room for a התיר.

Rabbi Jachter tries to transfer this situation into modern terms. He claims that circumstances have changed. This generation is much less tolerant of pain, and therefore, being in pain may be considered a greater danger. He argues that the case discussed was one of psychological pain (not being able to leave the house) in which case the surgery is forbidden. However, in a case in which someone was in real physical pain, even רב משה would probably permit pain-alleviating procedures.

Although saving a patient’s life and alleviating pain are the most common reasons for surgery, lengthening a terminal patient’s life can also fill the הָלָכָה’s quota. In this case, רב משה is adamant that the surgery may only be done in order to save the patient’s life; therefore, one may not undergo a risky procedure to
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extend one’s life for a short time. He quotes the אֶֽחָ֣ד מָ֖יֶם אֲשֶׁרָ֣ה שָׁרָ֣יָהּ אֲנִיָּוָֽהּ 35 who holds that dubious procedures are only allowed if the patient will “live.” He interprets this to mean that the patient will live a normal lifespan.

Rabbi Bleich, on the other hand, quotes רַבָּה בָּאָדָם רַבָּתָן וּרְבָּה בָּאָדָם לְמַעֲרֹתָיו וּרְבָּה בָּאָדָם לְלָכֵּם 34 which states that one is allowed to risk יְהִי שָׁם for a longer life. Rabbi Bleich takes this to mean that life may be risked for more יְהִי שָׁם. Those same words are interpreted by רְבּוֹנָה שְׁטִיבֶה בָּאָדָם יִשְׁרֵי לִבּוֹ 36 He reads יְהִי שָׁם as “much life,” meaning a normal life span.

Rabbi Jachter 37 claims that it is hard to know what יְהִי שָׁם meant since there is no real opposite of יְהִי שָׁם. He suggests a compromise between רַבָּה בָּאָדָם רַבָּתָן and Rabbi Bleich: extremely risky procedures to extend life are forbidden while moderately risky procedures are permissible. Again, the decision would be a judgment call based on the prudent nature of each individual.

Another practical question is raised by elective surgery that has no medical benefit (such as cosmetic surgery). Are these permitted? When asked about a young girl who wanted to get plastic surgery for שִׁדּוֹכַ הָאֵדֻנְשׁ הַרְּמֵי 38 His reasoning is based on the רַבָּה בָּאָדָם יִשְׁרֵי לִבּוֹ 39 who, when talking about the אֵילָה הַאָרְיוֹר, describes the action as being אֵילָה הַאָרְיוֹר only when done in a degrading manner. Again, Rabbi Jachter infers from here...
that if the wound or incision is cut in a beneficial way, it is completely permitted. He also brings proof from a 
משנה in בכורות 40 which discusses who is prohibition from working as a כהן. The 
משנה describes a person who removed his extraneous finger without mentioning that this action is אסור. Based on this omission, אבב 
concludes that such actions are permitted.

Rab Chayyim Bar-David 41 was asked a similar question concerning a girl looking for a שידוך. He too responded that based on the precedent, one would be allowed to do so. פסק he derives his decisión from the המשנה regarding amputation. 42 He also quotes a חכמים on the 
משנה in בכורות שער א which states that although a man is generally prohibited from removing scabs for the purpose of beautification, if the embarrassment causes him anguish, he is permitted to do so. 44 argues that not being able to get a שידוך is another cause of psychological pain; therefore, he allows cosmetic surgery to alleviate this stress. In terms of the issue of סכנה, he brings down a 
גמרא in יבמות 45 which allows people to engage in dangerous activity if it is commonly practiced by society. This is based on the 
פסוק: 'שומר פתאים ה - יבמות עב' protects the simple.
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argues that it is an insult to change one of His creations. He quotes a Gemara in Tractate Taanit in which Rav Elazar asked a particularly ugly man if all people from his city are as ugly as he. The man responded that it is as if Rav Elazar had insulted him by saying “what an ugly vessel you have made.” Based on this, the poskim holds that all cosmetic surgeries are completely prohibited.

Rav Zeev ben Elazar 48 writes a responsa regarding this issue but does not arrive at a concrete answer. He uses the same argument as Rav Meshes concerning the prohibition of wounding oneself, but still has trouble solving the same problem. He maintains that one should only undergo surgery if the surgery is absolutely vital to the patient’s survival. He admits that Rav Beirish’s argument is logical, but does not endorse the ruling. He concludes his responsa: this issue requires further investigation.

The questions regarding medical risk taking are both extensive and complicated. With the vast array of opinions about each case, there are many approaches to choose from. Therefore, הלכה, the patient’s wishes are an integral part of the decision making process; however, if חס ושלום, one is in such a situation, a rabbi should be consulted to ensure that everything done is within the confines of ההלכה.
Terminal Illness

When someone gets sick, that person generally takes medication with the hope that he or she will recover. However, certain illnesses, such as Tay-Sachs and Lou Gehrig's Disease, are incurable. Tay-Sachs causes a child to become blind and deaf, and renders the child unable to swallow. Muscles begin to weaken. Paralysis begins to set in. By age four, the child usually dies from recurring infections. Lou Gehrig's Disease, also known as ALS, is a rapidly progressive disease. Ultimately, the ability of the brain to start and control voluntary movement is lost. Patients lose their strength and the ability to move their arms, legs, and their entire body. ALS patients die from respiratory failure within three to five years from the onset of symptoms. Doctors are still searching for cures to these such terminal sicknesses. God forbid, if one has a loved one stricken with one of these diseases, human nature would dictate that one removes these people from their misery. Must you prolong someone's death in excruciating pain as long as possible by injecting them with different medicines? Why is all of this fair? Such questions are heavily debated today.

The הרבי"י asserts that the human body belongs to ה, and that we are obligated to safeguard it. Therefore, ה_life regards human life as having infinite value. Every life is sacred and one must preserve life at any cost. The רב שלמה זלמן איברנץ and the רב יוסף שלום אלישיב say that even if someone is terminally ill, the patient must be treated with all medications available to try to save his or her life. ה created

---

1 תְּלֹא בֶּן תְּלֹא נְעֹרִית הָנָּם אֲשֶׁר אֲנָהִי אֲנָהִי נְעֹרִית הָנָּם (התוֹחֵל ב') הַלְּכָּךְ
"כֵּלֶלֶׁה שְׁלֹא בְּרֵר נְעֹרִית הָנָּם אֲנָהִי אֲנָהִי נְעֹרִית הָנָּם (התוֹחֵל ב') הַלְּכָּךְ"
man with wisdom which must be used to prolong lives to the extent of our ability to do so. In a public letter regarding the treatment of terminally ill patients, they explicitly stated that according to the Torah, one is obligated to treat a patient even if the doctor rules that the use of medication will increase the patient’s suffering by prolonging life. One cannot withhold medication from the afflicted in order to lessen his or her suffering. The Torah agrees with this opinion: he holds that if one withholds treatment he is causing death, which is considered euthanasia, and is completely forbidden.

However, there are situations in which other options may be taken into consideration. For example, the Talmud teaches that if there is a dangerous procedure or experimental drug, the patient is not obliged to undergo the surgery or take the medication. Since there is a possibility that doing so may shorten his life, the patient may decide to forgo the treatment, even though this would mean that he would surely die.

Another issue to address is a patient who is in severe pain. The Torah does not want anyone to be in unnecessary pain. Rabbi J. David Bleich, in his book *Bioethical Dilemmas*, infers from this, and goes as far as to say that one is allowed to use marijuana if that will soothe the pain that the patient is experiencing – even if he or she becomes addicted. If there is a medication that alleviates pain, one is allowed to take it. The Torah wants man to take assistive medication, but when there is a doubt as whether medication will save a life or cause more suffering, life takes priority.

Additionally, the Halakha discusses the scenario known as גוסס. According to the Rav, this term applies to an ill person who is

---

2 See *Talmud* Bava Metzia 59b.
3 See *Shulchan Aruch* (Orah Hayim 542:1).
4 See *Yerushalmi* 7:7.
6 See *Shulchan Aruch* (Orah Hayim 542:1).
7 See *Talmud* Gittin 49b.
Terminal Illness

almost dead, but one can hear heavy breathing and spit churning in the throat. The שעולה וברך lists what may not be done to a patient while in this non-responsive state. One may not place him on the ground, remove his pillow, or wash him, for fear that any movement will hasten his death.

Yet, the פוסקים argue as to when the death process actually begins; therefore, the question arises of at what point the obligation to heal the patient still exists. The רד"א שלט in יורה דעה seems to hold that one is allowed to stop clattering noise or take away salt from a person's tongue with the idea that these things may be delaying the patient's death. It thus seems that while he agrees we may not actively hasten death, we may engage in passive intervention. This is not considered actively killing, since life necessities are not being removed; rather, possible life extending devices are being withheld.

However, many פוסקים interpret this רד"א differently or even disagree completely. For example, רד"א רבי יעקב ריישר, author of התייעץ, says even in a situation involving transgressing an איסור שבת, one must do everything necessary to save a person in a state of סגוס. Similarly, בוב סולובייצק says that a doctor must do everything in his ability to save a terminally ill patient, including extending the life of a brain dead patient. Today, many people do not show the symptoms of a גוסס, so those specific הלכות are not directly relevant.

The איגרות משה explains the רד"א by saying that if a patient is in a state of pain, one does not have to postpone his death.

7 Bleich, Bioethical Dilemmas, p. 71
8 ממבצ ב' 122
9 משכון משפט ב"א
10 מובא בBLEICH, BIOETHICAL DILEMMAS, P. 71
Even though קסוס is almost dead, he too is considered to be in pain. If the physician determined that that the patient cannot be cured and that his or her life cannot be prolonged without suffering, one does not have to give him further medication.

Why must life be protected so carefully? If life were worthless, man would just be allowed to self destruct without a second thought. In ספר שמות13 there is a well-known comment of רש"י on the words ראה אשתו לווה ויהי רש"י says that ראה said to her father, "If a decree on the males, should you decree against the females also?", and that then took the advice of his daughter and remarried. Perhaps we can add a level of interpretation and suggest that what מרים was also saying was that פרעה is taking away the עולם הזה of these male babies, but you are going to take away their עולם הבא as well. By divorcing his wife, עמרם put a גזרה on עולם הבא. Everyone born in this world, even if they only existed for a split second, merits עולם הבא. The decree in Egypt to kill all of the male babies was irrelevant to עולם הבא, since one cannot decide to withhold another's life, let alone to end a life.

The above רש"י contains a very powerful message for our topic. How can a human decide take away someone else's עולם הבא? No one wants to see anyone suffer, but one must keep in mind that they are suffering by ה' s decree. ה rewards man with the greatest present ever – the eternal life of עולם הבא – so how can mere mortals deprive anyone of that gift? The more one lives in this world the more עולם הבא one will receive. Therefore, even the smallest amount of additional time in this earth is precious. Life's a present from ה that only He can take away.

Because life is precious, a patient cannot decide simply to die a natural death without trying any means to survive. פיקוח נפש applies to everyone regardless of whether they are suffering or in a

---

13 שמות ב:א רש"י "יהלך אח בולהו - פירוש היה מנהט מתפליヘ פרעה (ו)город להקמה והוריך שלחן בנה באשה אשר דבר
องקים. ב:ר "ישו והיה הירש ועשה ב:קוות שט".
vegetative state. The ーショルトへリ 14 states that if a man is stuck under debris from a collapsed building on שבע, one must be מחל שבע and do anything in his ability to save this man even if he will only live for another hour. The اصرת הנין 15 discusses the case of an אושאר השבע. When she drinks the water, if she is guilty she will blow up and if not she will be blessed with ברכות. However, according to one opinion in the שבע, sometimes a woman who did commit the sin might not die right away. If she has some טעם הנה before, 'ה will postpone her death, though she will have pain and suffering. This is considered a privilege – a gift from 'ה to be alive with pain rather then dead.

Medication is not the only cure for ill people – 'ה is the ultimate doctor. The  בייה והלט 16 relays the importance of מביקר המחלות: if one visits a sick person, then the person will live. If one does not do מביקר המחלות, then the sick person may die. The reason for this phenomenon is that by doing מביקר המחלות, the visitor will see the sick person and pray for his survival. Furthermore, by visiting the sick, the gates of heaven are opened. The  גמרא 17 comments that if a
person is terminally ill and is suffering, then one is allowed to pray for his death. The "א" continues that this is even praiseworthy. It therefore seems that from a technical view, a person is allowed to pray for someone to die because at the end of the day, everything is in 'ển's hands.

However, one must inquire why one is allowed to pray for a sickly person to die? Man is not 'ה. Man does not know the extent of another man's suffering; therefore being able to pray for another's death seems almost presumptuous. This person is sick for a reason, so man should pray that 'ה opens the gates of רחמים and does what is best for him because only He knows. One can question whether or not one should pray for a sick man's רפואה or not, but one should never pray for someone's death no matter how much pain they are experiencing. 'ה can choose to answer תפילות. Praying does not ensure a response. A פְּרִיקָא אֲבָא in פרקי אבות18 says בְּעוֹלָם שָׁעָה – against your will you were created; against your will you were born; against your will you live; against your will you die. Man does not decide anything; everything is up to 'ה. Man does not choose when he lives or dies, 'ה does.

Society dictates that an individual should have control of his or her body and that each decision one makes is final, but this is not so. For example, in secular society, a woman can decide if she wants an abortion; however, the Jewish approach is somewhat different. Humans cannot decide that it's time for another mortal to die. There are some things that are simply not in man's control – for instance, death – so why would anyone pray for someone else to die?

We are human and humans have limitations. Sometimes humans get so caught up with themselves that they think they know everything. Man often thinks he know what is in everyone's best interest. In this situation though, 'ה is showing man that he
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knows nothing. Man is not א. Man cannot decide to end someone else’s life. Although one cannot rely on miracles, Judaism inspires man to always hope for a miracle. That is why one cannot withhold treatment from a sick person. In the end of the day, הכל בידי שמים – everything is up to א. Man is limited; man came from the dust of the earth that א created. א provides life with so many pleasures, so how could anyone want to throw it away? No matter how much pain one undergoes, life is worthwhile, and all the more so, a great עולם הבא is always worth while.

The Talmud ליקנ אראי תואר א expounds that if a patient is experiencing great pain and suffering from medication, he can decide to stop taking the medication; however the doctor must give the patient food and oxygen – even against the patient’s will. He continues that if the patient is God-fearing and not mentally confused, one should explain to him that a single hour of repentance in this world is more valuable than all of the world to come. א does not cause anyone to suffer for no reason. He brings the positive out of a negative situation. Although physically one may undergo a lot of pain, spiritually, one receives more עולם הבא – the greatest present א can ever give humans. That is whyewood remodelned דברי啰. It was worth it to possibly give birth to a baby boy in order for them to receive עולם הבא.

The Torah let man be מחלל שבת, the holiest day of the week, in order to save a person’s life. Life isn’t something one can just give up and throw away. The fact that an innocent infant is born with Tay-Sachs and will not get to live until its fifth birthday may not make sense, but if these babies were not born at all, they would not merit עולם הבא. א has a plan and there is a reason for everything. Man just has to believe that א will do what is best for him, because He will.
It is the end of התפילה. People are putting away their סידורים, packing up, and swiftly maneuvering their way towards the exit of the בית כנסת. Unfortunately, these are the sounds often heard approaching the תפילה of עלינו. Most people do not recognize the beauty and importance of עלינו. Said at the end of התפילה three times a day, עלינו is often uttered with one foot out the door. However, this is tragic, as can be considered thecker of עלינו. The א”רחא even states that עלינו, צלע עלינו – there is no praise like עלינו, it rises above all other שבחות in the world. One must ponder why this צלע עלינו contain that deems it worthy of such a high status?

First of all, it is significant to note that this is actually a very ancient תפילה, written at a pivotal point at a very early stage in our national history. According to a tradition dating back to the Geonim, the first paragraph of עלינו was written by יוהושע when he crossed the ירדן with בני ישראל into ארץ ישראל. The second paragraph, על כן נקוה, was composed by עכן before being executed for taking from the שלל of יריחו.3 רב שמשון רפאל הירש postulates that the authorship and placement of this תפילה at the conclusion of every daily תפילה demonstrates its profound significance.

According to רב שמשון דוד פינקוס prayer has two purposes: to enable one to request his desires from the Creator, and to bring one closer to ‘ה by enabling daily meetings with the King.

On a similar note, the ב”ח explains that the reason עלינו was added into the daily prayers was in order to implant faith in the

---

1 ספר מצוות ברכה ארוח חיים קלב
3 תפיש שמשון חתים
4 ביב דוד אראד וייס קלב
Oneness of ה’ s Kingship, and to insure that בני ישראל will not be tempted to follow the other nations.

It is therefore very appropriate that עלינו plays such a prominent role in the תפילות of ראש השנה and יום כיפור, a time when we are supposed to have a heightened awareness of המלכות ה’. At the climax of יום כיפור, the entire nation exclaims seven times, as if to inform ה’ in those last possible seconds that each individual has taken this awareness of His Kingship to heart. During daily prayer, however, theשטן puts thoughts through one’s head to distract him from conversing with ה’, therefore, during תפילה, one proclaims that everyone else serves emptiness, הבל וריק, while בני ישראל serve the Omniscient and Omni-present ה’. This תפילה creates a מחיצה between בני ישראל and the rest of the world thereby preventing any influence of those negative powers.

What are the negative powers and empty distractions that the other nations serve? What thoughts does theשטן plant in בני ישראל’s head? רב פינקוס quotes the רבי נחמן who explains that during תפילה the{text}שטן tries to convince us that כחי ועוצם ידי עשה לי את החיל הזה to make us believe that ה’ is not in total control. This evokes thoughts of worry and confusion – if ה’ is not in control, one is responsible for overcoming his own obstacles, and for planning his own life. The스트ן preys on these misgiving and implants the thoughts that if one does not solve these problems, the world will come to an end. These worries are tormenting and distracting during תפילה; however, in reality, ה’ controls the world and is the One who will plan one’s life for eternity. Hence, one can say with confidence that ה’ will take care of everything and one need not worry. With this thought lingering, one leaves תפילה with the
sense that he or she is completely dependent on ה and His will, bringing one closer to ה.

The conclusion of עליית הבית’s first section also plays a role in strengthening one’s connection to ה.

רבי קוק\(^{10}\) adds a similar idea regarding this verse. He expounds that knowing ה’s Oneness is not enough, rather one must והשבת אל לבבך – internalize the idea. This, in turn, will manifest itself in one’s actions and show how much one believes in ה. When one reaches the point where his actions reflect his belief in ה, one can then get closer to Him. רבי שמשון רפאל הירש\(^{11}\) adds that the פסוק is teaching that בני ישראל’s experiences up until this point stand as proof of ה’s Oneness – a fact of which בני ישראל must always be conscious. During prayer, one must realize that whether He appears as ה, signifying מידת הרחמים, or as להים א, the aspect of strict judgment, in either case we should always be aware that להים הוא הא’ - that ה is all One: no matter what characteristic appears dominant, He is ה Who always loves and cares for בני ישראל.

When one thinks about this aspect of ה, this draws one closer to Him and makes one crave a closer relationship with ברוך הוהא’קדוש.

After understanding the true meaning of תפילה עלית, one can easily understand the specific importance of such a תפילה. The אבודרהם השלם סדר ראש השנה\(^{12}\) writes that man can only do his part by believing in ה wholeheartedly as ultimate King of the universe and serving Him. Only then can man fully place his hope and trust in ה – a trust that He will take care of man’s needs and remove all the idolatry in the world so that His name can be praised and exalted throughout the entire world.

---

\(^{9}\) Lev. 20:1

\(^{10}\) Anal. Ra"a ה וחק לא מוהר ש"ת

\(^{11}\) Rema ד:லט

\(^{12}\) אבותדס השולך סדר ראש השנה
The Knock on the Door

On the evening prior to the destruction of סדום, two angels arrived at the gate of the city. לוֹט greeted them and invited them into his home. At first they refused the invitation, but agreed after לוֹט persisted.

Why was it so crucial for הָיָה’s plans that the angels arrive in the evening and become לוֹט’s invited guests? The אור החיים explains: Even though לוֹט’s salvation was due primarily to the merits of his uncle אבָּרוֹם, he would not have been saved had he lacked some merit of his own. הָיָה sent him an opportunity to perform חָסֶד, and thereby לוֹט and his family would be saved.

לוֹט’s wife, however, did not appreciate this. יִרְשָׁור, quoting הנָשַׁת, relates that she complained about this terrible custom of הָכַת אָרְחִים that לוֹט wanted to institute in סדום. Tragically, she did not survive the destruction of סדום.

There are times in life when we have opportunities to perform acts of חָסֶד — to help people, give צָדָק, visit the sick, comfort mourners, etc. Not all of these activities are always so pleasurable, and at times we might even consider them burdensome. The message of the story of the angels (as לֶרַב פָּאָם זֶצֶר notes) is that the road to the ישועה that we so desperately seek, often begins with the slight צָרָה of an act of חָסֶד that הָיָה orchestrates on our behalf.

The knock on the door, mistakenly viewed as an annoying interruption, may truly be the blessed opportunity that we’ve been seeking.

Let us not hesitate to answer the call.
מאכלי חלב ושכרות
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החלנו עבודה של חיים לחיות והדרכה. נכון, דבש מתוקה התורה, היא אלא לנפש והכרחיתمزינה גם, חלב כמו.

הזה במשל נוספת נקודה גם, ויש ויתכן. אתיה להבין כדי, זהים אנחנו是我们 השבועות חג של לאופי, בשון הקצר, הסבר להקדים.

אני לחשוב רגילים אנחנו, כשבועות "תורתנו מתן זמן," הזה לתחילת רמז שום, אין עצהertia בתורה, אבל.

למרות לי, פרק משמות שברור "השבועות לחג מאד קרוב, התורה שמתן ט, בו ואוליagle יום הבכורים 77 או "יום הבכורים 88. העומר ספירת גם, השבועות לחג מצות חגה בין שמкатרות, מוצגת איננה בתורה, אלא, מצות בחג מיוחדת המנחה קרבן בין מקשרת, קרבן העומר – קרבן המנחה, קרבן הלוחם והספירה – קרבן העומר, בжение מסתכלים, מסגייל מסגד גיון מיתר, שבית הלוחמים מאיטס, ושובים התחילה לחג, מצות Ağustos בלשכת התבואה, המפורט. ואילו קרב שרי הלוחמים מיין את התтика התאמה phúcטיאלית בפוא, התברר כי פוטנטיאלית להנשמה את ספירת העומר.

העומר א *)&דורי תיבת, ודנה בה בחשיבות עבר מחקירות וחברו

(שאינו רלָנוֹטְיוֹנִים בְּגָלוֹת) לנד מיט ניתורין. ממילא, סג גירס אחר מיט טרומת ההנאה, אשר – ארגונים וכבר ( Urdu באיטות (בופר) סופיים ובקר אהמ ומער

חלם, אלא בין זה המגמה (עמור חיות) לפני השועות (עומר מיט) ההנאה, סג במערב זה אוז בולאי פוטנטיאלית להנשמה, לכל, את יל שיעור – היא התחליק Độים מיטי ליבים יחות ההנאה, שלחנ מתב tents מתורח הזהכלילה.
מאכלים חלב בשבועות

גישו לב: בחג המצות, נאנים וזכותים Caleb את חיר השırım, חיר של גב שמחות ושמירת ליפודא מכלה על עמיד וסמל בתקופה עם זה אסף עם אמת באביב. גב שמחות נאנים וזכותים Caleb את חיר השירים, חיר של גב שמחות ושמירת ליפודא מכלה על עמיד וסמל בתקופה עם זה אסף עם אמת באביב. גב שמחות נאנים וזכותים Caleb את חיר השירים, חיר של גב שמחות ושמירת ליפודא מכלה על עמיד וסמל בתקופה עם זה אסף עם אמת באביב. גב שמחות נאנים וזכותים Caleb את חיר השירים, חיר של גב שמחות ושמירת ליפודא מכלה על עמיד וסמל בתקופה עם זה אסף עם אמת באביב. גב שמחות נאנים וזכותים Caleb את חיר השירים, חיר של גב שמחות ושמירת ליפודא מכלה על עמיד וסמל בתקופה עם זה אסף עם אמת באביב. גב שמחות נאנים וזכותים Caleb את חיר השירים, חיר של גב שמחות ושמירת ליפודא מכלה על עמיד וסמל בתקופה עם זה אסף עם אמת באביב. גב שמחות נאנים וזכותים Caleb את חיר השירים, חיר של גב שמחות ושמירת ליפודא מכלה על עמיד וסמל בתקופה עם זה אסף עם אמת באביב. גב שמחות נאנים וזכותים Caleb את חיר השירים, חיר של גב שמחות ושמירת ליפודא מכלה על עמיד וסמל בתקופה עם זה אסף עם אמת באביב. גב שמחות נאנים וזכותים Caleb את חיר השירים, חיר של גב שמחות ושמירת ליפודא מכלה על עמיד וסמל בתקופה עם זה אסף עם אמת באביב. גב שמחות נאנים וזכותים Caleb את חיר השירים, חיר של גב שמחות ושמירת ליפודא מכלה על עמיד וסמל בתקופה עם זה אסף עם אמת באביב. גב שמחות נאנים וזכותים Caleb את חיר השירים, חיר של גב שמחות ושמירת ליפודא מכלה על עמיד וסמל בתקופה עם זה אסף עם אמת באביב. גב שמחות נאנים וזכותים Caleb את חיר השירים, חיר של גב שמחות ושמירת ליפודא מכלה על עמיד וסמל בתקופה עם זה אסף עם אמת באביב. גב שמחות נאנים וזכותים Caleb את חיר השירים, חיר של גב שמחות ושמירת ליפודא מכלה על עמיד וסמל בתקופה עם זה אסף עם אמת באביב. גב שמחות נאנים וזכותים Caleb את חיר השירים, חיר של גב שמחות ושמירת ליפודא מכלה על עמיד וסמל בתקופה עם זה אסף עם אמת באביב. גב שמחות נאנים וזכותים Caleb את חיר השירים, חיר של גב שמחות ושמירת ליפודא מכלה על עמיד וסמל בתקופה עם זה אסף עם אמת באביב. גב שמחות נאנים וזכותים Caleb את חיר השירים, חיר של גב שמחות ושמירת ליפודא מכלה על עמיד וסמל בתקופה עם זה אסף עם אמת באביב. גב שמחות נאנים וזכותים Caleb את חיר השירים, חיר של גב שמחות ושמירת ליפודא מכלה על עמיד וסמל בתקופה עם זה אסף עם אמת באביב. גב שמחות נאנים וזכותים Caleb את חיר השירים, חיר של גב שמחות ושמירת ליפודא מכלה על עמיד וסמל בתקופה עם זה אסף עם אמת באביב. גב שמחות נאנים וזכותים Caleb את חיר השירים, חיר של גב שמחות ושמירת ליפודא מכלה על עמיד וסמל בתקופה עם זה אסף עם אמת באביב. גב שמחות נאנים וזכותים Caleb את חיר השירים, חיר של גב שמחות ושמירת ליפודא מכלה על עמיד וסמל בתקופה עם זה אסף עם אמת באביב. גב שמחות נאנים וזכותים Caleb את חיר השירים, חיר של גב שמחות ושמירת ליפודא מכלה על עמיד וסמל בתקופה עם זה אסף עם אמת באביב. גב שמחות נאנים וזכותים Caleb את חיר השירים, חיר של גב שמחות ושמירת ליפודא מכלה על עמיד וסמל בתקופה עם זה אסף עם אמת באביב. גב שמחות נאנים וזכותים Caleb את חיר השירים, חיר של גב שמחות ושמירת ליפודא מכלה על עמיד וסמל בתקופה עם זה אסף עם אמת באبيب.
ברר ישוע בן מנוח כותב, זאמוג יש צרכן מקודר מנוח וューיק
ולכチン. יא תלוק וא טגיט מקוח יח יבר יביכ חבית וא חכון לטובה. לוּגראדorsche של הוכתע ומכסהותardy בקברו (סוי ל\): "עיקרי לע הצוותית צגה הביזה שאחת ילא.

הוכותע שחי הצוותית ונה ברכ חת חת דליולי יכ מקומוע
ולכチン שמס פמר מקוח עאות דליולי יכ מקומוע לטובה שיתים
יהיו לי ראש בך יפי הז חמר מבוח מקומע מסיעה צי
(nav) בפומיס בטב במשכט שטח על קרש זא מקוח יד לכותס את
_OVERFLOW
במקומע ממיד היא ירי בהיב מקוח עאות יד לכותס את
 BCH שחרי מקומע אלא שאני יא רייבי לע פשאש מקומע חורי על
וכתס עמה יראש ש_aspect יב לע מקיקת שטושי יד אפי לכותס
מצומ שחיי יא שמכס יא לצוותית יד לכותס
במקומע.

ארוח טבגי הז צומס הסברא והגד דסברה מקוח את צוותית
ראת småספמע (פוי\ב) לטב הב הנפה יד לע סקמא מקית שעם על
מקיקת מקית איס יכ מקומוע יד לכותס שחי הצוותית ייב יוטמא
ולו ביר יילו ודני טסמא דואת ספרצב בשטח צוותיה לילית
дум איזי הצוותי בפליטו ממסקקה המקומע אפי יוטשד יד
נמי איזי הצוותי בטבגי מקוח את דליולי אידי ודני בח שאח את
נDoctrine. המקומע יס蟆י הבח יי וירז מאריו וטחושה לכל מידי את
בי נמי מלכאתו ייב משמו כמנה בטושש.

מיעקאר סבר הרמא שחי הצוותית מקוח יח יבר לטובה. על בצמא
מקוח את צעיח ייב יער המיילק - יהוי\על מתכנתיע והלא נתי - הלא חליק
مؤפק הצוותי המיילק; יכתב צהורי ומשלס שעראה מיילק. על מסכמח
הגדור מקוח זא הכונה לטובה. על צעיח יי על מתכנתיע ויה יעד עיקר
מיילק, הלא נתי; והלא ממקוח את צעיח יי הלא דוקא.

לצארה, אט מקבל העצמות מקמקס על הראוי, יי לכותס על ייד את
שיסות המורדים (סוי סים\); [ימבזב בביי וומריא (סוי שימי סיג\): "עיקרי לע הצוותית כתוע
נתנו את אוכלס אתמה ההקה יבירי וושי אט Москов מקוח
עליו, של ביטול 138 שכתב פסק.

"מzczeות ועליהן לפי כתיבה במקומו אותיות 'כמאן פעמים זה כתיב ליולה"LEMĞW" במקומוirk רוחיו ואותיו העייתיים של המרהיב שדרכו במכות ההלכות,شعرיר עירית" כידוע היה תנאים מור笤יה של המרהיב שדרכו במכות ההלכות,ASHBOARD במכות ההלכות, שאר הסпромצ ד千方百ך הנה gamer, מספינן ובבר יódigo המה שדרי במקומו.

לפי היות: הממשש של ביור הלקתeda. בStroke פור כ라이 דגל (משה) או בעינו מתכתי את האותיות שדרכו במקומו הורה על מחיקת המילה עלייה על פי כתיבה במקומו מחרישו, אלא כי район מהירה, דאורייתאunar ששוות עלייה על פי כתיב המילה העייתיים של המרהיב שדרכו במכות ההלכות,?url生態 לא הישר להב הווא רמב"ן כדי ממקומית עד לכתב משכבה ש獗ו של במקומו במקומה.

אם יש במקומם דרי לכות גלאאם המה שדרי במקומו הורה על מחיקת המילה עלייה על פי כתיב המילה העייתיים של המרהיב שדרכו במכות ההלכות,?url生態 לא הישר להב הווא רמב"ן כדי ממקומית עד לכתב משכבה ש퍼ישו מהירה, דאורייתאunar ששוות עלייה על פי כתיב המילה העייתיים של המרהיב שדרכו במכות ההלכות,?url Ecology לא הישר להב הווא רמב"ן כדי ממקומית עד לכתב משכבה ש퍼ישו מהירה, דאורייתאunar ששוות עלייה על פי כתיב המילה העייתיים של המרהיב שדרכו במכות ההלכות,?url Ecology לא הישר להב הווא רמב"ן כדי ממקומית עד לכתב משכבה ש퍼ישו מהירה, דאורייתאunar ששוות עלייה על פי כתיב המילה העייתיים של המרהיב שדרכו במכות ההלכות,?url Ecology לא הישר להב הווא רמב"ן כדי ממקומית עד L

וכי שיוור רומני (את): "הומרון דרי שעון הקולות ואשע עלAFEKCI, ברי. הנה: נסע לערבר עגון שכתב עליה

כמי אוחיות, או lorem פיתק الكر אאלילה, דחי מוקח,"
ויהיהmö תמחוננו שטן בישות ו[יעי דגלו מרבדב וממצה בורוד
ובךד שחלות, עת יבשחיה אזור יתקח ארי (סי' ק"ג), אנסמ ברעך מֵד מתנק
ומתקלק. על ידי של עליים ביסוד הדובים, שלכאו דמיי והמרדכי מוספסיס
על הת훈ת הצרדה שותה של מלאתה מוקח.

- ב -

יש לפרש בלמי רמייה (אנם אל דבריה האישיות עבום) שיש ב' מולי מוקח
(כל' סג והמרדכי המג וו של האישיות). יש מוקח לש בוולת כתב וו מוקח לש
הכן לכלותה. מוקח לש בוולת כתב שיקוד커퓡אות ו herein בהו און יעמו לכתב
אלא נ tumblr המוקח לש垣 לכלותה ווי תחת, ויחבריו ווי התמך לע
עין במכנייה אייה (סיי ר"ז) שכחב מצח את אלדה (ווע-threats עי
וי ציווה ב' פרץ לי כלות כתיביה לחיים. אנם במקחלת שיא להו, או
אך יא חיה אלבה שמחות שיא לחיים.
מיור יתי, פ' כי כלות כתיביא לחיים. אנם במקחלת שיא להו.

הומר:

המוקח און והיא דדהו או יש במקowość גדיש לכלותה שיא אוותול ייב
אימו, י' מתוח ב' ייסו הז הפרמא בכותב שיא בכותב ייבת
במקוח החר בכותב לכלותה שהמקוח לכלותה. ב
וכל' יוי לע יב סיפר וכחביה באיש שלבוק ממקחה
فيد לכלותה שיא אוותול ייב הממקח לכלותה פטרו או שלבוק או
תי במחר יתי, פ' כי כלות כתיביא לחיים. אנם במקחלת שיא להו.

ולאובאר יש כא סתריה מנייה בסייע, או מוקח ייב עים לכלותב ייב
אוויות או על מטי לולק כ' שיא. אחל פל מימי מברת יベן; י' טאן ב' מני
במקוח, או מוקח אוויות, ייב בותו לכלות ויבת; יריך פ' על מטי לולק כ' שיא
בכתי סלול איה מלאכון. הממקח שיערות ויד (וי און באית) וי שיא
כותב ויריך עים לכלות הממקח, יידי' אתיות.

כותב: עיני ב侧结构性' עייני דבריה הפקות, והוסי' כתוב.
שאין אף היא יש מקום חיוב כתיבה דברי לדחות נארה לכתוב ע"ב באים, הסבר א שאין כך אף מחיק הכשרת ממהッシים, ממהッシים את רמאו על 원 איסורא דאינו חידוש מסקנת, ואינו באינו באין בהתחלהlogan זצלאף גם אין בהתחלהlogan זצלאף גם אין בהתחלהlogan זצלאף וגם אין בהתחלהlogan זצלאף וגם אין בהתחלהlogan זצלאף וגם אין בהתחלהlogan זצלאף וגם אין בהתחלהlogan זצלאף גם אין בהתחלהlogan זצלאף וגם אין בהתחלהlogan זצלאף וגם אין בהתחלהlogan זצלאף וגם אין בהתחלהlogan זצלאף וגם אין בהתחלהlogan זצלאף וגם אין בהתחלהlogan زצלאף וגם אין בהתחלהlogan זצלאף וגם אין בהתחלהlogan זצלאף וגם אין בהתחלהlogan זצלאף וגם אין בהתחלהlogan זצלאף וגם אין בהתחלהlogan זצלאף וגם אין בהתחלהlogen זצלאף וגם אין בהתחלהlogan זצלאף וגם אין בהתחלהlogan זצלאף וגם אין בהתחלהlogan זצלאף וגם אין בהתחלהlogan זצלאף וגםאין בהתחלהlogan זצלאף וגם אין בהתחלהlogan זצלאף וגםאין בהתחלהlogan זצלאף וגםאין בהתחלהlogan זצלאף וגםאין בהתחלהlogan זצלאף וגםאין בהתחלהlogan זצלאף וגםאין בהתחלהlogan זצלאף MutableLiveData לפי
על חזרה זה תוליה, משל מחוק. (א) דריבור הרמ"א (שו"ז וא"ח)
spm הסמ"ג ג' סוס המדריך, יאמר דריבור עגון שבchers לעין
狴ואית ואפשי, שאינה מקユニ פי א"ת רגיל כדי 맛ון, ודריבור
שה시스템 ע棨יו השפנרי שלמה ברוחי חדש, הנלעアクセ_lifetime
מלעה לא מדברים או אתיות או בני פרחים וסמטים ובירי בדומה
Placement בין מצדיהם או בני פרחים וסמטים ובירי בדומה
געוץ לשאר קלפים לפניהם שלמה בToShow אתיות
לשם, מה דחיית המאת של אוסירה מה אוכיל, וליד הויב
ואין מחוק לכלerman אוסיר י"ע מדברים.
נראה שלפ דרכין בבר הנוראויי וג' מובארים הים. טראה
שנגרשים א"וי בלע התער על פי ב' בך. תחילת כה שבארהיה, McCoy
דריבור הרמ"א מילא לכל, אף המה שאנה מוסקנתר א"וי, השעש כדריבור
המדרים (משה חסיד מילא) (דריבור). אם כ, לכ די החסיד הוסמכ החינית
אינו מחוק הכלerman, אם מחוק מחוק הלטיה והימן - א"וי חValueChanged
דריות הכל רע שיאי דער לכלerman. אם כים אפשיות ליתור חיים מוחק, למשל-
אבלי אלא אייש דיבור ואס אייניפ לכותב,أكلםffen מחוקים מחוק
לכותב, א"וי מחוק לכלerman. זה
חרר כה החשושו הנוראויי א"וי בלע ספליא סאל לא קבל חזורים ויה, שיש
עד יציא המסילה א"וי בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלع בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע בלע贝尔ימא. אויל היא אתיות, על מחוק לולם שמחות על ידי שרפת - א"וי
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בעש רב ויהי צא'ו, רב ברוקי ישן בכן בכול, העניין שליערכו הולכותן בבר
ושמואל וההוא שלרב יש בכן בכול למשמראום אין בקן בכול.6 יארש זב פרעי
ולสโมสร סוברים כב אמי ישיא מתחקול רב וושמואל ויהי הכירהו כמואל
וכשה נשתב: (1) כלכל הוא החלה כבר באיסורא, וכל אפיין את נתי
והוא דחיות שבתא בדויב, בורא עין(2) העניין שליערכו הולכותן בבר
ה考えて דאין בכן בכול, וההוא הכירה בכבר יש בכן בכול.7 מפלשלום החורף
שליש בשוכל עלי,ANOא שם הוא שבן בכן בכול תחתון וו סוסי בכרמל
והיו userID בכרמל אנא—ושיסי קרができる אדום ל inte בכול. זורק
ולומר שרשièrement סומר את ההויה את חכמתה הכלבר רב והשמואל חכמתה על
יסוד זה. זמרי, רבות אותם קדוק את.
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אני עני אבל את מהו אדום בכרמל אנא—ושיסי קרができる אדום ל inte בכול.
השימש את חותיתא הכלבר בכן בכול תשימש את חותיתא הכלבר.
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hoea

(ס"י ר"א) יסכנר דבורה ר"וי שוממר, חלבר הניל ת舘.

cיאו חיבר דבר לקרקע עיקר וואמחבר לקרקע את התלתה בכיי' שיש đa הỎ

(חופב). כמ"ג האמרה שלוש עיקcharted(לקקרק) והייד החיה יש האב, לכל

ויייך הקראק' חינא. כלומר נידד זה לקרקע לא יואמיตกון בזח האל

ויייך יד שהtworzyć אף אם שמחפל בְד' מיכיא' והשיב בְד' ויאמי'וא.

כשתלוי נ"ד'ז"וד'ו, כמקא' דליע יוו פדמיא' ובודק' חנוך.

כבני' באהארו.10

atta הזר למחבר לקרקע והייך-USをして.10 לא ישות

haustin (בשבكت: "י"וי"ת), ניאו הבדול בְל' הקראק' אלאGBK חישאר

עריך בגדורה ולאומתו. כלום עלעך לד' המלאכה לא הבדול בְל' הקראק', אלא

כי החיתים שמיא בזר ריצ' בנה שבנה. וכל בקנה פקעד' לכל היוד חניך

בשתהנה, כלא בְל' חוהא'нского ריצ' שופל חניך מְד' בנה

ומנות. או הרוסים (בהתחזיו על אתר' ה"ב) חכבי שלמרות שיא בְנ' ושתיה

כלים יש לוחללה מלאכת בני הקראק' "עשיות" לכל', כلاح יא או ד"ל

איש פוקיא צמיא התשחי שמשנ' הבנה (אלאב,דר). ולייиш שמשנ' הבנה

הו זכר שחלחלה עשה שהמלנה לא פלוכי, והייד לעשיות מכותו: "י"וי"ת

זר ולאו פלוכי, והייד לעשיות מכותו: "י"וי"ת" ובראש.11 לא אציא הזר

בזח אלא פלוכי חנוך_TRACK שמשל לא פלוכי, והייד לעשיות מכותו: "י"וי"ת" אי

זר ולאו פלוכי, והייד לעשיות מכותו: "י"וי"ת" ובראש.11 לא אציא הזר

וכמות עניא זם המיעים, באומת הזומר יבננו מובאות. שלישית התסה' יא בְנ' זה

בכליםיא כני שיתו הייד ריצ' בנה שבנו בכלים ובהו האמת. או לחתים

高峰论坛י' או שמחפל בְל' חניך' ובו המלאכה. או ניח

עשית כל יא והית בְד' בנה וכל מיתולים חויב שמשנ' בתלהלה. והיוד

ראני' סבר כנימוסי' כלים' או בְד' חניך' בְל' חניך' שמשנ' בתלהלה.

הייד שמשנ' בְל' חניך' אלא וביוארתי בְל' חניך' שמשנ' בתלהלה.
عضوיה לכל כליו 11 זכר ונתקל הפרש של אדם, שממשה את الملאתה ב ומתה, היכין את הולדה והזירה ואת buổi אחד מבני הנכוןسكنיה, שחברה בבריה ובבריה מבני הנכון, שחברה בבריה.

וכדי לתביין כי לא ישות תנייה, שביה בבריה אא רבי בבריה אא, ובריה בבריה אא, ובריה בבריה אא. גם לתביין כי לא ישות תנייה, שביה בבריה אא, ובריה בבריה אא, ובריה בבריה אא.

ואז ли אלihar אביו, ובריה בבריה אא, ובריה בבריה אא, ובריה בבריה אא.

ולא בבריה אא, ובריה בבריה אא, ובריה בבריה אא, ובריה בבריה אא.

ועשייה דבר מתהילihan, ולהתהלihan.

11 "א"ו הר"ה, ובצכה, או. הנ今日は, ובריה בבריה אא, ובריה בבריה אא, ובריה בבריה אא, ובריה בבריה אא. לא בבריה אא, ובריה בבריה אא, ובריה בבריה אא, ובריה בבריה אא. וז"ו. מברך, שבריה בבריה אא, ובריה בבריה אא, ובריה בבריה אא, ובריה בבריה אא. בשמייהו, שבריה בבריה אא, ובריה בבריה אא, ובריה בבריה אא, ובריה בבריה אא. ובריה בבריה אא, ובריה בבריה אא, ובריה בבריה אא, ובריה בבריה אא. ומברך, ובריה בבריה אא, ובריה בבריה אא, ובריה בבריה אא, ובריה בבריה אא.