

B'S'D'

INTERNET PARSHA SHEET  
ON B'HAALOSCHA - 5759

To receive this parsha sheet in WP 6.1 file (readable by Word), mailto:cschulman@cahill.com with copy to crshulman@aol.com.

SOME INTERNET DVAR TORAH LISTS Virtual Jerusalem: E-mail to: listproc@jer1.co.il In msg type: subscribe -<listname> Your\_Name Some of lists: DafYomi (by Ohr Somayach); ParashaQA (by Ohr Somayach); Weekly (Ohr Somayach on Parsha); YSParsha (on Shaalvim); YITorah (Young Israel); Camera; ShabbatZomet; ...

Hashem," in ultimate terms they stayed in the same place. A baby in its mother's arms, traveling on a train from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. The mother has traveled many miles. Relative to the mother, however, the baby hasn't moved. Sometimes we look at our lives and think "I'm in the wrong place."

The Seven Books Of Moses "When the Ark would journey, Moshe said 'Arise Hashem, and let Your enemies be scattered'...And when it rested, he would say, 'Return, O, Hashem the myriad thousands of Israel'" (10:35-36)

Everyone knows that there are five books of the Torah. The Pentateuch. Or are there? The Talmud tells us that there are actually seven books of the Torah. Not only that, but the above two verses constitute an entire book by themselves.

How can it be that just two verses can have the status of an entire book of the Torah? These two verses are like a history book of the Jewish People, a microcosm of everything that will happen:

"When the Ark would journey.." The Jewish People have spent more time in exile, journeying from one land to another, than we have spent in our homeland. It is to this phase of Jewish history that Moshe addresses his prayer "Arise Hashem and let Your enemies be scattered."

When the Jewish People are hounded from one country to another, in peril of their lives, Moshe prays that Hashem will not let His people be destroyed. "And when it rested...." When the Jewish People do find calm and rest, we face another and more pernicious enemy. Rest brings complacency. We forget Who it is who really protects us, placing our trust instead in politicians, in mere mortals who cannot save us.

With regard to this period of Jewish history Moshe prays "Return, Hashem, the myriad thousands of Israel." In the seeming calm of post-war acceptance, there will be a generation of people who have no desire to be Jewish, and no idea what it means to be Jewish.

It is to this generation that Moshe turns his prayer to G-d, beseeching Him to return the myriad thousands who have been swallowed up and assimilated amongst the nations.

Sources: \* The Right Place - Talmud Shabbat 31b, Rabbi Chaim Shmuelevitz - Sicho

5733/Essay 23, Rabbi Mordechai Perlman \* The Seven Books Of Moses - Talmud Shabbat 117, Rabbi M.Z. Zachs in Iturei Torah Written and Compiled by Rabbi Yaakov Asher Sinclair General Editor: Rabbi Moshe Newman Production Design: Eli Ballon Ohr Somayach International 22 Shimon Hatzadik Street, POB 18103 Jerusalem 91180, Israel E-Mail: info@ohr.org.il Home Page: http://www.ohr.org.il parasha-qa@vjlists.com Recommended Reading List Ramban 8:2 Preview of Chanukah 9:1 Korban Pesach in the Midbar 9:10 Pesach Sheini 9:14 Pesach of the Ger 10:29 Yitro's Choice 10:35 Flight from Sinai 11:1Sin of Complainers 11:5 Fish and Vegetables in Egypt 11:6 Complaints about Manna 11:16 Significance of Number 70 Sefer Hachinuch 380 Pesach Sheini 384 Significance of Trumpets Sforno 9:1 The Four Merits 11:22Never Satisfied Written and Compiled by Rabbi Reuven Subar

From: Ohr Somayach[SMTP:ohr@virtual.co.il] \* TORAH WEEKLY \* Parshat Beha'aloscha

The Right Place "According to the word of Hashem they would encamp, and according to the word of Hashem they would journey" (9:23) A baby traveling in its mother's arms. The ultimate feeling of security. The world beyond those arms may be dangerous. A thousand threats may lurk beyond those arms, but the baby feels only the warmth and security of its mother's love.

When G-d created the world, He employed thirty-nine types of creativity. Those thirty-nine types of creative activity find their parallel in the construction of the Mishkan (Tent of Meeting) which the Jewish People took with them during their wanderings in the Sinai desert.

When we keep Shabbat we are refraining from those thirty-nine categories of creative endeavor. The definition of what the Torah calls melacha (inaccurately translated as "work") derives from the paradigm of the Mishkan. There's a fascinating problem which the Talmud addresses in Tractate Shabbat: We know that on Shabbat there is a prohibition against demolishing a building. However, there are certain limitations to this prohibition. The Torah prohibition of demolition on Shabbat is limited to when the intention of the demolition is to rebuild on the same spot.

If you intended to rebuild the same building down the block, you would not have transgressed a Torah law. Now, here's the problem. As we know, the Jewish People didn't stay in one place during their 40 years in the desert. They made 24 different stops. Some were for a few hours, whereas some were for years. If the Torah prohibition of demolition is derived from the Mishkan, why is it prohibited only to demolish with the intention to rebuild in the same place? The law doesn't fit the paradigm. The paradigm of life in the desert was that the Mishkan was demolished, broken down into its parts and reassembled somewhere else. According to the principle that melacha parallels the paradigm of the Mishkan, the Torah prohibition against demolition on Shabbat should apply even if the intention is to build in another place, not just on the same spot. The Talmud answers "According to the word of Hashem they would encamp and according to the word of Hashem they would journey." The "place" of the Jewish People in the desert was "according to the word of Hashem." The entire Creation is nothing more than the expression of G-d's Will -- His Word. The fact of "place" is nothing more than the expression of G-d's Will. Nowhere exists except because G-d wills it to be, because there is no existence outside the Will of G-d. Thus, wherever G-d wills the Jewish People to be defines their place. When they moved "by the word of

From: Rabbi Yissocher Frand[SMTP:ryfrand@torah.org] "RavFrand" List - Rabbi Frand on Parshas Beha'aloscha

These divrei Torah were adapted from the hashkafa portion of Rabbi Yissocher Frand's Commuter Chavrusah Tapes on the weekly portion: Tape # 196, Vegetarianism. Good Shabbos!

The Cloud Moves On and So Does Life There is a very interesting Ramba"n in this week's parsha. The Torah says that the pattern of the Jewish nation travelling and camping in the wilderness was dependent upon the movement of the Cloud that accompanied them. The Ramba"n comments that it was not uncommon for the Jews to arrive at an absolutely undesirable place in the dessert. At times, they wanted to leave a place immediately, but they would need to stay because the Cloud stopped over the Tabernacle. Similarly, at other times, they arrived at a lovely place, exhausted, and wishing to stay for a long time. Often, after only two or three days in such places, the Cloud began to move and they continued their travels. The Ramba"n adds that sometimes they would come to a spot, the Cloud would stop, and they would all unpack. Then, the next morning, after they finished unpacking all of their belongings, the Cloud would move and they would have to repack and start travelling all over again. Imagine such an experience! We know what is involved in going on a trip. Everything is loaded into the station wagon. With great effort, everything is tied down on

the roof. When we finally arrive at our destination, we want to at least stay for a couple of weeks! This is the meaning of the pasuk [verse], "When the Cloud lingered upon the Tabernacle many days, the Children of Israel would maintain the charge of Hashem and would not journey" [Bamidbar 9:19]. The travels were not easy. They were a tremendous test. However, there is an obvious question. G-d is not a capricious puppeteer who demands that people "jump" for no reason. What was the point of making the sojourn in the Dessert so arbitrary and so burdensome? Rav Dessler offers a very interesting insight in his sefer [book] Michtav May'Eliyahu (Volume 4). Rav Dessler explains that the time in the wilderness was the period during which the Jews received much of the Torah. Perhaps G-d was trying to teach us the lesson that we must learn Torah and perform Mitzvos in spite of any outside conditions. Many of us say, "If only we had a little more free time" or "If only we did not have to worry so much about making a living..." "If only we did not have to worry about our children" -- "Oh boy would we be able to sit and learn Torah and daven [pray] like we should daven, without rushing through!" As a Rebbe in the Yeshiva, I must, from time to time, chastise a bachur when he is not performing up to par. I often hear excuses like: "I am busy with school work" or "I am having trouble with shidduchim" [dating] -- if only I had my shidduch and I finished college -- oh boy would I be able to sit and learn!" But life does not work like that. Life is always full of disturbances. We are not living in the Garden of Eden. There are financial problems. There are problems with parents, problems with children. There are always problems!

That is what the Torah is teaching us through the travels in the wilderness. Life in the desert was not easy. It was no picnic. But life must continue. In other words, we must continue learning and living as an honest and dignified Jew in spite of the surrounding conditions. Anyone who has ever read the history of the Mir Yeshiva during World War Two is amazed. The Mir Yeshiva fled from Mir and Poland to Russia and across Russia into Kobe, Japan and from Kobe to Shanghai, China. They were young men -- single and married -- who did not know what the next day would bring. Bochim were separated from their families. They did not know if their families were alive or dead. They did not know if they would ever get out of the morass; and if they would, if they would ever get married.

Any "Mirrer talmid" [student at the Mir Yeshiva] from that time period can tell you that in the worst days of Shanghai, the Yeshiva continued; the Sedarim [regular schedule of hours for learning Torah] were maintained, people learned and people wrote Torah S'farrim [books]. People learned Torah in the worst of conditions. We, Baruch Hashem [thank G-d], have relatively easy lives. Our parents lived through much more difficult conditions than we can ever imagine. They learned Torah and performed Mitzvos in spite of the tough conditions. This is the lesson of the Cloud -- continuing to exist when not everything is provided on a silver platter. Life is not provided on a silver platter, but life, Torah and Mitzvos must continue.

"Statistical" Cruelty This week's parsha contains the positive Biblical command [Rambam Hilchos Ta'anis Chapter 1] of "crying out and blowing trumpet blasts regarding every calamity that befalls the community". According to some opinions, this law is applicable even nowadays (in the Land of Israel); according to other opinions, it is only applicable when the Beis HaMikdash is built. The Rambam, quoting the pasuk in this week's portion [Bamidbar 10:9], explains that every communal calamity -- be it a plague or pestilence or locusts or any public suffering -- requires crying out and blowing of trumpets. The Rambam explains that this is part of the Teshuvah [Repentance] process. When we Jews hear the sound of the trumpet we know that the troubles befalling us are because of our deeds. This introspection and determination to repent and improve our communal and individual ways will eventually stop our misfortunes. But, says the Rambam, if the response of the community is not to blow and not to pray, repent and think any differently, but rather to attribute the misfortune to "the ways of the world", to statistical chance, to the "realities of life" -- this is derech achzariyus [the way of cruelty]. Such attitudes cause people to remain attached to their evil ways and cause G-d's response to be "more such

statistics". This expression of the Rambam -- "derech achzariyus" -- has always bothered me. If the Rambam would have called it "the way of heretics" or "the way of fools", I would not have been bothered, but "the way of the cruel" is a perplexing choice of words. What does this have to do with being cruel? Not long ago, I heard an interesting insight from Rav Nossan Scherman into the meaning of this Rambam. Rav Scherman compared this matter to an intersection in one's neighborhood where accidents are constantly occurring. It is just a terrible corner -- again and again, another accident, another person killed. Someone approaches the government and petitions that they do something about the intersection. "Put up a stop sign; put up a red light; do something -- there is a carnage going on out there!" The bureaucrat responds "No, the department has determined that there is no need for a stop sign." That bureaucrat is cruel, because he can stop the carnage, he can stop the accidents; but he is not willing to do anything about it. It is simply cruel to preside over carnage and do nothing, when it is within your power to stop the carnage.

This is what the Rambam is telling us. Troubles befall a community, and the community can do something about it -- because the blowing of the trumpets and doing Teshuvah will cause the troubles to stop -- however, the community fails to do something about the troubles, but rather attributes them to "the realities of life". Such a community is cruel to its own members. So many times, when we see things go wrong in our communities, we have a tendency to react by saying, "Well, that's just the way it is". That is cruel. This is not the reaction that the Torah expects from us. The Torah wants us to put up a stop sign -- to stop and think and react and try to improve. A community that fails to react is as bad as the bureaucrat who fails to put up the stop sign on the carnage-prone intersection.

Transcribed by David Twersky; Seattle, Washington twerskyd@aol.com Technical Assistance by Dovid Hoffman; Yerushalayim dhoffman@torah.org Tapes or a complete catalogue can be ordered from the Yad Yechiel Institute, PO Box 511, Owings Mills MD 21117-0511. Call (410) 358-0416 for further information. RavFrاند, Copyright (c) 1999 by Rabbi Y. Frاند and Project Genesis, Inc. Project Genesis: Torah on the Information Superhighway learn@torah.org 17 Warren Road, Suite 2B http://www.torah.org/ Baltimore, MD 21208 (410) 602-1350 FAX: 602-1351

From: yated-usa@ttec.com

Kortz Un Sharf- Short and Sweet Parsha Vertlach by Shaya Gottlieb

"B'haaloscho Es Haneiros"-When you will light the candles 8:2 Rashi: Why is the parsha of the menorah near the parsha of the Nesim? When Aharon Hakohen saw the Nesiim bringing a korbon, he had 'chalishas hadaas' because his shevet did not have a part in the chanukas hamishkon. Hakodosh Boruch Hu assured him, "your avodah is greater than theirs, for you will light the menorah." Why is lighting the menorah greater than bringing a korbon? Medrash Rabbo: Though the korbonos were only applicable when the Bais Hamikdosh was standing, the menora will endure forever. Ramban: When the Bais Hamikdosh was destroyed, lighting the menora was also abolished! The Ramban brings a medrash from Rabenu Nissim in reply. Hashem promised Aharon that through his descendants, the Chashmonaim, the menora will be lit once more. The neiros of Chanuka, which are lit every year, are what is meant by "avol haneiros l'olam kayomin"-the neiros endure forever.

The korbonos that the nesiim brought to the Chanukas Hamishkon were meant to atone for the individual sins of every shevet. -Sforno Aharon Hakohen felt that since he was involved in the Cheit Hoegel, he should have brought a korbon. Perhaps his sin will prevent the Shechina from resting amongst Klal Yisroel! Hakodosh Boruch Hu showed him the menora, with the eternal 'ner hamaarovi' that was never extinguished, though it received the same amount of oil as the other neiros. This was proof that the Shechina rests amongst Klal Yisroel, (Shabbos, 22). The ner hamaarovi was the greatest proof that Klal Yisroel was forgiven for the cheit hoegel. The 'ner hamaarovi' only burned in the merit of the Kohel Godol. After Shimon Hatzadik's era, the nes of the eternal flame did not continue, because the Kohanim Gedolim were unworthy. This was the greatest proof that Aharon Hakohen was a tzaddik and his sins were forgiven. -Avnei Ezel

According to halocho, the menora was allowed to be lit by a zohr, (not a kohen), but 'hatovas haneiros', cleaning out the menorah was only

allowed to be done by a kohein. From here we learn that the hachono, the preparation to a mitzva is greater than the mitzva itself. -Rav Mendel Pilitzer

Rashi: B'haaloscha - the Kohen had to light the menorah until the flame burned on its own accord. This is an allusion to teaching, to lighting the flame of Torah in the hearts of young children. A Rebbe or teacher has completed their mission when the flame of Torah rises on its own-the child is motivated to continue learning and growing.

"Vayaas Kein Aharon"- and Aharon did so 8:3 Rashi: To tell the praise of Aharon, that he did not deviate. What type of praise is this? Why should Aharon deviate from Hashem's command? Although Aharon became elevated as a Kohen Godol, his personality did not change. He didn't become arrogant, but remained with the same level of humility. -Rav Meir of Premishlan

He never changed his lofty spiritual standing-always remaining on the same madreiga, ready and prepared to do the mitzva.

"Vayaas Kein" Just like the 'kein', the middle branch of the menorah does not feel superior to the other branches, so, too, Aharon did not feel superior due to his station. -Sifsei Kodesh

---

From [jgross@torah.org](mailto:jgross@torah.org) [neustadt@torah.org](mailto:neustadt@torah.org);  
[jgross@torah.org](mailto:jgross@torah.org);[genesis@torah.org](mailto:genesis@torah.org) WEEKLY-HALACHA FOR 5759  
SELECTED HALACHOS RELATING TO PARSHAS BEHALOSCHA

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

Towards the face of the menorah shall the seven lamps cast light (8:2)  
A SEVEN-BRANCH CANDELABRUM

QUESTION: In view of the Biblical prohibition against duplicating vessels that were used in the Mishkan, would one be allowed to make a seven-branched candelabrum? If one owns such a candelabrum, is he allowed to keep it?

DISCUSSION: The Talmud(1) forbids manufacturing a seven-branched candelabrum, in keeping with the Biblical(2) prohibition(3) of "imitating" any of the vessels (keilim) that were used in the Mishkan. There are three views in the early commentaries in regard to the extent of the prohibition. Some(4) hold that only an exact replica is prohibited. Any slight change from the original in the Mishkan is permitted. Others(5) hold that any menorah which would have been considered kosher b'dieved, is prohibited. Other poskim(6) are even more stringent. They hold that any seven-branched menorah, made out of any metal, regardless of its shape or form, is prohibited. The Shulchan Aruch(7) rules [in the opinion of the Shach] in accordance with the second view, i.e., that even a menorah that is not made exactly like the one in the Mishkan but would be kosher b'dieved is prohibited. He rules, therefore, that if the menorah is not made from gold but from other types of metals; if the replica is made without the decorative cups, knobs, or flowers that were part of the original menorah; if the menorah is shorter than the 18 tefachim (4.5-6 feet) that the original menorah measured, it is still prohibited to replicate. There are, however, some poskim who follow the third approach, that a menorah which would not have been considered kosher even b'dieved is still prohibited. In their opinion, it is forbidden to make any menorah, no matter what its shape or form, if it has seven branches. Even a menorah which is made to hold candles and not oil would be prohibited according to this strict interpretation of the halachah(8). A menorah which is round or square would also be prohibited(9). There is a debate among latter-day poskim as to whether the halachah should follow the [Shach's interpretation of the] Shulchan Aruch's lenient ruling or the stricter ruling of other poskim(10). The poskim are also undecided about whether the prohibition applies only to the manufacture of such a menorah, or also to keeping it in one's possession. The poskim are also in doubt concerning the status of an eight-branched menorah of which one branch broke off(11). Since this prohibition is of Biblical origin, we must, wherever possible, be stringent when in doubt. Therefore: Any menorah with six, eight, or nine branches may be made and kept in one's possession. It is prohibited to make

a seven-branched menorah out of any metal whatsoever. A seven-branched menorah made out of wood or porcelain is permitted(12). A round, triangular or square menorah with seven branches is also included in this prohibition. Many poskim permit a seven-branched electric menorah(13), while others forbid it(14). Ideally, it is best to refrain from making one. If one happens to have such a menorah, many poskim allow one to retain it(15).

FOOTNOTES: 1 Rosh ha-Shanah 24a. 2 Tosfos, Avodah Zarah 43b. 3 Yisro 20:20. 4 The view of the Chacham Tzvi 60. See also Meiri (Rosh ha-Shanah 24a) who says that any deviation from the menorah in the Mishkan is permitted. 5 Ma'harik (75), in explanation of the view of Tosfos. 6 Bechor Shor (Rosh ha-Shanah, ibid.) 7 Y.D. 141:8. 8 Pischei Teshuvah Y.D. 141:14-15, rejecting the view of Mishnas Chachamim who permitted a seven-branched candle menorah. 9 Bechor Shor says that even according to the view of the Shulchan Aruch, a round menorah would be prohibited, since we do not find that the order in which the candles are placed invalidates a kosher menorah. 10 Pischei Teshuvah, Birkei Yosef and Sho'el u'Meishiv 3:71 rule strictly. Many other poskim, quoted in Darkei Teshuvah 141:56, Yabia Omer 1:12 and Yechaveh Da'as 3:61 rule leniently. Igros Moshe Y.D. 3:31, without quoting the various views, rules that only a kosher menorah is prohibited to replicate. He is undecided about an oil menorah which cannot hold the required minimum of half a lug. 11 See Darkei Teshuvah 141:52-53, who remains in doubt concerning these questions and quotes several views. See Birkei Yosef, however, who relates an episode where a seven-branched candelabrum was made and the Rabbis of Yerushalayim ruled that it must be removed. 12 Shach Y.D. 141. 13 Yesodei Yeshurun 1 pg. 47; Mishpatei Uziel Y.D. 18. 14 Shearim Metzuyanim b'Halachah 168:4 quoting Chavolim ba-Ne'imim 3:54; Yaskil Avdi 7:16. 15 See Yabia Omer and Yechaveh Da'as, ibid.

<http://community.cleveland.com/cc/CAJS> (c) 1999 by Rabbi Neustadt, Dr. Jeffrey Gross and Project Genesis, Inc. The author, Rabbi Neustadt, is the principal of Yavne Teachers' College in Cleveland, Ohio. He is also the Magid Shiur of a daily Mishna Berurah class at Congregation Shomre Shabbos. The Weekly-Halacha Series is distributed L'zchus Doniel Meir ben Hinda. weekly sponsorships are available - please mail to [jgross@torah.org](mailto:jgross@torah.org). The series is distributed by the Harbotzas Torah Division of Congregation Shomre Shabbos, 1801 South Taylor Road, Cleveland Heights, Ohio 44118 HaRav Yisroel Grumer, Marah D'Asra. Project Genesis: Torah on the Information Superhighway [learn@torah.org](mailto:learn@torah.org) 17 Warren Road, Suite 2B <http://www.torah.org/Baltimore,MD21208> (410) 602-1350 FAX: 602-1351

---

From: Shlomo Katz[SMTP:skatz@torah.org] Hamaayan / The Torah Spring Edited by Shlomo Katz Contributing Editor: Daniel Dadusc Be'ha'alotecha

Sponsored by The Vogel family on the first yearzeit of Rabbi Joseph Braver a"h

"Aharon did so . . ." (8:3) Rashi writes: "The verse speaks in praise of Aharon to teach us that he changed nothing." Is it necessary to tell us that a tzaddik such as Aharon did not deviate from G-d's command? R' Chaim Hager of Kosov z"l (1795-1854; father of the first Vizhnitzer Rebbe) offers the following explanation: Regarding each of Hashem's creations, the verses in the first chapter of Bereishit say, "G-d said, 'Let there be such-and- such,' and it was so." The only exception is the light, about which we read (Bereishit 1:3): "G-d said, 'Let there be light,' and there was light." Why does it the Torah not say, "and it was so," about the light? The Torah is alluding to Chazal's teaching that the light which we use today is not the first light that Hashem created. That first light, our Sages teach, was put away for tzaddikim to use in Olam Haba. However, writes R' Hager, when Aharon lit the menorah in the Tabernacle, he brought out a little bit of the "unchanged" light from the first day of creation. He filled in the missing "so" from the verse "Let there be light." (Torat Chaim)

Hamaayan, Copyright (c) 1999 by Shlomo Katz and Project Genesis, Inc. Posted by Alan Broder, [ajb@torah.org](mailto:ajb@torah.org). <http://www.torah.org/learning/hamaayan/> [www.acoast.com/~sehc/hamaayan/](http://www.acoast.com/~sehc/hamaayan/). Project Genesis: Torah on the Information Superhighway [learn@torah.org](mailto:learn@torah.org) 17 Warren Road <http://www.torah.org/Baltimore,MD21208>

---

From: Yeshivat Har Etzion's Israel Koschitzky Virtual Beit Midrash[SMTP:yhe@vbm-torah.org]  
PARASHAT BEHA'ALOTEKHA SICHA OF HARAV AMITAL  
SHLIT"A THE DEDICATION OF THE ALTAR

Summarized by Rav Eliyahu Blumenzweig

"Why was the parasha dealing with the menorah juxtaposed to the parasha dealing with the princes of the tribes? Because when Aharon witnessed the role of the princes in dedicating the mishkan, he was saddened at not being among them, representing his tribe. G-d said to him, 'On your life - your [task] is greater than theirs, for you light and prepare the candles.'" (Midrash Tanchuma Bamidbar 5) The Ramban expresses surprise at these words: what reason could there possibly be for Aharon

to feel saddened - Aharon, who entered the Kodesh Kodashim on Yom Kippur, who brought the ma'al-offerings of the Kohen Gadol and was involved in other sacrificial tasks that were his responsibility alone? And even more surprising - what consolation did he find in G-d's assurance regarding the re-dedication of the Beit Ha-Mikdash by the Hasmoneans (according to the Ramban's explanation of G-d's answer)? It seems that the princes of the other tribes did in fact merit to perform a special task, which Aharon envied: that of the dedication of the mizbe'ach (altar). They were the ones who dedicated G-d's mishkan; they were the first to bring their sacrifices to the mishkan. Aharon envied their sense of initiative, of being the first. The forces which are unleashed and revealed by virtue of the primary act are enormous and wondrous. The steps which follow are built on the previous ones, on that primary act, and they reinforce what already exists. Hence the great importance of the first step, which serves to form and lay the foundations of the future edifice. With that first step, with the laying of the foundations of any endeavor, all the power is drawn from the future, from the vision which will be realized from that moment onwards. Such actions, which draw their power from the view towards the future, contain tremendous inner strength. Thus the Ramban explains that just as the princes were equal in wisdom, so were the measures of each of their sacrifices equal. Remarkably enough, this was achieved without any consultation or previous agreement between them. Each prince did his own calculation according to his personality and his considerations, and each ended up with the same decision as the others. This, then, reveals the principle that the forces which are connected to the primary act are all derived from a single sublime source, influencing and being influenced by it. This was the primacy which Aharon sought, and his lack of participation in this act is what saddened him. And it was in response to that sadness that he was told that he, too, would merit to perform an initiatory act - that of lighting the menorah. In general, every act or task is an addition and reinforcement to what already exists. But lighting always comes only when that which existed previously has already been extinguished, such that each time the lighting is a separate act which does not derive its strength from the acts which preceded it. Each act of lighting represents continual renewal, without any reliance on the past. "A mitzva is a candle, and the Torah is light" - Torah is truly a light, and at its foundation is the idea that each day Torah should appear new and fresh to us. We are to study Torah and engage in the mitzvot with eye to the future, with the expectation of the realization of our goals. Then the future and the goal will provide the great power contained in the primary step, which is continually being renewed.

If there is any period in a person's life which symbolizes primacy and originality, and power drawn from the future, it is the time of youth. This was the period in the life of the nation when the Torah was given, the period of "chesed ne'urayikh" - as G-d says, "I remember the lovingkindness of your youth" (Yirmiyahu 2). It was during this period that the tremendous powers contained within Israel were revealed, when they followed G-d with boundless yearning and longing, "When you walked after me in the desert, in an unplanted land..." (ibid.). The Zohar teaches that prior to the generation which left Egypt and received the Torah, there was another generation in which the Torah should have been given - the generation of the Flood. That, too, was a period of "youth," a time when tremendous powers were revealed and great strides were made in many areas of life. But this was a time of "the sins of youth" - the great powers contained in this beginning were directed towards negative ends, and led to destruction and ruin. The generation of the desert demonstrated "forces of youth" directed towards lovingkindness (chesed) and hence became worthy of receiving the Torah. (Originally delivered on Leil Shabbat Parashat Beha'alotekha 5731. Translated by Kaeren Fish.)

Copyright (c) 1999 Yeshivat Har Etzion From: Yeshivat Har Etzion's Israel Koschitzky Virtual Beit Midrash[SMTP:yhe@vbm-torah.org] yhe-parsha@vbm-torah.org Mazal tov to Moshe '86 and Kaeren Fish upon the birth of a baby girl. Believe it or not - Kaeren was diligently at work translating this article when called away to the labor room, and yet remembered to call us to find a replacement translator! Yishar koach. Mazal tov to Avi '92 and Shira Shmidman upon the birth of a baby boy. Name unavailable at press time. Mazal tov to Michy and Laurie Kossowsky upon the birth of a baby boy, Zecharia Sofer. May you all be

zocheh le-gadlam le-Torah, le-chuppa u- lema'asim tovim!! Mazal tov to Michael Gewirtz '94 and Lauren Gabe upon their engagement. May they be zocheh to build a bayit ne'eman be-Yisrael.

From:Jonathan Schwartz[SMTP:jschwartz@ymail.yu.edu]  
 To: chabura@samet.com Subject: Internet Chabura -- Parshas B'Ha'alosecha ... And one for the road The Gemara in Kiddushin (40b, see Rashi and Tosfos) notes that one who eats in the marketplace is like a dog. Many add that he is pasul from giving testimony. Rav Idi Bar Avin paskins like those opinions. The Rambam (Hil. Eidus 11:5) writes that those who are despised are not able to give testimony. The Rambam notes that people who "walk" and eat in public in front of everyone are those who are called despised since these people are like dogs and won't be careful to only offer true testimony. The Rambam adds the category of "walking" to the gemara's initial prohibition of eating. This gives rise to a possible heter to eat in a caf where one would be eating in the marketplace but would be sitting and not walking. For the concept of sitting to eat seems to be human-like as opposed to walking while eating. This heter is actually written in the Hagahos of the Yaavetz (Kiddushin 40b) who differentiates between walking and eating and merely sitting and eating. The former is bad, the other non-dog-like. The Yaavetz uses this answer to explain the position of the Bavli despite the difficulty raised from a case in Talmud Yirushalmi which implies that only for a Talmid Chacham is eating out in the market a crime. According to the Yaavetz, one can declare different levels of eating out. Eating in a caf (open air in the market) is a problem for a talmid chacham. One who eats on the run, would be pasul from offering testimony since this is a problem even for a layman. The Maharsha (Kiddushin, ibid) tries to explain why eating "out" is considered dog-like. According to the Maharsha, the food of a dog is not found readily at home. Therefore, he eats in the market if he finds food there. Wherever he can find food, he eats. Rav Yona Metzger (shut miyam hahalacha IV, 77) suggests that eating at a table, even when not indoors, is different than this trait associated with dogs. midrash is that people actually seemed to eat in the markets and on the road.

Still, the Rambam appears opposed to the practice (See Deos, 5:2) Based upon the Rambam, it seems that a Talmid Chacham should exact a bit of Tznius not even to eat from a table that is set up outside in the middle of a market area so that he will not become lowered in the eyes of those with whom he associates. Certainly, one who is walking on foot, should not be eating at the same time for that is dog-like (Rav Metzger paskins that eating in one's car or on a bus is not dog-like but should not be done by talmidei chachamim) and would make one pasul for testimony.

Battala news Mazal Tov to Dr. and Mrs. Mandelbaum upon Yitzi's aufruf and forthcoming marriage. Mazal tov to Rabbi and Mrs. Yakov Werblowsky upon their recent marriage

From Zomet[SMTP:zomet@virtual.co.il]  
 Subject: Shabbat-B'Shabbato: Behaalotecha 5759  
 A MITZVA IN THE TORAH PORTION: The Call of Trumpets  
 by Rabbi Binyamin Tabory

Trumpets are sounded on three occasions: (1) To call the nation, and to organize the camp for travel; (2) When there is a war, or when the community faces a disaster, such as blight, mildew, or locusts; (3) When sacrifices are brought on a holiday or at the beginning of a new month. In spite of this, the sounding of trumpets is considered not three separate mitzvot but only one. It is true that the call to prepare for travel should not be counted, since this was only relevant during the time of the desert and is not a mitzva for future generations. However, the other two were also counted by the Rambam as a single mitzva. He writes that it is required to sound trumpets in the Temple for all holiday sacrifices, and he adds that in addition we are commanded to sound a trumpet in case of impending disaster, in order to pray to G-d for help.

Why aren't these considered two separate mitzvot? After all, they are mentioned in separate verses in the Torah, and they are different in detail. Some people have explained that in all cases it is the priests who are

obligated to sound the trumpets. This is also true of trumpets blown for a fast day, as is written by the Rambam: "The Kohanim blow a trumpet" [Hilchos Taanios 4:15]. Thus, the sounding of the trumpets is one of the rituals performed by the Kohanim and not an independent mitzva. However, if this is the case, the trumpets should not be counted as a separate mitzva at all, since they should then be included as part of the general commandment of performing the rituals. Rabbi Sa'adia Gaon in fact does not list the sounding of the trumpets as a mitzva. (According to Rashi, the Kohanim blow the trumpets for a sacrifice and to call the camp together, but not during a time of disaster.)

Another answer given is that the main mitzva is during the time of a war or a disaster, while trumpets during a holiday sacrifice are indeed part of the ceremony and not a separate mitzva. This is similar to the wine poured on the altar during a sacrifice, which is not counted by the Rambam as a separate mitzva. However, as we have seen above, the language of the Rambam implies that the main mitzva is during a sacrifice, and he adds the trumpet for a time of disaster almost as an afterthought.

One of the sages in the Sifri explains that the "war" described in this verse is the War of Gog and Magog, at the time of Mashiach. Rabbi Yehuda Shaviv has used this approach to explain that since this is a unique occurrence, the commandment has the status of a mitzva which is not relevant for all generations.

Another proposal is that of Rabbi Moshe Feinstein, who suggests that the basic mitzva is a single one, to sound a trumpet on appropriate occasions. The concept is one of outlook: even when we go to war, we do not abandon our rituals in the Temple. This approach would also answer the question of the Magen Avraham, who asked why we do not sound a trumpet in modern times, when there is a war or a disaster. Since this is related to the rituals in the Temple, and in fact makes use of trumpets which are also used in the Temple, we cannot observe the mitzva at the present time. Another approach is that of Rabbi Yaacov Emden, who writes that it is necessary for the one who blows the trumpet to be a proven Kohen, and we do not have such proof of ancestry today.

---

From: Ohr Somayach[SMTP:ohr@VIRTUAL.CO.IL] The Weekly Daf #277 Beitz 6 - 11 Parshas Beha'alotcho (Outside Israel) / Shlach (Inside Israel) Week of 18 - 24 Sivan 5759 / 2 - 8 June 1999

Eyes of the Dove A weeping rabbi, a Russian general and a wandering dove -- what is the connection? It was the custom of Rabbi Chaim Berlin, who spent the later years of his life in Jerusalem, to melodiously chant the verses of Shir Hashirim (Song of Songs) on late Friday afternoons as a welcome to Shabbat. Neighbors were so enchanted by the beauty of his recitation that they stood beneath his window to listen. But they were always mystified in the manner in which his sweet singing was interrupted by a tearful rendition of passage 1:15 in which the Jewish People are extolled as having a special beauty and "the eyes of a dove." When someone finally had the courage to ask for an explanation the rabbi told him the following story:

"When I served as rabbi of the Jewish community in Moscow, one day an army general came into my chambers and ordered me to remove all the people who had come to consult me so that he could discuss something privately. He then confided to me that he was a Jew and that his wife had given birth to a son for whom he wished to have me arrange a circumcision. Any public knowledge of this would endanger his career and even his life, so it all had to be done with the greatest secrecy.

"At that moment I recalled what the gemara says about doves that are found outside their nest on a holiday. Since only a dove which had been designated before the holiday for use on the holiday may be slaughtered for consumption, it is necessary to determine whether or not these doves came from a designated nest. If these doves are old enough to fly, say our Sages, we must assume that these birds could have come from far away, from an undesignated nest, and cannot be used on this day. But if they are so young that they are only capable of wandering from the nest on foot, we assume that if there is no other nest within fifty cubits of where the doves are found that they must definitely have wandered from the designated nest. This criterion is based on the established principle that a dove will not wander by foot more than fifty cubits from its nest. Even if there is another nest within this distance, but the dove must go around a corner in order to reach it, we still assume that it did not wander from that undesignated nest. This, once again, is based on another facet of the dove's nature -- it will wander from its nest only as long as it still can see that nest.

"This," concluded the rabbi, "is the meaning of Jews being compared to the eyes of a dove. A Jew may wander from his faith, but he always keeps his eyes on the Jewish nest from which he came and it is that awareness which preserves him as a Jew. Whenever I say these words in Shir Hashirim I recall that encounter with the Russian general and I cannot help but cry." \* Beitz 11a

Written and Compiled by Rabbi Mendel Weinbach General Editor: Rabbi Moshe Newman  
Production Design: Eli Ballon Ohr Somayach International 22 Shimon Hatzadik Street, POB 18103

From: Mordecai Kornfeld[SMTP:kornfeld@netvision.net.il]

INSIGHTS INTO THE DAILY DAF brought to you by Kollel Iyun Hadaf of Yerushalayim daf@dafyomi.co.il, http://www.dafyomi.co.il

BEITZAH 2 and 3 - have been dedicated by Mrs. Rita Grunberger of Queens, N.Y., in loving memory of her late husband, Yitzchok Yakov ben Eiyahu Grunberger. Mr Grunberger helped many people quietly in an unassuming manner and is sorely missed by all who knew him. Yahrzeit: 10 Sivan. The Kollel needs your help in order to continue its work. Pledge a Daf dedication now! DAF: \$250; WEEK: \$1,250; MONTH: \$5,000. For more information write to: daf@shemayisrael.co.il

Beitzah 2 INTRODUCTION TO MUKTZAH One of the main topics of Maseches Beitzah is the topic of Muktzah. In order to better understand the discussions throughout the Gemara regarding Muktzah, it is worthwhile to review some of the basic concepts involved.

(a) MUKTZAH - The word Muktzah (from the word "Katzah") literally means "set aside at the far edge [of one's intentions for use]." The term is used to describe items that are set aside not to be used on this day, such as wood stacked away in storage (the word for a storage area is "Muktzah"). In a broader sense, the word Muktzah includes anything that a person did not intend to use at the time of the onset of Shabbos or Yom Tov, for whatever reason.

(b) THE ARGUMENT OF THE TANAIM - Rabbi Yehudah and Rabbi Shimon argue whether, on Shabbos, one may handle items that fall into certain categories of Muktzah. When we say that Rabbi Shimon "does not hold of Muktzah," that does not mean that Rabbi Shimon maintains that there is no prohibition of Muktzah whatsoever. Rather, it means that he holds that "certain categories" of Muktzah are not prohibited. There are, however, categories of Muktzah which are prohibited according to everyone. There are at least six different categories of Muktzah concerning which Rabbi Yehudah and Rabbi Shimon disagree: 1. HIKTZEHU MID'A'ATO ("he set it aside from his mind"). This refers to objects which a person did not have in mind to use during Shabbos or Yom Tov. According to Rabbi Yehudah, any object that one put aside because he did not intend to use it on Shabbos, is Muktzah and is prohibited. According to Rabbi Shimon, even objects which one put aside because he did not intend to use them may be used, and do not become Muktzah, as long as they have a use that is permitted on Shabbos or Yom Tov. Only items which a person shows that he consciously decided "not to use" by making them unfit for use on Shabbos (such as fruits that he put out to dry right before Shabbos, which become inedible until they are fully dried) are prohibited as Muktzah items. Even if such items become fit for use on Shabbos (i.e. before he had intended them to), they may still not be used on Shabbos. 2. NOLAD. When an item did not exist in its present form during Bein ha'Shemashos between Friday and Shabbos, but rather it was created (or was significantly changed) on Shabbos, it belongs to the category of Muktzah known as Nolad ("born"). Utensils that broke on Shabbos did not exist in their present form before Shabbos. Therefore, they are considered Nolad. Similarly, date pits from dates that were eaten on Shabbos are Nolad, since they were part of a fruit when Shabbos entered and emerged as pits only on Shabbos. Moving such items is prohibited according to Rabbi Yehudah, since a person could not have had in mind to use them before Shabbos, when they did not yet exist, and is permitted according to Rabbi Shimon, since he holds that advance positive intention to use an item on Shabbos is not necessary. 3. MUKTZAH MACHMAS ISUR ("Muktzah due to a prohibition," also known as Migo d'Iskatza'i, "since it was set aside"). According to Rabbi Yehudah, anything that was Muktzah during Bein ha'Shemashos remains Muktzah for the rest of Shabbos or Yom Tov even if the reason for it being set aside has abated. This is called "Migo d'Iskatza'i l'Vein ha'Shemashos, Iskatza'i l'Chulei Yoma" ("since it was set aside for Bein ha'Shemashos, it is set aside for the entire day"). According to Rabbi Shimon, there are times when we do not apply the principle of "Migo d'Iskatza'i." If an object was Muktzah during Bein ha'Shemashos, and its owner "realized" that it will probably become usable during Shabbos, he may use or move the object after the point in which it becomes usable (see Shabbos 44a, 46b). 4. MUKTZAH MACHMAS MI'US. Items that are repulsive are automatically considered set aside not to be used (Muktzah) according to Rabbi Yehudah. 5. KELI SHE'MELACHTO EINO ELA LISUR. Items which are used "almost exclusively" for tasks which are prohibited on Shabbos or Yom Tov are considered Muktzah according to Rabbi Yehudah. According to Rabbi Shimon, they may be used for a permitted purpose (but they may not be moved for their own protection). This is not to be confused with Kli she'Melachto l'Isur, items which are used for a prohibited purpose "and are sometimes used" for permitted uses as well. Even Rabbi Yehudah permits moving a Kli she'Melachto l'Isur in order to use it for a permitted purpose, or to make room for something else ("l'Tzorech Gufo u'Mekomo") - TOSFOS, Shabbos 36a DH Ha Rabbi Yehudah, 44a DH Mitah 6. MUCHAN L'ADAM EINO MUKTZAH. R'ELAVIM (lit. "that which is prepared for use of man is not prepared for dogs"). There are two distinct types of Muktzah which can be included in this expression: a. An object that was fit for human use, but cannot be used because of the laws of Shabbos or Yom Tov. For example, on Shabbos, a live animal is not fit for human use since it is forbidden to slaughter an animal on Shabbos. Even though live animals are sometimes fed to dogs, since this animal was designated to be used for "humans" after Shabbos, it is Muktzah (according to Rabbi Yehudah) and may not be fed to dogs. b. If something happens to an object "on Shabbos" that makes it unfit for man, it is Muktzah and may not even be fed to dogs (according to Rabbi Yehudah). This is a form of Nolad. For example, if an animal was alive before Yom Tov (and was fit for man, since he could slaughter and eat it on Yom Tov) and then it died on Yom Tov, becoming unfit for man, Rabbi Yehudah prohibits feeding it to dogs. Rabbi Shimon permits feeding it to dogs.

(c) There are other categories of Muktzah that are prohibited according to both Rabbi Yehudah and Rabbi Shimon: 1. MUKTZAH MACHMAS GUFO (lit. "set aside because of itself"). This refers to any item which intrinsically has no use, such as a rock. 2. HUKTZAH L'MITZVASO (lit. "set aside for its Mitzvah"). Items which are designated to be used for a Mitzvah may not be used for other purposes, that detract from the Mitzvah, "even during the week". On Shabbos, such items are Muktzah (as long as they are still fit for the Mitzvah -- if they become unfit for the Mitzvah in middle of Shabbos, their status will depend on the Halachah of Migo d'Iskatza'l, see above, (b):3. 3. DAVAR SHE'EINO RA'UY SHE'DECHA'O B'YADAYIM ("an item which is not fit to be used on Shabbos because its owner actively put it into a situation that it would not be able to be used on Shabbos"). An item which is not fit for use, "and" which one consciously decided not to use, is Muktzah, even if one subsequently decides to use it. (See above, (b):1) 4. DAVAR HE'ASUR BEIN HA'SHEMASHOS SHE'LO CHASHAV SHE'YAVO L'YEDEI HETER B'SHABBOS. An

item which was forbidden at Bein ha'Shemashos (such as fruits from which Terumah had not yet been separated), which one did not think would become permitted on Shabbos, remains prohibited as Muktzah even when the Isur that prohibited until now is removed. 5. MUKTZAH MACHMAS CHISARON KIS. Items which are set aside from use due to their fragility (i.e., their main use is prohibited on Shabbos, and using them in any other manner may damage them) are Muktzah (for example, a Moהל's scalpel).

The \*D\*AFYOMI \*A\*DVANCEMENT \*F\*ORUM, brought to you by Kollel Iyun Hadaf info@dafyomi.co.il <http://www.dafyomi.co.il>

[From 2 years ago:] <http://www.torah.org/advanced/mikra/5757/bm/dt.57.4.02.html>

PARASHAT B'HA'ALOT'KHA RAV SOLOVEITCHIK'S LECTURE ON LEADERSHIP

Lecture given by Rabbi Joseph Soloveitchik zt"l on June 10, 1974 transcribed by Yitzchak Eshalom [note: a section of this lecture can be found in "Reflections of the Rav", vol. 1, pp. 150-159. This presentation was transcribed from a tape-recording; any errors or unclarity should be ascribed to the transcriber. Please take into account that it is a straight transcription - the beauty of the oral presentation is diminished by the written format.]

This paper will deal with a problem which is quite acute now - as it was 3500 years ago - the problem of leadership. The paper won't be restricted to the Sidra of B'ha'alot'kha, which is one of the most difficult Sidrot in the entire Humash. The Sidra of B'ha'alot'kha is very puzzling. It is puzzling for two reasons. First, certain events described in the Sidra are incomprehensible. We simply cannot grasp the etiology of these events - nor their teleology. For example, we do not understand the story about Miriam, her criticism and disapproval of Moshe. It is hard to grasp that Miriam, the devoted and loyal sister, who, as a little girl, stood alone on the shore of the Nile and watched the floating ark because she had faith and hope in the matter of her little brother (the baby in the ark) was concerned, while all adults, including his mother and father, resigned and abandoned the baby. And his sister stood afar, in order to know... It is quite puzzling that this sister should suddenly turn into the accuser and prosecuting attorney of her great brother. Equally incomprehensible is the strictness, sadness and speed with which the Almighty meted out her punishment. Equally difficult to grasp is the connection between this episode and the tragedy which was recorded in the Torah earlier - the tragedy of "Kivrot haTa'avah" (the graves of the voluptuaries). This is one difficulty. There is a second difficulty. Moshe went through many crises. He lived through many distressful experiences and moments. And worst of all, as you know, was the Egel (golden calf) experience, which threatened to terminate the very relationship between G-d and Israel. Yet, he never panicked, never complained, never acted out of black despair. On the contrary, steadfastly and heroically, he petitioned the Almighty for forgiveness; defending the people, arguing their case like an attorney in court. Our Rabbis describe this by way of a metaphor, commenting on the verse: Vay'chal Moshe. Vay'chal, in contradistinction to vay'vakesh or vayit'chanen Moshe, emphasizes the element of strength and boldness. There is bold prayer and there is humble prayer. Vay'chal has the connotation of bold prayer. In a strange, yet beautiful metaphor, Our Rabbis say:

Moshe seized the corner of the mantle of the Almighty, and said: "I will not let you loose unless you forgive the sin of the people." Suddenly, in our Sidra, Moshe began to complain. When the multitude, began to rebel, Moshe, instead of defending the people, began to complain, almost accusing the people. He said things which he had never before uttered: So Moshe said to Hashem, "Why have you treated your servant so badly? Why have I not found favor in your sight, that you lay the burden of all this people on me? I am not able to carry all this people alone, for they are too heavy for me. If this is the way you are going to treat me, put me to death at once if I have found favor in your sight and do not let me see my misery." These are words which were never uttered by Moshe. It is true that he uttered a similar phrase when he was sent to Pharaoh on his first errand and his mission ended with complete failure. He came back to G-d and said: Hashem, why have you mistreated this people? Why did you ever send me? This was the question of a young, inexperienced man. But Moshe, the leader who took the people out of Egypt, never repeated the question. It is not Moshe-like to act like a frightened person and to speak out of the depths of resignation and to condemn the people. These are two examples of events which require interpretation to understand. We have to study Humash the way we study Gemara, to analyze and conceptualize the Humash and to find in every verse the meaning, the connotation and the principle. However, the most difficult problem with B'ha'alot'kha is not limited to the substance of events as to the continuity of the Sidra. The lack of systematic development of the story which the Torah is trying to tell us is perplexing. The Torah is always careful about continuity and wholeness of the narrative. The Torah never tells us half a story. There is always development, transition, complete narration - when the Torah is finished with a story, the story is complete. As far as B'ha'alot'kha is concerned, we just don't know. We don't know how many stories there are in B'ha'alot'kha, how many stories are complete, how many are incomplete, we simply don't see the thread of continuity in B'ha'alot'kha.

Let us just simply review B'ha'alot'kha, the events which were recorded in the Sidra of B'ha'alot'kha. It commences with the Sanctification of the Levites (several verses were dedicated to the Menorah; Our Rabbis were right that B'ha'alot'kha et haNerot (the Mitzvah of the Menorah) actually belongs in Parashat Naso. That's what Rashi wanted to convey when he said: Aharon became upset - "and you shall present them as an elevation offering". Then the Torah tells us about Pesach Sheni - it is Pesach baShana haShenit (Pesach in the second year) and Pesach Sheni (the second Pesach). Halakhically, Pesach Sheni refers to the Pesach which is offered in Iyyar, by the one who is far away and the one who is impure (at the time of the first Pesach). But here the story is of the Pesach baShana haShenit and the Torah recorded the incident with the ritually impure people within the framework of the Pesach baShana haShenit. They approached Moshe, why must we be kept from presenting Hashem's offering at its appointed time among the Israelites?; Moshe inquired of the Almighty and the institution of Pesach Sheni was established. Where is the transition from the Sanctification of the Levites to the Pesach baShana haShenit? We don't know. Two different stories? We have no continuous development. Then, following the description of the Pesach baShana haShenit and Pesach Sheni, we have another description of the cloud, the pillar of cloud guiding the people on their journeys. There is no transition from the story about the Pesach to the story about the pillar of cloud, and the Torah tells us in detail how the journeys of B'nei Yisrael are completely dependent upon the position of the pillar of cloud. Whenever the cloud lifted from over the tent, then the Israelites would set out... following the narrative about the cloud, the Torah relates to us the

commandment pertaining to Hatzotzrot- the two trumpets - and their use for assembling the community and the journeying of the camps. And the Torah describes almost in detail the signal system connected with the Hatzotzrot; one blast, so one camp moves, another blast, a different camp moves, the T'ruah, the T'ki'ah. At the conclusion of the section dealing with the Hatzotzrot, the Torah reviews the previous theme; the journeying of the camps, and again tells us in detail the order in which the camps traveled, Yehuda at the head, followed by Yissakhar and so forth. Then, after the Torah describes the organization of the camps and how they moved and traveled, suddenly we hear a very strange conversation which, prima facie, is puzzling and enigmatic. A conversation between Moshe and his father-in-law. Moshe, humbly extending an invitation to his father-in-law: Moses said to Hobab son of Reuel the Midianite, Moses' father-in-law, "We are setting out for the place of which Hashem said, 'I will give it to you'; come with us, and we will treat you well; for Hashem has promised good to Israel." But he said to him, "I will not go, but I will go back to my own land and to my kindred." He said, "Do not leave us, for you know where we should camp in the wilderness, and you will serve as eyes for us. Moreover, if you go with us, whatever good Hashem does for us, the same we will do for you. Moshe argued with his father-in-law; he wanted his father-in-law to leave Midian and to join B'nei Yisrael, but Yitro was stubborn. Following this conversation, we are suddenly confronted with a Parasha consisting of two Pesukim: Vay'hi bin'soa ha'aron... - Whenever the ark set out, Moses would say, Arise, Hashem, let your enemies be scattered, and your foes flee before you." And whenever it came to rest, he would say, Return, Hashem of the ten thousand thousands of Israel."

At the beginning of the Parasha there is an inverted Nun and at the end of the Parasha there is an inverted Nun, in order to emphasize that this parasha is out of context here. Indeed it is out of context. And the question is obvious: if it is out of context, why did the Torah insert the Parasha into a section within which it would always stand out as out of context. The Parasha could have been beautifully inserted at the end of Pekudei: For the cloud of Hashem was on the tabernacle by day, and fire was in the cloud by night, before the eyes of all the house of Israel at each stage of their journey. The two Pesukim would have been a most appropriate conclusion or sequel to that: Whenever the ark set out, Moses would say, Arise, Hashem, let your enemies be scattered, and your foes flee before you." And whenever it came to rest, he would say, Return, Hashem of the ten thousand thousands of Israel." And finally, following the Parasha of Vay'hi bin'soa ha'aron..., the Torah tells us the tragic story - which we will analyze - of the Kivrot haTa'avah - the people who desired. They didn't do anything else, no crime, no idolatry, no murder, no sexual promiscuity, no robbery, no burglary - nothing, they just were overcome by a desire and they wept that's all - they didn't yell, they didn't throw stones at Moshe, like they did in other situations. Nothing, they didn't say anything, they weren't threatening anyone, just complaining. People of desire - this tragic story is told. The name Kivrot haTa'avah - could have been invented today, to characterize modern man. The grave of desire which man digs for himself, or I would rather say, the grave which the desire digs for man. The grave of the voluptuaries. Finally, the conclusion of the Sidra is the story of Miriam.

We simply are perplexed. How many stories are in B'ha'alot'kha? One story or many stories? If there is one, there must be transition; if there is no transition, if there is no gradual and systematic development of a theme, then there is no unity. Whoever writes a composition paper, in first year English, knows that there must be unity. Unity is when a theme is developed. Prima facie, there is no development of anything and there is no literary unity. There are many stories. But each story per se is half a story, not a complete story. (Whatever I tell you tonight occurred to me during the Torah reading on Shabbat - it's completely new, so you won't find it anywhere - no one plagiarized me yet. I'm just reviewing my thoughts to you tonight, for the first time.) I had a feeling when the Ba'al Qeriah (Torah reader) was reading the Sedra, as if we were jumping like a bee on a clear warm summer morning from flower to flower accumulating the sweet nectar. Is it possible that the principle of the unity of the Torah, the unity of the themes which the Torah develops was lost in Parashat B'ha'alot'kha? It is an impossibility.

Now let me move slowly - my job, you understand very well, is to restore the unity of the Parasha. The Parasha is one story, one tragic story. A tragic story which changes Jewish history completely, from top to bottom. The inverted Nuns symbolize an inverted historical process here. An inverted Nun is not so bad. But when history is being inverted, not realized or stopped suddenly, this is very tragic. Our Rabbis speak about punishment in B'ha'alot'kha as the worst distressful events in Jewish History, "In order to separate between one punishment and another punishment."

Let us start with the Exodus. When the Almighty charged Moshe with the assignment of redeeming the Jews, liberating them from Egypt, he told him the following: (He told him many things, but the Hinuch, R. Aharon haLevi (?), said that the necessary prerequisite of the Exodus is the following sentence:) And it shall be your sign that it was I who sent you, when you will free the people from Egypt, you shall worship G-d on this mountain. This is a difficult sentence. In other words, the Almighty told Moshe that the Exodus drama will culminate in two events: you shall worship G-d on this mountain How many events does this encompass? It means that the Exodus will not be consummated until you worship G-d at this mountain. What does He mean by this? What did Moshe understand by these words? The Hinuch says: He meant two things: Mattan Torah the giving of the Law, the Torah teaches Man how to worship G-d, the continuous worship of G-d; the Man who lives according to the principles and rules of the Torah is a steady worshipper of G-d. There is no neutral moment; worship is a continuous process. However, he meant something else, namely the construction of the Mishkan (Tabernacle). Certainly the purpose of the Mishkan is worship. As a matter of fact, the Torah was given at Mount Sinai and the Mishkan was constructed immediately after Moshe came down from the Mount. Betzalel started the work of constructing the Mishkan on the day after Moshe came down from Mount Sinai, assembled the people and told them that a Mishkan should be constructed. It's no wonder that following the Aseret haDibrot (Ten Statements, - "Ten Commandments") in Parashat Yitro, G-d mentioned to Moshe the construction of an altar: But if you make for me an altar of stone... If the Jews hadn't succumbed to the hysteria of the Erev Rav (multitudes), had they rejected the Egel, the two objectives would have been realized much sooner. Because of the Egel, the time schedule was changed and the consumation of the "you shall worship G-d on this mountain" was delayed for 80 days. If the Egel had not been made and the whole tragedy of the Egel had been avoided, Moshe would have come down on Tamuz 17 and immediately they would have started to construct the Mishkan. Because of the Egel, Moshe had to spend 80 more days on Mount Sinai in prayer. Moshe came down from Mount Sinai on the day following Yom HaKippurim -so the construction of the Mishkan was delayed for 80 days. However, on the day after

Yom HaKippurim, after Moshe came down with the second set of Tablets and the message of forgiveness, he quickly assembled the congregation and told them about the immediate task to be discharged - the building of the Beit HaMikdash. The work of construction began immediately. How long did it take them to construct the Mishkan, to complete the work? The Mishkan was completed and put together on Rosh Chodesh Nissan, which was, according to Our Rabbis, the Shemini laMilu'im - (eighth day of the Milu'im - handing over the priesthood to Aharon) - the day on which the princes began to offer their gifts to the Beit HaMikdash. When those two objectives, Mattan Torah and the construction of the Beit HaMikdash, were achieved, the Geula found its realization. The "you shall worship G-d on this mountain" was translated into reality, into fact. The people, therefore, had no business prolonging their stay in Midbar Sinai (the Wilderness of Sinai). They stayed in Midbar Sinai as long as it was necessary to receive the Torah - which had to happen twice, due to the Egel, and as long as it was necessary in order to complete the work on the Beit HaMikdash, because both are encompassed by the commandment: But the very moment that the second set of tablets were delivered to Yisrael and the Beit HaMikdash was constructed and completed, the vessels erected and the sacrifices offered, the task of Yisrael in Midbar Sinai was discharged and fulfilled. There was no purpose in extending the sojourn any longer. The Torah in Naso tells us about the final act of the dedication of the Mishkan, namely, the sacrifices by the princes. The Torah did not forget to mention a secondary matter, like the sanctification of the Levi'im. The Torah apprises us in Tzav about the sanctification of the Kohanim, which was of primary significance. In a word, with the dedication of the Mishkan by the princes and the election of the Levi'im, everything which was necessary in order to have the Mishkan serve the great purpose of worship was prepared and ready; the work was completed. When could B'nei Yisrael simply get up and leave Midbar Sinai? The Mishkan was completed on Rosh Chodesh Nissan, the twelve princes offered their gifts, the Almighty said: They shall present their offerings, one leader each day, for the dedication of the altar... meaning Rosh Chodesh Nissan plus 12 days. They were ready to march on the 13th of Nissan. However, the cloud did not move or rise, because the next day was Erev Pesach, the Korban Pesach, so the march was postponed until after Pesach. Everybody knew that the stay of the Jews in the wilderness of Sinai came to a close; the job was done; the Beit HaMikdash built, the Torah given, now we have to resume our march. However, the march had to wait until after the Jews offered the Korban Pesach. The second Pesach they celebrated in Midbar Sinai: Hashem spoke to Moses in the wilderness of Sinai, in the first month of the second year after they had come out of the land of Egypt, saying: Let the Israelites keep the passover at its appointed time.

(The Almighty said: "I will postpone the journey until after the Korban Pesach will be offered." So the Torah told us about the Korban Pesach in B'ha'alot'kha, because the Korban Pesach was the only obstacle to the resumption of the march. During the offering of the Pesach, the ritually impure men inquired about their status, Moshe Rabbeanu asked the Almighty and the institution of Pesach Sheni was introduced for those who were unable to offer the Pesach in Nissan. It is perfect continuity: the sanctification of the Levi'im was the last act of "you shall worship G-d on this mountain." It was not as important as the sanctification of the Kohanim, which is why the Torah tells us about the sanctification of the Kohanim in Tzav and Tetzaveh. The sanctification of the Levi'im is not as important; you could operate the Beit HaMikdash without the Levi'im. Shira (the main function of the Levi'im) is not indispensable; the Levi'im are more or less a luxury. The Torah tells us that every detail was completed, we were ready to march, the Almighty told Moshe to offer the Pesach first in Midbar Sinai and after the Pesach was offered, the B'nei Yisrael were supposed to resume their march. In a word, I repeat, the two prerequisites for moving on were met: the Torah given and accepted and the Mishkan ready for worship. The great march was supposed to start; the march to Eretz Yisrael. All 4 freedoms were attained, "I will take out...I will save...I will redeem...", and with Mattan Torah and the construction of the Mikdash, the "I will take..." was realized as well. The hour was struck for the fifth freedom to be realized and be translated into a reality, namely "I will bring (you into the land...)". Now, how long was the march supposed to last? Several days. That's why the Torah reveals to us the details of the march. First, who was the guide, the leader? If you march towards a certain destination, particularly in the desert, you need a leader. The answer is the pillar of cloud - as an instrument in the hands of the Almighty. The guide was the Almighty as the Torah told us in B'shallach: Hashem went in front of them in a pillar of cloud by day, to lead them along the way, and in a pillar of fire by night, to give them light, so that they might travel by day and by night. Now the Torah tells us how the camps were arranged marching, which tribes formed the avant garde and which tribes formed the rear guard: M'asef lekhol haMachanot. The Torah speaks of Tziv'otam (hosts) of warriors: Kol Yotz'ei Tzava. The Torah also relates to us the story of the two Hatzotzrot in this context because it's very important, the story of the signal system. Since Moshe was the commander he instructed the various camps on their march to the promised land, so there was need for communication. And the means of communication were the two silver trumpets, the Hatzotzrot of silver. Torah is not only important to explain intellectually in categories, but also in emotional categories. If you want to understand the beauty and greatness of the Torah, the emotional mood which is created by the reading of the Torah is perhaps more important than the intellectual gesture. Read B'ha'alot'kha carefully.

So they set out from the mount of Hashem three days' journey with the ark of the covenant of Hashem going before them three days' journey, to seek out a resting place for them, and When both are blown, the whole congregation shall assemble before you at the entrance of the tent of meeting. But if only one is blown, then the leaders, the heads of the tribes of Israel, shall assemble before you. When you blow a Truah, the camps on the east side shall set out; when you blow a second Truah, the camps on the south side shall set out. A Truah is to be blown whenever they are to set out. There is a mood of expectancy and tension. Expectancy permeates the pages of B'ha'alot'kha. There is a mood of mobilization and rigid order in the air. All conditions were met, the reward is about to be granted, finally the promise to Abraham is about to be fulfilled. The "I will bring them" will become the fifth freedom. The people are on their final triumphal march. In this mood, Moshe was excited. He was expecting great things. There is tenseness in the air and there is determination and boldness to break through if necessary.

Interesting is the conversation between Moshe and his father-in-law. What kind of mood on the part of Moshe is mirrored or reflected by this conversation? We get a glimpse into Moshe, into his mood, those days, after the second Passover as the people started to march. In the second year, in the second month, on the twentieth day of the month, the cloud lifted from over the tabernacle of

the covenant. Then the Israelites set out by stages... It was not one of the many journeys; it was the journey, the final journey. What is the emotional climate of this conversation: Moses said to Hobab son of Reuel the Midianite, Moses' father-in-law, "We are setting out for the place of which Hashem said, 'I will give it to you'; come with us, and we will treat you well; for Hashem has promised good to Israel." It is a climate of serenity, of peace of mind, an unqualified assurance. Moshe spoke of the final journey to the promised land. No waiting anymore, no Ani Ma'amin - I believe in the coming of Mashiach, even if he may tarry, I will wait for him... There would be no need for it anymore. No delays, no procrastination, no if and no when: Im Shamo'a Tishm'u - If you will listen - It is now! It is going to happen right now, not tomorrow. It is present tense, not "We will set out" - rather, "We are setting out" ...for the place of which Hashem said, 'I will give it to you'; come with us, and we will treat you well; for Hashem has promised good to Israel. all the promises will be fulfilled. I won't have to ask questions Hashem, why have you mistreated this people? Why did you ever send me? Ever since I came to Pharaoh... no problems, no questions, no doubts, nothing! It will be very simple.

I want to let you in on another secret. It was not an invitation which a son-in-law extended to his father-in-law. It was not an invitation extended by an individual to another human being to share the good things in life. It was more than that. It was an invitation extended by Moshe, as a representative of Klal Yisrael to all Gerim of all generations. The Midrash in Kohelet says: All of the rivers flow into the sea and the sea is never filled" - these are the Gerim who come to Eretz Yisrael to convert. It was extended to the entire non-Jewish world: Join us! Join us in the promised land - provided that the non-Jew is ready to subject himself to the same Divine discipline as we did. Any human being was offered the opportunity to join the march to the promised land, the march to the Messianic era. If that march had been realized, the coming of Mashiach would have taken place then and Moshe would have been the Melekh haMashiach. It was quite optional - the Jews could have reached it, they lost it so Moshe is not the Melekh haMashiach and the distance between them in time is long and far. The Torah was given to us. Eretz Yisrael was given to us, certainly. However, we were told to pass on G-d's word to mankind as such. We all know the famous verse in Shofarot of Rosh HaShana:

All you inhabitants of the world, you who live on the earth, when a signal is raised on the mountains, look! When a trumpet is blown, listen! We are all invited - all the dwellers on this world.

We are setting out for the place of which Hashem said, 'I will give it to you'; come with us, and we will treat you well...

What does Moshe think? That Yitro, the non-Jew, is dependent upon us? Our Torah is commodious enough to encompass the entire world.

There is enough Hessed, goodness and happiness in the Torah to be transmitted to others and to be shared by others. Join our triumphal march, Moshe said to Yitro, towards our destiny. It may become your destiny as well. When I read this Parasha, it attracts me; there is something moving, touching. Sometimes I want to cry when I read this Parasha. The simplicity with which the great Moshe, the master of all wise men and the father of all prophets speaks. He uses the grammatical first person: We are setting out...come with us, and we will treat you well...whatever good Hashem does for us... What does it mean? Moshe was certain - there was not even a shadow of doubt in his mind - that he was going to enter the promised land. He and the entire congregation will be classified as both Yotz'ei Mitzrayim (departers from Egypt) and Ba'ei ha'Eretz (those who come into the Land). He was sure, he was convinced that he would see the beautiful land, the hills of Judea, the prairie land of the Sharon Valley, he was certain that he will climb the mount of Levanon. Later he prayed, but his prayer did not come true: ...

Let me cross over to see the good land beyond the Jordan, that good hill country and the Lebanon. But that time he felt no need for prayer: there was no doubt about his destiny. The whole operation, if successfully brought to a close would have lasted several days. And at that time there was no need for Meraglim, for scouts to explore the land, to see whether the land is good or bad, or to see whether the cities are surrounded by walls or they are open cities, what kind of population is there - strong, weak, a sickly population or a healthy population. There was no need for it, all those scouts and all the exploration and intelligence work is only necessary if a man has doubts. This was the pre-doubt period in Jewish history. We are setting out for the place of which Hashem said, 'I will give it to you'; come with us, and we will treat you well... Share with us! An open invitation to everybody. Yitro or no Yitro, father-in-law of Moshe or the stranger. The Torah tells us indeed,

And they journeyed from the mount of the Eternal three days journey, and the Ark of the Covenant went before them in the three days journey to seek out a Menucha (resting place) for them, Where did it go? Where is Menucha for the Jews? What was the destination? Rashi, quoting Sifri, says: A distance of three days journey they miraculously traveled in one day, because the Almighty wanted to bring them into Eretz Yisrael.

My dear friends, tell me, at that time, before the great reversal took place, was the Parasha of Vay'hi bin'soa' ha'aron in its proper place or out of context? Before the Jews alienated G-d, before they fell from Him and they needed the Meraglim as scouts and they had doubts. Before, every Jew was convinced: This is the final consummation of all hope. It was beautiful, the Torah tells us:

And they journeyed from the mount of the Eternal three days journey, and the Ark of the Covenant went before them in the three days journey to seek out a Menucha (resting place) for them, the cloud of Hashem being over them by day when they set out from the camp. (meaning security on all sides) Vay'hi Binsoa' ha'aron - Whenever the ark set out (leading them right into Eretz Yisrael) Moses would say, "Arise, Hashem, let your enemies be scattered, and your foes flee before you." Who were the enemies? The last war they fought was the war against Amalek and the next war was against Sichon and Og, 40 years later. Why was Moshe speaking about enemies and fiends and people who threatened them? Who did Moshe have in mind? We are travelling fast to Eretz Yisrael - there we will be confronted by somebody, if the great hope had been realized, there would have been no need to engage in battle for seven years.

Whenever the ark set out, Moses would say, Arise, Hashem, let your enemies be scattered, and your foes flee before you." And whenever it came to rest, he would say, Return, Hashem of the ten thousand thousands of Israel." It was not misplaced. It was the continuation of the great story of the final, triumphal Messianic march into Eretz Yisrael, which was supposed to take place approximately 3500 years ago. It was certainly in its place and there was no need for an inverted Nun at the beginning and for an inverted Nun at the end, it would have been the climax of the whole story. Had this come true, nothing had happened, the whole Jewish history would have taken a

different turn. According to our tradition, (Hazal said it many times) had Moshe entered Eretz Yisrael, it never would have been taken from us - because Moshe would have been crowned as Melekh haMashiach. The Messianic era would have commenced with the conquest of Eretz Yisrael by Moshe. Moshe believed with a great passion and love that the final march of redemption had begun - it was only a question of days.

Suddenly, something happened. Neither Moshe nor anybody else expected the event to transpire. What happened? In the story of the Egel, we know what happened. Concerning the Meraglim (spies) we know what happened. About Pe'or in Midian, 40 years later, we know what happened. What happened here? [Seemingly] nothing in particular.

And the multitude that was among them felt a lust, had a desire. And B'nei Yisrael wept again and they said: Who shall give us flesh to eat? And the Torah tells us that this seizure by desire was evil. It aroused the wrath of the Almighty and also Moshe resented it. Uv'einei Moshe ra' - In Moshe's eyes it was evil - first time in Jewish history. Moshe was not the defense attorney: it was evil. This interrupted the great march. - it has brought the march to an end. The vision of Mashiach, of Eretz Yisrael, of the redemption of Yisrael, became a distant one, like a distant star on a mysterious horizon. It twinkled, but the road suddenly became almost endless. Why did Moshe feel discouraged? Why didn't he offer prayers for the people as was his practice in past situations?

Because the incident of Kivrot haTa'avah differed greatly from that of the Egel. The making of the Egel was the result of great primitive fright. The people thought that Moshe was died, they were afraid of the desert, they did not know what the future held in store for them, they were simply overwhelmed by a feeling of loneliness and terror, consequently, they violated the precept of vrz vsucg. There were mitigating circumstances - they wanted the golden calf to substitute for Moshe, as all the Rishonim (medieval commentators) say.

When you speak about Avodah Zarah (idolatry), you have to distinguish between Avodah Zarah as a ceremony/ ritual and between the pagan way of life. In Hazal's opinion, an Avodah Zarah-worshipper will also adopt the pagan way of life. But in this day and age, we know that it's possible for people to live like pagans even though no idolatry is involved. Paganism is not the worship of an idol, it encompasses more - a certain style of life. What is the pagan way of life, in contradistinction to the Torah way of life? The pagan cries for variety for boundlessness for unlimited lust and insatiable desire, the demonic dream of total conquest, of drinking the cup of pleasure to its dregs. The pagan way of life is the very antithesis of Yahadut, which demands limitedness of enjoyment and the ability to step backwards if necessary, the ability to withdraw - to retreat. The unlimited desire, which the Greeks call hedone, is the worst desire in Man. When Man reaches out for the unreachable, for the orgasmic and hypnotic, then they don't violate the prohibition of Avodah Zarah, but they adopt the pagan way of life; and the Torah hated the pagan way of life more than it hated the idol. Because an idol cannot exist for a long time, it cannot last. Finally, an intelligent person realizes that it is just wood and metal; it has no life. Avodah Zarah per se is short-lived, however the pagan way of life has a tremendous attraction for people. The Torah describes so beautifully the way in which the pagan gathers, accumulates property - gathers the Slav, the quail, how he gathers property, means of gratification for his hungry senses. So the people worked all that day and night and all the next day, gathering the quails; the least anyone gathered was ten homers; and they spread them out for themselves all around the camp. They were mad with desire, there was no controlling/limiting element in their desire for vastness, the imagination excited them and their good sense was surrounded with a nimbus which was irresistible, "the more, the better, and you start gathering new goods even before you have completed gathering the other goods." The pagan is impatient and insatiable. That's what the Torah describes in Kivrot haTa'avah.

There's another story in the Torah which, in contradistinction to the unlimited desire of the pagan, the Torah describes the Jewish way of life. It's interesting - it's the Manna. And Moshe said to them: this is the bread which the Lord has given you to eat, gather as much of it as each of you requires to eat, an omer to a person, for as many as you as there are. But when they measure it, by the omer, he who gathered much had no excess and he who gathered little had no deficiency. This is the approach of Yahadut. The great tragedy happened, the great triumphal final march suddenly came to a stop, the people who rejected the basic principle of economic limitedness and aesthetic enjoyment, these people were not worthy to enter the Land. Suddenly, parashat Vay'hi binsoa' ha'aron found itself dislocated. The distance to that land suddenly became very long. Of course, there was no edict yet concerning the 40 years, the time the people would have to spend in the desert, but Moshe felt intuitively that the great march had come to an end. Hopes he had will be unfulfilled and visions he had will not be realized and his prayers will be rejected. He knew that.

I tell you frankly, I don't have to say Moshe, Moshe was the master of the prophets, G-d revealed everything to him. I remember from my own experience, during the illness of my wife, who was sick for four years. Of course, I am a realist, and it is very hard to fool me - not even doctors can fool me. But, somehow I was convinced that somehow she would manage to get out of it. And I lived with hope and tremendous unlimited faith. I remember, it was the last Yom Kippur before she died. It was Kol Nidrei and I was holding a Sefer Torah for Kol Nidrei and when the Hazzan finished Kol Nidrei and said Shehech'yanu veqiy'manu vehig'yanu laz'man hazeh I turned over the Sefer Torah to a Talmid of mine and told him to put it in the Aron Kodesh. He put it in the Aron Kodesh, apparently he didn't place it well, I don't know what, but the Sefer Torah slipped and fell, not on the floor, but in the Aron Kodesh. At that time I was filled - don't ask me how or why - I felt a gefil - nothing will help. And indeed it was.

When the Am haMit'avim (the people who had the craving) began to complain and to weep, Moshe knew: This is the end, he'll never see Eretz Yisrael, never! That's why he said:

If this is the way you are going to treat me, put me to death at once...and do not let me see my misery. And how beautifully our Rabbis said: "Eldad and Meidad were having prophecy in the camp" What did they say? What was the excitement about? They said just one short sentence: Moshe's hopes: "We are setting out...come with us, and we will treat you well..." will never come true Moshe will die - he'll be buried in the sand dunes in the desert - he'll never see the beautiful land and the Levanon - Moshe meit viY'hoshua makhnis Moshe will die and Yehoshua will lead [the people] in to the Land.

And then parashat Vay'hi binsoa' ha'aron lost its place - it was dislocated and displaced. Do you know why it was dislocated and displaced? Because two little Nuns were inverted - the march was inverted. Instead of the march bringing them closer to Eretz Yisrael, the march took them away

from Eretz Yisrael. Binsoa' ha'aron the Nun was inverted and with the inversion of the Nun, Jewish history became inverted- and it is still inverted. The Parasha is still "dislocated". We cannot say "we are setting forth" with the same assurance and certitude that Moshe said it to Yitro his father-in-law just 24 hours before the Mit'avim inverted the Jewish process of redemption.

Finally, is now the continuation of the Parasha - I didn't yet explain the problem of Miriam, which I will now explain. The Torah describes the Exodus, Mattan Torah in Parashat Yitro, the construction of the Mikdash in Parashat Teruma. Suddenly, something happened which interrupted the continuity - the Egel, the construction was delayed for a certain number of days. Sefer Vayyikra (Leviticus) is devoted completely to the worship, to "you shall worship G-d on this mountain."

In Sefer Bamidbar (Numbers) the Torah tells us about the last act of dedication by the princes, and the lighting of the candles, and the sanctification of the Levi'im, so "you shall worship G-d on this mountain" was attained, the two objectives were reached, now the march began. The Torah tells us how the Jews were marching on the final triumphal march on the final triumphal journey to Eretz Yisrael, the pillar of cloud covered them, protected them, shielded them it was in front and was also the rear guard protecting them in back, and then how Moshe communicated with the camps, the Hatzotrot of silver, and Moshe's conversation with Yitro, he already had Eretz Yisrael within his reach, he extended the generous invitation to mankind, to share in our Ge'ulah - our redemption, and everything was ready.

Vay'hi Bin'soa' ha'aron - it should take us just a few more days. During the last few days, something happened - disaster struck. That disaster inverted Jewish History and that disaster dislocated Parashat Vay'hi Bin'soa' ha'aron. And that disaster inverted the march - instead of marching to Eretz Yisrael, we began to march away from Eretz Yisrael. Moshe discovered something else - he realized something else. He knew pretty well that he was chosen as the teacher of Klal Yisrael. G-d did not elect him as a diplomat, as a negotiator, but as the teacher or the Rebbe of the people, as their spiritual and moral leader. G-d Himself told him, when Moshe asked: "Who am I, that I should go to Phar'ah?" He said: "you shall worship G-d on this mountain".

Basically, "Moshe, had I been looking for a negotiator, I wouldn't have selected you. But I'm not looking for a negotiator - I can do the art of negotiating by myself. I need a teacher for my people - as a teacher, you yourself will agree that you are the best one - you are a teacher par excellence. And that's why I selected you: 'And it shall be your sign' - and that is the reason 'that it was I who sent you'; that I selected you and not somebody else (this is how the Sefer haHinukh understands it)." There were many people in Egypt who were qualified to be negotiators; because the purpose of the Exodus is not political freedom, but the conversion of a slave society into a Kingdom of Kohanim and a holy nation. And for that you are wonderful. Moshe knew this. However, he did not expect, until the Mit'avim, that he would assume the role of a teacher, but of a nursing mother/father - an Omein.

What is an Omein? - it is a nursing mother or father. Of course, a nursing mother teaches the baby. Perhaps the mother is the best and most important teacher in the life of a baby. But she does something else - the Rebbe teaches the talmidim. The nursing mother, in addition to teaching, carries the baby in her bosom or in her arms. "...as a nurse carries a sucking child,". What does this mean? Usually the father doesn't do it, the mother does it. The father has no patience for that. It has more meaning than the literal meaning of the word. The teacher does teach his disciple, but the disciple very seldom becomes a part of him. When the mother teaches the baby, the baby becomes a part of her. The mother, when she rears the baby, has one calling, one purpose, to protect the baby. The Omein or the mother basically do not belong to themselves. Many may be very critical of my statement but this is true according to Yahadut. A mother has no life of her own. She belongs to the infant. At least as long as the infant is helpless and is exposed to the dangers of a hostile environment. She belongs to the infant.

Moshe discovered now that teaching is not enough for a leader of Yisrael. A teacher, no matter how devoted, has a life of his own. That his job is nursing, carrying the baby in his arms, watching every step, guessing the baby's needs (a baby cannot say what she wants, you have to guess) feeling pain when the baby cries and being happy when the baby is cheerful. Teaching or instructing her good performances, but that is not everything. Moshe, who reconciled with his role as a teacher and leader of adults, began to doubt his ability to play the role of an Omein or mother nurse. Listen to his words: Did I conceive all these people, did I bear them, that you say to me: Carry them in your bosom as a nurse carries an infant? Moshe discovered something tragic in a mother's life. That from now on, as an individual, he has no rights at all, no right to rejoice, whenever G-d will be good to him. As a private person, he is not entitled to enjoy life as an individual, to be happy in an ordinary way, like any other human being, because his children will never belong to Moshe. He lost his family. He became the mother nurse of Klal Yisrael, no family of his own. This is what our Rabbis say: "he separated himself from his wife." It isn't just his wife from whom he separated, it's the wife and children (two lovely boys), his sister, his brother. He could not share his joy with them, they could not share their joy with him, he is the father of Yisrael, the father of Klal Yisrael, and that is what he means: the role of "as a nurse carries a sucking child" was imposed upon him during the rebellion of the Mit'onenim. He separated himself, not only from his mate, but also from his children. Where are Moshe's children? Do we ever come across Moshe's children? There was a census taken in the desert the beginning of the 40 years and at the end of the 40 years. Are Moshe's children mentioned? Not once.

This is the lineage of Aaron and Moses...These are the names of the sons of Aaron: Nadab the firstborn, and Abihu, Eleazar, and Ithamar; Where are Moshe's children? Moshe didn't have children. And it is later, in T'nakh, the name of Moshe's child was mentioned, not as the son of Moshe, but the son of "Menasheh". Why was a little Nun added to the name? Not only in order to reflect unfavorably upon Moshe - this is ridiculous, Moshe was not responsible for what happened, but because Moshe did not have children. I always say that if Moshe had a child, then according to the law he would have been in a most awful dilemma. According to the law, it would have been required of him to give preference to his child, as far as the study of Torah is concerned, over the child of his next-door neighbor. This is a law which Moshe Rabbenu taught us: Your own son takes precedence (in teaching Torah) over the son of your fellow. On the other hand, Moshe had no right to give any preference, or to give an additional second to his son, because he was the father of every child within the Jewish community. So Moshe lost his children. He became the Omein, the nursing mother, of Klal Yisrael. And that is exactly what G-d told him at the time of Mattan Torah: You say to them, return to your tents, to your private lives, but you, stay here. Moshe realized it during

the incident of the Mit'onenim. And that is what Miriam, the true, loyal sister, resented. Does prophecy require of Man alienation of his family? Does G-d require of the prophet that he should forget his sister and brother, his children and wife, and dedicate himself only to the people?

...Has he not spoken through us also? And we live a beautiful life with our husbands and children and relatives. And it doesn't interfere with our devotion to the people. That's exactly what G-d resented and told her: There is a difference between you and Moshe. An ordinary prophet does not have to sacrifice his private interest, his selfish concern, his family, his father, mother children, brother, sister; he can be a prophet, communicate with G-d, and at the same time be a devoted father, a loving brother, and a helpful head of the family. "Not so my servant Moshe." He's consecrated fully and wholly to me. And that's how the Parasha of B'haalot'kha concludes its long story - it's one story, this story - of a great march which could have led us into the Messianic era. On that day, G-d will be one and His Name one. but which was interrupted by some multitude which was permissive, hedones.

Text Copyright \_ 1997 by Rabbi Yitzchak Etshalom. The author is Mashgiach Ruchani of Shalhevet High School in Los Angeles California. Mikra [Project Genesis]

---

[Didn't make Fri. AM distribution:]

From: torahweb[SMTP:torahweb@torahweb.org]

Sent: Friday, June 04, 1999 2:22 PM

To: weeklydvartorah@torahweb.org

Subject Rabbi Mordechai Willig - Be-Haaloscha

Rabbi Mordechai Willig

TORAT EMET

I

The commandment to light the menorah daily in the Beit Hamikdash follows immediately after the dedication of the Mishkan by the Nesi'im. Rashi comments that these two sections are juxtaposed in the Torah to tell us that Aharon felt badly that he did not take part in the dedication. To console Aharon, God gave him the mitzvah of lighting the menorah, and told him, "Yours is greater than theirs [the nesi'im], for you light the candles daily."

Rashi's comment requires explanation. After all, Aharon was told of the mitzvah of lighting the menorah long before the dedication of the Mishkan (see Shmot, 27:21; Vayikra, 24:3). How was he consoled by God's answer? Furthermore, why was Aharon upset by being left out of the dedication? Certainly, he was not insulted by being excluded from the honor of the ceremonies!

A dedication has a great and lasting significance. The peak of excitement attained at the outset of any undertaking must provide inspiration for the entire lifetime of the person or institution involved. Aharon feared that he and his descendants would lack the excitement that all other Jews had gained through their participation in the dedication. To allay Aharon's fears, God responded that the mitzvah of the menorah would be an even greater source of spiritual invigoration for him and his descendants.

Why was the menorah singled out among all the mitzvot of the Kohanim as an inspiration even more powerful and lasting than that of the dedication of the Mishkan? The answer lies in the symbolism of the menorah. The menorah represents Torah, and the study of Torah, unlike other mitzvot, constantly affords new insights. Because of his involvement with the menorah and Torah, Aharon did not need the excitement of the dedication. For Aharon, every day was new and refreshing, as the words of the Torah are like new to us each day (Rashi, D'varim 6:6). Therefore, Aharon's source of constant spiritual regeneration was, indeed, greater than that of the Nesi'im.

II

Rashi (ibid.) teaches that the words of Torah should be like new to us each day. The Talmud (Chagiga 3a), however, states that Torah is new, and tells us that it is impossible to be in a Beit Medrash without a chiddush. How can we account for the difference between Rashi's teaching, that the Torah should be like new, and the statement of the Talmud, that the Torah is new? Rashi refers to "these words," the written Torah, which is unchanging, but must be in our eyes as if it were new. The Talmud describes the Oral Torah, which is studied in a Beit Medrash. Talmudic discourse inevitably yields fresh insights and, as such, is really new. The Talmud (ibid. 3b) further expresses the freshness and expansion of Torah when it explains the passage (Koheles 12:11) that compares words of Torah to plantings, saying that just as a plant procreates, so to the words of Torah procreate. This metaphor is also utilized in our daily prayers, when we bless God for implanting eternal life within us, "v'chayei olam nata b'tocheinu".

Let us take a moment to further discuss the procreation of Torah by examining the aforementioned phrase in conjunction with two others that precede it in our prayers. The first phrase, which immediately precedes it, states "v'nasan lanu Toras Emes", "and God gave us the Torah of truth". The Beit Halevi (Yitro) explains that God giving us the Torah of truth refers to

the written law, whose truth is determined by the interpretation of the Sages, which comprises the ever-expanding Oral law. The second phrase, which appears before the two phrases quoted above, states, "Baruch Hu Elokeinu shebra'anu lichvodo vihidvilanu min hatoim", "Blessed is God Who created us for His glory and separated us from those who stray." What does this juxtaposition teach us?

Perhaps the last phrase represents a prerequisite for innovation in Torah. Unchecked creativity can lead to false and even dangerous procreation. In order for a novel interpretation to be part of Torat Emet, ultimate and eternal truth, its author must not stray, and must be separated from those who stray. How can this be assured?

If one recognizes that he was created to serve God and enhance K'vod Shomayim (the glory of Heaven in the eyes of men), then he will not stray. By contrast, if one is interested in greater self-actualization and in adding to his own glory, then he will likely stray from the truth.

In other words, we must begin by stating categorically that our role in this world is to bring honor to God. We will thereby avoid straying from the truth of Torah. And lest one think that, as a result, there is no room for originality and creativity in Torah, we conclude by alluding to the inevitable positive procreation of Torah which is implanted within us.

The modern Western world has strayed from this fundamental principle which is now disparaged as fundamentalism. Modern man and woman are interested in self-gratification and actualization. For the spiritually inclined, this manifests itself not as hedonism but as religious subjectivism. If it feels good, do it, and, if you are Jewish, call it a mitzvah. This unholy procreation of those who have strayed poses a serious threat to authentic Torah study and practice.