



BS"D

To: parsha@parsha.net  
From: cshulman@gmail.com

## INTERNET PARSHA SHEET ON BESHALACH - 5778

In our 23rd year! To receive this parsha sheet, go to <http://www.parsha.net> and click Subscribe or send a blank e-mail to [parsha-subscribe@yahoo.com](mailto:parsha-subscribe@yahoo.com) Please also copy me at [cshulman@gmail.com](mailto:cshulman@gmail.com) A complete archive of previous issues is now available at <http://www.parsha.net> It is also fully searchable.

---

Sponsored anonymously in memory of  
**Chaim Yissachar z"l ben Yechiel Zaydel Dov**

---

Sponsored by  
**Dr. Phil & Leah Kazlow.**  
in memory of Phil's father.  
**Yosef ben Chaim Zvi - Joseph Kazlow z"l.**  
on the occasion of his Yartzeit - 13 Shvat

---

To sponsor a parsha sheet (proceeds to tzedaka) contact  
[cshulman@parsha.net](mailto:cshulman@parsha.net)

---

from: **Rabbi Yissocher Frand** <[ryfrand@torah.org](mailto:ryfrand@torah.org)> to: [ravfrand@torah.org](mailto:ravfrand@torah.org)  
date: Wed, Jan 24, 2018 at 10:41 AM subject: Rav Frand - In Shirah, the Emotions Surpass the Words

These divrei Torah were adapted from the hashkafa portion of Rabbi Yissocher Frand's Commuter Chavrusah Tapes on the weekly portion: # 1018 – Bracha Achrona: How Soon Must You Say It? Good Shabbos!

The Shirah in Parshas B'Shalach begins with the words, "Then Moshe and the Children of Israel sang (Az Yashir Moshe u'Venei Yisrael) this song to Hashem, and they said as follows..." [Shemos 15:1]. The words "Az Yashir" are problematic because the word "Yashir" (will sing) is future tense, while the Torah is narrating for us an event that took place in the past.

This prompts the Gemara [Sanhedrin 91b] to cite this pasuk as one of the Biblical sources for the concept of the Resurrection of the Dead (Techiyas ha'Meisim). The Gemara says that, in fact, the words "Az Yashir" allude to a future event, after the time of Techiyas ha'Meisim, when Moshe and the Children of Israel will sing. This, however, is a drasha. It is not the simple interpretation of the pasuk.

Rashi, whose commentary is based primarily on peshuto shel mikra [the simple interpretation of the pasuk], interprets the words "Az Yashir" as follows: "Az" [then] when they saw the miracle, the thought entered their hearts to sing a Shirah [song].

The Sifsei Chachomim clarifies Rashi's remarks. Really, this is a contradiction between two words: Az means "then" (implying past tense); but Yashir means "will sing" (implying future tense). So, are we talking past tense or future tense? In order to resolve this problem, Rashi says "Az" – then (past) they were inspired, and they had this feeling in their hearts to sing (future) a song (right then).

The Maharal in Gur Aryeh adds a further comment to explain what Rashi means: When a person is extremely elated, he gets the feeling that he wants

to somehow express his joy. Song that comes out of happiness does not emerge from the mouth or the brain. It emerges from a joy that begins in the person's heart. It was the heart that first formulated the determination that he will sing.

This is what Rashi is trying to convey to us. Az (then) they saw something miraculous. They saw the Hand of G-d. They were overwhelmed with emotion, joy, and simcha. They had Shirah in their hearts. That inspired them to sing. In song, the words are merely a subsequent outward manifestation of that which has already occurred inside.

To give a simple example: When a person runs a fever, there are external manifestations. The person's temperature rises, he looks flushed, etc. But that is only symptomatic of something that has already happened internally. There must be some kind of internal infection that triggered the fever.

This is what Rashi means to say in explaining the terminology "Az Yashir": The internal emotion leads a person to articulate the joy outwardly, in the form of Shirah.

The sefer Bei Chiyah says that this is perhaps what the Gemara means [Eruchin 11a] by the statement "One only recites Shirah [song] over wine." On all Jewish occasions, whenever there is any type of Shirah (such as Birkas Eirusin; Birkas Milah; Kiddush on Shabbos; Kiddush on Yom Tov), we always say the Shirah over a cup of wine. The Talmud further states that "When wine enters (a person's mouth) secrets emerge." When a person drinks wine, he becomes a little intoxicated, he loses his inhibitions, and then those things that were stored within (i.e., the secrets) come out. This is the nature of wine, and this is the nature of Shirah. They are both manifestations of what is going on within a person's inner emotions and inner self.

This explanation can help us understand another teaching of the Maharal. The Maharal asks (as many people do), why is there no bracha [blessing] on sippur yetzias Mitzrayim (the mitzvah of retelling the story of the Exodus by the Pesach Seder)? Why do we not begin the Hagadah by reciting a blessing: Baruch Ata Hashem Elokeinu Melech ha'Olam asher kidshanu b'mitzvosav v'tzivanu al mitzvas sippur yetzias Mitzrayim?

The Maharal answers (in his Hagadah) that it is because the mitzvah of retelling the story of the Exodus is a mitzvah of the heart, and we only make brochos on mitzvos that involve some kind of activity (either action or speech), never on mitzvos that are primarily mitzvos of the heart. In spite of the fact that we sit at the table for hours and talk about the Exodus, the primary fulfillment is that which a person feels in his heart.

Based on this idea, the sefer Bei Chiyah makes a beautiful observation regarding the following question. The Gemara says that the sections of the Torah involving Shirah need to be written "ariach al gabei leveinah" [the script of the line above is written over the empty space of the line below it, in a bricklaying pattern] [Megillah 16b]. Rashi says that there is actually more empty space than words in the Shirah – more blanks than writing. This is because a Shira is composed of two things: (1) the human emotion where the joy is felt and (2) the actual articulation of those emotions. Whenever a person feels overwhelmed with simcha and wants to express it, and even sing about it, the actual words only comprise a miniscule percentage of the emotions the person is feeling. Therefore, shiras ha'yam needs to be written in a style where the script is broken up by blank spaces and, in fact, there are more blank spaces than there is script. There is more emotion than a person can articulate.

Think about it. Have you ever spoken at your child's Bar Mitzvah? Have you spoken at your child's wedding? People become tongue tied. They cannot give proper expression to their feelings because they are so overwhelmed by their emotions, that they are hard to articulate. That is why shirah is ariach al gabei leveinah. There must be writing, but there must be even more blank space.

Shirah begins in the heart. It is all about emotion. The words are merely an articulation of a small fraction of the emotions, which cannot be fully articulated.

The sefer Bei Chiyah concludes with a final point. Where does Az Yashir begin? Most of us would say that it begins with the words, "I will sing to Hashem for He is exalted above all exaltedness..." Superficially, the words, "Then will sing, Moshe and the Children of Israel, this song to Hashem, and they said as follows" are just an introduction that gives historical context. They are merely a preamble to the song, with the song itself beginning with the next phrase, "Ashira l'Hashem..." And yet, when we look at a Sefer Torah, we see that even the first words "Az Yashir..." are written in the ariach al gabei leveinah format. Why does the script/blank space format already begin with the preamble?

The answer is that this is already part of the Shirah. "Az" – they were already overcome with emotion. And "Yashir" – they wanted to sing in the future because that is the way all songs begin. This is more than just a preamble or prologue. This opening line is what the Shirah is all about. It began with overwhelming emotions; it began in their hearts. THEN, the result of that is the desire TO EXPRESS that emotion – Yashir in the future.

Transcribed by David Twersky; Jerusalem DavidATwersky@gmail.com Technical Assistance by Dovid Hoffman; Baltimore, MD dhoffman@torah.org This week's write-up is adapted from the hashkafa portion of Rabbi Yissochar Frand's Commuter Chavrusah Series on the weekly Torah portion. A complete catalogue can be ordered from the Yad Yechiel Institute, PO Box 511, Owings Mills MD 21117-0511. Call (410) 358-0416 or e-mail tapes@yadyechiel.org or visit <http://www.yadyechiel.org/> for further information. Rav Frand © 2017 by Torah.org. Donate to Project Genesis - Torah.org Join the Jewish Learning Revolution! Torah.org: The Judaism Site brings this and a host of other classes to you every week. Visit <http://torah.org> to get your own free copy of this mailing or subscribe to the series of your choice. Permission is granted to redistribute, but please give proper attribution and copyright to the author and Torah.org. Both the author and Torah.org reserve certain rights. Email copyrights@torah.org for full information. Torah.org: The Judaism Site Project Genesis, Inc. 2833 Smith Ave., Suite 225 Baltimore, MD 21209 ?<http://www.torah.org/learn@torah.org> (410) 602-1350

---

<http://www.revach.net/parshas-hashavua/quick-vort/Parshas-Bishalach-Rav-Shimon-Schwab-The-Women-Sing-A-Song-Of-Faith/3394>

Parshas Bishalach: **Rav Shimon Schwab - The Women Sing A Song Of Faith**

Rav Shimon Schwab asks, why does the torah interrupt between the Shira of Moshe and the Shira of Miriam by recapping and telling us "Ki Va Sus Paroh..." that Paroh and his men drowned in the sea, don't we already know that?

He answers that we know that the women of that generation had more emuna then the men. "Bs'char Nashim Tzidkanios SheHayu BiOso HaDor Nigalu", they were redeemed in the merit of the righteous women. Similarly on the Yam Suf the women showed more emuna. Before the men sang Shira it says, "Vayar Yisroel Es Mitzrayim Meis Al Sfas HaYam", the men were worried and said, just like we escaped on this side, maybe the Mitzrim escaped on the other side. Therefore Hashem washed the Mitzri bodies onto the shore for them to witness first hand. Only then "Az Yashir" did they begin to sing Shira.

Not so our Nashim Tzidkanios, the Torah tells us. "Ki Va Sus Paroh B'Richo U'Parashav Bayam, VaYashev Hashem Aleihem Es Mai HaYam", as soon as waters came tumbling down on the Mitzrim in the Yam... "U'Bnei Yisroel Halchu Bayabasha B'Soch HaYam", even as the Bnei Yisroel were still walking through the Yam... "VaTikach Miriam HaNevia..." the women were already saying Shira. The women believed, and they were sure that Hashem had performed a great Nes without asking for the evidence.

---

from: Shabbat Shalom <shabbatshalom@ounetwork.org> date: Thu, Jan 25, 2018 at 11:58 PM

The Longer, Shorter Road

Britain's Former Chief **Rabbi Lord Jonathan Sacks**

At the end of his new book, Tribe of Mentors, Timothy Ferris cites the following poem by Portia Nelson. It's called 'Autobiography in Five Short Chapters':

Chapter 1: I walk down the street. There is a deep hole in the sidewalk. I fall in. I am lost... I am helpless. It isn't my fault. It takes forever to find a way out.

Chapter 2: I walk down the same street. There is a deep hole in the sidewalk. I pretend I don't see it. I fall in again. I can't believe I am in this same place. But it isn't my fault. It still takes a long time to get out.

Chapter 3: I walk down the same street. There is a deep hole in the sidewalk. I see it is there. I still fall in... It's a habit... But, my eyes are open. I know where I am. It is my fault. I get out immediately.

Chapter 4: I walk down the same street. There is a deep hole in the sidewalk. I walk around it.

Chapter 5: I walk down another street.

That is probably how life is like for many of us. It certainly was for me. We set off, confident that we know where we are going, only to find that it is rarely that simple. "Life," said John Lennon, "is what happens while we are making other plans." We fall into holes. We make mistakes. Then we make them again. Eventually we avoid them, but by then we may have the growing suspicion that we took the wrong turning to begin with. If we are lucky, we find another road.

Hence the opening of this week's parsha:

When Pharaoh let the people leave, God did not lead them by way of the land of the Philistines, although that was nearby, for God said, "Lest the people change their minds when they encounter war and return to Egypt." So God brought the people by a roundabout route by way of the desert to the Red Sea ... (Ex. 13:17-18).

This is actually quite a difficult text to understand. In and of itself it makes eminent sense. God did not want the people immediately to face battle with the seven nations in the land of Canaan since, as newly liberated slaves, they were psychologically unprepared for war. We now know also that there was an additional factor. There were Egyptian forts at various points along the sea route to Canaan, so the Israelites would come up against them even before reaching the land.

Three facts, though, still need to be reckoned with. First, the Torah itself says that God "hardened Pharaoh's heart" (Ex. 14:4), leading him to pursue the Israelites with a force of six hundred chariots. This so demoralised the Israelites that they cried, "Were there not there are enough graves in Egypt that you had to bring us out here to die in the desert? ... It would have been better to be slaves in Egypt than to die in the desert" (Ex. 14:11-12). Why did God cause Pharaoh to pursue the Israelites if He did not want them to think of going back? He should surely have made the first stage of their journey as undemanding as possible.

Second, the people did face war long before they came anywhere near the land of Canaan. They did so almost immediately after crossing the Red Sea, when they were attacked by the Amalekites (Ex. 17:8). The strange fact is that when they had to fight a battle on their own, without any miraculous intervention from God, they expressed no fear. Inspired by Moses' upraised arms, they fought and won (Ex. 17:10-13).

Third, the roundabout route failed to prevent the people's response to the report of the spies. Terrified by their account of the strength of the native population and the well-fortified nature of their cities, they said, "Let us appoint a (new) leader and return to Egypt" (Num. 14:4).

It seems, therefore, that the circuitous route by which God led the Israelites was not to prevent their wanting to return, but rather, to prevent their being able to return. Leading them miraculously through the Red Sea was like Caesar crossing the Rubicon, or Cortes burning his boats before his conquest of the Aztecs. It made retreat impossible. Whatever their doubts and fears, the Israelites had no real choice. They had to continue onward, even if in the end it took forty years and a new generation to reach their destination.

What this meant was that almost from the dawn of their history as a nation, Jews were forced to learn that lasting achievement takes time. You can never get there by the shortest road. Thanks to the work of Anders Ericsson, popularised by Malcolm Gladwell, we know that greatness in many fields takes 10,000 hours of practice.[1] The history of all too many nations born after the Second World War and the end of empire, shows that you can't create a democracy by United Nations decree, or freedom by a Universal Declaration of Human Rights. People who try to get rich fast often discover that their wealth is like Jonah's gourd: it appears overnight and disappears the next day. When you try to take a shortcut, you find yourself, like the poet, falling into a hole.

The Talmud tells the story of Rabbi Yehoshua ben Hanania who asked a young man sitting at a crossroad, "Which is the way to the town?" The young man pointed to one of the paths and said, "This way is short but long. The other way is long but short." Yehoshua ben Hanania set out on the first path, quickly arrived at the town, but found his way blocked by gardens and orchards. He then returned to the young man and said, "Didn't you tell me that this path was short?" "I did," said the young man, "but I also warned you that it was long." [2] Better to take the long road that eventually gets you to your destination than the short one that doesn't even though it looks as if it does.

Today's world is full of books, videos and programmes promising a fast-track to almost anything from weight loss to riches to success and fame. The life-changing idea symbolised by the route God led the Israelites on when they left Egypt is that there are no fast tracks. The long way is short; the short way is long. Better by far to know at the outset that the road is long, the work is hard, and there will be many setbacks and false turnings. You will need grit, resilience, stamina and persistence. In place of a pillar of cloud leading the way, you will need the advice of mentors and the encouragement of friends. But the journey is exhilarating, and there is no other way. The harder it gets, the stronger you become.

[1] See Anders Ericsson, Peak: Secrets From The New Science of Expertise, Mariner, 2017; Malcolm Gladwell, Outliers, Little, Brown, 2013. Of course, as many have pointed out, this is not true in all fields, nor is it the only relevant factor.

[2] Eruvin 53b.

---

from: Chanan Morrison <ravkooklist@gmail.com> to: **Rav Kook** List <Rav-Kook-List@googlegroups.com> date: Wed, Jan 24, 2018 at 2:06 AM subject: [**Rav Kook Torah**] BeShalach: Listening to the Old...

BeShalach: Listening to the Old...

### **Talmud Torah Truly Listening**

At a place in the desert called Marah, Moses sweetened the bitter waters so the people would have water to drink. Then he admonished them that they should listen carefully - שְׁמַעְתָּ לַיהוָה - to God's voice (Ex. 15:26).

Why is the verb "to listen" (שָׁמַעַתָּ) repeated? In Biblical Hebrew, the grammatical structure of combining the infinitive with the conjugated verb is used to place emphasis. Thus שְׁמַעְתָּ לַיהוָה means "you will listen carefully." The Talmud, however, often infers additional meanings from this repetition. In this case, the Sages derived an important lesson about Torah study:

"If שָׁמַעְתָּ - if you listen to the old - then תִּשְׁמַעְתָּ - you will merit listening to the new. But if you turn away [from the old], you will no longer hear."

(Berachot 40a) This statement needs clarification. What is meant by "old" and "new"? What special promise is hinted in the double verb, שְׁמַעְתָּ לַיהוָה ? Love of Torah

There are two reasons why people are drawn to study Torah. The first motivation is the natural desire to satisfy one's intellectual curiosity, just as with any other area of study.

However, the proper motivation for Torah study should be a love for Torah that is based on an awareness of the Torah's intrinsic value. This is called Torah lishmah - the study of Torah for its own sake.

Studying Torah lishmah means that one is aware of the holiness inherent in the very act of studying Torah. This level of Torah study requires one to see

the universal light that permeates each and every detail of the Torah, and recognize the Torah's ability to elevate the individual and the entire world with the light of Divine morality.

"We must sense the Godly soul to be found within the ensemble of the Torah's details, perfecting the universe - in life, in the material and spiritual realms, for the collective and the individual." (Orot HaTorah 2:2) Reviewing the Old

When is the disparity between different motivations for Torah study most pronounced? The true test comes with regard to "the old" - when reviewing material previously learned.

If our principal motive is merely intellectual curiosity, then such study will be unappealing and even burdensome. Why should one find reviewing old material to be interesting? If, however, we are studying the Torah because of its true inner value, because it is a revelation of God's blueprint for perfecting the world, then the newness of the material is not important. The value of Torah study comes from the very act of assimilating this Divine revelation, in uniting our thoughts with the holy concepts revealed in the Torah.

One who studies Torah lishmah internalizes its teachings. Thus, the Sages taught, one "possesses" the Torah he has studied, for it has become an integral part of him (see Kiddushin 32b). With this level of identification with the Torah and its teachings, "he will merit listening to the new" - he will be able to hear original Torah thoughts from within himself.

Rabbi Meir expressed this idea in Avot 6:1:

"All who engage in Torah study for its own sake merit many things.... The secrets of Torah are revealed to them. They become like a spring that flows with ever-increasing strength and a stream that never ceases." The scholar who studies Torah lishmah becomes a fountain of creativity, contributing his own innovative explanations and insights. When the Sages taught that this person "will merit hearing the new," this "new" isn't just new to him, but new to the entire world!

One who is disinterested in reviewing previously learned material, on the other hand, is demonstrating that Torah study is only an intellectual pursuit. This person, the Sages warned, "will no longer hear." Even new ideas will fail to pique his interest, for he will come to lack even the normal measure of curiosity with regard to the Torah's wisdom.

(Sapphire from the Land of Israel. Adapted from Ein Eyah vol. II, p. 185)

See also: Beshalach: The Inner Song of the Soul

---

from: Torah Musings <newsletter@torahmusings.com> date: Thu, Nov 23, 2017 at 11:19 AM subject: Torah Musings Daily Digest for 11/23/2017

### **Personal Judaism**

#### **by R. Gil Student**

Personal stringencies in Jewish practice are private matters but they can also provide insight into the nature of Jewish law. In an undated responsum, Rav Moshe Feinstein answered a question about the complex topic of eruv with a brief musing on the effect of halakhic decision-making on contemporary religious life.

The Shulchan Arukh (Orach Chaim 362:10) quotes the Rambam as ruling that "doorpost" eruv, the common string connecting poles, are ineffective on large areas unless the majority of the wall is solid. According to this position of the Rambam, some contemporary eruv are invalid because they utilize the "doorpost" model across most, maybe even all, of the perimeter of the eruv. While the broad consensus of halakhic authorities rejects this ruling of the Rambam, some people adopt the stringency of refusing to utilize eruv in deference to the Rambam.

An unidentified questioner asked Rav Moshe Feinstein whether someone who followed this position of the Rambam may change his practice and adopt the mainstream position allowing "doorpost" eruv. I imagine a recently married yeshiva student who easily refrained from using an eruv while single but now, with wife and baby in tow, finds rejecting the eruv

overly burdensome. Rav Feinstein (Iggeros Moshe, OC 2:83) responded that it depends why he acted strictly. If it was because he followed a ruling that the Rambam was correct, then he may not change his practice. While no one in our generation, Rav Feinstein stated, has the authority to rule either according to or against the Rambam in this debate, he may come from a community that has a longstanding ruling. Someone who comes from a community that follows the Rambam on this issue is as if he received a personal halakhic ruling according to the Rambam and he may not change his practice.

This last step is very important. Why does it matter whether he received a halakhic ruling? If the Rambam's position is a stringency for most people, it should also be for someone who received a halakhic ruling on the subject. Rav Feinstein directs readers to the Chayei Adam without specifying where. I believe he means ch. 127 par. 10, where the Chayei Adam follows the lead of the Peri Chadash (Orach Chaim 567) in a fascinating discussion of the nature of custom and halakhah. A custom, a minhag, retains the force of a vow. While this means that a personal custom is binding, it may be undone through the process of hataras nedarim, nullifying the vow.

A halakhic ruling, however, is not a matter of a vow. By asking a halakhic question, you are not merely implicitly accepting to follow a rabbi's guidance on the matter you bring before him. When a rabbi rules for a questioner on an halakhic matter, his ruling shapes the questioner's Torah obligation, creating a new halakhic reality for him. Such is the power of the halakhic decisor. The rabbi not only teaches the law but creates it. According to this approach, halakhah can be different for different people. For one person, the Rambam's view is merely a stringency. For another, it is Torah law.

This personal nature of Jewish law is at once jarring and reassuring. The discovery that halakhah is not a static body of law, an objective corpus of knowledge that we need only access, but a vibrant tree with many branches can be misleading. If there are multiple options, can I choose the law I want just I like choose the pizza topping that fits my taste and mood? R. Feinstein tells us that we may not. We are bound by the religion of our ancestors, the practices of our birthplaces and the guidance of our teachers. The circumstances of our lives, the experiences that formed us and the people who molded us, determine the details of our religious lives.

---

fw from hamelaket@gmail.com from: Torah in Action /Shema Yisrael  
<parsha@torahinaction.com>

subject: **Peninim on the Torah by Rabbi A. Leib Scheinbaum**

Bnei Yisrael raised their eyes and behold! – Egypt was journeying after them. (14:10) Klal Yisrael saw the united Egyptian Army coming after them. The word nosea, traveling, is written in the singular, rather than in the plural form, nosim. Rashi explains that the Egyptians came after the Jews b'lev echad k'ish echad, "with one heart, like one person." In a similar exposition in Parshas Yisro, Rashi comments concerning Klal Yisrael's coming to Har Sinai. Vayichan sham Yisrael, "and Yisrael camped there" (Shemos 9:2). Vayichan is singular, as opposed to vayachanu, which would be the proper plural conjugation form. Rashi expounds, k'ish echad b'lev echad, as one person with one heart. Notably, concerning Klal Yisrael's description of their unity, Rashi places ish, person (echad), prior to lev, heart; unlike, concerning the Egyptians, it was the heart first, b'lev echad, followed by ish echad, one person. Was there a difference in the relative types of unity? In a well-known exposition, Horav Yitzchak Hutner, zl, explains that Egyptian unity is based upon a common cause, not a common attribute. The Egyptians have only one characteristic in common with one another: their hatred of the Jews. This is what unified them. Otherwise, they were each self-serving, lacking any allegiance to one another. Thus, they were b'lev echad, one unified heart/cause, which made them into ish echad.

The Jewish People are different. They are k'ish echad, all compared to varied components of one body. All aspects of the body work together as lev echad. Their lev echad is the result of being an ish echad. The Jews, by

definition, are one unit bound by their collective body. When one organ of the body is in pain, the entire body suffers. Klal Yisrael does not require a common cause to unite us. We are one unit, because we are all components of one body – Klal Yisrael. We derive from here an important principle with regard to unity. One type of unity is synthesis unity, which is a composite of varied forms, people, elements to form an amalgamated front, position, stand. While this works under most conditions, the individuals involved are committed to a common goal – not to one another. In a symbiotic unity, a blending, a cooperative relationship exists between two persons or groups, whereby the two focus on unity among themselves in such a manner that the two become one. We have as of late been plagued by movements who have positioned themselves with a common goal to undermine traditional Orthodoxy, to modernize halachah by transforming it to state-of-art status. The individuals involved each have his/her own personal agenda, but are united by a common goal. Such unity is like the Egyptian unity which was a synthesis of variant persons united under a common banner. Such unity, because it involves various personalities and egos, each devoted to no one other than him/herself, will not endure. Unity must be symbiotic, whereby everyone not only works for a common goal and under a common banner, but each individual component abnegates him/herself to focus first on self-unity before addressing the issues.

Yisrael saw the great hand that Hashem inflicted upon Egypt. (14:31) "Great hand" is explained by the Chafetz Chaim, zl, as far-reaching. At times, years could go by before we see the great hand. Things happen; some (apparently) positive, and others which appear to be negative. We do not understand why, but we maintain our faith that these are not haphazard occurrences. Everything is a piece in Hashem's Divine Plan; everything has its assigned place. When we will be privy to the complete big picture, we will see with clarity how everything fits neatly into the puzzle of reality. Klal Yisrael suffered cruel and bitter persecution at the hand of the Egyptians. Surely, they must have had questions during those 210 years of servitude. They waited 210 years to see their oppressors perish in the Red Sea, while they were spared in the greatest miracle of all time. We, too, have questions, but we wait patiently for that glorious day when they will all be answered, when we will see the great hand of Hashem. What keeps us going? What preserves our faith? The great hand. The knowledge that, at times, the path to the explanation is a long one, and, until we reach the end of the road we will really not understand. In retrospect, we understand that everything has taken place at the perfect time. Horav Yitzchak Zilberstein, Shlita, relates the story of Reuven and Shimon (fictitious names), who were the best of friends. They both took an accounting course and completed it successfully. Reuven immediately landed a job at a company and did well there over the years. At one point, the company was in the market to fill another accounting position. Reuven mentioned the name of his good friend, who eventually impressed his boss so much that he was hired. Years went by with Reuven and Shimon growing in stature at the company. When the position of director opened up, they both submitted their resumes – since such a prestigious position would help ease the financial challenges each one had endured as their individual families grew. Indeed, the director's position paid over three times what they were presently earning. Since Reuven had seniority, he was certain that he would be selected for the position. How shocked and dismayed he was when Shimon was picked for the position over him. The dismay soon turned to anger – first at management, and then at Shimon, who, through no fault of his own, had become his competitor. Reuven was upset, but he internalized his feelings. He could have lashed out, but he kept it to himself. Nights went by that he did not sleep. Many a dinner with his wife and children was disrupted by these negative internal feelings, but, to the best that he was able, he shored up his faith in Hashem, trusting that eventually things would smooth themselves out. After all, whatever comes from Hashem has to be good. We might not see it right away, but, eventually, it all comes together. Time does not stop for anyone. Reuven's

children grew up, and his oldest son was now of marriageable age. He had an enviable reputation both as a scholar and a yarei Shomayim, G-d-fearing. A shadchan, marriage broker, approached Reuven and suggested a shidduch with an outstanding young woman, whose reputation appeared to be a perfect fit. The shadchan added that he had taken the liberty of mentioning the boy's name to the girl's family, and they were very receptive, to the point that they are prepared to give the "couple" a four-room apartment in Bnei Brak. Reuven seemed fine about the whole thing until he enquired regarding the girl's family. When he heard that it was none other than his old friend, Shimon, he was floored. The shadchan reiterated that the girl's father was ready to give his entire savings to have such a fine young man as a son-in-law. A few weeks later Reuven and Shimon – once best friends – now celebrated the engagement of their children. Now, let us ask ourselves: What would have happened had Reuven lost his cool and lashed out against Shimon when he was appointed director of the firm? Both Reuven and Shimon would have lost out, since the shidduch probably would not have materialized. Patience, forbearance, silence in the knowledge that we are all part of Hashem's Divine Plan proved determinative. Who understands the inspired life of a boy growing up in a home knowing that his father accepts Divine decree with complete equanimity?

---

from: torahweb@torahweb.org to: weeklydt@torahweb.org date: Wed, Jan 24, 2018 at 8:07 PM

**Rabbi Daniel Stein  
Saved by Sacrifice**

The Torah declares twice with regards to the development of Moshe that he grew up and became a gadol. The pasuk initially states, "The child grew up, and she brought him to Pharaoh's daughter and he became like her son" (Shemos 2:10), and then again, "Now it came to pass in those days that Moshe grew up and went out to his brothers and looked at their burdens" (Shemos 2:11). The Ramban explains that this description is repeated in order to indicate that Moshe achieved not only physical maturity, but spiritual maturity as well. It would seem that the definition of spiritual maturity is when one is able to see the burdens of others and identify with their pain. However, the pasuk continues, "he saw an Egyptian man striking a Jewish man of his brothers. He turned this way and that way, and he saw that there was no man, so he struck the Egyptian and hid him in the sand" (Shemos 2:11-12). Moshe not only empathized with others, he also jeopardized his own anonymity and security in order to save the life of someone else. This implies that the height of spiritual gadlus and maturity is when one is willing to sacrifice from themselves for others. In fact, Rashi (Avos 5:21) claims that the age of spiritual maturity for boys, bar mitzvah, is derived from Levi, who at the age of thirteen was considered a "man" (Breishis 34:25), because he was ready to pick up a sword and endanger his own safety in order to defend his sister Dinah.

As a result of their willingness to sacrifice for others, Levi, and specifically Moshe, were worthy of becoming the future teachers and leaders of the Jewish people. In Parshas Vayechi, Yaakov blessed Levi, "I will separate them throughout Yaakov, and I will scatter them throughout Yisrael" (Breishis 49:7). Rashi explains that the tribe of Levi had to be spread and sent throughout all of Eretz Yisrael because their primary duty would be to teach Torah to the entirety of the Jewish people. Rav Yaakov Kamenetsky (Emes L'Yaakov) adds that it was specifically Levi who was chosen for this mission, because every rebbi and teacher of Torah, must be able to sacrifice from themselves for their students and the community. When Levi took up arms to defend Dinah, he demonstrated the capacity to sacrifice for others, making his descendants uniquely suitable for the role of teachers and leaders within the community. Similarly, in Parshas Vayigash (Breishis 46:28), Yaakov sent Yehudah ahead of the rest of the caravan to establish a beis medrash, a house of Torah study in Goshen. Rabbi Alexander Zusia Friedman (Avnei Azel) claims that Yehudah was singled out for this task

because he pledged to preserve the welfare of Binyamin at great personal expense and peril. Yehudah's mindset of self-sacrifice and mutual responsibility is necessary when inaugurating a school of Torah study.

It is for this reason that Yocheved and Miriam who endangered their own well-being in order to save the lives of Jewish babies were rewarded by Hashem with "houses", as the pasuk states "He made houses for them" (Shemos 1:21). The Gemara (Sotah 11b) clarifies that the founders of the "houses" of religious leadership and royalty, Kehunah, Leviah, and Malchus, would be descendants of Yocheved and Miriam. Interestingly, it was Bilaam who advised Pharaoh to drown the Jewish babies (Sotah 11a and Shemos Rabbah 1:9), and according to Tosfos (Brochos 7a) Bilaam was accustomed to cursing the Jewish people daily by uttering the word "kalem", "annihilate them." Therefore, it is not surprising that Yocheved and Miriam, who thwarted the despicable plan of Bilaam, which was presumably triggered by the familiar formula of "kalem," should be rewarded with the houses of Kehunah, Leviah, and Malchus whose acronym is also "KaLeM." However, on a conceptual level as well, this was an appropriate reward for Yocheved and Miriam, and commensurate with their contribution. Religious leadership and royalty demand that one be prepared to sacrifice from themselves for others. Therefore, in recognition of their act of selflessness on behalf of the Jewish people, they rightfully deserved to be the patriarchs and paradigm for all future Jewish leaders.

In addition, even one act of self-sacrifice on behalf of others, can often outweigh and eclipse a host of other faults and transgressions. According to many meforshim, Dasan and Aviram from the tribe of Reuven were a pair of devious instigators. From their time together in Mitzrayim, throughout their travels in the desert, they consistently plotted against Moshe. Rashi (Shemos 2:15) writes that it was Dasan and Aviram who informed on Moshe to the authorities, requiring him to flee to Midian. Later, Rashi (Shemos 16:20) identifies the two individuals who defied the instructions of Moshe and left the manna over until the morning as Dasan and Aviram. Rabbeinu Bachya claims that it was Dasan and Aviram who proclaimed, "Let us appoint a leader and return to Egypt" (Bamidbar 14:4). The Torah (Bamidbar 16:1) includes Dasan and Aviram as central figures in the attempted coup and rebellion of Korach. Finally, in Parshas Beshalach, the pasuk (Shemos 14:3) implies that there were two Jews who did not escape with Bnei Yisrael but elected to stay behind with Pharaoh, and the Targum Yonasan identifies these two individuals as Dasan and Aviram.

If Dasan and Aviram were such detestable people who elected to stay behind in Mitzrayim, how did they survive the plague of darkness? Rashi (Shemos 10:22) claims that Hashem punished the Egyptians with darkness in order to conceal the demise of many Jews who were either not worthy of being redeemed or did not want to leave. If Dasan and Aviram were wicked and preferred to stay behind in Mitzrayim why were they not killed during the plague of darkness as well? Moreover, if they chose to stay behind how could they be present throughout Bnei Yisrael's travels in the desert? Rabbi Yehoshua Leib Diskin (Maharil Diskin) explains, that despite all of their sins and transgressions, Dasan and Aviram were spared during the plague of darkness because they sacrificed on behalf of the Jewish people. In Parshas Shemos (5:14) the Torah tells of Jewish overseers who were beaten for not coercing the Jewish slaves to meet the stipulated quota of bricks. According to the Medrash (Shemos Rabbah 5:20), these Jewish overseers were none other than Dasan and Aviram. The beatings they endured in order to protect their fellow Jews from cruel and sadistic quotas, overshadowed all of their other offenses and indiscretions and shielded them during the plague of darkness.

Similarly, Rabbi Chaim of Chernowitz (Be'er Mayim Chaim) suggests that Dasan and Aviram were reunited with the rest of Bnei Yisrael in the desert, even though they initially chose to remain behind in Mitzrayim, because Hashem split the Yam Suf a second time, just for them! The Torah states "Then the children of Yisrael came into the midst of the sea on dry land, and the waters were to them as a wall from their right and from their left"

(Shemos 14:22). After the Egyptians pursued Bnei Yisrael into the sea and the waters came crashing down upon them, the Torah states again, "the children of Yisrael went on dry land in the midst of the sea, and the water was to them like a wall from their right and from their left" (Shemos 14:29). The Be'er Mayim Chaim explains that Hashem split the waters of the Yam Suf twice; the first time on behalf of the majority of Bnei Yisrael who initially chose to leave, and the second time for the sole benefit of Dasan and Aviram. Despite all of the damage caused by Dasan and Aviram, Hashem rescued them in dramatic fashion only because they had withstood suffering on behalf of others. In the merit of a renewed sense of obligation to the community, and a profound sense of appreciation to those who have sacrificed on our behalf and on behalf of others, may we all be blessed with permanent "houses" of Torah scholarship and leadership, and may Hashem redeem us once again with the coming of the Moshiach speedily in our days!  
More divrei Torah from Rabbi Stein  
More divrei Torah on Parshas Beshalach  
Copyright © 2018 by TorahWeb.org. All rights reserved. --  
Weeklydt mailing list [Weeklydt@torahweb.org](mailto:Weeklydt@torahweb.org)  
[http://mail.torahweb.org/mailman/listinfo/weeklydt\\_torahweb.org](http://mail.torahweb.org/mailman/listinfo/weeklydt_torahweb.org)

from: Esplanade Capital [jeisenstadt@esplanadecap.com](mailto:jeisenstadt@esplanadecap.com)  
date: Thu, Jan 25, 2018 at 1:35 PM  
subject: Regarding Rabbi Reisman's Chumash Shiur

**Rabbi Yisroel Reisman - Parshas Beshalach 5769**

Rebbi started the Shiur with 3 questions. The first one is, it says in 13:18 (הַמְּשִׁימִים: אֵין הַמּוֹשִׁימִים) Chamushim Olu, that the Bnei Yisrael came up armed when they left Mitzrayim as Rashi says (אֵלָּא מְזוּיָיִנִים). If they took arms, they obviously planned on using it. So why didn't they use it when Mitzrayim was Rodfim Acharayhem as it says in 14:8 (וַיִּרְדְּפוּ, אַחֲרָיֶיךָ בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל), and they were all in a panic?

The second question is, we learn this week about the Man. Since there was a double portion on Friday for Shabbos, we have Lechem Mishneh as a Zeicher on Shabbos. If a Yom Tov in the Midbar fell out on a Friday, then there was 3 portions of Man on Thursday as Tosafos in Maseches Beitzah on 2b says (וְהָיָה בַּיּוֹם הַשֵּׁנִי וְגו'. פֶּרֶשׁ"י וְע"כּ בָּא לְאֶשְׁמוּעֵינָא דַּאֲפִילוּ הִכְנָה בִּידֵי שְׂמִים) (ב) ביצה אסורה דאי משום הכנה בידי אדם כלומר שיאפו ויבשלו מבעוד יום הא בהדיא כתיב את אשר תאפו אפו אלא הזמנה בפה קאמר ואין ל"ט מכן לשבת כו' ואין שבת מכן ל"ט מ"ש דכיון דאין ל"ט מכן לשבת כ"ש דאין שבת מכן ל"ט והקשה רש"י אם כן ביצה שנולדה באחד בשבת או לאחר ל"ט תתסר מ"ש דשבת ו"ט לא מכינין אהדין כ"ש דלא מכינין אחול ותירק דלגבי סעודת חול לא צריך הכנה דאין סעודת חול חשובה אך תימה הוואיל והכנה דאורייתא היאך אופין ומבשלין מ"ט לשבת וכו' ע"י ערובי תבשילין וכי אתי תקנתא דרבנן וליעקר הכנה דאורייתא ונראה ליישב דרבה גופיה אזיל לטעמיה דאית ליה הוואיל ואי מקלעי אורחין חזי ליה השתא נמי חזי ליה ואפילו לדין ניחא דכל דבר אפוי ומבושל לא שייך ביה הכנה שאינו מחוסר רק תקון בעלמא דמעיקרא הוה חזי ליה רק גבי ביצה שהוא דבר חדש שלא היתה בעולם ולא היתה ראויה כלל מעיקרא (ולאפות ולבשל תקוני מלתא בעלמא) תימה דכאן משמע שהמן לא היה יורד ב"ט כדפי' רש"י הששי הראוי להכנה וזהו בחול והא אמר ויברך ויקדש ברכו במן וקדשו במן שבשבת לא היה יורד מן אבל ב"ט היה יורד ו"ל מדרשים חלוקין כדאיתא במדרש (מכילתא פ' בשלח) שבת לא יהיה (שמות טז) לרבות יום הכפורים לא יהיה בו לרבות ל"ט שלא היה יורד בהן מן וע"ל דאפי' היה יורד ב"ט מ"מ ב"ט שחל להיות בע"ש לא היה יורד מדכתיב קרא בו ביום הששי ולא כתיב ששי משמע הששי להיות (המיוחד שהוא ראוי להכנה ולא בששי שהוא י"ט Why don't we have a zecher to this as well, when a Yom Tov falls out on a Friday and take 3 Chalakim of Lechem? An answer was not offered, however, we are pointed to the Meshech Chochmoh who deals with this.

The third question is, we know that Moshe Rabbeinu took Atzmois Yoisef Imoi as it says in 13:19 (וַיִּקַּח מֹשֶׁה אֶת-עֲצָמוֹת יוֹסֵף, עִמּוֹ) and Rashi points this out (וְהַעֲלִיתֶם אֶת עֲצָמוֹתַי מִזֶּה אֶתְכֶם: לְאַחֲרָיִךְ הַשְּׂבִיעִי כֹן, לְמַדּוּנוּ שְׁאֵף עֲצָמוֹת כָּל הַשְּׂבִיעִים הַעֲלוּ) (עמ"הם, שנאמר אתכם Moshe took Yosef's. If so, then it is shver, why did Moshe take Atzmois Yosef more than any other Atzmois, and what was the Gadlus of Moische if every Shevet took Atzmois?

Rabbi Yeshoshua Leib Diskin asked this question. He answers that Moshe was afraid that Menashe and Ephraim would fight over who should take it, so he took it. Maybe we can say, the other Atzmois were buried, so it wasn't hard from them to take it, however, Yoisef's Atzmois that was in the Nilus was a big thing. That is why it says that Moshe was Oisek with Yoisef's Atzmois and Klal Yisrael was Oisek with Bizas Mitzrayim. Maybe this is what is so special about it, however, it doesn't fit so well with what is the Gadlus of Moshe Rabbeinu if every other Sheivet also took Atzamos.

The Meshech Chochmoh on this week's Parsha comes to answer the question of why the Yam Suf didn't want to split because Halalu Oivdei Avodah Zarah V'Halalu Oivdei Avodah Zarah, however, the other Nisim for example the Makkoh of Tzefardaiya did happen in Mitzrayim without any glitches. Why wasn't there the same Tayna of Halalu Oivdei Avodah Zarah V'Halalu Oivdei Avodah Zarah?

The Meshech Chochmoh klers, which Aveirah is a more Chomordik Aveirah, an Aveirah Maisi like Chillul Shabbos or Avodah Zarah, or an Aveirah that is a Kilkul Hamiddos like Sinah, Chemdah, Loshon Horah, Machloikes (which are faults in the Midda of a person)?

We seem to find a contradiction in Chazal. On the one hand, Yehoraig V'al Ya'avoir is only on 3 Aveirois Maisiyois. It seems Maisiyois Aveirois are worse than Aveirois that are Kilkul Hammidois. On the other hand, we see repeatedly that when Aveirois that are Kilkul Hammiddos like Gaivoh are discussed, Hashem says Ani V'hu Einon Yechoilin Ladur B'oilom Echad. So the language is much harsher for an Aveira that is Kilkul Hamiddos than it is for an Aveirah that is done with a Maiseh.

The Meshech Chochmoh's Yesoid is that there is a difference between a Din Hatzibbur and a Din Hayachid. Every Yachid has his battle with certain Middos. Some people have a problem with Atzlus and some don't. Mitzvois Maisiyois are much more Chomer for an individual because you have to draw the line by certain Aveirois. Like for example Chillul Shabbos is K'neged Kol Hatoirah Kuloi. For a Yochid being Oiver an Aveira Maisiois is worse than being Oiver an Aveira that is Kilkul Hamiddos. However, for a Tzibbur that is being Oiver an Aveira that is Kilkul Hamiddos is much worse, for example a whole city that are Ba'al Lashon Hora or Ba'al Machloikes. So when you look at a Tzibbur, Kilkul Hamiddos is far worse.

We find that the 2 main Aveirois in the Midbar, were the Eigel and the Meraglim. The Eigel was an Aveira Maisi and the Meraglim was Kilkul Hamiddo. As a result of the Eigel, they were still able to go to Eretz Yisrael. After the Meraglim, they were not able to go to Eretz Yisrael. The reason is because the Aveira was worse because of the Kilkul Hamiddo. The same thing is found regarding the Batei Mikdashois that were Choriv. The Bayis Rishon was Chareiv because of the big 3 Aveirois. That Galus was for only 70 years. Bayis Sheini which was destroyed because of Sinas Chinum which is far worse, has not been rebuilt yet. We find that even when Yidden do Aveirois, Hashem is Shoicen Imi, however regarding Lashon Hora or Machloikes, Hashem will not stay with us.

In Mitzrayim, we find that Klal Yisrael was Oihavim Zeh Es Zeh. Chazal praise the Yidden in Mitzrayim. There was no Kilkul Hamiddos in Mitzrayim. So there was no Halalu Oivdei Avodah Zarah V'Halalu Oivdei Avodah Zarah because the same way Kilkul Hamiddos is terrible for a Tzibbur, so to when there are Middos Toivois it is a saving grace for the Tzibbur. When they got to the Yam, they began to argue with some saying we should go back to Mitzrayim. Once they became embroiled in Machloikes the protection left them and the Taynois of Halalu Oivdei Avodah Zarah V'Halalu Oivdei Avodah Zarah came back as well.

This might be the reason it is special to perform a Mitzvah or learn a Masechtah that is often time not done or learned. On a Yochid it doesn't matter much, however, for a Tzibbur not to for example have a Chevrah Kaddisha or a Bikkur Choilim it is a problem.

The Ohr Somaich in the beginning of Hilchos Talmud Torah asks why is there no individual Mitzvois for every Middah Toivah. Why isn't there a Lav for getting angry or jealousy. For an individual you can't be Toivea for

Middos, because some people are easy to anger and some are harder to anger. Some people find it hard to get up in the morning and for others that is not their Yeitzer Hora. So it is not Shava L'chol Nefesh. Mitzvois Maiseyois are Shava L'chol Nefesh. So when you attach yourself to a community, the Kilkul of the community of the Tzibbur that is in a Machloikes should not be underestimated.

The following Yesod is something Rav Pam used to say over in his Schmuzzin. Chazal say the Man was able to be Mevarer a Mitziyos. Let's say there was a child and it was a Sofeik if it was a seven month child from the second husband or a nine month child from the first husband, or an Eved Canani, where there was a dispute between 2 families as to who owned him. What would happen is, in the morning the Man would fall, and in whichever person's Rishus the extra portion of Man would fall for the child or the Eved, that would be Mevarer the S'feika of whose child it was or who's Eved it was. The Kasha is, Torah Lav Bashomayim Hu so how can it be that the Man was Mevarer a Halachah?

There is a Gemara in Maseches Yoma 75a (in the 9<sup>th</sup> wide line) ( והמן כזרע ) גר לבן (וטעמו) אמר ר' אסי עגול כנידא ולבן כמרגלית (תניא נמי הכי) גר שדומה לזרע פשתן בגבעולין אחרים אומרים גר שדומה להגדה שמושכת לבו של אדם כמים תניא אידך גר שמגיד להם לישראל אי בן תשעה לראשון ואי בן שבעה לאחרון לבן שמלבין עונותיהן של ישראל תניא ר' יוסי אומר כשם שהנביא היה מגיד להם לישראל מה שבחורין ומה שבסדקין כך המן מגיד להם לישראל מה שבחורין ומה שבסדקין כיצד שנים שבאו לפני משה לדין זה אומר עבדי נגבת וזה אומר אתה מכרתו לי אמר להם משה לבוקר משפט למחר אם נמצא עומרו בבית רבו ראשון בידוע שזה נגבו אם נמצא עומרו בבית רבו שני בידוע שזה מכרו לו וכן איש ואשה שבאו לפני משה לדין זה אומר היא סרחה עלי והיא אומרת הוא סרח עלי אמר להם משה לבקר משפט למחר אם נמצא עומרה בבית בעלה בידוע שהיא סרחה עליו נמצא עומרה בבית אביה בידוע (שהוא סרח עליה) that says that the Man was Mevarer these S'feikos. The Tosafos Yoim Kipurim (a sefer on Yoma) asks this Kasha.

He answers what appears to be a Doichek Teretz, that the P'sak Din came from Moishe's Bais Din. If people would have Taynois, Moishe would show them the Man as a Raya to his P'sak. The Maratz Chiyois has a more Yesoidoisika Teretz. Rav Elchonon in the second Cheileik of the Koivetz Shiurim says this Teretz as well. Rav Pam would also say it over in the name of the Chidah. Toirah Lav Bashomayim Hi means Shamayim can't be Mevarer a Halachah, a Din can't be Mevarer Bashomayim. However, a Shailla in a physical fact (a Mitziyos) of course Shamayim can be Mevarer that, and therefore, the Man can be Mevarer it because it was a Shailla in fact (whose child or Eved is it).

The Ponovitche Rav in Sefer Moshchas Shemen, Cheilek Bais says, the Gemara many times says Teiku, which Pashut P'shat means let it stand. The Toisafos Yom Tov brings that Teiku means Tishbi Yetareitz Kushiyois V'abayois. Meaning Eliyahu Hanavi will Pasken the Halacha. The Gemara says in Eilu Mitziyos, and also in the first Perek by Manah Shlishi that Yhei Munach Ad Sheyavaoi Eliyahu. Why is it that in one place we say Teiku and in the other place we say Ad Sheyavoi Eliyahu? Why do we change it? Why do we call him Tishbi there and Eliyahu here?

The answer is based on the Chasam Soifer in Cheilek Vav Siman Tzadik Ches. The Chasam Soifer says, is Eliyahu Hanavi who never died Michuyav in Mitzvois? The Gemara says that when he comes to tell us that Moshich is coming, he will not come on Shabbos because he can't travel, meaning he is Michuyav in Techumin. The Chasam Soifer asks, what happens when there are 2 Brisim on Shabbos, how does he travel then?

The Chasam Soifer answers, when Eliyahu comes down as a Guf, he is Michuyav in Mitzvois. By a Bris, Eliyahu comes down as a Malach, and therefore, is not Michuyav in Mitzvois. If so, then when Eliyahu comes to Pasken Halachos, if he comes in a Guf he can Pasken Halachos, however, if he comes as a Malach then Toirah Lav Bashomayim Hu and he wouldn't be able to Pasken Halachos.

When Eliyahu comes to be Mevarer a Mitziyos, Eliyahu will just say who dropped it. So then we say, Ad Sheyavoi Eliyahu. Even a Malach could be Mevarer. However, to be Mevarer a Halacha as is implied by the word Tishbi meaning that he lives in the town of Tishbi, he must come in a Guf to Pasken a Halacha.

---

fw from hamelaket@gmail.com from: Destiny Foundation/Rabbi Berel Wein <info@jewishdestiny.com> reply-to: info@jewishdestiny.com subject: **Weekly Parsha from Rabbi Berel Wein**  
Rabbi Wein's Weekly Blog BSHALACH

The Pharaoh of Egypt has finally relented and freed the Jewish people from their centuries of slavery and persecution and allowed them to leave his country. Even though he was forced to do so by continuing plagues and disasters that fell upon him and his people, nevertheless freeing the Jewish people was a noble thing that he accomplished. Yet, as is the want of all tyrants and evil people, he does not view his behavior and action as being noble and praiseworthy. Instead he is convinced that he has made a grave error and in order to correct that mistake, immobilizes his army in order to force the Jewish people back into Egyptian slavery. He has second thoughts about what he did and is determined to revert once again to tyranny and murder in order to "correct" his previous error. It is this process of regretting the good and repeating the evil that will prove to be his ultimate undoing. In Judaism, second thoughts and regret are usually reserved for the process of repentance for misdeeds and earlier mistakes and sins. The first step in the process of repentance is experiencing full and sincere regret at having been guilty of wrong behavior and forbidden actions. Second thoughts are reserved for good and for improvement, not for backtracking and sorrow over what one has done in his or her life. The reason that regret can transform previous wrongs into positive action and serve as a token of forgiveness for that action is that second thoughts, the true reflection of what we believe and feel, reveal our true intent and our inner desires. If we are able to regret evil that means that we are determined to pursue good and therefore the Lord will accept, so to speak, our wishes and convert the previous fall into a positive step, in the direction of obedience and holiness.

The Pharaoh's second thoughts reveal his true nature and what he felt and desired. He never intended to release the Jewish people from bondage and only did so under the pressure of the death of the firstborn in the Egyptian nation. However, once that initial shock was removed and his true nature began to exhibit itself, Pharaoh pursues the children of Israel and is determined to destroy them and bring them back into Egyptian slavery. The Torah teaches us here that our second thoughts in life reveal to a great extent who we are and what path in life we wish to pursue. Many times we are forced to do good things because of social pressures and other unholy motives. When these disappear so does our desire to do good. And the same is true in the opposite vein. Sometimes we are forced to do things that are really repugnant to us because of outside pressures that we cannot control. But we regret having done so because our inner self only desires good and a sincere attachment to God and His Torah. So, to a great extent, it is our second thoughts that reveal our true selves and reveal to all who we really are. Shabbat shalom Rabbi Berel Wein

---

from: Rabbi Mordechai Kamenetzky <rmk@torah.org> to: drasha@torah.org date: Wed, Jan 24, 2018 at 10:58 AM subject: Drasha - Input...Output

**Drasha**  
**By Rabbi Mordechai Kamenetzky**  
Parshas Beshalach  
**Input...Output**

The sea had split. The enemy was drowned. And now the problems began. The newly liberated nation was stranded in a scorching desert facing an unending landscape of uncertainties. Taskmasters no longer responded to their cries — Hashem did. He responded with protection and shelter on every level. But the Jews were still not satisfied. They were hungry. "If only we had died.. in the land of Egypt. Why did you liberate us to die in the desert?" they cried to Moshe. (Exodus 16:3 )

Hashem responds with a most miraculous and equally mysterious celestial gift. Food fell from the heavens, but the people accepted it with piqued curiosity. Indeed, the dew-covered matter satiated their hunger, but they were not sure what exactly it was. "Each man said to his friend, manna ! For they did not know what it was." (Exodus 16:14) The commentaries explain that the word manna is a Hebrew-Egyptian form of the word "what."

At first, the Torah only discusses the physical attributes of the manna : "it was like a thin frost on the earth." The Torah continues to tell us that on Shabbos the manna did not fall. A double portion fell on Friday — the extra portion was allotted for Shabbos. In referring to the manna of Shabbos the Torah tells us, "the children of Israel named it manna , and it tasted like a cake fried in honey." Later, however, the Torah describes the manna 's taste differently: "it tasted like dough kneaded with oil." (Numbers 11:8) Why does the Torah wait to describe the manna 's taste until Shabbos? Also, when did it taste sweet and when did it only taste like oily dough?

Another question is before Shabbos people asked, "what is it?" On Shabbos they named the miraculous food — "It is 'what'" (manna ). Why did the Jews wait until Shabbos to describe concretely the miraculous edible with an official title manna — the 'what' food?

In the town of Lomza there was a group of woodcutters hired by the townsfolk to cut down trees for firewood. The strong laborers swung their axes and hit the trees all while shouting a great cry HAH with each blow. The timing had to be flawless. If the cry HAH came a split second early or, a second after the blade hit the tree, it would be a worthless shout that would not aid the lumberjacks at all.

Each year, Zelig the meshugener (crazy), a once-successful businessman who had lost his mind together with the loss of a young daughter, accompanied the woodcutters on their quest. He stood in the background and precisely as the ax hit the tree he, too, shouted on the top of his lungs HAH!

When it was time to get paid, the deranged Zelig also stood in line. "I deserve some silver coins!" he exclaimed. "After all without the chopping would not be as effective!"

The case was brought before the Chief Rabbi of Lomza who looked at the five lumberjacks and then at the meshugener. "Listen carefully, Zelig," said the Rabbi. He then took 10 silver pieces in his hand and jingled them loudly. They made a loud clanging noise. Then he gave each woodsman two silver pieces. He turned to Zelig and smiled. "The men who gave the labor get the coins, and, Zelig, you who gave the sound, get the sound of the coins!"

Hashem in His infinite wisdom began our lessons in living through our daily fare. The Talmud states that the taste of the manna was integrally linked with the taster's thoughts. If one thought of steak the manna tasted like steak: if one thought of borscht, the manna tasted like borscht. In fact, the Chofetz Chaim was once asked, "what happens if you think nothing?" He answered very profoundly: "If one thinks of nothing, then one tastes nothing!"

During the week the Jews had the manna but did not realize its great potential. The Malbim explains that is why it only tasted like oily dough. But on Shabbos, a day filled with sweet relaxation, heavenly thoughts filled the minds of the nation. And those sweet thoughts produced sweet tastes!

The Talmud also says that to small children the manna tasted like dough, but to scholars it tasted like honey. For if one thinks of honey, he tastes honey. When one thinks blandly, he has bland taste.

Perhaps on Shabbos the Jewish People realized the important lesson of life. The questions we face should not be addressed as eternally mysterious. We can not face the unknown with the question, "what is it?" Rather, we can define our destiny and challenge our uncertainties. "It is what!" What you put into it is exactly what you take out! Life presents us many opportunities. We can approach those moments with lofty thoughts and see, smell, and taste its sweetness. Or we can see nothing and taste nothing. We can chop hard and reap the benefits, or we can kvetch and enjoy only the echoes of our emptiness.

Dedicated by Mr. and Mrs. Jules Beck in memory of Mr. Beck's father Ahron ben Yaakov Naftali on his Yahrzeit — 10 Shevat Text Copyright © 1996 by Rabbi M. Kamenetzky and Project Genesis, Inc.

The author is the Dean of the Yeshiva of South Shore. Drasha is the e-mail edition of FaxHomily, a weekly torah facsimile on the weekly portion which is sponsored by The Henry and Myrtle Hirsch Foundation

---

from: Mordechai Tzion toratravaviner@yahoo.com [ravaviner] <ravaviner-noreply@yahoogroups.com> to: ravaviner@yahoogroups.com date: Tue, Jan 23, 2018 at 2:06 PM subject: [ravaviner] Short & Sweet - Text Message Q&A #276 [1 Attachment]

Yeshivat Ateret Yerushalayim

**From the teachings of the Rosh Yeshiva**

**Ha-Rav Shlomo Aviner Shlit"a** Text Message Q&A #276 Ask Rav Aviner: toratravaviner@yahoo.com

Prepared by Rabbi Mordechai Tzion

Visit our blog: www.ravaviner.com Ha-Rav answers hundreds of text message questions a day. Here's a sample:

**Paying to Enter a Nature Reserve**

Q: Is it permissible to enter a Nature Reserve without paying? A: No. They invest in taking care of it and one must pay.

Q: But it is in Eretz Yisrael? A: Your house is also in Eretz Yisrael, but since you bought it, you establish the rules.

**Pregnancy at an Older Age**

Q: I am a woman age 40. My husband and I want to have another child, but the doctor warned us of the potential dangers of having a child with a birth defect. What should we do? A: You should try to become pregnant. 1. Birth defects are rare. 2. If you do become pregnant, you should have all of the prenatal tests. If there is a problem, ask a Rav if it is permissible to end the pregnancy (Shut She'eilat Shlomo 2:312. Ha-Rav Eliezer Melamed, Rabbi of Har Beracha, in his book "Peninei Halachah" [Volume 3 p. 221] writes, "A few years ago Ha-Rav Aviner published a responsum in which he encourages older women to test their amniotic fluid, so that if their fetus is sick, they can take counsel with a rabbi and decide if they will follow the strict or lenient position [regarding abortion]. This responsum was hung in various hospitals, and in its merit, a not insignificant number of women, approximately in their forties, who had earlier feared becoming pregnant, lest they gave birth to a sick baby, dared to become pregnant, and may there be more like this in Israel.").

**Speaking to Rabbis in Third Person**

Q: Why do we speak to Rabbis in the third person while we recite blessings and Daven to Hashem in the second person? A: It is all dependent on the custom of the place and the time.

**Love of Photography**

Q: I have a love of photography. Can I utilize it to help in the service of Hashem? A: Yes. By photographing images which awaken pure emotions. See the introduction of Maran Ha-Rav Kook to Shir Ha-Shirim at the beginning of his commentary on the Siddur "Olat Re'eiyah" Volume 2.

**Bug Extermination**

Q: Is it permissible to have a bug exterminator come to our house, or should we be strict because of "Tza'ar Ba'alei Chaim" - causing undue pain to animals? A: It is permissible. Killing animals is not included in the prohibition of "Tza'ar Ba'alei Chaim" - causing undue pain to animals (Ma'aseh Ish vol. 7, p. 163. Shut Teshuvot Ve-Hanhagot 2:726. And Ha-Rav Moshe Feinstein writes in Shut Igrot Moshe Choshen Mishpat 2:47 that if it is possible, it is proper not to kill bugs and mice with your hands but with a trap. His proof is from the Wayward City - a place in which a majority of citizens worship idols and therefore has to be destroyed [Devarim 13:13-19]. Hashem promises that if the Wayward City is destroyed, He will give you mercy. The Or Ha-Chaim Ha-Kadosh explains [verse 18] that this promise is made because destroying and killing causes one to be cruel. It is therefore better not to kill bugs and mice with one's bare-hands. But this is a stricture).

**Removing Corpse from Temple Mount**



Q: Is it permissible to enter the Temple Mount in order to remove the corpse of a non-Jew? A: Yes, since it makes the Temple Mount impure. It is preferable to have a Jew do so. Furthermore, he should first immerse in the Mikveh, wear the minimal amount of clothing possible, bring the minimal amount of equipment possible and go without wear shoes. He should enter the shortest way possible and remain there for the shortest amount of time possible.

Taking a Baby Out During First 40 Days

Q: Why is it forbidden to take a baby out during the first 40 days? A: It is permissible (See Ha-Rav Ovadiah Yosef in Ma'ayan Omer Volume 12 1:10).

One should obviously make sure the baby is healthy (and see Segulot Raboteinu p. 371).

Damage to Parked Car

Q: Someone parked in an inappropriate and forbidden manner, and as a result, I hit the car. Who is obligated to pay the damages? A: Nevertheless, the one who is driving has to take care. He is obligated to pay.

Elite Army Unit and Arrogance

Q: I serve in one of the most respected elite army units in Tzahal. What can I do so I don't become arrogant? A: 1. Don't tell people what unite you serve in. 2. Learn Mesilat Yesharim on humility, Chapters 11-22-23. Also Igeret Ha-Ramban. 3. We are small creatures who do not need guidance no to be arrogant, after all we are not worth much. See Mesilat Yesharim, Chapter 22. Special thank you to Orly Tzion for editing the Ateret Yerushalayim Parashah Sheet

Posted by: Mordechai Tzion <toratravaviner@yahoo.com>

---

fw from hamelaket@gmail.com

from: Rabbi Yirmiyohu Kaganoff <ymkaganoff@gmail.com>

to: kaganoff-a@googlegroups.com

According to some commentaries, the source for some of the laws regarding the prohibition of carrying on Shabbos is in this week's parsha. This certainly provides an excellent reason to discuss:

### Carrying Him Home

By Rabbi Yirmiyohu Kaganoff

Question #1: My son "We were returning home in an area without an eruv, when my two-year old decided that he was walking no farther. Is there a halachically acceptable way for me to carry him home?"

Question #2: Public safety "There is something dangerous lying in the street. May we remove it on Shabbos before anyone gets hurt?"

Question #3: Tefillin "While taking a Shabbos stroll through the woods outside my town, I discovered some pairs of tefillin lying on the ground! Presumably, these were taken by thieves who broke into a shul, but subsequently abandoned them. Is there any way that I can bring these tefillin back to town?"

Answer: All of the above questions involve carrying something on Shabbos in a place where there is no eruv. Our topic will be whether there is a halachic basis to permit carrying under these circumstances. As always, the purpose of this article is not to render decisions for our readers, but to introduce background and have the reader refer any related questions to his or her rav or posek. But first, some basic background.

What is "carrying"? As we know, one of the 39 melachos of Shabbos is hotza'ah, which is violated by transporting an item from a reshus harabim, a public thoroughfare or open marketplace, into a reshus hayachid, an enclosed area, or, vice versa, by transporting from a reshus hayachid to a reshus harabim. The melacha also includes carrying or otherwise transporting items four amos (about seven feet) or more within a reshus harabim (Shabbos 96b; Tosafos, Shabbos 2a s.v. pashat). With reference to the laws of Shabbos, the terms reshus hayachid and reshus harabim are not determined by ownership, but by the extent to which the area is enclosed and how it is used. An area could be either publicly-owned or ownerless and still qualify as a reshus hayachid; an area owned by an individual might still qualify as a reshus harabim.

Akirah and hanacha Violating this melacha min haTorah is defined by three steps.

(1) The first step is called akirah, literally, uprooting, which means removing the item from a place where it is at rest. The item must be at rest before the melacha is performed. "At rest" does not have to mean that it is on the ground – it could be resting on an item or piece of furniture, and, sometimes could even be "resting" in someone's hand. Removing it from its "place of rest" qualifies as an akirah.

(2) The second step is the actual movement of the item, as described above.

(3) The final step is called hanacha, placing, which means that when the melacha activity is completed, the item is again "at rest."

Let me use the first Mishnah of Maseches Shabbos for examples that explain these rules: One person, whom we will call "the outsider," is standing in a reshus harabim, picks up an item that is located in the reshus harabim and passes it to someone in a reshus hayachid, "the insider." If the outsider places the item into the hand of the insider, then the outsider has violated Shabbos – he (1) performed the akirah, (2) transported the item from a reshus harabim into a reshus hayachid and (3) performed the hanacha. Placing the item into the insider's hand is considered hanacha, since the item is now "at rest," and, when it reaches its resting point, it is in the reshus hayachid.

However, if the outsider merely extends his hand containing the item into the reshus hayachid, and the insider takes the item from the outsider's hand, neither of them has performed a Torah violation of Shabbos. Although the outsider performed akirah and moved the item into the reshus hayachid (thereby performing steps 1 and 2), he did not complete the hanacha (step 3). Since the item was still in the suspended hand of the outsider, who himself was standing in a different area, it is not considered to be at rest in a reshus hayachid.

In this situation, the Mishnah explains that neither the outsider nor the insider has violated a melacha min haTorah. Nevertheless, both have violated rabbinic prohibitions, because Chazal prohibited performing akirah without hanacha and also prohibited performing hanacha without akirah. In addition, Chazal prohibited carrying something in the reshus harabim without either akirah or hanacha, and transporting something from a reshus hayachid to a reshus harabim, or vice versa, without akirah or hanacha.

Akirah and hanacha both within a reshus harabim Similarly, the Torah's prohibition to carry something or otherwise transport it four amos or more within a reshus harabim is only when there is both an akirah and a hanacha. If one transports it more than four amos, but did not perform both an akirah and a hanacha, the prohibition is only miderabbanan. Thus, if someone picks up an item in a reshus harabim, carries it four amos, but did not stop, and a different person removes it from his hand, neither of them has desecrated Shabbos min haTorah, although both violated rabbinic prohibitions for performing part of the melacha act.

What is a hanacha? Here is another example of a case where no hanacha was performed. Someone picks up a bundle in a reshus harabim, places it on his shoulder, and walks with it more than four amos. At this point, he stops to adjust the bundle. The Gemara (Shabbos 5b) teaches that this is not considered a hanacha, and therefore the person has not desecrated Shabbos min haTorah.

However, if the person carrying the bundle stopped to rest, it is considered hanacha. (We will explain shortly what we mean that he "stopped to rest.") Therefore, if he performed an akirah, carried a bundle more than four amos in a reshus harabim and then stopped to rest, he has performed a melacha, whereas if he stopped simply to rearrange his bundle and then continued on his way, he did not yet perform a melacha.

Less than four amos In addition to the requirements of akirah and hanacha, one violates the melacha of carrying within a reshus harabim only when one transports the item at least four amos. Carrying an item less than four amos, called pachos mei' arba amos, in a reshus harabim does not violate Torah law. Whether this is prohibited by the Sages is the subject of a dispute among tana'im. According to the Rambam, it is permitted even miderabbanan to move an item less than four amos in a reshus harabim, whereas according to the Raavad, this is prohibited miderabbanan, except in extenuating situations.

A lenient hanacha Until now, both akirah and hanacha have been sources of stringency, meaning that they have created a Torah prohibition, and without both of them, one does not violate the melacha of carrying min haTorah. However, there is actually a leniency that can be created by performing a hanacha. Here is the case: Someone transported an item less than four amos through a reshus harabim and then performed a hanacha, thereby completing this act of carrying. He then performs a new akirah and carries the item an additional short distance, but again less than four amos. Although, as we will soon see, it is prohibited to do this on Shabbos, there is no violation min haTorah; each time he carried the item, it was for less than four amos, since the two acts were separated by a hanacha.

Pachos pachos What is the halacha regarding the following scenario: Reuven notices an item in a reshus harabim that he would like to move to a different location, more than four amos from where it currently is. He knows that it is prohibited min haTorah for him to pick it up, move it there, and put it down in its new location, since this constitutes akirah, moving it more than four amos, and hanacha. Instead, Reuven decides to do the following: he will pick up the item, move it less than four amos and put it down. Although he did both an akirah and a hanacha, since he moved the item less than four amos, this does not constitute a Torah violation, and, according to many rishonim, it is permitted lechatchilah. However, moving the item less than four amos does not accomplish what Reuven wants. In order to get the item to where he would like it to be, Reuven performs this process again – that is, he picks it up, moves it less than

four amos, and puts it down again. This type of carrying is called pachos pachos mei' arba amos, meaning that although each time he carries the item he transports it less than four amos, he carries it this way more than one time. Reuven would like to repeat this process until he gets the item where he wants it. Is this permitted?

Indeed, Reuven's plan will avoid desecrating a Torah prohibition of Shabbos, since he has successfully avoided performing melacha. However, Chazal prohibited someone from transporting an item this way out of concern that he may err, even once, and carry the item four amos or more and then perform the hanacha, thereby violating Shabbos min haTorah (Shabbos 153b).

However, the Gemara mentions that, under certain extraordinary circumstances, someone is permitted to transport an item in this manner. For example, someone walking through a reshus harabim discovers a pair of tefillin! He is concerned that, should he leave the tefillin where they are, they will be desecrated. The Gemara rules that, should the finder have no other option, he may transport the tefillin to a secure place via pachos pachos (Eruvin 97b). In other words, in order to avoid the desecration of the tefillin, Chazal relaxed the prohibition of carrying pachos pachos.

Babies and thorns Similarly, the Gemara discusses this in the context of a baby who is outside of an eruv, and permits use of the heter of pachos pachos to transport him to an appropriate place. In yet another example, the Gemara permits removing a thorn from a reshus harabim so that no one gets hurt (Shabbos 42a). Again, in an extenuating situation, Chazal permitted one to carry this way, even though it is usually not permitted.

At this point, we can address a different one of our above questions: "There is something dangerous lying in the street. May we remove it before anyone gets hurt?" The answer is that one may remove it by carrying it less than four amos, stopping, and then repeating, as described above.

Must he sit down? As I explained above, transporting something pachos pachos can be accomplished only when there is a proper hanacha to divide the two carrying acts into two separate halachic activities. What constitutes a proper hanacha in this instance?

There is a dispute between rishonim whether, in this instance, the person transporting the tefillin must sit down, or whether it is sufficient that he stop to rest while remaining standing. Rashi (Avodah Zarah 70a) rules that it is sufficient for someone to stop to rest within four amos of his last stop. He does not explain how long he must rest for it to be considered a hanacha.

There are those who disagree with Rashi, contending that stopping to rest qualifies as a hanacha only when one truly wants to rest. However, when one's goal is not to rest, but simply to avoid desecrating Shabbos, stopping of this nature while still standing does not constitute hanacha. According to this opinion, to avoid the prohibition of carrying on Shabbos, the tefillin transporter must actually sit down to qualify as having performed hanacha (Rabbeinu Yerucham, quoted by Beis Yosef, Orach Chayim 266 and 349, as explained by Magen Avraham 266:9).

How do we rule?

There is a dispute among early acharonim whether we follow Rashi or Rabbeinu Yerucham in this matter, but the majority follow Rashi's approach that stopping to rest is adequate as a hanacha, even in this situation (Darchei Moshe, Orach Chayim 266:1; Magen Avraham 266:9; cf. Taz, Orach Chayim 266:4 who rules like Rabbeinu Yerucham).

Found tefillin At this point, we can address one of our opening questions: "While taking a Shabbos stroll through the woods outside my town, I discovered some pairs of tefillin lying on the ground! Presumably, these were taken by thieves who broke into a shul, but subsequently abandoned them. Is there any way that I can bring these tefillin back to town?" In this context, the Gemara rules that if one cannot safely remain with the tefillin until Shabbos ends, one may bring them back via the method of pachos pachos, meaning that one carries the tefillin for less than four amos, stops to rest, and then continues. According to Rabbeinu Yerucham, one should actually sit down when one stops to rest, whereas according to Rashi, this is unnecessary.

Karmelis Until this point, we have been discussing the halachic rules that exist min haTorah, and we have dealt with areas that are either reshus harabim or reshus hayachid. However, there are many areas that do not qualify as either reshus harabim or reshus hayachid. A reshus harabim must be meant for public use or thoroughfare (Shabbos 6a) and must also meet other specific requirements, which I discussed in a different article. Any area that does not meet the Torah's definition of a reshus harabim, and yet is not enclosed, is called a karmelis. Min haTorah, one may carry inside, into and from a karmelis. However, Chazal ruled that a karmelis must be treated with the stringencies of both a reshus hayachid and a reshus harabim. This means that it is forbidden to carry inside, into, or from any area that is not completely enclosed. This is the way we are familiar with observing Shabbos – one does not carry in any unenclosed area.

Nevertheless, the Gemara rules that there are exceptional situations when Chazal permitted one to carry in a karmelis. The Gemara mentions explicitly that should one

find a thorn in a karmelis that might hurt someone, one can simply pick it up and remove it, since the prohibition of carrying within and out of a karmelis is only midrabbanan.

Pachos pachos in a karmelis Is it permitted to carry pachos pachos in a karmelis? In other words, since carrying in a karmelis is, itself, prohibited only midrabbanan, and carrying pachos pachos in a reshus harabim is prohibited only midrabbanan, if we combine both of these aspects in one case, is it permitted to carry?

This question is discussed neither in the Gemara nor by most of the rishonim. Although there are several attempts to demonstrate proof one way or the other from the Gemara and the early authorities, none of the proofs is conclusive. There is a dispute among the later authorities, many contending that pachos pachos is prohibited in a karmelis (Tashbeitz 2:281; Shulchan Aruch, Orach Chayim 349:5; Gra), whereas others feel that there should be no halachic problem at all with carrying pachos pachos in a karmelis (Even Ha'ozar and Maamar Mordechai, Orach Chayim 349; Shu"t Avodas Hagershuni #104). Common practice is to prohibit carrying pachos pachos in a karmelis, following the ruling of the Shulchan Aruch.

Conclusion Let us now examine our opening question: "We were returning home in an area without an eruv when my two-year old decided that he was walking no farther. Is there a halachically acceptable way for me to carry him home?"

According to what we have now learned, even if the area in question qualifies as a reshus harabim, if one were to pick up the child, carry him less than four amos, and then stop, this would be permitted under the circumstances. Assuming that there are two people to carry the child, there is even a better solution, one that space-constraints does not allow us to explain fully, and that is to have the two people hand the child from one to the other and back without either walking four amos at any given time. There is also another reason to be lenient in the case of a child old enough to walk, in that carrying him in a reshus harabim is not prohibited min haTorah, because of a principle called chai nosei es atzmo, which we will have to leave for a future article.

Difference of carrying The melacha of hotza'ah, carrying, is qualitatively different from the other 38 melachos. Every other melacha results in some type of change, either physical or chemical, to the item on which the melacha is performed. In the case of carrying, the only thing being changed is the item's location. Furthermore, the rules governing what is permitted min haTorah and what violates Torah law seem strange and arbitrary. Yet, we understand that these rules are part of our Torah shebe'al peh, and we have to study to learn how to apply them. The Navi Yirmiyohu (17:19-27) was concerned about carrying on Shabbos; it is a melacha like any other, yet people mistakenly think that it is not important. Indeed, we would not usually define transporting something as changing it functionally, which is what most melachos accomplish. Yet, this does not make the melacha of hotza'ah any less important than any other melacha.

Rav Hirsch (Shemos 35:2) explains that whereas other melachos demonstrate man's mastery over the physical world, carrying demonstrates his mastery over the social sphere. The actions that show the responsibility of the individual to the community and vice versa are often acts of hotza'ah. Thus, the prohibition to carry on Shabbos is to demonstrate man's subordination to Hashem, in regard to his role and position in his social and national life.