

BS"D

To: Parsha@YahooGroups.com  
From: crshulman@aol.com

## INTERNET PARSHA SHEET ON SHMINI PARSHAS HACHODESH - 5763

To receive this parsha sheet in Word and/or Text format, send a blank e-mail to [parsha-subscribe@yahoogroups.com](mailto:parsha-subscribe@yahoogroups.com) or go to <http://groups.yahoo.com/group/parsha/join> Please also copy me at [crshulman@aol.com](mailto:crshulman@aol.com) For old parsha sheets see <http://groups.yahoo.com/group/parsha/messages> For Torah links see <http://groups.yahoo.com/group/parsha/links>

---

[http://www.torahweb.org/torah/2000/parsha/rwil\\_shmini.html](http://www.torahweb.org/torah/2000/parsha/rwil_shmini.html)  
TorahWeb [From 3 years ago]  
RABBI MORDECHAI WILLIG  
ZIKNEI YISRAEL

The medrash in the opening pasuk of Parshat She mini compares Ziknei Yisrael (elders of Israel, i.e. Torah leaders) with the wings of a bird: just as a bird cannot fly without wings, Yisrael can not do anything without their Zikeynim. (Yife Toar explains that this refers to the fact that the advice of Torah scholars is followed by Am Yisrael.)

The notion of Torah knowledge imparting to the scholar that learns lishmah the ability to offer wise counsel that individuals can benefit from is found in the beraita of Kinyan Torah (Avot 6:1). The medrash extends the principle to Klal Yisrael, the Jewish community as a whole.

Advice is, by definition, not binding. One who seeks rabbinic advice and chooses to ignore it does not violate halachah. Indeed, if he is convinced, based on superior information, that the Rabbi has erred, he should ignore the advice. Many rabbis do not offer specific counsel when the expertise of others in a particular area exceeds their own. Instead, they advise the questioner to follow the opinion of an expert in the field.

The possibility that the greatest of scholars can err in strict halachah is explicit in Vayikra (4:13 see Rashi). Even in that case, an individual who is convinced that the Sanhedrin erred may not rely on their decision (Horayot 2b).

The Talmud (Gittin 56b) cites the view of Rabbi Akiva that Rabbi Yochanan ben Zakai, the greatest Torah leader of his day, erred grievously in a political decision equivalent to advice for Klal Yisrael. While it is true that the Talmud defends Rabbi Yochanan ben Zakai's view, and, assuming it is wrong, attributes it to divine intervention which confounded the wisdom of a chacham, nonetheless, the principle of rabbinic fallibility is extended from pure halachah to more general matters.

This exception does not detract from the idea of the medrash cited earlier. Just as in halachah we must follow rabbinic rulings, despite the possibility of error rather than lapse into halachic anarchy (see Sefer HaChinuch, 496) so too in the realm of advice, both personal and communal, we do well by adhering to the counsel of Ziknei Yisrael, even though it is sometimes wrong. In his eulogy for R. Chaim Ozer z"l, the Rav z"l noted that a Torah leader whose life was devoted to halachic learning and decisions could be relied upon for solutions to political and worldly matters (Divrei Hagut VeHaaracha p.192).

Ironically, the great rabbanim of that very era were criticized for offering bad advice that led to terrible consequences during the Holocaust. The proper resolution is that while Torah confers great insight on general matters to those who pursue it lishmah and

master it, mistakes, both large and small, do exist and at times are caused by divine intervention confounding the wise. Between the body specific halachot, codified in the Shulchan Aruch, and poskim for all generations, and the realm of advice referred to in the medrash, there is a third area: this includes matters which are of a halchic nature, but go beyond specific rules of classical psak. Some have referred to this domain as public policy, a term borrowed from the lexicon of secular law. Some rabbis have defended their refusal to submit to the opinion of acknowledged Torah giants on the grounds that on such issues there is no rabbinic authority. Of course, if this is true, laymen are free to reject the opinions of their rabbis as well. However, this domain is not limited to public affairs. Rabbanim have traditionally ruled on such matters for both individuals and communities and their rulings were considered as authoritative as any psak in specific ritual or civil law.

A European rav prohibited the introduction of Reform innovations in his kehilla. His psak was accepted even though no technical violation of a particular paragraph of the Shulchan Aruch occurred. Even in private matters, more difficult to enforce or document, most of those who adhered to the Rav's psak on a strict Shulchan Aruch matter followed his more general halachic decisions.

Thus, these decisions should be referred to as halachic policy and as in other areas, the Ziknei Yisrael should be the ones to decide the matter. Moreover, if one submits a question of this nature to a Rav he is bound by the decision which is not merely advice.

With the breakdown of the kehilla system, the decisions of rabannim are not as binding in Shulchan Aruch matters or general halachic matters. Different opinions, sometimes both valid, can coexist in the same community, in both realms, and proper respect should be demonstrated for the view of another. However, in principle, there is the idea that greater Torah knowledge in the specifics of Shas and poskim confers greater authority on matters of halachic policy, and that authority must be accepted.

In the world of Modern Orthodoxy this acceptance is far from universal. American culture, which objects to submission to authority, and the greater tolerance for opposing views, in all halachic areas, generally shown by the Torah scholars of this community have combined to create the illusion that, if no specific classical text is violated, anything goes. This mistaken impression is a grave danger to this community as such and individuals and families that belong to it.

Of course, the principle of rabinnic fallibility applies here as well. Moreover, in halachic policy matters, conditions and nuances can change and lead to different decisions. But, as in the other areas, communities and individuals should look to the Torah scholars of their time, place, and broadly defined community for proper leadership. If this is done, then as the medrash teaches, those who follow can soar to greater heights in all aspects of life.

---

From: RABBI JONATHAN SCHWARTZ [[jschwrtz@ymail.yu.edu](mailto:jschwrtz@ymail.yu.edu)]  
Sent: Wed March 24 2003 To:  
[internetchaburah@yahoogroups.com](mailto:internetchaburah@yahoogroups.com) Subject: [internetchaburah]  
Internetchaburah - Parshat Shimini/HaChodesh  
Prologue:Following the seven days of dedication of the Mishkan,Aharon was instructed to assume the duties and office of Kohein Gadol. Rashi cites the Torat Kohanim which notes that Aharon was afraid and had to be instructed by Moshe to bring his Korbanot. Moshe perceived Aharon's concerns of embarrassment. Yet, why was he embarrassed?

Rav Yitzchak of Volozhin (Foot note to Ruach Chaim, 4) explained that Aharon, in his humility, felt unworthy to be the Kohein Gadol. Hence, when called upon to assume the great office, he was embarrassed. Moshe recognized Aharon's hesitation and informed him that this was precisely what made him worthy of the position of Kohein Gadol. The attribute of humility is so precious, G-d utilized it in the criteria for the position of the Kehuna Gedola.

Still, Moshe informed Aharon that while it is a good trait, humility should never preclude someone from assuming worthy accomplishments and goals. A truly humble individual will learn from others and will be open to constructive criticism and growth. Armed with these benefits of humility, the humble person will excel at all of his endeavors.

#### MAOT CHITTIN: AN APPEAL FOR WHAT??

The Aruch Hashulchan (Orach Chaim 429) notes that the announcement of Maot Chittin collections is meant to coincide with the beginning of the month of Nissan. What is the source of this Minhag? And in keeping with the theme of this season, how is this appeal different from all other appeals?

The Rema (Orach Chaim, 429) notes the Minhag of buying Chittin (wheat) and distributing it to the poor for Pesach. The Rema adds that whoever lived in the community for 12 months must contribute to this fund. The Mogen Avraham (2) adds that the poor person living in the community for 12 months was allowed to take Chittin if he was a part of the community for 12 months. The Smak limits the time frames to 30 days. The Mogen Avraham concludes that if a poor person did not qualify for Chittin, he should still receive Matzot, like any other Tzeddaka campaign, just not Chittin. Now, if the rules of Maot Chittin parallel other Tzeddaka rules, why is it noted in Hilchot Pesach and not in Yoreh Deah (250) where the rules of Tzeddaka and giving the poor that which they lack, are discussed?

The Rambam (Hilchot Yom Tov 6:17) notes that Yom Tov places obligations on man that are more than just the rules of the holiday. Namely, we are commanded to be B'Simcha on Yom Tov. The Rambam adds that this is not only true of the man but also of those who are "Nilvim Alav" (dependent upon him). The Rambam adds that one who fulfills the letter of the law, eating meat and drinking wine and celebrating in his home while locking out the poor, is not celebrating his holiday but rather Simchat Kraiso (celebrating his stomach).

The suggestion of the Rambam is that holiday funds serve an additional component on top of Tzeddaka, namely they help fulfill the obligations of Simchat Yom Tov. This is especially true today when we do not offer Korbanot Shalmei Simcha (See Tosafot Moed Katan 14b for a different view; Shut Shaagas Aryeh (85) as well). Thus, the Rema who opens his section on Yom Tov with Hil. Pesach, does so with the introduction that the laws of Yom Tov carry an obligation to add monies for the poor as part of Yom Tov preparations in fulfillment of Simchat Yom Tov (See Orot HaPesach <2> and Shurei Maran HaGrid Al Pesachim 6a for elaboration on these themes).

Harav HaGoan R. Shlomo Wahrman Shlita (Orot HaPesach <2>) noted a big differentiation between Maot Chittin and regular Tzeddaka. For when it comes to regular Tzeddaka the person comes before others (Rema Yoreh Deah 251:3) and one does not borrow in order to fulfill the Mitzva, the Mitzva of Simchas Yom Tov requires one to borrow if he cannot fulfill the obligation on his own (As found in Beitza 15b).

The Mekor Chaim (Orach Chaim, 429:3) too, notes that there is a difference between Maos Chittin and other Tzeddakot. Other charity collections like the Kupa and Tamchui are also thirty day

collections in the eyes of the Rema. Yet he counts Maot Chittin as a tax, exercisable only once a year for one living in a community for 12 months and does not follow regular Tzeddaka rules. The Vilna Gaon too, is cited as supporting the idea of Maot Chittin as an aspect of the rules of the Chag. He notes that the verse in Parshat Bo which states man's obligation to eat Matzot which adds Matzot Yeiachel Eit Shivat HaYamim. The Gra seized on the apparent redundancy and the passive Yeiachel to note that man has an obligation of Pesach to worry that his fellow Jews have the means to make Pesach from year to year. He adds that the first verse is Chaser (Matzot is spelled Matzat) while the later one is written in full. The implication is clear: Part of the obligations of Pesach include a responsibility to see to it that the poor have enough for Pesach. Thus, the Rema did not include this as another rule of Hil. Tzeddaka but forged a connection to Hilchot Pesach as well.

Battala News

Mazal Tov to Mr. and Mrs. Jerry Balsam upon their recent marriage.

Mazal Tov to Mr. and Mrs. Josh Schwartz upon the birth of a baby girl

Mazal Tov to Rabbi and Mrs. Brian Gopin upon the birth and bris of a baby boy

Mazal Tov to Mr. and Mrs. Yisroel Halpert upon the birth of Chava Shoshanna

Mazal Tov to Mr. and Mrs. Alan Pfeiffer upon the birth of a baby boy.

Hear Internet Chaburah live!! Every Tuesday Evening at Kehillat Ateret Zvi, Fifth Avenue Synagogue, 5 East 62nd Street New York, NY 10021. For further information call (212) 838-2122 To subscribe to this group, send an email to: internetchaburah - subscribe@yahoogroups.com

---

<http://www.tzemachdavid.org/thepracticaltorah/shemini.shtml>

THE PRACTICAL HALACHA  
BY RABBI MICHAEL TAUBES  
Parshas Shemini:  
CHOLOV YISRAEL

No definitive Halacha LeMa'aseh conclusions should be applied to practical situations based on any of these Shiurim.

Among the different animals which the Torah states may not be eaten is the camel, because it possesses only one of the required physical properties, as it chews its cud but does not have properly split hooves (VaYikra 11:4). The Gemara in Bechoros (6b) indicates that according to one view, because the camel is specified twice in the Torah, once, as Rashi (Ibid. s.v. Gamal) explains, in the Posuk in this Parsha (Ibid.) and once in a Posuk in Mishneh Torah, a nickname for Sefer Devarim (14:7), we may derive that both the camel itself and its milk may not be consumed. The other opinion in the Gemara (Ibid.) is that this prohibition to consume the milk of a camel is derived from an extra word in the Posuk in this Parsha (VaYikra Ibid.). According to both views, there is no question that the Torah forbids a Jew to consume the milk of a camel.

Actually, the Mishnah earlier in Bechoros (5b) states that anything produced by a non-Kosher animal is likewise not Kosher itself; the Gemara later (Ibid. 7a-7b) implies that the milk of a non-Kosher animal is included in this statement and is thus forbidden. The first Gemara cited above (Ibid. 6b) explains, however, why milk may have a different set of rules than other animal by-products, and thus a separate derivation is needed to prohibit milk from a non-Kosher animal, as explained as well by the Torah Temimah

on the above Posuk in this Parsha (VaYikra Ibid. Os 16). The Rambam (Hilchos Maachalos Asuros 3:1) and the Shulchan Aruch (Yoreh Deah Siman 81:1) clearly rule that milk from a non-Kosher animal may not be consumed, although the Rambam (Ibid.) derives the prohibition from a different Posuk in this Parsha (Ibid. Pasuk 16), based on a statement in the Gemara in Chulin (64b).

The Mishnah in Avodah Zarah (35b), when listing various products which, if manufactured by a non-Jew, may not be eaten, states that any milk which was milked by a non-Jew without the presence of a Jew there may not be consumed. The Gemara (Ibid.) explains that such milk is forbidden for a Jew because of the possibility that the non-Jewish manufacturer may have mixed in some milk from a non-Kosher animal. The Rambam (Ibid. Halacha 13) rules accordingly, as does the Shulchan Aruch (Yoreh Deah Siman 115:1); the Ramo (Ibid.) adds that one should not use the same vessels for milk from a Kosher animal that are used for milk from a non-Kosher animal because of the residue from the non-Kosher milk which may remain and become mixed in. The Vilna Gaon (Biur HaGra Ibid. Sif Katan 4) notes that because of this possibility that the vessels used by a non-Jew for milking may indeed contain the residue of non-Kosher milk, a Jew may not drink the milk processed by a non-Jew even if there is no concern that the non-Jew will intentionally mix non-Kosher milk in with the Kosher milk.

As is stated clearly by the Mishnah later in Avodah Zarah (39b), if a Jew is watching when the non-Jew does the milking, the milk may be consumed by Jews; milk produced under the supervision of a Jew is popularly referred to as Cholov Yisrael. The Gemara (Ibid.), as clarified by Tosafos (Ibid. s.v. Tanina) indicates that the Jew does not have to actually be watching the non-Jew at all times, but rather must be nearby and able to see at any time what the non-Jew is doing if he wants to. In such a case, we may assume that the non-Jew will not mix in any non-Kosher milk, even if he has the chance to do so, for fear of being caught (Mirtas) and, as the Meiri adds (Beis HaBechirah on 35b Ibid s.v. HaMishnah) of losing his sale. The Rambam (Ibid. Halachah 17) thus rules that if the Jew can potentially see the non-Jew milking the cows at any time, even if he does not see him at every moment, the milk is considered Kosher. The Maggid Mishneh (Ibid.) points out, though, that this is the case only if the non-Jew is milking the cows for the benefit of a Jew and is aware that the Jew cannot consume milk from a non-Kosher animal; he thus will not want to get caught mixing in any milk from a non-Kosher animal. Otherwise, however, one cannot rely on the fact that the Jew is simply able to monitor the non-Jew's actions. The Shulchan Aruch (Ibid.) rules accordingly, and the Shach (Ibid. Sif Katan 3) adds that if the non-Jew was milking the cow for his own needs, the milk is forbidden for a Jew unless a Jew actually watched the entire milking process and saw that no non-Kosher milk was mixed in.

The Shach (Ibid. Sif Katan 4) also explains that in order to allow milk which was milked by a non-Jew, it is sufficient if a Jew serves merely as a Yotzei V'Nichnas that is, he regularly comes in and out (unannounced) to the place where the milking is being done, because in such a case, the Mirtas factor is present, meaning that the non-Jew will fear getting caught mixing in any forbidden ingredients since the Jew may walk in at any time, and he therefore will not do it. The Shach (Ibid.) notes that this logic is accepted in other areas of Halacha as well; the Taz (Ibid. Sif Katan 3) among others, concurs, citing another example of such a situation. The Ramo (Ibid.) writes that it is proper for the Jew to be present at the beginning of the milking process and to first check to make sure that there is no prohibited food already in the

vessels into which the milk will be placed; he also rules (Ibid.) that even a young child can serve as the supervisor for this purpose. The Shach (Ibid. Sif Katan 12) and the Taz (Ibid. Sif Katan 5) quote that the child must be at least nine years old; the Chochmas Adam (Klal 67 Sif 4) allows even a child of six to do this, provided that he is an intelligent child. He does quote, however, that some did not rely on a child for this supervision at all; this is the position of the Ritva in his commentary on the aforementioned Gemara in Avodah Zarah (Chidushei HaRitva on Avodah Zarah Ibid. s.v. Yosheiv) where he specifically requires an adult. It should be stressed that if no Jew can even possibly see what the non-Jew is doing when milking the cow, the milk is obviously forbidden, as indicated by the Meiri (Ibid.) and others. The Mordechai in Avodah Zarah (Siman 826, in 41b in the Rif) quotes an authority who holds that if it can be ascertained that the non-Jew has no access to non-Kosher milk, a Jew may consume the milk provided by this non-Jew even though no Jew was present during the milking process, but he rejects this view, preferring the other authorities he quotes who hold that even in such a case, a Jew must be present at least at the start of the milking process. The Shulchan Aruch (Yoreh Deah Ibid.), as explained by the Taz (Ibid. Sif Katan 2), requires that a Jew must at least be nearby for the milk to be permitted. The Radvaz (Sheilos V'Teshuvos HaRadvaz Chelek 4 Siman Aleph 147), however, rules clearly that if it is absolutely certain that no milk from a non-Kosher animal can be found which the non-Jew could obtain, a Jew may consume the milk processed by a non-Jew even if no Jew was present during the milking. He asserts that other authorities agree with him and that there never was a ban on all milk processed by a non-Jew regardless of the circumstances. Rather, the prohibition against consuming milk provided by a non-Jew was formulated merely because of the possibility that non-Kosher milk would get mixed in with the Kosher milk. Where no such possibility exists, there never was a prohibition.

The Chasam Sofer (Sheilos V'Teshuvos Chasam Sofer Chelek Yoreh Deah Siman 107), however, writes that the prohibition against consuming milk processed by a non-Jew was a general, broadly intended prohibition, which therefore applies in all cases, even when it is clear that the original reason for the prohibition, namely, the possibility that non-Kosher milk may get mixed in with the Kosher milk, does not apply in a particular situation. He also writes (Ibid.) that the long-standing Jewish practice to drink only Cholov Yisrael constitutes the acceptance of this behavior as a Neder a vow from the Torah, and thus it cannot be changed. The Chochmas Adam (Ibid. Sif 1) writes that the major Poskim do not accept any leniency in this regard; the Aruch HaShulchan (Yoreh Deah Ibid. Sif 6) likewise stresses that one should not be lenient in this Halacha, documenting with an interesting story that the problem of non-Kosher ingredients in milk can come up even when not at all expected.

It must be noted, however, that Rav Moshe Feinstein (Sheilos V'Teshuvos Igros Moshe Yoreh Deah Chelek 1 Siman 47) suggests a leniency which is applicable today, at least in the United States, where government laws strictly regulate the manufacturing of milk for public sale, and where government inspectors regularly visit dairy plants to guarantee that certain standards are met. Since mixing in other types of milk (such as from non-Kosher animals) with milk from a cow (which of course is Kosher) would adversely affect the product from the government's point of view, no dairy plant worker would risk doing this because he would undoubtedly be caught by the inspectors and would likely be penalized or perhaps lose his job. A dairy plant which did such a thing would likely face a fine and perhaps

even have to shut down. Rav Feinstein therefore rules (Ibid.) that the government's inspection of dairy plants and their certification of dairy products is a valid substitute for the required Jewish supervision of the milking process, because the definitive knowledge of something is the equivalent of actually seeing it. He asserts that all the Poskim would agree to this; this ruling is also articulated by the Chazon Ish (Chelek Yoreh Deah Siman 41 Os 4). Rav Feinstein does conclude (Ibid.), however, that it is proper for one to be strict and drink only real Cholov Yisrael, not relying on the government's standards, which is the practice he himself followed. It should be pointed out that there is also some discussion among the Poskim regarding other dairy and milk products in terms of the above Halachos.

---

<http://www.koltorah.org/volume9/shemini2000.htm>  
IS IT THE GOLD OR THE CALF?

BY RABBI EZRA WEINER

"Take for yourself a young bull for a sin offering."

Virtually all commentaries maintain that Hashem's commandment to Aharon that he offer a calf as a sin offering is to demonstrate that Aharon required atonement for his affiliation with and facilitation of the Chet Haegel.

The Mizrachi (Rav Eliyahu ben Avraham Mizrachi) raises the following question: there is a well-known principle: the accuser cannot become the defendant. This is the source for the requirement of only using white material for the Kohen Gadol's garments on Yom Kippur. The additional four golden garments are reminiscent of the Chet Haegel, so on the Day of Atonement we do not wish to assist the prosecution. Since we accept the principle of "the accuser cannot become the defendant," why is Aharon commanded to bring a calf? Will this reminder of the Chet Haegel serve to hinder his atonement?

Rav Shlomo Garzfried answers that the concern of the calf is not provoking the accuser by reminding him of the Chet Haegel. However, when the reminder itself is performing the actions to gain atonement, it is actually preferable. Therefore, a calf is a most appropriate choice for the Korban.

Another answer involves labeling the Chet Haegel as a serious transgression because it was made of gold, not because it happened to be calf. The fact that it was made of molten gold constituted the sin as idol worship. It is for this reason that "the accuser cannot become the defendant" would not apply to a regular calf brought as a Korban. This also explains why the Mitzva of red heifer does not pose a contradiction of this principle. Because it is the reminder of the gold in the golden calf that is the problem.

---

From: Shema Yisrael Torah Network  
[shemalists@shemayisrael.com] To: Peninim Parsha Subject:  
PENINIM ON THE TORAH  
BY RABBI A. LEIB SCHEINBAUM  
Parshas Shmini

These shall you abominate from among the birds, they may not be eaten...the chasidah. (11:13,19)

What a beautiful name - chasidah! Rashi says that the chasidah truly was a bird that performed chesed - with members of its own specie. This is not an admirable trait. We Jews do not believe in selective, discriminatory, chesed. Rashi's use of the word chavrosehah, its "friends", seems to lend itself to a deeper thought. The term chaver/chibur means connection. When two people are connected with each other, they are considered chaveirim. The connection is of an equal and positive nature.

There is something in common between the two. A reyah is a stronger form of friendship. In any event, the term chaver refers to someone who sees things in the same manner that I do. We are connected because we agree with each other. This implies that the chasidah acts kindly only with those it can call a chaver, with whom it sees "eye to eye."

The chasidah represents the individual who acts kindly with those that are like him: they dress like him, they pray in the same shul where he prays, they believe in the same approach to serving Hashem as he believes. In short, they are of the same weltanschauung, they share the same perspective and world view.

Is that so bad? After all, there is just so much money and time to go around. Why not stay focused on one particular group - "my people"? First of all, this is not chesed. Chesed means to act benevolently towards others. One who discriminates, does not act kindly towards others - he acts kindly towards himself!

I think Rashi is emphasizing another point with the word chaver.

What is the greatest chesed we can perform for another Jew? Even greater than physical chesed is spiritual chesed. Should we ignore another Jew just because he is not as observant as we are? What are we doing about his lack of observance? Is the Jew who is not shomer Shabbos, Shabbos observant, any better off than the observant Jew who is living in a state of poverty? There is no greater form of abject poverty than the Jew who is "empty of mitzvos!" Perhaps, if we would view our non-observant brethren in this light, as Jews in need, we might reach out to them and perform the ultimate chesed - spiritual chesed. We have to remember that our "chavrusashaft," connection, with all Jews is the fact that we are all bnei Avraham, Yitzchak, and Yaakov. The Klausenberger Rebbe, zl, was a towering tzaddik whose overwhelming love for all Jews was legend. It was after the war, after the accursed Nazis had decimated so many of our people, that the Rebbe's boundless love came to the fore. The American liberators supplied him with a vehicle and a driver. The Rebbe went to all the little villages surrounding Feldafing, the DP camp where he was stationed, with the slogan, "I am looking for my brothers." There were Jews there that were hidden during the war who had completely given up hope of ever being reunited with their people. The Rebbe gave them hope; he gave them courage to carry on.

Many survivors followed the Rebbe to Feldafing with no real desire to go. They had food given to them by the Americans. They had support. Why would they want to follow the Rebbe? Many even went so far as to say that they had suffered long enough as Jews. They no longer had any desire to continue living as the oppressed people. The Rebbe convinced them, slowly - very slowly and with great patience - that it was the right thing to be with other Jewish survivors.

Once, the Rebbe encouraged a young teenager to come with him to the camp. The boy resisted because he was sure the Rebbe would not let him go to the movies. The Rebbe was not deterred. He promised the boy that when life returned to some sort of normalcy and a movie theater was opened for the survivors - he would give him the money to purchase a ticket. The boy joined the Rebbe, who later kept his word and bought the boy a ticket to the movies. The Rebbe's love eventually brought the boy back to Yiddishkeit.

The Rebbe did not lecture the survivors. He understood their questions and inner struggle. He showered them with love and kindness and these were the keys to opening their hearts and souls to return to Hashem. The Rebbe comforted everybody. His motto was: "If you are a Jew, you are my brother! I will do everything that I can for you."

There were dozens of young orphans in the camp with no one to care for them. The Rebbe felt it was his obligation to see to their physical and spiritual needs, in the same manner that a biological father cares for his child. The story is told about a young girl who, due to her abject poverty, walked around the camp without socks. Upon seeing her one day, the Rebbe took off his own socks in the middle of the street and gave them to her. "It is unbecoming for a Jewish girl to walk around this way," he said. While this narrative demonstrates the Rebbe's love and caring, it also underscores his love for the Jewish People. A Jewish girl does not walk around without socks!

As mentioned before, the greatest chesed is the one that stretches across the great divide that exists between those that are observant and those who, for whatever reason, have not yet been fortunate enough to see the true way a Jew should live. The Rebbe did not care about a person's past or present - only his future. An American official once related to the Rebbe that there was a group of Hungarian Jewish girls in one of the DP camps who were acting inappropriately, in a manner indicating that they had completely forgotten their roots. The Rebbe spared no time, and he immediately left for the camp in search of these girls. He spoke to them like a loving father. With compassion and understanding, he was able to convince them to leave the camp and return with him. The Rebbe established a school for these girls, all of whom had been raised in observant homes. At times, when depression took hold of them, and the girls would cry bitterly about their lives and the losses they had experienced, the Rebbe would listen intently and offer soothing words that healed and encouraged. Probably the greatest tribute to the Rebbe was the fact that all the children called him by one name - Tatte, father. They were attached to him like a child to a father, since, indeed, he was truly a spiritual father to them.

It would have been so easy to let apathy take control, and religious differences continue to breach Jewish unity. It took a great man to tower over these differences, to see beyond the petty and inconsequential, and look at the Jewish neshamah, soul, in its pristine beauty. Indeed, it takes a great person to focus upon the areas that unify us, rather than our differences. And these shall be impure to you among the creeping things that creep upon the earth; the rat and the mouse, and the tortoise according to its variety. (11:29)

There is an intriguing Midrash that comments on the word "v'zeh," "and these," with which our Pasuk begins. Chazal tell us Hashem showed Moshe Rabbeinu four things with His finger because Moshe was puzzled by them. He showed him how the shemen ha'mishchah, oil of anointing, was made. Second, He showed Moshe the work of the Menorah. Third, He showed him the creeping things that are ritually impure. Also, He showed him the moon, so that Moshe would know when the new month was to be sanctified. In each case the word "zeh," this, was used to indicate a special emphasis made by Hashem in showing Moshe the intended subject. The Midrash ends with the following statement: "He stirred up the fire and showed him the salamander, for it says in Sefer Tehillim, 29:7, "Kol Hashem chotzeiv lahavos eish," "The voice of Hashem hews out flames of fire." When did He do this? When He said, "And these are they that are ritually impure to you."

What is the Midrash teaching us with the last statement concerning the salamander? Horav Mordechai Rogov, zl, in his Ateres Mordechai has a compelling explanation of this Midrash. Hashem was intimating to Moshe that Klal Yisrael would be subject to trial by fire. There would be difficult and trying times in Jewish history when we would encounter persecution and tribulation of the worst kind. The "stirring of the fire" which the

Midrash mentions, is a reference to the periods of affliction when our enemies would burn our bodies and destroy our lives. Yet, it was at this very time that Hashem showed Moshe the "salamander," a creature which Chazal in the Talmud Chagiga 27a say, is created and formed from fire. Consequently, this creature is immune to the effects of fire.

Fire destroys everything but fire. Klal Yisrael is likened to the salamander for they will not be consumed by the flames of persecution. Those who attempt to annihilate us will not succeed. We have been in galus, exile, for over two thousand years. How many fires have been set to destroy us? Torquemada did not succeed and neither did Hitler. Nations have come and gone, but Klal Yisrael will live forever. A nation forged in fire will not be destroyed by fire. The Navi Yirmiyahu says, "So says Hashem; is not My word like fire." We have the power of the salamander within us as we cling to the Torah, Hashem's word.

Rav Rogov offers a powerful insight. When was the message regarding the salamander revealed to Moshe? In what context was it related to him? It was in connection to the laws of kosher foods that Hashem stressed our relationship to the salamander. If, in fact, the Torah is still adhered to even after our long and agonizing exile, it is on account of our care and concern specifically to the laws of prohibited foods. These spiritually defiled foods contaminate one's heart, thereby breaking down one's resistance to the effects of the fires of exile.

What a powerful statement! Our bodies are not simple bodies. They are the repository of the holy neshamah, soul, given to us by Hashem. This container must be cared for by following the "directions" given by its "Maker." A vital factor that is necessary if our bodies are to retain their holy spirit, be strong, and able to resist the harmful spiritual and physical challenges of the exile, is by scrupulously adhering to the laws of Kashrus.

Sponsored by Yaakov and Karen Nisenbaum and Family in memory of our Father and Grandfather Martin Nisenbaum

---

From: Kerem B'Yavneh Online [feedback@kby.org] To: KBY parsha Subject: Parshat Shemini

PARSHAT SHEMINI

ARROGANCE IN THE SERVICE OF HASHEM

ROSH HAYESHIVA RAV MORDECHAI GREENBERG SHLITA

The sons of Aharon, Nadav and Avihu, each took his fire pan, they put fire in them and placed incense upon it; and they brought before Hashem an alien fire that He had not commanded them. A fire came forth from before Hashem and consumed them, and they died before Hashem. (Vayikra 10:1-2)

Many interpretations are offered as to the sin of Aharon's sons. It seems, though, that the common denominator of them all is excessive self-pride, which is prohibited, especially for a priest who stands in service before G-d. Thus, it says in the Talmud Yerushalmi, "There is no [self-]greatness in the palace of the King." The Chovot Halevavot similarly writes (Sha'ar Hakenia ch. 6):

He should throw aside any self-glorification, haughtiness, and self-concern at the time of his service of G-d ... as the Torah writes about Aharon – despite his greatness, "He shall separate the ash." (Vayikra 6:3) G-d commanded him to take out the ash each and every day, to inculcate humility and to remove haughtiness from him. Similar to this, Scripture says about David, "leaping and dancing before Hashem." (Shmuel II 6:16)

Due to this arrogance they ruled before their teacher, sated their eyes of the Shechina, offered an alien fire, and thought that they were worthy of leading the people. [The Gemara Sanhedrin 52a and the Midrash teach that they said, "When will these two elderly

people (i.e., Moshe and Aharon) die, and you and I will lead the generation." G-d said to them: "Do not boast about tomorrow." Ramchal (R. Moshe Chaim Luzzato) similarly writes in his work, Adir Bamorom:

He should not seek to achieve wisdom in order to reach greatness, but rather his service should be completely pure ... If not, he should be very careful, lest he ruin and not improve, and will be cast off like Acher (Elisha b. Avuya), or will be harmed like Ben Zoma. His heart should not sway him to say that G-d is yielding ... A person should not dare draw close to this great service without being called ... Rather, he should sit lowly as all other people, and should not become haughty over his brethren to raise himself to [a place] inappropriate for him, and he will receive reward for refraining just as for doing.

On a different point in the parsha, the Gerer Rebbe interpreted homiletically the Gemara in Kiddushin (30a), "The vav of gachon (belly) is the middle of the letters of the Torah." He said: A Jewish person who already learned half the Torah is liable to take credit, to pat his belly contentedly and say, "Rejoice, my insides, for I have learned much Torah." However, Chazal say, "If you learned much Torah – do not take credit, since you were created for this." (Avot 2:8) We are telling him that he should be humble, and not pat his belly, but rather he should crawl on his belly.

This same idea is said in the name of his grandfather, the Chiddushei Harim. The Gemara (Bava Batra 146a) asks on the pasuk "All the days of a poor man are bad" (Mishlei 15:15) – But there is Shabbat and Yom Tov?! The Gemara answers: "As Shmuel, who said that a change in [eating] habit is the beginning of a stomach ache." i.e., although the poor person enjoys special food on Shabbat and Yom Tov, the very change for good causes him bad later on, since his stomach is not used to it. However, the Rebbe explained as follows: The "poor" person refers to one poor in wisdom; all of his days are bad and lacking satisfaction. The Gemara asks, but on Shabbat and Yom Tov every person acquires additional da'at and rises a little from his level, and therefore he should be satisfied then! The Gemara answers that a change in habit is the beginning of a stomachache. Precisely because he feels himself elevated and more intelligent than usual, he gets a stomachache, i.e., he begins to pat his belly and to say, "Rejoice, my insides," which is, once again, something bad.

It says this it is proper to shed tears during the Torah reading about the death of Aharon's sons, and then his sins are forgiven. One who takes to heart the loss of Aharon's children, and this arouses him to repentance, is forgiven for all of his sins, "For thus said the exalted and uplifted One, Who abides forever and Whose Name is holy: I abide in exaltedness and holiness, but I am with the despondent and lowly of spirit." (Yeshaya 57:15)

To subscribe, please visit  
<http://www.kby.org/torah/subscriptions.cfm>.

---

From: RABBI BEREL WEIN [rbwein@torah.org] Sent March 26, 2003 AM  
To: rabbiwein@torah.org Subject: Rabbi Wein - Shemini  
In the face of overwhelming tragedy, the death of his two sons, Aharon is nevertheless reprimanded by Moshe for a seeming infraction of the halacha regarding the eating from a sacrifice while one is yet grief-stricken over the personal loss of near relatives. Aharon responds by defending his position as being halachically correct and proving the point to Moshe. Thereafter, Moshe, upon reflection, admits that Aharon is correct and that he fulfilled the Torah's law in this matter completely. The question that begs answering in this situation is the obvious one. At a black moment such as this one, where is there room for discussion of an arcane halachic rule? Is this not a moment for emotion, for compassion, for sympathy, not for law and legalisms? Is it not almost cruel of Moshe to raise any sort of

halachic issue whatsoever with his brother at a time of such sadness and tragedy?

As usual, the Torah uses this all too human situation to grant us an insight into G-d's view, so to speak, of life and human behavior. For any sort of mental stability to be present in one's life, one must live by a set of values and rules. Without such norms and standards, one is constantly blind-sided and buffeted by the never-ending problems of life. And one is a prisoner of one's emotions and personal conflicts. There are so many times in life that one asks one's self, "Now what am I supposed to do? How am I to react to this event?" It is because of this recurring and never-ending human question that halacha takes on such a central role in the life of a Jew. It is precisely for this reason that halacha is so all pervasive, covering every act and situation of a Jew's existence. It is halacha that rules our lives and sets our standards of behavior under all circumstances and all human conditions.

In today's society, G-d and religion have to somehow conform to the human being's comfort and pleasure zone. Religion cannot be too demanding. Three days of mourning is sufficient, not seven. Restrictions on behavior and entertainment on the part of the mourner are to be discarded. Religion cannot make one feel uncomfortable or make too many demands on time or life-style. G-d should have no say in the way human beings should express their emotions. In a society as self-centered as is ours, religion is defined by and for me alone. There is no room for communal or generational considerations. It is only me - here and now - that counts. Thus the positive psychological benefits of a halachically endorsed grieving period and process is ignored and eventually forgotten. The Torah and Jewish tradition have carefully and minutely described the laws, attitudes and customs that should govern one who is in the process of confronting tragedy and loss. The Torah in this instance, as in all other affairs of life, is on the side of humans. It attempts to give us perspective and balance, strength and inner fortitude in order that we are better equipped to deal with the inevitable blows of life. Therefore, Moshe correctly calls Aharon to task for apparently not following the Torah's law when tragedy overwhelmed him and his family. But it is the very steadfastness of Aharon in observing the Torah's laws, as expressed in his response to Moshe's criticism, that allows him to revive himself and rise from his grief and pain and become the great High Priest of Israel, beloved by G-d and all of the Jewish people.

Death is always an unwelcome visitor. Nevertheless, our mortality makes its appearance at our doorstep unavoidable. Yet there lies within the soul deep resources that enable human beings to deal with this final act of the life cycle. The Torah, and its accompanying halachic rules and norms, lights the way through the darkness of sad events and moments of grief. "Yea, though I walk in the valley of the shadow of death, I fear no evil, for You are with me," says King David. In Jewish tradition and history "You are with me" is reflected in the laws and customs that the halacha has created for those trying and searing moments. And in so doing, "You are with me" becomes the cry of our ultimate triumph over death and darkness.

Shabbat Shalom. Rabbi Berel Wein  
RabbiWein, Copyright © 2003 by Rabbi Berel Wein and Torah.org.  
Torah.org: The Judaism Site <http://www.torah.org/> Project  
Genesis, Inc. [learn@torah.org](mailto:learn@torah.org)

---

From: RABBI RISKIN'S SHABBAT SHALOM LIST  
[parsha@ohrtorahstone.org.il] Sent: March 26, 2003 To:  
Shabbat\_Shalom@ohrtorahstone.org.il Subject: Shabbat Shalom: Parshat  
Shemini by Rabbi Shlomo Riskin  
Shabbat Shalom: Parshat Shemini (Leviticus 9:1-11:47) By Shlomo Riskin  
Efrat, Israel - One of the most problematic incidents in the entire Bible is the traumatic death of the two sons of Aaron, Nadav and Avihu – precisely at the zenith of the dedication of the Sanctuary, which was to be the sacerdotal province of the High Priest, Aaron. This week's Torah reading describes the context of the tragedy, which only increases our perplexity: "And Moses and Aaron entered the Tent of Meeting, and they went out and blessed the nation; the glory of G-d appeared to the entire nation. And a fire came forth from before G-d, consuming the whole burnt offering on the altar. The entire nation saw and exulted and fell upon their faces. And the sons of Aaron, Nadav and Avihu took each person his censor and placed fire in them and laid incense thereon and they sacrificed a strange fire before G-d which He had not commanded them. And a fire came forth

from before G-d consuming them; and they died before the L-rd" (Leviticus 9:23,24; 10:1,2).

It is apparent that they were punished. But this punishment appears to be far harsher than their crime would seem to warrant! After all, the Bible describes a moment of national ecstasy, an unexpected expression of joy and submission when the Almighty crowned the dedication of the Sanctuary by demonstrating His acceptance of the Divine service by sending a Divine fire. The two sons of Aaron, caught up in the religious excitement of the moment, attempt to return G-d's gratuitous compliment by themselves offering a fire they had not been commanded to bring. They merely went beyond the requirement of the law, answering G-d's unexpected fire with their uncommanded fire. Even Moses comments, "This is what G-d has said, by My near ones shall I be sanctified" (Leviticus 10:3). Is an act emanating from a desire to come near to G-d worthy of death?!

I believe the solution to the mystery is to be found in the expression used to describe the offering of Nadav and Avihu, a "strange fire," eish zara, reminiscent of the Hebrew avodah zara, strange service, the usual phrase for idolatry. The Bible does isolate and emphasize a unique prohibition of fire idolatry, immolating one's child to the idol Moloch, a strange and false god who demands the fire consumption of children as the manner of his devotion. At least three times, the Bible especially forbids this form of idolatry, a strange service. Initially it is to be found in the Biblical portion of sexual immorality, the prohibition of giving ones seed to a strange and uncertified place (someone else's wife, one's close relatives, individuals of the same sex, animals); within this context, the Bible commands, "And you shall not give of your seed (children) to be passed over to Moloch" (Leviticus 18:21).

Barely one chapter later, the prohibition is fleshed out: "An individual who gives his seed to Moloch must be put to death... And I shall put My face against that individual and cut him off from the midst of his nation because he has given his seed to Moloch, in order to defile My Sanctuary and profane My Holy Name..." (Leviticus 20:2). A third description of this abomination appears in the last of the five Books of Moses, "Let there not be found among you one who passes over his son or daughter into fire." Combining together the various elements involved in the three verses similar in language – "passing over one's child in fire to Moloch" – causes the Talmud to rule that the prohibition is literally sacrificing one's child in fire to the false god (B.T. Sanhedrin 64, Ramban to Leviticus 18:21). Apparently such an abominable act could only be performed in a moment of religious fanatic ecstasy, a moment in which one's false religious value took precedence over the life of one's innocent child. The "strange fire" brought by Nadav and Avihu was certainly not the same; but since it too emanated from a moment of religious ecstasy, such ill-advised and uncommanded fires had to be "nipped in the bud"!

Tragically, Islamic fundamentalism has adopted precisely this abomination as a major form of its terrorist activity: educating and training their youths to blow themselves up in the fire of destructive materials in the name of Allah and with the promise of a Paradise of 72 virgins. Indeed, these "priests" are worse than the priests of Moloch: these modern-day human sacrifices are "inspired" not only to sacrifice themselves, but also to blow up scores of innocent people – children and women as well as civilian men – along with themselves!

The fifteenth century scholar Rav Menahem Meiri taught that idolatry has little to do with thought – theology and has everything to do with action – morality: an idolater is one who is "immorally defiled in his deeds and ugly in his personality traits" (Bet Habehirah to the first Mishnah, second chapter of Tractate Avodah Zarah). Islamic fundamentalism has turned Allah into Moloch – Satan, and made every mosque which preaches the doctrine of suicide bombing a hell-haven of idolatry.

Shabbat Shalom.

You can find Rabbi Riskin's parshiot on the web at:

<http://www.ohrtorahstone.org.il/parsha/index.htm>

Ohr Torah Stone Colleges and Graduate Programs Rabbi Shlomo Riskin,  
Chancellor Rabbi Chaim Brovender, Dean To subscribe, E-mail to:  
<Shabbat\_Shalom-on@ohrtorahstone.org.il>

---

From: National Council of Young Israel [YI\_Torah@lb.bcentral.com]  
Parshat Shemini 25 Adar II 5763 March 29, 2003 Daf Yomi: Avodah Zara  
16

Guest Author: RABBI NACHMAN COHEN

Young Israel of North Riverdale/Yonkers - Ohab Zedek, NY

Rabbi Isaiah Horowitz, known as the Shelah [an acronym for his famed work, Shenei Luchot haBerit] posits that the Sidrot which we read each Shabbat correspond to the time of the year that they are read. (This is the basis for my sefer, A Time for All Things.) Each year most Parshiyot are read during the same Hebrew Calendar week. For example, Chaye Sara is always read between 22 and 27 Cheshvan. The major exceptions are the parshiyot between Pikudei and Bechukotei. These can be read as much as a month away from their regular dates due to the additional four weeks of the leap month of Adar. To compensate, the Parshiyot of VaYakhel and Pikudei, Tazriva and Metzora, Acharei Mot and Kedoshim, and Behar and Bechukotei that are ordinarily read over four weeks are read over eight weeks. One Parsha that is significantly affected by the advent of a leap year is Parshat Shemini. Customarily, this Parsha is read immediately after Pesach. During leap years, however, it is read before Pesach. Based on the hypothesis of the Shelah, the placement of this reading is highly symbolic. But first, a word about leap years and their function is in order. The Torah states that Pesach must fall in the spring [that is, after the vernal equinox]. Since a normal Jewish year is composed of 12 lunar months wherein the mean month is 29.5 days, the Jewish year is generally 354 days. The mean Solar year, on the other hand, is approximately 365.25 days. Thus, the solar year exceeds the lunar year by more than 11 days per year. Were this to go on indefinitely, Pesach would eventually come out in the winter, fall and summer. To prevent this, an extra month is added seven times in nineteen years. The addition of these months serves to rectify the discrepancy between the two calendars.

In kabbalistic writings, the Sun is symbolic of HaShem, whereas the Moon is symbolic of Mankind. The Sun projects light, the Moon reflects it. At Creation, the Moon was on par with the Sun [as stated, G-d created the "two great luminaries] in that each night there was a full [that is, a totally illuminated] Moon. This symbolized that Mankind was fully accepting of everything G-d commanded. However, once Adam sinned by saying "there cannot be two simultaneous rulers of Earth... [and while] the Heavens belong to G-d, the Earth belongs to Man," G-d responded by telling the Moon "diminish your light" [that is, wax and wane] to symbolize humanities fluctuations in its loyalty to Me. Full Moon [is when Pesach and Sukkot begin] represents a period when Mankind has complete faith in HaShem. The end of the month when the Moon has almost completely waned symbolizes a time when Mankind has all but completely abandoned G-d. At the very crucial moment at the end of each month when the last reflection of sunlight disappears from the Moon and G-d, by all rights, should destroy the world, HaShem exclaims, "It is My fault that Mankind sinned! I created the Yetzer haRa which they could not overcome!" In response, the Al-Mighty established Rosh Chodesh proclaiming, "Bring a sin offering to atone for My transgression." Thus, Rosh Chodesh became a "Day of Forgiveness for all of Jewry." But Rosh Chodesh, in general, is merely a reprieve; G-d gives the Jewish people "a breather" because kavayakhol, He was complicit in their sin. Rosh Chodesh does not represent a time when Israel has rectified its sins. The latter is symbolized by leap years.

Through leap years the solar and lunar calendars converge. This symbolizes the time when Nation Israel returns to HaShem. Because of their teshuva HaShem forgives them for their past sins. The scales are wiped clean and Israel is afforded a fresh opportunity to begin again. Rosh Chodesh Nisan symbolizes this beginning. In Parshat haChodesh we read, "This month [Nissan] is for you the month of months, the beginning of the yearly [lunar] cycle." Nissan is the month during which we bring the communal korbanot from the "new" Machatzit haShekel donations. These donations serve as a source for HaShem to renew his relationship with Nation Israel. With this revitalized power Israel is able to grow ever closer to Him. The potential for Israel's perfection is symbolically displayed in the growth of the light reflected by the Moon towards Earth each night from the first to the fifteenth of Nissan. The fifteenth of Nissan, Pesach, is the time reserved for the Redemption. R. Yehoshua reiterates this when he posits: In Nissan we were redeemed, in Nissan we will be redeemed in the End of Days. To emphasize the importance of Leap Years, Shemini is read on leap years on Shabbat Rosh Chodesh Nisan or if Rosh Chodesh falls during the week of the Shabbat preceding Rosh Chodesh Nissan.

The Parsha of Shemini has two aspects to it: The joy of the dedication of the Mishkan on 1 Nissan, and the associated sin of Nadav and Avihu which marred the happiness of this day.

The focus of Parshat Shemini is defined by when the Parsha is read. In this regard, Shemini parallels Bereishit, which is read on Simchat Torah and again on Shabbat Bereishit. When read on Simchat Torah, Bereishit explicates the end point we seek to reach through our avodah [devotion] during the Yamim Nora'im [Holidays]; namely, during the Yamim Nora'im we seek to return the world to its Gan Eden level. For this the reading of the Creation Chapter is quite appropriate. However, when read on Shabbat Bereishit this same parsha that begins with the glory of Creation ends with G-d's lamenting that He should never have created human beings. Right after Sukkot we must remember that the world is not perfect and that we must strive to rectify the sin of Adam. The same is true of Parshat Shemini. On regular years, we read Shemini after Pesach because these years represent the world before its tikkun. On those years, the reading of Shemini is meant to remind us of our failings and transgressions. This is not the case on leap years. On this and every other leap year we read Shemini on or right before I Nissan, the day the Mishkan was permanently established, because this underscores that when Nation Israel repents its past sins [symbolized by the synchronization of the Solar and Lunar Calendars] it will be given renewed fervor to worship G-d b'shleimut [symbolized by Rosh Chodesh]. When this perfection is reached the Beit haMikdash will be rebuilt. Then the Shekhina will once again reside within each and every Jew. May we merit seeing these events fulfilled b'miheira b'yameinu.

NCYI's Weekly Divrei Torah Bulletin is sponsored by the Henry, Bertha and Edward Rothman Foundation - Rochester, New York; Cleveland, Ohio; Circleville, Ohio To receive a free e-mail subscription to NCYI's weekly Torah Bulletin, send an email to: YI\_Torah@lb.bcentral.com © 2002 National Council of Young Israel. All Rights Reserved.

---

From: Menachem Leibtag [tsc@bezeqint.net] Sent: March 26, 2003  
 Subject: [Par-reg]Parshat Shmini - shiur  
 RABBI MENACHEM LEIBTAG  
 THE TANACH STUDY CENTER [http://www.tanach.org] In Memory of  
 Rabbi Abraham Leibtag Shiurim in Chumash & Navi by Menachem Leibtag  
 PARSHAT SHMINI

For some reason, the dedication of the mishkan required two consecutive ceremonies: 1) The seven day 'milu'im' service (see Vayikra 8:1-36); & 2) The special korbanot offered on 'yom ha-shmini' (9:1-24).

In this week's shiur, we discuss the necessity for each of these ceremonies, as well as their relevance not only to Sefer Vayikra, but also to our understanding of how we celebrate Yom Kippur and Shavu'ot.

**INTRODUCTION** Even though Sefer Vayikra is primarily a book of laws, Parshat Shmini is an exception as it contains a 'story' (i.e. a narrative). Therefore, in our shiur, we must explain not only what this narrative is about, we must also explain why it is recorded at this point in Chumash. To do so, we begin our shiur with a quick review of the first half of the Sefer Vayikra, to identify the precise point where this story is told.

**WHAT 'BELONGS' IN SEFER VAYIKRA** Vayikra began with the laws of korbanot that the individual can or must bring (chapters 1-5), and continued with the laws for how the kohanim should offer these korbanot (chapters 6-7). At this point (towards the end of Parshat Tzav / see 8:1), this continuing presentation of mitzvot is 'interrupted' by a set of stories in chapters 8 thru 10: Chapter 8 describes the seven day milu'im inauguration ceremony of the kohanim and the mizbeiach, Chapter 9 describes the mishkan's inaugural ceremony on 'yom ha-shmini' [the 'eighth day'] when G-d's glory 'returns', Chapter 10 describes the story of the tragic death of Nadav and Avihu on that day.

Then, in chapter 11, Sefer Vayikra returns once again to its presentation of various laws, which continues till the end of the Sefer! [Most of these laws relate to the mishkan, e.g. Parshat Shmini concludes with the laws of 'tum'at ochlin' (see 11:1-47); then Tazria / Metzora continues with other laws relating to tum'a. In regard to the topic of the rest of the mitzvot in Sefer Vayikra, see TSC shiur on Parshat Acharei Mot.]

The peculiarity of this story becomes more acute when we consider that this entire narrative (i.e. Vayikra chapters 8-10) may actually 'belong' in Sefer Shmot. Recall how Sefer Shmot concluded with the story of the mishkan's assembly and its dedication. [In case you forgot, review chapter 40, especially 40:12-14!] Furthermore, it is easy to prove that the story of the seven-day milu'im (i.e. Vayikra chapter 8) definitely 'belongs' in Sefer Shmot. Recall how Parshiot Vayakhel / Pekudei (i.e. Shmot chapters 35-

40) described how Bnei Yisrael fulfilled all of the commandments that Moshe was commanded in Parshiot Teruma / Tetzaveh (i.e. chapters 25-30). Considering that G-d's original commandment of the 'seven day milu'im' was first recorded in Parshat Tetzaveh (see Shmot chapter 29, compare with Vayikra chapter 8), there is no apparent reason why that story should have been the only exception!

To summarize, we have shown how and why the narrative in Vayikra chapter 8-10 does not 'belong' in Sefer Vayikra, and why it does belong in Sefer Shmot! To explain why, our shiur will first explain the difference between the details of the mishkan found in Sefer Shmot in contrast to those found in Vayikra. Then we will discuss what is special about each of the two dedication ceremonies to explain why they are recorded specifically in Sefer Vayikra (and not in Shmot).

**BETWEEN SHMOT AND VAYIKRA** There is a very simple distinction that explains why we find the laws concerning the mishkan in two different books. Sefer Shmot describes how to build it, while Sefer Vayikra explains how to use it. For example, in Sefer Shmot - chapters 25-31 (Parshiot Teruma / Tetzaveh) described the commandment to build the mishkan, while chapters 35-40 (Parshiot Vayakhel / Pekudei) detailed how it was actually built. In contrast, the first seven chapters of Sefer Vayikra describe which korbanot the individual can (or must) bring, as well as how the kohanim are to offer them. The only topic that 'crosses lines' (for some reason) is the seven-day milu'im ceremony, for its commandment is recorded in Sefer Shmot, while its execution is recorded in Sefer Vayikra!

To understand why, we must consider the purpose of this ceremony, and relate it to the above distinction.

**THE SEVEN DAY "MILU'IM" CEREMONY** Let's review the primary elements of this ceremony: First, Moshe must anoint the vessels of the mishkan, as well as the kohanim and their garments (w/ shemen ha-mishcha see 8:5-13). Then, on each of the seven days, three korbanot are offered: 1. A chatat - one 'par' (bull)- the blood is sprinkled on the upper section of the mizbeiach 2. An olah - one 'ayil' (ram)- the blood is sprinkled on the bottom of the mizbeiach 3. The milu'im (like a shlamim) - one ayil (ram) - the blood is sprinkled on the kohanim, as well as the mizbeiach. [See Shmot 29:1-37 & Vayikra 8:14-24.]

This anointing ceremony can easily be understood as the final stage of the mishkan's construction. So too the korbanot, for the sprinkling of their blood also appears to serve as a type of anointing. From this perspective, it makes sense that this ceremony is detailed in Sefer Shmot, at the conclusion of the laws that describe how to build the mishkan. [And that is exactly where we find it (see Shmot chapter 29 and the TSC shiur on Parshat Tetzaveh).] On the other hand, this ceremony could also be considered the very first 'use' of the mishkan, for this is the first time that korbanot are actually offered. Hence, from this perspective, it makes sense that its details are recorded in Sefer Vayikra., together with all the other laws detailing how to use the mishkan. [The deeper meaning of this is discussed in Part Two.]

With this in mind, let's discuss the purpose of the additional ceremony that takes place on the 'eighth day'.

**YOM HA-SHMINI** On yom ha-shmini, the day following the completion of the seven-day milu'im, the mishkan becomes fully functional. Furthermore, on this day, Aharon and his sons will officiate for the first time. Thus, a special inaugural ceremony is necessary (see 9:1-24), which will be quite different than the seven day milu'im. On this day, we find a commandment to offer a special set of korbanot whose purpose is stated explicitly: "This is what Hashem has commanded you to do in order that the presence of G-d ('kvod Hashem') may appear to you" (9:6) [see also 9:5].

To understand why specifically this point is so crucial in the mishkan's dedication, recall how G-d had taken away His 'Shchina' (from the camp of Bnei Yisrael) due to the sins of chet ha-egel: "Moshe took the tent and pitched it outside the camp, far away from the camp and called it the ohel mo'ed. Anyone who sought G-d would have to go the ohel mo'ed located outside the camp" (See Shmot 33:7 and its context).

Recall as well that this was the very same Shchina that Bnei Yisrael had witnessed at Ma'amad Har Sinai. Then, when Moshe ascended Har Sinai to receive the second luchot, G-d promised him that His Shchina would indeed return to the camp (see 34:8-10); however, it was first necessary for Bnei Yisrael to build the mishkan to facilitate its return. [Note Shmot 25:8 - "ve-asu li mikdash ve-shachanti betocham" - in contrast to 33:7.] From this perspective, the special korbanot offered on yom ha-

shmini serve a double purpose: (1) They atone for the sins of chet ha-egel. (2) They recreate the experience of Ma'amad Har Sinai.

This explains the purpose of the various korbanot of yom ha-shmini: (1) Due to chet ha-egel: Aharon must bring a chatat and olah: "He said to Aharon: Take an egel for a chatat..." (9:2) Bnei Yisrael must also bring a chatat and olah: "Speak to Bnei Yisrael saying: Take a se'ir for a chatat and an egel and a keves for an olah..." (9:3). and (2) To 'recreate' Ma'amad Har Sinai: Bnei Yisrael must also offer a korban shlamim together with their olot, just as they had offered when G-d appeared onto them during Ma'amad Har Sinai (see Shmot 24:4-11, read carefully!). "[to Bnei Yisrael, cont'd,....] and a shor and ayil for a shlamim to offer before G-d, and a mincha, for today G-d will appear to you." (9:4).

In this manner, the special korbanot of yom ha-shmini mark a climax - for they will facilitate the return of the Shchina: Note again: "For today G-d's glory (kvod Hashem) will appear to you" (9:5). [See also 9:23-24, compare with Shmot 24:16-18.] [Note once again how this parallel emphasizes the purpose of the mishkan as a perpetuation of Har Sinai.] YOM HA-SHMINI / YOM KIPPUR AND SHAVU'OT Although the special korbanot of yom ha-shmini were a 'one-time event', we find a very similar set of korbanot that are offered every year on Yom Kippur which may reflect this very same purpose.

YOM KIPPUR Recall from Vayikra chapter 16 that on Yom Kippur a special chatat and olah are offered by the kohen gadol and another set are offered by Bnei Yisrael. Recall as well that these korbanot are offered on the very same day that Bnei Yisrael received atonement for chet ha-egel!

The following table highlights this parallel:

	YOM HA-SHMINI	YOM KIPPUR (in Acharei Mot)
AHARON		
Chatat:	egel	par (an adult egel)
Olah:	ayil	ayil
BNEI YISRAEL		
Chatat:	se'ir	se'ir
Olah:	keves	ayil (an adult keves)
	egel	- (+ korbanot in Pinchas i.e. par ayil & kvasim)

[The basic structure of korbanot is the same. The minute differences can be explained due to the special nature of yom ha-shmini. See Further Iyun Section.]

Hence, Yom Kippur can be understood as an annual rededication of the mishkan, especially from the perspective of its purpose as a site where Bnei Yisrael can receive atonement for their sins.

SHAVU'OT Even though the primary parallel to yom ha-shmini is clearly Yom Kippur, there was an additional korban shlamim offered on yom ha-shmini that doesn't find a parallel on Yom Kippur. [This only stands to reason, as a korban shlamim is eaten, and on Yom Kippur we are not allowed to eat.] However, we do find a parallel to this korban on Shavu'ot, which just so happens to be the only holiday when Bnei Yisrael offer a 'collective' korban shlamim: "And with the 'shte' ha-lechem' you shall offer an olah... a chatat... and two lambs for a zevach shlamim" (Vyk 23:19).

Recall as well that the first time Bnei Yisrael offered a shlamim was at Ma'amad Har Sinai (see Shmot 24:5). As the mishkan was to perpetuate that experience, we find a korban shlamim offered at the inaugural ceremony of the mishkan on yom ha-shmini. To remember that event, we offer a special korban shlamim (shel tzibbur) every year on Shavu'ot, commemorating Ma'amad Har Sinai. It is not by chance that this korban, like the korbanot of yom ha-shmini, is offered at the completion of seven cycles of seven days.

NADAV AND AVIHU At the conclusion of this ceremony, Nadav and Avihu are punished by death for offering 'eish zara' which G-d had not commanded (see 10:1-2). Again we find a parallel to Har Sinai and chet ha-egel. At Har Sinai, Bnei Yisrael and the kohanim were forewarned: "And G-d told Moshe: Go down and warn the people that they must not break through [the barrier surrounding] Har Sinai, lest they gaze at Hashem and perish. The kohanim also, who come near Hashem, must sanctify themselves ('yitkadashu' - compare 'bi-krovai akadesh' / 10:3), lest G-d punish them." (Shmot 19:21) [See also Chizkuni on Vayikra 10:3-4.]

As this inaugural ceremony parallels the events of Har Sinai, the warning concerning approaching Har Sinai also applies to the mishkan. Extra caution was necessary. Similarly, just as Aharon, despite his good intentions, had sinned at chet ha-egel, in suggesting an action which G-d had not commanded, so too his children Nadav and Avihu. Despite their good intention when offering this eish zara, G-d did not command them to do so! [Recall the repetition of "ka'asher tziva Hashem et Moshe in

Parshiot Vayakhel / Pekudei.] Because of these events, i.e. the improper entry of Nadav and Avihu into the mishkan, Sefer Vayikra continues at this point with a discussion of the laws of 'tum'a ve-tahara', which regulate who is permitted and who is forbidden to enter the mishkan (chaps 11-16).

WHY IN SEFER VAYIKRA? Now that we have explained the purpose of these two dedication ceremonies, we must explain why this lone lengthy narrative is recorded in Sefer Vayikra instead of in Sefer Shmot. One could suggest that this narrative, even though it may technically 'belong' in Sefer Shmot, is recorded specifically in Sefer Vayikra because of the special connection between this narrative and the laws of korbanot in Sefer Vayikra: One could suggest that the special 'ayil ha-milu'im' offered during the 'seven day milu'im' ceremony serves as the 'prototype' for the korban shlamim - for it included the separation of the 'chazeh ve-shok' for the kohen offering the korban. Therefore, this narrative is recorded immediately after the laws of the korban shlamim in Parshat Tzav (see 7:35-37 & last week's shiur). Similarly, the special korbanot offered on yom ha-shmini can be understood as the 'prototype' for the yearly korbanot offered yearly on Yom Kippur as detailed later in chapter 16, and the special korban shlamim offered on Shavu'ot as explained later in chapter 23. Finally, the narrative describing Nadav & Avihu's forbidden entry in the kodesh serves as the introduction to an entire set of laws concerning who can and who cannot enter the mikdash, beginning in chapter 11 and continuing thru chapter 16. Accordingly, we can continue to understand Sefer Vayikra as a 'book of laws' - 'torat kohanim'. However, it includes this narrative describing the dedication of the mikdash for that story serves as the basis for various types of korbanot that are offered in the mishkan. In the shiurim to follow, we will continue to discuss this theme.

shabbat shalom,  
menachem

Copyright (c) 2002 Menachem Leibtag To SUBSCRIBE or UNSUBSCRIBE to this list or for more information - go to the following link:  
<http://mail.tanach.org/mailman/listinfo/par-reg>