

BS"D



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

INTERNET PARSHA SHEET
ON VAYIKRA ZACHOR - 5768

In our 13th year! To receive this parsha sheet, go to <http://www.parsha.net> and click Subscribe or send a blank e-mail to subscribe@parsha.net Please also copy me at cshulman@gmail.com A complete archive of previous issues is now available at <http://www.parsha.net> It is also fully searchable.

This week's Internet Parsha Sheet is sponsored:

by **Dr. Sam & Nora Friedman** of Teaneck in memory of Rav Shalom Dov Ber ben Shmaryahu and Dvora bas Yehoshua Heschel, and

by **Chaim & Rena Shulman** in honor of **Michael & Rachel Fiskus** on their **25th wedding anniversary** and on their honor this weekend at the **Young Israel of Jamaica Estates 25 annual dinner**

To sponsor an issue (proceeds to Tzedaka) email cshulman@gmail.com

http://www.aish.com/spirituality/philosophy/Remember_Amalek.asp
by **Mois Navon** **A lesson on Divine Providence in memory of the fallen Torah students of Mercaz HaRav, hy"d.**

I was in my rabbinical class finishing the evening prayers as the sounds of automatic gunfire rang out through the Yeshiva. We were in the classroom above the Library which turned out to be the killer's target. As we lay on the floor, bracing furniture against the doors, we could only imagine the horror he was wreaking in the rest of the Yeshiva. We were unarmed and could only wait and pray that help arrive as soon as possible. We called the police, but it was only thanks to a man named Dadon and an off-duty officer named Shapira who neutralized the killer. When the security forces finally arrived, they searched the building and found us sitting on the floor in the dark.

As they whisked us out of the building, we gained a first hand glimpse of the horror the killer had wrought. We were spared only because we were delayed in finding a tenth man to make our minyan. Had we finished praying one minute earlier we would have found ourselves in the path of the killer.

As I was driven home by my daughters, the gnawing question of why bad things happen to good people was now magnified by the fact that murder was perpetrated against young Torah students learning Torah in a Torah Academy. I offer this essay as an attempt to come to grips with this dilemma.

"The Torah is a tree of life to those who grasp hold of it." And yet eight Torah students, learning Torah in a Torah Academy, were mercilessly gunned down by a raging beast called Amalek.

How can we reconcile the special Divine providence extended to those "grasping hold" the Torah, with the bloody reality to which we bear painful witness? The answer lies in the date of the attack: Rosh Chodesh Adar.

Rosh Chodesh is a time of joy in that the new moon symbolizes renewal and rejuvenation. Yet it is also a time when the moon is not visible, and consequently, is a time of darkness symbolizing evil.

Adar is a month of great joy for we celebrate the victory of good over evil. Yet it is also a month of fasting over the evil designs of Amalek. Indeed it is in this month that we remember Amalek by reading the "zachor" Torah

portion. We remember that "God's war against Amalek is from generation to generation."

The ability to exercise a choice between good and evil demands the existence of evil and by extension, people who purvey that evil. Rabbi Shimshon Raphael Hirsch explains that the battle against Amalek is really a battle over whether Man will obey G-d or the dictates of his own rationale. Man expresses his freewill by deciding to act either according to his own definitions of right and wrong, which devolve to his own "might and power," or according to God's definition of morality.

The ability to exercise a choice between good and evil demands the existence of evil and by extension, people who purvey that evil. Those people are known as Amalek. And though Amalek was a specific people, the verse commanding their destruction states: "blot out the memory of Amalek". Consequently, Hirsch explains that the memory of Amalek, of people who glorify the sword, must be blotted out. For as long as their memory is glorified others will follow the path of evil and reject the path of morality.

Although evil, necessary for freewill, is part and parcel of Creation, it is seemingly nevertheless a stain on a loving G-d who wants only good for his creations. So much so that God, as it were, offers a "sin offering" as atonement on none other than Rosh Chodesh, when light is diminished and evil reigns supreme. G-d can do little more than offer a sacrifice in atonement, lest he remove from Man the very task He entrusted to him: to be a partner in creation, to complete creation, through his own efforts.

Nowhere is this paradigm of existence more pronounced than in the story of Ester read on Purim. The Megilla tells of Amalek's plan to annihilate Israel where he obtains the King's seal on a decree to that end. The Jews fast and pray that Esther's efforts to annul the decree succeed. However they are told, "The decree of the King cannot be annulled." Since when can't a king issue an annulment?! The answer is that this refers to not just any king, but the King of Kings. The decree that cannot be annulled is God's decree of Creation, the decree of freewill, the decree that evil must have free reign.

The Jews obtained only the permission to fight back -- this was God's answer to their fasting and prayers. The Jews obtained only the permission to fight back -- this was God's answer to their fasting and prayers. And as they fought evil, so too must we. Real evil will not go away with appeasement and peace negotiations.

The Megilla ends with the celebration of the victory of the Jews. We rejoice however, not at our own strength, realizing that victory would be for naught without God's hidden help. Indeed it is this knowledge, that G-d works behind the scenes to guarantee our success, which is the source of our joy.

It is only the guaranteed assistance of the Creator that can explain Israel's continued existence in the face of evil perpetrated by the Amaleks of the world. But that guarantee extends only to the nation as a whole and not to individuals. No individual can confidently assume a protected existence - not even a Torah scholar, learning Torah, in a Torah academy.

So what of the promise that "grasping" the Torah offers special Divine providence? Perhaps, though the Torah does provide a path to righteousness and life in general, there are times that are beyond man's comprehension. At such times we must lament: "Difficult is the death of the righteous in the eyes of God."

As such, the Zohar provides a succinct theological response in the form of prudent advice: "A man should not confidently affirm - G-d will deliver me or will do for me this or that - but rather he should endeavor to fulfill the precepts, walk the path of truth, and put trust in Him that He will help."

And thus we fight Amalek. A fight for the perfection of the world. It is a fight man wages internally, striving to fulfill God's will. It is also a fight man wages against those who wield "might and power" to avoid carrying out God's will.

The victory of this fight is embodied in the Holy Temple, symbolizing God's dwelling amongst mankind upon acceptance of His will. In the

Megilla, Haman sought to derail the building of the Temple. Today, Amalek attacked our small Holy Temple, the Yeshiva, center of Torah learning, whose purpose is to bring God's will, God's peace, to mankind.

And so it was on Rosh Chodesh Adar, a time of good mixed with evil, that our rejoicing was mixed with tears. We cry bitterly over the loss of our holy Torah students at the hands of Amalek. But we rejoice in the Divine promise that no matter what designs the evil Amaleks of the world will conspire, they will never destroy the nation of Israel. In the words of Haftarat Zachor: "Netzah Yisrael Lo Yishaker" -- The eternity of the people of Israel is guaranteed by God.

Published: Thursday, March 13, 2008

About the author: Mois Navon Mois Navon is a Computer Engineer and part-time Rabbinical Student in Mercaz Harav Yeshiva's Rabbi Aharon Soloveitchik Semicha Program. This essay has been excerpted from a fuller discussion which can be accessed at www.divreinafon.com See more articles by Mois Navon

http://www.jewishpress.com/displayContent_new.cfm?mode=a§ionid=56&contentid=30627&contentName=Hebron%201929,%20Jerusalem%202008:%20The%20Link

Hebron 1929, Jerusalem 2008: The Link By: Micah D. Halpern

History – the remembrance and recording of the past – in the Muslim Arab world differs from history in the Western world. The Western world records past events and calls them history. The Muslim Arab world recalls myths, hopes, conspiracies and events and calls that history. In the Arab world history and memory merge into a psycho-cultural universe that informs and motivates and plots the future. The events on the evening of Thursday, March 6, 2008 were part of a chain of events that began years earlier, late at night on Friday, August 2, 1929. The eight Jewish students killed last week by an Arab terrorist in their religious school were a part of history even before they were brutally massacred. The machine gun-toting terrorist who entered Mercaz HaRav yeshiva and the people who rejoiced for his having been there were all reliving a historical memory from 1929. They were reliving the 1929 massacre in Hebron that began at Yeshivat Hebron. They were reenacting the massacre of other Jewish students in another religious school. The location and the act chosen for this terrorist deed were a direct outgrowth of Arab/Jewish interaction and history – a history of Arabs massacring Jews. They were reconnecting the present with their past. It was a hot Friday night in August. The students were gathered together in their yeshiva in the city of Hebron. The Sabbath had already been ushered in when the massacre began. The calls for reinforcements from the one British policeman in the area went unheeded for five hours, until it was too late. When it ended, three days later, 67 Jews were dead – butchered with axes and knives and swords. Those students still alive were evacuated by the British to Jerusalem.

That 1929 massacre became the paradigm in the Arab world for removing Jews. Massacre them. Massacre them especially while they are at study in their religious schools. Massacre them today and it will lead to the Jewish evacuation of Jerusalem just as it led to the Jewish evacuation of Hebron in 1929. In the morning, after a night of murdering Jews, Arab leaders came to the home of a man whom they respected, a well-liked teacher at the yeshiva. They had a proposal to place before Rabbi Jacob Slonim. If the rabbi were to hand over all the Ashkenazi students (those from European backgrounds), they would end the massacre and spare the lives of the Sephardi students (those from Arab lands). Rabbi Slonim declined the offer. He was killed on the spot. The massacre continued. Tensions between Arabs and Jews, particularly in Jerusalem around the area of the Western Wall, were high in the days leading up to the Hebron Massacre. In sermons delivered in area mosques and propaganda spread in Arabic newspapers, stories were told of Jews killing Arabs and taking advantage of Muslim holy sites. These messages fed already widespread conspiracy theories that the Jews were

engaged in "wholesale murder of the Arabs." So the Arabs of Hebron took matters into their own hands, murdering the Jews of Hebron and forcing the survivors out of their city. Reenactments of the Hebron massacre have been carried out several times over the years, but never so successfully as this last attack at Mercaz HaRav. Arab leaders around the world are still stoking the flames of conspiracy in order to motivate their murderers to act. That is one of the reasons one hears from them, with regular frequency, of the Holocaust Israel is allegedly perpetrating against the Palestinians.

There is no Holocaust being perpetrated by Israelis or by Jews anywhere in the world upon Arabs, and there are no Jewish land grabbers. If anything, the opposite is true. Jews are ceding land and Israel is pursuing peace. But that message will not motivate. Hatred and fear breed evil. Untruths motivate massacres. History and conspiracy theories merge.

Micah D. Halpern is a columnist, political commentator and author of "Thugs." He maintains The Micah Report at www.micahhalpern.com

from **Rabbi Yissocher Frand** <ryfrand@torah.org reply-to: ryfrand@torah.org, genesis@torah.org to ravfrand@torah.org date Mar 13, 2008 10:09 PM subject Rabbi Frand on Parshas Vayikra mailed-by torah.org Images from this sender are always displayed. Don't display from now on.

Rabbi Yissocher Frand To sponsor an edition of the Rabbi Yissocher Frand e-mail list, click here Rabbi Frand on Parshas Vayikra

The Superiority Of The Poor Man's Offering

The Torah writes in this week's parsha regarding the offering of the Korban Mincha: "When a soul (nefesh) will bring a meal-offering to Hashem, his offering shall be of fine flour; he shall pour oil on it and place frankincense on it" [Vayikra 2:1]. This is in contradistinction to the expression used at the start of the parsha in connection with the animal offerings: "When a person (adam) from among you will bring an offering to Hashem from the animals..." [Vayikra 1:2].

Rashi comments that by the Mincha flour offering, which is the least expensive of all sacrifices, the Torah uses the expression "when a soul will bring". This, Rashi says, is the only offering by which the Torah refers to the one who brings the korban as a nefesh (soul). Rashi explains that typically poor people bring flour offerings in lieu of more expensive animal sacrifices. The Almighty therefore emphasizes: "I give him credit as if he offered his soul."

A rich person pays \$1500 for a n ox and slaughters it for the Mizbayach [altar]. The Torah says "very nice", but it is not the same as the flour offering of a poor person who may have paid \$3.50 for the combination of a little flour and a little oil. The poor person's offering is treated with greater respect, so to speak. Why is that?

Rav Elya Meir Bloch says the simple interpretation is that the \$1500 for the rich person may be a smaller percentage of his net worth or his disposable income than the much smaller amount spent by the poor person is, as a total of the latter's net worth or disposable income. Relatively speaking, the poor person made a larger contribution of his wealth than the rich person.

But, says Rav Elya Meir, this is not the correct way to interpret these pasukim [verses]. Rav Elya Meir sees a deeper interpretation.

The Ramban writes that when a person offers an animal sacrifice, he is really supposed to think that the slaughtered animal on the mizbayach should really be him. As it is with so many Mitzvos, the Torah desires one's heart, not just the hollow act of bringing a sacrifice. The Torah wants the intent of what he is doing to penetrate into the deepest recesses of a person's personality. The Torah is interested in the person achieving the feeling of what bringing a korban is supposed to be about.

When a wealthy person plunks down his \$1500 for his offering, he has the attitude that "I certainly did my share. This animal cost me 1500 bucks!

What more do You want?" Therefore, he lacks the requisite humility appropriate for one who is supposed to be seeking atonement. But the poor man knows that all he is bringing is a minimal korban – a little flour, a little oil. He knows that he does not earn atonement for \$3.50. He understands that his offering is just symbolic and is supposed to represent a deeper emotion that emerges from the recesses of his soul. He puts his heart and soul into the offering because he clearly realizes that it is not the flour and the oil that will gain him atonement.

When a person is poor and can not afford to buy his way out of his iniquity, the only thing he has going for him is his nefesh – his soul. Therefore, he puts his heart and soul into the offering. The Torah highlights this idea by the use of the word nefesh in connection with the flour offering.

Aharon Was A Kiruv Worker Who Did Not Compromise On His Principles

The Torah further states regarding the flour offering "He shall bring it to the sons of Aharon, the Kohanim..." [Vayikra 2:2]. The Medrash Rabbah quotes the pasuk [verse]: "The teaching of truth was in his mouth, and injustice was not found on his lips; he walked with Me in peace and with fairness, and turned many away from iniquity." [Malachi 2:6]. This pasuk describes the quintessential priest. The prophet Malachi contrasts the Kohanim who served in his time who had less than sterling character with the ideal Kohain. Chazal say that the ideal Kohen whom Malachi is describing was the Priest of all Priests – Aharon haKohen.

The Medrash elaborates on the expression "the teaching of truth was in his mouth...and he turned many away from iniquity" as meaning "he did not forbid that which was permitted and he did not permit that which was forbidden." He always told it like it was. "And turned many away from iniquity". Aharon was a "kiruv worker". He brought people back to Torah and religion.

Avos D'Rabbi Nasan elaborates: When Aharon would meet someone in the street; he would be kind to them and greet them cheerfully. The next day, when that person would contemplate doing something wrong, he would ask himself "how could I disappoint Aharon the Kohen?" This was Aharon's approach to "outreach" (kiruv).

People have the tendency to say that when they are trying to "bring people back," perhaps the rules can be bent. Perhaps we can compromise on what the halacha is in order to achieve better results in kiruv. The above-cited Medrash alludes to this issue. Aharon was extremely successful at drawing near distant members of the flock. "He loved G-d's creatures and he drew them near to Torah." [Pirkei Avos 1:12] When he died, we read that "all the house of Israel" mourned him. [Bamidbar 20:29] There was greater mourning for him than even for his brother Moshe. He was beloved by the people. People simply could not bring themselves to do any wrong in his presence.

The pasuk we quoted from Malachi says about Aharon "no injustice (avlah) was ever found on his lips". I once heard that the implicit praise in this expression was that Aharon never had to bawl anyone out. He never had to chastise anyone or yell at them. There was never a mean word that came out of his mouth. How then was it that he was successful? How was he able to help people turn away from iniquity? The answer was that his persona was so sweet and so endearing that people refused to let themselves offend him by sinning. They simply could not do it to him.

But the first statement of the pasuk in Malachi is that "The teaching of truth (Toras emes) was in his mouth". He never bent the rules. That is why the Medrash needs to tell us that he did not forbid that which was permitted and he did not permit that which was forbidden. What kind of praise is that? The answer is that when a person is in such a position and is trying to draw people near to Judaism, the evil inclination to bend the rules a bit and to compromise is very strong. In fact, in many situations, rules are bent and things are not done the way they are supposed to be done.

Aharon was a very successful kiruv worker, but he was successful because of the fact that Toras emes was in his mouth – he did NOT bend the rules.

He refused to permit that which was forbidden or to forbid that which was permitted.

Defeating the Purpose

The Ramban speaks about the "secret of sacrifices" in this week's parsha. He writes that a person can sin through thought, speech, or action, and that the act of bringing a sacrifice has corresponding components. One places his hands upon the head of the animal (semicha) to correspond to the sinful action he did; he verbally confesses his sin to correspond to sinful speech; and he watches it burn in the fire to correspond to his sinful thoughts.

The act of bringing a sacrifice is the ultimate act of submission. A person admits: "Truly, I have done wrong. I have disobeyed the Master of the Universe. I have not listened to Your word. I am the one who deserves to be brought on this altar." These are the thoughts that should be in a person's mind when he brings his korban -- that he has sinned to Him with his body and soul. "There on the altar -- but for the Grace of G-d -- go I."

In a Jewish leap year, Parshas Vayikra coincides with Shabbos Parshas Zachor . [Devorim 25:17-19]. The corresponding Haftorah is from Sefer Shmuel [Samuel I 15:1-34]. The prophet Samuel commands King Saul to destroy Amalek: "Destroy everything he has, have no pity on him, kill man and woman alike, infant and suckling alike, ox and sheep alike, camel and donkey alike." [pasuk 3]. But we are told in pasuk 9: "Saul and the people took pity on Agag, on the best of the sheep and cattle, the fatted bulls and the fatty sheep, and on all that was good..."

When Shmuel approached Saul and asked him what was the noise of cattle he was hearing, Saul excused himself by saying the animals were spared in order that they might be slaughtered "to Hashem your G-d." In other words, King Saul argued "I am only doing it for You, Master of the Universe. What could be a bigger sanctification of Your Name than offering sacrifices from these prime head of cattle?" Samuel responded with searing words (pasuk 22): "Does Hashem delight in elevation-offerings and feast-offerings as much as in obedience to the voice of Hashem? Behold, to obey is better than a choice offering, to be attentive than the fat of rams."

G-d wants us to listen, to obey. There was great irony in Saul's excuse. The whole purpose of bringing sacrifices is because we have NOT listened; we have NOT obeyed properly. How shallow and meaningless are Saul's words to the prophet, "I have saved the animals in order to bring sacrifices"? He had it all backwards! It is better to listen in the first place and not need to bring a sacrifice, than to not listen to G-d's words (to kill all the animals) and to pride oneself in his willingness to bring sacrifices. One should bring his offerings out of a feeling of subservience, not out of a motive that "I have a better idea than what G-d commanded."

This write-up is adapted from the hashkafa portion of Rabbi Yissocher Frand's Commuter Chavrusah Torah Tapes on the weekly Torah Portion.

They're here! Commuter's Chavrusa Vayikra Series 21 on tape or CD, to enlighten, inspire and perhaps amuse you with such fascinating topics as: "Paying the Plumber and Babysitter"; "Mortin for Your Children"; Oy: My Tefillin are Pasul" New Special Interest - When Winning Isn't Everything"

EXCITING NEW OFFER - HOT OFF THE PRESS - THIS WEEK'S SHIUR - THIS WEEK'S PARSHA AVAILABLE FROM OUR WEBSITE (WWW.YADYECHEL.ORG) ON MP3 THE NEXT MORNING (FRIDAY MORNING) - ONLY \$5.00 A DOWNLOAD

Now available Commuter's Chavrusah series 1,2,3,4,5,6 and 7 and Parsha Perceptions series 1,2,3 and 4 in MP3 format from our website

For complete listings of all the new offerings, log onto our secure site at <http://www.yadyechiel.org> and select the "Timely Offers" button, or send e-mail to tapes@yadyechiel.org, or call us at 410-358-0416.

And while you're there, don't forget that the entire Yad Yechiel Tape Library, featuring the complete collection of Rav Frand's cassette /CD shiurim, is also now available for viewing online. At <http://www.yadyechiel.org>, you can browse through a comprehensive listing of 20 years of weekly shiurim, view Parsha Perceptions, Halacha Tapes, Hashkafa Tapes and Theme Sets. Plus, you'll find order information on this easy-to-navigate site. Tapes or a complete catalogue can be ordered from the Yad Yechiel Institute, PO Box 511, Owings Mills MD 21117-0511. Call (410) 358-0416 or e-mail tapes@yadyechiel.org or visit <http://www.yadyechiel.org/> for further information.

Transcribed by David Twersky Seattle, WA; Technical Assistance by Dovid Hoffman, Baltimore, MD RavFrand, Copyright © 2007 by Rabbi Yissocher

Frاند and 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> or email learn@torah.org to get your own free copy of this mailing. Need to change or stop your subscription? Please visit our subscription center, <http://torah.org/subscribe/> -- see the links on that page.

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. 122 Slade Avenue, Suite 250 Baltimore, MD 21208 <http://www.torah.org/> learn@torah.org (410) 602-1350 FAX: (410) 510-1053

from TorahWeb <torahweb@torahweb.org> hide details Mar 12 (2 days ago) to weeklydt@torahweb2.org date Mar 12, 2008 9:59 PM subject **Rabbi Yonason Sacks - Two Geulot, One Message** http://www.torahweb.org/torah/2008/moadim/rsac_purim.html

TorahWeb.org Homepage

Rabbi Yonason Sacks Two Geulot, One Message The mitzvah of "zechiras yetziyas Mitzrayim," remembering the Exodus, occupies an incontrovertibly prominent position in Jewish consciousness. Ramban (Shemos 13:16) notes that the Jew's constant recollection of yetziyas Mitzrayim attests to his unwavering belief in the veracity of the Creator and His Torah, and that "Because HaKadosh Baruch Hu will not perform overt miracles in every generation to (convince) the wicked and the deniers, He commanded us to make a constant recollection of what our eyes saw, and to transmit the matter to our children, and from their children to their children, until the final generation." In underscoring the significance of this commandment, Ramban enumerates the plethora of other mitzvos which also serve to deepen the Jew's awareness of yetziyas Mitzrayim, ranging from chametz and korban Pesach to tefillin, mezuzah, krias Shema, and sukkah. The Ramban emphasizes that by perceiving the providence of HaKadosh Baruch Hu throughout our national history, we cultivate an acute awareness of His omnipotent existence and the truth of His Torah. Our recollection of the unquestionable Divine involvement in the wondrous miracles of yetziyas Mitzrayim proclaims our steadfast belief in HaKadosh Baruch Hu. At the same time, however, Ramban adds that our attention to these "great" miracles should never distract us from the "minor" miracles which occur constantly throughout our own lives. On the contrary, a fundamental and inviolable tenet of Jewish belief is that "From the great miracles, a person comes to admit to the hidden miracles that are the foundation of the entire Torah. For no one has a portion in the Torah of Moshe until he believes that all of our words and events are miracles, and they are not all a product of nature." According to the Ramban, the daily requirement of zechiras yetziyas Mitzrayim teaches us the eternal mission of the Jew: to perceive and appreciate the undeniable presence of the yad Hashem in each and every aspect of life.

The Ramban's notion that miracles exist in both revealed and concealed forms is evident in the very meaning of the word "neis" itself. The conventional translation of the term "neis" denotes a "miracle" or "wonder", as Rashi describes in Shemos 17:16. However, the Torah also employs the very same term to signify a "banner" or "flag," as seen in Bamidbar 26:10 and Yeshayah 18:3. In light of the Ramban's explanation, these two definitions are not coincidental. The glorious and overt miracles serve as a "banner," proclaiming and confirming the miraculous status of the smaller, "natural" miracles and wonders. Such a relationship is certainly apparent in the dual miracles of Chanukah. Chanukah celebrates both the "natural" military victory and the "supernatural" burning of a small amount of oil for 8 days. The unquestionably supernatural burning of the oil corroborated the equally miraculous nature of the military victory.

This duality finds particular relevance in our current season of Adar. The Gemara (Megillah 6b) presents a dispute as to whether the Megillah should optimally read in Adar 1 or Adar 2. Rebbe Eliezer B'Rebbi Yossi requires that the Megillah be read in the first Adar, in accordance with the principle "Ain ma'avirin al hamitzvos -- one should not skip over opportunities to

fulfill a mitzvah". Rebbe Shimon Ben Gamliel, however, defers the reading of the Megillah to the second Adar, in order to juxtapose one geulah (Purim) to another (Pesach). His ruling begs the simple question: what is the value of adjoining the two geulos?

Perhaps Rebbe Shimon Ben Gamliel's ruling is precisely rooted in the Ramban's understanding of revealed and concealed miracles. The Vilna Gaon, in his commentary to Megillas Esther (1:2), emphasizes that the significance of the holiday of Purim lies in the ostensibly natural occurrence of supernatural miracles. The salvation was performed in the context of "hester panim" -- concealment of the Divine hand. The Vilna Gaon cites the well known question of the Gemarah (Chullin 139b): "Esther min haTorah minayin? - Where is Esther alluded to in the Torah?" The Gemarah cites the verse (Devarim 31) "V'anochi haster astir panai bayom hahu -- And I will conceal my face on that day." It is precisely this concealment, or "hester panim," set in the darkness of the Babylonian exile, which characterizes the miracle of Purim. The Jewish people's imperilment and subsequent salvation were orchestrated through entirely "natural" means, and the name of HaKadosh Baruch Hu is not even mentioned in the Megillah.

In stark contrast, the miracles of Pesach were marked by drastic deviations from the normal course of nature. From the transformation of water to blood to the splitting of the sea, the hand of HaKadosh Baruch Hu was unquestionably evident throughout the Exodus; Jews and non-Jews alike were forced to recognize His insurmountable involvement. In light of the Ramban's comment, perhaps the juxtaposition of Purim and Pesach serves to further sensitize the Jew to the miracles of HaKadosh Baruch Hu. Through the revealed miracles of Pesach, we recognize the equally undeniable involvement of HaKadosh Baruch Hu in the story of Purim. Pesach's open miracles thus affirm Purim's silent miracles.

May our constant remembrance of yetziyas Mitzrayim, along with the other annual commemorations of HaKadosh Baruch Hu's indescribable wonders, help us to perceive and appreciate the constant miracles with which HaKadosh Baruch Hu blesses us each and every day of our lives. Copyright © 2008 by The TorahWeb Foundation. All rights reserved.

<http://www.anshe.org/parsha.htm#parsha> **Parsha Page by Fred Toczek** - A Service of Anshe Emes Synagogue (Los Angeles) VAYIKRAH 5757

I. Summary

The Five Principal Korbonos (Sacrifices) which could be offered by an individual:

A. Olah (Consumed Offering): This was consumed entirely by the fire on the Altar.

B. Mincha (Allegiance - Gift): An offering of flour usually brought by a person of modest means.

C. Sh'lomim (Peace Offering): A means of expressing thanks to Hashem on joyous occasions.

D. Chatos (Sin Offering): An atonement for certain sins committed unintentionally by an individual (e.g., eating Chometz on Pesach, doing a Malacha on Shabbos).

Korbon Oleh V'Yored: A special type of sin offering (which varied according to the sinner's wealth) for: (1) swearing falsely that he hadn't seen or heard evidence necessary for testimony; (2) entering the Sanctuary, or eating Kodshim while "tumah" (unclean); and (3) failing to fulfill a vow.

E. Oshom (Guilt Offering): Offered as part of the penitence required for certain improper acts (e.g., retaining another's property by swearing falsely). (In each case, the wrongdoer was required to restore the property plus an additional 20% to its rightful owner before he could offer this sacrifice and receive Divine forgiveness.)

II. Divrei Torah

A. Lil'Mode U'Lilamed (**Rabbi Mordechai Katz**)

1. Korbonos (Sacrifices) and Prayers. The word "Korbonos" includes the word "Korov" (near); a sacrifice was a means of approaching Hashem, supplicating for Divine forgiveness or demonstrating appreciation for Divine assistance, and bringing oneself closer to Hashem. How do we achieve this today? Through prayer. Prayer testifies to Hashem's mastery of the world, gives us an opportunity to thank Hashem and allows us to ask for Hashem's assistance.

2. Offering one's "soul". The Torah refers to one who offers the Mincha offering as "the Soul who will offer a Korbon." Why does it use the word "soul", not "person"? This sacrifice was ordinarily offered by a poor person, for whom it was a difficult financial burden. Thus, in Hashem's Eyes, it is as though his very soul was sacrificed. This is the essence of offering sacrifices, or giving charity, as illustrated by the following story: A Rabbi was approached by a widow, despondent that she didn't have any money for the marriage of her daughter. The Rabbi initially said "if only I were wealthy, I would gladly give you money"; a few minutes later, he went to the cupboard and gave her a pair of silver candlesticks which he had received as a present. After the woman left, he explained to his wife what had happened and told her that two potatoes would serve as their new candlesticks. When his wife noted how much he loved the silver candlesticks, the Rabbi responded: "I know, and now I realize what true Tzedakah (charity) means".

B. Growth Through Torah (**Rabbi Zelig Pliskin**)

1. Acknowledge the gifts you have received from Hashem. "And if you bring near a flour offering baked in the oven . . . and if your offering is a flour offering baked in a pan . . . and if your offering is a flour offering baked in a pot." Rabbi Hirsch comments that these three elements of the Mincha offering express our acknowledgment to Hashem for our food, comfort and satisfaction. More specifically, these items have the relationship to each other of bread (symbolizing the ordinary food for happy daily life), cake (symbolizing extra enjoyment, the unusual condition of luxury) and specially prepared foods (symbolizing temporary, passing moments of special joy). Together, they symbolize that our daily necessities, extras and moments of special joy are all gifts from Hashem.

2. Be yourself, but be certain to utilize your full potential. Yeast and honey were not permitted in the offerings on the altar, but salt was. Rabbi Mordechai Gifter teaches that yeast makes the dough rise higher and honey makes things sweeter, but both are external additives. Salt, however, only brings out the food's existing flavor. When serving Hashem, we should follow the model of salt -- we should be ourselves, but make every effort to be all that we can be. (Dipping bread in salt should remind us not only of the sacrifices, but of our obligation to use our potential to the fullest.)

3. Give charity according to your means. "And if one does not have the financial means for two turtledoves or young pigeons, one shall bring his offering for his transgression the tenth part of an ephah of fine flour for a sin offering". One must give charity based upon one's means; the same applies to one's other talents - e.g., the greater your intellect or listening skills, the greater your obligation to share your wisdom with, or lend a ear, to others.

C. Majesty of Man (**Rabbi A. Henach Leibowitz**)

Moshe's Modesty. Why does the word "Vayikroh" in this Parsha include an Alef that is much smaller than the other letters? The word "vayikroh" means "called", and refers to Hashem calling upon Moshe. Moshe, however, wanted to write "vayikar" ("met" or "happened upon"), so as not to reveal the great honor Hashem bestowed upon him through direct communication with him. Hashem, however, insisted that the Alef be included, although it is printed smaller as an eternal reminder of Moshe's extraordinary humility. Rabbeinu Yonah teaches the meaning of humility by examining its opposite -- haughtiness, which results from feelings of inferiority and inadequacy, and for which one compensates by denigrating others. However, one who is confident in himself (and has realistic

understanding of his self-worth) has no need to be haughty or to pretend to be anyone he isn't. Since Moshe understood his true value, he didn't underestimate himself and therefore had no need to deprecate others. We must each realize that we have a unique soul given to us directly from Hashem and that, accordingly, our potential for achievement is immeasurable. With this understanding, we can be humble enough to admit our shortcomings and, as a result, show our inner strength and desire to improve ourselves. Humility can allow us to reach even higher levels of personal and spiritual growth and connection to Hashem.

D. Kol Dodi on the Torah (**Rabbi David Feinstein**)

"Torah, the service of Hashem and kind deeds" (the three pillars on which the world stands) (Pirke Avos). "And Hashem spoke to Moshe from the Tent of Meeting". Rashi comments that Hashem's voice stopped at the doorway of the Tent of Meeting; as we learn in Tehillim, Hashem's Voice is power -- why, then, didn't Hashem permit His Voice to be heard outside the walls of the Tent? The Torah was given 3 times -- at Mt. Sinai; in the Mishkan (Tent of Meeting); and on the Plains of Moab. Each time, it was conveyed in the exact same Voice, to show that all three times were of equal importance. But, why did it need to be repeated three times? Each time corresponds to one of the above pillars -- (1) Mt. Sinai represents the giving of the Torah; (2) the Mishkan, where the service of the offerings and incense took place, represents service of Hashem; and (3) the Plains of Moab, where the Jews entered into a covenant to be responsible for each other, highlights the pillar of generosity and kind relations among our fellow man. Each of these three aspects of Torah are mutually interdependent. Thus, for example, Torah learning must be for its own sake and directed towards serving Hashem and a means of finding ways of expressing kindness to others.

E. In The Garden of The Torah (**the Lubavitcher Rebbe, Rabbi Menachem M. Schneerson, ztl**)

The Dearness of Every Jew. The Parsha begins "And Hashem called to Moshe, and Hashem spoke to him". Before Hashem spoke to Moshe, He called to him, showing him an unique measure of endearment. Hashem did not call to him to impart information; rather, He did so to express the fundamental love He shares with our people (whom He was addressing through our leader, Moshe). The above concept is fundamental when it comes to relationships with our fellow Jews, even those whose conduct may be (at the present) estranged from our heritage. For every Jew has a soul that is "an actual part of G-d" (Tanya). We should strive to be inclusive, not exclusive, emulating the example of our Torah reading, and share with our fellow Jews the beauty of the Torah. In so doing, we must not be critical of another's level of observance (when Yeshayahu the prophet made harsh statements about the Jewish people, G-d rebuked him severely even though his words were justified); instead of being critical, we must endeavor to appreciate -- and always accentuate -- the positive qualities which every Jew possesses. For indeed, the very fact of a Jew's existence is an expression of G-d's praise, independent of any Divine service which he or she may perform.

F. Love Thy Neighbor (**Rabbi Zelig Pliskin**)

G-d is ever-present. The Torah states "If a person sins and commits a trespass against G-d, by lying to his comrade about an article for safekeeping . . . he shall give it to its owner on the day he admits his guilt". Why is this a trespass against G-d? The answer is illustrated by the following story: Once when Rabbi Zundel Salanter was riding in a wagon, the driver passed by an apple tree and was overcome by a desire to take a few apples. Not realizing the identity of his passenger, the driver told him "You keep watch and warn me if you see anyone looking." A few seconds later, Rav Zundel cried out, "Someone's looking!" The wagon driver jumped into the wagon and rode off. As he was driving away, he looked back and didn't see anyone. "What is the idea of fooling me?", shouted the

driver. "My dear friend", replied Rav Zundel, "I wouldn't lie to you. G-d sees every action".

G. Wellsprings of Torah (Rabbi Alexander Zusia Friedman)

A lesson in humility. "And he shall flay the burned offering and cut it into pieces." If a man thinks that he is a person of many virtues and fears lest this make him arrogant, let him take all his good deeds and virtues and "cut them to pieces," examine them thoroughly and critically, and he will see that he is still far from perfection.

H. Shabbos Stories (Rabbi Shimon Finkelman)

1. A lesson for children (and all of us). There is a widespread custom for young children to begin their study of Chumash (Bible) with this Parsha. The Book of Yayikrah deals with the laws of Temple service and ritual impurity. As the Midrash puts it, "Let the pure [children] come and engage in [the study of] the laws of purity." Sefer Avnei Ezel says that this custom is also a message to parents: The opening of the Book of Yayikrah deals extensively with korbanos (Temple sacrifices). A parent must be prepared to make sacrifices -- both financial and lifestyle -- so that his/her children can study Torah and grow up in a home imbued with a love and appreciation for Judaism.

2. Teaching your children. Chazal teach that the Book of Yayikrah opens with the words, "He [Hashem] called to Moshe" to teach that Hashem summoned Moshe lovingly, saying, "Moshe, Moshe, whenever He wished to speak with him." We may suggest that this, too, is implied in the custom of children beginning their study of Torah with the Book of Yayikrah. Just as Hashem called lovingly to Moshe, so too, must a parent or teacher speak lovingly to a child when teaching him or her the proper way to behave.

I. Divrei Torah (National Council of Young Israel)

A lesson of the Korbanos (Sacrifices). The above Midrash respecting the custom of children beginning their Chumash studies with this Parsha can be better understood by understanding the essence of the korbanot (sacrifices). Basically, korban, signifies "drawing near" to Hashem (from the root "korov" [near]) through the medium of sacrifices that the person offers to Hashem. This is effectuated by the understanding and realization on the part of the person that he is obligated to bring a korban. This understanding is followed by the actual performance of "smicha", laying of hands upon the offering and confessing his iniquities (Yoma 36A). The elements of repentance and appreciation of one's faults and inadequacies, thus "humbling oneself before Hashem," are basic to the proper offering of a korban. Humbleness is basic to Hashem's acceptance of the korban and greater than all sacrifices; whether bringing an external korban or an internal korban -- a willingness to sacrifice for his religious principles and convictions. By his sincerity of purpose while sacrificing, he draws nearer to Hashem. The Midrash quoted above stresses the importance of inculcating, from a very early age, the concept of humbleness before Hashem and readiness to sacrifice for one's religious convictions. Let the "pure" children occupy themselves with the "pure" -- korbanot that will teach them humbleness, leading to proper fear and reverence for Hashem, and thus develop a strength of character, ethics and morals.

<http://www.chiefrabbi.org/>

Covenant & Conversation

Thoughts on the Weekly Parsha from

Sir Jonathan Sacks

Chief Rabbi of the United Hebrew Congregations of the British Commonwealth

[From 2 years ago - 5766]

<http://www.chiefrabbi.org/tt-index.html>

Vayikra

The laws of sacrifices that dominate the early chapters of the book of Vayikra / Leviticus, are among the hardest in the Torah to relate to - for it

has been almost 2000 years since the Temple was destroyed and the sacrificial system came to an end. But Jewish thinkers, especially the more mystical among them, strove to understand the inner significance of the sacrifices, the statement they made about the relationship between humanity and G-d. They were thus able to rescue their spirit even if their physical enactment was no longer possible.

Among the simplest yet most profound was the comment made by R. Shneur Zalman of Ladi, the first Rebbe of Lubavitch. He noticed a grammatical oddity about the second line of today's sedra:

Speak to the children of Israel and say to them: when one of you offers a sacrifice to the Lord, the sacrifice must be taken from the cattle, sheep or goats. (Lev. 1:2) Or so the verse would read if it were constructed according to the normal rules of grammar. However, in Hebrew the word order of the sentence is strange and unexpected. We would expect to read: adam mikem ki yakriv, "when one of you offers a sacrifice". Instead what it says is adam ki yakriv mikem, "when one offers a sacrifice of you". The essence of sacrifice, said R. Shneur Zalman, is that we offer ourselves. We bring to G-d our faculties, our energies, our thoughts and emotions. The physical form of sacrifice - an animal offered on the altar - is only an external manifestation of an inner act. The real sacrifice is mikem, "of you". We give G-d something of ourselves.

Let us stay with this idea and pursue it further. In sacrifice, what do we give G-d? The Jewish mystics, among them R. Shneur Zalman, spoke about two souls each of us has - the animal soul (nefesh ha-behamit) and the G-dly soul. On the one hand we are physical beings. We are part of nature. We have physical needs: food, drink, shelter. We are born, we live, we die. As Kohelet / Ecclesiastes puts it:

Man's fate is like that of the animals; the same fate awaits them both: As one dies, so dies the other. Both have the same breath; man has no advantage over the animal. Everything is a mere fleeting breath. (Ecclesiastes 3: 19) Yet we are not simply animals. We have within us immortal longings. We can think, speak, communicate. We can - by the acts of speaking and listening - reach out to others. We are the one life form known to us in the vast universe that can ask the question "Why?" We can formulate ideas and be moved by high ideals. We are not governed by biological drives alone. Psalm 8 is a hymn of wonder on this theme:

When I consider your heavens, the work of your fingers, the moon and the stars, which you have set in place, what is man that you are mindful of him, the son of man that you care for him? Yet You made him a little lower than the angels and crowned him with glory and honor. You made him ruler over the works of your hands; you put everything under his feet . . .

Physically, we are almost nothing; spiritually, we are brushed by the wings of eternity. We have a G-dly soul.

The nature of sacrifice, understood psychologically, is now clear. What we offer G-d is (not just an animal but) the nefesh ha-behamit, the animal soul within us.

The verse uses three words for the animals to be sacrificed: behemah (animal), bakar (cattle) and tzon (flock). Each represents an animal-like feature of the human personality.

Behemah is animal instinct itself. The word refers to domesticated animals. It does not imply the savage instincts of the predator. What it means is something more tame. Animals spend their time searching for food. Their lives are bounded by the struggle to survive. To sacrifice the animal within us is to be moved by something more than mere survival.

Wittgenstein, when asked what was the task of philosophy, answered "To show the fly the way out of the fly-bottle". The fly, trapped in the bottle, bangs its head against the glass, trying to find a way out. The one thing it fails to do is to look up. The G-dly soul within us is the force that makes us look up, beyond the physical world, beyond mere survival, in search of meaning, purpose, goal.

The word bakar, cattle, in Hebrew reminds us of the word boker, "dawn", literally to "break through", as the first rays of sunlight break through the

darkness of night. Cattle, stampeding, break through barriers. Unless constrained by fences, cattle are no respecters of boundaries. To sacrifice the bakar is to learn to recognize and respect boundaries - between holy and profane, pure and impure, permitted and forbidden. Barriers of the mind can sometimes be stronger than walls.

Finally tzon, flocks, represents the herd instinct - the powerful drive to move in a given direction because others are doing likewise. The great figures of Judaism - Abraham, Moses, the prophets - were distinguished precisely by their ability to stand apart from the herd; to be different, to challenge the idols of the age, to refuse to capitulate to the intellectual fashions of the moment. That ultimately is the meaning of holiness in Judaism. Kadosh, the holy, is something set apart, different, separate, distinctive. Jews were the only people in history consistently to refuse to assimilate to the dominant culture or convert to the dominant faith.

The noun korban, "sacrifice", and the verb le-hakriv, "to offer something as a sacrifice" actually mean "that which is brought close" and "the act of bringing close". The key element is not so much giving something up (the usual meaning of sacrifice) but rather bringing something close to G-d. Le-hakriv is to bring the animal element to be transformed through the Divine fire that once burned on the altar, and still burns at the heart of prayer if we truly seek closeness to G-d.

By one of the great ironies of history, this ancient idea has become suddenly contemporary. Darwinism, the decoding of the human genome, and scientific materialism (the idea that the material is all there is) have led to the widespread conclusion that we are animals, nothing more, nothing less. We share 98 per cent of our genes with the primates. We are, as Desmond Morris used to put it, "the naked ape". Homo sapiens exists by mere accident. We are the result of a random series of genetic mutations who just happened to be more adapted to survival than other species. The nefesh ha-behamit, the animal soul, is all there is.

The refutation of this idea - and it is one of the most absurdly reductive ever held by intelligent minds - lies in the very act of sacrifice itself as the mystics understood it. We can redirect our animal instincts. We can rise above mere survival. We are capable of honouring boundaries. We can step outside our environment. We can transcend the behemah, the bakar and the tzon. No animal is capable of self-transformation; but we are. Poetry, music, love, wonder - the things that have no survival value but which speak to our deepest sense of being - all tell us that we are not mere animals, assemblages of selfish genes. By bringing that which is animal within us close to G-d, we allow the material to be suffused with the spiritual and we become something else: no longer slaves of nature but servants of the living G-d.

from Shema Yisrael Torah Network <shemalist@shemayisrael.com>
hide details Mar 13 (19 hours ago) to Peninim
<peninim@shemayisrael.com> date Mar 13, 2008 4:42 AM subject
Peninim on the Torah by Rabbi A. Leib Scheinbaum - Parshas Vayikra
mailed-by shemayisrael.com

PARSHAS VAYIKRA He (Hashem) called to Moshe. (1:1) Although Moshe Rabbeinu had reached the unprecedented spiritual plateau of being able to speak "face to face" with the Almighty, he did not enter the Kodosh HaKodoshim, Holy of Holies, unless he was called by Hashem. Chazal use this as a source for an important dictum: "Any talmid chacham, Torah scholar, who does not possess daas, knowledge, has a worth less than an animal's carcass."

Strong words. Apparently, daas is a significant prerequisite for the talmid chacham. Surely, it was Moshe's derech erez -- good manners, etiquette, and decency-- that did not permit him to come "calling" on Hashem without first being issued a summons. It was not his daas. What does knowledge have to do with refinement and proper demeanor? Why do

Chazal denounce the talmid chacham who lacks daas, rather than the one who lacks derech erez?

Horav Mordechai Gifter, zl, illuminates this concept for us after first explaining the true meaning of daas, knowledge. We often come across three terms: chochmah; binah; daas. These denote three distinct levels of knowledge, with daas the third and highest level. Chochmah and binah are levels of understanding that remain relegated solely to the area of the mind. For example, how often do we find individuals who preach one thing, but are loathe to "practice what they preach"? Why is this? How does one expound one idea for others, but refuse to live by it himself? It occurs when one studies and even achieves proficiency in a subject, but does not integrate his erudition into his essence. It remains solely cognitive, within the chambers of his mind.

The converse is true concerning daas. The word daas, which is translated in English as knowledge, has a much deeper meaning in the Torah vernacular. Daas is knowledge that has become intrinsic to one's being. Daas is not confined to the mind, but flows through the individual's essence. It inspires and imbues his every thought and movement. Every step that he takes is governed by his daas. Thus, a concept that he has comprehended on the level of daas will be reflected in the manner in which the individual lives, as well as in his total demeanor.

Moshe's derech erez was not simply an exercise in etiquette, the result of what one considers appropriate conduct. No, Moshe's derech erez was the outcome of his profound daas, his depth of understanding of the Torah and the assimilation of this knowledge into every fiber of his being. Every movement that Moshe took was dictated by his daas. Chazal emphasize the significance of talmidei chachamim, Torah scholars, elevating the Torah they study to the exalted level of daas, whereby it becomes a part of them. Their Torah knowledge should not remain abstract but, rather, the motivating factor behind their every action.

We suggest that this might be the meaning of daas Torah, the wisdom that is derived from the Torah. A gadol baTorah, one who has achieved distinction in Torah, is an individual who not only has amassed an incredible amount of erudition, but who has been able to transform himself into a veritable vessel comprised of Torah. Every part of his being reflects the Torah he has learned. The Torah guides and governs every movement that he makes. Hence, the decision he renders is daas Torah, the wisdom of the Torah. The Torah is not only in his mind; it dictates his thought process, so that it produces a Torah-oriented decision.

Man is the only creature capable of refining his understanding, thereby transforming it into daas. If he fails to do so, if he studies, but relegates his knowledge to the confines of the mind, he has dismally failed to achieve his primary goal in life. He has failed! An animal, on the other hand, cannot possibly attain the level of cognition available to humans, but it at least fulfills its purpose on this world. Thus, a talmid chacham, a scholar, who has not fulfilled his purpose in life because he left his knowledge trapped in his mind is worse off than an animal's dead carcass, for he did not fulfill his G-d-given potential in life, while the animal did.

He (Hashem) called to Moshe. (1:1)

Parshas Vayikra commences with the word, Vayikra, which expresses Hashem's call to Moshe. Rashi distinguishes the term vayikra, used when Hashem speaks to Moshe Rabbeinu, from vayikar, which is a derivative of mikreh, meaning chance/happenstance, and is also related to spiritual contamination. Rashi explains that when Hashem speaks to Moshe it is a seminal, "planned" experience, reflecting the highest level of His love for the Rabban Shel Kol Yisrael. The term, vayikar, however, represents impermanence, something that just occurred. Hashem is not really interested in speaking with Bilaam. It is something that He "happened" to do. The Avnei Nezer adds that when Hashem speaks with Bilaam, it is neither direct, nor "face to face." Hashem speaks to the "place" where Bilaam is situated. Bilaam just happens to hear what Hashem says. Thus,

no change occurs vis-?-vis Bilaam, since he is not affected by the experience. After the dialogue, he reverts to his original impure essence.

The Shem MiShmuel explains his father's commentary saying that the level one achieves through nevuah, prophecy, is the result of the character traits and total demeanor of the navi. Moshe manifested the attributes essential to achieve prophecy. Bilaam refused to change. Although he wanted to receive a prophetic vision, he did not want to do so at the expense of his reprehensible lifestyle. Therefore, Hashem spoke "around" him, rather than to him. He cites the Zohar HaKadosh that compares Bilaam to a leper who visits the king. The king refuses to permit him to enter his palace, for fear of it becoming contaminated. Instead, the king leaves his throne room and goes outside the palace to meet with the leper. Not so, when the king's friend arrives. He is allowed to enter into the king's innermost chamber to meet the king.

The very fact that the transitory and random comprise an attribute that is equated with Bilaam indicates that one of the primary principles of kedushah, sanctity, is stability and permanence. Tumah, spiritual contamination, is a negative quality that is intrinsic to the unstable and unanchored. The deep-rooted and resolute cannot be swayed regardless of the strength behind the winds of change. The wicked, however, who are not firmly anchored in solid conviction, are easily induced, because they themselves waver back and forth from one set of beliefs to another.

When a person offers a meal-offering to Hashem. (2:1)

The Torah uses the word nefesh, soul, to describe a person, rather than the usual term, adam, man, because the individual who offers the meal-offering is undoubtedly one of limited means. Therefore, his offering reflects a major sacrifice on his part, almost as if he were giving a part of himself. It is for this reason that Hashem declares, "I will regard it as if he offered his soul." In his sefer, Panim Yafos, Horav Pinchas Horowitz, zl, questions the Korban Minchah's designation as the sacrifice brought by the abject poor. At first glance, one would suggest that the korban ha'of, fowl, was even less expensive than the meal-offering. The fowl-offering consists of a dove or turtledove without any added ingredients. The bird itself is the complete korban. The Korban Minchah, however, requires one-tenth of an eifah of fine flour and a lug of oil and frankincense. When the ingredients are calculated, the meal-offering is more expensive. Why then do Chazal stipulate that this is the korban of the dal she'b'dalim, poorest of the poor?

The Sefas Emes adds to this when he notes that a Korban Minchah may not be brought by partners. It must be the sacrifice of an individual. The fowl, however, may be brought by more than one person. Thus, the Minchah is not necessarily the least expensive sacrifice.

The Chasam Sofer addresses this question, offering a response that goes to the root of the Korban Minchah, the individual who offers it, and what goes through his mind in preparation for bringing this korban. The poor man does not have a penny that he can call his own. He has no money with which to purchase a sheep, a fowl, or even a meal-offering. Nonetheless, in his desire to bring a free-willed offering to Hashem, to somehow make a gesture of gratitude to the Almighty Who has given him "so much," he decides that he will take off a drop of flour from his meager piece of bread. It will be a smaller slice, but he will have saved a drop of flour that over time will suffice for a korban. Every time his wife bakes a small challah, because that is all they can afford, he instructs her to make it yet smaller. We must save for a korban. Therefore, every week their challah is smaller than usual, and their "savings" are placed in a small container, set aside for the korban. He does the same with the little oil he collects every week, until soon he has all the required ingredients. He can now go to the Bais HaMikdash and proudly offer his korban. It took him some time, but he is here!

When we keep the above in mind, is it any wonder why Hashem has such exceptional appreciation for the one who brings a Korban Minchah? It is the result of a long, deliberative process that demonstrates the poor man's total devotion to this korban. It is not what one brings; it is how one brings it, and what goes into the preparation, that leave the ultimate impression.

When a person offers a meal-offering to Hashem. (2:1)

Interestingly, of all those who bring a voluntary offering, it is only the one who brings a Korban Minchah, meal-offering, that is described as a nefesh, soul. Rashi explains that the one who has brought a meal-offering is probably a poor person who cannot afford more. Hashem says, "I will regard it as if he offered his soul."

The Midrash relates an incident in which a woman brought an offering of flour to the Kohen to have it offered as a sacrifice. The Kohen regrettably took a terrible attitude towards this poor woman's offering and began to embarrass her; "Look what they bring as an offering. What is there to eat? What is there to sacrifice?" That night, the Kohen had a dream in which he was admonished never to humiliate anyone who brought a korban, sacrifice, regardless of its diminutive size or value, because what the poor offer is really their nefesh, life. It takes so much for them to scrape together the means for bringing the korban, they are literally offering themselves. The Midrash concludes that, actually the idea is a kal v'chomer, a priori logical deduction. If one is not really offering a living creation, the Torah nonetheless writes that it is as if they offer a nefesh and should be considered as having offered a nefesh, referring to his own life.

The Midrash is basically emphasizing the significance of korbanos and the place they have in Jewish life. One who has the proper intentions when he offers a korban has the ability to elevate this sacrifice in his stead. It takes his place as if he had been sacrificed. We often do not think of the sacrifice people make in maintaining their commitments as Torah Jews. For some, it is the tzedakah, charity, they give. For others, it is the tuition they pay to schools so that their sons and daughters receive a Torah education. For many, this continues on long after their children are married and have children of their own. That is what being an observant Jew is all about: knowing one's priorities and being prepared to make sacrifices for them.

Horav Sholom Schwadron, zl, relates a powerful story that so impacted the community in which it occurred, that they recorded it in the perpetual history of the Chevra Kadisha, sacred burial society, of Vilna. In the cemetery of Vilna there is a grave with the following inscription on its headstone: "Po nitman, Here lies, Ploni ben Ploni, who left this world on yom ploni and was laid to rest on yom ploni." After the inscription, there is a pasuk from Shlomo HaMelech's Eishes Chayil (Mishlei 31:10) engraved on the bottom of the stone: Kapah parsah l'ani, v'yadeha shilcha l'evyon. "Her palm, she opened to the poor and her hands, she stretched out to the needy." This is a poignant and meaningful inscription - for a woman. Eishas Chayil is a tribute which is traditionally used to describe the quintessential Jewish woman. Why is this pasuk used in connection with a man? It is not as if there is a dearth of pesukim available to laud the achievements of a man.

After careful deliberation, the following story was discovered written in the pinkas, ledger, of the city's Chevra Kadisha. Apparently, the deceased had lived his entire life in the Vilna area and was well-known for his charitable bequests. He was an individual who loved -- and thrived on-- giving whatever he had to the poor. He was very wealthy and his fame as an incredible baal tzedakah, philanthropist, spread, bringing in its wake the poor from all the surrounding cities. This not only did not bother our hero, it encouraged him. He reveled in the opportunity to help others. Indeed, as his wealth increased, so did his charitable donations. He just loved to give.

This went on for many years until his business began to waver. The market was no longer the same. People were not as willing to buy, and his great wealth began to decrease with the day's market report. Soon his liquid assets were at the point of no return. Then his properties, stocks and material possessions were sold for whatever cash they could raise. During this entire time, he kept on giving out tzedakah to the needy. Perhaps his contributions were smaller, but he nonetheless continued to give. When he bottomed out, he was left with his palatial mansion and whatever silver was in the house. There was no longer any money left for the poor.

Meanwhile, the question that was raging throughout the streets of Vilna was: What did this man do to sustain such a serious punishment? He was an individual of impeccable character who gave everything to the poor. Why should he be punished so? This question extended beyond the streets into the hallowed halls of the city's spiritual leaders, the rabbanim and dayanim who adjudicated Jewish law for the community. At first, they were also stymied. After discussing the issue at length, they arrived at the conclusion that it was the result of not adhering to Chazal's dictum of, "One who gives charity, should not give more than a fifth of his wealth." This person gave out far more than a fifth. True, he was performing a mitzvah, but when Chazal make a statement they know what they are talking about. When one disregards Chazal – even for something positive – he may one day disregard their admonitions that have a negative connotation.

The Bais Din, judicial court, of the city decided that the only way of protecting this person from himself, from his profound love of the mitzvah of tzedakah, was to place him under house arrest. He was not permitted to leave his home. This way the poor could not approach him in the street or in shul to request alms.

The poor obviously had a difficult time accepting this rabbinic decree and they continued to come to his house. They would scream by his window late at night when no one was around, begging him for whatever assistance he could give them. He would throw silver pieces and jewelry through the window - anything he could get his hands on, as long as it could be pawned by a poor man. This went on for a while until this too came to an end, because, there was no longer anything left in the house. The man who was once the richest, most benevolent man in the community, was now totally wiped out. He had nothing.

It was the "last night," when, at midnight, two poor men came to his window and begged for alms. The man who had never turned anyone away was distraught: "I have nothing left. I am terribly sorry. I cannot help you." The poor men continued begging, crying to him, "Please, our families are starving. Please help us."

The man was moved. He had to do something. He would turn over his house. Perhaps, he had overlooked a piece of silver or gold. How could he allow their families to starve? He looked, and he found! Hidden beneath a cupboard was one golden spoon. It was quite expensive and could do wonders for a poor man's family needs, but, what could he do with one golden spoon and two poor men?

Suddenly, he had an idea. He would break the spoon, giving one man the handle and the other the spoon. The poor men were overjoyed, because they knew the value of this spoon was far beyond anything they had imagined receiving. They would immediately sell their "individual" portions of the spoon in order to sustain their families for another few months.

The next morning the rich man was no longer among the living. He had returned his pure soul to its Maker that night. It had been his last night on this earth, and he had spent it doing what he loved. This time he did it with the greatest sacrifice. He gave others when he no longer had anything for himself. The Chevra Kadisha sought to memorialize his name and his special deeds - especially his last act of tzedakah, on the last night of his life. They, therefore, inscribed Shlomo HaMelech's meaningful verse on his tombstone.

You shall salt your every meal-offering with salt. (2:13)

Horav Yaakov Abuchatzera, zl, takes this pasuk further by rendering it homiletically, as a reference to prayer. Now that because of our sins, we no longer have a Bais HaMikdash, prayer takes the place of korbanos. Our tefillos, prayers, are the sacrifices we offer to the Almighty. Therefore, "every meal-offering," every prayer that is expressed by us in place of a korban, should be "salted." It should be accompanied with "salty" tears, because Shaarei demaos lo ninalu, "The gates of tears are not closed." Chazal tell us that with the destruction of the Bais HaMikdash, the Heavenly Gates were closed to us - all except for the gates of tears. Sincere

expression which is manifest through tears will penetrate the Heavenly Gates and effect a positive response for our supplications.

We may add that just as salt enhances and preserves, it can, as the Ramban notes, have a detrimental effect on plants, corroding many substances. It all depends on how one uses the salt. Likewise, tears are effective if one cries for the proper and correct reason. Unwarranted weeping can corrode and destroy. Tears of hope will catalyze a message of salvation.

Sponsored I'zechar nishmas haisha Yenta bas R' Nochum Tzvi a"h niftar 8 Adar 5760 By the Schulhof, Winter & Feigenbaum Families

YatedUSA Parshas Vayikrah 7 Adar II 5768 Halacha Discussion by **Rabbi Doniel Neustadt**

Amirah l'Akum: Basic Parameters

Although the prohibition of amirah l'akum (telling a non-Jew to do a melachah for a Jew on Shabbos) is a Rabbinical ordinance, it has a Biblical source¹ and is, therefore, considered a severe Rabbinic prohibition. We will attempt to establish the parameters of this multi-faceted halachah: General Rules In order to employ a non-Jew to do a melachah on Shabbos, there are two separate restrictions (often confused) that must be borne in mind. Only when neither of the restrictions applies is it permitted for a non-Jew to do work for a Jew on Shabbos. The two restrictions are: ¹ To command a non-Jew to do any work that would be prohibited for a Jew to do on Shabbos. The command may not be made either on Shabbos or before Shabbos.² ² To benefit directly from work done by a non-Jew for a Jew on Shabbos, even if the non-Jew was not commanded to do the work.³ Our Sages enacted this prohibition so that a person will not be tempted to transgress the prohibition of amirah l'akum and ask a non-Jew to do a melachah for him.⁴ Consequently, if a) a non-Jew was not commanded to do the melachah and b) the Jew will not directly benefit from his work, it would be permitted for a Jew to use a non-Jew to work on Shabbos, for in this way, neither prohibition is being transgressed. How does one avoid the first restriction-commanding the non-Jew? This prohibition can be avoided if the non-Jew understands what he has to do without being explicitly commanded. The Jew may hint to a non-Jew what he wants done, but the hint may not be given in the form of a command. For example, it is permissible to tell a non-Jew: "My bedroom lights are on and I will not be able to sleep"; "It is a pity that so much electricity is being wasted;" "The food on the stove is burning" etc.⁵ It is forbidden, however, to add: "Will you please help me out?" since then the hint is accompanied by a form of a command.⁶ Even if the non-Jew asks: "Should I turn the light off for you?" it is forbidden to answer: "Yes." Hints are also prohibited even if no words are exchanged and one merely gestures or nods in a way that implies do such and such.⁷ How does one avoid the second restriction — benefiting directly from a non-Jew? As we mentioned earlier, our Sages prohibited only direct benefit, such as turning on a light or cooking food, etc. Indirect benefit is permitted. Moreover, they prohibited new benefit only, not additional benefit, which is permitted. Let us explain those terms: ¹ Indirect benefit is when the benefit is not a direct result of the melachah, but a by-product of it; when the melachah removes an obstacle which then enables one to benefit from something. For example: Putting out a light in a bedroom does not directly enable a person to sleep; it merely removes the light which until now made it difficult for him to fall asleep.⁸ ² Additional benefit is when a benefit was previously available to some extent, but the melachah performed by the non-Jew makes it easier to do that which was possible to do even without the melachah that the non-Jew did. For example: Additional lights are turned on by a non-Jew in a room which is already lit.⁹ Note: Although the restriction of benefiting from a non-Jew's melachah is lifted when the action is indirect or additional, it is still forbidden to command him to do the indirect or additional melachah, since the first prohibition still applies. Practical Applications: ¹ A non-Jew, without being told, turns on a light in a dark room for the benefit of a Jew.

It is forbidden to read in that room or to derive any other use from the light, since the benefit is new and direct. (There are exceptions to this rule. In the case of a mitzvah that affects many people, in the case of an ill person, even if he is not dangerously ill, etc. A rav must be consulted.) ? A non-Jew turns off the light in a bedroom. One is permitted to sleep there since he is benefiting indirectly. It is not permitted, however, to instruct the non-Jew to turn the light off.¹⁰ ? A non-Jew, without being told, turns on a light in a dimly lit room so that the Jew can see better. The Jew may continue using the room for whatever use he was making of it before the non-Jew turned on the light, even though it is now much easier for the Jew to see in the room.¹¹ ? A room is lit by faint, natural daylight. If a non-Jew turns on an electric light, the Jew may continue using the room as long as there is some degree of daylight. Once it turns dark, however, the non-Jew's melachah is producing new, not additional, benefit. It is, therefore, prohibited to derive any benefit from the light that was turned on. ? It is prohibited to hint to a non-Jew that it is hot in the room, hoping that he will turn on an air conditioner, since the benefit that the Jew will have from the air conditioner, cool air circulating in the room, is direct and new.¹² Note: The illustrations above are merely samples of the general principles governing amirah l'akum. There are many more details, exceptions and conditions that are involved in the practical halachah, both l'chumrah and l'kulah, which cannot be included here. A rav should be consulted. Question: What may be done if one realizes on Shabbos or Yom Tov that his car lights — either the headlights or the interior lights — were mistakenly left on? Discussion: In order of halachic preference, the following may be done: • If a non-Jew who sees the lights on offers to shut them off, it is permitted to accept his offer. Although generally it is forbidden to directly benefit from an action of a non-Jew on Shabbos even if he offers to do a forbidden Labor on his own, shutting off lights is considered an indirect benefit — a preventive action, which is permitted, as explained earlier. • If there is no non-Jew who offers to shut off the lights, it is permitted to hint to a non-Jew that the lights should be turned off, e.g., “It is a pity that the battery is going to die.” If the hint will not be understood, and if the battery will in all probability die and cause a substantial loss to the owner of the vehicle, it is permitted to ask the non-Jew directly to extinguish the lights. This is permitted because most poskim hold that extinguishing a light on Shabbos is merely a Rabbinical prohibition,¹³ and the basic halachah¹⁴ is that it is permitted to ask a non-Jew to perform a Rabbinical prohibition on one's behalf in order to prevent a substantial loss.¹⁵

FOOTNOTES 1 Mishnah Berurah 243:7 and Sha'ar ha-Tziyun 7. See also Mor u'Ketziyah, O.C. 243. 2 O.C. 307:2; Avnei Nezer, O.C. 43:6; Aruch ha-Shulchan 307:12. 3 O.C. 276:1. 4 Mishnah Berurah 276:2; 307:72; 325:28. 5 Mishnah Berurah 307:76; Shemiras Shabbos K'hilchasah 30:7. According to Rav S.Z. Auerbach, however, this is permitted only in a hotel or in the home of a non-Jew; see Shulchan Shlomo 307:32-2. 6 When the command to do work on Shabbos is given before Shabbos, or when a command to do work is given on Shabbos for work to be done after Shabbos, it may be given as a hint in the form of a command; Rama 307:22; Mishnah Berurah 307:10. 7 Chayei Adam 62:2. 8 See Kalkeles Shabbos (Amirah L'akum 5); Mishnah Berurah 307:11; Shemiras Shabbos K'hilchasah 30:5; 30:36; The Sanctity of Shabbos, pg. 11. 9 Mishnah Berurah 306:76. 10 According to some poskim, turning a light off is only an issur d'Rabbanan. Accordingly, in certain situations one may even instruct a non-Jew to turn the lights off; see The Sanctity of Shabbos, pg. 26. See, however, Me'or ha-Shabbos vol. 1, pg. 513, a written responsum from Rav S.Z. Auerbach who is hesitant to allow this. 11 O.C. 276:4. 12 Igros Moshe, Y.D. 3:47-2. 13 See Mishnah Berurah 278:3. 14 See Mishnah Berurah 307:22 and Sha'ar ha-Tziyun 334:57. 15 Melachim Omnyach 4:8 and 6, note 4. See Shemiras Shabbos k'Hilchasah 30, note 14.

from Halacha <noreply@yutorah.org>

Weekly Halacha Overview-

Use of an Amplification System for Reading the Megillah RABBI JOSH FLUG

Use of an Amplification System for Reading the Megillah

The reading of Megillat Esther on Purim provides a rare opportunity for a weekday service that produces large crowds. As such, the question arises whether one can fulfill the mitzvah of reading the Megillah by listening to the ba'al korei (reader) through an amplification system (microphone and speakers).

The centerpiece of this discussion is a Mishna, Rosh HaShanah 27b. The Mishna states that if a shofar is blown into a pit, if the listener hears the actual sound of the shofar, he fulfills the mitzvah of listening to the shofar. However, if he hears the echo of the shofar, he does not fulfill the mitzvah. The contemporary discussions about fulfilling the mitzvah of shofar or Megillah through an amplification system either explicitly or implicitly address the nature of the problem of hearing the echo.

The Stringent Position

R. Shlomo Z. Auerbach, Minchat Shlomo no. 9, notes that there is a fundamental problem with fulfilling the mitzvah of shofar or Megillah through an amplification system because when one hears the sound coming out of the speaker, it is not the actual sound of the shofar or the reader. Rather, it is an analog or digital reproduction of the original sound. R. Shalom Vider, in Teshuvot Yerushat P'leitah no. 6, presents the same objection to fulfilling these mitzvot through an amplification system and suggests that the Mishna's problem of hearing the echo of the shofar is simply that one does not actually hear the shofar but rather a reproduced sound.

R. Yosef Engel, Gilyonei HaShas, Berachot 25b, states that the fact that one does not hear the actual sound produced by the shofar or the reader does not prevent one from fulfilling the mitzvah. After all, even without an amplification system, one only hears the vibration of matter in one's immediate area and not the original sound waves. Nevertheless, the problem with an amplification system is that one does not hear the sound in a natural manner. Hearing a sound through in an abnormal fashion may not be considered a halachically valid form of hearing.

One can add that this is the Mishna's problem with hearing an echo. Although there is always an echo produced by any sound, the human ear cannot detect the echo unless there is a considerable delay (approximately 1/10 of a second) between the original sound and the echo. Thus, it is possible that the problem with hearing the echo of the shofar is that one does not hear the shofar in a natural manner.

The Middle Position

R. Chaim E. Shapira, Minchat Elazar 2:72, suggests that the problem with hearing a shofar through an echo not only applies if only the echo is heard but even if one hears the sound of the shofar and the echo together. According to Minchat Elazar, one can only fulfill the mitzvah of listening to the shofar by hearing the unadulterated sound of the shofar. If other sounds are heard together with the shofar, one does not fulfill the mitzvah. Regarding sounds heard through amplification systems, the sound comes out of the speaker together with other non-shofar signals and therefore, one cannot fulfill the mitzvah by hearing a shofar through an amplification system.

Nevertheless, Minchat Elazar notes that the concern of hearing the sound of the echo is only mentioned in the context of the mitzvah of listening to the shofar. He writes that he knows of no reason to invalidate an amplification system for the mitzvah of Megillah.

R. Tzvi Pesach Frank, in a responsum printed in Minchat Yitzchak 2:113, also suggests that there is a difference between listening to a shofar through an amplification system and listening to the Megillah through an amplification system. Regarding the shofar, the mitzvah is actually to hear the sound of the shofar. Therefore, if the sound is tainted by an echo, one cannot fulfill the mitzvah. However, regarding the Megillah, the mitzvah is not to listen to the Megillah, but to read the Megillah. All of the listeners fulfill their mitzvah based on the principle of shomei'a k'oneh (the listener is like the responder). When one listens to the Megillah, it is as if he himself is

reading the Megillah. According to R. Frank, a tainted sound does not prevent the shomei'a k'oneh principle from taking effect and therefore, one can fulfill the mitzvah of Megillah by listening through an amplification system.

The Lenient Position

R. Auerbach, op. cit., notes that he discussed the matter with R. Avraham Y. Karelitz (Chazon Ish). Chazon Ish responded that if the listener hears the sound through an amplification system immediately after the sound is produced it is possible that he fulfills the mitzvah. R. Auerbach explains that accordingly, one must explain that the problem with the echo is that the sound is not heard immediately upon its production.

R. Moshe Feinstein, Igrot Moshe, Orach Chaim 2:108, argues that even if one were to consider the sound coming out of a speaker as a reproduction, it does not necessarily invalidate the sound because any sound that is heard is not the actual produced sound (similar to R. Engel's initial assertion). He posits that the problem with hearing the echo is that an echo is a weak sound. Sound produced through an amplification system is a strong sound and therefore not subject to the invalidity of the sound of the echo. Therefore, R. Feinstein rules that in principle one should not protest those who use an amplification system for the reading of the Megillah. [R. Feinstein presents other reasons why one should not accept this practice.]

Hearing Aids

R. Auerbach, op. cit., writes that according to his own opinion that one may not fulfill the mitzvah of shofar or Megillah by listening through an amplification system, one who listens using a hearing aid would not fulfill the mitzvah either. R. Auerbach notes that a hearing aid is merely a miniature amplification system. According to R. Shapira and R. Frank, a hearing aid would be valid for listening to the Megillah. [It should be noted that there are two important practical differences between these two opinions. First, according to R. Auerbach, a person listening to shofar or Megillah should not recite a beracha. Second, according to R. Auerbach, if an individual is able to hear without the hearing aid, he should remove it (or deactivate) when listening to the shofar or Megillah. If the individual cannot hear without it, R. Auerbach will most likely agree that he should listen with the hearing aid and then he will either be in fulfillment of the mitzvah according to those who disagree or exempt from the mitzvah because he has no way of fulfilling it.]

R. Moshe Shternbuch (in the journal Ateret Shlomo Vol. IX) presents a distinction between hearing aids and amplification systems. R. Shternbuch seems to follow the approach of R. Engel that the problem with amplification systems is that one does not hear the sound in a natural manner. As such, R. Shternbuch posits that if a particular individual always uses a hearing aid to hear, this becomes his natural method of hearing and he may fulfill the mitzvah in this manner. R. Shternbuch adds that one may add the opinion of Chazon Ish as a mitigating factor.

R. Shternbuch applies his ruling to cochlear implants. A cochlear implant is a device that gives those who are totally deaf or severely hard of hearing the ability to hear by stimulating the auditory nerves to replicate the effect of the original sound. The cochlear implant bypasses the ear so that no sound is heard through the ear. One could argue that this is not considered sh'mia (listening) at all since the sound is not heard through the ear. Nevertheless, R. Shternbuch rules that since this is the normal way of hearing for an individual who has a cochlear implant, he may fulfill the mitzvah of shofar and Megillah by means of the cochlear implant. R. Joshua Flug is the Rosh Kollel of the Boca Raton Community Kollel, a member of the YU Kollel Initiative and senior editor for the Marcos and Adina Katz YUTorah.org, a division of Yeshiva University's Center for the Jewish Future. To access the archives of the Weekly Halacha Overview click here. To unsubscribe from this list, please click here.

http://www.torahweb.org/torah/2002/parsha/rsch_vayikra.html

The Leader With the Small Aleph **Rabbi Herschel Schachter**

The TorahWeb Foundation

The Talmud (Chagiga 5b) tells us that G-d "sheds three tears" over the tragedies of the human situations that people bring upon themselves. One of those tears is over people appointed to positions of leadership who misuse their authority for the purpose of self-aggrandizement. It is a psychological principle that power corrupts. It is very unusual for one to wield a lot of power and to remain unaffected. The parsha speaks of the case of the Jewish king of Eretz Yisroel (the land of Israel) sinning and being able to offer a special kind of "korban chatas" ("sin offering"). The expression used is, "asher nasi yecheta" ("that a leader shall sin"), and the Rabbis pointed out that the connotation of the phrase is that "it is the good fortune and to the credit of that generation" that their chosen leader is able to admit his mistakes. "Hakaras hachet" (recognizing that one has sinned) is difficult for any intelligent person, and even more difficult for one in a position of leadership. If the chosen leader is able to admit his errors, this indicates that the people had chosen wisely.

Rav Chaim Soloveitchik, when he had to choose a dayan (rabbinical judge) for the city of Brisk to assist him in paskening the shailos (issuing Jewish legal rulings in response to questions), he preferred Rav Simcha Zelig Regeur over the other candidates because he alone was able to admit that he did not know how to pasken on several of the issues that Rav Chaim had posed to him. The Talmud recommends even for laymen that we all "train ourselves to say that we do not know". This criterion is even more crucial for appointing one to a position of leadership.

The Talmud tells us that in the overwhelming majority of cases the views of Beis Hillel have been accepted as opposed to those of Beis Shammai. One of the reasons given for this is that generally speaking the students of Beis Hillel were more humble than those of Beis Shammai. In general, the students of Beis Shammai were more brilliant than those of Beis Hillel, and often found it too difficult to humble themselves to the degree of their counterparts. The assumption is that the more humble the individual is, the better the chance he has to discover the deep truths of the Torah.

Moshe Rabbeinu was the greatest Torah scholar of all times, precisely because of his great humility. The opening mishna in Avos states that "Moshe kibel Torah meSinai" The simple translation of the phrase means that he received the Torah at the location of Mt. Sinai. There is a famous interpretation offered by both Chassidic and Misnagdishe rabbonim, that Moshe was worthy of receiving the Torah because he was like Mt. Sinai, i.e., because of his humility. Just as Sinai was not so tall a mountain, and acted with humility in context to the other mountains, and was therefore chosen by G-d for the purpose of matan Torah in lieu of other tall mountains, so too, Moshe Rabbinu, Beis Hillel, and anyone else humble of spirit, stands a better chance of succeeding in clarifying the truth of the Torah.

When choosing a rabbi of whom we ask sheilos, or when selecting one for a position of leadership, the criterion of humility should be high on the list of qualities to look for. It is indeed the "good fortune of the generation" to be able to choose as their leader someone who is in the habit of saying "eini yodeah", and humble enough to admit on occasion that he erred.

At the end of the first word in Chumash Vayikra there is a small aleph, as opposed to the first letter of the word "Adam" at the beginning of Sefer Divrei Hayamim, where there is a large aleph. The small aleph is understood as representing the humility of Moshe Rabbeinu. The Baal HaTanya explained, along the same lines, that the extra-large aleph of "Adam" represents the arrogance of Adam Harishon. The chumash tells us that the cause of the original sin was the arrogant attitude of Adam and Chava who believed the words of the Snake, who said that if they ate from the Etz Hadaas they would become as great as G-d! Fortunate is the generation who understands enough to appoint as its leader the person with the small "aleph" like Moshe Rabbeinu

הקפיד דוקא שלא להרוג הנקבות. והשיב יואב שלמד ק"ו ממלחמת עמלק, מה אם במלחמת עמלק אסור להרוג כ"א הזכרים (לפי טעונו שקרא זכר עמלק בקמץ) כ"ש במלחמת רשות ע"ש. אך לפירושו יפלא מה כל השו"ט בזה, הרי כיון שהיתה מלחמת רשות באמת אסור להרוג את הנקבות, שהרי מקרא מלא הוא ב' שופטים (כ), י"ד) רק הנשים והטף והבהמה וכל אשר יהיה בעיר כל שללה תבו לך. וצ"ל לדעת מהרש"א דהתם רשות קאמר, שאין חייבים להרוג הנשים והטף. אבל עיין ברמב"ם הל' מלכים פ"ו ה"ד כתב מפורש שבמלחמת רשות אין הורגין אשה ולא קטן, הרי שמפרש דקרא איסורא קאמר, שבמלחמת רשות אסור <להרוג נשים וטף. ולפ"ז א"א לפרש כפירוש המהרש"א>

ולנ"ל ניחא דמבואר במכילתא הנ"ל דרשת ר' יהושע דכפל הלשון דמחה אמחה בא רבות כל משפחותיו, דהיינו כל משפחות עשירי

ג. ור"א המודעי דדריש אמחה לרבות כל הדור ההוא, הכונה כמש"א ר"א המודעי עצמו שם במשך: ר"א המודעי אומר אימתי יאבד שמן של אלו בשעה שנעקר ע"ז היא ועובדיה... באותה שעה נאמר (זכריה י"ד) ויצא ה' ונלחם בגויים ההם כו' ע"ש. והנה רישא דההוא קרא: ואספתי את כל הגויים אל ירושלים למלחמה כו', וע"ז אמר ויצא ה' ונלחם בגויים ההם כיום הלחמו ביום קרב. הרי דס"ל לר"א המודעי דגמר המלחמה בעמלק יהיה כשיעשה הקב"ה מלחמה עם כל הגויים הנאספים על ירושלים. ואשר לכן נראה דזה ג"כ כוננו כאן במש"א אמחה לרבות כל הדור ההוא, היינו כל הגויים דאותו הדור הנאספים על ירושלים ד. ולכשתמצא לומר, ר' יהושע ור"א המודעי פליגי לשיטתייהו. דעיין מגילה (ז) "כתב זאת", מה שכתוב כאן. "זכרון", מה שכתוב במשנה תורה. "בספר", מה שכתוב בבבאיים, דברי ר' יהושע. ר"א המודעי אומר "כתב זאת", מה שכתוב כאן ובמשנה תורה. "זכרון", מה שכתוב בבבאיים, "בספר", מה שכתוב במגילה ע"כ. מבואר דר' יהושע ס"ל דמה שכתוב כאן (כפ' בשלח) ומש"כ במשנה תורה (כפ' זכור) חשיבי ב' כתיבות, ור"א המודעי ס"ל דחשיבי כתיבה אחת. ופולוגתם צ"ב

ויתכן, דנתבאר לעיל מחלוקת רש"י והרמב"ם אם מחה אמחה היינו ע"י ישראל, והוא דבר אחד עם מחה תמחה, או דמחה אמחה היינו ע"י הקב"ה, ואינו ענין להמצוה דמחה תמחה. וי"ל דבזה פליגי ר' יהושע ור' אליעזר המודעי. דר' יהושע ס"ל דמחה אמחה היינו ע"י ישראל, והוא דבר אחד עם מחה תמחה. וממילא דמש"כ במשנה תורה "תמחה" הוא כפל מה שנאמר בפ' בשלח, והו"ל ב' כתיבות. ואילו ר"א המודעי ס"ל דאמחה היינו ע"י הקב"ה, ואינו ענין לתמחה, ולכן חשיבי כתיבה אחת, דאינו כפל הפרשה ב' פעמים, אלא שני חצאי פרשה, דכפ' זכור כתוב המצוה דאמחה למחות, וכפ' בשלח כתיב שנאמר המחיה תחיה ע"י הקב"ה

ה. ומעתה, ר' יהושע דדריש אמחה דקאי אבני עשירי, אזיל לשי' שהמחיה היא ע"י ישראל, דהמלחמה בבני עשירי תחיה ע"י ישראל כמש"כ הרמב"ן שמה שעשה בהם משה ויהושע בראשונה יעשו אליהו ומשיח בן יוסף באחרונה. ומקרא מלא הוא (עובדיה א') והיה בית יעקב אש ובית יוסף להבה ובית עשירי לקש כו' ועלו מושיעים מהר ציון לשפוט את הר עשירי. וכו'

אבל ר"א המודעי דדריש אמחה דקאי על כל הדור ההוא, היינו כל הגויים הנאספים על ירושלים, לשי' שהמחיה היא ע"י הקב"ה, דבאותה שעה כתיב ויצא ה' ונלחם בגויים ההם כיום הלחמו ביום קרב

ג. בביוה לא שלחו את ידם

א. ועיין ברבינו בחיי סו"פ בשלח, דעתו כדעת רש"י דחייבים לאבד גם רכושם של עמלק, והוסיף דלכן כתיב במגילת אסתר ובבזוה לא שלחו את ידם, דבמלחמת עמלק אסור ליהנות מן הביוה אלא הכל בכלל מצות ממה תמחה והגרי"פ בבאורו על סה"מ לרס"ג הקשה ממש"כ הנה בית המן נתתי לאסתר, איך היו מותרים ליהנות מבית המן

ב. ונראה, דעי"ש ברבינו בחיי כתב וז"ל: וע"ד הפשט כי יד על כס ית-ה... באר כי המלחמה והשלל הכל לה' כו' ומפני זה נזהר מרדכי בדבר שלא ליהנות משלל המן שהיה מזרע עמלק כענין שנא' בפרעניות המן ובבזוה לא שלח את ידם, לפי שהתורה הזהירה בכך תמחה את זכר עמלק עכ"ל

ולמדנו מדבריו, שיסוד החיוב למחות את רכושם של עמלק הוא בהיותו ביזת המלחמה עם עמלק, והמלחמה הזאת צ"ל קדש לה'. אבל מה שאינו בכלל ביזת המלחמה באמת אינו בכלל חיוב מחיה ואף דקרא כתיב סתמא, אמחה את זכר עמלק, ודרשו במכילתא שלא יאמרו גמל זה של עמלק היה, נראה שאי"ז סותר למה שכתבנו, דבאמת כיון שעמלק נמחה גם הגמל אינו נקרא על שם עמלק, כ"א מצד שהוא ביזת מלחמת עמלק. דעצם העובדא שהוא מבית עמלק גורם שהוא נקרא על שם עמלק אף שכבר פקע הבעלות של עמלק. אבל כל שאינו בכלל הביזוה אינו נקרא על שם עמלק כלל, לאחר שנמחו מן העולם

ג. וא"כ ניחא דבביוה דייקא לא שלחו את ידם, אבל בית המן לא היה מן הביוה כלל, רק אחשורוש נתנו למרדכי, ובזה לא היה שום איסור ושום חיוב מחיה, וק"ל

ד. נין ונכד

א. עוד יתכן בדעת הרמב"ם שהשמיט הדין דמחית רכושו של עמלק, דהנה באמת לשון

מחית זכר עמלק

א-

משור ועד שה

א. על הפסוק "מחה תמחה את זכר עמלק" כתב רש"י וז"ל מאיש ועד אשה מעולל ועד יונק משור ועד שה שלא יהא שם עמלק נזכר אפילו על בהמה לומר בהמה זו של עמלק היתה עכ"ל. ולשון זה הוא מדברי שמואל לשאול (ש"א ט"ו, ג), וס"ל לרש"י שכן היא המצוה לדורות לאבד אפילו הבהמות

ב. והמקור לזה מן המכילתא סו"פ בשלח וז"ל ר"א המודעי אומר נשבע הקב"ה בכסא הכבוד שלו אם אניה נין ונכד של עמלק תחת כל השמים, שלא יאמרו גמל זה של עמלק ע"כ.

ג. אבל הרמב"ם והחינוך השמיטו דין זה, וצריך להבין למה לא חשו לדברי המכילתא מתחילה עלה בלבי לומר שהרמב"ם מפרש גמל במכילתא מלשון כגמול עלי אמו, והיה > ניחא יותר הלשון שפתח בנין ונכד ומסיים בגמל (וע"ז לקמן ענף ד' ידובר בזה). אבל באמת זה נסתר מלשון המכילתא דרשב"י ששם איתא: שלא יאמרו גמל זה של עמלק רחל <זו של עמלק אילן זה של עמלק ע"ש

ד. ונראה, דהנה בפ' יבוא עמלק (סו"פ בשלח) כתיב: כתב זאת זכרון בספר ושים באזני יהושע כי מחה אמחה את זכר עמלק כו'. ופרש"י שם ד"ה כי מחה אמחה וז"ל לכך אני מזהירך שחפץ אני למחות עכ"ל. ובאר הרא"ם שם וז"ל לא שאמחה אותו אני, דא"כ מאי ושים באזני יהושע ע"כ

מבואר ששיטת רש"י דמה שנאמר בפ' בשלח מחה אמחה כו' ומה שנאמר בפ' כי תצא מחה תמחה כו' הכל אחד, שהקב"ה ימחה את עמלק ע"י ישראל שציווה אותם במצות המחיה וכן נראה גם דעת הרמב"ן סו"פ בשלח שם שכתב וז"ל כי מחה אמחה את זרעו ונתתי נקמתו בו ביד עמי ישראל עכ"ל, הרי דס"ל ג"כ שההבטחה דמחה אמחה היא מתקיימת ע"י ישראל, דהיינו ע"י המצוה דמחה תמחה

ה. אבל עיין בסה"מ להרמב"ם מ"ע קפ"ז כתב בין הדברים וז"ל כשיאבד הש"ית זרע עמלק לגמרי ויכריתו עד אחריתו, כמו שיהיה במהרה בימינו כמו שהבטיחנו יתברך באמרו כי מחה אמחה את זכר עמלק כו' עכ"ל הנצרך לעניינו. ומשמע קצת מלשונו שהרמב"ם מפרש שהקב"ה הבטיח לשרש אחר עמלק בעצמו, שלא ע"י ישראל, וזהו ההבטחה דמחה אמחה ו. ומעתה, הרי המכילתא הנ"ל משמע שנסמך על מש"כ "מתחת השמים", כמבואר הלשון שם "אם אניה נין ונכד כו' תחת כל השמים שלא יאמרו גמל זה של עמלק כו'", וכן מפורש במכילתא דרשב"י ששם הלשון: "מתחת השמים, ר' יהושע אומר שלא יהיה לו נין ונכד לעמלק שלא יאמרו גמל זה של עמלק רחל זו של עמלק אילן זה של עמלק" ע"ש. והרי זה הוא סיפא דקרא דמחה אמחה. ולדעת רש"י דהבטחה מחה אמחה ומצות מחה תמחה הם דבר אחד אם כן בא זה ולימד ע"ז דהמצוה היא משור ועד שה שלא יאמרו כו'. ולכן רש"י לשיטתו נקט שמצות תמחה היא גם להרוג הבהמות. אבל להרמב"ם מחה אמחה היא הבטחת הייעוד שהקב"ה ישרש אחריהם, וזה באמת יהיה באופן שלא יניח כו' ולא יאמרו גמל זה של עמלק היה, אבל אינו ענין להמצוה המוטלת על ישראל למחות, ובמצות מחה תמחה לא אשכחן גדר זה

ז. ומה ששמואל ציוה לשאול להרוג משור ועד שה כו' משום ששם לא היה קיום המצוה דמחה תמחה לבד, אלא שם היה אמור להיות קיום הייעוד דמחה אמחה, וכמה שאמר שמואל שם בשם הקב"ה, פקדתי את אשר עשה לך עמלק כו', וק"ל

ב-

ולמשפחותיו

א. וע"ז במכילתא שם עה"פ מחה אמחה וז"ל מחה לו ותולדותיו, אמחה לו ולמשפחותיו, דברי ר' יהושע. ר"א המודעי אומר... מחה לו ולכל תולדותיו, אמחה לו ולכל הדור ההוא, ע"כ. והוא מאמר סתום

ב. ונראה דתולדותיו הוא זרע עמלק כפשוטו, ומשפחותיו הוא בני עשירי בכלל, דעמלק הוא ממשפחת עשירי. ועיין ברמב"ן סו"פ בשלח וז"ל כי המלחמה מן המשפחה הזאת היא הראשונה והאחרונה לישראל, כי עמלק מזרע עשירי, וממנו באה אלינו המלחמה בראשית הגויים... והנה כל אשר עשו משה ויהושע בראשונה יעשו אליהו ומשיח בן יוסף עם זרעם. על כן התאמץ משה בדבר עכ"ל. ומבואר שהמלחמה בעמלק היא ראשית המלחמה שסופה להיות עם עשירי. וס"ל לר' יהושע דזה הוא המתרבה מכפל הלשון דמחה אמחה ועיין ב"ב (כא). כי ששה חדשים ישב שם יואב וכל ישראל עד הכרית כל זכר לאדם, כי אתא לקמיה דדוד א"ל מ"ט עבדת הכי <פרש"י: שלא הרגת את הנקבות >, א"ל דכתיב תמחה את זכר עמלק <שיואב קרא זכר בקמץ >, א"ל והא אנן זכר קרינן כו' ע"ש. ותמוה מה ענין מחית עמלק לענין מלחמת יואב באדם, ואיך נלמד ממה שנאמר מחה תמחה בעמלק, שהיה יואב צריך להרוג הנקבות באדם

וע"ש במהרש"א שפירש דלעולם שם היתה מלחמת רשות, אלא שמ"מ דוד שאלו למה >

ונראה שהוא מבואר מדברי רש"י פ' תצא הנ"ל, עה"פ מהה תמחה את זכר עמלק שכתב וז"ל: מאיש ועד אשה מעולל ועד יונק משור ועד שיה שלא יהא שם עמלק נזכר אפילו על בהמה כו' ע"ש. הרי בהדיא שהרבותא דזכר עמלק כולל טף ונשים ובהמות בהשוואה אחת, דכולם בכלל זכר עמלק

ד. ומעתה יל"פ דברי המכילתא דקאמר שנשבע הקב"ה שלא יניח בן ונכד לעמלק שלא יאמרו כו', ולמה צריך טעם מיוחד הרי זהו גוף המחיה. אבל לנ"ל ניהא, והיינו עפ"י שיטת רש"י (לעיל ענף א') דמחה אמהה ומחה תמחה הכל אחד, דהמחיה היא ע"י ישראל, והרי בעלמא הדין הוא שאסורים להרוג נשים וטף במלחמה. וגם בעמלק היה צ"ל כן, והמחיה יתקיים ע"י הריגת הגדולים. <הטף יקחו לעבדים וממילא יאבד עמלק מלהיות מגוי. > ולזה קאמר שנשבע הקב"ה שלא להניח זכר לעמלק כלל, לא נין ונכד ולא גמל ורחל, וכדברי רש"י מאיש ועד אשה מעולל ועד יונק משור ועד שיה כו

ה. והנה לעיל (ענף ג') צדדנו בדעת רבינו בחיי שהחוב דהריגת הבהמות הוא רק בביוה, ואי"ז סותר לדברינו כאן שהחוב הזה כולל נשים וטף, דגם הם בכלל ביוה כמבואר בפרשה (דביות מדין) (במדבר ל"א)

אך נפקותא להאמור, דלפי שתי הסברות האלו, שהחוב להרוג נשים וטף דעמלק הוא מצד שהם בכלל זכר עמלק, וכמו הבהמות, ושחוב זה הוא רק בביוה, יוצא לנו דאין חוב להרוג הנשים והטף של עמלק כ"א בשעת מלחמה כשהם בכלל ביוה עמלק, אבל שלא בשעת מלחמה לא

והנה מה שאמרו במכילתא שאין מקבלים גרים מעמלק יל"ע אם זהו דין בעמלק מצד עצמם שהם מופקעים מגירות, או שהוא מצד החוב מחיה, שא"א לקבלם כיון שחייבים להרגם. ואף שמהעשה דוד מוכח דאפילו עברו וקיבלו אינו מועיל, י"ל דהוא עדיין מצד החוב מחיה, דהחוב מחיה מפקיע את קבלתם

ואם נאמר כן ובצירוף מה שהעלנו שהחוב להרוג נשים וטף דעמלק הוא רק בשעת מלחמה וכשהם בכלל ביוה יתורר הקושיא ממש"א בגמ' גיטין מבני בניו של המן למדו תורה בבני ברק, דמכשח"ל ע"י שבאה אחת מבנותיו להתגיר שלא בשעת מלחמה, או אפילו בשעת מלחמה אבל באופן שלא היתה מכלל הביוה, דבכה"ג אינה בכלל זכר עמלק ויכולים לקבלה. אבל הנער העמלקי הרי אמר מפורש בן איש גר עמלקי אנכי, שאביו היה עמלקי ונתגיר, והזכרים חייבים להרוג אפילו כשאנים בכלל ביוה, שזהו גוף המחיה, וק"ל

-1-

א. כתב החינוך במצ' תר"ג שמצות זכירת עמלק נוגתת בזכרים דוקא שלהם לעשות מלחמה. אבל מסתימת לשון הרמב"ם פ"ה הל' מלכים ה"ה שלא חילק כן משמע דחולק על החינוך בזה

ב. ויש כאן מקום עיון דהנה הרמב"ם שם כתב וז"ל ומ"ע לזכור תמיד מעשיו הרעים ואריבתו כדי לעורר איבתו שנאמר זכור את אשר עשה לך עמלק כו' עכ"ל. וממש"כ שמצות זכירה היא כדי לעורר איבתו משמע שמצות הזכירה היא חיוק למצות המחיה. ויותר מבואר כן מלשון הרמב"ם בסה"מ מצ' קפ"ט וז"ל היא שמצונו לזכור מה שעשה לנו עמלק כו' ונעורר הנפשות במאמרים להלחם בו ונזרו העם לשנוא אותו עד שלא תשכח המצוה <היינו מצות המחיה> ולא תחלש שנאתו ותחסר מהנפשות מאורך הזמן והוא אמרו ית' זכור את אשר עשה לך עמלק כו' עכ"ל. הרי שטעם מצות הזכירה שלא תחלש שנאתו באורך הזמן ונתעצל מלמחות

אבל עיון החינוך שם כתב וז"ל משרשי המצוה לתת אל לבנו שכל המצר לישראל שנאו לפני המקום וכי לפי דעתו וערמת רוב נזקו תהיה מפלתו ורעתו, כמו שאתה מוצא בעמלק כי מפני שעשה רעה גדולה לישראל שהתחיל הוא להזיקם צונו ב"ה לאבד זכרו מני ארץ ולשרש אחריו עד כלה עכ"ל. הרי שלדעת החינוך אין מצות הזכירה סיג למצות המחיה רק היא תכלית בפנ"ע שניתן אל לבנו שכל המצר לישראל שנאו לפני המקום

ומעתה יקשה דלכ' יש כאן סברות הפוכות, דלפי דעת הרמב"ם שמצות הזכירה היא סיג וחיוק למצות המחיה, שלא תחלש שנאת עמלק באורך הזמן, היתה הסברה נותנת לפטור נשים ממצוה זו, כיון שלא בנות מלחמה הן, אבל מסתימת לשון הרמב"ם משמע דס"ל דנשים באמת חייבות. ומאידך, לפי דעת החינוך שמצות הזכירה היא שבביל שנשים אל לבנו שכל המצר לישראל שנאו לפני המקום, הרי ענין זה שייך גם אצל נשים, דגם להם לשים אל לבן דבר זה. ותמוה שהחינוך הוא הסובר דנשים פטורות

ג. אבל באמת נראה דלכ"מ, ואדרבא הרמב"ם והחינוך אזלי לשי' בזה. דהנה יש להבין במקרא דכתיב זכור את אשר עשה לך עמלק כו' שהיא מ"ע דזכירה, ואח"כ כתיב והיה בהניח ה' א' לך כו' תמחה את זכר עמלק, שהיא מצות המחיה. ושוב כתיב לא תשכח, שהיא הל"ת דמצות הזכירה. פתח וסיים במצות הזכירה, ובאמצע הזכיר מצות המחיה. וצריך להבין, למה נשתרבה מצות המחיה לאמצע מצות הזכירה. תינת להרמב"ם שתכלית מצות הזכירה היא שלא נתעצל מלקיים מצות המחיה, א"כ ניהא דקרא הכי קאמר זכור כו' כדי שתקיים מצות המחיה, אבל להחינוך דמצות הזכירה היא ענין בפנ"ע א"כ אין כאן מקומו של מצות המחיה כלל, והיה צריך לסיים במצות הזכירה, לא תשכח, קודם שמתחיל לדבר מצות המחיה

ולדעת החינוך נראה דצ"ל דמה שנזכר כאן מצות המחיה באמצע מצות הזכירה, אי"ז משום שהיא תכלית המצוה וכדעת הרמב"ם, אלא משום שזו היא מתוכן הזכירה, דגם את זה צריך לזכור, ובאמת שכן מבואר בהדיא בלשון החינוך שכתב: "לתת אל לבנו... וכי לפי

המכילתא קשה, דקאמר שנשבע הקב"ה אם אינה נין ונכד של עמלק תחת כל השמים שלא יאמרו גמל זה של עמלק ע"כ, פתח בנין ונכד ומסיים בגמל. וכע"ז הלשון במכילתא (דרשב"י, והוא לעיל אות ו)

גם משמע מלשון המכילתא שהטעם שנשבע שלא להניח בן ונכד לעמלק הוא כדי שלא יהיה לו זכר, וכענין שאמר לענין גמלו שלא יאמרו זה של עמלק, וקשה מה צריך לזה הרי אם נשאר נין ונכד לעמלק לא נמחה עמלק כלל, וחסר בעצם המחיה, ולא רק בענין של זכר

וי"ל דמייירי בנין ונכד ע"י בת, דהם עצמם אינם בכלל עמלק, שהיחוס הוא בתר האב, רק דמ"מ הוי זכר עמלק, שלא יאמרו זה מעמלק היה

ב. ומעתה אפשר להוסיף עוד, דנין ונכד זה מן הבת אינו מצד עצמו זכר עמלק כלל, שהרי לאו שם עמלק עליו, שמתניחס אחר אביו. רק דעכ"פ הרי הוא יורשו של עמלק, וירש את 'כל חילו, וע"ז יישאר זכר לעמלק שיאמרו גמל זה ירש מעמלק, רחל זו ירש מעמלק כו וא"כ ניהא מאד לשון המכילתא, דפתח בנין ונכד ומסיים בגמל, דהכי קאמר, שנשבע הקב"ה שלא להניח בן ונכד לעמלק, אפילו אלה שאינם בעצמם בכלל עמלק, דהיינו ע"י בת. ולמה נשבע כן, שלא יאמרו גמל זה של עמלק כו', דאם יישאר לו נין ונכד הרי יירש את כל רכוש עמלק וע"ז יהיה זכר לעמלק

וא"כ ניהא מה שהרמב"ם השמיט החיוב להרוג הבהמות, דבאמת ליכא חיוב להרוג הבהמות כלל. דכל שנכרת עמלק לגמרי, ואפילו נין ונכד אין לו, ממילא דלא נשאר לו זכר, דהבהמות הם הפקר והזוכה בהם זוכה מן הפקר ואין כאן זכר לעמלק כל עיקר <ומה שציוה שמואל על הבהמות צ"ל להוראת שעה היתה >

אך עדיין יקשה לפ"י דהא גופא הו"ל להרמב"ם לאשמענין דחייבים להרוג אפילו נכדיו של עמלק מן הבת. אלא אם כן נאמר שהשבעה הזאת היא הבטחת הקב"ה לשרש אחריו, אבל החיוב על ישראל דמחה תמחה הוא רק למחות את עמלק עצמם. אבל א"כ הוא כבר בכלל (מה) שתירצנו לעיל (ענף א)

ג. ולפי דעת רש"י שיש באמת חיוב לאבד רכושו של עמלק, צ"פ המכילתא דתרתיה קאמר, דהא שלא יניח בן ונכד לעמלק, ועוד שיהרוג הבהמות והרכוש. ומ"מ הא מיהת משמע מדברי המכילתא, שמה שנשבע שלא להניח בן ונכד לעמלק הוא מאותו הטעם שנשבע שלא להניח הבהמות, והוא שלא יישאר זכר לעמלק, אבל אינו מעצם חיוב המחיה. והיינו כנ"ל בכנדים דרך הבנות

-ה-

נשים וטף

א. עו"ל בבבאור דברי המכילתא הנ"ל, דמשמע שהטעם שנשבע שלא להניח בן ונכד לעמלק הוא כדי שלא יישאר זכר לעמלק, וקשה מה צריך לזה הרי זהו עצם החיוב מחיה, שהנין והנכד של עמלק הוא עמלק בעצמו

דע"ש ע"ש במכילתא וז"ל: ר"א אומר שנשבע המקום בכסא הכבוד שלו שאם יבא מכל האומות שיקבלוהו ולעמלק ולביתו לא יקבלוהו שנאמר (ש"ב א') ויאמר דוד אל הנער המגיד לו אי מזה אתה, ויאמר בן איש גר עמלקי אנכי, נזכר לדוד באותה שעה מש"נ למה שרבינו אבא יבוא מכל האומות שבעולם להתגיר שיקבלוהו, ומביתו של עמלק שלא יקבלוהו. מיד (שם) ויאמר אליו דוד דמך על ראשך כי פיך ענה בכך, לכך נאמר מדור דור ע"כ וא"כ י"ל שבאמת מגוף החיוב דמחה תמחה היה עדיין מקום לקבל גרים מעמלק, דכיון שנתגיר הרי נעשה כקטן שנולד ופקע החיוב. רק עדיין יש כאן זכר עמלק, שלא יאמרו זה מעמלק בא. וזהו כונת המכילתא דנשבע הקב"ה שלא להניח בן ונכד לעמלק היינו אפילו ע"י גירות

ודומה למה דקאמר עוד המכילתא שלא יאמרו גמל זה של עמלק, אף דאותו גמל אינו עכשיו של עמלק, רק שהיה כבר של עמלק. וכן הוא לשון רש"י פ' תצא: שלא יאמרו זה של עמלק היה <הוסיף תיבת "היה" על דברי המכילתא>. וה"ל לענין בן ונכד, הכונה ע"י גיור, אף דעכשיו אינו עמלקי, אבל כיון שהיה מעמלק כבר הר"ז זכר לעמלק

ב. ונראה עוד, בהקדם קושיית העולם ע"ד המכילתא הנ"ל שאין מקבלים גרים מעמלק, וק' ממש"א בגיטין (ז): מבני בניו של המן למדו תורה בבני ברק

ואין לומר דעברו וקבלו שאני, זה אינו דהמעשה דדוד ג"כ היה אחר שעברו וקיבלו, ולא > עוד אלא דמשמע שאביו של הנער הוא שנתגיר, דאמר בן איש גר עמלקי אנכי, ומ"מ הרגו דוד. וע"ע בברכת הנצי"ב על המכילתא שם כתב וז"ל ולעמלק ולביתו לא יקבלוהו כלומר בשעת מלחמה וגדולת ישראל כמו בימי דוד עכ"ל, ונראה שבא לתרץ קושיא זו. אבל עצם <התירוץ קשה מסברא, וגם לשון המכילתא לא משמע כן כלל, ואכ"מ >

ג. והנה בעלמא הדין הוא דבמלחמה אסור להרוג נשים וטף <כנ"ל (אות ט)>, וזלת במלחמת' ז' עממין מפורש בקרא פ' שופטים שחייבים להרוג אנשים ונשים וטף והרמב"ם פ"ו הל' מלכים הוסיף דה"ה במלחמת עמלק, והמקור מסוגיא דב"ב (כא) הנ"ל (אות ו) שיואב הרג הזכרים וטען עליו דוד דזכר עמלק כתיב. ויש לעיין אם חיוב זה להרוג אפילו הנשים והטף דעמלק נלמד מעצם המשמעות דמחה תמחה, דמחיה כוללת אפילו נשים וטף. או"ד הוא מיתורא דזכר עמלק, דלא גריעו מהבהמות שחייבים להרוג שלא

יאמרו גמל זה של עמלק היה

ומלשון הגמ' דאהדר ליה דוד ליואב והא אנן זכר עמלק קרינו ליכא ראייה, די"ל דלא בא > <אלא לאפוקי מטעותו של יואב שקרא זכר עמלק בקמץ >

דעתו וערמת רוב נזקו תהיה מפלתו ורעתו, כמו שאתה מוצא בעמלק כי מפני שעשה רעה גדולה לישראל שהתחיל הוא להזיקם צונו ב"ה לאבד זכרו מני ארץ ולשרש אחריו עד כלה עכ"ל. הרי שמתוכן הזכירה היותם שנואים לפני המקום עד כדי שצוה להחרימם. וזהו ביאור הכתובים לדעתו, וזכור כו' והיה בהניח כו' דהכל בכלל זכור, וזכור קאי אכל מה שלפניו, ולא תשכח אכל מה שלאחריו. ולכן שפיר נכתב מצות המחייבה בין זכור לבין לא תשכח.

ומעתה, הנה לפי דעת הרמב"ם אין לנו רמז שעצם הזכירה צריכה לכלול את מצות המחייבה. וממילא דאפשר דגם נשים חייבות בזה. ואף שתכלית המצוה היא שלא תחלש איבתו, דהיינו בשביל מצוות המחייבה, מ"מ גם לנשים יש חלק בדבר זה שלא תחלש איבתו מכלל האומה, ואף שאינן נוטלות חלק במלחמה בפועל מכל מקום צריכות הן להוריש איבת עמלק ושנאתו לבניהן אחריהן. אבל לפי דעת החינוך שהזכירה צריכה לכלול את מצות המחייבה, שצריכים להזכיר בתוך הזכירה את מצות המחייבה, לדידיה באמת מסתבר טפי דנשים פטורות, דאין לחייבן בהזכרת מצוה שאינן חייבות בה. וכדאשכחן לענין ברכת המזון שדנו בגמ' בברכות (כ:) דילמא נשים פטורות מה"ת וכתבו התוס' שם משום שצריכים להזכיר ברית ותורה ונשים פטורות ממצות אלו, >וגם להצד דנשים חייבות בברהמ"ז יש לחלק דהתם היא הזכרה פרטית משא"כ כאן הוא מעיקר הזכירה, >וק"ל

ד. והנה ידוע מה ששו"ט האחרונים אם יוצאים יד"ח מצות זכירה בקריאת פרשת ויבוא עמלק שבסוף פ' בשלח, דהמג"א כתב דיוצאים, והמשנ"ב חוכך בזה דשם צריכים להזכיר גם מצות המחייבה, וזה לא נמצא בפ' ויבוא עמלק, כ"א בפרשת זכור לבד. ובאמת מלשון החינוך משמע כדעת המשנ"ב שכתב שם וז"ל ודי לנו בזה לזכור הענין פעם אחת בשנה או בשתי שנים או שלש, הנה בכל מקומות קוראים ישראל ספר התורה בשנה אחת או בשתים או שלש לכל הפחות והנה הם יוצאים בכך ממצוה זו. ואולי נאמר כי מנהגן של ישראל בפ' זכור לקרותה בשבת מיוחד בכל שנה ושנה תורה היא ומפני מצוה זו הוא שקבעו כן והוא השבת שלפני פורים לעולם ודין היה לקרותה ביום פורים לפי שהוא מענינו של יום כי המן הרשע היה מזרעו, אבל להודיע שקודם נס זה נצטוינו בזכירה זו קבעו הפרשה קודם לפורים אבל סמכוהו לפורים על דרך מה שיאמרו ז"ל במקומות סמכו ענין לו עכ"ל. ומבואר דאלמלא המנהג דפרשת זכור היו מקיימים המצוה פעם אחת בשנה, ובמקומות שמסיימים התורה בג' שנים היו מקיימים המצוה פעם בג' שנים. ואם איתא דמקיימים המצוה גם בקריאת פ' ויבוא עמלק א"כ היה צריך לכתוב שמקיימים המצוה ב' פעמים בשנה, או ב'פ בג' שנים. אלא ע"כ דס"ל שאין יוצאים כ"א בקריאת פ' זכור דוקא. וכן מבואר ממש"כ שאין מקיימים המצוה בפורים עצמו, אף שקרה"ת דפורים היא באמת פרשת ויבוא עמלק.

וראיתי בחי' הגרי"ל דיסקין זצ"ל עמ"ס מגילה >שנדפס מכת"י> שכתב לדון דאפילו להסוכרים דאין יוצאים בפ' ויבוא עמלק, אבל נשים בודאי יוצאות ממג"פ דאם צריכים לקרות גם את מצות המחייבה א"כ מסתבר דנשים פטורות לגמרי דאינן בנות מלחמה, ואם אי"צ לקרות את מצות המחייבה א"כ יכולים לצאת בפ' ויבוא עמלק. וזהו ממש כהסברא הנ"ל.

ה. ובדעת הרמב"ם שלא חילק בין אנשים לנשים במצות זכירה יש לומר דרך אחרת, בהקדם מה שקשה לי בדברי הרמב"ם בסה"מ בסוף מנין העשין שמנה שם כל המצוות ההכרחיות שנוהגות בכל זמן ובכל יחיד. ולא מנה שם מצות הזכירה כלל. וצ"ע טעמא. וזה נותן מקום לדון שמא ס"ל להרב"ם שמצוות הזכירה אינה חובת יחיד כלל, כ"א חובת הציבור. ורגלים לדבר לשונו בסה"מ מ"ע קפ"ט וז"ל ונעורר הנפשות במאמרים להלחם בו ונזרז העם לשנוא אותו כו' עכ"ל וקצת משמע כנ"ל שהמצוה היא על הציבור שהייבים לעורר את היחידים. וממילא דלא שייך לומר במצוה זו שהיא נוהגת בזכרים ולא בנקבות, כיון שהיא מצות הציבור, וק"ל.