

**Weekly Parsha SHMINI 5782**

**Rabbi Wein's Weekly Blog**

All living creatures that exist in our world require nutrition to be able to survive. Human beings, being the most sophisticated of all creatures on this planet, are especially concerned with the food that they eat. Most human beings know that they eat to survive, but there are many, especially in Western society today, that survive to be able to eat.

The variety of foods, recipes and menus that are designed by human beings for their food consumption is almost endless. And medical science has shown us that what and how we eat affects our health, longevity, psychological mood and even our social standing. As such, it becomes almost logical and understandable that the Torah, which is the book of life and of human beings, would suggest and ordain for us a list of foods that somehow would prove harmful to our spiritual health and traditional growth, to prevent man from harm.

In this week's Torah reading, we are presented with such a list of forbidden and permissible foods available for the consumption by the Jewish people, for them to maintain their status as a kingdom of priests and a holy nation. The Torah, in effect, is telling us that the physical foods that we consume somehow affect our inner souls, psyches and patterns of behavior. We are what we eat!

One of the hallmarks of Jewish survival throughout the ages has been the observance of the laws pertaining to kosher food, which takes on not only a physical dimension but an overriding spiritual dimension as well. What Jews eat has become the standard to measure the level of piety and tradition that exists within the national entity of the people of Israel.

The Talmud is of the opinion that eating non-kosher food somehow affects our spiritual senses. Commentators thought that eventually generations of Jews who unfortunately consumed non-kosher food became less charitable with their wealth, talents, and time. I know of no survey or statistical study that relates to this issue. However, in my many years as a rabbi of a congregation and as a fundraiser as well, I have noticed that generations of Jews who have assimilated and are no longer observant tend to be less committed towards charitable Jewish causes that were helped by their kosher food-eating ancestors.

There is no question that the laws of kosher food have contributed immensely to the survival of the Jewish people and the strengthening of Jewish core values throughout the ages. Kosher food was and is the hallmark of the Jewish people and remains a bulwark against the ravages of intermarriage and the adoption of value systems that are antithetical to Torah values and traditional Jewish societal life.

Perhaps even more than having a mezuzah on the doorpost, having a kosher kitchen brought a feeling of spirituality and godliness into the home, no matter how modest its physical appearance and stature may have been. It is ironic in the extreme that in our current world, where kosher food is so readily and easily available, and with so many varieties of Kosher food, which can satisfy any gourmet pallet, tragically so many Jews have opted out from the observance of eating kosher in their daily lives. A renewed drive to promote the kosher home in all its aspects is certainly needed.

Shabbat shalom

Rabbi Berel Wein

---

**COVENANT & CONVERSATION**

**Fire: Holy and Unholy**

**SHEMINI • 5773, 5775, 5782**

**Lord Rabbi Jonathan Sacks zt"l**

fire nadav avihu holy spark bonfire wood flames

The shock is immense. For several weeks and many chapters – the longest prelude in the Torah – we have read of the preparations for the moment at which God would bring His Presence to rest in the midst of the people. Five parshiyot (Terumah, Tetzaveh, Ki Tissa, Vayakhel and Pekudei) describe the instructions for building the Sanctuary. Two further parshiyot (Vayikra, Tzav) detail the sacrificial offerings to be brought there. All is now ready. For seven days the Priests (Aaron and his sons) have been consecrated into office. Now comes the eighth day when the service of the Mishkan will begin.

The entire people have played their part in constructing what will become the visible home of the Divine Presence on Earth. With a simple, moving verse the drama reaches its climax:

Moses and Aaron went into the Tent of Meeting and when they came out, they blessed the people. God's glory was then revealed to all the people. Lev. 9:23

Just as we think the narrative has reached closure, a terrifying scene takes place:

Aaron's sons, Nadav and Avihu, took their censers, put fire into them and added incense; and they offered unauthorised fire before God, which He had not instructed them to offer. Fire came forth from before God, and it consumed them so that they died before God. Moses then said to Aaron: "This is what God spoke of when He said: Among those who approach Me, I will show Myself holy; in the sight of all the people I will be honoured." Lev. 10:1-3

Celebration turned to tragedy with the death of Aaron's two eldest sons. The Sages and commentators offer many explanations. Nadav and Avihu died because: they entered the Holy of Holies;[1] they were not wearing the requisite clothes;[2] they took fire from the kitchen, not the Altar;[3] they did not consult Moses and Aaron;[4] nor did they consult one another.[5] According to some they were guilty of hubris. They were impatient to assume leadership roles themselves;[6] and they did not marry, considering themselves above such things.[7] Yet others see their deaths as delayed punishment for an earlier sin, when, at Mount Sinai they "ate and drank" in the Presence of God (Ex. 24:9-11).

These interpretations represent close readings of the four places in the Torah which Nadav and Avihu's death is mentioned (Lev. 10:2, Lev. 16:1, Num. 3:4, Num. 26:61), as well as the reference to their presence on Mount Sinai. Each is a profound meditation on the dangers of over-enthusiasm in the religious life. However, the simplest explanation is the one explicit in the Torah itself. Nadav and Avihu died because they offered unauthorised, literally "strange," fire, meaning "that which was not commanded." To understand the significance of this, we must go back to first principles and remind ourselves of the meaning of kadosh, "holy", and thus of the Mikdash as the home of the holy.

The holy is that segment of time and space God has reserved for His Presence. Creation involves concealment. The word *olam*, "universe", is semantically linked to the word *ne'elam*, "hidden". To give humankind some of His own creative powers – the use of language to think, communicate, understand, imagine alternative futures and choose between them – God must do more than create *Homo sapiens*. He must efface Himself (what the Kabbalists called *tzimtzum*) to create space for human action. No single act more profoundly indicates the love and

generosity implicit in creation. God as we encounter Him in the Torah is like a parent who knows they must hold back, let go, refrain from intervening, if their children are to become responsible and mature.

But there is a limit. To efface Himself entirely would be equivalent to abandoning the world, deserting His own children. That, God may not and will not do. How then does God leave a trace of His Presence on Earth?

The biblical answer is not philosophical. A philosophical answer (I am thinking here of the mainstream of Western philosophy, beginning in antiquity with Plato, in modernity with Descartes) would be one that applies universally – i.e., at all times, in all places. But there is no answer that applies to all times and places. That is why philosophy cannot and never will understand the apparent contradiction between Divine creation and human freewill, or between Divine Presence and the empirical world in which we reflect, choose and act.

Jewish thought is counter-philosophical. It insists that truths are embodied precisely in particular times and places. There are holy times (the seventh day, seventh month, seventh year, and the end of seven septennial cycles, the jubilee). There are holy people (the Children of Israel as a whole; within them, the Levi'im, and within them the Kohanim). And there is holy space (eventually, Israel; within that, Jerusalem; within that the Temple; in the desert, they were the Mishkan, the Holy, and the Holy of Holies).

The holy is that point of time and space in which the Presence of God is encountered by *tzimtzum* – self-renunciation – on the part of mankind. Just as God makes space for man by an act of self-limitation, so man makes space for God by an act of self-limitation. The holy is where God is experienced as absolute Presence. Not accidentally but essentially, this can only take place through the total renunciation of human will and initiative. That is not because God does not value human will and initiative. To the contrary: God has empowered mankind to use them to become His "partners in the work of creation".

However, to be true to God's purposes, there must be times and places at which humanity experiences the reality of the Divine. Those times and places require absolute obedience. The most fundamental mistake – the mistake of Nadav and Avihu – is to take the powers that belong to man's encounter with the world, and apply them to man's encounter with the Divine. Had Nadav and Avihu used their own initiative to

fight evil and injustice they would have been heroes. Because they used their own initiative in the arena of the holy, they erred. They asserted their own presence in the absolute Presence of God. That is a contradiction in terms. That is why they died.

We err if we think of God as capricious, jealous, angry: a myth spread by early Christianity in an attempt to define itself as the religion of love, superseding the cruel/harsh/retributive God of the “Old Testament”. When the Torah itself uses such language it “speaks in the language of humanity” (Brachot 31a) – that is to say, in terms people will understand.

In truth, Tanach is a love story through and through – the passionate love of the Creator for His creatures that survives all the disappointments and betrayals of human history. God needs us to encounter Him, not because He needs mankind but because we need Him. If civilisation is to be guided by love, justice, and respect for the integrity of creation, there must be moments in which we leave the “I” behind and encounter the fullness of being in all its glory.

That is the function of the holy – the point at which “I am” is silent in the overwhelming presence of “There is”. That is what Nadav and Avihu forgot – that to enter holy space or time requires ontological humility, the total renunciation of human initiative and desire.

The significance of this fact cannot be over-estimated. When we confuse God’s will with our will, we turn the holy – the source of life – into something unholy and a source of death. The classic example of this is “holy war,” jihad, crusade – investing imperialism (the desire to rule over other people) with the cloak of sanctity as if conquest and forced conversion were God’s will.

The story of Nadav and Avihu reminds us yet again of the warning first spelled out in the days of Cain and Abel. The first act of worship led to the first murder. Like nuclear fission, worship generates power, which can be benign but can also be profoundly dangerous.

The episode of Nadav and Avihu is written in three kinds of fire. First there is the fire from Heaven:

Fire came forth from before God and consumed the burnt offering. Lev. 9:24

This was the fire of favour, consummating the service of the Sanctuary. Then came the “unauthorised fire” offered by the two sons.

Aaron’s sons, Nadav and Avihu took their censers, put fire in them and added incense; and they offered

unauthorised fire before God, which He had not instructed them [to offer]. Lev. 10:1

Then there was the counter-fire from Heaven:

Fire came forth from before God, and it consumed them so that they died before God. Lev. 10:2

The message is simple and intensely serious: Religion is not what the European Enlightenment thought it would become: mute, marginal and mild. It is fire – and like fire, it warms but it also burns. And we are the guardians of the flame.

---

### **Shabbat Shalom: Parshat Shemini (Leviticus 9:1-11:47)**

#### **Rabbi Shlomo Riskin**

Efrat, Israel – “And Aaron was silent – “VaYidom Aharon” (Leviticus 10:3)

In the midst of the joyous celebration dedicating the desert Sanctuary, fire came out from before the Lord and devoured Nadav and Avihu, the two sons of Aaron, the High Priest. “And Moses said to Aaron, ‘that is what the Lord has said, saying that through those closest to Me shall I be sanctified...’”(Lev.10:3). Rashi quotes the following words which the rabbis attribute to Moses:

“Moses said to Aaron, ‘Aaron my brother, I know that this Temple Sanctuary will have to be sanctified by beloved friends of the Divine, and I thought that it would be either through you or through me. Now I see that they (Nadav and Avihu) were greater than both me and you...’”

According to this view, Nadav and Avihu were saintly individuals; worthy of being sacrificed on the altar of the desert Sanctuary, “VaYidom Aharon” – Aaron silently acquiesced to God’s will. But why did the desert Sanctuary, and by extension any great advance of the Jewish nation, have to be dedicated by the deaths of great Jewish personalities? Why must the pages of our glorious history be drenched in the blood of holy martyrs and soaked by the tears of mourners they leave behind?

The only answer I can give to this agonizing question of lamah – why? – is the one word answer that our Israeli children like to give to our questions about why they do what they do: “kakha” – that is just how it is. Why must sacrifice be a necessary condition for redemption?

The pattern may be discerned as far back as the Covenant between the Pieces, in which God guarantees Abram eternal seed (Gen 15:1-6) and the land of Israel (15:7). After this, a great fear descends

upon Abram as he is told that his seed will be strangers in a strange land where they will be afflicted and enslaved until they leave, freed and enriched. God then commands Abram to circumcise himself and his entire male household. The blood of the covenant is thus built into the very male organ of propagation (Gen 17); the price of our nationhood is blood, sacrifice and affliction.

At our Passover Seder, the celebration of our national birth, we retell the tale of our initial march from servitude to freedom in the words of the fully liberated Jew bringing his first fruits to the Holy Temple in Jerusalem: "My father, (Jacob), was almost destroyed by the Aramean (Laban), and he went down to Egypt, and he became there a great mighty and populous (rav) nation" (Deut 26:5). The author of the Passover Haggadah then explicates the text with the description presented by the prophet Ezekiel (16:7):

"I caused you to be populous (revavah) even as the vegetation of the field, and you did increase and grow up and you came to excellent beauty. Your breasts were fashioned and your hair was grown – yet you were naked and bare".

The Hebrews in Egypt were numerous and powerful, but empty and bare of merit, of true character and courage. To achieve this, they had to undergo the suffering of Egyptian enslavement, having their male babies cast into the Nile. They had to place their lives on the line by sacrificing the "god" of the Egyptians to the God of Israel and the world. They had to place the blood of this sacrifice on their doorposts and they had to undergo circumcision, to demonstrate their readiness to shed blood for freedom, for independence, and for their right to worship God in their own way.

With all of this in mind, the author of the Haggadah returns to Ezekiel (16:6):

"And I passed over you, and I saw that you were rooted in your blood, and I say to you by that blood shall you live (the blood of circumcision)."

It is your willingness to sacrifice for your ideals that make you worthy of emulation, that made you a special and "chosen" people! And so the author of the Haggadah then returns to Biblical description of Hebrew suffering in Egypt, a suffering which was meant to teach us to "love the other, the stranger, because you were strangers in the land of Egypt."

Rabbi Yisrael Prager tells how a Nazi guard in the Vilna ghetto interrupted a secret nocturnal matzoh baking, causing the blood of the Jewish victims to mix

with the dough of the baking matzot. The Rabbi cried out, "Behold we are prepared and ready to perform the commandment of the blood of the paschal sacrifice, the blood of the matzot which symbolize the paschal sacrifice!" As he concluded his blessing, his blood too was mixed with the baking matzot.

Lamah? Why such necessary sacrifice? Kakha, because so it is, because such is the inscrutable will of the Almighty. And "ashreiha'am she kakhah lo", happy is the nation that can say kakhah, happy is the nation which understands that its sacrifices are for the sake of the Almighty, for the purification of their nation, for the world message that freedom and the absolute value that every human being is created in God's image. And that these are values worth fighting for, values worth committing blood for. May it be God's will that we now begin our exit from enslavement and our entry into redemption, for us and the entire world.

Shabbat Shalom!

---

### **Insights Parshas Shemini - Adar II 5782**

**Yeshiva Beis Moshe Chaim/Talmudic University  
Based on the Torah of our Rosh HaYeshiva HaRav  
Yochanan Zweig**

**This week's Insights is dedicated in loving memory  
of Devorah bas Yisroel Dovid. "May her Neshamas  
have an Aliya!"**

#### **You Are How You Eat**

For I am Hashem that lifted you out of the land of Egypt, to be your God [...] (11:45).

The last forty seven verses in this week's parsha describe with intricate detail the laws of kashrus as it relates to the different animals, birds, and fish that may be eaten. The Torah also specifically prohibits certain animals and birds from being consumed. Additionally, the Torah excludes from consumption an entire group of animals that are disgusting to eat because they creep on the ground and consuming them would be "abominable" (11:43).

The Torah then gives the reason for all these laws of kashrus: "For I am Hashem that lifted you out of the land of Egypt, to be your God [...]" (11:45). Rashi on this possuk quotes the Talmud (Bava Metzia 61b), which explains why the Torah uses such unusual language here.

Rav Chanina asked Ravina, why is it that everywhere in the Torah it says, "I am Hashem that took you out of Egypt" but here it says, "For I am Hashem that lifted you out of the land of Egypt"? The Gemara

answers that not eating these lowly animals elevates a person, thus the Torah uses the language that Hashem “lifted” the Jewish people out of Egypt because this very commitment elevates us.

In fact, this concept, that keeping the laws of kashrus raises us up, really applies to all the mitzvos. In other words, Hashem took us out of Egypt to give us the Torah and we should keep His mitzvos so that we can grow and be elevated. But why is this statement made specifically by the laws of kashrus?

The Talmud (Yoma 75b) relates a fascinating (and for some reason little known) fact: “Rav Acha Bar Yaakov said, ‘In the beginning the Jewish people were like chickens pecking at the garbage continuously until Moshe Rabbeinu came along and established meal times for them.’”

This is quite remarkable on many levels; first of all what is this comparison to chickens eating garbage? Secondly, why is this so important that Moshe felt that he had to come along and change how people eat?

Maimonides, in his introduction to Pirkei Avos, discusses the issue of whether it is better to want to sin but refrain because Hashem commanded us not to, or rather to not even desire to sin to begin with. He concludes that there are two types of sins, those that are moral/ethical issues (e.g. stealing) and those that we don’t really understand (e.g. kashrus). He continues, those that are moral issues we shouldn’t even desire to sin by and those that are unknowable decrees from Hashem we should desire to transgress but exert an effort to control ourselves.

Controlling one’s food intake is one of the hardest ongoing challenges in many people’s lives. The drive to just consume whatever they desire stems from many parts of one’s psyche; a person may desire as much pleasure as possible or a person may binge to drown out emotional distress or other issues. One of the hardest parts of being on a diet is that one has to eat to live; it isn’t like smoking or a drug addiction where the vice can be entirely eliminated.

Thus, every time we decide what and how much to eat we need to exercise restraint and self-control. This effort is what highlights the difference between man and the animal kingdom. Man becoming restrained and in control of his desires is what truly elevates mankind and puts him in touch with his elevated soul. It is no coincidence that the original sin of Adam Harishon came through eating and permanently lowered mankind into physical beings by introducing death to the world (see next article).

This is why Bnei Yisroel were compared to chickens eating garbage – a lower animal doesn’t really care if it resorts to eating refuse, but people understand that it is beneath one’s dignity as humans to behave that way. This is why it was so important that Moshe felt it necessary to teach the Jewish people how to eat; it was a lesson that we are elevated beings not merely rational animals and therefore we need to always be in control. This is also why the laws of kashrus highlight the entirety of the Torah’s intent – to grow as humans and elevate ourselves to be God-like by exerting self-restraint.

### **Moshe’s Ark**

Hashem spoke to Moshe and Aharon saying: Speak to Bnei Yisroel and they shall take to you a perfectly red cow [...] (19:1-2).

This week we read one of the four “special” parshios – Parshas Parah – the description of the mitzvah of the Parah Adumah. The ashes of the Parah Adumah, an extremely rare perfectly red cow, would be used in the process of purifying those who had come into contact with the dead. This is read specifically at this time of year because everyone needed to be purified in order to partake in the Pascal Lamb.

In this possuk, Rashi (ad loc) is bothered by the term “to you,” which is in the singular even though Hashem was addressing both Moshe and Aharon. He goes on to explain that the Parah Adumah was a mitzvah that would always be referred to as the cow that Moshe prepared in the desert. In other words, this mitzvah is permanently associated with Moshe Rabbeinu.

What exactly does this mean? While it is true that Moshe organized the procedure of the one that was done in the desert, why would a Parah Adumah done a thousand years later still be referred to as Moshe’s? How did Moshe come to acquire the naming rights to the Parah Adumah and why this mitzvah more than any other?

Rashi, in his addendum to the end of the section describing the Parah Adumah, describes ten similarities between the processing of the Parah Adumah and the sin of the golden calf. In other words, the Parah Adumah is meant as an atonement for the sin of the golden calf. How does this dovetail with the main purpose of the Parah Adumah, that of purifying those that have come into contact with a dead person?

The Gemara (Shabbos 146a) informs us that death left the world when Hashem gave the Torah on Har Sinai to Bnei Yisroel. Death was introduced into the world

when Adam sinned by eating from the Tree of Knowledge. In other words, Bnei Yisroel accepting the Torah was a rectification of Adam's sin and therefore death left the world. The Gemara continues; when Bnei Yisroel sinned by the golden calf death returned. In fact, Hashem had proclaimed a death sentence on the entire Jewish people.

Moshe was the only one not included in the death sentence of the golden calf. Actually, Hashem made an offer to Moshe that he would rebuild the Jewish people solely from Moshe, which he refused. Instead, Moshe pleaded on behalf of Bnei Yisroel that Hashem should spare them. Hashem relented and, in fact, taught Moshe the process of achieving forgiveness by reciting the Thirteen Attributes of Mercy that we have incorporated into the Yom Kippur davening.

The Parah Adumah, whose actual purpose is to remove the defilement that comes from being in contact with a dead person, is therefore an atonement on the sin of the golden calf, which was the cause of death returning to the world. This explains why Moshe is forevermore credited with the mitzvah of Parah Adumah; it was he who pleaded with Hashem not to destroy Bnei Yisroel after the sin of the golden calf. The Parah Adumah, in effect, serves the exact function that Moshe accomplished when he prevailed upon Hashem to spare Bnei Yisroel. Having Moshe's name attached to the mitzvah is the very definition of the purpose of the Parah Adumah.

Talmudic College of Florida

Rohr Talmudic University Campus

4000 Alton Road, Miami Beach, FL 33140

---

**chiefrabbi.org**

**Chief Rabbi Ephraim Mirvis**

***Dvar Torah Shemini: The most important ingredient for great leadership***

**23 March 2022**

A surprising ingredient for outstanding leadership – this is what we discover in Parshat Shemini.

Aaron had been appointed as the Kohen Gadol, the High Priest of the nation. And now, the moment came for him to offer his opening sacrifice, and yet Moshe needed to say to Aharon (Vayikra 9:7), “Krav el hamizbeach,” – “Approach the altar.”

Rashi on Vayikra 9:7 explains that Moshe was saying to Aaron, “Lama ata vosh? Lechach nivcharta,” – “Why are you withdrawing yourself? It is for this that you were chosen.”

The Baal Shem Tov gives a beautiful peirush here. He says that Aharon was filled with humility and that's why he would have preferred that somebody else would have taken on this role, in the same way as he loved the fact that his younger brother Moshe became the leader of the nation. Moshe therefore said to his brother Aaron, “Lechach nivcharta,” – “It's on account of your humility that you are becoming the Kohen Gadol.”

The Talmud Yerushalmi tells us a fascinating story about the people of Simonia in the northern Galilee. They approached Rebbe Yehuda HaNasi in the third century and they explained that they were an important community, and asked if he could please provide an outstanding rabbi for them. Rebbe Yehuda HaNasi said, “I've got just the right person for you. His name is Levi Bar Sisi.”

Levi bar Sisi arrived in Simonia. They created a large bimah, a platform, upon which they seated him on a throne. The people came and they fired questions at him – questions in halacha, questions in Tanach – and he was stunned. He didn't know how to answer a single question! The people went back to Rebbe Yehuda HaNasi and said, “The man you sent us – he's a fake! He's a dud! What happened?”

Rebbe Yehuda HaNasi said, “But at the very least, he's as great as I am!” Indeed, we know that Levi bar Sisi assisted Rebbe Yehuda HaNasi in compiling the Mishnah! So Rebbe Yehuda HaNasi turned to Levi bar Sisi and asked him what had happened.

“Well,” said Levi bar Sisi, “They made a king out of me, it went to my head and I forgot everything!”

The Talmud here wants us to know that sometimes arrogance can be an impediment to outstanding leadership. Rather we should have the qualities of Aaron the High Priest, who was filled with humility.

Indeed, sometimes we notice how a person who promotes himself or herself, somebody who's arrogant, can end up attaining a position of power, authority and leadership. Actually from the Torah we learn that the most outstanding ingredient for great leadership is the humility of Aharon the High Priest.

*Shabbat shalom.*

*Rabbi Mirvis is the Chief Rabbi of the United Kingdom. He was formerly Chief Rabbi of Ireland.*

---

**Drasha Parshas**

***Drasha Parshas Shemini - Consolation Reprise***  
***Rabbi Mordechai Kamenetzky***

Tragedies happen. Unfortunately, we can't control them, and we have to learn to live with their consequences, as we try to continue our lives. Tragedy does not discriminate. It touches the lives of the wealthy and the poor, the wicked and the righteous. The Torah does not avoid telling us about the greatest of tragedies that happened to the most righteous of men. This week it describes the tragedy that occurred to one of our greatest leaders, Ahron the Kohen Gadol (High Priest). His two children, Nadav and Avihu, were tragically consumed by fire while bringing an undesignated offering to Hashem. Moshe is faced with the most difficult of challenges, consoling his bereaved brother who just lost two of his beloved children. The challenge is great and the words of consolation that Moshe used should serve as a precedent for all consolation for generations.

Moshe consoles Ahron by telling him, "This is what Hashem has previously said: By those who are close to me I shall be sanctified and thus I will be honored by the entire congregation" (Leviticus 10:3). Powerful words. Deep and mystical. We are in this world by G-d's command, and our mission is to maintain and promote His glory. Those are words that may not console simple folk, but they were enough for Ahron who after hearing the words went from weeping to silence. But Moshe did not just quote the Torah, he prefaced his remarks: "This is what Hashem has previously said." Only after that premise does he continue with the words of consolation. Why was it necessary to preface those powerful words by saying that they were once stated? After all, the entire Torah was once stated. Could Moshe not just as easily have stated, "My dear brother Ahron. Hashem is glorified by judgment of his dear ones."

It seems that the familiarity of the statements was part and parcel of its consoling theme. Why?

The sudden death of Reb Yosef could not have come at a more untimely time – a few days before Passover. A Holocaust survivor, he had rebuilt his life in Canada and left this world a successful businessman, with a wonderful wife, children, and grandchildren. It was difficult, however, for them all to leave their families for the first days of Passover to accompany his body, and thus his widow traveled with her son to bury her husband in Israel. After the funeral the two mourners sat in their apartment in the Shaarei Chesed section of Jerusalem. Passover was fast approaching, and they were planning to spend the Seder at the home of relatives. As they were about to end the brief Shiva

period and leave their apartment, a soft knock interrupted their thoughts. At the door to her apartment stood none other than one of Israel's most revered Torah sages, Rabbi Shlomo Zalman Auerbach.

"I live nearby," he said, "and I heard that there was a funeral today. I came to offer my condolences."

The sage then heard a brief history of Reb Yosef's difficult, yet remarkably triumphant life.

Then Reb Shlomo Zalman turned to the widow and asked a very strange question. "Did you say the blessing Boruch Dayan HaEmes? Blessed are You, Hashem, the true Judge." (This blessing acknowledges the acceptance of Hashem as the Master Planner of all events acknowledging that all that happens is for the best.) "Why? Yes," answered the elderly lady. "I said it right as the funeral ended. But it is very difficult to understand and accept."

Reb Shlomo Zalman, a man who lived through dire poverty and illness, four wars, and the murder of a relative by Arab terrorists, nodded. "I understand your questions. That blessing is very difficult to understand and to accept. You must, however, say it again and again. As difficult as it may be, believe me, if you repeat it enough you will understand it."

Moshe understood that as difficult as it may be, the words he used to console Ahron were the precise ones that encompassed the essence of the meaning of life and death. They would be understood by Ahron. But he had to preface it by saying that this not a new form of condolence. It has been said before. It was already taught. Now it must be repeated.

Difficult questions have no simple answers, but it is the faith of generations that must be constantly repeated and repeated. There are no new condolences; there are no fast answers. The only answers we can give are those that have been said for generations. Perhaps that is why we console our loved ones today with the same consolation that has been said for centuries. "May you be comforted among the mourners of Zion and Jerusalem." And it shall be repeated – again and again – until there is no more mourning.

*Good Shabbos!*

*Dedicated by the Tau Family in memory of Sam Tau  
Copyright © 1998 by Rabbi M. Kamenetzky and  
Project Genesis, Inc.*

*Rabbi M. Kamenetzky is the Dean of the Yeshiva of South Shore.*

*Drasha © 2020 by Torah.org.*

---

**Rabbi Yissocher Frand - Parshas Shemini**  
***An Original Interpretation of "Through Those Near to Me I Will Be Sanctified"***

This week's parsha contains the tragic story of the death of Nadav and Avihu, the two eldest sons of Aharon HaKohen: "The sons of Aharon, Nadav and Avihu, each took his fire pan, they put fire in them and placed incense upon it; and they brought before Hashem an alien fire that He had not commanded them. A fire came forth from before Hashem and consumed them, and they died before Hashem. Moshe said to Aharon, of this did Hashem speak, saying: "I will be sanctified through those who are nearest Me, thus I will be honored before the entire people"; and Aharon was silent." (Vayikra 10:1-3).

In reaction to these events, Aharon did not express any of the natural grief that he certainly felt, but rather he remained silent. The Torah then records Moshe's command to Aharon and his remaining two sons: "Do not leave your heads unshorn and do not rend your garments, that you not die and He become wrathful with the entire assembly; and your brethren the entire House of Israel shall bewail the conflagration that Hashem ignited." (Vaykira 10:6)

I would like to quote an insight on this parsha that I saw in the sefer Zevech Mishpacha sent to me by my fifth grade Rebbe, Rabbi Chaim Zvi Hollander (1927-2021), containing some of his Chumash insights. Rav Hollander, zt"l, was active into his nineties as a Rebbe in Beis Yisrael in Neve Yaakov in Eretz Yisrael. I want to share his observation about this incident.

After the Holocaust, there were Jews who felt there was no reason to go on. They felt there was no point to live any longer and there was certainly no point to being a Jew any longer. Rabbi Hollander quotes a Rav who came to these people who lost all hope to live and certainly to maintain their Yiddishkeit. The Rav told them over a Rashbam from this week's parsha.

Moshe said, "This is what Hashem spoke when saying 'through those who are near to Me I will be sanctified' (B'Krovai E'Kadesh)" Rashi interprets the words to mean that Moshe told Aharon, "Aharon, I knew that the Mishkan was going to be sanctified by the death of those close to the Omnipresent (Kedoshim), but I thought it was going to be through you or me. I now see that your two sons were greater than either of us." Thus, according to Rashi, B'Krovai E'Kadesh was referring to Nadav and Avihu.

The Rashbam has a totally different interpretation of those words. According to the Rashbam, B'Krovai E'Kadesh is NOT referring to Nadav and Avihu.

It had been Aharon's inclination, as a result of this tragic incident, to abstain from doing the Avodah (Priestly Service). His reaction was, "I can't do the Avodah under these circumstances. I just lost my two sons!" Moshe thus instructed him otherwise: "I am telling you, Aharon, that the Ribono shel Olam wants you to continue doing the Avodah. B'Krovai E'Kadesh means through those High Priests who are close to Me I wish to be sanctified. "I want you to complete the Avodah because that will be a tremendous Kiddush Hashem. The mere fact that you are capable of putting away your own personal tragedy and continue engaging in the Divine Service of Hashem is itself the greatest sanctification of My Name. Through you and your remaining sons not letting your personal grief take over, and continuing to do the Avodah – that itself is the referenced manifestation of B'Krovai E'Kadesh (through those close to Me I will be sanctified)."

The Rashbam explains the next words of the pasuk "v'Al pnei kol ha'Am E'Kaved" that when someone, lo aleynu, sees his children die and nonetheless he submerges his mourning in his service of the Creator, it is the Glory of the Shechina (Divine Presence). It is the greatest Kiddush Hashem, the greatest Kavod Shechina that human beings are capable of putting aside their own personal grief and continuing to perform the Avodas Hashem.

This is what that Rav told those Holocaust survivors. He directed those Jews who did not want to go on, and who did not want to continue with their Yiddishkeit, to this Rashbam. There is no greater Sanctification of G-d's Name than for people who have gone through what they had been through, and to continue to be Servants of Hashem.

It is easy to "talk the talk." It is another thing to "walk the walk." But there are thousands of Yidden, that despite what they went through – and the horrible things that they experienced – who nevertheless did not lose their Emunah and continued to be Ovdei Hashem. That is a replication of what Aharon haKohen and his remaining sons did. In spite of their terrible tragedy, they were able to go on with their Avodas Hashem. That was the classic example of B'Krovai E'Kadesh. The term Krovai (those near to Me) refers not to Nadav and Avihu, but rather to Aharon, Elazar, and Isamar, who continued on with



their Avodas Hashem after the tragic loss of their sons and brothers.

*Transcribed by David Twersky; Jerusalem  
DavidATwersky@gmail.com*

*Technical Assistance by Dovid Hoffman; Baltimore,  
MD [dhoffman@torah.org](mailto:dhoffman@torah.org)*

*Rav Frand © 2020 by Torah.org.*

---

**Rabbi Shmuel Rabinowitz**

***Bs"d Parashat Shemini 5782 - Praying? Put Your Ego Aside!***

Parashat Shemini opens with the description of the great day when the Mishkan (Tabernacle) was dedicated following the seven days of investiture during which Moses did the work in the Mishkan. On the eighth day, Moses passed the "baton" to Aaron and his sons:

*And Moses said to Aaron, "Approach the altar and perform your sin offering and your burnt offering, atoning for yourself and for the people, and perform the people's sacrifice, atoning for them, as the Lord has commanded. (Vayikra 9, 7)*

Aaron did not approach the altar of his own accord but did so only after Moses instructed him to approach it. Why didn't Aaron approach on his own to begin the work?

Rashi brings us the sages' explanation:

...because Aaron was bashful and afraid to approach. So, Moses said to him: "Why are you ashamed? For this you have been chosen!"

The simple meaning is that Aaron was too bashful to approach and begin the sacred work, and Moses urged him on by saying – Don't be bashful. The Creator of the Universe chose you! Gather up your courage and start the work.

The ARIZaL (Rabbi Isaac Luria, of greatest kabbalists of Zefat, 1537 – 1572) reveals another layer of this issue and writes, "The meaning of this is that only you have this quality of humility and bashfulness, and therefore you were chosen from among the rest of your peers."

When Moses saw that Aaron was ashamed to enter the holy place, he told him that that humility of his is the reason he was chosen to serve in the House of G-d. Why? Because a person who would not be bashful is one who believes he is worthy and suitable for this role, and this itself would be a sign that he is not worthy to serve in this important job.

The Ba'al Shem Tov (Rabbi Israel ben Eliezer, founder of the Hassidic movement) adds something to

this explanation based on the verse in Psalms (51, 19), "The sacrifices of G-d are a broken spirit."

The Talmud states the following:

*Rabbi Yehoshua ben Levi says: Come and see how great the lowly in spirit are before the Holy One, Blessed be He. For when the Temple was standing, a person would sacrifice a burnt-offering and the merit of a burnt-offering would be his; he would sacrifice a meal-offering and the merit of a meal-offering would be his. But with regard to one whose spirit is lowly, the verse ascribes him credit as if he had sacrificed all the sacrificial offerings, as it is stated: "The sacrifices of G-d are a broken spirit" (Psalms 51:19). And not only that, but his prayer is not despised, as it is stated: "A broken and contrite heart, O G-d, You will not despise." (Sota 5, 2)*

What is the connection between humility, a broken spirit, and offering sacrifices?

The work of the sacrifices stood at the center of the holy work. As opposed to all the other jobs that symbolized the connection between life and holiness, the sacrifices symbolize the nullification of life in the face of holiness. A person with humility and bashfulness, who nullifies himself in the face of holiness, is like someone who sacrifices his spirit and soul before the sacred. Therefore, for Aaron the Kohen, whose job it was to offer the sacrifices in the Temple, the trait he needed more than any other was that of humility and bashfulness.

Today, because of our many sins, we no longer have kohanim doing their work, but each and every one of us is a sort of "kohen" when standing in prayer before the Creator of the Universe. Then, our prayer is like a sacrifice on the altar, as the Prophet Hoshea (14, 3) said, "and let us render [for] bulls [the offering of] our lips."

If we want our prayers to be heard, we must approach prayer with humility and humbleness. Only when we understand how small and inconsequential we are in comparison with the greatness of G-d can we "approach the altar" and pray.

*The writer is rabbi of the Western Wall and Holy Sites.*

---

**Rav Kook Torah**

***Rav Kook on Mishpatim: An Eye for an Eye  
Rabbi Chanan Morrison***

Tehillim 24: Climbing and Standing

*"Who may climb God's mountain? Who may stand in His holy place?" (Psalms 24:3)*

What is the significance of these two activities - climbing and standing - on God's mountain?

Ascending in Knowledge

We use our legs to advance forward, to walk and climb. We also use them to stand in one place. Each of these two functions, climbing and standing, is a metaphor for a specific form of Divine service.

"Climbing God's mountain" suggests a spiritual ascent, as we strive to gain greater enlightenment and refinement of character. Torah study in particular is associated with spiritual advance, by acquiring wisdom and ethical insight.

Therefore, the Sages called Torah study a *derech*. It is a path upon which we progress and advance. As Hillel taught, it is a never-ending journey of spiritual ascent: "One who does not add [to his Torah knowledge], ceases" (Avot 1:13).

Standing in Prayer

And which Divine service corresponds to "standing in His holy place"?

When we walk or climb, our legs are apart. We make progress, but our position is less secure and less stable.

When we stand, on the other hand, our legs are joined together. Standing indicates a state of stability and balance.

Spiritually, "to stand" is to absorb that which we have learned and grasped. This is a critical part of Divine service, when we reinforce our spiritual acquisitions. By ingraining these attainments in the soul, we ensure that we will retain them, despite life's trials and vicissitudes.

If Torah study is the way we climb God's mountain, then prayer is the way we stand in that holy place. In fact, the central prayer is called the Amidah - "the standing prayer." The function of prayer is to internalize our spiritual accomplishments, as we examine ourselves and reflect on our true goals and desires.

For this reason, the Sages taught that we should pray standing, with our legs together. When praying, we are like angels, who are described as having a single, straight leg: "their leg was a straight leg" (Ezekiel 1:7). Angels do not progress in holiness. Their very essence is one of maintaining their level of spiritual perfection. When we pray, we emulate the angel's stance of unity and harmony, of being at one with our spiritual state.

In Torah study, we aspire to attain higher levels, to ascend God's mountain. This requires exertion and

effort, like a climber scaling a high mountain. Standing, on the other hand, indicates a more relaxed, natural position. This is the state of the angels, effortless in their inherent holiness. Through prayer, we seek to internalize our spiritual attainments, until they become natural and ingrained traits in the soul.

(Adapted from *Ein Eyah* vol. I, p. 61. )

Copyright © 2022 Rav Kook Torah

---

### **Shema Yisrael Torah Network**

#### ***Peninim on the Torah - Parashas Shemini***

#### **פרשת שמ"י תשפ"ב**

**Come near to the Altar, and perform the service of your sin-offering and your elevation-offering, and provide atonement for yourself. (9:7)**

The *Chatas*, sin-offering, which Aharon *HaKohen* brought, was personal. It atoned for his participation in the *chet ha'eigal*, Golden Calf debacle. Why was it necessary for Aharon to offer up his *korban* prior to offering up the communal offering? *Horav Eliyahu Meir Bloch, zl*, derives from here that, prior to teaching others, one must first and foremost show that he himself is free of any such taint. When one seeks to convey his *hashkafos*, perspectives/outlook on life (based upon the Torah) to others, he must first be an exemplar of his teaching. *K'shot atzmecha v'achar kach k'shot acheirim*, "Beautify yourself first and (only) then attempt to beautify others." Simply, this *Chazal* (*Sanhedrin* 18a) teaches that one should reflect on his own actions and self-evaluate prior to having the presumption to criticize others.

*Horav S. R. Hirsch, zl*, explains that the first time the word *k'shot* is used, it is related to the Aramaic word *kushta*, which means "truth." In other words, *Chazal* are being frank with us. Be truthful with yourself – do not delude yourself that you are perfect – before you have the temerity to rebuke others. First of all, it is improper. Second, it will be ineffective. No one wants to be criticized by a chameleon who expediently changes to please others to further his own goals. Thus, Aharon publicly addressed his own "failing" before he sought forgiveness from the nation.

*Horav Naftali Amsterdam, zl*, was one of the primary students of *Horav Yisrael Salanter, zl*. His erudition and righteousness notwithstanding, he made every attempt to conceal his greatness and his role in his saintly *Rebbe's mussar* movement. Out of fear that his service to Hashem would become a source of false

pride, he was self-effacing even in his private life. He obstinately refused to accept any service from others, and he vehemently demurred from entering the field of *rabbanus*. He earned his meager livelihood as a baker, whose products his wife sold in their little bakery. Sadly, his returns were less than satisfactory. When his daughter reached marriageable age, he was unable to provide for her dowry. In the end, he took a *rabbinic* position, followed by becoming a *dayan* in Petersburg – a position he held until he earned enough money to cover his payables. He then returned to full-time learning.

*Rav* Naftali neither had to teach his students *mussar*, ethical character development, from a book, nor lecture to them from a lectern, because he himself was a living volume of *mussar*. He embodied the highest ideals of *mussar*.

It is related that one week the holy *Chafetz Chaim* cancelled his weekly *shmuess*, ethical discourse. At the appointed time, he ascended to the lectern and said, “*Kinderlach*, my children, today I am unable to offer words of *mussar*. I can neither arouse your emotions nor inspire you, because this week I received copies of the *Mishnah Berurah* (his magnum opus), and I was compelled to spend long hours reviewing and editing each volume for errors. I would hate to sell a volume that had mistakes. This would be tantamount to stealing. I cannot demand diligence in Torah study when I myself have been lax in my commitment.”

**The sons of Aharon, Nadav and Avihu, each took his firepan... and they brought before Hashem an alien fire that He had not commanded them. (10:1)**

Nadav and Avihu’s action was clearly in violation of the norm. These two *tzaddikim*, righteous persons, did not plan on sinning against Hashem. They were of the opinion that their initiative was appropriate and even commendable. Wherein lay the difference between their position and that of Moshe *Rabbeinu*? While the commentators enumerate a number of areas in which they could have been lacking (clearly relative to their exalted spiritual status), the *Talmud* (*Eiruv* 63a) underscores two: they entered the Sanctuary while intoxicated with wine; they rendered a *halachic* decision in the presence of their *Rebbe*, Moshe. Both of these seeming indiscretions require elucidation. First, in what area did they disagree with their *Rebbe*? Second, why would they enter the Sanctuary while inebriated? What spiritual advantage would this afford them?

The *Sefas Emes* explains that Nadav and Avihu sought to achieve angel status, through which (like angels) they would perceive the *ratzon*, will, of Hashem without waiting for Him to command them. They hypothesized that when *Klal Yisrael* responded to the Giving of the Torah with a resounding *Naase v’nishma*, “We will do and we will listen,” they were intimating that they were prepared to do/act without even receiving a prior command or authorization. We perceive what is Hashem’s will, and we immediately act. Moshe *Rabbeinu* disagreed. He understood that Judaism is a discipline based on carrying out Hashem’s command.

Why did they enter the Sanctuary while intoxicated? They felt that wine expands the mind, thus allowing for greater, more intense perception of the Divine. Wine would allow them to go beyond the normal scope of understanding.

*Horav Moshe Pick*, *zl*, expands upon the words of the *Sefas Emes*. He asserts that Nadav and Avihu’s understanding of the *Rabbinic* maxim (*Kiddushin* 31a), *Gadol ha’metzuvah v’oseh mimi she’eino metzuvah v’oseh*; “Greater is the one who is commanded and does it than one who is not commanded – yet still does it,” contrasts with Moshe’s understanding of it. Nadav and Avihu felt that this maxim applied to one who has achieved extreme level of spirituality. On their spiritual plateau, perceiving what Hashem wants and acting upon it is yet greater than waiting for prior authorization. To act on one’s own volition is, in their opinion, the hallmark of service to Hashem. Moshe (like Avraham *Avinu* who did not circumcise himself until Hashem commanded him to do so) disagreed. Their contrasting opinions went back to their divergent understanding of *Klal Yisrael*’s declaration, *Naase v’nishma*. Were they advocating acting without prior command or rationale?

Why did they drink wine prior to performing the service? Wine makes one happy: *V’yayin y’samach levav enosh*, “And wine gladdens the heart of a man” (*Tehillim* 104:15). They waited to serve Hashem amid unbridled joy. Wine would enable them to do so. Moshe, however, taught that the only true joy can be derived from fulfilling Hashem’s *mitzvah*. Carrying out the Almighty’s command is our greatest joy. Wine is a substitute, but does not provide the real experience.

**וישמע משה וייטב בעיניו**

**Moshe heard, and he approved. (10:20)**

We do not find disputes between *Klal Yisrael's* leaders: Moshe *Rabbeinu* and his brother, Aharon *HaKohen* – except with regard to the *sa'ir Rosh Chodesh*, he-goat brought on *Rosh Chodesh*. They disagreed about whether an *onein*, mourner, was permitted to eat the *sa'ir Rosh Chodesh* on the day of the funeral. The question arose concerning *kodshei doros*, that which is sanctified for generations: a *korban* which will continually be offered; and *kodshei shaah*, a *korban* designated for that specific time. Three he-goats were offered that day – two of which were *kodshei shah*, and one of which was *kodshei doros*. Aharon reasoned that Hashem's command that the *Kohanim* eat the meal-offerings, which were *kodshei shaah*, applied equally to the two sacrifices which were *kodshei shaah*. He felt that they should not eat the *sa'ir Rosh Chodesh*, as they were *kodshei doros*. Moshe disagreed with Aharon, to the point that he became “angry.” Had he not become upset, he would have understood Aharon's logical rationale. Moshe ultimately agreed with Aharon, saying, “I heard (the decision), but I forgot.”

*Horav Chaim Shmuelevitz, zl*, was wont to comment concerning Moshe's ability to concede error – rather than cover up when it would be rationally acceptable. When Moshe said, *Shamaati v'shochachti*; “I heard but I forgot,” he was opening himself to an accusation that some might level at him: “What else did you forget? Did you make any ‘other’ alterations in the Torah?” Indeed, the entire *mesorah*, tradition of transmission from *Sinai*, was in danger of being impugned. Nonetheless, Moshe did not allow this possible allegation to prevent him from stating the truth. Veracity trumps *l'shem Shomayim*, acting for the sake of Heaven. Some rabble rousers might have raised questions, ultimately leading to a *chillul Hashem*, desecration of Hashem's Name. Moshe *Rabbeinu* understood the mandate of *Midvar sheker tirschak*, “Distance yourself from falsehood” (*Shemos* 23:7) to override all *cheshbonos*, justifications.

During the controversy surrounding the implementation of the study of *mussar* into the *yeshivah* curriculum (or for that matter, taking time ordinarily dedicated for Torah study and diverting part of it to *mussar* study or the study of the soul), *Horav Yisrael Salanter, zl*, the *Mussar* Movements founder and chief proponent, would upon occasion be harassed by the *misnagdim*, opposition, to the movement. This was no different from that which the early *chassidim* endured in their quest to imbue *avodas Hashem*, the

service to the Almighty, with passion and joy. While today *mussar* study is an accepted, vital part of Torah study, a time existed in which a number of Lithuanian *gedolim*, Torah giants, were vehemently opposed to it. As usual, one could always find *rif raf* who live for controversy and dispute, who come out of their “holes” in order to disparage and malign anyone who does not agree with them.

*Rav Yisrael* was brilliant and erudite, but he did not call attention to his vast knowledge – focusing instead on the need to study *mussar*. He was a prolific speaker, who had the ability to captivate, as well as inspire, his audience. He was asked to give a *drashah*, lecture, in Vilna, which was a huge Torah center. His *misnagdim*, many of whom were quite learned, planned to attend for the purpose of refuting his words, thereby casting aspersion on him, his scholarship, and, above all, the *Mussar* Movement.

During the *shiur*, a member of the opposition asked a powerful question focused on the fundamental principle upon which the *shiur* was based. *Rav Yisrael* stood thinking for a few moments, then announced that based upon the question presented to him, his entire *shiur* was refuted. He then left the podium and returned to his seat. Afterwards, he explained that actually he had twelve answers to the question. They were so compelling that the questioner would be unable to unravel them to see that they did not ultimately answer the question. At the end of the day, however, truth must prevail. If these answers were not an absolute fit, they were false. He would rather have his *shiur* refuted, suffer the “possible” humiliation, than to agree to settle for anything that was not completely true.

*Rav Yisrael* confessed that a powerful battle raged within him. On the one hand, admitting defeat imperiled his life's work. On the other hand, how could he settle for something that lacked integrity? Finally, he cried out to himself, “Yisrael! Yisrael! You learn *mussar*, and *mussar* obligates you not to settle for anything that is not absolute truth. This is when I decided to end the *shiur*.”

**ולא תטמאו בהם ונטמתם בהם**

**Do not contaminate yourselves through them lest you become contaminated through them. (11:43)**

Noticeably, the *aleph* of *v'nitamtem* /*v'nitmeisem* is missing. We translate *v'nitmeisem* as, “and you have become contaminated through them.” In contrast, we read *v'nitamtem* as “and you become dulled by them.” Consuming forbidden foods will

cause the mind to become dense (with regard to learning Torah, which he will have difficulty grasping) and ultimately blunt his spirituality. The following story is frightening and gives us all something to ponder. A devout family was blessed that all of their sons were accomplished *talmidei chachamim*, Torah scholars, except for their youngest child, who could not comprehend the simplest, most basic line of Torah. Regardless of the material and the proficiency of the *rebbe*, it did not enter his head. He could grasp nothing. With regard to secular studies, he was absolutely brilliant, nothing was difficult, as he was able to master the most difficult subjects with minimal effort. The parents had spoken to a number of Torah giants and received blessings, but nothing seemed to be effective.

One day, *Horav Akiva Eiger*, *zl*, visited their community. The mother of this boy made an appointment to speak with him concerning her son. The *gaon* listened and replied, “The great *halachic* arbiters (*Shach Yoreh Deah* 81) write that extreme care must be tendered in order that a child not consume any forbidden food. Failure to do this will result in limiting the child’s ability to understand and retain Torah. “*Rebbe*, what can we do now to help him?” the mother asked. “He should study amid deprivation. This will cleanse him of the contamination that he absorbed” was his response.

The parents struggled to discern when their son could have possibly come in contact with non-kosher/spiritually defective food. They reviewed every possible activity in which their son could have accidentally stumbled and eaten prohibited food. After scrutinizing every juncture and circumstance during which he might have eaten something questionable, they remembered! When the boy was five years old, he had walked home from *cheder*. It was *Chanukah*, and *cheder* was over early. The boy passed a wedding hall where a wedding was in full session. One of the *mechutanim*, in laws, gave the boy a piece of chicken to eat on his way home.

The father heard this and wondered. The caterer was a devout Jew. The *shochet*, ritual slaughterer, was a *Chabad chassid* who was equally devout. He visited the caterer and asked him straight, “Did anything unusual occur during a wedding ten years ago on *Chanukah*?” He looked in his calendar and read that a certain Jew had remarried on the second night of *Chanukah*. The father returned to the *shochet* and asked if possibly something had gone

wrong that night. The *shochet* thought for a few moments, then his face turned ashen, “Yes, yes, at that wedding I had made a mistake in the slaughtering of a number of chickens.” The father of the boy was shaking when he asked, “You allowed the guests to eat chicken that was not kosher?” “No, no,” replied the *shochet*, “the chicken was kosher *l’mehadrin*, for the most meticulous standards. There was, however, another problem. Thirty years ago, the *chassan*, groom, at that wedding had divorced his first wife. Rumors went out that the *get*, divorce, was not up to par. A number of distinguished *Rabbanim* ruled that the *get* was invalid. Over time, people forgot about it, and this man, who had no respect for the ruling of the *Rabbanim*, went about his merry way. Ten years ago, he remarried in the hall in question. I was the *shochet*. A number of days after the wedding, one of my friends, also a *Chabad chassid*, rebuked me, “How could you have allowed the few ruble that you earned for slaughtering the chicken to blind you to the fact that our revered *Rebbe*, the *Baal HaTanya*, was one of the primary signatories invalidating that *get*! The *Rebbe* declared that anyone who slaughtered for the second wedding of that scoundrel – the *shechitah* is *treifah*!”

The father and *shochet* broke down in bitter weeping. The father had finally discovered where his son had obtained non-kosher chicken, – or rather, chicken that had been rendered unkosher by the holy *Baal HaTanya*.

להבדיל בין הטמא ובין הטהור ובין החיה הנאכלת ובין החיה אשר לא תאכל

**To distinguish between the contaminated and the pure, and between the creature that may be eaten and the creature that may not be eaten. (11:47)**

A Jew must know the Torah and its laws; otherwise, he is challenged to keep them. In order to carry out the will of Hashem, we must know what is His will and how to execute it properly. In most cases the distinction between “clean” and “unclean,” “pure” and “not pure,” what may be eaten and what may not be eaten, is evident and does not require a degree in higher Torah knowledge. It is, however, vital that we know how to distinguish between those categories that are similar to one another. For example, the slaughtering of an animal or fowl is an intricate procedure, in which a fraction of an inch determines its *kashrus* status. *Halachah* demands that the majority of the windpipe must be cut. This means that kosher versus *treifah* is determined by a millimeter.

This concept applies in other areas as well, as *Horav Moshe Schwab, zl (Mashgiach Yeshivas Gateshead)* points out.

The *Mashgiach* observes how a moment can make a difference in *halachah*. *Shabbos* begins at sunset. One minute before sunset is Friday; one minute later is *Shabbos*. One minute before *Pesach* (the time declared when *chametz* is prohibited), bread may be eaten. A minute later, one who eats bread is guilty of *kares*, Heavenly excision. The same idea applies to a minute before *Yom Kippur*. Mere seconds distinguishes between life and death.

Likewise with regard to spiritual development. Every *mitzvah* that one performs elevates him. Indeed, he is no longer the same person as he was before he performed the *mitzvah*. He is now different; thus, more is expected of him. One *mitzvah*, and he is a new person. Responding *Amen* seems like a small, simple gesture, but it changes the very essence of an individual. Judaism deals with intricacies, whereby the slightest misstep can spell spiritual disaster. Likewise, the right word at the appropriate time can transform disaster into smash success.

The shortest *mussar shmuess*, rebuke/ethical discourse, was delivered by Hashem to Adam *HaRishon*. He asked Adam, *Ayeca?* “Where are you?” or (as explained by the commentators), “Do you know where you are?” Do you realize how far you have fallen from the spiritual apex that you were on? Do you realize that you sinned in the holiest place in the universe? Do you know where you are going? All this (and more) is included in this one brief word of rebuke. One word that speaks volumes.

One well-placed word can transform a person’s trajectory of life; it can imbue him with the self-confidence he needs to succeed, the courage to help him from falling deeper into the depth of morass. *Horav Yosef Yoizel Horvitz, zl*, revered as the *Alter* of Novoradok, was *Rosh Yeshivah* of the famed *yeshivah*, which had established eighty-five branches throughout Eastern Europe by the outbreak of World War II. His students were prepared to (and often did) risk their lives to disseminate Torah to the far reaches of the Jewish communities where they could make a difference. One man had initiated all this. That, however, is not the end of the story. It is how it happened, what motivated him, and who altered his spiritual trajectory that provides us with a valuable lesson concerning the little things, the one word, one phrase, that can transform a life.

*Rav Yosef Yoizel* was not always a *Rosh Yeshivah*. In fact, it was the farthest thing from his mind. He was, instead, a successful textile merchant who was supporting his immediate family of eleven. Anyone with deep insight could perceive that this young textile merchant had much more to offer the Torah world than fabric. Indeed, if he could put his entrepreneurial skills to use for Torah causes, he would alter the “fabric” of Jewish minds and fill them with Torah. At one point, *Rav Yosef Yoizel* met the saintly *Horav Yisrael Salanter, zl*, father of the *Mussar* Movement and primary expositor for placing greater focus on character trait refinement. *Rav Yisrael* felt that the young man who stood before him should be devoting more time to Torah study. Furthermore, he perceived greatness and leadership qualities in him.

During the course of their conversation, *Rav Yisrael* pointed out that *Rav Yosef Yoizel* was spending too much time engrossed in commerce. As a result, his Torah studies were suffering. The young merchant asked, “If I spend my time learning, how would I live? How would I feed my family?”

*Rav Yisrael*’s retort blasted the young man out of his materialistic reverie, “More to the point – with what will you die?!” This short rejoinder changed the trajectory of the future *Alter* of Novoradok and catalyzed a Torah revolution that resulted in the founding of eighty five *yeshivos* that were home to thousands of *yeshivah* students.

*Rav Yisrael* did not say much, but the brief comeback pierced the protective wall that the future *Alter* had built around himself and opened his mind to the truth. It does not require long winded discourses. It requires a few well-placed words spoken with sincerity and love.

*In memory of our Father and Grandfather*

*Martin Nisenbaum* - ל מרדכי בן ל אפרים ז"ל - נפטר ל"ח ניסן תשל"ג

זוכה לראות דורות עוסקים בתורה ויראת שמים

*Sponsored by Yaakov and Karen Nisenbaum and Family*

*Hebrew Academy of Cleveland, ©All rights reserved  
prepared and edited by Rabbi L. Scheinbaum*

---

#### **Carbon Fiber versus Titanium**

##### **Rabbi Yirmiyohu Kaganoff**

Question #1: Interruptions

When is it good to interrupt?

Question #2: Flying through Air

Is an entertainer swinging from a flying trapeze an ohel?

Question #3: Ohel Zaruk

Why would anyone throw a tent?

Question #4: Carbon Fiber versus Titanium

What difference does it make, halachically, whether an airplane is manufactured from aluminum, titanium or carbon fiber?

Foreword:

The laws of tumas ohel, defined below, are taught at the beginning of parshas Chukas, which we read this Shabbos as our maftir, parshas Parah. Technically, these laws are not germane exclusively to kohanim, but are a subset of the laws of tumas meis, the laws of tumah that result from contact with a dead person, which apply to all people. However, since we are all currently tamei meis, and without parah adumah we cannot become tahor again, the laws of tumas meis primarily affect kohanim. I say primarily because, in fact, everyone is required to make sure that a kohein not become tamei. So, for this reason, we should all be fully familiar with the laws of tumas meis. For our purposes, I will subdivide the laws of tumas meis into four general categories:

#### 1. Maga -- touch

This is tumah spread through physical, tactile contact. This method of spreading tumah is not unique to tumas meis, but applies to virtually all tamei sources, including neveilah (dead animals), sheratzim (certain varieties of dead, small creatures) and people who contract tumah (see Keilim 1:1). However, there is no prohibition for a kohein to become tamei because of either neveilah or sheratzim, and, therefore, the laws of these tumas are, for the most part, not that applicable until we again have korbanos, the Beis Hamikdash and the ashes of parah adumah.

#### 2. Masa -- lifting

Tumas masa is generated when a person lifts a tamei item. This is also not limited to tumas meis, but applies to most varieties of tumah (see Keilim 1:2). Perhaps the most common case today of becoming tamei through tumas neveilah is someone who lifts or moves a non-kosher piece of meat in a supermarket. Since the animal died without the benefit of shechitah, the meat is neveilah and therefore tamei. Someone who moves the neveilah becomes tamei, even if he did not touch the meat itself, but only lifted or moved the package.

#### 3. Ohel -- "under cover"

Ohel literally means tent, but tumas ohel means tumah from a meis that spreads underneath an extended roofed area and thereby conveys tumah to any person or vessel that is also under the extended ohel area. This will be the main topic of this article.

#### 4. Other related tumah considerations

There are various other categories of tumas meis, such as golel, dofek, kever, kever sasum, and cherev harei hu kechalal, each of which has its own, highly detailed laws that I will not be discussing in this article. Most of these -- golel, dofek, kever, and kever sasum -- concern either parts of a grave, or different methods of burial. Cherev harei hu kechalal is a type of tumas meis conveyed via items (according to many rishonim, only metal items) that, themselves, contracted tumah via a meis. Most rishonim rule that the prohibition of a kohein contracting tumas meis does not include coming in contact with cherev harei hu kechalal (see Tosafos, Nazir 54b).

#### Ohel

Although the word ohel translates as "tent," or "roof," tumas ohel has much broader connotations. Tumas ohel is conveyed via almost any item that covers at least a tefach (about three inches) cubed, regardless of how high it is above the meis or above the kohein. A ledge of a building, an umbrella, or a branch that is a

tefach wide and overhangs a grave or corpse conveys tumah onto anyone or any vessel susceptible to tumah positioned directly beneath the ohel. Tumas ohel spreads from one ohel area to any other ohel that overlaps or connects, even if the different ohel "roofs" are of very different heights. It also spreads from one area to another adjacent area through an open door, window or other break in a wall, even if it is as small as a tefach by a tefach. Thus, a series of overlapping or connecting roofs, ledges, caves, umbrellas, tree branches or even people, can create a continuous ohel that transfers tumah for great distances. Indeed, that which appears to be separate buildings or structures may be one large ohel connected by open doors and windows (under certain circumstances, even through closed ones), ledges or tunnels, and tumah in one building may spread across an entire complex of buildings. This is particularly common in hospitals, museums, shopping malls, university campuses, subway systems and airport terminals, where human remains in one building may spread tumah throughout the entire complex or airport -- notwithstanding that those complexes appear to be several separate buildings -- via interconnecting tunnels or other passageways.

An airplane that is partly over a grave or meis and partly over a branch, umbrella or person will also convey tumas ohel. We will soon discuss if this is true only if when the airplane is stationary or even if it is in flight.

In the modern world, numerous teshuvos have been published discussing whether tumas meis extends to an entire train or vehicle, when part of it passes through a cemetery or under a tree that overhangs a cemetery (see, for example, Shu't Maharam Schick, Yoreh Deah #353; Shu't Birchas Retzei #12; Shu't Melamed Leho'il 2:133 and in many more recent publications). Responsa concerning whether a kohein may fly in an airplane whose route takes it over graves or cemeteries appeared as early as the 1930's, in the very infancy of commercial air travel.

Many common situations can create a halachic problem for a kohein, because of the laws of tumas ohel. For example: carrying human remains into an airport terminal or medical facility that connects to a subway station could convey tumah throughout the entire subway system and prohibit any kohein from remaining anywhere in the subway, since the entire system qualifies as one large ohel. Therefore, someone dying in a Bronx subway station contaminates a kohein awaiting his commuter train in Penn Station! These more complicated ohel situations can be easily rectified during construction or refurbishing of the buildings -- however, they require input of a knowledgeable expert in these matters to explain how to avoid the problems. There are hospitals in Israel in which these tumah problems were rectified, because care was taken during renovation to consult rabbinic authorities how to remedy the problem.

This article will be discussing tumas ohel as spread through keilim, which I will translate loosely, but not that accurately, as "vessels," and an important concept of tumas ohel called chatzitzah, blocking or interrupting tumah.

#### Blocking tumah

Although tumas meis spreads throughout the building in which it exists, it usually does not spread through the ceiling of the room in which it is located. These halachos are derived from the posuk in parshas Chukas (19:14) that implies that, although tumah spreads under and throughout the roofed area in which it is currently found, it is blocked from spreading above, below, or



outside that ohel area. A ceiling usually is a barrier blocking tumah from spreading (Ohalos, Chapter 9).

There are three ways to provide a barrier to block tumah:

1. An item situated directly above the tumah might block tumah from penetrating above and through it.
2. An item situated directly below the tumah might block the tumah from penetrating below and through it.
3. Closing an opening in a room or building, thus preventing tumah from moving laterally from one roofed area to an adjacent roofed area.

What blocks tumah

As a rule of thumb, anything that is not mekabel, susceptible to, tumah will be able to block tumah. What materials are mekabeil tumah? There are several categories of utensils (defined here as receptacles that can contain an item) depending on the type of material of which they are manufactured. For our purposes in this article, we will discuss three categories:

A. Never mekabeil tumah

Materials that do not become tamei. Indeed, there are many such materials. In the time of the Mishnah, these included most unfired vessels made of earth, and those made of stone. According to many authorities, today these would include vessels made of plastic materials and, potentially, might include materials made of carbon fiber or fiberglass.

B. Always mekabeil tumah

There are materials that become tamei when they are complete utensils, regardless of their size. In general, metal items, or at least those made of the six metals mentioned in the Torah as susceptible to tumah – gold, silver, copper, iron, tin and lead (Bamidbar 31, 22) are always mekabeil tumah. Steel, the most common metal used today in manufacture, is predominantly iron, and the Mishnah implies that an alloy has the halachic status of its majority constituent (Keilim 11:4). Thus, although there are hundreds of steel alloys containing a wide variety of other components, for halachic purposes, steel is iron. Similarly, both bronze, an alloy of predominantly copper and tin, and brass, an alloy of predominantly copper and zinc, are halachically treated as copper; pewter, an alloy of predominantly tin with either lead or antimony, is treated as tin. Therefore, items made of steel, bronze, brass or pewter all become tamei and do not block tumah.

C. Depends on size

This category consists of materials that become tamei when they are manufactured into small vessels, but do not become tamei when manufactured into large vessels, which are not meant to be moved when full. For these purposes, a “large vessel” is defined as one that can hold sixty se’ah, which, by my estimate, is between 150-250 gallons. (For comparison purposes, a standard wine barrel holds 31.5 gallons.) This category includes wood and most natural cloth.

Interruptions

At this point, we are in a position to appreciate our opening question: “When is it good to interrupt?”

The answer is when we are interrupting tumah, i.e., blocking tumah so that an adjacent area will not be forbidden for kohanim to enter. In this case, interrupting is definitely a welcome action. A vessel made from material in category A, or a large item in category C, can serve as a tumah blocker.

With the greatest of ease

Does the daring young entertainer swinging from a flying trapeze qualify as an ohel?

The Mishnah states: “The following items neither convey tumah nor block it... someone jumping from one spot to another, a bird flying overhead, a garment fluttering in the breeze, or a boat sailing on the water” (Ohalos 8:5). The reason why tumah does not spread underneath the person, bird, garment or boat is because it is not at rest, unlike an ohel (Sefer Hayashar #275). Thus, the daring young man on the flying trapeze does not qualify either as an ohel to convey tumah or as an interrupter to block it. (Of course, this is relevant only if he is flying outdoors on his trapeze, and the meis is not underneath any other ohel. Otherwise, the “big tent” conveys tumas ohel.)

However, this is only if the item is not at rest. Should you tie down the garment or chain the boat in place, it becomes an ohel and spreads tumah underneath itself and contaminates anything both above and below itself (see Ohalos, Chapter 9).

Ohel zaruk

Let us now explore the third of our opening questions: Why would anyone throw a tent?

Allow me to introduce a concept called ohel zaruk, which literally translates as a “thrown tent,” and is the subject of a dispute between the tana'im, Rabbi and Rabbi Yosi berabbi Yehudah. Rabbi asserts that an ohel zaruk, a moving ohel, such as a large cabinet being transported by animals, does not block tumah, whereas Rabbi Yosi berabbi Yehudah rules that it does (Eruvin 30b; Chagigah 25a; Nazir 55a; Gittin 8b). Their dispute applies in the case of a large vessel [category C above], which is not mekabeil tumah, and therefore can potentially block tumah. When such a vessel is stationary, all agree that it blocks tumah; the dispute between Rabbi and Rabbi Yosi berabbi Yehudah concerns whether it blocks tumah while moving.

According to several early acharonim, this dispute is only a rabbinic issue. In the opinion of these poskim (Shu't Shevus Yaakov, Yoreh Deah 1:85 and 2:88, Penei Yehoshua, Sukkah 21a s.v. Uve'ikar), all tana'im agree that, min haTorah, an ohel zaruk blocks tumah. The dispute between Rabbi and Rabbi Yosi berabbi Yehudah is whether Chazal made a takanah that ohel zaruk does not block tumah, Rabbi Yosi berabbi Yehudah contending that they did and Rabbi contending that they did not.

Aluminum, titanium, zinc and chrome

The entire discussion regarding whether airplanes can block tumah is only if we assume that they are not mekabeil tumah (see Ohalos 2:1). To clarify this topic, we need to analyze yet another major issue. What is the halachic status, in respect to the laws of tumah and taharah, of metals that have been discovered or rendered practically useful since the times of Chazal, including zinc, chrome, manganese, nickel, magnesium, platinum, aluminum, titanium and many others? The Tiferes Yisroel assumes that they have the same halachic status as the six metals mentioned in the Torah, and therefore they are mekabeil tumah min haTorah (Yevakeish Daas #44). As such, they could never block tumah, as explained above.

However, there are poskim who dispute this conclusion of the Tiferes Yisroel and contend that only the six types of metal that the Torah mentions are mekabeil tumah, and not any of the newly discovered ones (Shu't Igros Moshe, Yoreh Deah 2:164; Sefer Tevilas Keilim page 243). We should also note that Rav Avraham Shaag, the rebbi of Rav Yosef Chayim Sonnenfeld, seems to hold that all these materials will be mekabeil tumah miderabbanan, which would preclude their blocking tumah (Shu't Ohel Avraham #24).



The primary metals used for airplane manufacture today are aluminum and titanium. Only small amounts of steel are used, since it is very heavy. Most of our readers are familiar somewhat with steel and aluminum, but not with titanium, which is almost as strong as steel, but much lighter, and is resistant to heat and corrosion. The Lockheed SR-71 Blackbird, the world's fastest jet-propelled aircraft, is made of titanium. The Boeing 747 is made predominantly of aluminum. Newer aircraft are being made from composite materials, such as graphite-epoxy, also called carbon fiber, which are very strong, but much lighter than titanium or aluminum. More than half of the materials used to make the Boeing 787 Dreamliner are carbon fibers.

#### Carbon fiber versus titanium

At this point, it is appropriate to discuss the last of our opening questions: "What difference does it make, halachically, whether an airplane is manufactured from aluminum, titanium or carbon fiber?"

Assuming that we rule that the entire airplane is considered one item for *kabalas tumah* purposes, and that 51% of the component materials of an airplane determine whether it is *mekabeil tumah* or not (see *Keilim* 11:4, see also *Keilim* 13:6), a Dreamliner manufactured from carbon fiber might have more potential resolutions to our halachic issues of blocking *tumah* than a plane manufactured from titanium or aluminum. However, since I am aware that there are rabbonim who dispute my assumptions, I will simply instruct our *kohein* to ask the question of his *posek*.

#### Conclusion

Although it is beyond our ability to fathom the reasons for the *mitzvos*, we can and should attempt to glean a taste of Hashem's *mitzvos*, in order to grow from the experience of observing them. Thus, it behooves us to attempt to explain why, under normal circumstances, the Torah bans a *kohein* from having contact with a *meis*. Rav Hirsch, in his commentary on *Vayikra* 21:5, provides us with a beautiful insight into this *mitzvah*. In most religions, fear of death and what happens afterward are the major "selling points." Thus, the role of the priest is most important when dealing with death. However, the Torah's focus is how to live like a Jew—to learn Torah and perform *mitzvos*, and devote our energies to developing ourselves in Hashem's image. To emphasize that the Torah is the blueprint of perfect living, the *kohein*, who is the nation's teacher, is excluded from anything to do with death. The *kohein*'s role is to imbue us with the knowledge and enthusiasm to live!!

---

#### *Ohr Somayach Insights into Halacha*

*For the week ending 30 March 2019 / 23 Adar II 5779*

#### ***Buffalo Burgers and the Zebu Controversy***

#### ***Rabbi Yehuda Spitz***

Parashas Shemini discusses and specifies the requirements and parameters for determining the kosher status of members of the animal kingdom. For example:

Fish need to have fins and scales;[1] while

Domestic land animals (*beheimos*) must chew their cud (*ruminant*) and have completely split hooves;[2]

Non-domestic land animals (*chayos*) share the same basic set of rules to be considered kosher, but have slightly differing *halachos*. Some of the more well-known ones include that they do not have the prohibition of eating forbidden fats (*cheilev*) that a domestic land animal does, but there is a requirement to cover its blood immediately after slaughtering (*kisui hadam*), similar to a fowl but unlike a *beheimah*. [3]

#### BuffaloBurgers

Our question is what a buffalo is considered. Can we partake of a nice juicy buffalo burger? Although the Shulchan Aruch himself rules that a buffalo is considered a kosher *beheimah*, [4] it is quite certain that he was not referring to our American Buffalo - which was unknown at the time and is truly a Bison - but rather the Asian Water Buffalo. [5]

Still, it is clear that the American Buffalo / Bison chews its cud and has split hooves, the signs of a kosher animal. Surely that should be enough to let us start grilling!

But, if so, why is its meat not more common? And, on an anecdotal level, this author has never seen Buffalo (Bison) Burgers advertised in Eretz Yisrael in any Mehadrin supermarket, butcher, or even fast food joint! So, as the expression goes, "Where's the beef?"

#### Cryptic Comments and Fowl Play

The reason for the lack of American Buffalo (Bison) meat is based on a cryptic comment of the Shach, where he compares the *kashrus* status of the *chaya* to that of fowl.

The Torah enumerates 24 various non-kosher "birds". [6] Since so many thousands of avian species exist, Chazal specify four necessary anatomical indicative features (*simanim*) that identify a specific type of fowl as kosher: an extra toe, a crop, a peelable gizzard (meaning the gizzard's inner lining can be peeled from the outer muscle wall), and being non-predatory ('*doreis*'). [7]

However, as the exact translation of the non-kosher birds listed in the Torah is unknown, as well as the fact that we cannot be assured of the absolute non-predatory nature of any given species of bird, many early authorities contend that we do not rely on our understanding of these *simanim*, but rather only eat fowl that we have a tradition (*mesorah*) that this specific species is indeed kosher. Indeed, Rashi cites precedent from the case of the 'Swamp Chicken' (*Tarnegolta D'Agma*), with which even Chazal made a mistake, not realizing at first that it is truly predatory in nature (*doreis*) and therefore non-kosher. [8] He therefore maintains that since we are not experts, we additionally need a *mesorah* to allow fowl to be eaten. The Rema [9] in fact, and concurred by virtually all halachic authorities, definitively rules this way *lemaaseh*, that we may not eat any species of bird without a *mesorah*.

Concerning the laws of a kosher *chaya*, the Shulchan Aruch discusses the different types of horns which distinguish a *chaya* from *abeheimah*. [10] The Shach [11] enigmatically comments that "I did not elaborate, since nowadays we only use what we received as a *mesorah*, similar to the laws of kosher fowl". The basic understanding seems to be that the Shach is implying that just as for a bird to be considered kosher it needs to have a *mesorah* even if it fits all other requirements, so too a *chaya* would also need to have a *mesorah* to allow it to be eaten, even though it is technically kosher! This would imply that the American Bison would be on the *verboten* list, as if it was an unknown animal, by definition it could not have had a *mesorah*.

#### Mandating Mesorahs?

The Pri Megadim, [12] foremost commentary on the Shach, categorically rejects such a possibility, as it would run counter to the Gemara's ruling [13] that identifying features are sufficient to determine a *chaya*'s *kashrus* status. Additionally, there is no mention of such a requirement in any of the early authorities. He concludes that the Shach must have meant something else entirely; namely regarding the differences between a *beheimah* and a *chaya*: Since the defining distinctions between a *beheimah*

and a chaya are often unclear, one should not eat the cheilev of any species (permissible by a chaya, prohibited by a beheimah) unless we have an oral tradition that said species is indeed a kosher chaya. In other words, the Shach was referring to the need of a mesorah to allow a nuance in halacha, but not in actually identifying a kosher animal. The majority of later authorities agree with the Pri Megadim's understanding of the Shach's comment and rule likewise, that mesorah plays no factor in whether or not an animal (domestic or not) may be eaten; the only necessary requirements being that it chews its cud and has split hooves.[14] This would mean that buffalo burgers can be on the menu!

However, before you get that grill fired up, you might want to "Hold Your Horses (er... Buffalo)". Two major later authorities, the Chochmas Adam and the Aruch Hashulchan[15] both seem to accept the Shach's words at face value, and not like the Pri Megadim's interpretation, implying that an oral tradition is needed to allow any land animal to be eaten. In fact, the renowned Chazon Ish[16] ruled this way explicitly in 1950, regarding the importing of the Zebu ("The Indian Humpbacked Cow") to Israel, stating that the Chochmas Adam's interpretation of the Shach's comment is the correct one! He therefore maintained that any "new" land animal may not be eaten unless there is a mesorah. He added that since the sefer Chochmas Adam was considered in Lithuania (Lita) as the authoritative work on Yoreh Deah, we must follow his ruling relating to this.[17] The Chazon Ish concludes that the only known animals that we eat are "cows, sheep, and goats". This understanding would obviously not permit the Buffalo / Bison either.

In fact when the "New Zebu Controversy" broke out in 2004, many wished to have Zebu meat banned (which would logically be extended to buffalo as well), based primarily on the Chazon Ish's strongly worded ruling from over 50 years prior.[18]

#### Grounds for Leniency

However, several contemporary authorities[19] pointed out many potential flaws with making such an argument, including:

If the Shach truly meant to qualify the permissibility of eating a chaya, he would have written it in the previous chapter (Y.D. 79), which discusses which animals are kosher, and not where he actually commented, where only identifying features were being discussed.

The Chochmas Adam and Aruch Hashulchan are not really any clearer in his ruling than the Shach himself; thus allowing their comments to be interpreted like the Pri Megadim's opinion as well.[20]

The Chazon Ish himself only restricted an animal that is considered a "new species"; it has since been proven that the Zebu has been eaten and considered kosher for a long time in many different countries.[21] In fact, due to this reasoning, the Chazon Ish himself ate turkey, the quintessential 'New World' fowl, based on a responsum of his father's, Rav Shemaryahu Yosef Karelitz.

Rav Yaakov Kamenetzky has been quoted as maintaining that the Pri Megadim was considered the authoritative work in Lita, and not necessarily the Chochmas Adam.[22]

Even if we would assume that the Chochmas Adam's ruling would be binding for those in Lita, it most definitely would not be obligatory to any other communities, who would be free to follow their own halachic authorities.

The Chochmas Adam himself writes that deer (venison) is permissible, and as mentioned previously, the Shulchan Aruch

ruled that Water Buffalo is kosher, proving that the Chazon Ish's rule of only eating "cows, sheep, and goats", is not absolute.

The Chochmas Adam and the Aruch Hashulchan both wrote explicitly that only a chaya needs a mesorah, not a beheimah. The Zebu (being a humpbacked cow) however, is considered a beheimah, not a chaya, and therefore should not require an oral tradition.

The Chazon Ish himself, in a later letter,[23] accepts that the Zebu is technically a kosher animal, but reiterates that we need to have a proper mesorah to permit it to be eaten. Yet, he concludes that "in our times, with Reform making inroads into authentic Torah Judaism, it is impossible to allow new things to be considered permitted if in the past they were deemed prohibited... as one breach (of tradition) leads to subsequent breaches". Nowadays, it can be debated that this logic might no longer be applicable.[24]

#### Buffalo To Go?

Due to these rationales, as well as the facts that currently most milk cows in Israel are descended from Zebu, and that many Tefillin and Sifrei Torah are written on parchment (klaf) made from their hides, and although initially reported otherwise,[25] Rav Yosef Shalom Elyashiv zt"l, and other contemporary poskim, later concluded that these humpbacked cows are essentially permitted.[26]

Therefore, even if one wishes to be stringent with eating the Zebu or Buffalo itself (as Rav Elyashiv himself favored), nevertheless, regarding potential related offshoot issues, such as crossbred offspring and the halachic status of their milk, as well as Sifrei Torah and Mezuzos written on their hides, etc. the final psak is that these are certainly permitted.

#### Conclusively Kosher?

All this said, are we going to see Buffalo Burgers or 'Zebu Zurprize' in our local supermarket any time soon? In America, perhaps. In Israel, probably not.

As even though many contemporary authorities rule that there is no real kashrus issue with them and that they may be eaten by even those stringent on the highest levels of kashrus, on the other hand, authorities maintain that out of respect and in deference to the great Chazon Ish, and especially in Eretz Yisrael, "the land of the Chazon Ish", it is preferable to abstain from partaking of them.[27] For this reason Buffalo / Bison Burgers apparently won't be found in Israel with a Mehadrin hashgacha, although more easily obtainable in the land "where the buffalo roam".

[1] Vayikra (Parashas Shemini Ch.11: 9 - 13). The specifics of defining and discerning which animals are considered kosher are also presented in Parashas Re'eh (Devarim Ch. 14: 9 - 10). This topic is discussed at length in a previous article titled "Fish With Legs?!".

[2] Vayikra (Parashas Shemini Ch. 11: 1 - 3) and Devarim (Parashas Re'eh Ch. 14: 6).

[3] See Vayikra (Parashas Acharei Mos Ch. 17: 13 and Mishnah and Gemara Chullin (83b and 89b).

[4] Shulchan Aruch (Y.D. 28: 4). The Rema (ad loc.) however, is unsure and classifies it as a possible chaya. The main difference between these two positions is whether one should cover its blood after slaughter without a bracha.

[5] The Ba'er HaGolah (ad loc. 9) traces this to the Agur (1099), citing Rav Yeshaya Ha'acharon of Italy. This buffalo is also mentioned by Tosafos (Zevachim 113b s.v. orzulaya), the Mordechai (Chullin 653), the Shach (Y.D. 80: 3), and Aruch Hashulchan (Y.D. 80: 12). In Italy "buffalo" is still used to refer to the Water Buffalo. It would be hard to imagine that these early authorities were referring to the American Bison which was completely unknown at the time of writing their sefarim. See Rabbi Dr. Ari Z. Zivotofsky's excellent article on [www.kashrut.com](http://www.kashrut.com) titled "Kashrut of Exotic Animals: The Buffalo." Rav Shlomo Miller of Toronto, in his second teshuva on topic (titled 'Zebu and Bison 2'; available on his Kollel's website - [www.kollel.org](http://www.kollel.org)), maintains that as we are uncertain whether Bison is a beheimah or chaya (or possibly the fabled koy or

kviy), even if one holds that it is permitted to be eaten, it nonetheless requires *kisui hadam* and it may not be bred.

[6] *Vayikra* (Parashas Shemini Ch. 11: 13 - 24) and *Devarim* (Parashas Re'eh Ch. 14: 11 - 21).

[7] *Mishnah* and following *Gemara* (*Chullin* 59a - 61b). There is much debate among the *Rishonim* how to properly define these *simanim*, especially a 'non-doreis', as well as if the *Gemara*'s intent was that all four features are necessary to render a bird kosher, or if the three physical characteristics are sufficient proof that the fowl is non-predatory and therefore kosher.

[8] *Gemara Chullin* (62b) and *Rashi* (ad loc. s.v. *chazyuha*).

[9] *Rema* (Y.D. 82: 3). The *Shulchan Aruch* (Y.D. 82: 2) actually rules this way as well, but allows several more leniencies (see ad loc. 82: 3) than the *Rema*'s stronger language.

[10] *Shulchan Aruch* (Y.D. 80: 1). Speaking of horns, for a fascinating discussion of what a unicorn might be considered, see *Pri Chodosh* (Y.D. 80: 2) and *Shu"t Beis Yaakov* (41).

[11] *Shach* (Y.D. 80: 1). See also the *Ibn Ezra*'s commentary to *Parashas Re'eh* (*Devarim* Ch. 14: 5) who likewise writes an ambiguous comment related to *beheimos* and *chayos* which can also possibly be interpreted in both of these different manners. It is noteworthy that *Rav Yisroel Halevi Belsky* (*Shu"t Shulchan Halevi*, Ch. 19: 1 s.v. *u'mah*) writes that it is abundantly clear that the *Ibn Ezra* did not intend to get involved in the practical halacha of defining said animals, but is rather simply stating that he is aware that there are other kosher animals extant, yet is uncertain how to properly identify them. In other words, he is merely pointing out that these other animals were not common in his time and place (1100s, Spain).

[12] *Pri Megadim* (Y.D. 80: S.D. 1).

[13] *Gemara Chullin* (59b).

[14] Including the *Kreisli U'Pleisi* (ad loc. 2), *Pischei Teshuva* (ad loc. end 1; he is arguing on the *Beis Yaakov* *ibid.* s.v. *v'gam*, who opines that a *chaya* must have another *siman* in order to be considered kosher: horns; the *Beis Yaakov*'s opinion is rejected by many, if not all, halachic authorities), *Beis Yitzchak* (ad loc. *Amudei Zahav* 3), *Mishmeres Shalom* (ad loc. S.D. 1), *Darchei Teshuva* (ad loc. 3), and *Kaf Hachaim* (ad loc. 5).

[15] *Chochmas Adam* (36: 1) and *Aruch Hashulchan* (Y.D. 80: end 10).

[16] *Chazon Ish* (Y.D. 11: 4 and 5), *Kovetz Igros Chazon Ish* (vol. 1: 99; vol. 2: 83; and vol. 3: 113). These writings of the *Chazon Ish* were actually a series of correspondence between himself and the Chief Rabbi of Israel, *Rav Yitzchak Isaac Halevi Herzog*. *Rav Herzog* wrote a *Kuntress* on the topic, titled '*Kuntress Pnei Shor*' (printed in his responsa as *Shu"t Heichal Yitzchak* Y.D. vol. 1: 20) concluding that the *Zebu* is permitted to be eaten. He also maintained that there was a *mesorah* in India and other countries going back centuries that the *Zebu* was considered a kosher cow. He suggests that anyone who argues that a *mesorah* is required is possibly violating the Biblical prohibition of '*Bal Tosif*', adding on to the *Torah*'s commandments (*Devarim*, *Parashas Re'eh* Ch. 13: 1; see *Sefer Hachinuch* ad loc. *Mitzva* 454). See also *Pe'er Hador* (of the *Chazon Ish*; vol. 4, pg. 226 - 230), and *Orchos Rabbeinu* (new edition; vol. 4, pg. 9 - 16), which cite and summarize the correspondence. *Rav Chaim Kanievsky* was recently quoted (*sefer Doleh U'Mashkeh* pg. 255 - 256) regarding the '*Bor Hahodu Shehaya B'zman HaChazon Ish*', as expressing very strongly that he considers it 100% non-kosher. The *Beis Halevi* is quoted as being of the same opinion as the *Chazon Ish* - see *Contemporary Halachic Problems* (vol. 5, pg. 255, footnote 15).

[17] The *Chazon Ish*'s brother-in-law, the *Steipler Gaon* (see *Orchos Rabbeinu*; new edition, vol. 4, pg. 91: 20) also held this way, that *Rav Avraham Danzig*'s classic halachic works, *Chayei Adam* on *Orach Chaim* and *Chochmas Adam* on *Yoreh Deah* were '*sifrei yesod lehoraasav v'hanhagosav*'. His son, *Rav Chaim Kanievsky*, follows this as well, telling people who were *nichshal* in a *Bassar B'Chalav* matter, to relearn and review the halachos with the *Chochmas Adam*. See *sefer Doleh U'Mashkeh* (pg. 258 - 259) and *Rabbi Yaakov Skoczylas*' *Ohel Yaakov* (on *Issur V'Hetter*, revised edition pg. 222, footnote s.v. *v'shamaati*).

[18] See *Orchos Rabbeinu* (new edition; vol. 4, pg. 9 - 16) at length. Likewise, *Rav Shlomo Miller* wrote a strongly worded *teshuva* on topic dated 8 Shevat 5766 (titled '*Zebu and Bison*'; available on his *Kollel*'s website - [www.kollel.org](http://www.kollel.org)) stating that although there are *kashrus* agencies who grant *hashgacha* to *Zebu* and / or *Bison* meat, nevertheless the *psak* of the *Chazon Ish* was already accepted, and based on this, *Rav Elyashiv* and other *poskim* of *Eretz Yisrael* prohibited this meat, and therefore it should not be eaten. However, in a later (albeit undated) *teshuva* on topic (titled '*Zebu and Bison 2*'; also available on his *Kollel*'s website) and possibly due to the arguments raised above, *Rav Miller* backtracks somewhat on his prohibitory *psak*, writing that his intention is simply to raise awareness for those who follow the *Chazon Ish*, that nowadays they should not eat *Zebu* and *Bison*, as the same issues should still apply.

[19] Including *Rav Yitzchak Isaac Halevi Herzog* (*ibid.*), *Rav Meshulem Roth* ('*The Hordonka Iluy*'; *Shu"t Kol Mevasser* vol. 1: 9), *Rav Shalom Krauss* (*Shu"t Divrei Shalom* vol. 7: 38), *Rav Shmuel Halevi Wosner* (*Shu"t Shevet Halevi* vol.

10: 114), *Rav Yisroel Halevi Belsky* (*Shu"t Shulchan HaLevi*, *Chelek HaBiurim* 19), *Rav Yechezkel Roth* (*Shu"t Eimek HaTeshuva* vol. 6: 305), and *Rav Asher Weiss* (*Minchas Asher al HaTorah*, *Shemini*, 14). Although not all bring the same arguments, nevertheless, each of these authorities cites at least one of these reasons. This was also the opinion of *Rav Moshe Feinstein* (see *Mesores Moshe* vol. 1, Y.D. 13, pg. 211 and footnote 22, and vol. 2, Y.D. 15, pg. 169), that the *ikar* is to follow the *Pri Megadim*'s understanding and that *buffalo* is a kosher animal. See also *Rabbi Dr. Ari Z. Zivotofsky*'s article on topic published in *Kovetz HaMe'ayen* (Teves 5768, vol. 48: 2, pg. 16 - 18).

[20] See for example, the *Beis Yitzchak* (*ibid.*) and *Kaf Hachaim* (*ibid.*), who cite their opinions this way as basic understanding.

[21] See *Shu"t Meishiv Davar* (Y.D. 22). Although referring to the turkey, the symbolic New World fowl which the vast majority of world Jewry eats, even though a *mesorah* pre-Columbus would be a seeming impossibility, nonetheless, the *Netziv* permits it to be eaten on this basis, that it has been eaten for a long time and is now considered having a *mesorah*. For more on the topic of the *kashrus* status of turkey, and its more *kashrus*-wise complicated companion fowl, the *Muscovy Duck*, *Posen Hen*, *Guineafowl*, and / or *Cochin*, and how they are / were viewed from a halachic perspective through the ages, see *Nachal Eshkol* (on the *Sefer HaEshkol*, *Hilchos Beheima*, *Chaya*, v'Of 22: 10; he understands there to be an *Indian mesorah* on the turkey), *Knesses HaGedolah* (Y.D. 82: 31), *Shu"t Shoel U'Meishiv* (*Mahadura Telita'ah* vol. 1: 149 and *Mahadura Chamisha'ah* vol. 1: 69), *Shu"t Chasam Sofer* (Y.D. 74), *Shu"t Divrei Chaim* (O.C. 9 and Y.D. vol. 2, 45 - 48), *Shu"t Maharam Schick* (Y.D. 98 - 100), *Shu"t Tuv Ta'am V'Daas* (*Mahadura Telita'ah* 150 - 152), *Shu"t HaLevi Lecha Shlomo* (Y.D. 111), *Shu"t Beis Yitzchak* (Y.D. vol. 1: 106), *Shu"t Yehuda Yaaleh* (vol. 1, Y.D. 92 - 94), *Shu"t Tzelosa D'Avraham* (7), *Shu"t HaRim* (Y.D. 8), *Shu"t Tzemach Tzedek* (Y.D. 60), *Shu"t She'eilas Shalom* (Y.D. 22), *Arugas Habosem* (*Kuntress HaTeshuvos* 16), *Shu"t Ori V'Yishi* (vol. 1: 11), *Damesek Eliezer* (51: 84 and Ch. 4, 12: 73), *Shu"t Binyan Tzion* (vol. 1: 42), *Shu"t Dvar Halacha* (53), *Rav Yissachar Dov Illovy's Shu"t Milchemos Elokim* (pg. 162 - 165; also citing *teshuvos* from *Rav Samson Raphael Hirsch* and *Rav Nosson Adler*, the first Chief Rabbi of England - regarding the *Muscovy Duck*), *Shu"t Avnei Nezer* (Y.D. 75), *Shu"t Michtav Sofer* (Y.D. 3), *Shu"t Melamed L'hoye'el* (vol. 2 - Y.D. 15), the *Maharsham's Daas Torah* (Y.D. 82: 3), *Shu"t Mei Ba'er* (19; who opines that the turkey actually came from India and even has a *mesorah* dating back to *Moshe Rabbeinu*!), *Zivchei Tzedek* (82: 17), *Darchei Teshuva* (82: 26), *Rav Yehuda Leib Tzirelsohn's Ma'archei Lev* (*Chelek HaTeshuvos*, Y.D. 30 - regarding the *Posen Hen*), *Shu"t Divrei Malkiel* (vol. 4: 56), *Rav Yosef Aharon Teren of Argentina's Zecher Yosef* (pg. 1a - 6b; regarding the *Muscovy Duck*), *Shu"t Nishmas Chaim* (Y.D. 63), *Kaf Hachaim* (Y.D. 82: 21), *Shu"t Igros Moshe* (Y.D. vol. 1: 34; also citing the opinions of *Rav Naftali Carlebach* and *Rav Yosef Eliyahu Henkin* - regarding the *Posen Hen*), *Shu"t Har Tzvi* (Y.D. 75 - regarding the *Muscovy Duck*), *Shu"t Minchas Yitzchak* (vol. 5: 31), *Kovetz Mesorah* (vol. 3, pg. 60 - 65; in a *maamar* from the *Beis Avi*, *Rav Yitzchak Isaac Liebes*, regarding *Rock Cornish Hens*), *Shu"t Shulchan Halevi* (Ch. 19: 1), *Rav Shmuel Salani's* posthumously published *Aderes Shmuel* (222; pg. 225 - 228), *Sichas Chullin* (pg. 429, on *Chullin* 63a; who astoundingly posits that the turkey *mesorah* possibly came from the Ten Lost Tribes who might have been early American Natives, as per *Rav Menashe ben Yisrael's* unsubstantiated theory, who then contacted *Indian and English Poskim*!), and *Rav Yaakov Yedidyah Adani's* fascinating halachic history of the *Muscovy Duck*, published in *Kovetz Eitz Chaim* (vol. 26; *Elul* 5776, pg. 430 - 455). Additionally, and quite interestingly, we find that several *Acharonim*, including the *Bach* (O.C. 79, s.v. *kasav B"Y*), *Magen Avraham* (ad loc. 14), *Ateres Zekeinim* (ad loc.), *Ba'er Heitiv* (ad loc. 12), *Aruch Hashulchan* (ad loc. 16), and *Mishnah Berurah* (ad loc. 26), understand the *Yerushalmi's* (*Eruvin* Ch. 3, *Halacha* 5) '*Red Chickens*' (*Tarnegolim Aduma*), which we must distance ourselves from its excrement while davening (see *Shulchan Aruch* ad loc. 6; as opposed to the understanding of red excrement from a chicken), to be referring to a turkey; giving implicit consent that it is indeed a kosher bird (however, and quite interestingly, it remains unclear how an American New World fowl was seemingly extant in *Eretz Yisrael* at the time of the writing of the *Yerushalmi*). In fact, the *Chazon Ish* himself ate turkey, based on a *teshuva* of his father's, *Rav Shemaryahu Yosef Karelitz* [this *teshuva* was recently published in *Shu"t V'Chiddushim Chazon Ish* (132)]. See *Orchos Rabbeinu* (new edition; vol. 4, pg. 9: 1). The mainstream opinion that turkey is considered an acceptable fowl is also seen by the contemporary *Poskim* who allowed it being eaten on Thanksgiving. This issue was discussed at length in a recent article titled '*Thanksgiving: Harmless Holiday or Chukos HaGoyim?*'.

[22] *Shu"t Shulchan Halevi* (*ibid.*, pg. 282, s.v. *v'yoser*).

[23] Printed in *Pa'er Hador* (*ibid.*, pg. 228 - 230), and later reprinted in *Kovetz Igros Chazon Ish* (vol. 3: 113), and *Orchos Rabbeinu* (*ibid.*, pg. 12 - 13).

[24] It is worthwhile to note that another of the issues the *Chazon Ish* prohibits for the same reason is slaughtering meat in another country and importing it to *Eretz Yisrael*. This author is not entirely sure why that proviso is widely ignored (as even the most *Mehudar Badatzim* perform *shechitah* in foreign countries), but

the Zebu issue erupted in renewed controversy, even as both are part and parcel of the same letter the great Chazon Ish wrote.

[25] 'Hoda'ah L'Tzibbur', B'sheim Rav Elyashiv and Rav Nissim Karelitz, dated 21 Adar 5764 – interestingly signed by three 'Talmidim' - Rav Yitzchak Mordechai Rubin, Rav Dovid Aryeh Morgenstern, and Rav Moshe Mordechai Karp, and not Rav Elyashiv himself; originally published in the Israeli daily Yated Ne'man newspaper on March 19, 2004. See Orchos Rabbeinu (ibid.), Kovetz Yeshurun (vol. 22, pg. 934 s.v. uv'g), Rav Shlomo Miller's first teshuva on topic (ibid.), Contemporary Halakhic Problems (vol. 5, pg. 260), Rav Yirmiyohu Kaganoff's recent From Buffalo Burgers to Monetary Mysteries (pg. 217 - 218, "Anyone For a Buffalo Burger?"), and Halachic World (vol. 2, pg. 162, "Bison Blues").

[26] See Shu"t Shulchan Halevi (ibid, pg. 284: 2), Minchas Asher (ibid, pg. 82, s.v. hinei), Rav Shlomo Miller's second teshuva on topic (titled 'Zebu and Bison 2'), and Shu"t Videbarta Bam (vol. 2: 235 and 236 s.v. v'shamaati; citing Rav Dovid Feinstein). This is because although these animals may not have a true mesorah, and according to some, may therefore not be eaten, nonetheless, they still have simanei kashrus, and are therefore definitively considered kosher animals. As such, the potential problematic issues with their offspring regarding 'Zera HaAv' (Gemara Chullin 79a) should not apply in our case, as there is a Safek Derabbanan on a disputed prohibition that is clearly at worst, a minhag. [See Gemara Bechoros (7a), Rambam (Hilchos Maachalos Asuros Ch. 1: 13), Lechem Mishnah (ad loc.), Tosafos (Chullin 58a s.v. m'kaan), and Shu"t Avnei Nezer (Y.D. 75: 8).] See also Orchos Rabbeinu (ibid.) which details several fascinating conversations between its author, Rav Avrohom Halevi Hurvitz and Rav Ezeriel Auerbach, Rav Elyashiv's son-in-law, on this topic. He concludes that

lemaaseh, Rav Elyashiv held that the Israeli hashgachos should not perform shechitah on Zebu to import it davka to Eretz Yisrael, as the ikar hanhagah should be according to "Rabban shel Yisrael" the Chazon Ish, but even so, notes that Rav Elyashiv held that the Chazon Ish's psak is not the "psak hakavua b'davar issur achilas beheimos bli mesores", and therefore was essentially meikil regarding other Zebu-related issues, such as chashashos of offspring, milk, Sifrei Torah and Tefillin, etc.

[27] See Shu"t Shevet Halevi (ibid.), Orchos Rabbeinu (ibid.), Minchas Asher (ibid.), and Shu"t Videbarta Bam (ibid., citing Rav Dovid Feinstein).

Disclaimer: This is not a comprehensive guide, rather a brief summary to raise awareness of the issues. In any real case one should ask a competent Halachic authority.

For any questions, comments or for the full Mareh Mekomos / sources, please email the author: yspitz@ohr.edu.

This article was written L'Iluy Nishmas Yisrael Eliezer ben Zev a"h - my dear Great-Uncle Larry Spitz, who was niftar this month, L'Zechus for Shira Yaffa bas Rochel Miriam v'chol yotzei chalatzecha for a yeshua teikif umiyad, and l'Refuah Sheleimah for Shoshana Leah bas Dreiza Liba, Mordechai ben Sarah, and Shayna bas Fayga.

L'iluy Nishmas the Rosh HaYeshiva - Rav Chonoh Menachem Mendel ben R' Yechezkel Shraga, Rav Yaakov Yeshaya ben R' Boruch Yehuda Rabbi Yehuda Spitz, author of M'Shulchan Yehuda on Inyanei Halacha, serves as the Sho'el U'Meishiv and Rosh Chabura of the Ohr Lagolah Halacha Kollel at Yeshivas Ohr Somayach in Yerushalayim.

© 1995-2022 Ohr Somayach International - All rights reserved.

---

## לע"נ

שרה משא בת ר' יעקב אליעזר ע"ה  
ביילא בת (אריה) לייב ע"ה  
אנא מלכה בת ישראל ע"ה