
THE GUTNICK EDITION

חמשה חומשי תורה
Chumash

THE BOOK OF GENESIS

ספר בראשית

*With Rashi's commentary, Targum Onkelos,
Haftaros and commentary anthologized from
Classic Rabbinic Texts and the works of the
Lubavitcher Rebbe*

Compiled and Adapted by
Rabbi Chaim Miller

First Edition September 2003
Second Edition August 2004
Third Edition June 2005
Fourth Edition September 2008

CHUMASH - THE BOOK OF GENESIS

with commentary from Classic Rabbinic Texts and the Lubavitcher Rebbe

ISBN-13: 978-0-9725010-8-8 (Set: 978-0-9725010-0-2)

ISBN-10: 0-9725010-8-8 (Set: 0-9725010-0-2)

LCCN: 2008928858

© Copyright 2003-8 by Chaim Miller

Published and Distributed by:

Kol Menachem

827 Montgomery Street, Brooklyn N.Y. 11213

For orders tel: 1-888-580-1900 718-951-6328 Fax:718-953-3346

www.kolmenachem.com e-mail: info@kolmenachem.com

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any manner whatsoever without written permission from the copyright holder, except in the case of brief quotations in reviews for inclusion in a magazine, newspaper or broadcast.

Table of Contents

<i>Preface</i>ix
<i>Foreword</i>xi
<i>Bereishis</i>1
<i>Noach</i>39
<i>Lech Lecha</i>69
<i>Vayeira</i>99
<i>Chayei Sarah</i>139
<i>Toldos</i>165
<i>Vayeitzei</i>191
<i>Vayishlach</i>223
<i>Vayeishev</i>257
<i>Mikeitz</i>285
<i>Vayigash</i>317
<i>Vayechi</i>339
<i>Haftaros</i>365
<i>Bibliography</i>407

Foreword

What can a Torah commentator living in our times possibly add to two thousand years of Rabbinic scholarship? He might attempt to interpret the Torah as it relates to modern times. He may reorganize the thoughts of his predecessors, rendering them more accessible to his own generation. Or, he might attempt to innovate gems of profundity, lifting the Torah student to new horizons of inspiration.

In his commentaries to the Torah, the Lubavitcher Rebbe demonstrates all of these qualities. His words have highlighted the relevance of ancient teachings to a generation which faced the uneasy task of acclimatizing to postwar life in the western world. His voice was heard by Torah scholars, Chasidim and non-Chasidim, women, children, and even non-Jews. He skillfully articulated Talmud, Midrash, Halacha, and Chasidic teachings, bringing depth and warmth to a vast variety of Torah subjects. His vast body of over one hundred published works demonstrates expertise in virtually every field of specialized Torah study, including Bible, Talmud, Midrash, Jewish Philosophy, Mussar, Kabbalah and Chasidic teachings. His most famous work, bearing the deceptively unsophisticated title of *Likutei Sichos* (“Selected Sermons”), cites literally thousands of different sources in exhaustive footnotes throughout its thirty nine volumes.

However, one particular area of the Rebbe's Torah writings which stands out, perhaps more than all others, as being *truly* original are his talks on *Rashi's* commentary to the Torah – colloquially referred to as “*Rashi Sichos*.” It is on these studies that the current work has been predominantly based.

THE “RASHI SICHA”

Rashi—an acronym for Rabbi Shlomo Yitzchaki (1040-1105)—authored what is considered to be the most fundamental of Rabbinic commentaries on the Bible and Talmud. His commentary on the Torah was the first Hebrew book to be printed (in Rome c. 1470), and is appended to all standard editions of the Chumash.

Rashi's commentary is considered to be basic to the understanding of the text of Chumash, and has been the subject of numerous volumes of “supercommentary,” which attempt to explain the precise reasoning behind each of Rashi's comments. Most prominent of the supercommentators include Rabbi Yehudah Loewe, (the “*Maharal*” of Prague, 1512-1609), Rabbi R' Eliyahu Mizrachi (1450-1525) and R' David ben Shmuel HaLevi (1586-1667, author of *Taz*, a major commentary on the *Shulchan Aruch*). These are a mere few

of over one hundred published works of supercommentary on *Rashi's* commentary to the Torah.

In 1964, shortly after the passing of his mother, the Rebbe began to devote a portion of his regular public talks to developing an innovative approach to the study of *Rashi's* commentary to the Torah. This continued on a regular basis until 1988, by which time over 800 such talks had been delivered, recorded and published.

The Rebbe argued that *Rashi's* commentary was written to be understood by a small child who is studying scripture for the first time. This assertion is based on *Rashi's* own words, that “I only come to explain the simple meaning of scripture” (*Rashi to Bereishis* 3:8). Thus, any explanation of *Rashi's* words which would require a knowledge of Talmud or Midrash is immediately rejected, for the child who is beginning a study of scripture has not yet learned these texts. In fact, a solution based on a later verse, or a later comment of *Rashi* is also unacceptable, for we can presume that *Rashi* expected his reader to know no more than what he has already learned.

Thus, while the classic supercommentators interpreted *Rashi* through the lens of Talmudic and Midrashic literature, the Rebbe contended that this was not *Rashi's* true intention. Rather, each line of *Rashi's* monumental commentary is to be understood with two basic tools: a.) Simple logic, basic enough for a five-year-old to appreciate. b.) A knowledge of the verses and *Rashi's* comments up to this point.

But somehow, the simple answers are the hardest to find. One intellectual feat which is difficult for the scholar is simplicity, and the greater the scholar the harder he finds it to embrace the simple logic of a child.

The Rebbe, however, despite having achieved mastery in so many areas of Torah study (and academic excellence), never lost the ability to relate to ordinary people. It was once said of the Rebbe that, “His mind is that of a great genius, and yet he believes with the simple faith of a small child.” This too is reflected in the Rebbe's talks, for after challenging the greatest commentators on their “own ground” of Talmudic agility, he then proceeds to offer an answer that even a small child could have thought of, if he would have applied his mind with sufficient effort.

Being simple and “obvious” in nature, the Rebbe's solutions are extremely convincing. This quality is enhanced by his technique of analyzing the precise phraseology of *Rashi* meticulously, explaining the necessity for each sentence, word, and often, letter.

Obviously, a thorough analysis of the method and system of the *Rashi Sichos* is far beyond the scope of this short introduction, and much has already been written on the subject.¹

The current work is a humble attempt to generate further interest in the study of these fascinating talks among a broader audience. Since each Parsha of the Torah has been the subject of approximately sixteen such talks, they collectively cover a vast range of major issues in each of the 53 Parshiyos of the Torah. Thus, when placed alongside each other, they form a formidable body of Torah commentary.

1. *Klalei Rashi* (“Principles of Rashi [Study]) by Rabbi Tuvia Bloy (expanded edition 1991, Kehos Publication Society) cites some 389 (!) principles for the study of *Rashi* which are innovated in *Likutei Sichos*. See also *Chumash Peshuto Shel Mikrah* by Rabbi Avraham Zayentz (published by the author in 2001).

Understandably, the entire project has been carried out with considerable trepidation. To provide the reader with the full text of the Chumash in Hebrew and English, together with the fundamental texts of *Rashi* and Onkelos, leaves little room in which to compact the *Sichos*. Add to that the fact that the Rebbe's *Sichos* do not lend themselves to simplification or translation. Each *Sicha* is truly a work of art – where countless details and ideas coexist harmoniously – and, like any work of art, as soon as a few details are compromised the entire structure is weakened. In order to be explained in English, many ideas need to be amplified and clarified, leaving no space for many other beautiful and inspiring comments found within the *Sicha*.

In all of his edited talks, the Rebbe cross-referenced his own ideas to those of the classic commentators, indicating clearly that he did not wish his own ideas to be perceived in isolation of the Rabbinic scholarship which preceded. Therefore, in order to remain loyal to his directive it has proved crucial to include a digest of “classic commentaries” to the Torah, on each issue which is addressed within the *Sichos*. However, in this edition the “classic commentaries” and the *Sichos* have been kept distinct (but cross-referenced) for the sake of clarity. This also means that the Chumash together with the “classic commentaries” can be appreciated separately, as a complete work in itself.

Finally, numerous ideas from the Rebbe's vast body of Chasidic teachings and practical directives have been included on the page (in shaded boxes), under the headings “Sparks of Chasidus” (Chasidic insights) and “The Last Word” (Practical directives). The main body of the text (entitled “*Toras Menachem*”) is based predominantly on the Rebbe's *Rashi Sichos* which, as argued above, is the most fundamental contribution of the Rebbe to the study of Chumash.

Despite the fact that this volume proudly bears the Rebbe's name, its contents were not checked by him personally, though every effort has been made to be loyal to the original source. At the end of each explanation a reference has been provided for the reader to research the topic further. Our words here are intended as no more than a “taste” in order to tempt the reader to open up the *Sicha* itself, or ask his teacher to study it with him. While we have taken every precaution to be loyal to the original ideas, it is inevitable that the adaptation here will not retain the impact and character of the original. Thus, we urge the reader not to judge the Rebbe's *sichos* from what is presented here. This is merely an extremely diluted sample which is intended to encourage further study of a fascinating and enlightening original text.

FURTHER NOTES ON TRANSLATION AND ADAPTATION

In addition to the Hebrew texts of Chumash, *Rashi* and Onkelos, the English texts are divided into seven sections: a.) English translation of the Chumash. b.) “Classic Questions” c.) Summary of the *mitzvos* found in each Parsha according to the *Sefer haChinuch*. d.) Commentaries of the Rebbe, divided into four parts: i.) *Toras Menachem* (explanations at the simple level of Torah interpretation), ii.) Sparks of Chasidus, iii.) The Last Word (practical insights), iv.) Explanations of the name of each Parsha.

ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF CHUMASH

In his “Bible Unauthorized,”² Moose³ highlights the pitfalls of translating the Chumash into English:

“Even the most perfect literal translation would not truly represent the Bible. It was not composed in such a way as to permit a literal translation.

The original text of the Bible, particularly of the Pentateuch, is in reality no more than a shorthand text, but so cleverly composed that it makes sense even in its shorthand form, while its full meaning is discernable only by making use of the keys incorporated in it through a code of many signs, elaborated for that purpose...

A literal translation is thus out of the question if one is to understand the true meaning of the Bible. The correct way to understand the Bible is to give each verse in its shorthand text, and then give the traditional commentary...”

To address the above problem, numerous comments have been included within the current translation. All the comments are based on *Rashi’s* commentary to the Torah, which is the foremost of all rabbinic commentaries.

Until recent years, an English translation of Chumash according to *Rashi’s* commentary was not available. The translations which did remain loyal to classic rabbinic interpretation adopted a “pluralistic” approach, following whichever commentator provided the most straightforward or aesthetically satisfying interpretation to each verse.

Recently, a number of translations have emerged that are loyal to *Rashi*, including those of Goldberg⁴, Moore⁵, Herczeg⁶ and Scherman⁷. However, all these works have chosen to draw only from *Rashi’s* shorter and less elaborate comments. Presumably this is based on a presumption that *Rashi’s* commentary is a mixture of literal interpretation together with longer, midrashic insights and parables, the latter of which could be omitted in a plain translation.

A cornerstone of the Rebbe’s analysis is that all of *Rashi’s* words are essential to a basic understanding of the text. Therefore, if *Rashi* on occasion makes a seemingly elaborate comment, or cites a midrashic teaching, this in no way represents a temporary deviation from his remit to “explain the simple meaning of scripture.” Rather, each comment, however elaborate it may be, is required in order to understand the *literal* meaning of scripture.⁸

Therefore, in the current translation—which is entirely new—we have attempted to incorporate many more of *Rashi’s* comments than in previous works. Ideas from *Rashi* have

2. *In the Beginning—The Bible Unauthorized* by A. H. Moose (pp. 23-24, 28). First published in 1942. Revised edition by David Sternlight Ph.D., published by Thirty Seven Books, 2001. This work was promoted by the previous Lubavitcher Rebbe (see his *Igros Kodesh* vol. 7, p. 399).

3. A pseudonym for Rabbi Aharon Levit, editor of the Lubavitcher Journal *Hakriyah Vehakedushah*. For biographical details see *Toldos Chabad Be’artsos Habris* (Kehos Publication Society 1988), pp. 344-5.

4. *The Linear Chumash* by Rabbi Pesach Goldberg (Feldheim Publications, 1992).

5. *Torah - The Margolin Edition*, by Rabbi Binyamin S. Moore (Feldheim Publications, 1999).

6. *Rashi - Commentary on the Torah* by Rabbi Yisrael Isser Zvi Herczeg (Mesorah Publications 1994).

7. *The Chumash - Stone Edition*, by Rabbi Nosson Scherman (Mesorah Publications 1993).

8. See *Klalei Rashi* chap. 1.

been placed in brackets to distinguish them from the words of scripture.

Obviously it has not been possible to include all of *Rashi's* comments in a translation, but it is hoped that the numerous additional comments which have been added will give the reader a greater appreciation of the Chumash as it has been learned classically for hundreds of years.

The translation itself has been written in a contemporary style, attempting to make the words of Torah relevant to the modern reader. Nevertheless, every attempt has been made to remain loyal to scripture. Unlike Kaplan⁹, we have not omitted awkward words or abandoned translation for idiom. However, we have also rejected the opposite extreme exemplified by Scherman⁷, where the precise sequence of words within each verse is preserved, and loyalty to original Hebrew grammar has led to abnormal English usage.

In addition, the text has been punctuated and paragraphed at the discretion of the translator, following the precedent of Kaplan and Scherman. Headings have been inserted within the English translation, to focus the attention of the reader, in a similar fashion to Kaplan. Practical *mitzvos* have been “bulleted” to highlight their significance.

CLASSIC QUESTIONS

Due to limitations of space and for the sake of clarity the following guidelines were followed:

- a.) The issues discussed are limited to those which are analyzed in the *Sichos* adapted within “*Toras Menachem*.”
- b.) The commentators quoted are usually those cited in the original *Sichos*.
- c.) The commentators’ words are paraphrased, rather than translated (with the exception of *Rashi's* words, which are usually translated).
- d.) The commentators are depicted as “debating” a particular “Classic Question.” However, in most cases this “debate” is somewhat artificial, since each commentator will invariably be discussing a range of issues in the original text from which the comment cited here will be a tiny portion.
- e.) Sometimes, the ideas are arranged so that one commentator appears to “pick up” where the previous comment finished, which may not be the case in the original.
- f.) Each commentator is depicted as answering a particular “Classic Question,” though, in the original, he may not have been addressing this question directly.

TORAS MENACHEM

Only a small fraction of the Rebbe’s published teachings were actually penned by the Rebbe himself. The vast majority of his works are transcripts of public talks which were transcribed by Chasidim (*hanachos*¹⁰). A significant number of these talks were

9. *The Living Torah* by Rabbi Aryeh Kaplan, (Moznaim Publishing Corporation 1981).

10. These have been collected and published in two major works: *Sichos Kodesh* (50 volumes), containing public talks from the years 5710-5741 (1950-1981), published in 1985-7, and *Hisvadyos*, containing public talks from the years 5742-5752 (1982-1992), published by *Va’ad Hanachos Belahak* (43 volumes).

reconstructed by a team of scholars, with numerous cross-references to classic rabbinic texts, and edited extensively by the Rebbe for publication (*Likutei Sichos*¹¹ and *Sefer Hasichos*¹²).

The Sicha has a distinct style, described succinctly by Solomon¹³:

“The genre of edited Sicha usually comprised inaugural questions and explorations of themes, tentative hypotheses, subsequent redefinition and restatement of the Sicha’s central concern, and a critical elucidation of the subject matter under analysis, thus facilitating the resolution of initial dilemmas.”

The introductory sections of a Sicha (the “inaugural questions and explorations of themes”) are often extremely complicated. The Rebbe may ask as many as ten or fifteen sequential questions, each accompanied by numerous proofs and logical substantiation. Often, these questions focus on hairsplitting details (described by Sacks¹⁴ as “microscopic tensions”) within the phraseology of source texts. In the light of such an intellectually demanding introduction, some effort is required to appreciate the “tentative hypotheses” which follow.

To reduce the level of complexity, most English adaptations have focussed on delivering only the “critical elucidation” which lies at the heart of a Sicha. This however, diminishes the impact of the ideas substantially, as the solution is no longer seen to resolve a host of “initial dilemmas.” Thus, Solomon¹⁵ criticizes such adaptations as being “skeletal.”

In this edition, we have attempted to preserve, to a considerable extent, the “explorations of themes” and analysis which occurs at the beginning of a Sicha. In order to simplify matters, sources which are cited in the Sicha have been recorded separately in the section entitled “Classic Questions.” This enables the reader to first familiarize himself with the rabbinic debate which is to be discussed in the Sicha, enabling the Sicha to be adapted in a more succinct form.

Nevertheless, numerous questions, hypotheses and their solutions have been omitted for the sake of brevity and clarity. Thus, the reader should bear in mind that the English adaptation contains but a few ideas which have been extracted from a Sicha which, hopefully, form a self-contained argument in themselves. Obviously, the adaptations differ in style tremendously from the original Sichos and, besides the omissions, the sequence of arguments has often been edited to be compatible with the format of this work.

Nevertheless, all the ideas contained in this work are to be found in the Rebbe’s published works. The editor has taken extreme care not to add arguments of his own. On a few rare occasions a brief note or cross-reference has been added, delineated clearly by square brackets.

A final note of importance: In addition to drawing from *Likutei Sichos*, we have also

11. Published by *Va’ad Lehafatzas Sichos* between 1962 and 2001 (39 volumes).

12. Containing talks from 5747-5752, published by *Va’ad Lehafatzas Sichos* in 12 volumes.

13. *Educational Teachings of Rabbi Menachem M. Schneerson* by Aryeh Solomon (Jason Aronson 2000), page 25.

14. *Torah Studies* by Rabbi Jonathan Sacks, Chief Rabbi of the United Kingdom and British Commonwealth. Published by Lubavitch Foundation UK (1986).

15. *Ibid.* p. 324.

referred considerably to *hanachos*, transcripts of the Rebbe's talks which he did not edit (see note 10 above).

Although these *hanachos* were not edited by the Rebbe, they remain the only extant source of many of his teachings on *Rashi*, and we have relied on them considerably. This decision was largely based on the Rebbe's own words to a volume of *hanachos* of the fifth Lubavitcher Rebbe (Rabbi Sholom Dovber Schneersohn) which he published in 1946¹⁶:

"Those who transcribed the sichos were veteran chasidim to whom every word and utterance of their Rebbe was holy to them. There is no doubt that they made every possible effort to preserve the wording of their teacher, not to add to or detract from it. While it is possible that, due to the length of the Sicha etc., they erred in transcribing some words...generally speaking, the content is certainly accurate."

SPARKS OF CHASIDUS

There is a tradition that, in addition to explaining Chumash at the literal level, *Rashi's* commentary to the Torah contains allusions to mystical concepts¹⁷. Thus, virtually every one of the Rebbe's "*Rashi Sichos*" climaxes in a mystical interpretation based on the teachings of Kabbalah and Chasidus. Under the heading of "Sparks of Chasidus" many of these ideas have been included, though they are considerably adapted to be suitable for a reader who has no grounding in Kabbalah or Chasidus. Many insights have also been culled from other talks and chasidic discourses of the Rebbe.

THE LAST WORD

A further hallmark of the Rebbe's teachings is a strong emphasis on the practical application of Torah concepts in everyday contemporary life. The Rebbe stated repeatedly that the Hebrew word "Torah" is etymologically connected to the word "Hora'ah," meaning instruction¹⁸. According to the Rebbe, no discussion—however sublime it may be—should remain totally academic.

In this vein, we have included many practical insights that are to be found in the *Sichos*. Once again, limitations of space have forced these ideas to be selected and condensed.

THE NAME OF THE PARSHA

On a regular basis, the Rebbe would refer to the significance of the name of each Parsha, and explain how the name reflects the content of the entire Parsha¹⁹. Ideas sampled from these *sichos* have been included at the beginning of each Parsha.

16. *Sefer Hasichos Toras Sholom*, Kehos Publication Society, p. iii.

17. See *Likutei Sichos* vol. 5, p. 1 and note 4 *ibid*. Sources cited in *Klalei Rashi*, chapter 17.

18. See *Zohar* III:53b. See also Solomon, *Educational Teachings* (cited above, note 13), pp. 94-5 and sources cited *loc. cit*.

19. See *Likutei Sichos* vol. 5, p. 57.

LIST OF MITZVOS

As an additional aid, a summary of all the *mitzvos* to be found in each Parsha has been included at the end of each Parsha. The reader should note however that the precise division of these *mitzvos* is an issue of contention among the commentators. We have followed the system of *Sefer Hachinuch*, since his codification follows the sequence of the weekly parsha.

HAFTAROS

The text of the Haftaros has been translated according to the interpretation of *Metzudos*, a pair of commentaries (*Metzudas Tziyon* and *Metzudas David*) by Rabbi Yechiel Hillel Altschuler (eighteenth century), which stresses the plain meaning of the text. In a similar vein to our translation to Chumash, numerous small annotations have been included (in brackets) within the translation, to assist the reader in appreciating the text according to its classic, rabbinic interpretation.

At present, we have only included the text of the Haftaros according to Chabad custom. We have also made no reference to the vast body of rabbinic commentary on the Haftaros (with the exception of *Metzudos*), nor have we attempted to incorporate any of the Rebbe's teachings on the Haftaros.

NOTES ON TRANSLITERATION

We have followed the transliteration system of Dr. Binyamin Kaplan (Tulane University in New Orleans, L.A.), which has been employed recently in a number of Lubavitch publications:

1. Words with a final *hei* are spelled with a final "h."
2. "Ei" (the vowel-sound in "weight") is used for *tzeirei*.
3. "Ai" is used for the vowel sound in the word "tide."
4. An apostrophe is used between consecutive vowel sounds, as in "mo'eid."
5. An "e" is used for a vocalized *sheva*, e.g. "bemeizid," not "b'meizid."
6. "A" is used for *kamatz*.
7. "O" is used for *cholam*.
8. "I" is used for *chirik*.
9. "F" is preferred to "ph."
10. Doubling of consonants is avoided.
11. "S" is used for *saf*.
12. "Ch" is used for *chaf* and *ches*.

Where it was felt appropriate, various exceptions have been made to the above rules.

VOWELS AND CANTILLATION MARKS

In this edition, the vowels and cantillation marks in the Hebrew text of the Chumash have been edited to be consistent with accurate source-texts. We have followed three sources: 1) Chumash “Torah Temimah”; 2) The well-known “Koren” Tanach; 3) Tanach according to the Aleppo Codex and other manuscripts, edited by Mordechai Breuer (published by Mosad Harav Kook).

When these texts differ, we have followed the majority, unless there was another source (Minchas Shai or similar) that supported the minority version. When Chumash Torah Temimah is contradicted by the other texts and the difference is significant, we indicate one version inside the Chumash, and the other by a footnote.

The above applies for all variations in vowels or cantillation marks, with the exception of *meseg* (a vertical line under a letter, usually used to denote a secondary accent). Regarding *meseg*, the following guidelines have been adopted:

1.) A regular “light” *meseg*, occurring in any open syllable not immediately followed by the primary accent or by another *meseg*, is printed in every applicable case, and also on the last available syllable, even if there is an available syllable on the previous word (as in 1, unlike 3).

2.) A *meseg* before *hei* or *ches* in words with the roots *h-y-h* and *ch-y-h* is likewise printed in every case (as in 1), even in nouns containing these roots (as in 3).

3.) A *meseg* before two identical letters, the first vocalized with a *sheva*, is also universally used (as in 1), except for words where the *masoretes* considered the *sheva* to be silent (as evidenced by 3).

4.) A *meseg* in a closed unaccented syllable containing a *tenuah gedolah* (large vowel) is also always used (following 1), except where using it would require removing a regular light *meseg* immediately preceding it (found in 3).

5.) A *meseg* in a closed syllable (known as “*keveidah*,” heavy) is used based on its occurrence in 3 (unlike 1).

6.) A *meseg* in an open syllable following the accent is used only if there is more than one source.

7.) A *meseg* is used on the word “*vaihi*” if it is accented with a *pashta*, or hyphenated to the next word.

8.) A *meseg* before a guttural at the end of a word – follows 3.

9.) *Meseg* together with *sheva* – follows 3.

HEBREW TEXT OF RASHI’S COMMENTARY

The Hebrew text of *Rashi*’s commentary to the Torah has been prepared according to the Lubavitcher Rebbe’s directives, printed in *Chumash Shai Lamora*, Jerusalem 5763:

a.) The publisher should not deviate from the common text of *Rashi's* commentary which is to be found in *Chumashim* that have been *widely used* in recent generations. Textual variants should be included only *in footnotes*.

b.) The fact that *Rashi* does not usually cite sources for his comments was intentional. Therefore, no references (other than those made by *Rashi* himself) should be included in the body of the text.

c.) While *Rashi* did not include punctuation marks etc., their inclusion by the publisher may, perhaps, be justified.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to gratefully acknowledge the following people:

Mr. Shmuel Dubosky, for his sustained and dedicated efforts in the editing and critical evaluation of this work; Rabbi Moshe Levin for checking the accuracy of the commentaries and editing the text; Rabbi Mendel Sufrin for checking the accuracy of the English translation of the Chumash. Rabbi Hillel Blesofsky and Mrs. Y. Homnick for checking and proofreading; Rabbi Shmuel Rabin, for editing the vowels and cantillation marks of the Hebrew text.

Rabbi Mordechai Sufrin, Rabbi Shalom Osdoba, Rabbi Heschel Greenberg, Rabbi Yosef Yitzchak Greenberg, Rabbi Uri Kaploun, Rabbi Daniel Levy for their assistance.

My wife, Chani, for her constant encouragement and emergency proofreading.

My parents and parents-in-law for supporting all my endeavors.

Those who were formative in my education and development are too many to list here, although I would like to make a special mention of my *mashpia*, Rabbi Yosef Yitzchok ("Fitzy") Lipskier, of blessed memory, whose inspiration I live with on a daily basis.

The patron of this edition is **Rabbi Meyer Gutnick**, who has graciously accepted upon himself the labor and expense of publishing and distributing this work. May this merit be a source of eternal blessing for him and his family.

May we soon merit the true and complete redemption, when all the Jewish people will be free to observe God's commands and study His Torah.

Rabbi Chaim Miller
20 Menachem Av 5764

טעמי המקרא / CANTILLATION MARKS

פִּשְׁטָא מְנַח זֶרְקָא מְנַח סְגוּלָּה מְנַח | מְנַח רְבִיעִי
מֵהַפֶּךְ פִּשְׁטָא זְקָף קָטָן זְקָף-גָּדוֹל מְרַכָּא טַפְחָא
מְנַח אֶתְנַחְתָּא פִּזְרֵי תְּלִישָׁא-קִטְנָה
תְּלִישָׁא-גָּדוֹלָה קְדָמָא וְאַזְלָא אֶזְלָא-גֵּרֶשׁ גֵּרִישִׁים
דְּרַגָּא תְּבִיר יְתִיב פְּסִיק | סוּף-פְּסוּקִי: שְׁלֹשִׁים
קַרְנֵי-פֶרֶה מְרַכָּא-כְּפוּלָה יְרַח-בֶּן-יוֹמוֹ:

🕍 BLESSINGS ON READING THE TORAH 🕍

The person who is called to the Torah takes hold of the handles of the *Sefer Torah* with his *tallis*¹, unrolls the *Sefer Torah* and, with his *tallis* (or the belt of the Torah) touches the beginning and end² of the reading. The scroll is then closed, he turns slightly to the right and says:

בְּרַכּוּ אֶת יְיָ הַמְּבַרֵךְ.

The congregation responds:

בְּרוּךְ יְיָ הַמְּבַרֵךְ לְעוֹלָם וָעֶד.

The person called to the Torah continues:

בְּרוּךְ יְיָ הַמְּבַרֵךְ לְעוֹלָם וָעֶד:

בְּרוּךְ אַתָּה יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ מֶלֶךְ הָעוֹלָם, אֲשֶׁר בָּחַר בְּנוֹ
מִכָּל הָעַמִּים, וְנָתַן לָנוּ אֶת תּוֹרָתוֹ. בְּרוּךְ אַתָּה יְיָ
נוֹתֵן הַתּוֹרָה:

The person called to the Torah now reads along with the reader in an undertone.

After the reading is complete, the person called to the Torah touches the end and the beginning³ of the reading with his *tallis* (or belt of the *Sefer Torah*) and kisses it. He then closes the scroll, turns slightly to the right and says:

בְּרוּךְ אַתָּה יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ מֶלֶךְ הָעוֹלָם, אֲשֶׁר נָתַן לָנוּ
תּוֹרַת אֱמֶת, וְחַיֵּי עוֹלָם נִטְעַ בְּתוֹכֵנוּ. בְּרוּךְ אַתָּה
יְיָ, נוֹתֵן הַתּוֹרָה:

After the reading is complete, the person called to the Torah stays at the *bimah* until the next reading is concluded (or, if it is the last reading, until the Torah is raised).

1. *Sefer Haminhagim*. According to the Rebbe's personal custom, the handles are held directly, without the *tallis* in between.

2. *Sefer Haminhagim*. According to the Rebbe's personal custom, the *tallis* is used to touch the beginning, the end and then the beginning of the reading again.

3. *Sefer Haminhagim*. According to the Rebbe's personal custom, the *tallis* is used to touch the end, the beginning and then the end of the reading again.

*In the early years of his leadership, the
Alter Rebbe declared publicly:*

"We have to live with the times!"

*Through his brother, the Maharil, the
senior chasidim discovered that the Rebbe
meant that one should live with the Parsha of
the week, and the particular Parsha of the
day. One should not only study the weekly
Parsha, but live with it.*

(HAYOM YOM, CHESHVAN 2)

parshas Bereishis

פֶּרֶשַׁת בְּרֵאשִׁית

🌀 The Name of the Parsha 🌀

Why does the Torah begin with the second letter of the Hebrew alphabet, *beis* (ב), and not the first letter, *alef* (א)?

The Jerusalem Talmud suggests that *alef* would be an inappropriate beginning, since it is the first letter of the word *arirah*, meaning “cursing.” *Beis*, on the other hand, begins the word *bracha*, meaning “blessing” (*Chagigah* 2:1).

But surely there are many positive words in Hebrew that begin with an *alef*, and many negative words that begin with a *beis*? Why should *beis* be identified with “blessing” in particular?

The fact that the Torah begins with the second letter of the Hebrew alphabet, *beis*, indicates that reading the text is actually the *second phase* of Torah study. Before a person even looks at the first verse of the Torah, he needs to prepare himself for the experience that he is about to undergo.

Basically, Torah study is somewhat of a paradox. On the one hand, it is a *mitzvah* that connects a person to God and—as with any *mitzvah*—the person needs to be aware of this fact to achieve a full “connection.” On the

other hand, if a person actually thinks about God *while* he is studying Torah, he will not be able to concentrate on the subject at hand.

The solution to this problem is through *preparation*. Before even opening the book, a person should take a few moments to reflect that he is about to study God’s wisdom that has been “condensed” into a humanly intelligible form. He is about to bind his mind into a total union with God.

Of course, when he actually studies the Torah, he will not be able to meditate on this fact, since he will be concentrating on the text. Therefore, it is crucial that a person has the correct intentions *before* he begins.

And that is why the Torah begins with a *beis*, to hint to its reader that *study is only the second phase of this mitzvah*.

Through studying Torah with the appropriate preparations blessings will come into a person’s life. Thus, the Jerusalem Talmud taught that the *beis* at the beginning of the Torah stands for *bracha*—blessing.

(Based on *Likutei Sichos* vol. 15, pp. 1ff; *ibid.* p. 326)

א בְּקֶדְמַיִן בְּרָא יי ית שְׁמַיָא וַיֵּת אֲרֵעָא:
 ב וְאַרְעָא הָיְתָה צְדָיָא וְרִיקְנִיָא וְחֲשׂוּכָא פְּרִשׁ עַל
 אֲפִי תְהוּמָא וְרוּחָא מִן קָדָם יי מְנַשְׁבָּא עַל

א בְּרֵאשִׁית בְּרָא אֱלֹהִים אֶת הַשָּׁמַיִם וְאֶת הָאָרֶץ: ב וְהָאָרֶץ
 הָיְתָה תְהוֹ וְזָהוּ וְחֶשֶׁךְ עַל-פְּנֵי תְהוֹם וְרוּחַ אֱלֹהִים מְרַחֶפֶת

*ב' רבתי

רש"י

ואם תאמר להורות צא שאלו תחלה נבראו, ופירושו בראשית הכל צרא אלו, ויש לך מקראות שמקלרים לשונם וממעטים תיבה אחת, כמו כי לא סגר דלתי צטני⁹, ולא פירש מי הסוגר. כמו ישא את חיל דמשק¹⁰, ולא פירש מי ישאנו, וכמו אם יחרוש בצקרים¹¹, ולא פירש אם יחרוש אדם בצקרים, וכמו מגיד מראשית אחרית¹², ולא פירש מגיד מראשית דבר אחרית דבר. (כ"י וכן בכאן בראשית כל). אם כן תמה על ענמך, שהרי המים קדמו, שהרי כתיב ורוח אלהים מרחפת על פני המים, ועדיין לא גלה המקרא צסידור הקודמים והמאוחרים כלום בריית המים מתי היתה, הא למדת, שקדמו המים לארץ, ועוד שהמים מאש ומים נבראו, על כרחך לא לימד המקרא בסדר המוקדמים והמאוחרים כלום: ברא אלהים. ולא אמר צרא ה', שנתחלה עלה במחשבה לבראותו צמדת הדין, וראה שאין העולם מתקיים, והקדים מדת רחמים ושתפה למדת הדין, וכיניו דכתיב ציום עשות ה' אלהים ארץ ושמים¹³: (צ) תהו ובהו. תהו לשון תמה ושמומן, שאדם תוכה ומשתומם על צבו שצב: תהו. אשטורדי"שין צלע": בהו. לשון רקות ולדו (סא"א): על פני תהום. על פני המים שעל הארץ: ורוח אלהים מרחפת. כסא

(ה) בראשית. אמר רבי יצחק, לא היה לריך להתחיל את התורה אלא מהחדש הזה לכם, שהיא מזוה ראשונה שנלטו צב ישראל, ומה טעם פתח בצראשית, משום כח מעשיו הגיד לעמו לתת להם נחלת גוים¹, שאם יאמרו אומות העולם לישראל, ליסטים אתם, שכצטתם ארלות שצעה גוים, הם אומרים לכם, כל הארץ של הקצ"ה היא, הוא צראה ונתנה לאשר ישר צעיניו, צרלנו נתנה לכם, וצרלנו נטלה מהם ונתנה לנו: בראשית ברא. אין המקרא הזה אומר אלא דרשנוי, כמ"ש רז"ל² צשציל התורה שנקראת ראשית דרכו³, וצשציל ישראל שנקראו ראשית צבואתו⁴, ואם צאת לפרשו כפשוטו כך פרשבו, צראשית צריית שמים וארץ, והארץ היתה תהו וצבו וחושך (וגו'), ויאמר אלהים יהי אור. ולא צא המקרא להורות סדר הצריאה לומר שאלו קדמו, שאם צא להורות כך, היה לו לכתוב, צראשונה צרא את השמים וגו', שאין לך ראשית צמקרא שאינו צצוק לתיצב שלאחריו, כמו צראשית ממלכת ויוקיס⁵, ראשית ממלכתו⁶, ראשית דגנך⁷, אף כאן אתה אומר צראשית צרא אלהים וגו' כמו צראשית צרוא, ודומה לו תחלת דבר ה' צבושע, כלומר תחלת דבורו של הקצ"ה צבושע ויאמר ה' אל הושע וגו'⁸.

CLASSIC QUESTIONS

● Why does the Torah begin with the creation of the world? (v.1)

RASHI: Rabbi Yitzchak said: Surely, the Torah should have begun from the words, "This month shall be for you..." (*Shemos* 12:2), the first commandment which the Jewish people were given. Why does it begin with "In the beginning?"

The reason is [conveyed by the verse]: "He declared to His people the power of His works in order to give them the inheritance of the nations" (*Psalms* 111:6), i.e., if the nations of the world will say to the Jewish people, "You are robbers, for you seized the land of the seven nations [who inhabited Cana'an]," they will reply: "The whole earth belongs to God. He created it and granted it to whoever was deemed

fit in His eyes! It was His will that they should have it; and, by His will, He took it from them and gave it to us!"

SIFSEI CHACHAMIM: *Rashi* was troubled by the fact that the Torah begins with stories when the Torah was given for the sake of its *mitzvos*. These stories seem superfluous.

NACHALAS YA'AKOV: *Rashi* was not suggesting that the section from *Bereishis* until "This month shall be for you..." should not be written at all. Rather, his question was: Why did the Torah begin with discursive narrative rather than with its primary content, the *mitzvos*. The account of creation, together with all the stories that follow it could have been included at the end of the *Chumash*, or in a separate book.

TORAS MENACHEM

🔗 WHAT IS TROUBLING RASHI? (v. 1)

Sifsei Chachamim writes that *Rashi* was troubled by the inclusion of stories in the Torah, which is primarily a code of *mitzvos*.

However, it is difficult to accept that this was the only point troubling *Rashi*, since there are many other stories written throughout the Torah whose necessity he does not challenge. Therefore, the inclusion of a story does not appear to be a "problem" which requires explanation.

One could argue [as **Nachalas Ya'akov** does] that *Rashi* was not troubled by the actual inclusion of these stories, but rather, he was concerned why the Torah should begin with narrative, rather than with its primary content, the *mitzvos*. The account of creation and other stories should have been included at a later point in the *Chumash*.

But if this indeed is *Rashi's* question, then what is his answer? According to *Rashi*, the account of creation was written here, at the beginning of the Torah, to answer a potential challenge from non-Jewish nations that the Land of Israel was unlawfully possessed. Our response to the nations—that the land was given to us by its Creator—would be equally valid wherever

it was recorded in the Torah; the fact that it was recorded at the beginning is not crucial to the argument. So, if *Rashi* was merely questioning the position in which the account of creation was included [as **Nachalas Ya'akov** argues], then he does not appear to have provided us with a solution.

FURTHER QUESTIONS ON RASHI

a.) *Rashi* suggests that the Torah should have begun from the words, "This month shall be for you" (*Shemos* 12:2), because it is the first *mitzvah*. However, in the book of *Bereishis* there are no fewer than three *mitzvos* recorded: the *mitzvah* of having children (1:28), the *mitzvah* of circumcision (17:10), and the prohibition against eating the sciatic nerve (32:33). How could *Rashi* suggest that the Torah should have only begun with *Shemos* chapter 12, omitting the above *mitzvos*?

b.) According to the seven Noachide laws which are binding on non-Jews, robbery is prohibited. Yet, we do not find that any nation was punished for conquering another because it was an act of robbery. On what basis could the nations challenge the Jewish people that "You are robbers, for you seized the land of the seven nations"?

🕍 CREATION: THE FIRST DAY—LIGHT & DARKNESS 🕍

In the beginning of God's creation of the heavens* and the earth (and their contents),² when the earth was astoundingly desolate, darkness was on the surface of the deep (waters that covered the land), and the (throne of) God's glory hovered over the water (at the command of God's) breath,

CLASSIC QUESTIONS

● Why was the world created? (v.1)

RASHI: The word *Bereishis* is crying out for a Midrashic interpretation: *Bereishis* means “two beginnings” (בִּי רֵאשִׁית), suggesting that God created the world for the sake of the Torah which is called, “the beginning of His way” (Prov. 8:22), and for the sake of the Jewish people who are called, “the first of His grain” (Jer. 2:3).

MASKIL LeDAVID: Since the verse employs the singular (“in the beginning”) from where did *Rashi* conclude that there are two beginnings, the Torah and the Jewish people?

However, *Rashi* is referring to the Jewish people as they are learning and observing the Torah, i.e. as they form two parts of one greater whole.

TORAS MENACHEM

THE EXPLANATION

The Torah contains the collected teachings given to the Jewish people. Since the Jewish people first assumed their current national character through the Exodus from Egypt and the giving of the Torah, *Rashi* was troubled, “Surely, the Torah should have begun from the words, ‘This month shall be for you...’, i.e. the first commandment which the Jewish people were given.” The stories before the period of the Exodus did not occur to members of the Jewish nation, so why are they recorded in the Torah, which is a text of instruction for Jews? They could have been recorded in a separate book, or handed down orally, but they should not have been included in a text of instructions which is specifically addressed to members of the Jewish nation.

Even the *mitzvos* which are recorded in the book of *Bereishis* were not given to the Jewish people, but rather to *Avraham* and his family etc. Thus, our obligation to circumcise and to refrain from eating the sciatic nerve comes from Sinai, and not from God's words to *Avraham* etc.**

Rashi answers that the stories which predate the Exodus from Egypt and the giving of the Torah were recorded as a proof to the nations of the world that the land of Israel belongs to the Jewish people:

According to both Noachide Law and Jewish Law, land acquired as a result of military conquest is not considered to be stolen property (see *Shulchan Aruch Admor Hazakein, Orach Chayim* 649:10). Therefore, the nations of the world could not possibly accuse the Jewish people of being “robbers” merely due to the fact that they seized the land of Canaan.

Rather, the nations' complaint is that the Jewish people have transformed the land permanently to be an essentially Jewish one, precluding any nation from identifying it as their own at any future time.

Even if the land will be conquered by another nation, it will remain the “Land of Israel” and Jewish people will refer to it as their own, perceiving the loss of the land as a temporary “exile.” For after Jewish conquest and inhabitation, the land became a holy, uniquely Jewish land at its very essence, remaining associated with the Jewish people forever.

🕍 The Last Word 🕍

According to *Rashi* (v. 1) the book of *Bereishis* was written to provide a response to the non-Jewish nations about our claim to the Land of Israel. However, it appears far-fetched to suggest that the entire book of *Bereishis*, and all the passages up to chapter 12 of *Shemos*, were written merely to answer a question that might be posed by non-Jews!

In truth, there is an extremely powerful message in these words for Jewish people, a lesson so profound that *Rashi* deemed it appropriate to form the “introduction” to his commentary.

Namely, despite the fact that the Jewish people are but a tiny minority, the Torah gives us the strength not to be intimidated by the nations of the world. At the very outset of Torah study, the Jew learns that he will be able to defend himself from the criticism of non-Jews, and observe the *mitzvos* proudly, with the full awareness that God created the world for this very purpose (see *Rashi* to v.1 at top of page).

(Based on *Sichas Shabbos Bereishis* 5741)

🕍 Sparks of Chasidus 🕍

- “In the beginning... the earth was astoundingly desolate.” God's plan is that a home should be made for Him in the lowest realms (*Midrash Tanchuma, Naso* 16). Therefore, the world began with utter desolation—the lowest of all existence—into which light, Torah and the Jewish people were then added.
- “The (throne of) God's glory hovered over the water (at the command of God's) breath.” Our sages said that this “breath” refers to the “spirit of Mashiach” (*Bereishis Rabah* 2:4, 8:1). From this we see that the concept of Mashiach is even more primal than that of light, for the “spirit of Mashiach” (v. 2) preceded the creation of light (v. 3).
- “The (throne of) God's glory hovered.” *Kabalah* teaches that the purpose of creation is to elevate 288 Godly sparks which are trapped in the physical world. This number is hinted to by the word מְרֹהֶפֶת (“hovered”) which contains the letters חפ, equaling 288.

(Based on *Sefer Hasichos* 5751, p. 63; *ibid.* p. 804; *ibid* 5752, p. 459)

* See *Sichas Shabbos Nitzavim* 5745, ch. 25. ** Although the Torah does not repeat the prohibition of eating the sciatic nerve after the Jewish people assumed a national identity, it nevertheless comes from Sinai. Thus, if the book of *Bereishis* was omitted—as *Rashi* suggests—details of these *mitzvos* would have been included at some later point.

אפי מִיָּא: ג וַיֹּאמֶר יי יְהִי נְהוֹרָא וְהָיָה נְהוֹרָא:
 ד וַתֵּזֶן יי יֵת נְהוֹרָא אֲרֵי טָב וְאִפְרִישׁ יי בֵּין
 נְהוֹרָא וּבֵין חֹשֶׁךְ: ה וַקָּרָא יי לְנְהוֹרָא יוֹמָא
 וּלְחֹשֶׁךְ קֶרָא לַיְלָא וְהָיָה רִמְשׁ וְהָיָה צִפְר
 יוֹמָא חָד: ו וַיֹּאמֶר יי יְהִי רְקִיעָא בְּמִצְעוֹת

עַל-פְּנֵי הַמַּיִם: ג וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים יְהִי אֹר וְיִהְיֶה-אֹר: ד וַיִּרְא
 אֱלֹהִים אֶת-הָאֹר כִּי-טוֹב וַיַּבְדֵּל אֱלֹהִים בֵּין הָאֹר וּבֵין
 הַחֹשֶׁךְ: ה וַיִּקְרָא אֱלֹהִים אֶל-הַיּוֹם וַיִּלְחַשְׁדָּה קֶרָא לַיְלָא
 וַיִּהְיֶה-עֶרֶב וַיִּהְיֶה-בֹקֶר יוֹם אֶחָד: פ וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים יְהִי רְקִיעַ

— כ"ט —

היה לו לכתוב יום ראשון, כמו שכתוב בשאר הימים, שני, שלישי, רביעי, למה כתב אחד, לפי שהיה הקצ"ה יחיד בעולמו, שלא נזכרו המלאכים עד יום שני, כן מפורש בצראשית רבא: (ו) יהי רקיע. יתחזק הרקיע, שאף על פי שנזכרו שמים ציוס ראשון, עדיין לחים היו, וקראו צשני מגערת הקצ"ה צאמרו יכי רקיע, וזהו שכתוב עמודי שמים ירופפו, כל יום ראשון, וצשני יתמהו מגערתו, כאדם שמשחמם ועומד מגערת המאיים

הכבוד עומד באויר, ומרחף על פני המים ברוח פיו של הקצ"ה וצמאמרו, כיונה המרחפת על הקן, אקוב"טיר בלע"ז: (ד) וירא אלהים את האור כי טוב ויבדל. אף בזכ אנו לריכס לדברי אגדה, ראהו שאינו כדאי להשתמש בו רשעים, והבדילו ללדיקים לעתיד לזכ. ולפי פשוטו כך פרשהו, ראהו כי טוב, ואין נאה לו ולחשך שיהיו משחמשין בערבוביא, וקצע לזה תחומו ציוס ולזה תחומו צלילה: (ה) יום אחד. לפי סדר לשון הפרשה

CLASSIC QUESTIONS

● Why did God separate the light from the darkness? (v. 4)

RASHI: Here too, we need the words of the *Midrash*: He saw that it was not proper for the wicked to use it, so He separated it for the righteous in the future.

According to its literal meaning, the explanation of the verse is as follows: He saw that it was good, and it was not fitting that it (the light) and darkness should function in a jumble, so He assigned for one its boundary by day, and for the other one its boundary by night.

BARTENURA: Verse 2 states that, “darkness was on the surface of the deep (waters that covered the land),” and then, in verse 3, light is created. Surely then, God had *already* distinguished the light from the darkness, so why does verse 4 state, “God separated the light from the darkness”?

To answer this problem, *Rashi* writes “we need the words of the *Midrash*,” and explains that the additional “separation” in verse 4 refers to God separating the light for the righteous in the future.

TORAS MENACHEM

This could cause the non-Jewish nations to complain, “You are robbers!” For by conquering the Land of Israel, the Jewish people “robbed” all the nations of the world from ever identifying themselves with the land again. From that point on it became the Land of *Israel*, an identity that it retained even after the Jewish people were exiled from it.

The Jewish people can thus reply, “The whole earth belongs to God. He created it and granted it to whomever was deemed fit in His eyes!” I.e. the *permanent acquisition* of the Land of Israel by the Jewish people is *God’s will*. From the moment He created the world, He already intended that the Jewish people should inherit the land. The permanent acquisition of the land by the Jewish people is thus not robbery, but Divinely willed.

However, this begs the question: If God intended at the very outset of creation that the Land of Israel should be an exclusively Jewish land, to the extent that no other nation could identify with it, then why did He allow other nations to possess it before the Jewish people?

To answer this question, *Rashi* continues, “*It was His will that they should have it; and, by His will, He took it from them and gave it to us!*” I.e. the very same Divine will caused both events.

God’s intention was that the Jewish people should acquire a non-Jewish land and *transform* it into a holy land, the Land of Israel. Therefore, He first gave it to the nations, and then He told the Jewish people to conquer it.

In the final analysis, we see that *Rashi* has explained the necessity for the narrative up to *Shemos* chapter 12. All this information is required to explain how God intended the Land of Israel for the Jewish people at the very outset of Creation (*Parshas Bereishis*), and yet He first gave it to the nations (see *Noach* 10:5, *Lech Lecha* 12:6 and *Rashi* *ibid.*). In order to explain the lengthy delay which occurred before the Jewish people received the land, the Torah describes the “Covenant of the Parts” where Avraham was told

that his descendants would be exiled for hundreds of years (15:13). The remaining part of the book of *Bereishis* is thus required to explain how this occurred in actuality, i.e. how Avraham’s descendants went down into Egypt and were enslaved. Then we read finally, at the beginning of the book of *Shemos*, how the exile ended and the Jewish people left Egypt to receive the Torah and conquer the Land of Israel.

(Based on *Likutei Sichos* vol. 5, pp. 1ff; *Sichas Shabbos Bereishis* 5726)

☞ LIGHT & DARKNESS (v. 4)

Bartenura writes that *Rashi* cites the *Midrash* in his commentary to verse 4, in order to explain why the Torah states, “God separated the light from the darkness,” a detail which seems to have already occurred in verses 2 and 3.

However, *Bartenura* fails to explain why *Rashi* chose to cite the Midrashic interpretation *before* he explains the verse at the literal level. Surely *Rashi* should have written the straightforward explanation first, before citing the more esoteric words of the *Midrash*?

RASHI’S PROBLEM

Rashi was troubled why the verse states, “God said, ‘Let there be light!’—and there was light. God saw that *the light* was good, and God separated....” The term “the light” appears to be superfluous here, as the verse could have stated more simply, “God saw that *it* was good.”

This led *Rashi* to the conclusion that, here in verse 4, God must have perceived some additional “good” quality within the light which was not yet apparent in verse 3. Therefore, in addition to telling us that “there was light” (v. 3), the Torah adds here that “God saw that *the light* was good” (v. 4), suggesting that *within* the light an especially good quality was to be found.

³ God said, “Let there be light!”—and there was light.

⁴ God saw that the light was good, and God separated the (times of) light from the (times of) darkness (in the following manner:)⁵ God called out to the light (and assigned it to the) day, and He called out to the darkness (and assigned it to) the night.*

It became evening and it became morning—one day.

CLASSIC QUESTIONS

● Why does the verse write, “one day” and not “the first day”? (v. 5)

RASHI: To fit in with the context of the chapter, the verse should have stated, “the first day,” as is written regarding the other days: “second,” “third,” “fourth.” Why did Scripture write “one”?

Because God was alone in His world, since the angels were not created until the second day. This is explained in *Bereishis Rabah* (3:8).

TORAS MENACHEM

In other words, the light contained two qualities: a.) Its natural property of illumination; b.) A deeper aspect of “goodness.” *Rashi* explains that

God separated out the latter from the former, to be reserved for the righteous in the future.

We have thus answered *Bartenura*’s question (why the Torah needs to repeat the separation of the light in verse 4), for the separation here refers to a separation *within the light itself*; and clearly, this information is not conveyed by verses 2 and 3.

Furthermore, we have also explained why the Midrashic interpretation is so crucial at the literal level (such that *Rashi* cites it first), since only the Midrashic interpretation explains how an actual “separation” took place *within* a single entity. According to the plain meaning however—that God separated the *times* of light from the times of darkness (see *Rashi*)—the verse is speaking more of an “allocation” or “redistribution,” rather than a genuine “separation.”

WHY WAS GOD ALONE ON THE FIRST DAY?

Based on the above, we can explain a difficulty with *Rashi*’s comment to verse 5. The verse states, “*It became evening and it became morning, one day.*” *Rashi* questions why the Torah employs the expression “one day” rather than saying “the first day,” and he answers that this alludes to the Midrashic teaching that God was totally “alone in His world” on that day.

This begs the question: Since God had already created light on the first day, then surely He was not alone, since He was accompanied by His first creation: the light. Why does *Rashi* write that God was “alone in His world.”

The answer to this problem is to be found in the nature of light:

It was explained above that the light which was created on the first day

🌀 The Last Word 🌀

THE AGE OF THE WORLD

Those well-meaning persons who felt impelled to interpret certain passages in the Torah differently from the time-honored traditional interpretation, did so only in the mistaken belief that the Torah view (on the age of the world etc.) was at variance with science; otherwise they would not have sought new interpretations in the Torah.

The apologetic literature—at least a substantial part of it—that was created as a result of this misconception, relied on the principle that, as in the case of “*muttar leshanos mipnei darchei shalom*” [it is permissible to alter the facts for the sake of peace], there was no harm in making an “innocent” verbal concession to science, if it would be helpful in strengthening commitment to Torah and *mitzvos* of many.

At the bottom of this attitude was the mistaken belief that scientific “conclusions” were categorical and absolute...

The crucial point, however, is that the latest conclusions of science introduced a radical change into science’s own evaluation of itself, clearly defining its own limitations. Accordingly, there is nothing categorical in science; the principle of cause and effect is substituted by “probable sequence of events” etc....

Science demands empirical verification: “conclusions” are considered “scientific” if they have been investigated experimentally—but certainly not in relation to conditions which have never been known to mankind and can never be duplicated.

In view of all that has been said above, there is no reason whatever to believe that science (as different from scientists) can state anything definitive on something which occurred in the remote past, in the pre-dawn of history. Consequently, there is no need to seek new reinterpretations in the Torah to “reconcile” them with science....

(Excerpt from a letter written by the Rebbe)

🌀 Sparks of Chasidus 🌀

Why did God create light first of all, only then to hide it? (see *Rashi* to v. 4)

Because the ultimate purpose of Creation is that God’s presence should be revealed in the lowest realms (*Midrash Tanchumah, Naso* 16), therefore, at the very outset of Creation God made a “mission statement” declaring what the ultimate purpose of the world should be—revelation; like an architect (so to speak) who draws up plans before constructing a building.

(Based on Likutei Sichos vol. 10, p. 7ff.)

* See *Sichas Shabbos Bereishis* 5743, ch. 36.

מִיָּא וַיְהִי מִפְּרִישׁ בֵּין מִיָּא לְמִיָּא: וְעַבְדַּי יִי ית
 רְקִיעָא וְאַפְרִישׁ בֵּין מִיָּא דִּי מְלַרְע לְרְקִיעָא
 וּבֵין מִיָּא דִּי מְעַל לְרְקִיעָא וְהוּהּ בֶּן: ה וַיִּקְרָא
 יִי לְרְקִיעָא שְׁמַיָּא וְהוּהּ רְמֵשׁ וְהוּהּ צִפְרָא יוֹם
 תְּנִין: ט וְאָמַר יִי יתְּכַנְשׁוּן מִיָּא מִתְּחִיל שְׁמַיָּא
 לְאַתְרָא חַד וְתִתְּחַוֵּי יִבְשָׁתָא וְהוּהּ בֶּן: ו וַיִּקְרָא
 יִי לְיִבְשָׁתָא אֲרֶעָא וּלְבֵית פְּנִישׁוֹת מִיָּא קְרָא
 יִמְמִי וְהוּא יִי אַרְי טַב: יא וְאָמַר יִי תְּדַאֲרִית
 אֲרֶעָא דְתָאָה עֲשָׂבָא דְבַר זְרַעִיה מְזַרְעֵי אֵילָן
 פְּרִין עֵבֶד פְּרִין לְזַנְיָה דִּי בַר זְרַעִיה בֵּיה עַל
 אֲרֶעָא וְהוּהּ בֶּן: יב וְאִפִּיקַת אֲרֶעָא דְתָאָה
 עֲשָׂבָא דְבַר זְרַעִיה מְזַרְעֵי לְזַנְיָה וְאֵילָן עֵבֶד
 פְּרִין דְבַר זְרַעִיה בֵּיה לְזַנְיָה וְהוּא יִי אַרְי טַב:
 יג וְהוּהּ רְמֵשׁ וְהוּהּ צִפְרָא יוֹם תְּלִיתָא:
 יד וְאָמַר יִי יְהוֹן גְּהוּרִין בְּרְקִיעָא דְשְׁמַיָּא

בְּתוֹךְ הַמַּיִם וַיְהִי מִבְּדִיל בֵּין מַיִם לְמַיִם: ו וַיַּעַשׂ אֱלֹהִים
 אֶת־הָרְקִיעַ וַיַּבְדִּיל בֵּין הַמַּיִם אֲשֶׁר מִתַּחַת לְרְקִיעַ וּבֵין הַמַּיִם
 אֲשֶׁר מַעַל לְרְקִיעַ וַיְהִי־בֶן: ה וַיִּקְרָא אֱלֹהִים לְרְקִיעַ שְׁמַיִם
 וַיְהִי־עֶרֶב וַיְהִי־בֹקֶר יוֹם שֵׁנִי: פ ט וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים יִקְוּ הַמַּיִם
 מִתַּחַת הַשָּׁמַיִם אֶל־מְקוֹם אֶחָד וְתִרְאֶה הַיַּבְשָׁה וַיְהִי־בֶן:
 י וַיִּקְרָא אֱלֹהִים א לַיַּבְשָׁה אֶרֶץ וּלְמִקְוֵה הַמַּיִם קָרָא יַמִּים וַיֵּרָא
 אֱלֹהִים כִּי־טוֹב: יא וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים תְּדַשֵּׂא הָאָרֶץ דְּשֵׂא עֵשֶׂב
 מְזֵרִיעַ זֶרַע עֵיץ פְּרִי עֹשֶׂה פְּרִי לְמִינּוֹ אֲשֶׁר זֶרְעוּ־בוֹ
 עַל־הָאָרֶץ וַיְהִי־בֶן: יב וַתּוֹצֵא הָאָרֶץ דְּשֵׂא עֵשֶׂב מְזֵרִיעַ זֶרַע
 לְמִינֵהוּ וְעֵץ עֹשֶׂה־פְּרִי אֲשֶׁר זֶרְעוּ־בוֹ לְמִינֵהוּ וַיֵּרָא אֱלֹהִים
 כִּי־טוֹב: יג וַיְהִי־עֶרֶב וַיְהִי־בֹקֶר יוֹם שְׁלִישִׁי: פ יד וַיֹּאמֶר

כש"י

וכלא יס אחד הוא, אלא אינו דומה טעם דג העולה מן היס צעכו לדג העולה מן היס צאספמיא: (יא) תדשא הארץ דשא עשב. לא דשא לשון עשב ולא עשב לשון דשא, ולא היה לשון המקרא לומר חשיב הארץ, שמיני דשאים מחולקין, כל אחד לעצמו נקרא עשב פלוני, ואין לשון למדבר לומר דשא פלוני, שלשון דשא הוא לבישת הארץ כשהיא מתמלאת בדשאים: תדשא הארץ. תתמלא ותתכסה לצוש עשבים, בלשון לע"ז נקרא דשא ארצרייזן בלע"ז, כולן צערבוציא, וכל שורש לעצמו נקרא עשב: מזריע זרע. שיגדל צו זרע לזרוע ממנו במקום אחר: עץ פרי. שיהא טעם העץ כטעם הפרי. והיא לא עשהה כן, אלא ותואא הארץ וגו' ועץ עושה פרי, ולא העץ פרי, לפיכך כשתקלל אדם על עונו נפקדה גם היא על עוניה (ותקללה): אשר זרעו בו. הן גרעיני כל פרי, שמכן האילן נומה כשנוטעין אותן: (יב) ותוצא הארץ

עליו: בתוך המים. צאמלע המים, שיש הפרש בין מים העליונים לרקיע כמו בין הרקיע למים שעל הארץ, הא למדת, שהם תלויים צמאמרו של מלך: (י) ויעש אלהים את הרקיע. תקנו על עמדו, והיא עשייתו, כמו ועשהה את זכרניה: מעל לרקיע. על הרקיע לא נאמר, אלא מעל לרקיע, לפי שהן תלויים באויר. ומפני מה לא נאמר כי טוב ביום שני, לפי שלא היה נגמר מלאכת המים עד יום השלישי, והרי התחיל זה בשני, ודבר שלא נגמר אינו צמילואו וטובו, ובשלישי שנגמרה מלאכת המים והתחיל נגמר מלאכה אחרת, כפל צו כי טוב שני פעמים, אחת לגמר מלאכת השני, ואחת לגמר מלאכת היום: (ח) ויקרא אלהים לרקיע שמים. שא מים, שם מים, אש ומים, שערבן זה צוה ועשה מהם שמים: (ט) יקוו המים. שטוחין היו על פני כל הארץ, והקוים באוקיינוס, הוא היס הגדול שצכל הימים: (י) קרא ימים.

TORAS MENACHEM

had two properties: a.) Its superficial quality of physical illumination, and b.) An inner, deeper "good" that was separated out.

The inner quality of the light had the effect of revealing the purpose of creation, how every entity that exists is, in essence, totally one with God.

God found it necessary to hide this inner aspect of the light in order to grant man free choice. For if the inner purpose of every object was plainly evident, it would be impossible to sin, since a sin is only made possible via concealment of the truth.

Therefore *Rashi* writes that, despite the existence of light on the first day, "God was alone in the world," for, the inner light revealed how God is truly at one with His creations to the extent that there is "nothing but God." I.e. despite the fact that creation had started on the first day, God was still "alone in His world," since the inner light revealed how everything that existed was totally one with Him.

(Based on *Likutei Sichos* vol. 25, p. 1ff)

 Sparks of Chasidus 

"LET THE FIRMAMENT (MATERIALIZE)..." (v. 6)

The verse states, "Forever, O God, Your word stands firm in the heavens" (Psalms 119:89). The *Baal Shem Tov*, of blessed memory, has explained that "Your word" which You uttered, "Let the firmament (materialize) between the waters..." (v. 6), these very words and letters stand firmly forever within the firmament of heaven and are forever found within all the heavens to give them life.... For if the letters were to depart even for an instant, God forbid, and return to their source, all the heavens would become naught and absolute nothingness, and it would be as though they had never existed at all, exactly as before the utterance, "Let the firmament (materialize)..."

(Tanya, Sha'ar Hayichud Veha'emunah, chap. 1)

🌀 THE SECOND DAY—SEPARATION OF WATERS 🌀

1:6 **G**od said, “Let the firmament (materialize) between the waters, and let it separate between (the upper) waters and (the lower) waters.”

⁷ God made the firmament (fixed in its position). He separated between the waters that were below the firmament and the waters that were above the firmament (by suspending the upper waters in mid-air), and it remained that way. ⁸ God called the firmament “sky.”

It became evening and it became morning—a second day.

🌀 THE THIRD DAY—LAND & VEGETATION 🌀

1:9 **G**od said, “Let the water that is below the skies gather into one location, and let the dry land appear!”—and that is what happened.

¹⁰ God called the dry land “earth,” and He called the gathering of the waters “seas.” God saw that (the work of the second and third days) was good.

¹¹ God said, “Let the earth be covered with vegetation, plants that reproduce by seed and trees (with edible bark that tastes like) fruit, which produce fruit of their own species containing their own seed, over the earth!”—and that is what happened. ¹² The earth germinated vegetation, plants that reproduce by seed of their own species and fruit-producing trees, in which its seeds of its own species are found.

God saw that it was good.

¹³ *It became evening and it became morning—a third day.*

CLASSIC QUESTIONS

● Why did God call the firmament “skies” (v. 8)

RASHI: The Hebrew word for “skies,” שָׁמַיִם, is a combination of different words: שָׂא מַיִם (“bear water”), שָׁם מַיִם (“there is water”), אֵשׁ וּמַיִם (“fire and water”). He mixed them together and made the skies from them (See “The Last Word” below).

TORAS MENACHEM

🌀 The Last Word 🌀

THE FOUR ELEMENTS

During the first three days of Creation, God distinguished the four elements: earth (v. 9-10), water (v. 6-7), air (alluded to by the word רֵיחַ in v. 2) and fire (see *Rashi* to v. 8). In the following letter, this concept is reconciled with the view of Science that there are over 100 elements:

“Modern chemistry does not recognize over one hundred basic elements but a considerably fewer number if matter is to be reduced to its basic components or particles. For the so-called elements themselves are made up of atoms, which are the smallest particles into which an element can be divided and yet retain its properties and characteristics, but the atoms themselves are further made up of smaller particles, such as electrons, protons, neutrons.

“Thus the answer to your question lies in the proper definition of the terms under discussion. For as indicated above, the so-called element is not the basic particle matter. Even the term ‘atom’ which

originally meant something invisible, is an archaism now employed only for convenience, as it no longer corresponds to its original meaning. Similarly when we speak of an individual as being an element of society this does not mean that the individual himself is not composite.

“This should be born in mind when we consider the term Yesodoth in the *Zohar*, *Midrash Rabba*, *Kabbalah*, etc. and of course, in the *Tanya* and other *Chabad* sources. This does not mean something which under normal circumstances is indivisible or unchangeable, [everything that exists in the world.] I might also mention that there is another school of thought that conceives these four Yesodoth, not in their physical aspects, but rather qualitatively, this is to say, ‘fire’ in the sense of the properties of heat and dryness; ‘water’, in the sense of coolness and humidity.”

(Excerpt from a letter written by the Rebbe)

לְאֶפְרָשָׁא בֵּין יִמְמָא וּבֵין לִילָיָא וַיְהוּן לְאֶתִין
וּלְזִמְנִין וּלְמִמְנֵי בְּהוּן יוֹמִין וְשָׁנִין: טו וַיְהוּן
לְנְהוּרִין בְּרִקִיעָא דְשָׁמַיָא לְאַנְהָרָא עַל אַרְעָא
וְהוּהוּ בִּן: טז וְעַבְדֵי יְיָ יַת תְּרִין נְהוּרָא רַבְרָבִיא
יַת נְהוּרָא רַבָּא לְמִשְׁלַט בִּימְמָא וַיַּת נְהוּרָא
זְעִירָא לְמִשְׁלַט בְּלִילָיָא וַיַּת כּוֹכְבֵיא: יז וַיְהִי
יַתְהוּן יְיָ בְּרִקִיעָא דְשָׁמַיָא לְאַנְהָרָא עַל
אַרְעָא: יח וּלְמִשְׁלַט בִּימְמָא וּבְלִילָיָא
וּלְאֶפְרָשָׁא בֵּין נְהוּרָא וּבֵין חֲשׂוּכָא וַחֲזָא יְיָ אֲרִי
טָב: יט וְהוּהוּ רְמֵשׁ וְהוּהוּ צֶפֶר יוֹם רַבִּיעָא:
כ וְאָמַר יְיָ יִרְחֲשׁוּן מִיָּא רְחֵשׁ נִפְשָׁא חִיתָא
וְעוֹפָא דְפִרְחָא עַל אַרְעָא עַל אֲפִי רִקִיעָא

אֱלֹהִים יְהִי מְאֹרֵת בְּרִקִיעַ הַשָּׁמַיִם לְהַבְדִּיל בֵּין הַיּוֹם וּבֵין
הַלַּיְלָה וְהָיוּ לְאֹתוֹת וּלְמוֹעֲדִים וּלְיָמִים וּשְׁנָיִם: טו וְהָיוּ לְמְאֹרֹת
בְּרִקִיעַ הַשָּׁמַיִם לְהָאִיר עַל-הָאָרֶץ וַיְהִי-כֵן: טז וַיַּעַשׂ אֱלֹהִים
אֶת-שְׁנֵי הַמְּאֹרֹת הַגְּדֹלִים אֶת-הַמְּאֹר הַגָּדֹל לְמִשְׁשֶׁלֶת הַיּוֹם
וְאֶת-הַמְּאֹר הַקָּטָן לְמִשְׁשֶׁלֶת הַלַּיְלָה וְאֵת הַכּוֹכָבִים: יז וַיִּתֵּן
אֹתָם אֱלֹהִים בְּרִקִיעַ הַשָּׁמַיִם לְהָאִיר עַל-הָאָרֶץ: יח וּלְמִשְׁלַ
בַּיּוֹם וּבְלַיְלָה וּלְהַבְדִּיל בֵּין הָאֹר וּבֵין הַחֹשֶׁךְ וַיֵּרָא אֱלֹהִים
כִּי-טוֹב: יט וַיְהִי-עֶרֶב וַיְהִי-בֹקֶר יוֹם רְבִיעִי: כ כ וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים
יִשְׂרְצוּ הַמַּיִם שָׂרָץ נֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה וְעוֹף יְעוֹפֵף עַל-הָאָרֶץ עַל-פְּנֵי

דש"י

מאורות השמים אל תחתו וגו',² צעשוכס רלון הקצ"ה, אין אתם לריכין
לדאוג מן הפורענות: ולמועדים. על שם העתיד, שעתידיש ישראל להלטות
על המועדות, והם נמנים למוולד הלצנה: ולימים. שמוש החמה חלי יוס
ושמוש הלצנה חליו הרי יוס שלם: ושנים. לסוף שס"ה ימים (ס"א ורביע
יוס), יגמרו מהלכתם זי"צ מזלות המשרתים אותם, והיא שנה, וחוזרים
ומתחילים פעם שניה לסצצ בגלגל כמחלכין הראשון: (טו) והיו למאורות.
עוד זאת ישמשו שיאירו לעולם: (טז) המארת הגדולים. שוים נצראו,
ונתמעטה הלצנה, על שקטרגה ואמרה אי אפשר לשני מלכים שישתמשו
צכתר אחד: ואת הכוכבים. על ידי שמיטע את הלצנה, הרצה לצאיה להפיס
דעתה: (כ) נפש חיה. שיכא צה חיות: שרץ. כל דבר חי שאינו גצוה מן

וגו'. אף על פי שלא נאמר למינכו צדשאין צווייהו, שמשו שלטו האילנות
על כך, ונשא קל וחומר בעלמון, כדמפרש צאגדה צשחית חולין! (יד) יהי
מארת וגו'. מיוס ראשון נצראו, וצריעו לזה עליהם להתלות צריקע, וכן
כל תולדות שמים וארץ נצראו ציוס ראשון, וכל אחד ואחד נקצע ציוס שגזר
עליו, הוא שכתוצ את השמים, לצרות תולדותיהם, ואת הארץ, לצרות
תולדותיה: יהי מארת. חסר וי"ו כתיב, על שהוא יוס מארה ליפול אסכרה
צתינוקות, הוא שנינו, צריעו היו מתענים על אסכרה שלא תפול צתינוקות:
להבדיל בין היום ובין הלילה. משגנו האור הראשון, אצל צשצעת (כ"א
צג) ימי צראשית, שמשו האור והחשך הראשונים שניהם יחד, צין ציוס צין
צלילה: והיו לאתת. כשהמאורות לוקין סימן רע הוא לעולם, שנאמר

CLASSIC QUESTIONS

● When were the luminaries created? (v. 14)

RASHI: They were created on the first day, and on the fourth day, He commanded them to be suspended in the sky.

Similarly, all the creations of the skies and the earth were created

on the first day, and each one was fixed in its proper place on the day that was decreed upon it. Verse 1 is thus to be read, "In the beginning of God's creation of the skies and the earth and their contents."

TORAS MENACHEM

🔗 GOD'S METHOD OF CREATING THE WORLD (v. 14)

Rashi explains (v. 14) that everything was created on the first day, and merely "fixed" on subsequent days. From this it follows that God's utterances were only made on the subsequent days where it was necessary to *change* various details of the creation. Those details which did not need to be changed were thus not "mentioned" by God in His utterances.

This explains why, for example, God did not say, "Let there be fire," since the nature of fire did not change after creation. This is in contrast to "earth" which was mentioned (on the second day and third days) since its nature changed when it began to emerge from the water and sprout vegetation.

One might ask: since the above concept is crucial to our understanding of the creation story, why did *Rashi* not mention it at the beginning of his commentary when he describes the events of the first day?

The reason why *Rashi* only mentions this concept here for the first time is because there has been no indication in scripture up to this point that the entire creation was already in existence on the first day. God said, "Let there be light... Let the earth be covered, etc." suggesting that these entities were appearing for the first time. Only when *Rashi* encountered the phrase, "The luminaries shall be positioned in the firmament" (v. 14), which suggests the positioning of *previously existing* luminaries, did *Rashi* come to the conclusion that "all the creations of the skies and the earth were created on the first day, and each one was fixed in its proper place on the day that was decreed upon it."

That is to say, verse 14 forces us to reconsider our understanding of verse 1. Initially we presumed that only skies and earth were created on the first day and the other details were added later; but on reading verse 14 we realize that God also created "their contents" on the first day, and merely fixed them in place during the rest of the week.

(Based on *Sichas Shabbos Bereishis* 5734; *Likutei Sichos* vol. 15, p. 469)

☞ THE FOURTH DAY—SUN, MOON & STARS ☞

1:14 **G**od said, *“The luminaries shall be positioned in the firmament of the skies to separate between the day and the night! They will serve as omens (of bad events, when there is an eclipse, and will determine the time of the Jewish) festivals, (and the sun and moon will define) the days and years! ¹⁵ They will (also) act as luminaries in the firmament of the skies to shed light upon the earth!”*—and that is what happened.

¹⁶ God made two large luminaries (but since they clashed, He reduced one in size. Thus,) the large luminary was to rule over the day and the small luminary was to rule over the night, and (He made) the stars (in order to appease the moon). ¹⁷ God placed them in the firmament of the skies to shed light upon the earth, ¹⁸ to rule over the day and over the night, and to separate between the light and between the darkness.

God saw that it was good.

¹⁹ It became evening and it became morning—a fourth day.

☞ THE FIFTH DAY—SMALL CREATURES, FISH & BIRDS ☞

²⁰ God said, *“Let the waters produce swarms of (small) living creatures, and let birds fly over the earth, across the firmament of the skies!”*

TORAS MENACHEM

☞ The Last Word ☞

ORBIT OF THE CELESTIAL BODIES

You touch upon the question of whether the sun revolves around the earth or vice versa, in view of the fact that you heard from a college student that "the truth is that the earth revolves around the sun."

It greatly surprises me that, according to your letter, the student declared that science has resolved that the earth revolves around the sun. The surprising thing is that a person making such a declaration would be about one half a century behind the times insofar as the position of modern science is concerned. For it is approximately one half a century ago that the theory of Relativity was expounded, which was accepted by all scientists as the basis for all the branches of science. One of the basic elements of this theory is that when two bodies in space are in motion relative to one another (actually the theory was initiated on the basis of the movements of stars, planets, the earth, etc.), science declares with "absolute certainty" that from the scientific point of view, both possibilities are equally valid, namely that the earth revolves around the sun, or the sun revolves around the earth.

An essential point in the above conclusion is that it is not based on a lack of more definitive knowledge, but this is the inevitable conclusion based upon the present position of science, namely that in principle it is impossible that it could be scientifically proven

which of the two, the sun or the earth, revolves around the other.

Needless to say, any particular scientist, like any individual, is entitled to his own opinion as to which alternative he prefers, or that he simply is inclined to believe in one rather than in the other. However, this is only an expression of a personal preference which any individual human being is entitled to. But it would not be true to say that science has resolved the question in favor of one school of thought against the other. To be sure, there were scientists who made such declarations over one half century ago, as mentioned above, and this provides at least some explanation why the textbooks in the elementary schools have still retained that outdated position. However, it is surprising that a college student, who has already passed through high school and has entered college, and should therefore have some knowledge of the theory of Relativity, should attribute to science such an unscientific and obsolete statement.

To sum up the above, it is clear that where one says that it is possible to be a scientist and accept the idea that the sun revolves around the earth, and another one says that science rejects this idea (I emphasize the word science, as distinct from scientist, as a human being—no more, as mentioned above)—the first one has both his feet firmly on a modern scientific foundation, while the second one appears to have remained in the world and time of Copernicus.

(Excerpted from a letter written by the Rebbe on 23rd of Elul, 5723 [1962].)

דְּשָׁמַיָּא: כא וּבְרָא יי ית תַּנְיָנָא רַבְרְבָנָא וְיַת
כָּל נַפְשָׁא חַיְתָא דְרַחֲשָׂא דִּי אֲרַחֲשׁוּ מִיָּא
לְזַנְהוּן וְיַת כָּל עוֹפֵא דְפִרְחָ לְזַנְהוּי וְחִזָּא יי
אַרְי מִב: כב וּבְרִיד יתְהוּן יי לְמִימְר פּוּשׁוּ וּסְגוּ
וּמְלוּ ית מִיָּא בְיַמְמָא וְעוֹפֵא יִסְגִי בְאַרְעָא:
כג וְהוּהוּ רַמְשׁ וְהוּהוּ עֶפֶר יוֹם חַמִּישָׁא: כד וְאָמַר
יי תַּפְיִק אֲרַעָא נַפְשָׁא חַיְתָא לְזַנְהוּ בְעִיר
וּרְחִישׁ וְחַת אֲרַעָא לְזַנְהוּ וְהוּהוּ כן: כה וְעַבְד
יי ית חַת אֲרַעָא לְזַנְהוּ וְיַת בְּעִירָא לְזַנְהוּ וְיַת
כָּל רִיחֲשָׂא דְאַרְעָא לְזַנְהוּי וְחִזָּא יי אַרְי מִב:
כו וְאָמַר יי וְעַבְד אֲנָשָׂא בְצַלְמֵנָא כְּדַמּוּתָנָא
וְיִשְׁלֹטוּן בְּנוּגֵי יָמָא וּבְעוֹפֵא דְשָׁמַיָּא וּבְבְעִירָא
וּבְכָל אֲרַעָא וּבְכָל רִיחֲשָׂא דְרַחֲשִׁישׁ עַל אֲרַעָא:
כז וּבְרָא יי ית אָדָם בְּצַלְמִיָּה בְצֶלֶם אֱלֹהִין
בְּרָא יתִיהָ דְכַר וְנוֹקְבָא בְרָא יתְהוּן:
כח וּבְרִיד יתְהוּן יי וְאָמַר לְהוּן יי פּוּשׁוּ וּסְגוּ
וּמְלוּ ית אֲרַעָא וּתְקוּפוּ עֲלָהּ וּשְׁלוּטוּ בְּנוּגֵי יָמָא
וּבְעוֹפֵא דְשָׁמַיָּא וּבְכָל חַיְתָא דְרַחֲשָׂא עַל
אֲרַעָא: כט וְאָמַר יי הָא יִהְיֶיבִית לְכוּן יַת כָּל

רְקִיעַ הַשָּׁמַיִם: כא וַיִּבְרָא אֱלֹהִים אֶת־הַתַּנִּינִים הַגְּדֹלִים וְאֶת
כָּל־נֶפֶשׁ הַחַיָּה | הַרְמֵשֶׁת אֲשֶׁר שָׂרְעוּ הַמַּיִם לְמִינֵהֶם וְאֶת
כָּל־עוֹף כָּנָף לְמִינֵהוּ וַיִּרְא אֱלֹהִים כִּי־טוֹב: כב וַיִּבְרָךְ אֹתָם
אֱלֹהִים לֵאמֹר פְּרוּ וּרְבוּ וּמְלֵאוּ אֶת־הַמַּיִם בַּיַּמִּים וְהָעוֹף יִרְבֶּה
בָּאָרֶץ: כג וַיְהִי־עֶרֶב וַיְהִי־בֹקֶר יוֹם חַמִּישִׁי: כד וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים
תּוֹצֵא הָאָרֶץ נֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה לְמִינָהּ בַּהֵמָּה וּרְמֵשׂ וְחַי־תוֹ־אָרֶץ
לְמִינָהּ וַיְהִי־כֵן: כה וַיַּעַשׂ אֱלֹהִים אֶת־חַיַּת הָאָרֶץ לְמִינָהּ
וְאֶת־הַבְּהֵמָה לְמִינָהּ וְאֶת כָּל־רֶמֶשׂ הָאֲדָמָה לְמִינָהּ וַיִּרְא
אֱלֹהִים כִּי־טוֹב: כז וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים נַעֲשֵׂה אָדָם בְּצַלְמֵנוּ
כְּדַמּוּתֵנוּ וַיִּרְדּוּ בִדְגַת הַיָּם וּבְעוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם וּבַבְּהֵמָה
וּבְכָל־הָאָרֶץ וּבְכָל־הָרֶמֶשׂ הָרֹמֵשׂ עַל־הָאָרֶץ: כח וַיִּבְרָא
אֱלֹהִים | אֶת־הָאָדָם בְּצַלְמוֹ בְּצֶלֶם אֱלֹהִים בְּרָא אֹתוֹ זָכָר
וּנְקֵבָה בְּרָא אֹתָם: כט וַיִּבְרָךְ אֹתָם אֱלֹהִים וַיֹּאמֶר לָהֶם אֱלֹהִים
פְּרוּ וּרְבוּ וּמְלֵאוּ אֶת־הָאָרֶץ וּכְבִשְׁתָּהּ וּרְדוּ בְּדִגַּת הַיָּם וּבְעוֹף
הַשָּׁמַיִם וּבְכָל־חַיָּה הָרֹמֵשֶׁת עַל־הָאָרֶץ: כט וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים

דש"י

קדישין שאלתא, אף כאן צפמליא שלו נטל רשות, אמר להם יש צעליונים כדמותי, אם אין כדמותי צחחטוים הרי יש קנאה צמטשא בראשית: נעשה אדם. אף על פי שלא סיעעכו ביצירתו, ויש מקום למינים לרדות, לא נמנע הכתוב מללמד דרך ארץ ומדת ענוה, שיהא הגדול נמלך ונטל רשות מן הקטן, ואם כתב אעשה אדם, לא למדנו שיהא מדבר עם בית דינו, אלא עם עלמו. ותשובתו כתובה צלדו, ויצרל את האדם, ולא כתיב ויצרלו: בצלמו. צדפוס שלנו: כדמותנו. להצין ולהשכיח: וירדו בדגת הים. יש בלשון הזה לשון ריודי ולשון ירידה, זכה רודכ בחיות וצבחות, לא זכה, נעשה ירוד לפניהם והחיה מושלת זו: (כז) ויברא אלהים את האדם בצלמו. צדפוס העשוי לו, שהכל נברא במאמר והוא נברא צידים, שנאמר ותשת עלי כפכה², נעשה צחותם, כמטבע העשויה על ידי רושם שקורין קווייץ, (וכ"י קוויץ) וכן הוא אומר תהפך כחומר חותם³: בצלם אלהים ברא אותו. פירש לך, שאותו אלם המתוקן לו, אלם דיוקן יולרו הוא: זכר ונקבה ברא אותם. ולהלן הוא אומר ויקח אחת מללעותיו וגו'⁴, מדרש אגדה שנצראו שני פרנאופים צריאה ראשונה ואחר כך חלקן. ופשוטו של מקרא, כאן הודיעך שנצראו שניהם בששי, ולא פירש לך כיצד צרייתן, ופירש לך צמקום אחרי: (כח) ובבשה. חסר וי"ו, ללמדך שהזכר כובש את הנקבה, שלא תהא ילאנית, ועוד ללמדך, שהאיש שדרכו לכבוש, מלווה על

הארץ קרוי שרץ. צעוף כגון צבוצים, צשקלים כגון נמלים וחיפושין ותולעים, וצבריות כגון חולד ועכצר וחומט וכיוצא בהם וכן הדגים: (כח) התנינכם. דגים גדולים שצים. וצדצרי אגדה¹ הוא לויתן וכן זוגו, שצראם זכר ונקבה, והרג את הנקבה ומלחה ללדיקים לעתיד לבא, שאם יפרו וירצו, לא יתקיים העולם צפניהם: נפש החיה. נפש שיש בה חיות: (כט) ויברך אותם. לפי שמחכרים אותם ולדין מהם ואוכלין אותם, הולרכו לצרכה, ואף החיות הולרכו לצרכה, אלא מפני הנחש שעתיד לקללה לכך לא צרכו, שלא יהא הוא צכלל: פרו. לשון פרי, כלומר עשו פירות: ורבו. אם לא אמר אלא פרו, היה אחד מוליד אחד ולא יותר, וצא ורצו שאחד מוליד הרבה: (כד) תוצא הארץ. הוא שפירשתי שהכל נברא מיוס ראשון ולא הולרכו אלא להוליאם: נפש חיה. שיש בה חיות: ורמש. הם שרצים, שהם נמוכים ורומשים על הארץ ונראים כאילו נגררים, שאין הולכן ניכר. כל לשון רמש ושרץ בלשוננו קונומוצריי"ש: (כה) ויעש. תקנס צלציונס צחיקונו וצקומתן: (כו) נעשה אדם. ענותותו של הקצ"ה למדנו מכאן, לפי שהאדם הוא צדמות המלאכים ויתקנאו צו, לפיכך נמלך בהם, וכשהוא דן את המלאכים הוא נמלך צפמליא שלו, שכן מלינו צחאצב, שאמר לו מיכה ראיתי את ה' יושב על כסאו וכל צבא השמים עומד עליו מימינו ומשמאלו, וכי יש ימין ושמאל לפניו, אלא אלו מימינים לזכות ואלו משמאלים לחובה, וכן בגזירת עירין פתגמא וצמאמר

CLASSIC QUESTIONS

● What is the unique quality of the fifth day? (v. 20-23)

TALMUD: Anybody born on the fifth day of the week will have a tendency to be kind, because fish and birds were created on this day and fish and birds do not need to work hard for their sustenance, but are fed purely by the kindness of God (*Shabbos* 156a and *Rashi* *ibid.*).

²¹ God created the large sea fish, all the creeping living creatures that the waters produced in swarms, according to their species, and all the winged birds according to their species.

God saw that it was good.

²² God blessed them, saying, “Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the waters of the seas, and let the birds multiply upon the earth!”

²³ It became evening and it became morning—a fifth day.

🌀 THE SIXTH DAY—ANIMALS & MAN 🌀

1:24 **G**od said, “Let the earth produce living creatures according to their (various) species, cattle, creeping things and wild animals of the earth according to their (various) species!”—and that is what happened.

²⁵ God made the wild animals of the earth according to their (various) species, the cattle according to their (various) species, and all the creeping things of the ground according to their (various) species.

God saw that it was good.

²⁶ God (consulted the Heavenly Court and) said, “Let us make man (Adam) in our mold, (intellectually endowed) like us, and (if he is worthy) let him rule over the fish of the sea, over the birds of the skies, over the cattle, over all the earth and over all the creeping things that creep on the earth!”

²⁷ God created man (by hand) in (the) mold (which was made for) him. The mold (which He used) to create him (resembled the image of) God. (On that day) He created (both) male and female.

²⁸ God blessed them. God said to them, “Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth! (Let the man be responsible for) taking control of it! Rule over the fish of the sea, the birds of the skies and over all the wild animals that move upon the earth!”

TORAS MENACHEM

🌀 The Last Word 🌀

“BE FRUITFUL AND MULTIPLY” (v. 28)

The first *mitzvah* in the Torah is to be fruitful and multiply (v. 28). To rear a child, to initiate him or her into the Jewish faith, to educate children in Torah and *mitzvos*—this is true *nachas* (satisfaction). Being childless, no matter how much freedom it allows, is no comparison.

One who fears that he will not be able to cope financially unless he uses birth control is assuming that he succeeds through his own efforts alone. True, Torah requires that man work to provide for his family, but it is a primary tenet of Judaism that all success comes from God, that His blessings give sustenance and not one's own efforts alone. It is God who provides for all of His creatures; another mouth will not overburden Him.

Our Sages also explain that Mashiach will not come until all the souls have descended into this world (*Yevamos* 62a). Through having children the time of his coming is hastened. May it be speedily in our days.

(Sichas Shabbos Parshas Naso 5740, Rosh Chodesh Shevat 5741)

🌀 THE FIFTH DAY (v. 20-23)

The **Talmud** states that a person born on the fifth day of the week will have a tendency to kindness since birds and fish, who are fed by the kindness of God, were created on that day.

Elsewhere in the *Talmud* a further statement is made that Jewish people can be recognized by “three signs,” one of which is that they are “kindhearted” (*Yevamos* 89a; See also *Tanya*, end of ch. 1). So, if all Jews are kindhearted in any case, what is the unique quality of being born on the fifth day?

Clearly, these two texts of the *Talmud* are speaking of two different forms of kindness:

The inherent kind nature of the Jewish people is a function of their personalities. This is limited in the sense that a person will only extend himself to a certain point to help another. However kind-hearted a person might be, his willingness to put himself aside for another person will have its limit when stretched.

In contrast, a person born on the fifth day will have a tendency to help others to the extent that he totally disregards his own personal needs and interests, in a way that is somewhat reminiscent of God's boundless kindness.

However, although those born on the fifth day may be predisposed towards a greater form of kindness, they only have a “tendency” towards this trait which may or may not express itself. It is not an actual conscious

עֲשָׂבָא דְּבַר זְרַעיה מְזֻדְרָע דִּי עַל אֲפִי כָּל אֲרֵעָא וְנִתְּן כָּל אֵילָנָא דִּי בֵיה פִּירֵי אֵילָנָא דְּבַר זְרַעיה מְזֻדְרָע לְבֹן יְהִי לְמִיכָל: ל וְלְכָל חוֹת אֲרֵעָא וְלְכָל עוֹפָא דְּשָׁמַיָא וְלְכָל דְּרַחֲשֵׁי עַל אֲרֵעָא דִּי בֵיה נִפְשָׂא חַיָּתָא יִתְּ כָּל יְרוּק עֲשָׂבָא לְמִיכָל וְהָוָה בֵּן: לא וַתֹּזֵא יְיָ יִתְּ כָּל דְּעֵבֶד וְהָא תְּקִין לְחֻדָּא וְהָוָה רִמְשׁ וְהָוָה צִפֹּר יוֹם שְׁתִּיתָאִי: א וְאֲשַׁתְּכֻלְלוּ שָׁמַיָא וְאֲרֵעָא וְכָל חַיִּילֵיהוֹן: ב וְשִׂיבִי יְיָ בְּיוֹמָא שְׁבִיעָאָה עֲבִידְתִּיהָ דִּי עֲבָד וְנָח בְּיוֹמָא שְׁבִיעָאָה מְכָל

הִנֵּה נָתַתִּי לָכֶם אֶת־כָּל־עֵשֶׂב | זֶרַע זֶרַע אֲשֶׁר עַל־פְּנֵי כָּל־הָאָרֶץ וְאֶת־כָּל־הָעֵץ אֲשֶׁר־בוּ פְּרִי־עֵץ זֶרַע זֶרַע לָכֶם יִהְיֶה לְאֹכְלָהּ: ג וְלְכָל־חַיַּת הָאָרֶץ וְלְכָל־עוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם וְלְכָל | רוֹמֵשׁ עַל־הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר־בוּ נֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה אֶת־כָּל־יֶרֶק עֵשֶׂב לְאֹכְלָהּ וַיְהִי־בֵן: לא וַיֵּרָא אֱלֹהִים אֶת־כָּל־אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה וְהִנֵּה־טוֹב מְאֹד וַיְהִי־עֶרְב וַיְהִי־בֹקֶר יוֹם הַשְּׁשִׁי: פ ב א וַיִּכְלְוּ הַשָּׁמַיִם וְהָאָרֶץ וְכָל־צְבָאָם: ד וַיְכַל אֱלֹהִים בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי מְלַאכְתּוֹ אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה וַיִּשְׁבַּת בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי מְכָל־מְלַאכְתּוֹ

כ"ט

אחר, יום הששי, כלם תלוים ועומדים עד יום הששי, הוא ששי צסיון (ס"א) שציוס ו' צסיון שקצלו ישראל התורה נתחזקו כל יצירת צראשית ונחשצ כאלו נצרא העולם עתה וזכו יום הששי צ"א שאותו יום ו' צסיון) המוכן למתן תורה: (צ) ויכל אלהים ביום השביעי. ר' שמעון אומר, צשר ודס שאינו יודע עתיו ורגעיו, לריך להוסיף מחול על הקודש, אזל הקצ"ח שיודע עתיו ורגעיו, נכנס צו כחוט השערה ונראה כאלו כלל צו ציוס. דצר אחר, מה היה

פריה ורציה, ולא האשה: (כט) לכם יהיה לאכלה ולכל חית הארץ. השוכה להם צהמות וחיות למאכל, ולא הרשה לאדם ולאשתו להמית צריה ולאכול צשר, אך כל ירק עשב יאכלו יחד כלם, וכשצצו צני נח הציר להם צשר, שנאמר כל רמש אשר הוא חי וגו', כירק עשב שצרתיו לאדם הראשון, נתתי לכם את כל: (לא) יום הששי. הוסיף ה' צששי, צגמר מעשה צראשית, לומר שצתנה עמהם על מנת שיקצלו עליהם ישראל חמשה חומשי תורה. דצר

CLASSIC QUESTIONS

● What were Adam and Chava allowed to eat? (v. 29-30)

RASHI: The Torah states that vegetable matter should be food, "for you, for all the wild animals etc." (v. 29-30). I.e. [the Torah] equated cattle and the animals to man regarding the food that they were permitted to eat. He did not allow Adam and his wife to kill a creature and to eat its flesh. They were only permitted to eat the vegetation, as were the animals.

Later, He permitted the sons of Noach to eat flesh, as it is written (9:3): "Every creeping thing that is alive, etc." Like the green herbs, which I permitted to the first man, I have given you everything.

GUR ARYEH: When *Rashi* writes that, "The Torah equated cattle and the animals to man," he means that just like animals were only allowed to eat vegetation, likewise man was only permitted to eat vegetable matter.

LEVUSH HA'OHRAH: The argument of *Gur Aryeh* is untenable. How can he write that "animals were only allowed to eat vegetation," when many animals do indeed kill other animals for food?

MIZRACHI: Rather, *Rashi's* comparison is: Just as animals were not permitted to kill humans, so too, humans were not permitted to kill animals.

TORAS MENACHEM

part of their personality. Thus, there remains an advantage to the general kind nature shared by all Jews, for it is a *tangible* character trait which expresses itself openly.

(Based on *Likutei Sichos* vol. 25, p. 10ff.)

☞ THE DIET OF MAN AND THE ANIMALS (v. 29-30)

Rashi writes, "The Torah equated cattle and the animals to man regarding the food that they were permitted to eat," that they were only allowed to eat vegetation, and not meat.

The following points, however, remain to be clarified:

a.) *Rashi's* commentary to the Torah was written to explain the simple meaning of scripture, i.e. information which is crucial for a basic understanding of the verses. What question is *Rashi* answering?

b.) The Torah states explicitly, that "I have hereby given you every plant...and every tree that has seed-bearing fruit! They shall be food for you" (v. 29-30). From the fact that God makes no mention of meat, it is obvious that man was required to be a vegetarian. Why does *Rashi* feel it necessary to prove this by comparing man to animals?

c.) What exactly is meant by the comparison, "The Torah equated cattle and the animals to man regarding the food that they were permitted to eat"?

d.) *Rashi* writes that, "He did not allow Adam and his wife to kill a creature and to eat its flesh," which suggests that they *were* allowed to eat meat from an animal that died by itself, or was killed by another animal. What led *Rashi* to this conclusion?

THE EXPLANATION

On reading verses 29 and 30, *Rashi* was troubled by two questions:

a.) Of what relevance is the diet of Adam and Chava to the account of the creation of the world?

b.) Why did God inform Adam and Chava about the diet of the animals?

Due to the force of these questions, *Rashi* came to the conclusion that the Torah could not merely be teaching us some details of dietary laws that pertain to man and animals (as the commentators suggest—see "Classic Questions"). Rather, the Torah clarifies here the importance and priority of man above the other creations:

²⁹ God said, “I have hereby given you every plant that reproduces by seed that is upon the surface of the entire earth, and every tree that has seed-bearing fruit! They shall be food for you, ³⁰ for all the wild animals of the earth, for all the birds of the skies, and for everything which moves upon the earth that is alive! The food (for humans and animals) shall be plant vegetation (only)!”—and that is what happened.

³¹ God saw everything that He had made, and—look!—it was very good.

It became evening and it became morning—the sixth day.

🌀 THE SEVENTH DAY—GOD RESTS FROM WORK 🌀

2 **T**he skies, the earth and all their numerous components were completed.

² On the seventh day, God completed His work that He had made. On the seventh day, He rested from all His work that He had done.

CLASSIC QUESTIONS

● When did God finish working? (v. 2)

RASHI: Rabbi Shimon said: A man of flesh and blood, who cannot judge his times and his moments, must add some time from the week to Shabbos. God, who can judge His times and His moments, entered a hairsbreadth into Shabbos, and it appeared as if He completed the work on that day.

Another explanation: What was the world lacking? Rest. When Shabbos came, rest came. The work was completed and finished.

CHIZKUNI: The verse states that God only finished working on Shabbos, which seems to suggest that some of the work was carried out on Shabbos itself. However, in truth, it only appeared that God

finished the work on Shabbos. For on Friday it was not yet clear whether God had finished working, or whether He was going to do more work the following day. Only on Shabbos did it become apparent that God had finished working

IBN EZRA: Thus, the verse should not be translated, “On the seventh day, God finished his work,” but rather, “By the seventh day, God finished his work.”

SFORNO: God actually finished work at the beginning of the seventh day, but He only worked for an infinitesimally small moment, as our Sages expressed with the term “with a hairsbreadth.”

TORAS MENACHEM

First, we read that, “God created man (by hand) in (the) mold (which was made for) him. The mold (which He used) to create him (resembled the image of) God” (v. 27) Then, God told man to “rule over the fish of the sea, the birds of the skies and over all the wild animals that move upon the earth,” indicating his primary role in the purpose of creation.

Thus, when reading verses 29 and 30, which describe the diet of man and the animals, *Rashi* understood that this information was not being stated as a parenthetical detail, but rather, to clarify further the role of man which had been described in the previous verses.

The knowledge that man is the pinnacle of creation (described in v. 26-28) could lead him to become arrogant and disrespectful of the world’s contents. So, after describing the greatness of man, the Torah continued and “equated cattle and the animals to man regarding the food that they were allowed to eat.” I.e. these verses are an attempt to humble man with the knowledge that, despite the fact that he is the pinnacle of creation formed in the image of God, he is nevertheless a creature that needs to eat in order to survive, like any animal.

Despite the fact that God told man to “rule over the fish of the sea, the birds of the skies and over all the wild animals that move upon the earth” (v. 28), he nevertheless limited the authority of man, in that “He did not allow Adam and his wife to kill a creature and to eat its flesh.” This was in order to ensure that man’s awareness of his own genuine greatness should not lead to arrogance or pompousness.

Nevertheless, if an animal died naturally, there was no objection to man eating it, as the intention here is that man should be humbled by withholding his authority to kill other animals.

(Based on *Likutei Sichos* vol. 20, p. 7ff.)

🌀 DID GOD WORK ON SHABBOS? (v. 2)

Rashi’s comment to verse 2 appears to contradict itself. First he writes that God’s work activities “entered a hairsbreadth into Shabbos,” which suggests that, for a miniscule amount of time, God was actually working on Shabbos [c.f. *Sforno*]. But then, *Rashi* states that it only “appeared as if He completed the work on that day” [c.f. *Chizkuni*].

Both of these interpretations are difficult to accept since:

a.) How could God possibly work on Shabbos, even for a fraction of the day, when work is prohibited the *entire* day?

b.) If God only *appeared* to work on Shabbos, then why does the Torah state that “on the seventh day, God completed His work,” when in truth He completed it on the sixth day?

RASHI’S FIRST INTERPRETATION

The Torah appears to be extremely ambiguous about the precise point when the creation was completed. First we read that on the sixth day, “God saw *everything* that He had made...The skies, the earth and all their multitudes *were completed*” (1:31-2:1). But then, the Torah continues that it was only “on the seventh day” that “God *completed* His work that He had made” (v. 2).

So, when did God actually finish, on the sixth day or the seventh?

To answer this question, *Rashi* cites the teaching of Rabbi Shimon, that God can perform acts with such extreme precision that he is able to “enter a hairsbreadth into Shabbos,” continuing to do work without actually transgressing Shabbos. This explains why the Torah states, “on the seventh day, God completed His work that He had made,” (despite the fact that “the skies, the earth and all their multitudes were completed,” on

עבדתיה די עבד: ג ובריו יי נת יומא
שביעאה וקריש יתיה ארי ביה נח מכל
עבדתיה די ברא יי למעבד: ד אלן תולדת
שמאי וארעא כד אתבריאו ביומא די עבד יי
אלהים ארעא ושמאי: ה וכל אילני תקלא
עד לא הוו בארעא וכל עשבא דתקלא עד
לא צמח ארי לא אחית מתרא יי אלהים על
ארעא ואנש לית למפלה ית אדמתא:
ו ועננא הוה סליק מן ארעא ואשקי ית כל אפי

אשר עשה: ג ויברך אלהים את-יום השביעי ויקדש אתו כי
בו שבת מכל-מלאכתו אשר-ברא אלהים לעשות: פ
[שני] ד אלה תולדות השמים והארץ בהבראם* ביום עשות
יהוה אלהים ארץ ושמים: ה וכל אשית השדה טרם יהיה
בארץ וכל-עשב הטרם יצמח כי לא המטיר יהוה
אלהים על-הארץ ואדם אין לעבד את-האדמה: ו ואד יעלה

*ה' זעירא

רש"י

לראות שחת, כה"א זאת שסתומה מכל לדדיה, ופתוחה למטה לרדת דרך שס:
(ה) טרם יהיה בארץ. כל טרם שבמקרא לשון עד לא הוא, ואינו לשון קודם,
ואינו נפעל לומר הטרים כאשר יאמר הקדים, וזה מוכיח, ועוד אחר כי טרם
תיראו³, עדיין לא תיראו. ואף זה תפרש עדיין לא היה בארץ, כשנגמרה בריאת
העולם צשעי קודם שנברא אדם וכל עשב השדה עדיין לא צמח, וצגי שכתוב
ותולא, לא ילאו אלא על פתח קרקע עמדו עד יום ששי. ולמה כי לא המטיר,
ומה טעם לא המטיר, לפי שאדם אין לעבוד את האדמה, ואין מכיר בטובתן של
גשמים, וכשבא אדם וידע שהם צורך לעולם, התפלל עליהם וירדו, ולמחו האילנות
ובדשאים: ה' אלהים. ה' הוא שמו, אלהים, שהוא שליט ושופט על כל העולם,
וכן פירושו זה בכל מקום לפי פשוטו, ה' שהוא אלהים: (ו) ואד יעלה.

העולם חסר, מנוחה, זאת שבת מנוחה, כלתה ונגמרה המלאכה: (ג) ויברך
ויקדש. ברכו זמן, שכל ימות השבוע ירד להם עומר לגלגולת, וצשעי לחם משנה.
וקדשו זמן, שלא ירד כלל צשעת, והמקרא כתוב על שם העתיד: אשר ברא
אלהים לעשות. המלאכה שהיתה ראויה לעשות צשעת, כפל ועשאה צשעי, כמו
שמפורש בצראשית רבה: (ד) אלה. האמורים למעלה: תולדות השמים
והארץ בהבראם ביום עשות ה'. ללמדך שכלם נבראו צראשון. דבר אחר
בצראשם, צב' צראש, שנאמר צב' ה' צור עולמים, צב' אוחיות הללו של השם, יאר
שני עולמים², ולמדך כאן שהעולם הזה נברא צה"א, (ס"א כמו שה"א פתוחה
למטה כך העולם פתוח לשמים שחשבה ועולם הצב' נברא ציו"ד לומר שצדיקים
שצאוחו זמן מועטים כמו י' שהיא קטנה צאוחיות) רמז שירדו הרשעים למטה

TORAS MENACHEM

the sixth day), because God did in fact carry out a small amount of work on the seventh day. Nevertheless, it was such a miniscule amount of work that it did not constitute a desecration of Shabbos.

To illustrate this point *Rashi* described it as a “hairsbreadth” of work, since a single hair is virtually imperceptible on its own, and only becomes noticeable when combined with other hairs. Similarly, the work that God did on Shabbos was so miniscule it was totally imperceptible.

Nevertheless, *Rashi* writes that it still “appeared as if He completed the work on that day”—despite the fact that only a miniscule amount of work was done on the seventh day—since, technically speaking, the work was finished then.

RASHI'S SECOND INTERPRETATION

In the final analysis however, the above explanation is not completely satisfying since:

a.) The verse, “on the seventh day, God completed His work that He had made” is rendered somewhat non-literally, to read, “in the first few moments of the seventh day, God completed his work, etc.”

b.) The above statement still contradicts the declaration in verses 1:31 and 2:1 that, “God saw everything that He had made...The skies, the earth and all their multitudes were completed,” already on the sixth day.

Therefore, *Rashi* brought a second explanation: “What was the world lacking? Rest. When Shabbos came, rest came. The work was completed and finished.” I.e. the creation of the world was indeed complete on the sixth day, and the only additional “creation” that was added on the seventh day was “rest.”

However, this interpretation is rather difficult to accept since, at the literal level, “rest” is not a type of creation or work, but rather, the absence

of work. It is thus inconsistent with the verse which states, “On the seventh day, God completed His work that He had made,” for it turns out that God did not do any *real* work on the seventh day.

Since this interpretation is less plausible than the first, *Rashi* cited it last.

WHAT WORK DID GOD DO?

Returning to the first interpretation of *Rashi*, we are left with the question: What work did God do for that momentary instant of time during the first Shabbos of creation? And why was it not considered to be a transgression of Shabbos?

On the sixth day God created only man and the animals. In chapter 3, verse 8, *Rashi* writes that Adam and Chava sinned during the tenth hour of the day, from which it is obvious that they must have been created before this time. Thus, in the remaining period of the day God would have been completing His other work of that day: creating the animals (which He had begun before the creation of man), “establishing their form and stature” (*Rashi* to 1:25). Therefore, we can presume that the “hairsbreadth” of work during Shabbos signified the completion of the animal kingdom.

Since the work done on Shabbos was merely the completion of acts carried out during the week, it was not considered to be a desecration of Shabbos.

One might ask: One of the forbidden types of work on Shabbos is *makeh bepatish*, completing the formation of an object with a final blow of the hammer. From this we see that even the completion of work is forbidden on Shabbos, so how could God complete His formation of the animals on Shabbos?

It could be argued that a person is only liable for *makeh bepatish* when

³ God blessed the seventh day (that a double portion of manna should descend in its honor) and He sanctified it (that no manna should descend on Shabbos itself), because on that (day) God rested from all His work that He had created, (for the remaining work which was left) to be done (on Shabbos, He carried out on Friday instead, by doubling His workload).

SECOND
READING

⁴ These (above mentioned details) are the chronology of the skies and the earth when they were created, on the (first) day when God, Almighty God, made earth and skies (and the subsequent days when He materialized the creations).

🕯️ DETAILS OF THE CREATION OF MAN & WOMAN 🕯️

(The Torah now adds further details concerning the creation of man and woman, mentioned above, 1:27)

⁵ (The vegetation had only germinated within the ground, but) none of the trees of the field were yet (sprouting) on the (surface of the) earth, nor had any vegetation of the field yet grown, because God, Almighty God, had not brought rain upon the earth (since) there was no man to (appreciate the rain and) work the soil.

⁶ (God caused) a mist to ascend from the earth (moistening the clouds in order to) soak the entire

CLASSIC QUESTIONS

● Why had God not sent rain? (v. 5)

RASHI: He had not caused it to rain, because there was no man to work the soil, and no one recognized the benefit of rain. But when

man came and recognized that it is a necessity for the world, he prayed for it. Then rain came down, and the trees and the herbs sprouted (See *"Sparks of Chasidus"*).

TORAS MENACHEM

the entire act that he performs occurs on Shabbos. In our case however, only a small portion of the act occurred on Shabbos (a "hairsbreadth") so God did not desecrate Shabbos.

One still might ask: There is a rabbinic prohibition which forbids even half a creative act (*melacha*) to be performed on Shabbos. For example,

the prohibition of carrying in the public domain on Shabbos involves two phases, "picking up" and "placing down." But, if a person picked an object up on Friday afternoon and then, after carrying it in the public domain, placed it down on Shabbos, he would have transgressed a rabbinic prohibition of performing half a creative act (see *Shabbos* 3b). (Even though these rabbinic laws were only introduced formally at the time of the second Temple, we are nevertheless taught that they were observed as early as the times of Avraham (*Rashi to Toldos* 26:5), so we can presume that God observed them too).

🕯️ The Last Word 🕯️

Why did God deem it necessary to continue working all the way up to *Shabbos*, and even to extend His work by a hairsbreadth into *Shabbos*? What was gained by this feat of precision?

God was teaching a lesson to mankind about the preciousness of time. So long as a person has the opportunity to carry out his Divinely ordained mission in this world, he should utilize every moment in order to realize its fullest potential, pushing every allocation of time to its utmost limits.

Alternatively: a person might bemoan the fact that we are living in such a spiritually desensitized generation. Gone are the days of the prophets and Talmudic sages, when the Jewish people served God with the utmost fervor! What could our lowly generation possibly achieve beyond the accomplishments of our ancestors?

The answer to this question can be derived from God's conduct when creating the world. Just like we see that every moment was precious to God, to the extent that he continued working to the very last opportunity—likewise the final work of the very last generations is of paramount importance. (*Likutei Sichos* vol. 5, p. 24ff.)

🕯️ Sparks of Chasidus 🕯️

“(GOD CAUSED) A MIST TO ASCEND...” (v. 6)

When a person prays to God, it is not merely that God “listens” to his prayers from above and responds accordingly. Rather, the process of prayer itself refines the person spiritually, rendering him a suitable receptacle for additional Divine blessings. The receipt of a blessing is thus the *direct outcome* of sincere, focused prayer.

This process is mirrored in the physical world by the method in which rain is formed: Rain is not a new entity that is formed in heaven, but rather, the same “mist” that ascends from the ground, forms clouds and eventually condenses into rain which showers back down onto the earth.

In this light, we can appreciate the inner intention of *Rashi's* comment (v. 5) that the first rain shower only occurred in response to Adam's prayer. (*Sefer Hama'amarim Melukat* vol. 4, pp. 254-5)

אֶדְמָתָא: וּבָרָא יי אֱלֹהִים ית אָדָם עֶפְרָא מִן אֶדְמָתָא וּנְפַח בְּאֶפְוֵהי נְשָׁמָתָא דְחַיֵּי וְהוּת בְּאָדָם לְרוּחַ מְמַלְלָא: ה וּנְצִיב יי אֱלֹהִים וּנְתָא כְעֵדֵן מְלַקְדָּמִין וְאִשְׁרֵי תַמְן ית אָדָם דִּי בְרָא: ט וְאֶצְמַח יי אֱלֹהִים מִן אַרְעָא כָּל אֵילָן דְמַרְגַּנָּה לְמַחְזֵי וְטַב לְמִיכַל וְאֵילָן חַיֵּי בְמִצְיֵעוֹת וּנְתָא וְאֵילָן דְאֶכְלִין פִּירוּהֵי חַכְמִין בֵּין טַב לְבִישׁ: י וּנְהָרָא הוּהוּ נְפִיק מְעַדֵּן לְאֶשְׁקָאָה ית וּנְתָא וּמְתַמֵּן מִתְפָּרֵשׁ וְהוּהוּ לְאַרְבְּעָא רִישֵׁי נְהָרִין: יא שׁוּם חַד פִּישׁוֹן הוּא מְקִיף ית כָּל אַרְעָא דְחַוִּילָה דִּי תַמְן דְּהָבָא: יב וּדְהָבָא דְאַרְעָא תְּהִיָּא טַב תַּמְן בְּדִלְחָא וְאֶבְנֵי בּוֹרְלָא: יג וְשׁוּם נְהָרָא תְּנַגְנָא גִּיחוֹן הוּא מְקִיף ית כָּל אַרְעָא דְכּוּשׁ: יד וְשׁוּם

מִן־הָאָרֶץ וְהִשְׁקָה אֶת־כָּל־פְּנֵי הָאֲדָמָה: ו וַיִּצְרֹ יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים אֶת־הָאָדָם עֶפְרָא מִן־הָאֲדָמָה וַיִּפַּח בְּאֶפְוֵי נְשָׁמַת חַיִּים וַיְהִי הָאָדָם לְנֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה: ה וַיֹּטֵעַ יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים גֵּן־בְּעֵדֵן מִקְדָּם וַיִּשֶׂם שָׁם אֶת־הָאָדָם אֲשֶׁר יָצָר: ט וַיִּצְמַח יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים מִן־הָאֲדָמָה כָּל־עֵץ נֶחֱמָד לְמַרְאֵה וְטוֹב לְמֵאֲכָל וְעֵץ הַחַיִּים בְּתוֹךְ הַגֵּן וְעֵץ הַדַּעַת טוֹב וְרַע: י וּנְהָר יֵצֵא מֵעֵדֵן לְהִשְׁקוֹת אֶת־הַגֵּן וּמִשָּׁם יִפְרֹד וְהָיָה לְאַרְבְּעָה רָאשִׁים: יא שָׁם הָאֶחָד פִּישׁוֹן הוּא הַסֹּבֵב אֶת כָּל־אֶרֶץ הַחַוִּילָה אֲשֶׁר־שָׁם הַזֹּהָב: יב וְהַב הָאֶרֶץ הַהוּא טוֹב שָׁם הַבְּרִלָח וְאֶבֶן הַשֹּׁהַם: יג וְשֵׁם־הַנְּהָר הַשְּׁנַי גִּיחוֹן הוּא הַסֹּבֵב אֶת כָּל־אֶרֶץ כּוּשׁ: יד וְשֵׁם הַנְּהָר הַשְּׁלִישִׁי

רש"י

בו דעה ודבור: (ח) מקדם. במזרחו של עדן נטע את הגן, ואם תאמר כרי כבר נאמר ויצר וגו' את האדם וגו', ראיתי בצרייתא של ר' אליעזר בנו של ר' יוסי בגלילי מל"ב מדות שהתורה נדרשת וזו אחת מהן, כלל שלאחריו מעשה הוא פרטו של ראשון, ויצר את האדם וגו', זהו כלל, סתם צרייתא מביאין וסתם מעשיו, חזר ופירש ויירר ה' אלהים וגו', וילמח לו גן עדן, ויניחהו בגן עדן, ויפל עליו תרדמה, השומע סבור שהוא מעשה אחר, ואינו אלא פרטו של ראשון. וכן אלל הבהמה חזר וכתב וילר ה' וגו' מן האדמה כל חית השדה, כדי לפרש ויצר אל האדם לקרות שם, וללמד על העופות שנבראו מן הרקק: (ט) ויצמח. לענין הגן הכתוב מדבר: בתוך הגן. בזמלע הגן: (יא) פישון. הוא נילוס נהר מצרים, ועל שם שמימיו מתצרכין ועולין ומשקין את הארץ נקרא פישון, כמו ופשו פרשיו? דבר אחר פישון, שהוא מגדל פשתן, שנאמר אלל מצרים ובושו עובדי פשתים: (יג) גיחון. שהיה כולך והומה והמייתו גדולה מאד, כמו וכי יגח, שמנגח וכולך והומה:

לענין צרייתו של אדם העלה הכתוב, והשקה עננים לשרות העפר, ונצרא אדם, כגבל זה שנותן מים ואחר כך לש את העיסה, אף כאן והשקה, ואחר כך וייצר: (י) וייצר. שתי יצירות, יצירה לעולם הזה ויצירה לתחיית המתים, אבל צבהמה שאינה עומדת לדין, לא נכתב ציוריה שני יודי"ן: עפר מן האדמה. כבר עפרו מכל האדמה, מארבע רוחות, שכל מקום שימות שם, תהא קולעתו לקבורה. דבר אחר, נעל עפרו ממקום שנאמר בו מצבה אדמה תעשה לי', הלואי תהא לו כפרה ויוכל לעמוד: ויפח באפיו. עשאו מן התחתונים ומן העליונים, גוף מן התחתונים ונשמה מן העליונים, לפי שציוס ראשון נבראו שמים וארץ, צשני צרר רוקיע לעליונים, צשלישי תרררר היצשה לתחתונים, צרביעי צרר מאורות לעליונים, צחמישי ישראו המים לתחתונים, הוצק צששי לצררות צו בעליונים ומתחתונים, ואם לאו יש קגחה צמעשה צראשית, סיכיו אלו רצוים על אלו צצריאת יום אחד: לבפש צחיה. אף צבהמה וחיב נקראו נפש חיב, אך צו של אדם חיב שצכולן, שנחוסף

CLASSIC QUESTIONS

- **How was man formed? (v. 7)**
RASHI: God gathered soil from the entire earth from all four directions, so that wherever man would die, the earth would accept him for burial.
 Another explanation: God took soil from the place of which it is said, "You shall make Me an altar of earth" (Shemos 20:21), to symbolize that it [the earth of the altar] should be an atonement for him, so that he would be able to endure.
- **When did God create the Garden of Eden? (v. 8)**
TALMUD: Seven things were [intended to be] created before the creation of the world: Torah, Teshuvah, the Garden of Eden,

- Gehinom, God's throne of glory, the Holy Temple and the name of Mashiach (Pesachim 54a; Nedarim 39b).
- MIDRASH:** Man was created on the sixth day of creation, and the Garden of Eden on the third day (Bereishis Rabah ch. 15).
- **Why didn't God create man in the Garden of Eden? (v. 8)**
CHIZKUNI: Because then man would have thought that the entire world was as beautiful as the Garden of Eden. Therefore, God first created man outside the Garden, to see how unpleasant the world really was, and then He placed him in the haven of the Garden.
- RADAK:** In this way man would recognize the kindness which God performed for him by placing him in the Garden.

TORAS MENACHEM

It does appear therefore that God "transgressed" a rabbinic law by carrying out part of a creative act on Shabbos.
 However, in the final analysis, God did not transgress Shabbos at all. For the rabbinic prohibition of performing half a creative act on Shabbos

only applies when each half is a significant proportion of the total act. In our case however, God only performed a miniscule portion of the act on Shabbos (a hairsbreadth), and was thus totally "exempt."
 (Based on Likutei Sichos vol. 5, p. 24ff.)

surface of the ground (so that man should be created from moist earth). ⁷ God, Almighty God, formed man out of soil from (the four corners of) the Earth. He blew into his nostrils a living soul, and man became a living, (thinking and speaking) being.

⁸ God, Almighty God, planted a garden in Eden to the east, and placed there the man which He had formed. ⁹ (In the garden,) God, Almighty God, made every tree that is pleasant to look at and good to eat grow out from the ground. The Tree of Life (grew) in the middle of the garden, and the Tree of Knowledge of good and evil (also grew in the garden).

¹⁰ A river flowed out of Eden to water the garden, and from there it separated and became the source of four riverheads. ¹¹ The name of one is Pishon (the Nile), which surrounds the entire land of Chavilah, where there is gold. ¹² The gold of that land is good. Crystal and onyx (are found) there. ¹³ The name of the second river is Gichon, which surrounds the entire land of Kush. ¹⁴ The name of the third river is

CLASSIC QUESTIONS

● Why did the four rivers receive their names? (v. 10-14)

RASHI: *Pishon* is the Nile, the river of Egypt. Because its waters are blessed, and they rise and water the land, it is called *Pishon*, as in the verse, “and their riders shall increase (וַיִּבְשְׁוּ)” (Habbakuk 1:8). Another explanation: It is called *Pishon* because it causes flax (פִּשְׁתָּן) to grow, as is stated in reference to Egypt, “And those who work at flax (פִּשְׁתָּן) ... shall be ashamed” (Isaiah 19:9).

Gichon flowed and roared, and its roaring was very great, as in the

verse: “If an ox gores (וַיִּגְחַק)” (*Shemos* 21:28), for he gores and roars while goring along.

Chidekel received its name because its waters are sharp (חַד) and light (קָל).

Pras received its name because its waters are fruitful (פְּרִיָּה) and increase abundantly, and make people healthy. It is the most important of all the rivers because it is mentioned in conjunction with the Land of Israel.

TORAS MENACHEM

🕯️ MAN AND THE GARDEN OF EDEN (v. 7-8)

a.) Why does *Rashi* not explain why Adam was created outside the Garden of *Eden*, only to be brought there later? [c.f. **Chizkuni, Radak**]

b.) In his second interpretation regarding how man was formed, *Rashi* writes that man was created on the site of the Altar. This is a fifteen-day journey by foot to the Euphrates River (see *Mishnah, Ta'anis* 1:3), which is in the proximity of the Garden of *Eden* (see v. 14). Why does *Rashi* not make any mention of Adam’s miraculous transportation to the Garden of *Eden*, where he covered a journey of fifteen days within one day?

🕯️ Sparks of Chasidus 🕯️

“HE BLEW INTO HIS NOSTRILS A LIVING SOUL” (v. 7)

- God created the world with Divine “speech.” Man’s soul however, was “blown” by God into his body (v. 7). When a person blows, he exhales from deep within his body. This analogy illustrates that the soul contains a deeper aspect of Divinity than the rest of the world, since it was “blown” out from God’s “innards” (so to speak) rather than the more effortless method of speech.
- In the case of animals (and plants) God created the soul and body together as a single unit. In creating man though, God first created a lifeless body into which He later infused a “soul of life.” This is because the soul of man is so high in comparison to the body that it could not be formed as a single unit. Rather, a separate act of God was required to achieve the remarkable union between them.

(Based on *Tanya* ch. 2; *Sefer Hama’amarim* 5714, p. 126)

THE EXPLANATION

The common conception [based on **Talmud** and **Midrash**] is that the Garden of *Eden* was created before man. *Rashi* however accepted the literal sequence of events recorded in the Torah, that first, “God, Almighty God, formed man out of soil” (v. 7), and that only afterwards, “God, Almighty God, planted a Garden in Eden to the east” (v. 8). Therefore, it is obvious why *Rashi* did not need to address the question why Adam was not created in the Garden of *Eden*, because when Adam was formed the Garden did not yet exist!

Similarly, *Rashi* did not need to explain Adam’s miraculous transferral to the Garden of *Eden* within one day, since the very fact he was formed from earth was itself miraculous. It is therefore not surprising that Adam’s miraculous formation should be followed by a miraculous transportation.

(Based on *Sichas Shabbos Bereishis* 5745)

🕯️ NAMES OF THE FOUR RIVERS (v. 10-14)

Why did *Rashi* feel the need to explain the significance behind the name of each river (cited in verses 10-14)? *Rashi* does not explain every name that is mentioned in the Torah, so presumably when he does offer an explanation it must be for a specific reason. What could that be in our case?

Rashi was troubled by the following question: since man had only just been created, and there were no other people around to talk to in any case, what is the point of naming the rivers? Surely a name is only required to communicate with another person?

Thus, on reading the verse, “A river flowed out of Eden to water the Garden, and from there it separated” (v. 10), *Rashi* came to the conclusion that the Torah must be adding these details about the various rivers, to stress the greatness of the Garden of *Eden*. Therefore he explains how each of the names enhances the Torah’s praise of the Garden of *Eden*, indicating how four mighty rivers arose from this sublime location.

(Based on *Sichas Shabbos Bereishis* 5729)

נִהְרָא תְּלִיתָא דִּינְגֵלַת הוּא מְהֵלֵךְ לְמַדִּינְהָא דְאַתּוּר וְנִהְרָא רְבִיעָאָה הוּא פְּרַת: טו וְדָבַר יְיָ אֱלֹהִים יַת אָדָם וְאִשְׁרֵיהּ בְּגִנְתָּא דְעֵדֶן לְמַפְלְחָה וּלְמִטְרָה: טז וּפְקִיד יְיָ אֱלֹהִים עַל אָדָם לְמִימַר מִכָּל אֵילָן גִּנְתָּא מִיכָל תִּיכּוּל: יז וּמֵאֵילָן דְאֶכְלִין פִּירוּהֵי חִכְמִין בֵּין טַב לְבִישׁ לֹא תִיכּוּל מִנֵּיהּ אַרְי פִּיּוּמָא דְתִיכּוּל מִנֵּיהּ מִמַּת תְּמוּת: יח וְאָמַר יְיָ אֱלֹהִים לֹא תִקַּן דִּיהֵי אָדָם בְּלַחֲדוּהֵי אַעֲבַד לֵיהּ סְמִךְ לְקַבְלֵיהּ: יט וּבְרָא יְיָ אֱלֹהִים מִן אַרְעָא כָּל חַיּוֹת בְּרָא וַיַּת כָּל עוֹפֵא דְשָׁמַיָא וְאִתֵּי לֹת אָדָם לְמַחְזֵי מַה יִּקְרִי לֵיהּ וְכָל דִּי הוּא קָרִי לֵיהּ אָדָם נִפְשָׁא חַיָּתָא הוּא שְׁמִיָּה: כ וּקְרָא

חֲדָקְל הוּא הֶהֱלֵךְ קִדְמַת אֲשׁוּר וַחֲנָהָר הָרְבִיעִי הוּא פְּרַת: טו וַיִּקַּח יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים אֶת־הָאָדָם וַיַּנְחֵהוּ בְּגִן־עֵדֶן לְעִבְדָּהּ וּלְשִׁמְרָהּ: טז וַיִּצְוֵ יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים עַל־הָאָדָם לֵאמֹר מִכָּל עֵץ־הַגֵּן אָכַל תֹּאכְל: יז וּמֵעֵץ הַדְּעַת טוֹב וְרָע לֹא תֹאכַל מִמֶּנּוּ כִּי בְיוֹם אָכַלְךָ מִמֶּנּוּ מוֹת תָּמוּת: יח וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים לֹא־טוֹב הֵיזֶת הָאָדָם לְבַדּוֹ אֶעֱשֶׂה־לּוֹ עֵזֶר כְּנֶגְדּוֹ: יט וַיִּצַּר יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים מִן־הָאָדָמָה כָּל־חַיֵּי הַשָּׁמַיִם וַיִּבְרָא אֶת־הָאָדָם לְרֵאשִׁית מַה־יִּקְרָא־לוֹ וְכָל־אֲשֶׁר יִקְרָא־לוֹ הָאָדָם נִפְשׁ חַיָּה הוּא שְׁמוֹ: [שלישי] כ וַיִּקְרָא הָאָדָם

— כש"י —

(יט) ויצר וגו' מן האדמה. היא ילירח היא עשייה האמורה למעלה ויעש אלהים את חית הארץ וגו', אלא צא ופירש שהעופות נבראו מן הרקק, לפי שאמר למעלה מן המים נבראו, וכאן אמר מן האדמה נבראו. ועוד ללמדך כאן, שצבעת ילירח, מיד צו ציוס, הביאם אל האדם לקרות להם שם. וצדצרי אגדה⁴ ילירח זו לשון ריודי וכבוש, כמו כי תלור אל עיר⁵, שכבשן תחת ידו של אדם: וכל אשר יקרא לו האדם נפש חיה וגו'. סרסכו ופרשכו, כל נפש

(יד) חדקל. שמימי חדין וקלין: פרת. שמימי פרין ורצין, ומצרין את האדם: כוש ואשור. עדיין לא היו, וכחז המקרא על שם העתיד: קדמת אשור. למזרח של אשור: הוא פרת. החשוב על כולם, הנזכר על שם ארץ ישראל: (טו) ויקח. לקחו צדצרים נאים, ופתחו ליכנס! (יח) לא טוב היות וגו'. שלא יאמרו שחי רשויות הן, הקצ"ב בעליונים יחיד ואין לו זוג, וזה תחתונים ואין לו זוג: עזר כנגדו. זכר עזר, לא זכר כנגדו להלחם?

CLASSIC QUESTIONS

● How did God bring man to the Garden of Eden? (v. 15)

RASHI: God enticed him with pleasant words and persuaded him to enter.

GUR ARYEH: Why would man need to be convinced to enter such a wonderful place as the Garden of Eden? Because man did not know how great the Garden of Eden was and he needed to be informed by God. Thus, the "pleasant words" with which God convinced man to enter were merely a description of the garden.

● Why was it "not good" for man to be alone? (v. 18)

RASHI: Because people might say, "There are two dominions! God alone rules over the upper worlds and He has no partner, and man is the sole ruler of the lower worlds, and he has no partner."

● Why was woman created "opposite" man? (v. 18)

RASHI: If he is worthy, she will be a helpmate. If he is not worthy, she will be against him, to fight him.

TORAS MENACHEM

🔗 MAN'S ENTRY INTO THE GARDEN OF EDEN (v. 15)

Rashi writes that God persuaded Adam to enter the Garden of Eden with, "pleasant words." But why did he need to be persuaded to enter the garden, which was the most desirable of all places in the world? [See Gur Aryeh].

The answer to this question is to be found at the end of the verse, "God...settled him in the Garden of Eden to cultivate it and to guard it," i.e. he was placed there to carry out a Divine mission. Adam was sensitive to the awesome responsibility that carrying out God's command entailed, so he was reluctant to enter. Consequently, it was necessary for God to persuade him with "pleasant words," describing the pleasant quality of Divine service.

(Based on Sichas Shabbos Bereishis 5745)

🔗 THE NEED FOR MAN'S PARTNER (v. 18)

Even a child who is studying Chumash for the first time understands that his father depends on the assistance and moral support of his mother. Consequently, when he reads verse 15, "It is not good that man is alone. I will make him a helpmate opposite him," the matter is self-understood. What forced Rashi to conclude that the Torah is speaking here of an ideological fear that "people might say, 'There are two dominions,'" when he could have written more simply that man needs the physical and emotional support of a partner?

THE EXPLANATION

If the Torah was informing us here that woman was created to provide support for man, the verse would have stated, "It is not good for man to be alone" (לא טוב לאדם היות לבדו). In fact, however, the Torah

Chidekel, which flows to the east of Ashur (Assyria), and the fourth river is Pras (Euphrates).

¹⁵ God, Almighty God, (persuaded) the man (to enter the Garden), and settled him in the Garden of Eden to cultivate it and to guard it.

¹⁶ God, Almighty God, commanded man, saying, “You may eat freely from every tree of the Garden,
¹⁷ but you must not eat from the Tree of Knowledge of good and evil. For on the day that you will eat from it you will certainly die.”

¹⁸ God, Almighty God, said, “It is not good that man is alone. I will make him a helpmate opposite him.”

¹⁹ God, Almighty God, formed from the earth every beast of the field and every bird of the skies, and He brought (each species straight-away as it was formed) to man to see what he would call it. Whatever the man called each living thing, (remained) its name (forever).

CLASSIC QUESTIONS

● How did Adam know the names of the animals? (v. 19-20)

MINCHAH BELULAH: A Hebrew name indicates an entity’s essential qualities. In his great wisdom, Adam was able to discern the correct name for each species upon observing its nature.

SHALOH: Adam’s wisdom here was that merely through seeing the physical animal he was able to determine its spiritual source.

● Did Adam name the fish too? (v. 19)

MIDRASH: Yes. Even though the Torah makes no mention of the fact, Adam actually named the fish (*Midrash Chaser Veyatir*).

CHIZKUNI: No. If God had brought the fish out of the sea to Adam, they would have died.

TORAS MENACHEM

states, “It is not good that man is alone” (לֹא טוֹב הָיִיתָ הָאָדָם לְבַדּוֹ), indicating that we are speaking here of something which is *essentially* “not good,” regardless of its emotional effect on man. Therefore, *Rashi* explained that the presence of a single man is undesirable in the sense that it may give the false impression that he is a deity.

GOD’S SOLUTION

However, even after the creation of woman this problem seems to remain since, in the final analysis, man was *created* alone, and remained that way for a period of time before he was joined by woman. Couldn’t that give the impression that man is some type of god?

This problem is solved by *Rashi*’s second comment that, “If he is worthy, she will be a helpmate. If he is not worthy, she will be against him, to fight him.” I.e. man will always be dependent on the support of woman to the extent that (if he is not worthy) they will fight with each other. Since he will constantly feel dependent on another, and he will be aware of the potential conflict that could arise with his partner at any moment, it will surely be fixed in man’s mind that he is not a self-sufficient being.

(Based on *Likutei Sichos* vol. 5, p. 20)

🕯️ NAMING OF THE ANIMALS (v. 19-20)

The naming of the animals by Adam could be understood in one of two ways:

a.) It was for the benefit of man, enabling him to distinguish one species from another.

b.) It was for the benefit of the creatures being named. (This is because a Hebrew name indicates an entity’s spiritual source (see **Shaloh**), so by calling each species by its correct name Adam illuminated the animal’s spiritual source within its physical body).

It could be argued that this, in fact, is the basis of the dispute between the **Midrash** and **Chizkuni** as to whether Adam named the fish:

Chizkuni understood that the naming was for the benefit of man. Thus, there was no need to name the fish which are not observable by man, as they inhabit the sea and die as soon as they leave the water.

The **Midrash** understood that the naming was for the benefit of the creatures being named. Consequently, the **Midrash** came to the conclusion that Adam would have named the fish too, as it was for their benefit to do so.

🕯️ The Last Word 🕯️

Our Sages taught that the verse “God, Almighty God, commanded man, saying, “You may eat freely from every tree of the Garden” (v. 16), alludes to the seven universal laws that God gave to all mankind:

“God”—belief in God

“Almighty God”—not to worship idols

“commanded”—establishing courts of law

“man”—not to murder

“saying”—not to indulge in forbidden relations (see *Jeremiah* 3:1)

“you may eat freely”—not to eat a limb from a living animal

“from every tree of the garden”—not to steal. (*Sanhedrin* 56b)

According to Jewish Law we are obliged to promote the observance of these laws among the nations of the world (*Rambam, Laws of Kings* 8:10-11). Unfortunately, in previous generations this was not possible, as any act which could be perceived as proselytizing would have threatened the security of the Jewish community. However nowadays, thanks to God’s blessings, we live in a free society which enables us to fulfill this holy obligation.

(See *Likutei Sichos*, vol. 26, pp. 132ff.)

אדם שמהן לכל בעי"א ולעופא דשמיא ולכל חיות ברא ולאדם לא אשכח סמך לקבליה: כא ורמא יי אלהים שנתא על אדם ודמך ונסיב דרא מעלעוהי ומלי בשרא תחותה: כב ובנא יי אלהים ית עלעא דנסיב מן אדם לאתתא ואיתה לות אדם: כג ואמר אדם דרא זמא נרמא מנרמי ובסרא מבסרי לרא יתקרי אתתא ארי מבעלא נסיבא דא: כד על בן ישבוק גבר בית משכבי אבוהי ואמיה ודבך באתתיה ויהו לבסרא חד: כה והו תרויהו ערמילאין אדם ואתתיה ולא מתפלמין: א והווא הוה חכים מכל חות ברא די עבד יי אלהים ואמר לאתתא בקושטא ארי אמר יי לא תיכלון מכל אילן גנתא: ב ואמרת אתתא לחויה מפירי אילן גנתא ניכול: ג ומפירי אילנא די במציעות גנתא אמר יי לא תיכלון מגיה ולא תקרבון ביה דלמא תמותון: ד ואמר חויה לאתתא לא

שמות לכל הבהמה ולעוף השמים ולכל חית השדה ולאדם לאמצא עזר כנגדו: כא ויפל יהוה אלהים | תרדמה על האדם וישן ויקח אחת מצלעותיו ויסגר בשר תחתנה: כב ויבן יהוה אלהים | את הצלע אשר לקח מן האדם לאשה ויבאה אל האדם: כג ויאמר האדם זאת הפעם עצם מעצמי ובשר מבשרי לזאת יקרא אשה כי מאיש לקחה זאת: כד על בן יעזב איש את אביו ואת אמו ודבק באשתו והיו לבשר אחד: כה ויהיו שניהם ערופים האדם ואשתו ולא יתבששו: ג א והנחש היה ערום מכל חית השדה אשר עשה יהוה אלהים ויאמר אל האשה אף כייאמר אלהים לא תאכלו מכל עץ הגן: ב ותאמר האשה אל הנחש מפרי עץ הגן נאכל: ג ומפרי העץ אשר בתוך הגן אמר אלהים לא תאכלו מפניו ולא תגעו בו פן תמתון: ד ויאמר הנחש

כש"י

הקדש חומרת כן, לאסור על בני נח העריות: לבשר אחד. הולד נולד על ידי שניהם, ושם נעשה צערם אחד: (כב) ולא יתבששו. שלא היו יודעים דרך לניעות להבחין בין טוב לרע, ואף על פי שנתנה זו דעה לקרות שמות, לא נתן זו יצר הרע, עד אכלו מן העץ ונכנסו בו יצר הרע, וידע מה בין טוב לרע: (ה) והנחש היה ערום. מה ענין זה לכאן, היה לו לסמוך ויעש לאדם ולאשתו כהנות עור וילבישם, אלא ללמדך מאיזו סבה קפץ הנחש עליהם, ראה אותם ערומים ועסוקים בתשיש לעין כל, ונתאחז להם? ערום מכל. לפי ערמתו וגדולתו היתה מפלתו, ערום מכל, ארוך מכל: ¹⁰ אף כי אמר וגו'. שמא אמר לכם לא תאכלו מכל וגו', ואף על פי שראה אותם אוכלים משאר פירות, הרבה עליה דברים, כדי שחשיבנו ויבא לדבר באותו העץ: (ג) ולא תגעו בו. הוסיפה על האו"י, לפיכך צאה לידי גרעון, הוא שנאמר אל

חיה אשר יקרא לו האדם שם, הוא שמו לעולם: (כ) ולאדם לא מצא עזר: (כא) ויפל ה' אלהים תרדמה. כשהציא, הציאן לפניו כל מין ומין, זכר ונקבה, אמר, לכלם יש בן זוג ולי אין בן זוג, מיד ויפל: מצלעותיו. מסערי, כמו וללע המשכן, זהו שאמרו שני פרלופין נצראו? ויסגור. מקום החתך: וישן ויקח. שלא יראה חתיכת בשר שממנו נצראת, ותחצה עליו: (כב) ויבן. כבנין, רחצה מלמטה וקצרה מלמעלה, לקבל הולד, כאורז של חטים שהוא רחב מלמטה וקצר מלמעלה, שלא יכבד משאו על קירותיו: ויבן את הצלע לאשה. להיות אשה, כמו ויעש אותו געון לאפוד⁴, להיות אפוד: (כג) זאת הפעם. מלמד שצא אדם על כל צהמה וחיה, ולא נתקררה דעתו עד שצא על חו"כ: לזאת יקרא אשה כי מאיש וגו'. לשון נופל על לשון, מכאן שנצרא העולם בשלשן הקדש⁶: (כד) על בן יעזב איש. רוח

TORAS MENACHEM

AN ALTERNATIVE ARGUMENT

Alternatively, it could be argued that both the *Midrash* and *Chizkuni* agreed that Adam named the animals for their own benefit. Rather, they differed over the more subtle implications of the naming process:

The story of Adam naming the animals is recorded at a significant juncture in the *Chumash*. Up to this point we have read solely about the creation of the world; and from here onwards we begin to read about the efforts—and transient failings—of man, to carry out God's will in the world, in order to "cultivate it and to guard it."

The question therefore arises: At which side of the "junction" does the account of Adam's naming of the species fall? Does this naming represent the completion of the *creative process*, where each living entity was finally assigned its own name? Or are we reading here of the first act of Divine *service* by man? Let us discuss each of these two avenues:

a.) Naming as an act of creation

The creation process witnessed the differentiation of primordial matter into different materials and creatures, i.e. a transition from unity (Godliness) to multiplicity (creation). The act of naming was the final stage of bringing multiplicity to the world, as each general category of animals became distinguished into specific species. Since multiplicity conceals God's presence—for in truth there is nothing but the *one* God—the process of naming the species endowed them with a greater sensation of individuality and separateness from God.

In this respect, there is a distinction between aquatic life and land animals. Fish die as soon as they leave their natural habitat of water, which is a graphic expression of their fragility and dependency. Land animals, by contrast, can survive for long periods of time in a variety of environments. Thus, land animals demonstrate multiplicity to a greater extent than fish, since they are more self-sufficient and independent.

THIRD READING ²⁰ Man named all the cattle and the birds of the skies and all the beasts of the field (and saw that each had a male and female counterpart). Man, however, did not find any helpmate opposite him (so he complained to God).

²¹ God, Almighty God, caused a deep sleep to fall upon man, and he slept. He took (a piece from) one of his sides, and He sealed the flesh in its place. ²² God, Almighty God, built the side that He had taken from man into a woman, and He brought her to man. ²³ Man said, "(After searching amongst all the animals and failing,) this time (I have found the) bone from my bones, and flesh from my flesh. This shall be called 'ishah' (woman) because she was taken from 'ish' (man)." ²⁴ Therefore, a man shall leave his father and his mother, and cling to his wife, and they shall become one flesh (through their children).

🕎 THE SIN OF THE TREE OF KNOWLEDGE 🕎

2:25 **T**hey were both naked, the man and his wife, and they were not ashamed (since they had no evil inclination, but their nakedness aroused the interest of the serpent).

3 ¹ The serpent was cunning, more than all the beasts of the field that God, Almighty God, had made. It said to the woman, "Did God perhaps say, 'You shall not eat of any of the trees of the garden?'"

² The woman said to the serpent, "We may eat from the fruit of the trees of the garden, ³ but from the fruit of the tree that is in the middle of the garden, God has said, "You shall not eat of it, and you shall not touch it, lest you die."

TORAS MENACHEM

Fish, by contrast, show the underlying unity of creation to a greater degree, for as soon as they are separated from their "source," they die. This is a physical expression of the spiritual reality that no entity is independent of God.

According to the above approach—that the naming of the animals was for the sake of increasing multiplicity—there was no need to name the fish, since multiplicity is not particularly pronounced in aquatic life. Thus *Chizkuni*, who adopted the approach that the fish were not named by Adam, alluded to the above reasoning with the words, "If God would have brought the fish out of the sea to Adam they would have died."

b.) Naming as an act of Divine service.

According to the second approach above, that man's naming of the animals was the first act of Divine service, it follows that the naming must have accomplished the purpose of all Divine service—to make the world more subservient to God. This was achieved through the naming, which connected the *spiritual* source of each creature with its existence on the physical plane.

This concurs with the view of the *Midrash* that the fish were named too, since all creatures would benefit from such a spiritual revelation

(Based on Likutei Sichos vol. 35, p. 1ff)

🕎 Sparks of Chasidus 🕎

THE SIN OF THE TREE OF KNOWLEDGE (2:25-3:24)

Three points require clarification:

a.) Why did God not want man to "be like God knowing good and evil" (v. 5)? Surely, God is utterly benevolent, and He would want His creations to share some of His exalted wisdom? After all, man was created in the image of God.

b.) Even if man sinned, why could he not eat from the Tree of Life and live forever (v. 22)? Surely if man would "stretch out his hand and take also from the Tree of Life and eat (from it, and he will be able to) live forever" (ibid.), it would eliminate the "death" that was imposed by the sin?

c.) The fact that man was expelled from the Garden of Eden is understood, since he abused his right to remain there by eating from the tree. But why was Adam then told to "cultivate the earth" (v. 23)?

God did not want man to become aware of the concept of evil, because man is unable to remain totally aloof from things that he comes to understand. Man's nature is to inquire, to empathize and to interact. When he encounters a new phenomenon, he wonders how it might affect his life. He begins to measure the idea according to the established norms of his conscious existence, and he allows his emotions to explore the new entity to see if he has discovered a new "love" or a new "hate." In short, when a person encounters something utterly new, he investigates it with the totality of his personality. From that point on, the concept leaves an indelible mark on his life.

So, God was aware that if man was to come to "know evil," the results would be disastrous, for in the process of his exploratory investigations, man would inevitably become attached to it.

(continued on page 23)

ממת תמותון: ה ארי גלי קדם יי ארי ביזמא
 דתיכלון מניה ויתפתח עיניכון ותהון
 כרברבין חכימין בין טב לבישו וחות אתתא
 ארי טב אילנא למיכל וארי אפי הוא לענין
 ומרג אילנא לאסתכלא ביה ונסיבת מאבה
 ואכלת ויהבת אף לבעלה עמה ואכל:
 ואתפתחא עיני תרויהון וידעו ארי ערשילאין
 אנון וחטיטו להון טרפי תאנין ועבדו להון
 זרין: ה ושמעו ית קל מימרא דיי אלהים
 דמהלך בגנתא למנה ימא ואטמר אדם
 ואתתיה מן קדם יי אלהים בנו אילן גנתא:
 ויקרא יי אלהים לאדם ואמר לה אן את:
 ויאמר ית קל מימרך שמעית בגנתא ודחלית
 ארי ערשילאי אנא ואטמריה: יא ואמר מן חוי
 לך ארי ערשילאי את המן אילנא דפקדתך
 בדיל דלא למיכל מניה אכלת: יב ואמר אדם
 אתתא דיהבת עמי היא יהבת לי מן אילנא

אלהאשה לאמות תמותון: ה כי ידע אלהים כי ביום
 אכלכם ממנו ונפקחו עיניכם והייתם כאלהים ידעי טוב ורע:
 ותרא האשה כי טוב העין למאכל וכי תאוה הוא לעינים
 ונחמד העין להשכיל ותקח מפריו ותאכל ותתן גם לאישה
 עמה ויאכל: ז ותפקחה עיני שניהם וידעו כי עירמם הם
 ויתפרו עלה תאנה ויעשו להם חגרת: ה וישמעו את-קול
 יהוה אלהים מתהלך בגן לרוח היום ויתחבא האדם ואשתו
 מפני יהוה אלהים בתוך עץ הגן: ט ויקרא יהוה אלהים
 אל-האדם ויאמר לו איכה: י ויאמר את-קולך שמעתי בגן
 ואירא כיי-עירם אנכי ואחבא: יא ויאמר מי הגיד לך כי עירם
 אתה המן-העין אשר צויתך לבלתי אכל-ממנו אכלת:
 יב ויאמר האדם האשה אשר נתתה עמדי הוא נתנה-לי

רש"י

ומפני מה לא נתפרסם העץ, שאין הקצ"ח חפץ להונות צריה, שלא יכלימוכו
 ויאמרו זהו שלקה בעולם על ידו:⁷ (ח) וישמעו. יש מדרשו אגדה רבים, וכבר
 סדרוס רבותינו על מכונס צבראשית רבה ובשאר מדרשות, ואני לא באתי אלא
 לפשוטו של מקרא, ולאגדה המיישבת דברי המקרא דבר דבור על אופניו: וישמעו.
 מה שמעו, שמעו את קול הקצ"ח שהיה מתהלך בגן: לרוח היום. לחותו רוח
 שהשמש באה משם [ס"א לשם ודוק כי כן עיקר] וזו היא מערבית, שלפנות ערב
 חמה צמערב ובה סרחו צעשירית:⁸ (ט) איכה. יודע היה היכן הוא, אלא ליכנס
 עמו בדברים, שלא יהא נזהל להשיב אס יעניסכו פתאום. וכן צקין אמר לו אי
 הצל אחיך,⁹ וכן צבלטס מי האנשים האלה עמך,¹⁰ ליכנס עמכם בדברים, וכן
 צחוקיבו בשלוחי מרוך צלאון:¹¹ (יא) מי הגיד לך. מאין לך לדעת מה צשת יש
 צעומד ערוס: המן העץ. צתמיה: (יב) אשר נתתה עמדי. כאן כפר בטובה:¹²

חוסף על דבריו:¹ (ד) לא מות תמותון. דחפה עד שנגעה צו, אמר לה כשם
 שאין מיתה צנגיעה כך אין מיתה צאכילה:² (ה) כי יודע. כל אומן שונא את
 בני אומנותו, מן העץ אכל וצברא את העולם:³ והייתם באלהים. יולרי עולמות:
 (ו) ותרא האשה. ראתה דבריו של נחש והנאו לה וכאמינתו: כי טוב העץ.
 להיות כאלהים: וכי תאוה הוא לעינים. כמו שאמר לה ונפקחו עיניכם:
 ונחמד להשכיל. כמו שאמר לה יודעי טוב ורע: ותתן גם לאישה. שלא
 תמות היא ויחיה הוא וישא אחרת: גם. לרצות צכמה וחייה: (ז) ותפקחה וגו'.
 לענין הצכמה דבר הכחוצ, ולא לענין רחיה ממש, וסוף המקרא מוכיח: וידעו
 כי עירומים הם. אף הסומא יודע כשהוא ערוס, אלא מהו וידעו כי עירומים
 הם, מנזה אחת היתה צידס ונתערטלו הימנה:⁴ עלה תאנה. הוא העץ שאכלו
 ממנו, צדבר שנתקלקלו צו נתקנו,⁵ אצל שאר העצים מנעוס מליטול עליהם,

CLASSIC QUESTIONS

● When did the Sin of the Tree of Knowledge occur? (v. 8)

RASHI: The verse states that they heard God’s voice in the “direction of the day.” This refers to the direction in which the sun sets, which is the west. For towards evening the sun is in the west, and they sinned in the tenth hour [of daylight].

TALMUD: The day on which Adam was created consisted of twelve hours. During the first hour his dust was gathered; the second hour

it was made into a shapeless mass; the third hour his limbs were stretched out; the fourth hour a soul was placed in him; the fifth hour he stood on his feet; the sixth hour he named the animals; the seventh hour he was paired with Chava; the eighth hour they had two children; the ninth hour he was commanded not to eat from the Tree of Knowledge; the tenth hour he sinned; the eleventh hour he was judged and the twelfth hour he was banished from the Garden of Eden and went on his way (*Sanhedrin* 38b).

TORAS MENACHEM

🔗 WHEN DID THE SIN OCCUR? (v. 8)

Rashi’s commentary is not a mere anthology of Talmudic and Midrashic teachings. Rather, as *Rashi* declares himself, his commentary was written exclusively to: “explain the *literal meaning of scripture*” (comment to *Bereishis* 3:8). Consequently, when *Rashi* does cite a Talmudic teaching, it would be a mistake to presume that he is citing the words in the same context

that they are brought in the Talmud itself, for the Talmud does not confine itself exclusively to literal interpretations. In fact, the large body of Talmudic and Midrashic commentary to the Torah is predominantly allegorical and *non-literal*. Thus, even when *Rashi* uses a Talmudic phrase, he does so in the context of his own literalist commentary, which was not necessarily the intention of the Talmud.

⁴ The serpent said to the woman, “You will surely not die. ⁵ God (told you not to eat it, because He) knows that on the day that you eat from it, your eyes will be opened, and you will be like God (with the ability to create worlds and) knowing good and evil.”

⁶ The woman (believed the serpent) that the tree was good food (that would make a person like God), that it was desirable to the eyes (for it would open them up), and that the tree was desirable to make one wise (knowing good and evil). She took of its fruit, and she ate (it), and she also gave (some to the cattle and wild animals, and fearing that she would die and that her husband would remarry, she gave some) to her husband (who was) with her, and he ate (it).

⁷ The “eyes” (of the intellects) of both of them were opened, and they realized that they were naked (of mitzvos, having ignored the only command they had been given). They sewed together fig leaves (from the tree) and made themselves loincloths.

⁸ They heard the sound of God, Almighty God, walking in the garden in the direction (which the sun sets every) day. The man and his wife hid from God, Almighty God, among the trees of the garden.

⁹ God, Almighty God, called to the man, and said to him, “Where are you?” (to engage him in conversation).

¹⁰ (Man) said, “I heard Your sound in the garden, and I was afraid because I am naked, so I hid.”

¹¹ (God) said, “Who told you that you are naked? Have you eaten from the tree from which I commanded you not to eat?”

¹² The man said, “The woman whom You gave (to be) with me gave me from the tree, and I ate.”

TORAS MENACHEM

In our case, *Rashi* writes that man sinned “in the tenth hour,” which at first glance would seem to refer to the Talmudic teaching that he sinned in the tenth hour of the sixth day of creation (see **Talmud**). However, at the literal level of Torah interpretation to which *Rashi* always confines himself, it could not possibly be argued that man sinned on the sixth day, for a number of reasons:

a.) At the end of the sixth day, the Torah states, “God saw everything that He had made, and look! *It was very good*” (1:31). Now, if the sixth day had been witness to man’s sin which brought i.) death, ii.) the labor of childbirth and iii.) the toils of earning a living to the world (see v. 16-19,

below), God would surely not have said, “It was *very good*”?

b.) It is reasonable to presume that Adam and Chava were of sufficiently strong moral caliber not to have stumbled in sin as soon as they were created, and the serpent would surely have taken some time to persuade Chava to eat from the tree. So at the literal level, it is extremely unlikely that all the events described here in chapter three occurred in the space of a few hours.

c.) Furthermore, the story is recorded after the story of creation has been completed, and *Rashi* gives no indication that it occurred beforehand, on the sixth day.

 *Sparks of Chasidus* 

THE SIN OF THE TREE OF KNOWLEDGE (CONT. FROM P. 21.)

Thus, when man sinned and became attached to evil, two major problems arose:

a.) If man were now to live forever, he would cause evil to be perpetuated eternally. For since he had now incorporated evil into his system, eternal life would provide an “eternal host” for man’s newly found parasite. Therefore, God decreed that man must die, and prevented him from eating from the Tree of Life which would return him to his previous, immortal status.

b.) A further, more serious problem was how to correct the event which had occurred. The boundaries between good and evil had become blurred and man found himself attracted to two mutually exclusive forces. His sin had generated cosmic repercussions in the upper realms, causing good and evil to coalesce, resulting in a

corrupted spirituality which had penetrated the entire universe, right down to the physical world.

The solution: “*God, Almighty God, sent him out of the Garden of Eden, to cultivate the earth from which he had been taken*” (v. 23).

Man had mixed good and evil throughout the spiritual and physical worlds, so he was sent out to correct the damage that he had caused. Since evil had penetrated the actual earth, man was given the task of refining the entire world. By performing the appropriate action with each “piece” of physicality, he would set free the kernel of good within it, allowing it to return to its holy source. To correct the world which he had profaned, man was required to “pick up the pieces”—literally—by separating with his own hands the good and evil which he had caused to be mixed together.

(Based on *Torah Ohr* 5c ff; *Toras Chaim Bereishis* 30a ff)

ואכלית: י' ואמר יי אלהים לאתתא מה דא עבדת ואמרת אתתא הווא אמעיני ואכלית: י' ואמר יי אלהים לחווא ארי עבדת דא ליט את מכל בעירא ומכל חיות ברא על מעד תיזיל ועפרא תיכול כל יומי חייך: טו ודכבו אשני בינד ובין אתתא ובין בינד ובין בנהא הוא יהא דכיר לך מה דעבדת ליה מלקדמין ואת תהא נטר ליה לסופא: טז לאתתא אמר אסנאה אסני צעריכי ועדוייכי בצער תלדין בנין ולות בעליך תהא תאובתיך והוא ישלט ביה: יז ולאדם אמר ארי קבילתא למימר אתתך ואכלת מן אילנא די פקדתך למימר לא תיכול מגיה ליטא ארעא בדילך בעמל תיכלינה כל יומי חייך: יח וכוזבין ואטדין תצמח לך ותיכול ית עשבא דחקלא: יט בזיעתא דאפך תיכול לחמא עד דתיתוב לארעא דמינה אתברייתא ארי עפרא את ולעפרא תתוב: כ וקרא אדם שום אתתיה חוה ארי היא הות אפא דכל בני אנשא: כא ועבר יי אלהים לאדם ולאאתתיה לבושין דיקר על משך בשריהון ואלבשינון: כב ואמר יי אלהים הא אדם הוה יחידי בעלמא מגיה למידע טב וביש וכען דלמא יושיט ידיה ויטב אף מאילן חייא ויכול ויחי לעלם: כג ושלחיה יי אלהים מנגתא דעדן למפלח ית אדמתא דאתברי מתפן: כד ותריד ית אדם ואשרי מלקדמין לנגתא דעדן ית כרוביא ית שגן חרבא דמתהפכא למטר ית

מן העץ ואכל: י' ויאמר יהוה אלהים לאשה מה זאת עשית ותאמר האשה הנחש השיאני ואכל: י' ויאמר יהוה אלהים אל הנחש כי עשית זאת ארוך אתה מכל הבהמה ומכל חית השדה על גהנך תלך ועפר תאכל כל ימי חייך: טו ואיבה אשית בינד ובין האשה ובין זרעך ובין זרעה הוא ישופך ראש ואתה תשופנו עקב: טז אל האשה אמר הרבה ארבה עצבוניך והרנך בעצב תלדי בנים ואל אישך תשוקתך והוא ימשל בך: טז ולאדם אמר כי שמעת לקול אשתך ותאכל מן העץ אשר צויתיה לאמר לא תאכל ממנו ארוה האדמה בעבורך בעצבוניך תאכלנה כל ימי חייך: יח וקוץ ודרדר תצמיח לך ואכלת את עשב השדה: יט בזעת אפיקך תאכל לחם עד שובך אל האדמה כי ממנה לקחת כיעפר אתה ואל עפר תשוב: כ ויקרא האדם שם אשתו חוה כי הוא היתה אם כל חי: כא ויעש יהוה אלהים לאדם ולאשתו כתנות עור וילבשם: פ ורביעי כב ויאמר א יהוה אלהים הן האדם היה כאחד ממנו לדעת טוב ורע ועתה אפן ישלח ידו ולקח גם מעץ החיים ואכל וחי לעלם: כג וישלחהו יהוה אלהים מגן עדן לעבד את האדמה אשר לקח משם: כד ויגרש את האדם וישכן מקדם לגן עדן את הפרזים ואת להט החרב המתהפכת לשמר את דרך עץ החיים: ט

כש"י

לך מלח לחוצו צפה, אלא הוא ימשול בך, הכל ממנו ולא ממך: תשוקתך. תאותך, כמו ונפשו שוקק^א: (ז) ארורה האדמה בעבורך. תעלה לך דברים ארוכים, כגון זבזים ופרעושים וגמלים, משל ליואל לתרבות רעה, וכבריות מקללות שדים שינק מהם: (יח) וקוץ ודרדר תצמיח לך. הארץ, כשתזרענה מיני זרעים, תלמיה קוץ ודרדר קודם ועכבות, והן נאכלים על ידי תיקון^א: ואכלת את עשב השדה. ומכ קללה היא זו, והלא צרכה נאמר לו הכה נחתי לכם את כל עשב זרע וגוי, אלא מה אמור כאן בראש הענין, ארורה האדמה בעבורך בעצבוניך, ואחר העצבון וקוץ ודרדר תלמיה לך, כשתזרענה קטניות או ירקות גבה, היא תלמיה לך קוליס ודרדרים ושאר עשבי השדה, ועל כרחך תאכלם: (יט) בזעת אפיקך. לאחר שתעריח צו הרבה: (כ) ויקרא האדם. חזר הכתוב לענינו כראשון ויקרא האדם שמות, ולא הפסיק, אלא ללמדך שעל ידי קריאת שמות זדווגה לו חוה, כמו שכתוב ולאדם לא מלא עזר כנגדו, לפיכך ויפל תרדמה, ועל ידי שכתב ויחיו שניהם ערומים, סמך לו פרשת הנחש, להודיעך, שמתוך שראש

(ג) השיאני. הטעני, כמו אל ישא אחסך חזקיהו: (יד) בי עשית זאת. מכאן שאין מהפכים בזכותו של מסית, שאילו שאלו למה עשית זאת, היכ לו להשיב דברי הרב ודברי התלמיד דברי מי שומעין^א. מכל הבהמה ומכל חית השדה. אם מצהמה נתקלל, מחיה לא כל שכן, העמידו רבותינו מדרש זה במסכת בכורות^א, ללמד שימי עיזו של נחש שצט שנים: על גחונך תלך. רגלים היו לו ונקללו: (טו) ואיבה אשית. אהה לא נחכוונה אלא שימות אדם כשיאכל הוא תחלה ותשא את חוה, ולא זאת לדבר אל חוה תחלה אלא לפי שהנשים דעתן קלות להפתות, ויודעות לפתות את צעליהן, לפיכך ואיבה אשית: ישופך. יכתך, כמו ואכות אותי^א, ותרוממו ושפית יתיב: ואתה תשופנו עקב. לא יבא לך קומה, ותשכנו בעקבו, ואף משם תמיתנו. ולשון תשופנו, כמו נשך צב^א, כשהנחש צא לנשוך הוא נושף כמין שריקה, ולפי שהלשון נופל על הלשון, כתב לשון נשיפה בשניהם: (טז) עצבוניך. זה עזר גידול צניס^א: והרנך. זה עזר העצור: בעצב תלדי בנים. זה עזר הלידה: ואל אישך תשוקתך. לתשמיש, ואף על פי כן אין

1 דברי הימים-ב לב, טו 2 טנהדרין כט: 3 דף ח. 4 סוטה ט: 5 דברים ט, כא 6 ישע"י מ, ד 7 עירובין ק: 8 ישע"י כט, ח 9 ב"ר כ, י

¹³ God, Almighty God, said to the woman, “What is this that you have done?”

The woman said, “The serpent misled me, and I ate.”

¹⁴ God, Almighty God, said to the serpent, “Because you have done this, you are (now) cursed more than all the cattle and more than all the wild animals of the field! You (will have your legs cut off so that you) shall walk on your belly, and you shall eat soil all the days of your life! ¹⁵ I shall place hatred between you and between the woman (you desired), and between your descendants and between her descendants. (Man) will crush you (on the) head, and you will bite his heel.”

¹⁶ To the woman He said, “I will greatly increase your anguish (of rearing children) and your (labor pains of) pregnancy. You will give birth to children in pain. You will desire (to be with) your husband but he will rule over you (to be with you when he desires).”

¹⁷ To man He said, “Since you listened to your wife’s voice, and you ate from the tree about which I commanded you, saying, ‘Do not eat from it,’ the ground will be cursed because of you (producing loathsome insects), and you will toil to eat from it all the days of your life. ¹⁸ (When you sow seeds, artichokes and cardoons, which have) thorns and thistles, will grow (with) your (crops) and you will eat the(se artichokes, cardoons and other) herbs of the field (that take a long time to prepare, due to lack of an alternative. ¹⁹ Only) with the sweat of your face (after much toil) will you eat bread, until you go back to the earth from where you were taken. For you are (from the) soil, and to soil you will return.”

(The narrative now returns to the subject of giving names, mentioned above 2:19-20)

²⁰ The man named his wife Chava, because she was the mother of all life.

²¹ God, Almighty God, made for Adam and for his wife skin-tight garments (alternatively: garments of animal skins), and He clothed them.

🌀 EXPULSION FROM THE GARDEN OF EDEN 🌀

3:22
FOURTH
READING

God, Almighty God, said, “Look!—man has become unique in the (lower) world by himself (since) he has the ability of knowing good and evil (unlike the animals). Now, (there is a fear that) perhaps he will stretch out his hand and take also from the Tree of Life and eat (from it, and he will be able to) live forever (and is likely to lead others astray, as they will think he is a god).”

²³ God, Almighty God, sent him out of the Garden of Eden to cultivate the earth from which he had been taken. ²⁴ He drove the man out, and to the east (side) of the Garden of Eden He stationed angels (of destruction) and the flame (alternatively: blade) of the revolving sword, to guard the way to the Tree of Life.

רש"י

צטלוינים, ומה היא יחידתו, לדעת טוב ורע, מה שאין כן בצמחה וחייה: ועתה פן ישלח ידו וגו'. ומשיחיה לעולם, הרי הוא קרוב להטעות הצריות אחריו, ויאמרו אף הוא אלוה. ויש מדרשי אגדה, אצל אין מיושבין על פשוטו: (כד) מקדם לגן עדן. צמזרחו של גן עדן, חוץ לגן: את הברובים. מלאכי חבלה: החרב המתהפכת. ולה להט לאיים עליו מלכום עוד לגן. תרגום לכת שכן, כמו שלף שנגא ולשון לע"ז למ"א. ומדרשי אגדה יש, ואני איני צא

אותם ערומים וראה אותם עסוקים בתשמיש, נחאזה לה וצא עליהם צמחשבה וצמרמה: חוה. נופל על לשון חיה, שמחיה את ולדוהיה, כאשר תאמר מה הוזה לאדם¹⁰ צלשון היה: (כא) בתנות עור. יש דברי אגדה אומרים חלקים כלפורן היו מדובקים על עורן. ויש אומרים דבר הבא מן העור, כגון אמר הארניצים שהוא רך וחס, ועשה להם כתנות ממנו: (כב) היה באחד ממנו. הרי הוא יחיד בתחתונים כמו שאני יחיד

TORAS MENACHEM

Thus, when *Rashi* encountered the Talmudic teaching that Adam and Chava sinned during the afternoon of the sixth day, he accepted the first premise (that they sinned in the afternoon), for this is indicated by scripture in verse 8; but he rejected the second premise that they sinned

on the sixth day, which is not indicated in scripture at all and, on the contrary, is incompatible with a literal rendering of the verses.

Instead, *Rashi* understood that the sin took place at some later date.

(Based on *Sichas Shabbos Bereishis* 5749)

אורח אילן תינא: א ואדם ידע ית מנה אהתיה ועדיאת וילידת ית קין ואמרת קניתי גברא (מן) קדם יי: ב ואוספת למילד ית אחוהי ית הבל והנה הבל רעי ענא וקין הנה גבר פלח בארעא: ג והנה מסופר יומין ואייתי קין מאבא דארעא תקרובתא קדם יי: ד והבל אייתי אף הוא מבכירי עניה ומשמניהון והנה רעוא מן קדם יי בהבל ובתקרובתיה: ה ובקין ובתקרובתיה לא הנה רעוא ותקוף לקין לתרא ואתקבישו אפיה: ו ואמר יי לקין למא תקוף לך ולמא אתקבישו אפך: ז הלא אם תוטיב עובדך ישתביק לך ואם לא תוטיב עובדך ליום דינא תסאך נטיר דעתיד לאתפרעא מנך אם לא תתוב ואם תתוב ישתביק לך: ח ואמר קין להבל אחוהי והנה במהויהון בתקלא וקם קין על הבל אחוהי וקטליה: ט ואמר יי לקין אן הבל אחיד ואמר לא ידענא הנטר אחי אנא: י ואמר מה עבדת קל דם זרעין דעתידין

ד א והאדם ידע את-חנה אשתו ותהר ותלד את-קין ותאמר קניתי איש את-יהוה: ג ותסף ללדת את-אחיו את-הבל ויהי-הבל רעה צאן וקין הנה עבד אדמה: ד ויהי מקץ ימים ויבא קין מפרי האדמה מנחה ליהוה: ה והבל הביא גם-הוא מבכרות צאנו ומחלבהן וישע יהוה אל-הבל ואל-מנחתו: ו ואל-קין ואל-מנחתו לא שעה ויחר לקין מאד ויפלו פניו: ז ויאמר יהוה אל-קין למה חרה לך ולמה נפלו פניך: ח הלא אם-תיטיב שאת ואם לא תיטיב לפתח חטאת רבץ ואלויד תשוקתו ואתה תמשל-בו: ט ויאמר קין אל-הבל אחיו ויהי בהיותם בשדה ויקם קין אל-הבל אחיו ויהרגהו: ט ויאמר יהוה אל-קין אי הבל אחיך ויאמר לא ידעתי השמר אחי אנכי: י ויאמר מה עשית קול דמי אחיך צעקים אלי

רש"י

מעליו, פנה מעליו: וישע. ירדה אש ולחכה מנחתו: (ז) הלא אם תיטיב. כהרגומו פירושו: לפתח חטאת רובץ. לפתח קצרך חטאך שמור: ואלויד תשוקתו. של חטאת, הוא יצר הרע, תמיד שוקק ומתאוה להכשילך: ואתה תמשל בו. אם חרצת תגבר עליו: (ח) ויאמר קין. נכנס עמו בדברי ריב ומלך, להטעול עליו להרגו. ויש צדק מדריש אגדה, אך זה ישובו של מקרא: (ט) אי הבל אחיך. ליכנס עמו בדברי נחת, אולי ישוב ויאמר אני כהגתיו וחטאתי לך: לא ידעתי. נעשה כגונז דעת העליונה: השומר אחי. לשון תימה הוא, וכן כל ה"א הנקודה בחטף פתח: (י) דמי אחיך. דמו ודם זרעיותיו. דבר אחר שעשה בו פלעים הרבה, שלא היה יודע מהיכין נפשו

אלה לפשוטו: (ח) והאדם ידע. כבר קודם הענין של מעלה, קודם שחטא ונטרד מגן עדן, וכן הכריון והלידה, שאם כתב וידע אדם, נשמע שלאחר שנטרד היו לו צניס: קין. על שם קניית: את ה'. כמו עס ה', כשברא אותי ואת אישי, לצדו צראנו, אבל צדק שחפס אנו עמו: את קין את אחיו את הבל. ג' חתים ריבויים הם, מלמד שחאומה נולדה עם קין, ועם הכל נולדו שטים, לכך נאמר ותוסף: (ז) רועה צאן. לפי שנתקללה האדמה, פירש לו מעבודתה: (ג) מפרי האדמה. מן הגרוע. ויש אגדה שאומרת זרע פשתן היה. (די"א מפרי מאיזה שצא לידו לא טוב ולא מוצר): (ד) וישע. ויפן. וכן ואל מנחתו לא שעה, לא פנה. וכן ואל ישעו³, אל יפנו. וכן שעה

CLASSIC QUESTIONS

● Who said, "I have acquired a man (as a partner) with God"? (v. 1)

TIKUNEI ZOHAR: This was said by Adam (99b).
VILNA GA'ON: There must be a printing mistake in the *Tikunei Zohar*, as it is clearly implicit from the Torah that *Chava* said these words.

● What kind of offering did *Kayin* Bring? (v. 3)

RASHI: He brought from the poorest crops. The *Midrash* says that it was flax seed. (An alternative explanation: from whatever fruit came to hand neither good nor choice).

MIZRACHI: One is forced to conclude that he brought the poorest of his crops, otherwise it is difficult to understand why God rejected the offering.

SIFSEI CHACHAMIM: *Rashi* brings the *Midrash* that *Kayin's* offering was flax-seed because he is troubled why the verse says "fruit of the land" rather than the more simple expression, "he brought an offering from the land."

The term "fruit" of the earth implies that it was a fruit similar to the land. The only species which could be termed both "fruit" and "of the land" is flax, because: a.) The Talmud teaches that any species whose stem does not disintegrate in the winter (such as flax) is termed "of the earth" (*Brachos* 40a). b.) It is also referred to as a fruit in the verse, "and she hid them in the stalks of flax" (*Ioshua* 6:26), where flax is referred to as an *eitz* (fruit tree).

GUR ARYEH: If *Kayin* was attempting to express gratitude to God by bringing an offering, why would he intentionally choose his poorest produce? *Kayin* recognized that his power rested with the *Ayin Hara* (evil eye), and so he brought a poor offering in an attempt to strengthen this evil power. But God, who is good, turned to *Hevel's* offering.

Why did *Hevel* not endeavor to bring a better species, such as an ox? He also felt the need to compete with *Kayin*, so he brought a sheep, which produces wool that is an alternative to flax.

BACHAYE: *Hevel* brought the most inferior type of cattle, demonstrating his lack of interest in worldly matters.

🕯️ KAYIN AND HEVEL 🕯️

4 **T**he man knew his wife Chava (before the sin), and she conceived and bore Kayin (together with a twin girl. When he was born) she said, “I have acquired (‘KaNisi) a man (as a partner) with God.”² She gave birth again to his brother Hevel (together with two twin girls).

Hevel was a shepherd of flocks (because he did not want to work with the land, which was cursed), and Kayin was a worker of the land.

³ It was at the end of (a number of) days, that Kayin brought some of the (worst) fruit of the land as an offering to God. ⁴ Hevel also offered from the firstborn of his flocks, from their fattest ones.

God turned to Hevel and to his offering (and it was consumed by a fire from heaven),⁵ but to Kayin and to his offering He did not turn. Kayin became very angry, and his face was dejected.

⁶ God said to Kayin, “Why are you angry, and why is your face dejected? ⁷ Surely, if you improve yourself you will be forgiven? If you do not improve yourself, however, then (your) sin is crouching (in wait) at the entrance (of your grave. The evil inclination) is longing (to entice you), but you can rule over it (if you want).”

⁸ Kayin (started an argument) with Hevel his brother (to find a pretext to kill him). Then, when they were in the field, Kayin assaulted Hevel his brother and killed him.

⁹ God said to Kayin, “Where is Hevel your brother?”

He said, “I don’t know. Am I my brother’s guardian?”

¹⁰ (God) said, “What have you done? Your brother’s blood (and the blood of his would-be

TORAS MENACHEM

🕯️ WHO NAMED KAYIN (v. 1)

The **Vilna Ga'on** argues that it was Chava who said, “I have acquired a man with God,” upon Kayin’s birth (and our text of the **Tikunei Zohar** which states that Adam said these words is incorrect).

However, this assertion is problematic, since the entire section in the

Tikunei Zohar speaks of Adam (and not Chava). It would thus appear that the text itself (which attributes the statement to Adam) is correct.

Nevertheless, we are left with the problem that according to Hebrew grammar the verse tells us that Chava said, “I have acquired a man (as a partner) with God,” when Kayin was born.

This could be resolved by a statement of *Da’as Zekeinim*, “from my teacher of blessed memory, I heard that their custom was that the man named the first child and the woman the second” (comm. to Bereishis 38:5). Thus, in our case, the Torah relates that Chava suggested the name Kayin, on the basis that “I have acquired (*kanisi*) a man with God,” and the *Tikunei Zohar* informs us of Adam’s approval, which finalized the name.

(Based on *Likutei Sichos* vol. 4, p. 1248)

🕯️ Sparks of Chasidus 🕯️

Clearly, both Kayin and Hevel wished to thank God and make a statement of His absolute unity with their offerings (v. 3-4), but it seems that they differed in their understanding of the term “unity.” Kayin understood that God’s unity is totally beyond the multiplicity found in the world. Thus, he picked the best of all species (flax), indicative of God’s greatness; but he paid no attention to the quality of the species, bringing the worst produce that he could find (*Rashi* to v. 3). He presumed that giving credence to the possibility of better and worse produce is not an appropriate offering to God, Who is totally beyond any distinction between “better” and “worse.”

However, his presumption was mistaken, as the ultimate expression of God’s unity is to show how He is One, *within* the multiplicity of the world. I.e. that every detail of creation, while it may be divided into better and worse, can nevertheless be elevated to God. Thus, Hevel was correct in understanding that the multiplicity of the world must be given credence, and so he was careful to offer the best of his chosen species.

(*Likutei Sichos* vol. 15, pp. 25-6)

🕯️ KAYIN’S OFFERING (v. 3)

Sifsei Chachamim writes that *Rashi* was troubled by the rather elaborate expression, “fruit of the land.”

However, it appears unlikely that the term “fruit of the land” would trouble *Rashi*, as it is a commonplace expression of the Torah, e.g., “You shall take of the first of all the fruit of the land” (*Devarim* 26:2), and similarly, “I have brought the first fruits of the land” (*ibid.* 10). Thus, *Rashi* would not be bothered why the Torah used this expression.

RASHI’S THREE COMMENTS

According to the first interpretation of *Rashi* that Kayin brought the worst fruits, it is difficult to understand why the Torah made no mention whatsoever of such an important detail.

Furthermore (as **Gur Aryeh** asks), Kayin surely brought the offering to show gratitude to God, so why would he bring from the worst produce? And, having offered the worst of his produce why would he have been so surprised when it was rejected by God, to the extent that, “Kayin became

למפק מן אֶחָד קְבִילִין קָדְמֵי מִן אֲרָעָא: י"א וְכַעַן לִיט אֵת מִן אֲדָמָתָא דְפִתְחַת יַת פּוּמְחָא לְמַסָּב יַת דְּמֵי אֶחָד מִן יָדָהּ: י"ב אֲרֵי תִפְלַח יַת אֲדָמָתָא לֹא תוֹסִיף לְמִתֵּן חֵילָה לְךָ מִפְּלִמְלָא וְגַלִּי תִהִי בְּאַרְעָא: י"ג וְאָמַר קַיִן קָדָם י"י סְגִי חוֹבִי מִלְּמַשְׁבָּק: י"ד הָא תְּרִיבְתָא יַתִּי יוֹמָא דִּין מַעַל אֲפִי אֲרָעָא וּמִן קָדְמָךְ לִית אֲפִשֶׁר לְאַטְמָרָא וְאִהִי מִפְּלִמְלָא וְגַלִּי בְּאַרְעָא וַיְהִי כֹל דִּישְׁכַּחֲנִינִי יִקְבְּלִינִי: י"ו וְאָמַר לִיהִי י"ז בְּכֹן כֹּל דִּיקְטוּל קַיִן לְשִׁבְעָא דְרִין יַתְפָּרַע מְנִיָּה וְשׁוּי י"י לְקַיִן אֲתָא בְּדִיל דְלֹא לְמַקְטֵל יַתִּיהָ כֹּל דִּישְׁכַּחֲנִיָּה: י"ח וְנִפְקַ קַיִן מִן קָדָם י"י וַיִּתֵּיב בְּאַרְעָא גַלִּי וּמִפְּלִמְלָא דִּתְהֵא עֲבִידָא עֲלוּהִי מִלְּקַדְמִין בְּגִנְתָּא דְעֵדֶן: י"י וַיִּבַע קַיִן יַת אֲתֵרִיָּה וְעַדִּיאַת וַיִּלְיֶדֶת יַת חֲנוּךְ וַתְּהֵא בְּנֵי קַרְתָּא וְקָרָא שְׁמָא דְקַרְתָּא כְּשׁוּם בְּרִיָּה חֲנוּךְ: י"י וְאֲתֵרִיָּה לִחְנוּךְ יַת עֵיֶרֶד וְעֵיֶרֶד אוֹלִיד יַת מְחוּיָאֵל וּמְחִיָּאֵל אוֹלִיד יַת מְתוּשָׁאֵל וּמְתוּשָׁאֵל אוֹלִיד יַת לָמֶךְ: י"י וְנִסִּיב לִיהִ לְמֶךְ

מִן־הָאֲדָמָה: י"א וְעֵתָה אָרֹר אֶתְּהָ מִן־הָאֲדָמָה אֲשֶׁר פָּצְתָה אֶת־פִּיהָ לְקַחַת אֶת־דְּמֵי אֶחָד מִיָּדָהּ: י"ב כִּי תֵעָבֵד אֶת־הָאֲדָמָה לְאֶתְסֹף תִּתְּכֹחַהּ לְךָ נָע וְנָד תִּהְיֶיהָ בְּאַרְצֵךְ: י"ג וַיֹּאמֶר קַיִן אֶל־יְהוָה גְּדוֹל עֲוֹנִי מִנְּשׂוּאָה: י"ד הֵן גִּרְשַׁתְּ אֹתִי הַיּוֹם מֵעַל פְּנֵי הָאֲדָמָה וּמִפְּנֵיךְ אֶסְתֵּר וְהִיִּיתִי נָע וְנָד בְּאַרְצֵךְ וְהָיָה כָּל־מֵצְאֵי יְהִרְגֵנִי: י"ו וַיֹּאמֶר לוֹ יְהוָה לְכֹן כָּל־הֲרֹג קַיִן שִׁבְעָתַיִם יִקָּם וַיִּשָּׂם יְהוָה לְקַיִן אוֹת לְבִלְתִּי הַפּוֹת־אֹתוֹ כָּל־מֵצְאֹו: י"ח וַיֵּצֵא קַיִן מִלְּפָנָי יְהוָה וַיֵּשֶׁב בְּאַרְצ־נֹד קַדְמַת־עֵדֶן: י"י וַיִּבַע קַיִן אֶת־אִשְׁתּוֹ וַתֵּהָרַ וַתֵּלֶד אֶת־חֲנוּךְ וַיְהִי בְנָה עֵיר וַיִּקְרָא שֵׁם הָעֵיר כְּשֵׁם בְּנוֹ חֲנוּךְ: י"י וַיִּוֹלֶד לְחֲנוּךְ אֶת־עֵיֶרֶד וְעֵיֶרֶד יָלַד אֶת־מְחוּיָאֵל וּמְחִיָּאֵל יָלַד אֶת־מְתוּשָׁאֵל וּמְתוּשָׁאֵל יָלַד אֶת־לָמֶךְ: (חמישיין) י"י וַיִּקְחָהּ לוֹ לְמֶךְ

כ"ש"י

אני נוקם נקמתי ממנו, שיעמוד למך מצני צניו ויכרהו. וסוף המקרא שאמר שבעתים יוקם, והוא נקמת הכל מקין, למדנו שתחלת מקרא לשון גערה הוא, שלא תהא צריה מזיקתו. וכיוצא בו ויאמר דוד כל מכה יבוסו ויגע צנור³, ולא פירש מה ישעיה לו, אבל דבר הכתוב ברמז, כל מכה יבוסו ויגע צנור ויקרב אל השער וכצננו, ואת העורים וגו', וגם אותם יכח על אשר אמרו העור והפסח לא יבא אל חוך הבית, המכה את אלו אני אעשנו ראש ושר, כאן קצר דבריו, ובדברי הימים⁴ פירש יהיה לראש ולשר: וישם ה' לקין אות. חקק לו אות משמו צמלחו [ס"א] דבר אחר כל מולאי יכרני

יואלה! מן האדמה. יותר ממה שנתקללה היא כבר צעונה, וגם צו רוספה לחטוא: (יא) אשר פצתה את פיה לקחת את דמי אחיך וגו'. וכנני מוסף לה קללה אלך, לא תוסף תח כחה [ס"א] הכל דבור אחד ממן האדמה ע"כ: (יב) נע וגד. אין לך רשות לדור במקום אחד: (יג) גדול עוני מנשוא. בתמייה, אהב טוען עליונים ותחטונים, ועוני אי אפשר לך לטעון? (טו) לכן כל הורג קין. זה אחד מן המקראות שקלרו דצריהם ורמזו ולא פירשו, לכן כל הורג קין, לשון גערה, כה ישעיה לו, כך וכך עונשו, ולא פירש עונשו: שבעתים יוקם. איני רוצה להנקם מקין עכשיו, לסוף שבעה דורות

TORAS MENACHEM

very angry, and his face was dejected" (v.5)? Surely, there must have been some (mistaken) logic on the part of Kayin as to why God should have accepted the worst produce?

To answer these problems Rashi brings two further explanations: a.) It was flax-seed, and b.) It was whatever fruit came to hand. Let us examine these two interpretations in order.

The student of Rashi has learned already of the significance of flax. When the Torah describes how a river went out from Eden and divided into four, the verse states, "The name of one was Pishon" (above 2:11). Rashi comments (in his second interpretation), "because it made pishtan (flax) grow."

Obviously, if a river is named after a product, it must be highly regarded. So from this comment of Rashi we can understand that although Kayin brought the worst flax, he nevertheless brought the worst of one of the best types of produce. Clearly, he understood that the most important element of the offering was the species, and in that respect he picked the best. Only, within that species itself, he brought the worst available. Hevel, on the other hand, did not endeavor to bring the best species (he only brought sheep, not oxen), but within that species he brought the very best: "firstborn" and "the fattest ones."

However, it still remains somewhat of a question why Kayin did not bring the best flax, if indeed he was trying to bring only the very best?

Thus (in many editions of Rashi) a further interpretation is brought, that Kayin merely brought whatever came to hand, neither the best nor the worst. According to this understanding, there is no question at all why Kayin would have been upset that God rejected his offering.

However, it remains problematic why God indeed rejected the offering. Thus Rashi places this interpretation last, as it is the most troublesome.

(Based on Likutei Sichos vol. 15, pp. 20-26)

The Last Word

We can learn from all the above the extent to which *hiddur* (enhancement of a) *mitzvah* is important. Despite the fact that Kayin brought an offering from a highly-regarded species, nevertheless, since he did not take care to bring the best flax available (a *hiddur* within a *hiddur*) his actions were considered sinful.

(Based on Likutei Sichos vol. 15, p. 26)

תִּרְתִּין נָשִׁים נָשִׂים שָׁם הָאֵחָת עֲרָה וְשֵׁם הַשְּׁנִית צִלָּה: כ וַתֵּלֶד עֲרָה אֶת־יִבְל הוּא הָיָה אָבִי יִשָּׁב אָהֵל וּמִקְנֶה: כא וְשֵׁם אָחִיו יִבְל הוּא הָיָה אָבִי כָּל־תַּפֵּשׁ בְּנֹר וְעֹגֵב: כב וְצִלָּה גַם־הוּא יֵלְדָה אֶת־תּוֹבֵל קִין לְמִשׁ כָּל־חַרֶשׁ נַחֲשֶׁת וּבְרוּל וְאָחוֹת תּוֹבֵל־קִין נַעֲמָה: [וששין] כג וַיֹּאמֶר לְמֶדֶד לְנָשָׁיו עֲרָה וְצִלָּה שְׂמַעַן קוּלִי נָשִׂי לְמֶדֶד הַאֲזִנָּה אִמְרָתִי כִּי אִישׁ הָרְגַתִּי לְפַעְעֵי וַיֵּלֶד לְחֶבְרָתִי: כד כִּי שִׁבְעֵתַיִם יָקָם־קִין וְלִמֶדֶד שִׁבְעֵים וְשִׁבְעָה: כה וַיֵּדַע אָדָם עוֹל אֶת־אִשְׁתּוֹ וַתֵּלֶד בֵּן וַתִּקְרָא אֶת־שְׁמוֹ שֵׁת כִּי שֵׁת־לִי אֱלֹהִים וְרַע אַחֲרַי תַּחַת הַבַּל כִּי הָרַגְנוּ קִין: כו וּלְשֵׁת גַּם־הוּא יֵלְד־בֵּן וַיִּקְרָא אֶת־שְׁמוֹ אֶנּוֹשׁ אֵז הוּחַל לְקָרָא בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה: ס

תִּרְתִּין נָשִׁים נָשִׂים שָׁם הָאֵחָת עֲרָה וְשֵׁם הַשְּׁנִית צִלָּה: כ וַתֵּלֶד עֲרָה אֶת־יִבְל הוּא הָיָה אָבִי יִשָּׁב אָהֵל וּמִקְנֶה: כא וְשֵׁם אָחִיו יִבְל הוּא הָיָה אָבִי כָּל־תַּפֵּשׁ בְּנֹר וְעֹגֵב: כב וְצִלָּה גַם־הוּא יֵלְדָה אֶת־תּוֹבֵל קִין לְמִשׁ כָּל־חַרֶשׁ נַחֲשֶׁת וּבְרוּל וְאָחוֹת תּוֹבֵל־קִין נַעֲמָה: [וששין] כג וַיֹּאמֶר לְמֶדֶד לְנָשָׁיו עֲרָה וְצִלָּה שְׂמַעַן קוּלִי נָשִׂי לְמֶדֶד הַאֲזִנָּה אִמְרָתִי כִּי אִישׁ הָרְגַתִּי לְפַעְעֵי וַיֵּלֶד לְחֶבְרָתִי: כד כִּי שִׁבְעֵתַיִם יָקָם־קִין וְלִמֶדֶד שִׁבְעֵים וְשִׁבְעָה: כה וַיֵּדַע אָדָם עוֹל אֶת־אִשְׁתּוֹ וַתֵּלֶד בֵּן וַתִּקְרָא אֶת־שְׁמוֹ שֵׁת כִּי שֵׁת־לִי אֱלֹהִים וְרַע אַחֲרַי תַּחַת הַבַּל כִּי הָרַגְנוּ קִין: כו וּלְשֵׁת גַּם־הוּא יֵלְד־בֵּן וַיִּקְרָא אֶת־שְׁמוֹ אֶנּוֹשׁ אֵז הוּחַל לְקָרָא בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה: ס

כש"י

כחיה, ואמר לאציו למשך צקשת וברגו, וכיון שידע שהוא קין זקנו, הכה כף אל כף וספק את בנו ציניהם וברגו, וכיו נשיו פורשות ממנו, והוא מפיסן: שמעון קולי. להשמע לי לתשמיש, וכי איש אשר הרגתי לפלעי הוא נכר, וכי אני פלעתי מזיד שיבא הפלע קרוי על שמי, וילד אשר הרגתי לחזורי נכר, כלומר על ידי חזורתי בתמייה, והלא שוגג אני ולא מזיד, לא זכו פלעי ולא זכו חזורתי: פצעו. מכת חרב אז חן, מקאדור"ה בלע"י: (כד) בי שבעתים יקם קין. קין שהרג מזיד נתלה לו עד שזעב דורות, אני שהרגתי שוגג לא כל שכן שיתלה לי שזעיות הרבה: שבעים ושבעה. לשון רצוי שזעיות אחז לו, כך דרש רבי תנחומא⁶. ומדרש בראשית רבה⁷, לא הרג למך כלום, ונשיו פורשות ממנו משקיימו פריה ורביה, לפי שגזרה גזרה לכלות זרעו של קין לאחר שזעב דורות, אמרו, מה אנו יולדות לזכרה, למחר המבול צא ושוטף את הכל, והוא אומר להן וכי איש הרגתי לפלעי, וכי אני הרגתי את הכל, שהיה איש צקומה וילד צשנים, שיבא זרעי כלה באותו עון, ומה קין שהרג נתלה לו שזעב דורות, אני שלא הרגתי לא כל שכן שיתלו לי שזעיות הרבה, וזה קל וחומר של שטות, אם כן אין הקדוש ברוך הוא גוצה את חובו ומקיים את דברו: (כה) וידע אדם וגו'. צא לו למך אלל אדם הראשון וקבל על נשיו, אמר להם, וכי עליכם לדקדק על גזירתו של מקום, אחס עשו מלאתכם והוא יעשה את שלו, אמרו לו קשוט עלמך תחלה, והלא פרשת מאשתיך זה מאה ושלושים שנה משנקסה מיתח על ידך, מיד וידע אדם וגו', ומה עוד, ללמד שנתוספה לו תאוה על תאוותו. צבראשית רבה⁸: (כו) אז הוחל. לשון חולין,

הענין שקיים הקצ"ה בצטתו, שאמר שזעתיים יוקם קין, ועמד למך לאחר שהוליד צנים ועשה דור שזעיו, וברג את קין, זה שאמר כי איש הרגתי לפלעי וגו': שתי נשים. כך היה דרכן של דור המבול, אחת לפריה ורביה ואחת לתשמיש, זו שיבא לתשמיש משקה כוס של עקרין (סא"א) כדי ששחקר, ומקושטת ככלה ומאכילה מעדנים, וחזרתה נזופה ואזלה כאלמנה, וזהו שפירש ח"ו¹ רועה עקרה לא תלד ואלמנה לא ייטיב, כמו שמפורש באגדת חלק: עדה. היא של פריה ורביה, על שם שמגונה עליו ומוסרת מאללו, נס"א ממאכלון עדה חרגום של סורה: צלה. היא של תשמיש, על שם שיושבת תמיד בללו, דברי אגדה הם צבראשית רבה²: (כ) אבי ישב אהל ומקנה. הוא היה הראשון לרועה צבמות צמדצרות, ויושב אהלים חדש כאן וחדש כאן צשביל מרעה לאנו, וכשכלה המרעה צמקום זה הולך ותוקע אהלו צמקום אחר. ומדרש אגדה צונה צחים לעבודת אלילים, כמה דאת אמר סמל הקנאה³ המקנה, וכן ואחיו תופש כנור ועוגב, לומר לעבודת אלילים: (כז) תובל קין. תיבל חומנתו של קין. תובל לשון תבלין, תיבל והתקין חומנתו של קין לעשותו כלי זיין לרוחאים: לוטש כל חרש נחשת וברזל. מחדד חומנות נחושת וברזל, כמו ילעושו עיניו ל⁴, חורש אינו לשון פועל צבגול אלא לשון פועל צזרי, שהרי נקוד קמץ קטן, וטעמו למטה, כלומר מחדד ומלחח כל כלי חומנות נחשת וברזל: בעמה. היא אשתו של נח, צבראשית רבה⁵: (כג) שמעון קולי. שהיו נשיו פורשות ממנו מתשמיש, לפי שהרג את קין ואת תובל קין בנו, שהיה למך סומא ותובל קין מושכו, וראה את קין ונדמה לו

CLASSIC QUESTIONS

● How did people come to worship idols? (v. 26)

RAMBAM: In the days of Enosh, people made a serious mistake, and the counsel of the wise people degenerated into foolishness....Their mistaken reasoning was that since God created the skies and spheres as part of nature, and placed them on high, giving them dignity, and since they (the skies and spheres) are servants who serve Him, it would be appropriate to laud, glorify and honor them. [They argued that] it is the will of the Almighty for man to make great and to dignify those who make God great and honor Him, in the same way that a king wants to honor the servants who serve him—such is the honor

of a king....This is the fundamental basis of idolatry....However, they did not deny the existence of God by saying that only such-and-such a star exists...

After some time, prophets of falsehood arose, and said that the Almighty had commanded them to serve such-and-such a star, to bring sacrifices to it, to offer libations to it and to build a temple containing its form, in order that all people—including women, children and ignoramuses—will be able to bow down to it. Each of these prophets made known a form which he had invented himself, and claimed that it was the form of such-and-such a star which had

1 כד, כא 2 כג, ב 3 יחזקאל ח, ג 4 איוב טו, ט 5 כג, ג 6 בראשית יא 7 כג, ד 8 כג, ח

bore Yaval. He was the father of nomadic cattle rearing. ²¹ His brother's name was Yuval. He was the father of those who play harp and flute (for idol worship). ²² Tzilah also gave birth, to Tuval-Kayin, who would sharpen all crafting tools for copper and iron (making weapons). Tuval-Kayin's sister was Na'amah.

SIXTH
READING

²³ Lemech (accidentally killed Kayin and Tuval-Kayin, and his wives separated from him. He) said to his wives, "Adah and Tzilah, listen to my voice (and accept me back)! Wives of Lemech, incline your ears to my words! (Did) I slay a man by wounding (him intentionally), or a child by hitting (him intentionally)?"

²⁴ If Kayin (who killed intentionally) was avenged after seven generations, then Lemech (who killed unintentionally) shall be (avenged after) seventy-seven (generations)!"

²⁵ Adam knew his wife again, and she bore a son. She named him Sheis, (saying), "For God has given ('shas') me another seed, instead of Hevel, for Kayin killed him." ²⁶ Sheis also fathered a son, and he named him Enosh.

Then, (God's Name) became profaned, by (people) calling (humans and idols) by the Name of God.

CLASSIC QUESTIONS

been made known to him in a prophecy. In this manner, people started to make figures in the temples, under trees and on the tops of mountains and hills, and they congregated and bowed down to them. The prophets said that it was a form which brought good and evil, and that it was fitting to serve and fear it. The prophets said that through this service one would multiply and be successful, and issued instructions concerning what may and may not be done. Other prophets of falsehood began to make themselves known, and said that the star itself, or a sphere or angel, had spoken to them about how to be served, and what may or may not be done. This matter, namely the worship of forms in different manners, the offering of sacrifices to them and the bowing down to them, became

propagated throughout the entire world. Due to the passage of time, the honored and fear-inducing Name was forgotten by all of nature, and was not recognized. Everybody, women and children included, knew only their forms of wood and stone, and the temples of stone, to which, from childhood, they had been educated to bow down, worship and take the name of for oaths. The wise people among them, such as the priests, imagined that there is no God, but only the stars and spheres, because of which they made representative figures. But as for the Creator, there was not a single person who recognized Him, except for various individuals, such as Chanoch, Mesushalach, Noach, Sheim and Aiver. Things continued in this manner until Avraham Avinu, pillar of the world, was born."

(Beginning of *Laws of Idol Worship*)

TORAS MENACHEM

🕯️ THE BEGINNINGS OF IDOL WORSHIP (v. 26)

Rambam describes the evolution of idolatry throughout the ages. But although very interesting to read, this passage would appear to belong better in a history book. *Rambam's Mishneh Torah* is a strictly halachic text (as *Rambam* himself writes in his introduction to the work) so we can presume that all the information conveyed here has a strong halachic connotation, which is crucial to an understanding of the prohibition of worshipping idols.

In addition, there are a number of difficulties with *Rambam's* description:

Rambam omits here the fact that *Adam HaRishon*, the first man, was commanded by God that neither he nor his descendants should worship idols (See above, p. 19, "The Last Word" to 2:16). How could he omit such a crucial point?

Furthermore, why does *Rambam* call idolatry a "mistake" ("In the days of *Enosh*, people made a serious mistake...Their mistaken reasoning was...")? Surely, this idol worship was much more than a mere "mistake"? It was a grave sin, a rebellion against God and an act of total heresy!

THE EXPLANATION

Rambam is teaching us here that idol worship, albeit a very practical prohibition, is based on a *philosophical* misjudgment, a "mistake." Therefore, in order that a person should not come to actually worship an

idol, it is insufficient for him to practice mere restraint. Rather, he must *understand* the false concepts on which idolatry is based.

Thus, he describes at length what the mistake actually was, why it is unfounded and how one mistake led to another. Only through understanding this mistake can a person have a firm basis that will protect him from the temptation to worship idols.

Consequently, it would have made no sense to mention that *Adam HaRishon* was commanded not to worship idols, for the whole purpose of this passage of *Rambam* is to teach us that first and foremost a person must come to the *logical* conclusion that God did not hand over any free choice to heavenly spheres, and that they are merely like "an axe in the hand of a lumberjack."

(Based on *Likutei Sichos* vol. 20, p.17ff)

🕯️ Sparks of Chasidus 🕯️

Chasidic teachings explain that not only is there no deity or power other than God, but in fact, there is *no true existence at all* besides God. The fact that we see a physical world is only due to our inability to see the Godly energy which enlivens it. In truth however, we are totally absorbed within the absolute oneness of God. (See *Derech Mitzvosecha*, *Mitzvas Achdus Havayah* ch. 3)

הוא את־יליד בַר וַקְרָא ית שְׁמִיה אֲנוּשׁ כִּכּוּן
 בְּיוֹמוֹהִי חָלוּ בְּנֵי אֲנָשָׁא מִלְּצִלָּאָה בְּשֵׁמַא דִּי:
 א דִּין סִפְר תּוֹלְדַת אָדָם בְּיוֹמָא דְבָרָא יִי אָדָם
 בְּדַמּוֹת אֱלֹהִים עֲבַד יְתִיה: ב דְּכַר וְנוֹקְבָא
 בְּרֵאנִין וּבְרִיד יְתֵהוּן וַקְרָא ית שְׁמֵהוּן אָדָם
 בְּיוֹמָא דְאֵתְּבְרִיאָו: ג וְחֵיא אָדָם מָאָה וּתְלַתִּין
 שָׁנִין וְאוֹלִיד בְּדַמּוֹתֵיה דְדַמֵּי לִיה וַקְרָא ית
 שְׁמִיה שַׁת: ד וְהוּו יוֹמֵי אָדָם כְּתַר דְּאוֹלִיד ית
 שַׁת תְּמַנֵּי מָאָה שָׁנִין וְאוֹלִיד בְּנִין וּבָנָן: ה וְהוּו
 כָּל יוֹמֵי אָדָם דְּחֵיא תְּשַׁע מָאָה וּתְלַתִּין שָׁנִין
 וּמִית: ו וְחֵיא שַׁת מָאָה וְחֲמִשׁ שָׁנִין וְאוֹלִיד ית
 אֲנוּשׁ: ז וְחֵיא שַׁת כְּתַר דְּאוֹלִיד ית אֲנוּשׁ
 תְּמַנֵּי מָאָה וְשִׁבְעַ שָׁנִין וְאוֹלִיד בְּנִין וּבָנָן:
 ח וְהוּו כָּל יוֹמֵי שַׁת תְּשַׁע מָאָה וְתַרְתֵּי עֶשְׂרֵי
 שָׁנִין וּמִית: ט וְחֵיא אֲנוּשׁ תְּשַׁעִּין שָׁנִין וְאוֹלִיד
 ית קִינָן: י וְחֵיא אֲנוּשׁ כְּתַר דְּאוֹלִיד ית קִינָן
 תְּמַנֵּי מָאָה וְחֲמִשׁ עֶשְׂרֵי שָׁנִין וְאוֹלִיד בְּנִין
 וּבָנָן: יא וְהוּו כָּל יוֹמֵי אֲנוּשׁ תְּשַׁע מָאָה וְחֲמִשׁ
 שָׁנִין וּמִית: יב וְחֵיא קִינָן שִׁבְעִין שָׁנִין וְאוֹלִיד
 ית מְהֻלְלָאֵל: יג וְחֵיא קִינָן כְּתַר דְּאוֹלִיד ית
 מְהֻלְלָאֵל תְּמַנֵּי מָאָה וְאַרְבַּעִין שָׁנִין וְאוֹלִיד
 בְּנִין וּבָנָן: יד וְהוּו כָּל יוֹמֵי קִינָן תְּשַׁע מָאָה
 וְעֶשְׂרָא שָׁנִין וּמִית: טו וְחֵיא מְהֻלְלָאֵל שְׁתֵּין
 וְחֲמִשׁ שָׁנִין וְאוֹלִיד ית יָרְד: טז וְחֵיא מְהֻלְלָאֵל
 כְּתַר דְּאוֹלִיד ית יָרְד תְּמַנֵּי מָאָה וּתְלַתִּין שָׁנִין
 וְאוֹלִיד בְּנִין וּבָנָן: יז וְהוּו כָּל יוֹמֵי מְהֻלְלָאֵל
 תְּמַנֵּי מָאָה וְתְשַׁעִּין וְחֲמִשׁ שָׁנִין וּמִית: יח וְחֵיא
 יָרְד מָאָה וְשְׁתֵּין וְתַרְתֵּין שָׁנִין וְאוֹלִיד ית
 חֲנוּךְ: יט וְחֵיא יָרְד כְּתַר דְּאוֹלִיד ית חֲנוּךְ תְּמַנֵּי
 מָאָה שָׁנִין וְאוֹלִיד בְּנִין וּבָנָן: כ וְהוּו כָּל יוֹמֵי
 יָרְד תְּשַׁע מָאָה וְשְׁתֵּין וְתַרְתֵּין שָׁנִין וּמִית:
 כא וְחֵיא חֲנוּךְ שְׁתֵּין וְחֲמִשׁ שָׁנִין וְאוֹלִיד ית
 מְתוּשֶׁלַח: כב וְחֵלִיף חֲנוּךְ בְּדַחְלָתָא דִּי כְּתַר
 דְּאוֹלִיד ית מְתוּשֶׁלַח תְּלַת מָאָה שָׁנִין וְאוֹלִיד
 בְּנִין וּבָנָן: כג וְהוּו כָּל יוֹמֵי חֲנוּךְ תְּלַת מָאָה
 וְשְׁתֵּין וְחֲמִשׁ שָׁנִין: כד וְחֵלִיף חֲנוּךְ בְּדַחְלָתָא
 דִּי וְלִיתוּהִי אָרִי (לֹא) אָמִית יְתִיה יִי:

ה א זֶה סֵפֶר תּוֹלְדֹת אָדָם בְּיוֹם בְּרָא אֱלֹהִים אָדָם בְּדַמּוֹת
 אֱלֹהִים עָשָׂה אֹתוֹ: ב זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה בְּרָאם וַיְבָרֶךְ אֹתָם וַיִּקְרָא
 אֶת־שֵׁמֶם אָדָם בְּיוֹם הַבְּרָאָם: ג וַיְחִי אָדָם שְׁלֹשִׁים וּמֵאֵת
 שָׁנָה וַיּוֹלֵד בְּדַמּוֹתוֹ בְּצִלְמוֹ וַיִּקְרָא אֶת־שְׁמוֹ שֵׁת: ד וַיְהִי
 יְמֵי־אָדָם אַחֲרֵי הוֹלִידוֹ אֶת־שֵׁת שְׁמֹנֶה מֵאֹת שָׁנָה וַיּוֹלֵד
 בָּנִים וּבָנוֹת: ה וַיְהִי כָּל־יְמֵי אָדָם אֲשֶׁר־חֵי תְשַׁע מֵאֹת שָׁנָה
 וּשְׁלֹשִׁים שָׁנָה וַיָּמָת: ו וַיְחִי־שֵׁת חֲמִשׁ שָׁנִים וּמֵאֵת שָׁנָה
 וַיּוֹלֵד אֶת־אֲנוּשׁ: ז וַיְחִי־שֵׁת אַחֲרֵי הוֹלִידוֹ אֶת־אֲנוּשׁ שִׁבְעַ
 שָׁנִים וּשְׁמֹנֶה מֵאֹת שָׁנָה וַיּוֹלֵד בָּנִים וּבָנוֹת: ח וַיְהִי כָּל־
 יְמֵי־שֵׁת שְׁתַּיִם עֶשְׂרֵה שָׁנָה וְתְשַׁע מֵאֹת שָׁנָה וַיָּמָת: ט וַיְחִי
 אֲנוּשׁ תְּשַׁעִּים שָׁנָה וַיּוֹלֵד אֶת־קִינָן: י וַיְחִי אֲנוּשׁ אַחֲרֵי הוֹלִידוֹ
 אֶת־קִינָן חֲמִשׁ עֶשְׂרֵה שָׁנָה וּשְׁמֹנֶה מֵאֹת שָׁנָה וַיּוֹלֵד בָּנִים
 וּבָנוֹת: יא וַיְהִי כָּל־יְמֵי אֲנוּשׁ חֲמִשׁ שָׁנִים וְתְשַׁע מֵאֹת שָׁנָה
 וַיָּמָת: ס יב וַיְחִי קִינָן שִׁבְעִים שָׁנָה וַיּוֹלֵד אֶת־מְהֻלְלָאֵל: יג וַיְחִי
 קִינָן אַחֲרֵי הוֹלִידוֹ אֶת־מְהֻלְלָאֵל אַרְבָּעִים שָׁנָה וּשְׁמֹנֶה מֵאֹת
 שָׁנָה וַיּוֹלֵד בָּנִים וּבָנוֹת: יד וַיְהִי כָּל־יְמֵי קִינָן עֶשֶׂר שָׁנִים
 וְתְשַׁע מֵאֹת שָׁנָה וַיָּמָת: טו וַיְחִי מְהֻלְלָאֵל חֲמִשׁ שָׁנִים
 וְשְׁשִׁים שָׁנָה וַיּוֹלֵד אֶת־יָרְד: טז וַיְחִי מְהֻלְלָאֵל אַחֲרֵי הוֹלִידוֹ
 אֶת־יָרְד שְׁלֹשִׁים שָׁנָה וּשְׁמֹנֶה מֵאֹת שָׁנָה וַיּוֹלֵד בָּנִים וּבָנוֹת:
 יז וַיְהִי כָּל־יְמֵי מְהֻלְלָאֵל חֲמִשׁ וְתְשַׁעִּים שָׁנָה וּשְׁמֹנֶה מֵאֹת
 שָׁנָה וַיָּמָת: ס יח וַיְחִי־יָרְד שְׁתַּיִם וְשְׁשִׁים שָׁנָה וּמֵאֵת שָׁנָה
 וַיּוֹלֵד אֶת־חֲנוּךְ: יט וַיְחִי־יָרְד אַחֲרֵי הוֹלִידוֹ אֶת־חֲנוּךְ שְׁמֹנֶה
 מֵאֹת שָׁנָה וַיּוֹלֵד בָּנִים וּבָנוֹת: כ וַיְהִי כָּל־יְמֵי־יָרְד שְׁתַּיִם
 וְשְׁשִׁים שָׁנָה וְתְשַׁע מֵאֹת שָׁנָה וַיָּמָת: ס כא וַיְחִי חֲנוּךְ חֲמִשׁ
 וְשְׁשִׁים שָׁנָה וַיּוֹלֵד אֶת־מְתוּשֶׁלַח: כב וַיְתַּהַלֵּךְ חֲנוּךְ אֶת־
 הָאֱלֹהִים אַחֲרֵי הוֹלִידוֹ אֶת־מְתוּשֶׁלַח שְׁלֹשׁ מֵאֹת שָׁנָה וַיּוֹלֵד
 בָּנִים וּבָנוֹת: כג וַיְהִי כָּל־יְמֵי חֲנוּךְ חֲמִשׁ וְשְׁשִׁים שָׁנָה וּשְׁלֹשׁ
 מֵאֹת שָׁנָה: כד וַיְתַּהַלֵּךְ חֲנוּךְ אֶת־הָאֱלֹהִים וַאֲיָנָנוּ כִּי־לָקַח

רש"י

לקרא את שמות האדם ואת שמות העצבים בשמו של הקצ"ב, לעשותן רגילים (ג) שלשים ומאת שנה. עד כאן פירש מן האשכ"ז (כד) ויתהלך חנוך. לדיק ולקרומון אלכות: (ה) זה ספר תולדות אדם. זו היא ספירת תולדות אדם, ומרדכי אגדה יש רצום: ביום ברא וגו'. מגיד שציוס שכרח כוליד:

🕎 THE OFFSPRING OF ADAM 🕎

5 **T**his is the account of Adam's offspring:
 On the day that God created man (he fathered children). He created him with a resemblance to God. ² He created them male and female, and He blessed them. He named them man (Adam) on the day they were created.

³ Adam lived one hundred and thirty years, and he fathered (a son) resembling him and with his form, and he named him Sheis. ⁴ After he had fathered Sheis, Adam lived for eight hundred years and he fathered sons and daughters. ⁵ Adam lived a total of nine hundred and thirty years, and he died.

⁶ Sheis lived one hundred and five years, and then he fathered Enosh. ⁷ After he had fathered Enosh, Sheis lived eight hundred and seven years, and he fathered sons and daughters. ⁸ Sheis lived a total of nine hundred and twelve years, and he died.

⁹ Enosh lived ninety years, and then he fathered Keinan. ¹⁰ After he had fathered Keinan, Enosh lived eight hundred and fifteen years, and he fathered sons and daughters. ¹¹ Enosh lived a total of nine hundred and five years, and he died.

¹² Keinan lived seventy years, and then he fathered Mahalaleil. ¹³ After he had fathered Mahalaleil, Keinan lived eight hundred and forty years, and he fathered sons and daughters. ¹⁴ Keinan lived a total of nine hundred and ten years, and he died.

¹⁵ Mahalaleil lived sixty-five years, and then he fathered Yared. ¹⁶ After he had fathered Yared, Mahalaleil lived eight hundred and thirty years, and he fathered sons and daughters. ¹⁷ Mahalaleil lived a total of eight hundred and ninety-five years, and he died.

¹⁸ Yared lived one hundred and sixty-two years, and then he fathered Chanoch. ¹⁹ After he had fathered Chanoch, Yared lived eight hundred years, and he fathered sons and daughters. ²⁰ Yared lived a total of nine hundred and sixty-two years, and he died.

²¹ Chanoch lived sixty-five years, and he fathered Mesushalach. ²² After he had fathered Mesushalach, Chanoch followed God for three hundred years, and he fathered sons and daughters. ²³ Chanoch lived a total of three hundred and sixty-five years. ²⁴ Chanoch followed God (but he could easily be misled, so

TORAS MENACHEM

🕎 Sparks of Chasidus 🕎

The "Generations of man" are all descended from Adam's son Sheis, whereas the descendants of Kayin died out (*Rashi* 4:24). Sheis thus represents man's quality of building and propagating the world (*tikun*). Kayin on the other hand, is indicative of man's tendency to struggle within himself, toiling with his own darker side in a search for personal perfection (*tohu*). Sheis was world-orientated; Kayin was self-orientated.

Which is the correct approach?

Presumably, Sheis was correct, since we see that the descendants of Sheis prevailed whereas those of Kayin did not (See *Rashi* to 4:24).

However, the outward, world-orientated approach of Sheis was not entirely correct. For even a person whose goals are to cultivate the world around him still needs to strive for personal perfection in his own life. His worldliness needs to be tempered with inwardness; his productivity coupled with piety.

So, even Sheis—the pioneer of all civilization—had a descendent, Chanoch, who was a total isolationist. In fact Chanoch was so detached from the world that he would have become corrupted with the slightest exposure to humanity, so God acted mercifully and took him away before his time (See *Rashi* to v. 24). And yet he was a descendent of Sheis, the founder of humanity!

But this, precisely, is the point. The quality of Sheis within us—the outwardness and the ambition—should harbor within it the quality of Chanoch—inwardness and piety. We should study Torah expansively, aiming to acquire vast amounts of knowledge, but at least occasionally we should study Torah without any ulterior motive at all. We should observe the *mitzvos* to make ourselves better people, but sometimes we should do a *mitzvah* simply because it is God's will. In that way, we ensure that the Sheis within us gives birth to the occasional Chanoch.

(Based on *Likutei Sichos* vol. 35, p. 7ff.)

כה וַתָּיָא מְתוּשֶׁלַח מֵאָה וַתִּמְנִין וּשְׁבַע שָׁנִין
 וְאוֹלִיד יֵת לָמֶךְ: כו וַתָּיָא מְתוּשֶׁלַח בְּתֵר
 דְּאוֹלִיד יֵת לָמֶךְ שְׁבַע מֵאָה וַתִּמְנִין וַתִּרְתִּין
 שָׁנִין וְאוֹלִיד בְּנִין וּבָנָן: כז וַהֲוּוּ כָּל יוֹמֵי
 מְתוּשֶׁלַח תְּשַׁע מֵאָה וְשֵׁתִין וַתִּשַׁע שָׁנִין
 וּמִיֵּת: כח וַתָּיָא לָמֶךְ מֵאָה וַתִּמְנִין וַתִּרְתִּין
 שָׁנִין וְאוֹלִיד בָּר: כט וַקְרָא יֵת שְׁמִיָּה נַח
 לְמִימְר דִּין וְנַחֲמַנְנָא מְעוּבְדָּנָא וּמְלֵאוֹת יְדָנָא
 מִן אֲרַעָא דִּי לְמִטָּה יֵי: ל וַתָּיָא לָמֶךְ בְּתֵר
 דְּאוֹלִיד יֵת נַח חֲמֵשׁ מֵאָה וַתִּשַׁעִין וַחֲמֵשׁ
 שָׁנִין וְאוֹלִיד בְּנִין וּבָנָן: לא וַהֲוּוּ כָּל יוֹמֵי לָמֶךְ
 שְׁבַע מֵאָה וּשְׁבַעִין וּשְׁבַע שָׁנִין וּמִיֵּת:
 לב וַהֲוּוּ נַח בֵּר חֲמֵשׁ מֵאָה שָׁנִין וְאוֹלִיד נַח יֵת
 שֵׁם יֵת חָם וַיֵּת יֵפֶת: * וַהֲוּוּ כָּד שְׂרִיאֻוּ בְנֵי
 אֲנָשָׁא לְמַסְגִּי עַל אֲפִי אֲרַעָא וּבְנָתָא אֲתִילִידוּ
 לָהֻן: * וַהֲוּוּ בְנֵי רִבְרֵבְיָא יֵת בְּנַת אֲנָשָׁא אַרִי
 שְׁפִירָו אַנְיִן וְנִסְבִּיבוּ לָהֻן נָשִׁין מִכָּל דִּי
 אֲתִרְעִיאֻוּ: * וַאֲמַר יֵי לֹא יִתְקִים דְּרָא בִישָׂא
 הַדִּין קְדָמִי לְעֵלָם כְּדִיל דְּאֲנֻן בִּשְׂרָא
 וְעוּבְדִיהֻן בִּישָׂא אֲרַכָּא יְהִיבַת לָהֻן מֵאָה
 וְעֶשְׂרִין שָׁנִין אִם יִתּוּבוּ: * וּגְבַרְיָא הֻוּוּ
 בְּאֲרַעָא בְּיוֹמֵיָא הָאֲנֻן וְאַף בְּתֵר כֵּן דִּי יַעֲלוּן
 בְּנֵי רִבְרֵבְיָא לְבַת אֲנָשָׁא וַיִּלְדִין לָהֻן אַנְיֻן
 וּגְבַרְיָא דְּמַעֲלָמָא אֲנָשִׁין דְּשָׂמָא: * וַתּוֹא יֵי
 אַרִי סְגִיאַת בִּישַׁת אֲנָשָׁא בְּאֲרַעָא וְכָל יַעֲרָא
 מִחֻשְׁבַּת לְבִיָּה לְחוּד בִּישׁ כָּל יוֹמֵיָא: * וַתּב יֵי
 בְּמִימְרִיָּה אַרִי עֵבֵד יֵת אָדָם בְּאֲרַעָא וַאֲמַר
 בְּמִימְרִיָּה לְמַתְבֵּר תִּקְפְּהֻן כְּרַעוּתִיָּה:
 * וַאֲמַר יֵי אֲמַחִי יֵת אֲנָשָׁא דִּי בְרֵאתִי מֵעַל אֲפִי

אֲתוּ אֱלֹהִים: * [שביעי] כה וַיְחִי מְתוּשֶׁלַח שְׁבַע וּשְׁמֹנִים שָׁנָה
 וּמֵאֵת שָׁנָה וַיּוֹלֵד אֶת־לָמֶךְ: כו וַיְחִי מְתוּשֶׁלַח אַחֲרֵי הוֹלִידוֹ
 אֶת־לָמֶךְ שְׁתַּיִם וּשְׁמוֹנִים שָׁנָה וּשְׁבַע מֵאוֹת שָׁנָה וַיּוֹלֵד בָּנִים
 וּבָנוֹת: כז וַיְהִי כָּל־יְמֵי מְתוּשֶׁלַח תְּשַׁע וּשְׁשִׁים שָׁנָה וַתִּשַׁע
 מֵאוֹת שָׁנָה וַיָּמָת: * כח וַיְחִי־לָמֶךְ שְׁתַּיִם וּשְׁמֹנִים שָׁנָה וּמֵאֵת
 שָׁנָה וַיּוֹלֵד בָּן: * כט וַיִּקְרָא אֶת־שְׁמוֹ נַח לֵאמֹר *זֶה יִנְחַמְנוּ
 מִמַּעַשְׁנוֹ וּמִעַצְבוֹן יְדִינוֹ מִן־הָאָדָמָה אֲשֶׁר אֲרַרְתִּי יְהוָה:
 * ל וַיְחִי־לָמֶךְ אַחֲרֵי הוֹלִידוֹ אֶת־נַח חֲמֵשׁ וַתִּשַׁעִים שָׁנָה וַחֲמֵשׁ
 מֵאֵת שָׁנָה וַיּוֹלֵד בָּנִים וּבָנוֹת: * לא וַיְהִי כָּל־יְמֵי־לָמֶךְ שְׁבַע
 וּשְׁבַעִים שָׁנָה וּשְׁבַע מֵאוֹת שָׁנָה וַיָּמָת: * ס לב וַיְהִי־נַח בֶּן־חֲמֵשׁ
 מֵאוֹת שָׁנָה וַיּוֹלֵד נַח אֶת־שֵׁם אֶת־חָם וְאֶת־יֵפֶת: * ו * וַיְהִי
 כִּי־הִחַל הָאָדָם לָרֵב עַל־פְּנֵי הָאָדָמָה וּבָנוֹת יָלְדוּ לָהֶם:
 * ג וַיִּרְאוּ בְנֵי־הָאֱלֹהִים אֶת־בָּנוֹת הָאָדָם כִּי טֹבֹת הֵנָּה וַיִּקְחוּ
 לָהֶם נָשִׁים מִכָּל אֲשֶׁר בָּחָרוּ: * ג וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה לֹא־יִדְוֹן רוּחִי
 בָּאָדָם לְעֵלָם בְּשָׁגֶם: * * הוּא בָּשָׂר וְהָיָו יָמָיו מֵאָה וְעֶשְׂרִים שָׁנָה:
 * ד הַנְּפֹלִים הָיוּ בָּאָרֶץ בֵּימֵי־הָהֵם וְגַם אַחֲרֵי־כֵן אֲשֶׁר יָבֹאוּ
 בְּנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים אֶל־בָּנוֹת הָאָדָם וַיִּלְדוּ לָהֶם הַמָּה הַגְּבֵרִים אֲשֶׁר
 מַעֲוֹלָם אֲנָשֵׁי הַשָּׁמַיִם: * פ [מפסיר] ה וַיִּרְא יְהוָה כִּי רַבָּה רָעַת הָאָדָם
 בָּאָרֶץ וְכָל־יֶעָר מַחֲשַׁבַת לְבֹו רַק רַע כָּל־הַיּוֹם: * ו וַיִּנְחַם יְהוָה
 כִּי־עָשָׂה אֶת־הָאָדָם בָּאָרֶץ וַיִּתְּעַצֵּב אֶל־לְבָבוֹ: * ז וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה

*הקורא יטעים הגריש לפני התלישא **ס"א בשגם

כ"ט

לעתיד, וכן לפני מתן תורה: את שם את חם ואת יפת. והלא יפת הגדול הוא, אלא צחחלכ אחכ דורש את שהוא לדיק, ונולד כשהוא מכול, ושצרכס ילא ממנו וכו'. צבראשית רבה: (3) בני האלהים. בני השמים והשופטים. דבר אחר בני האלכיס, הם השמים ההולכים בשליחותו של מקום, אף הם היו מתערבים בהם. כל אלכיס שבמקרא לשון מרות, וזה יוכיח ואתה תכיר לו לאלכיס⁶, ראה נחתיק אלכיס: בי טבת הנה. אמר רבי יודן עבת כתיב, כשהיו מטיבין אותה מקושטת ליכנס לחופה, היה גדול נכנס וצועלה תחלה⁷: מכל אשר בחרו. אף צעולת צעל, אף הזכר והצמחה⁸: (ג) לא ידון רוחי באדם. לא יתרעם ויריב רוחי עלי צעזיל האדם: לעולם. לאורך ימים, הנה רוחי נדון בקרבני אס להשמית ואס לרחס, לא יכיר מדון זה צרוחי לעולם, כלומר לאורך ימים: בשגם הוא בשר. כמו צגסם צסגו'ל, כלומר צעזיל שגס זאת זו שהוא צסר, ואף על פי כן אינו נכעס לפני, ומה אס יכיר אס או דבר קסה. כיוולא צו עד טקמטי דצורה¹⁰, כמו טקמטי, וכן¹⁰ טקסה

היה, וקל (ס"א וקצל) צדעתו לשזב להרשיע, לפיכך מיכר הקצ"ח וסילקו והמיתו קודם זמנו¹, וזכו שטינה הכחוצ צמיתתו לכחוצ ואינו צעולס למלאות שנותיו: כי לקח אותו. לפני זמנו, כמו הנני לוקח ממך את מחמד עיניך²: (כה) ויולד בן. שממנו נצנה העולם: (כט) זה ינחמנו. ינה ממנו את עצבו ודינו, עד שלא צא נח לא היה להם כלי מחרישה, וכוא הכין להם, וכיחה הארץ מויליאה קוליס ודרררים כשזרעים חטים, מקללתו של אדם הראשון, וצימי נח נחה, וזכו ינחמנו. ואס לא תפרשהו כד, אין טעם הלשון נופל על השם, ואתה לריך לקרות שמו מנחס: (ל3) בן חמש מאות שנה. אמר רבי יודן, מה טעם כל הדורות הולידו למאה שנה זה לחמש מאות, אמר הקצ"ח, אס רשעים הם, יאצדו צמים ורע (ס"א רע של לדיק זה) ללדיק זה, ואס לדיקים הם, אטריח עליו לעשות תיבות הרצה, כצס את מעיינו ולא הוליד עד חמש מאות שנה, כדי שלא יכא יפת הגדול צצצניו ראוי לעושנין לפני המצול³, דכתיב כי הנער צן מאה שנה ימות⁴, ראוי לעוש

1 ב"ד כה, א 2 יחזקאל כד, כו 3 ב"ד כו, ב 4 ישעי' סה, כ 5 כו, ג 6 שמות ד, טז 7 שם ז, א 8 ב"ד כו, ה 9 ב"ד שם 10 שופטים ה, ז * 10 שם ו, י"ד

אָרְעָא מֵאַנְשָׁא וְעַד בְּעִירָא עַד רִיחֶשָׁא וְעַד
 עוֹפָא דְשָׁמַיָא אֲרִי תְּבִית בְּמִימְרֵי אֲרִי
 עֲבַדְתָּנוּ: ה וְנָח אֲשַׁבַּח רַחֲמֵי קָדְשׁ יי: פ פ פ

אָמְחָה אֶת־הָאָדָם אֲשֶׁר־בָּרָאתִי מֵעַל פְּנֵי הָאָרֶץ מֵאָדָם
 עַד־בְּהֵמָה עַד־רֶמֶשׂ וְעַד־עוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם כִּי נִחַמְתִּי כִּי עָשִׂיתֶם:
 ה וְנָח מִצָּא הֵן בְּעֵינַי יְהוָה: פ פ פ

קמ"ו פסוקים, אמצו"ה סימן. יחזקיה"ו סימן.

כ"ש"י

העתידים לעמוד מהם: (f) ויאמר ה' אמחה את האדם. הוא עפר, ואזיא עליו מים ואמחה אותו, לכך נאמר לשון מחוי: מאדם עד בהמה. אף הם השחיתו דרכם! דבר אחר, הכל נצרא בשביל האדם, וכיון שהוא כלה מה נורח באלו? כי נחמתי כי עשיתם. חשבתי מה לעשות על אשר עשיתם: חסלת פרשת בראשית

שקצ"ה רואה את הנוגד, אמר לו הן, אמר לו והא כתיב ויתעלז אל לבו, אמר לו וולד לך בן זכר מימך, אמר לו הן, אמר לו ומה עשית, אמר לו שמחתי ושימחתי את הכל, אמר לו ולא היית יודע שסופו למות, אמר לו בשעת חדותא חדותא בשעת אכלא אכלא. אמר לו כך מעשה הקצ"ה, אף על פי שגלוי לפניו שסופו לחטוא ולאצדן, לא נמנע מלצדאן, בשביל הדיקים

TORAS MENACHEM

🔗 GOD'S DECREE AGAINST MANKIND (v. 7)

Onkelos renders a straightforward translation of verse 7: "God said, "I will obliterate (אָמְחָה) man from the face of the earth... because I regret (נִחַמְתִּי) the fact that I created him."

Rashi, however, appears to offer a non-literal translation, "I will wash away man from the face of the earth... because I have been reckoning what to do about the fact that I created him."

Why did *Rashi* not render אָמְחָה as "I will obliterate," as it is usually translated, and נִחַמְתִּי as "I regret"?

THE EXPLANATION

If one translates verse 7 literally (like *Onkelos*), that God planned to obliterate mankind, one will immediately be struck that reality testifies otherwise. Since we are still here to read the story, and there is no evidence that God retracted His plan, it is inconceivable that He actually intended to destroy mankind. Furthermore, in the very next verse we read that, "Noah found favor in the eyes of God," which introduces us to the following account of how Noah and his family were saved by God. Obviously then, God did not decide to "obliterate" mankind.

Therefore, *Rashi* came to the conclusion that in our verse אָמְחָה could not be understood in its usual translation (obliterate), but rather, it is to be rendered, "I will wash away." I.e. God decreed that He would bring a flood upon mankind, but this did not preclude the possibility of individuals being saved in the ark.

Similarly, *Rashi* rejected the interpretation that God regretted creating man, as we see that He did indeed allow man's existence to continue through Noah and his family. Therefore, *Rashi* was forced to adopt a slightly unusual translation, "I have been reckoning what to do about the fact that I created him."

DID GOD CHANGE HIS MIND?

One problem with this explanation is that it appears to contradict an earlier comment of *Rashi*. On verse 6, *Rashi* writes (in his second interpretation), "God's thoughts of mercy were transformed to judgment," from which it appears that God indeed regretted creating man. How does this correlate with *Rashi's* stance, as explained above, that God could not possibly have regretted making man since we see that man continues to exist?

⁷ God said, “I will wash away man, whom I created, from upon the face of the earth, man as well as cattle, creeping things and birds of the skies, for I have reckoned (what to do) about (the fact that) I made them.”

⁸ But Noach found favor in the eyes of God.

THE HAFTARAH FOR BEREISHIS IS ON PAGE 368. THE HAFTARAH FOR EREV ROSH CHODESH IS ON PAGE 394.

TORAS MENACHEM

The solution to this problem lies in the distinction between Divine “thought,” and Divine “speech.” In verse 6, “God’s *thoughts* of mercy were transformed to judgment,” i.e. He did indeed regret making man, but only in thought. However, in verse 7, “God *said*, ‘I will wash away man *etc.*’ From this we see that God was indeed harboring some regret to Himself (in “thought”) about creating man, but when He finally issued His decree in “speech,” the harshness of the plan was softened to

exclude those who would be saved in the Ark, from which mankind could be reconstructed.

This begs the question: what finally caused God to soften his decree?

This point is answered by the end of the verse itself, “because I have been reckoning what to do about the fact that *I created him.*” I.e. the fact that man was created by God Himself (“I created him”), eventually led God to have mercy on His own handiwork.

(Based on *Likutei Sichos* vol. 15, p. 27ff.)

🌀 The Last Word 🌀

From God’s reaction to the corruption of mankind, we can learn two powerful lessons in everyday life:

a.) *God thought about destroying mankind, but He only issued His decree verbally after He had softened His anger.* This teaches us how important it is to speak positively about other people. If God himself refrained from committing negative thoughts to speech, then all the more so should we be careful not to speak badly about others.

Our Sages taught that *Lashon Hara* (gossip) harms 1.) The gossiper, 2.) The listener and 3.) The one about whom the gossip is spoken (see *Arachin* 15b). Now it is easy to understand why the gossiper and listener suffer, since they participated in the sin. But why should the *subject* of the gossip suffer? After all, he was not even present at the time!

The answer lies in the fact that speech is a *revelation* of something that was previously hidden (in thought). Therefore, by speaking badly about another person it actually causes that person’s bad traits to be

more pronounced in the world, which could lead him to be the subject of a heavenly decree of punishment. Thus, it is bad *speech* that can harm another (and not thoughts, that remain hidden), which teaches us how careful a person should be with the words he utters about another.

b.) *God “reckoned” what to do with man, but He did not come to any firm resolution, even in thought.* This teaches us that even when we see a person do something bad, we should not come to any firm conclusion about the merit of his actions, even in thought (and certainly not in speech). For if God, who is all-knowing and never makes mistakes, still took time to “ponder” and “reckon” His harsh thoughts about man, then we, who are capable of easily misjudging another, should certainly not condemn another even in thought. Rather, we should always endeavor to “judge every person favorably” (*Avos* 1:5).

(Based on *Likutei Sichos* vol. 15, p. 31ff.)



Parshas Bereishis contains 1 positive *mitzvah*.

1. To be fruitful and multiply [1:28]



Haftaros

הַפְּטָרוֹת

🌀 BLESSINGS ON READING THE HAFTARAH 🌀

The person who was called up for *Maftir* says the following before reading the *Haftarah*:

בְּרוּךְ אַתָּה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ מֶלֶךְ הָעוֹלָם אֲשֶׁר בָּחַר
בְּנְבִיאִים טוֹבִים וְרָצָה בְּדְבָרֵיהֶם הַנְּאֻמִּים
בְּאַמַּת בְּרוּךְ אַתָּה יְהוָה הַבוֹחֵר בַּתּוֹרָה וּבַמִּשְׁנָה
עַבְדּוֹ וּבִישְׂרָאֵל עַמּוֹ וּבְנְבִיאֵי הָאֱמֶת וְצַדִּיק:

After the *Haftarah* the following blessings are recited:

בְּרוּךְ אַתָּה יי, אֱלֹהֵינוּ מֶלֶךְ הָעוֹלָם, צוֹר כָּל
הָעוֹלָמִים, צַדִּיק בְּכָל הַדּוֹרוֹת, הָאֵל הַנְּאֻמָּן
הָאֹמֵר וַעֲשֵׂה, הַמְדַבֵּר וּמְקַיֵּם, שְׁכַל דְּבָרָיו אֱמֶת וְצַדִּיק:
נְאֻמָּן אַתָּה הוּא יי אֱלֹהֵינוּ, וְנְאֻמָּנִים דְּבָרֶיךָ, וְדָבַר
אֶחָד מִדְּבָרֶיךָ אַחֲזוֹר לֹא יִשׁוּב רִיקָם, כִּי אֵל
מֶלֶךְ נְאֻמָּן וְרַחֲמָן אַתָּה. בְּרוּךְ אַתָּה יי, הָאֵל הַנְּאֻמָּן
בְּכָל דְּבָרָיו:

רַחֵם עַל צִיּוֹן כִּי הִיא בֵּית תְּהִינּוּ, וְלַעֲלוּבַת נַפְשׁ
תּוֹשִׁיעַ וְתִשְׁמַח בְּמַהֲרָה בְּיַמֵּינוּ. בְּרוּךְ אַתָּה יי,
מְשַׁמֵּחַ צִיּוֹן בְּבִנְיָהּ:

שְׂמֵחָנוּ, יי אֱלֹהֵינוּ, בְּאַלְיָהוּ הַנְּבִיא עַבְדְּךָ, וּבְמַלְכוּת
בֵּית דָּוִד מְשִׁיחְךָ, בְּמַהֲרָה יָבֹא וַיְגַל לְבַנּוֹ,
עַל כְּסֹאוֹ לֹא יֵשֵׁב זָר, וְלֹא יִנְחֲלוּ עוֹד אַחֲרָיִם אֶת
כְּבוֹדוֹ, כִּי בְשֵׁם קֹדֶשְׁךָ נִשְׁבַּעְתָּ לוֹ, שְׁלֹא יִכְבֶּה נֵרוֹ
לְעוֹלָם וָעֶד. בְּרוּךְ אַתָּה יי, מִגֵּן דָּוִד:

On fast days end here. On Shabbos (including Shabbos Chol HaMo'ed) continue°:

עַל הַתּוֹרָה וְעַל הָעֲבוּדָה וְעַל הַנְּבִיאִים וְעַל
יוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת הַזֶּה, שְׁנַתַּת לָנוּ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ לְקֹדֶשׁה
וּלְמִנוּחָה, לְכָבוֹד וּלְתַפְאֶרֶת:

עַל הַכֹּל, יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֲנַחְנוּ מוֹדִים לָךְ וּמְבָרְכִים אוֹתְךָ,
יְתַבְרַךְ שְׁמֶךָ בְּפִי כָל חַי תָּמִיד לְעוֹלָם וָעֶד. בְּרוּךְ

אַתָּה יְיָ, מְקַדֵּשׁ הַשַּׁבָּת (On Shabbos Chol HaMo'ed Succos add — וְיִשְׂרָאֵל וְהַזְּמַנִּים):

°On a Festival, and Shabbos that coincides with a Festival continue here:

עַל הַתּוֹרָה וְעַל הָעֲבוּדָה וְעַל הַנְּבִיאִים (On Shabbos) —וְעַל יוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת הַזֶּה) וְעַל יוֹם

Shemini Atzeres / Simchas Torah	Succos	Shavuos	Pesach
שְׁמִינִי עֲצַרַת הַחֹג	חֹג הַסּוּכּוֹת	חֹג הַשָּׁבוּעוֹת	חֹג הַמִּצּוֹת

הַזֶּה, וְעַל-יוֹם טוֹב מְקַרָּא קֹדֶשׁ הַזֶּה, שְׁנַתַּת לָנוּ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ (On Shabbos) —לְקֹדֶשׁה
וּלְמִנוּחָה) לְשִׁשּׁוֹן וּלְשִׂמְחָה, לְכָבוֹד וּלְתַפְאֶרֶת. עַל הַכֹּל, יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֲנַחְנוּ
מוֹדִים לָךְ וּמְבָרְכִים אוֹתְךָ, יְתַבְרַךְ שְׁמֶךָ בְּפִי כָל חַי תָּמִיד לְעוֹלָם וָעֶד. בְּרוּךְ
אַתָּה יְיָ, מְקַדֵּשׁ (On Shabbos) —הַשַּׁבָּת וְיִשְׂרָאֵל וְהַזְּמַנִּים:

°On Rosh Hashanah continue here:

עַל הַתּוֹרָה וְעַל הָעֲבוּדָה וְעַל הַנְּבִיאִים (On Shabbos) —וְעַל יוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת הַזֶּה) וְעַל יוֹם
הַזְּכוּרֹן הַזֶּה, וְעַל-יוֹם טוֹב מְקַרָּא קֹדֶשׁ הַזֶּה, שְׁנַתַּת לָנוּ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ (On Shabbos) —
לְקֹדֶשׁה וּלְמִנוּחָה) לְכָבוֹד וּלְתַפְאֶרֶת. עַל הַכֹּל, יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֲנַחְנוּ מוֹדִים לָךְ,
וּמְבָרְכִים אוֹתְךָ, יְתַבְרַךְ שְׁמֶךָ בְּפִי כָל חַי תָּמִיד לְעוֹלָם וָעֶד, וּדְבַרְךָ מְלַבְּנוּ
אִמַּת וְקַיָּים לְעֵד. בְּרוּךְ אַתָּה יְיָ, מְלַךְ עַל כָּל הָאָרֶץ, מְקַדֵּשׁ (On Shabbos) —הַשַּׁבָּת
וְיִשְׂרָאֵל וְיוֹם הַזְּכוּרֹן:

°On Yom Kippur continue here:

עַל הַתּוֹרָה וְעַל הָעֲבוּדָה וְעַל הַנְּבִיאִים (On Shabbos) —וְעַל יוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת הַזֶּה) וְעַל יוֹם
הַכַּפּוּרִים הַזֶּה, וְעַל-יוֹם סְלִיחַת הָעוֹן הַזֶּה, וְעַל יוֹם מְקַרָּא קֹדֶשׁ הַזֶּה, שְׁנַתַּת
לָנוּ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ (On Shabbos) —לְקֹדֶשׁה וּלְמִנוּחָה) לְסְלִיחָה וּלְמַחִילָה וּלְכַפְּרָה, לְכָבוֹד
וּלְתַפְאֶרֶת. עַל הַכֹּל יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ, אֲנַחְנוּ מוֹדִים לָךְ וּמְבָרְכִים אוֹתְךָ, יְתַבְרַךְ
שְׁמֶךָ בְּפִי כָל חַי תָּמִיד לְעוֹלָם וָעֶד, וּדְבַרְךָ מְלַבְּנוּ אִמַּת וְקַיָּים לְעֵד. בְּרוּךְ
אַתָּה יְיָ, מְלַךְ מוֹחֵל וְסוֹלֵחַ לְעוֹנוֹתֵינוּ, וְלְעוֹנוֹת עַמּוֹ בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל, וּמַעֲבִיר
אֲשָׁמוֹתֵינוּ בְּכָל שָׁנָה וְשָׁנָה, מְלַךְ עַל כָּל הָאָרֶץ, מְקַדֵּשׁ (On Shabbos) —הַשַּׁבָּת
וְיִשְׂרָאֵל וְיוֹם הַכַּפּוּרִים:

BEREISHIS / בראשית

(Isaiah 42:5 – 43:10)

מב ה כה־אמר האל | יהוה בורא השמים וְנוֹמֵיהֶם
 רַקַּע הָאָרֶץ וַיַּצְאֶצְאֶיהָ נָתַן נְשִׁמָּה לָעֵם עָלֶיהָ וְרוּחַ
 לְהִלְבֵּים בָּהּ: וְאֲנִי יְהוָה קְרָאתִיךָ בְּצַדֶּק וְאַחֲזֶק
 בְּיָדְךָ וְאַעֲרֹךְ וְאַתְנַדֶּה לְבָרִית עִם לְאוּרִי גּוֹיִם: לְפָקֶחַ
 עֵינַיִם עוֹרוֹת לְהוֹצִיא מִמְּסַגֵּר אֶסְפִּיר מִבַּיִת כִּלְאֵי
 יוֹשְׁבֵי חֹשֶׁךְ: אֲנִי יְהוָה הוּא שְׁמִי וּכְבוֹדִי לְאַחֵר
 לֹא־אֶתֵּן וְתַהֲלֹתֵי לְפָסִילִים: הֲרֵאשְׁנוֹת הִנְהַבְּאוּ
 וְחַדְשׁוֹת אֲנִי מְגִיד בְּטַרְס תַּצְמַחְנָה אֲשַׁמְיעַ אֶתְכֶם:
 שִׁירוּ לַיהוָה שִׁיר חֲדָשׁ תַּהֲלֹתוֹ מִקְצֵה הָאָרֶץ
 יוֹרְדֵי הַיָּם וּמְלֹאוּ אַיִים וַיִּשְׁבִּיהֶם: יִשְׂאוּ מִדְּבַר
 וְעָרְוּ חֲצֵרִים תִּשָּׁב קֶדֶר יִרְנֹו יוֹשְׁבֵי סֹלַע מִרֵּאשׁ
 הָרִים יִצְחֹו: יִשְׂיֻמוּ לַיהוָה כְּבוֹד וְתַהֲלֹתוֹ בְּאַיִים
 יִגִּידוּ: יְהוָה בְּגִבּוֹר יֵצֵא כְּאִישׁ מִלְחָמוֹת יַעִיר
 קִנְאָה יִרְיַע אֶפְי־יַעֲרִיחַ עַל־אֵיבָיו יִתְנַבֵּר:
 הַחֲשִׁיתִי מֵעוֹלָם אַחֲרִישׁ אֶתְאַפֵּק כִּי־לֹדָה אֶפְעֶה
 אֲשֶׁם וְאֶשְׂאֵף יַחַד: אַחֲרִיב הָרִים וְגִבְעוֹת

42:5 **T**his was said by the Almighty God, Who Created the heavens and stretched them out (like a tent), Who laid out the earth and made (all types of vegetation) grow from it, Who gives a soul to the people upon it, and a spirit to the (other creatures) who walk upon it:

God is Creator

⁶ "I am God. (What) I have said about you, (Mashiach, through the prophets,) is true (and everlasting)! I will hold your hand (to help you overcome every obstacle). I will guard you, and give you (the might to bring) the covenant of (Torah to My) people, (in order) to enlighten the (eyes of the) nations (about God), ⁷ to (open) eyes that have blinded (themselves not to see the work of God), to release (the Jewish people—who are) prisoners—from (their) captivity, and those who dwell in darkness from (their) imprisonment.

Mashiach will open eyes of the blind

⁸ "I am God—that is My Name. I will no (longer allow the nations to diminish) My honor (by worshiping) other (gods, as they have done until now! No longer will graven images (be given) My praise."

⁹ The first (prophecies which I prophesized about Sanchairiv) have (already) occurred. I (will) tell (you) new ones (about the final redemption). I will (now) let you hear (what is going to happen) before (these events) unfold:

¹⁰ (When the Final Redemption comes, they will) sing a new song to God, and His praise (will be heard) from

Song of the Final Redemption

the ends of the earth. Those who navigate the seas, and (the creatures that live) in it (will praise God. Even) the islands (themselves) and their inhabitants (will praise God. ¹¹ The whole) desert, together with its cities and villages (which are) inhabited by (the people of) Kedar, will raise (their voices in song). Those who live on stone peaks will sing—shouts (of joy will be heard) from the mountaintops. ¹² (With their mouths) they will ascribe glory to God, and they will tell of His praises in the islands.

¹³ God will go out (to rescue the Jewish people), aroused with zeal (for His people) like a man of war. He will shout and cry out against His enemies, and He will overcome (them).

¹⁴ (Says God), "I have kept quiet for all this time (that the nations have persecuted My people). I have been silent (and) I have restrained Myself. (But now) I will scream like a woman in childbirth (to destroy them). I will obliterate them and swallow them up all together. ¹⁵ I will destroy mountains and valleys, and I will dry out all their grass. I will make rivers into (dry

God punishes the nations

HAFTARAH OF PARSHAS BEREISHIS

This *Haftarah* praises God as Creator of Heaven and earth, similar to the *Parshah* which describes the creation of Heaven and earth by God.

The *Haftarah* opens with a description of how God will liberate the Jewish people from exile, and how the entire world will praise God after the final redemption arrives (42:5-12).

God promises to destroy the nations that have persecuted the Jewish people, and lead the people to their Land (13-17). He criticizes the Jewish people for being metaphorically "blind" and "deaf" to Torah and

mitzvos (18-21) and laments over their sorry state during exile (22-25). Finally, the prophet repeats God's promise to redeem them, just as He redeemed them from Egypt (43:1-10).

8. וְכִבּוֹדִי לְאַחֵר לֹא אֶתֵּן—I will not give My glory to another. When a Jew sins, he causes energy from his soul to be "spilled" into the domain of evil, which is known as the "other side." Nevertheless, only the peripheral layers of the soul could be involved in such an activity; the inner core of the soul always remains loyal to God. Thus, God says: I will not give My glory—the essence of the soul—to another, to the "other side" (*Likutei Sichos* vol.5, pp. 410-11).

and desolate) islands, and I will dry up their bodies of water.”

Jewish People are led home by God

16 “I will walk (the Jewish people to their Land) on a way that they did not know (as if they were) blind. I will lead them on a path they did not know. I will turn the darkness (of an unknown path) into light before them. (I will make) crooked paths straight (for them). I have (already) done such things (previously, when they came out of Egypt), so I will (surely) not forsake them (in the future).”

17 “(Then) those who trust in graven images will turn backwards, (being) embarrassed with (great) shame. (That will be the fate of) those who say to the molten idols: ‘you are our god.’”

Rebuke of the corrupt ones

18 “(You, O Israel,) who are deaf (towards My words) and blind (towards My commandments, now listen and) look to see (the goodness that is awaiting you! 19 I call all of you blind, even the righteous ones who serve Me, for) who is (really) blind if not one who serves Me, (and who knows how corrupt people are, yet he does not attempt to correct them? Who is) deaf if not the one who I (grace with wisdom and) send (to teach the people, and yet he pretends not to hear their evil actions, failing to correct them)? Who is as blind as a person who is perfect (in himself but does not reprimand others)? Who is as blind as a servant of God (who turns a blind eye to his people)? 20 Such people) have seen much (wisdom), yet you do not guard (others from evil ways, so they deserve to be called ‘blind.’ They have) open ears (to understand the mitzvos), yet (act as if they) do not hear (when it comes to guiding others, so they deserve to be called ‘deaf’. 21 The main reason why) God wants (such people, is not for their own merits, but) in order for (them to make another person) righteous, (and in order) for him to increase and strengthen (the) Torah (knowledge of others).”

Chabad* and Sefardic communities conclude here. Ashkenazic communities continue:

Sad state of the Jews in Exile

22 This people is looted and trampled. All their young men are dejected and and hidden in prisons. They are prey with no one to rescue them (from being looted); trampled with no one to say, “Return them (so they will be trampled no more).”

23 Who among you will pay attention to this, listen, and hear from now on (what will establish him in the end)?

24 Who handed Ya’akov over to be trampled and Israel to looters? Was it not God, against Whom we have sinned? (For the Jewish people) did not desire His ways or obey His Torah, 25 so He poured out (His) anger, His wrath and the might of war upon them. It blazed around

וְכָל-עֵשָׂבָם אֹבֵי־שׁוֹ וְשִׁמְתִי נְהָרוֹת לְאֵיִים וְאֲנָמִים אֹבֵי־שׁוֹ: 16 וְהוֹלַכְתִּי עֲוֹרִים בְּדַרְךְ לֹא יָדְעוּ בְנֵתִיבוֹת לֹא יָדְעוּ אֲדָרִיכֶם אֲשִׁים מִחֶשֶׂד לְפָנֵיהֶם לְאוֹר וּמַעֲקָשִׁים לְמִישׁוֹר אֱלֹה הַדְּבָלִים עָשִׂיתֶם וְלֹא עֲזַבְתֶּם: 17 נָסַגְנוּ אַחֲוֹר יָבֹשׁוּ בְשֵׁת הַבְּטָחִים בַּפֶּסֶל הָאֲמָרִים לְמִסְכָּה אַתֶּם אֱלֹהֵינוּ: 18 הַחֲרָשִׁים שָׁמְעוּ וְהָעֹרִים הִבִּיטוּ לְרֵאוֹת: 19 מִי עוֹר כִּי אִם-עֲבָדִי וְחָרַשׁ כִּמְלָאכִי אֲשַׁלַּח מִי עוֹר כִּמְשַׁלֵּם וְעוֹר כְּעַבְד יְהוָה: 20 רֵאוֹת [ראוית כן] רַבּוֹת וְלֹא תִשְׁמַר פְּקוּחַ אָזְנוֹים וְלֹא יִשְׁמַע: 21 יְהוָה חֲפִיץ לְמַעַן צַדִּיקוֹ יִגְדִּיל תּוֹרָה וַיִּאֲדִיר:

כב והוא עם-בזון ושסוי הפה בחורים בלם ובבתי כלאים החבאו היו לבז ואין מציל משסה ואין אמר השב: כג מי בכס יאזין זאת יקשב וישמע לאחור: כד מי-נתן למשסה [למשוסה כן] יעקב וישראל לבזים הלוא יהוה זו חטאנו לו ולא-אבו בדרכיו הלוך ולא שמעו בתורתו: כה וישפך עליו חמה אפו ועזו מלחמה ותלהטהו מסביב ולא ידע ותבער-בו ולא-ישים על-לב:

21. **יגדיל תורה ויאדיר**—To increase and strengthen Torah. The Talmud connects this verse with the highest level of Torah study, that which is carried out purely for the sake of expanding the body of Torah wisdom itself (see Chulin 66b). On the other hand, this verse is also employed in connection with the Torah study of young children, which is clearly at a

very basic level (see Rambam, Laws of Torah Study 2:7). The fact that the same verse is employed in both cases means that they are connected: the sublime spiritual loftiness of very advanced Torah scholars is shared in some measure by even the most basic exercise of Torah study (Sichas Shabbos Parshas Bereishis 5717, par. 7).

*While the Chabad custom is to finish the Haftarah with verse 21, in a leap year the Rebbe followed the custom of saying the extended Haftarah (according to Ashkenazic custom), finishing with 43:10. However, the Rebbe indicated that this was a personal directive that he had received from the Previous Rebbe and was not to be copied by others (See Sichas Shabbos Parshas Bereishis 5714, 5717, 5725 and 5744).

מִגּוֹ ׀ וְעַתָּה כֹּה־אָמַר יְהוָה בְּרֵאשִׁית יַעֲקֹב וַיִּצְרֶךְ
 יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶל־תִּירָא כִּי גִאלְתִּיךָ קָרָאתִי בְשִׁמְךָ לִי־
 אֶתָּה: ׀ כִּי־תַעֲבֹר בַּמַּיִם אֶתָּה אֲנִי וּבִנְהָרוֹת לֹא
 יִשְׁטַפּוּךָ כִּי־תִלְךָ בְּמוֹ־אֵשׁ לֹא תִכּוֹה וְלִהְבֵּה לֹא
 תִבְעֶר־בָּךְ: ׀ כִּי אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ קְדוֹשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל
 מוֹשִׁיעֶךָ נִתְתִּי כַּפָּרָךְ מִצָּרִים כּוֹשׁ וּסְבָא תַחֲתֶיךָ:
 ׀ מֵאֲשֶׁר יִקְרַתְּ בְּעֵינַי נִכְבַּדְתָּ וְאֲנִי אֶהְבַּתִּיךָ וְאַתָּן
 אָדָם תַּחֲתֶיךָ וְלְאֻמִּים תַּחַת נִפְשֶׁךָ: ׀ אֶל־תִּירָא
 כִּי אֶתְּךָ־אֲנִי מִמּוֹרָח אֲבִיא וְרִעֶךָ וּמִמַּעַרְב אֶקְבָּעֶךָ:
 ׀ אֲמַר לְצַפּוֹן תִּנְנִי וְלְתִימָן אֶל־תִּכְלְאִי הִבִּיאי בְנֵי
 מִרְחֹק וּבְנֹתַי מִקְצֵה הָאָרֶץ: ׀ כֹּל הַנִּקְרָא בְשִׁמִּי
 וְלִכְבוֹדִי בְּרֵאשִׁיתוֹ יִצְרֵתִיו אֶפ־עֲשִׂיתִיו: ׀ הוֹצִיא
 עִם־עוֹר וְעֵינַיִם יֵשׁ וְחַרְשִׁים וְאֲזִנִּים לָמוֹ:
 ׀ כָּל־הַגּוֹיִם נִקְבְּצוּ יַחְדָּו וַיִּאֲסְפוּ לְאֻמִּים מִי בְהֵם
 יִגִּיד זֹאת וְרֵאשִׁנוֹת יִשְׁמִיעֵנּוּ יִתְּנוּ עֲדֵיהֶם וַיִּצְדְּקוּ
 וַיִּשְׁמְעוּ וַיִּאֲמְרוּ אָמֵן: ׀ אַתָּם עַד־לִי נִאֲסֵ־יְהוָה וְעַבְדֵי
 אֲשֶׁר בָּחַרְתִּי לְמַעַן תִּדְבְּעוּ וְתִאֲמִינּוּ לִי וְתִבְּנִינוּ
 כִּי־אֲנִי הוּא לִפְנֵי לֹא־נִוצֵר אֵל וְאַחֲרַי לֹא יִהְיֶה:

them, but they paid no attention (to the fact that it was caused by God, and even after) it burned them they did not take it to heart (as Divine intervention).

^{43:1} (But despite all this) God—Who created you, O Ya'akov, and formed you, O Yisra'el—(nevertheless) says: “Do not fear, for I redeemed you (from Egypt) and I called you My own. ² When you pass through water (and nearly drown) I am with you; (even powerful) rivers will not sweep you away; when you walk through the inferno (of life’s difficulties), you will not be burnt, and the flame will not consume you, ³ for I am God, your God, the Holy One of Israel, your Savior. (Didn’t) I make Egypt your ransom (and save you, even though you did not deserve it? Didn’t I send) Ethiopia and Seba (to be destroyed by Sanchairiv) instead of you? ⁴ Because you are precious to Me and honored. I loved you! So I will give men in exchange for you and nations (to be destroyed) in place of you.

Promise of redemption

⁵ Do not fear, for I am with you. I will bring your children from the east and gather you from the west. ⁶ I will say to the north: “Give (Me the Jewish people who are scattered there),” and to the south, ‘Don’t hold them back!’ Bring My sons from afar and My daughters from the ends of the earth, ⁷ all (the Jewish people) who bear My Name, who (were made) for My glory. I have (already) created, fashioned and made (all that is necessary for their redemption in order to), ⁸ free the (exiled) people—who are blind though they have eyes, and deaf though they have ears.

peoples assembled, who among them (could) declare (future events like) this, or announce to us (that they had predicted) past events? (If so), let them produce their witnesses and be proven correct, such that those who hear them will say that it is true.

God’s witnesses

¹⁰ “You are my witnesses,” says God, “My servant whom I have chosen, that you may know and believe in Me, and understand that I am He before whom no god was created, and after whom none will exist.”

43:1. בְּרֵאשִׁית יַעֲקֹב וַיִּצְרֶךְ יִשְׂרָאֵל—Who created you, O Ya'akov, and formed you, O Israel. Rendered literally, the verse states, “This is what God says: ‘Ya'akov created you; Yisra'el formed you.’” On this, the Midrash expounds: “God said to his world, ‘World of mine! World of mine! I will tell you who created you and formed you. Ya'akov created you; Yisra'el formed you’” (Vayikra Rabah 36:4 and Maharzu ibid.). In other words, being that the purpose of creation is that the mitzvos should be performed by the Jewish people (“Ya'akov”; “Yisra'el”), the world’s very existence is attributed to them. The verse further explains that this takes place on two levels. The lower level of “Ya'akov”* represents the simple observance of mitzvos whose merit ensures the existence of the world’s physical matter (“Ya'akov who created you”). In the merit of the higher level of mitzvah observance signified by Yisra'el, the world is given its form (“who formed you Yisra'el”) (s.v. ha-ba'im 5743).

5-6. מִמּוֹרָח אֲבִיא וְרִעֶךָ...—I will bring your children from the east etc. With regard to the east and west, scripture uses the expressions:

“I will bring...and gather...,” indicating that God is informing the Jewish people how He will unite them when the Redemption arrives. But in reference to the north and south God addresses the compass points, saying to them “Give (Me),” and, “Don’t hold them back.” Of these latter two directions, the north is given the stronger instruction, to become a “giver,” i.e. a force which actively contributes to the Redemption, whereas the south is merely told not to interfere with or prevent the redemptive process—“Don’t hold them back.” This indicates the uniqueness of the Future Redemption: Even the north—which represents the forces of evil, “From the north, evil will venture forth” (Jer 1:14)—will be transformed into a positive force (Likutei Sichos vol. 4, p. 1065).

10. אַתֶּם עֵדֵי—You are my witnesses. Witnesses are only required to establish facts that have been concealed. Thus, as God’s “witnesses,” our task is to reveal the hidden identity of this physical world, demonstrating how every detail points to the presence of God (Hisvadyos 5745, vol. 3, p. 1566).

*Ya'akov's change of name to Yisra'el represented a spiritual elevation—see Rashi to Bereishis 32:29; Arizal, Sha'ar ha-Pesukim, Vayishlach 32, 29; Pardes, Sha'ar 23; Etz Chaim, Sha'ar 3. chap. 2; Torah Ohr, Vayeitzei 21a; Likutei Torah, Balak 70b.