



KOVETZ

HEOROS

HATMIMIM

V'ANASH

- Melbourne -

•

18

GIMMEL TAMMUZ,
YUD BEIS-YUD GIMMEL TAMMUZ, 5773

Heoros Hatmimim V'anash~ Melbourne



PUBLISHED BY THE STUDENTS OF THE RABBINICAL COLLEGE
OF
AUSTRALIA & NEW ZEALAND

•

A project of
The Talmidim Hashluchim
Hatmim Yisroel Leib Lester
Hatmim Yosef Yitzchak kastle

67 Alexandra st. East St. Kilda
Victoria 3183 Australia
YGHeoros@gmail.com

מוקדש

לכ"ק אדמו"ר נשיא דורנו

יה"ר שיראה הרבה נחת מבניו – התמימים
בפרט משלוחיו, חסידיו, וכלל ישראל בכלל

ויגאלנו ויוליכנו קוממיות לארצינו

וישמיענו תורה חדשה מפיו

בגאולה האמיתית והשלימה

תיכף ומיד ממש



לע"נ

ראובן אברהם בן אלתר שלמה זלמן

סירולניק

נפטר עש"ק ו' תמוז תשע"ג

שיהי' לו נחת רוח מכל יוצאי חלציו

ושבקרוב ממש יהי' הקיצו ורננו שוכני עפר

ביחד עם הגאולה האמיתית והשלימה תיכף

ומיד ממש!

מוקדש ע"י נכדו הש' מנחם מענדל שיחי'

ליבערמאן



מוקדש

לזכות התלמידים השלוחים

הת' ישראל שיחי' אוחנה
הת' שניאור זלמן שיחי' אוסוביצקי
הת' משה אהרן שיחי' באקמאן
הת' מנחם מענדל שיחי' הרץ
הת' ישראל שיחי' חאנאוויטש
יוסף חיים ברוך הכהן טייטולבוים
הת' מנחם מענדל שיחי' ליבערמאן
הת' ישראל לייב שיחי' לעסטער
הת' משה שיחי' לרמן
הת' שמואל שיחי' סלונים
הת' אברהם צבי הכהן שיחי' ענגעל
הת' יוסף יצחק שיחי' קעסל



מוקדש

לזכות ביאת הגואל צדק שיבוא ויגאלנו
ויוליכינו קוממיות לארצינו, בעגלא דידן,
ממש!



ולזכות הנערה המהוללה המשובחת בפי כל
מכירי'

אילנה לאה בת שיינדל רחל
שיהי' לה רפואה שלימה קרובה בטוב הנראה
והנגלה.



Dedicated in honor of
Elana Leah Bas Shaindel Rochel
That she should have a complete and
speedy recovery in a good and revealed
way.



מוקדש ע"י

ALSTON & BIRD LLP

LEIB LERNER
Partner
Attorney at Law
213-576-1193

333 South Hope Street
16th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071 USA
Direct: 213-476-1193
Fax: 213-576-1100

www.alston.com

Atlanta • Brussels • Charlotte • Dallas
Los Angeles • New York • Research Triangle
Silicon Valley • Ventura County
Washington, D.C.

email: leib.lerner@alston.com

לזכות התלמידים השלוחים שיחיו

נדפס ע"י ולזכות הרה"ח הרה"ת

ליב מרדכי לערנער וזוגזו אסתר עליזה שיחיו

ובניהם מנחם מענדל, חי' מושקא, אפרים פינחס
והינדא שיחיו



CONTENT

Dvar Malchus	8
Chassidus	
What is the Alter Rebbe's Kal V'chomer	12
Halacha	
SAVING SUPPER – OR ARE WE?	17
Yehoshua HaLevi Lefkowitz	

DVAR MALCHUS

Fathers and Mothers

Our Sages interpret the verse: "From the top of boulders, I see him. I gaze upon him from the hills," as an allegory, explaining that "the tops of boulders" refers to the Patriarchs, and "the hills" refer to the Matriarchs.

The significance of this commentary can be understood by comparing the different relationships which a father and a mother share with their child. A father's connection is general; it does not relate to the child's body in a specific way. For it is through the mother's nurturing of the fetus for nine months that the limbs and organs that make up a child's body become defined and develop.

For this reason, even after the child is born, his mother shares a closer relationship with him than his father, for it is she who has shaped the particulars of his existence. And thus, a child has a greater love for his mother than for his father, and a greater degree of awe for his father. For love depends on closeness, and awe comes about through distance.

Similar concepts apply with regard to the Patriarchs and the Matriarchs of the Jewish people. For this reason, when speaking about the Patriarchs, the verse uses the expression "I see him," which implies gazing from a distance, while with regard to the Matriarchs, it uses the expression, "I gaze upon him" which implies closeness. This is indicated by the *Targum* for the term "I gaze upon him," *sichisa*, which is also used as

the *Targum* for the word *vitabeit*. *Habat*, the Hebrew root for the latter term, implies looking closely with intent and concern.

In the Image of G-d

The conception of a child on the physical plane, as does every other material entity, stems from its spiritual source. Our emotions are referred to as "offspring," because they are brought into being by intellect. Deep understanding and meditation on the greatness of G-d spawns love and fear of G-d.

More particularly, our conceptual process can be divided into two thrusts: *Chochmah* and *Binah*. *Chochmah* is the seminal core of understanding. Therefore it is described with the analogy of a father. *Binah* represents the development of a conceptual framework, and therefore it is referred to with the analogy of a mother.

Our soul powers stem from the supernal *Sefiros*. And thus a similar pattern exists with regard to these *Sefiros*. They are divided into two fundamental categories which parallel intellect and emotion, it is the supernal intellect, *Chochmah* and *Binah*, which spawn the supernal emotions. And these emotions bring into being the spiritual worlds.

More particular, the parallel reflects the workings of *Chochmah* and *Binah*. *Chochmah* serves as "the father," for it is distant from the emotions and certainly from the worlds which they bring into being. *Binah* is considered "the mother" for it is closer to the emotions and also to the worlds.

Because *Binah* is closer to the worlds, the framework of reference which characterizes the worlds is significant for it. Therefore, the influence of *Binah* in the world, the comprehension of G-dliness, does not nullify that framework of reference. Instead, it brings about only *bittul hayesh*, self-nullification that does not entirely banish one's conception of

self. The person devotes himself to a higher purpose, but still retains his individual identity.

Chochmah, by contrast, appreciates that "He alone exists; there is nothing else"; all other existence becomes paled in the light of His presence. This level of awareness is indeed reflected in the name *Chochmah* whose letters can be rearranged to form the words *skoach mah* -- which reflect complete and utter *bittul*, *bittul bimetzius*.

Striving for a Purpose

The Patriarchs and the Matriarchs share a connection with every Jew, endowing every member of people with their spiritual legacy. Implied is that every Jew possesses two general spiritual thrusts. The Patriarchs endow him with the quality of *Chochmah*, the potential for complete and utter self-nullification, reflecting the sublime unity, while the Matriarchs endow him with the quality of *Binah*, self-nullification that allows a person to retain his identity, reflecting the lower plane of unity.

The ultimate purpose of existence is that the world be transformed into a dwelling for G-d. Thus our Divine service should not be removed from the world, but should focus on making the world a medium for G-dliness as it exists within its own context. For this reason, the Matriarchs whose Divine service reflects closer involvement with the world possess an advantage over the Patriarchs (despite the fact that *Binah*, the quality they personify, merely receives influence from *Chochmah*, the quality personified by the Patriarchs). And therefore, Avraham was instructed: "Listen to everything Sarah tells you."

Both these thrusts, the striving towards the sublime unity and the lower unity, which come from the Patriarchs and the Matriarchs (the "tops of the boulders" and the "hills") empower the Jewish people, enabling them to achieve the state described in the continuation of the verse: "It is a nation dwelling alone secure, not being counted among the nations."

Even during exile, this prophecy continues to be fulfilled. For the identity of the Jews has remained intact; they have not assimilated among the nations. Indeed, the exile lifts the Jews to a higher level, as indicated by the interpretation of this verse by the *Targum* as foreshadowing the Era of the Redemption when: "in the future, this nation will take possession of the earth," with the coming of the true and ultimate Redemption, led by *Mashiach*; may it take place in the immediate future.

A Woman in Her Home

Every Jewish home is a world of its own in which is manifest all the Ten *Sefiros*. Just as within the supernal *Sefiros* and within the powers of our soul, there is an advantage to *Binah* over *Chochmah* (despite the fact that *Binah* receives influence from *Chochmah*), so too, within the Jewish home, there is a dimension of supremacy to the woman's position.

And the woman's position in the home reflects the functioning of these *Sefiros*. The *Sefirah* of *Binah* receives influence from *Chochmah*, and conveys that influence to the emotional attributes. So too, a woman receives direction from her husband, as indicated by our Sages' statement: "Who is a proper wife? One that fulfills her husband's will." Nevertheless, the actual functioning of the home including the education of the children, hospitality to guests, generous gifts to *tzedakah* and the like are all the women's province.

A man is not at home during the major part of the day. He is busy with Torah study and prayer, or earning a livelihood. For his will to be "fulfilled," manifest in actual life, he must rely on his "proper wife."

Moreover, the Hebrew word translated as "fulfilled" *oseh* also means "make." At times, a "proper wife" "makes her husband's will." For there are times when the pressures and difficulties he faces drain him, and hinder him from desiring the correct things. At that time, "his proper

wife" should in a gentle and pleasant manner mold her husband's will, coaxing to the surface the desire to fulfill G-d's will that lies within the heart of every Jew.

"When a husband and wife are worthy, the Divine Presence rests among them." When a Jewish home is conducted as "a Sanctuary in microcosm," the Divine Presence rests within. And since the "Divine Presence rests within," "no evil will dwell among you." On the contrary, He will grant only good, overt and apparent good, as manifest in abundant blessings for children, health, and prosperity.

(Adapted from the maamar and Sichos of Yud-Gimmel Tammuz, 5722)



CHASSIDUS

What is the Alter Rebbe's Kal V'chomer

A Bochur in Yeshiva

In Chapter 1 of Shaar Hayichud Vihoemunah the Alter Rebbe brings the explanation of the Baal Shem Tov on the Possuk "Forever, Hashem, Your words stand in the Heavens"... that these words and letters stand forever in the firmament of the sky and are clothed within them forever to give them life – which is the concept of continuous creation.

In Chapter 2, the Alter Rebbe brings a proof from the miracle of the splitting of the Reed Sea, saying "and Hashem held the water with a strong wind all night ... and had Hashem stopped the wind ... the water would return ... like their way and their nature; and how much more so

with creation ex nihilo (something from nothing) that there must be a constant force of creation in the created”.

In a note on the 2nd Chapter, the Rebbe said that with this comparison to the miracle of the splitting of the sea the Alter Rebbe answers a question that would have arisen otherwise; The Alter Rebbe says in that chapter that one should not compare the works of man to the works of G-d i.e. that the works of man are not in need of constant creation unlike the works of the Almighty which are. The question though is, that this logic can be drawn on for the opposite conclusion; if the works of Hashem are indeed different, and that would seem to take into consideration His abilities as G-d Almighty and being that He is all able and there is nothing He cannot do, why does He have to constantly create the world – just as He is eternal His actions should be as well!? To this question, the proof of the splitting sea - being that HASHEM made the miracle needing, and HE provided, constant creation - is an answer.

This answer seems to require explanation; why is it imperative to say that just because the creation of the miracle was in such a way, it would dictate that the creation of the world was as well?

This is especially stressed with the Rebbe’s explanation (Likkutei Sichos vol. 26 page 51) in the matter of miracles:

In miracles there are two categories:

1. When the miracle changes the nature from what it was previously – like the case of Moshe’s hand becoming white, with Tzoraas, like snow, where even after the miracle the hand stayed with the Tzoraas naturally, and in order to return the hand to normal a second miracle was required.

2. When the existence changed because of a miracle and it was constantly miraculous i.e. the miracle had no place in nature – as in the example of the water (in Egypt) that turned to blood, where the water really stayed as it was (as seen in the sense that the Jews were still able to

drink it as water even if they were drinking from the same vessel as an Egyptian who was drinking blood) and only externally and practically did the water turn to blood, and once the miracle stopped, the water automatically stopped being blood.

So we see that there is a type of miracles where Hashem makes the miracle for a moment and the duration of the miraculous state is natural (now) to the object of the miracle. (This is unlike the miracle of splitting the Yam Suf where the Torah tells us that Hashem was making the wind that held up the water blow all night i.e. the nature of the water had not changed; the miracle was constant (Likkutei sichos vol 26 page 51).)

With this (the phenomenon of Moshe's hand) in mind and as a precedent – why don't we say that the creation of the world was such?

Now, a seemingly obvious answer is in order, being that the plagues in Egypt (frogs or locusts for example, or Moshe's hand for that matter) some of which were natural occurrences, that to cause the plague did require a miracle BUT to maintain the plague was quite natural – and to the contrary – to rid Egypt of the plague ANOTHER miracle was necessary. This of course applies when the natural order already had within it this natural phenomenon and it therefore did not REQUIRE more miracles to maintain it. However in the case of the creation of the world, the NATURAL order of the existence (prior to creation) was nonexistence, and therefore the continuous miracle is necessary.

This though, is seemingly already taken into consideration in the question in the note of the Rebbe in Tanya; the Rebbe doesn't seem to be asking from the point of view of the nature of nonexistence before creation as much as he is asking based on the abilities Hashem has, and therefore, He may have created the world as not needing constant creation anyways.

Just to take a deeper look at the miracle of Kerias Yam Suf, the Rebbe explains in Sefer Hasichos 5751 page 651 note 27, that the miracle

of the splitting of the sea was only similar to the miracle of the water turning into blood i.e. a constant miracle in the general sense however in its distinct details the miracle actually had similarities to the miracle of Moshe's hand, the composite (of these two different and even opposite miracles) creating a new and totally novel category of miracle; "like the miracle of Kerias Yam Suf, where the miracle made a change in the nature of the water to be like a "wall of stones" but the water in itself did not become like dry land and therefore "had Hashem stopped the wind for a moment the water would have returned..."

This explanation is found in an earlier explanation of the Rebbe in Likkutei Sichos vol. 6 on page 89, where the Rebbe asks about the language chosen by the Alter Rebbe in Tanya, proving the nature of the miracle: (the following is a loose translation of the notes on page 90)

"... 1) why does the Alter Rebbe say the words "like a barrel and like a wall" while Rashi (and others) say "like a barrel as a wall" 2) why does he say and a wall – what does that add? 3) just a bit later he says "and they did not stand as a wall" and totally leaves out the 'barrel'. why?

and we may explain that the Alter Rebbe is stressing both; in the beginning of the miracle the water stood as in a barrel – gathered in one place, but the nature of the water itself stayed the same, and afterwards, they hardened as not needing a vessel... and this is relevant to the content of the chapter as well, to bring out that the order in which the miracle took place was in a progressive "natural" way; contrary to the way Hashem creates the world which is something from nothing... and this is why the Alter Rebbe uses the word "and like a wall" because just from the fact that the water flows regularly and does not stand as if it were in a barrel, would not prove that the creation of heaven and earth would disappear if the power creating them left them (being that the "barrel" was only supporting an existing existence, however the "wall" is a

creation of a nature that wasn't there before and the constant creation is still necessary).”

Here we see the dual nature of the miracle; on the one hand the wind kept the water up and the water did not essentially change, and on the other hand there was a nature of rigidity present in the water.

It says in the maamer Kimei Tzeischa 5712 that the nes of kerias yam suf was a glimmer of the way things will be in the times of Moshiach and it “opened the channel” to this type of miraculous- nature. Except that when Moshiach comes there will be ultimate revelation of this – that the nature will fully exist (finite) and at the same time it won't be at all contrary to the infinite light of Hashem, Blessed Be He.

So, maybe we can suggest that this dual nature in the water was the “preview” to this phenomenon, or rather revelation, when Moshiach comes, but in the case of the splitting of the sea this had to take place in a miraculous i.e. temporary way, as it had to when Moshe was on the mountain. However when Moshiach comes it will be permanent.

Now, we may be able to understand the Rebbe's note in Tanya: the Rebbe says that HASHEM made the miracle of the splitting of the sea – meaning this is how He does things, and this is how HE prepares us for Moshiach which is why HE created the world and how HE knows it really is. So taking a look at Kerias Yam Suf, we see Moshiach, and through those lenses we see creation, all by Hashem for the same goal, and now Kerias Yam Suf is the proof of how the world was created (not because it has to be like that but because this is what HE does). Moshiach Now!



HALACHA

SAVING SUPPER – OR ARE WE?

Yehoshua HaLevi Lefkowitz

Smicha Program of 770 Heichal Menachem Mechon Chaim

The taste of the food is like the food itself. Picture the case - if someone cooks non-kosher food together with kosher, then the taste of the non-kosher food that is absorbed into the kosher food renders it forbidden. No surprises there. The question arises, however, when we have ‘a taste that imparts a taste’ – if someone cooks non-kosher food in a pot (imparting taste to the walls of the pot) and then cooks kosher food in that pot, does the taste of the non-kosher food (which traveled via the pot and into the kosher food) make the kosher food forbidden?

The answer, as it often is, is that it depends. We will refer to the taste that travels through the pot and into the second food as ‘second-stage taste’. If the original food that imparted the taste was *non-kosher* then indeed the second-stage taste is forbidden, like its source. If, however, the original food was *milk or meat* (which in and of themselves are permitted) then the second-stage taste is NOT treated like milk or meat, but *parev*. This means that the food which acquired this taste can be eaten with meat or with milk! Disallowed taste stays disallowed, but permitted taste becomes immune.

The question is why.

Rashba and Ran explain – by the time the taste of the original food has passed through a pot and into another food it can hardly be compared to

its original state. Such a taste cannot be linked with its original source-food enough that it should NOW acquire a restriction on being eaten. Hence second-stage taste of milk can be eaten with meat. However, if the taste was ALREADY forbidden, then becoming weaker will not make it permitted! Second-stage taste of a forbidden food is still forbidden.

The explanation is difficult though. The fact that a taste becomes weak and is no longer able to become problematic is understandable, but why should something that tastes of forbidden food ALWAYS remain that way? Where do we find such a concept, that one something becomes disallowed it remains as such even if it loses quantity or quality?

We can ask the same question elsewhere in this topic. If someone cooked something parev, like vegetables, in a pot used for meat, Rashba (Yoreh Deah siman 93) holds that the taste of meat absorbed in the walls of the pot is weakened in the process. This means that this pot can now be used for milk! However, if there was the taste of a disallowed food in the walls then cooking vegetables will not help (this is not the same case as 'second-stage taste' because the taste in the walls here is still the first-stage, and yet it becomes permitted). Here again we have the same rule play in – a disallowed thing remains disallowed but a permitted thing becomes unchangeable. What is the reason?

There is yet another place where we have the exact same idea. Often, the concept of 'bitul', nullification, allows us to ignore a forbidden food if it is one sixtieth in size of the permitted food it is combined with. When there is less than this ratio, the permitted food because forbidden due to the inseparability of the forbidden food from the allowed. Sometimes, though, the permitted food not only becomes forbidden to eat, but we even treat it as if it were forbidden food itself! This concept, called 'chanan' (in shorthand form), means that if this forbidden mixture of food falls into another pot of permitted food, that permitted food needs to be

sixty times the size of the ENTIRE forbidden mixture that fell in to outweigh and nullify it, not only sixty times the original forbidden food!

Why? Beis Yosef (Yoreh Deah siman 105) explains that even though the original forbidden food is too small to affect the second pot alone (being less than one sixtieth of it in size), the permitted food in the first pot that it mixed with (which became forbidden) helps it. And guess what? ‘Chanan’ does not apply to milk and meat! And so it’s now three times we have it – something disallowed remains disallowed but a permitted thing is nullified. Why is this the case?

And now for an answer. From a fourth case where this phenomena appears.

If a piece of meat is cooked with a forbidden liquid, unless the meat is sixty times the liquid’s quantity the meat absorbs too great an amount of the liquid and becomes forbidden. However, if the meat is then cooked in, for example, a pot of water in which there is NOW sixty times the amount of permitted food (between the water and meat) against the original forbidden liquid, then logically (note: in this instance there is no ‘chanan’) we would say that the meat becomes permitted again (because the liquid is nullified). In this case though the meat REMAINS forbidden. The reason, explains Beis Yosef in the name of Rashba (Yoreh Deah siman 106) is that even though NOW the meat has only a miniscule amount of forbidden liquid in it (the liquid having spread throughout the pot of water as well), since it was at one stage forbidden, it remains that way until ALL the forbidden liquid is removed (which is not possible)! And yet again, this concept does not apply to meat or milk!

Let’s state this a little differently: here since the meat at one point in time DID have the required quantity of forbidden food within it to become forbidden, and therefore DID become forbidden, then to remove this constriction we must remove ALL the forbidden food from within it.

Bringing down the quantity (to being less than one sixtieth) will not help, and nor would reducing its quality.

And with this key rule we can clarify all three of the previously difficult cases. Second-stage taste remains forbidden because it was once full-power taste and even though its quality was reduced, it was not completely degraded. First-stage taste in the wall of pot was also once at full potency and only became weaker, but was not totally removed. And the mixture that became 'chanan' keeps on going and invalidating other food because it became forbidden and still has some forbidden food in it, albeit a much reduced ratio of it.

And so we have defended Rashba and Ran.

