

OHRNET

SHABBAT PARSHAT YITRO • 19 SHVAT, 5779 - JANUARY 25, 2019 • VOL. 26 NO. 15

PARSHA INSIGHTS

by Rabbi Yaakov Asher Sinclair

Going Halfway to Others

“Moshe brought the people forth from the camp towards G-d.....” (19:17)

I got into a taxicab the other day and sat next to the driver. From his outward appearance it was impossible to tell whether he was religious or not. He was clean shaven and wore a khaki forage cap. We started to talk. “I give rides to soldiers and I give lifts to yeshiva students,” he said. “I’m not prejudiced. Come on, tell me. Am I religious or *Chiloni* (secular)?” “No Jew is *Chiloni*,” I replied. “He just hasn’t connected yet to his heritage.” “Very good!” he said. “I can see you are a student of the Berdichever.” (The Berdichever Rebbe’s love of every Jew and the lengths to which he would go to justify even the most egregious Torah transgressions are legion.) I replied, “*Halevai!* (I only wish!)”

“No, but why are people so nosy?” he continued. “The other day I was coming back from Tiberius, and I stopped to pick up some yeshiva students. Anyway, they’d been in the car for about five minutes and the one in the front says to me, ‘Where do you live?’ ‘Jerusalem’ I say. ‘So you just finished a job taking someone to Tiberius?’ he asked. I didn’t answer. ‘It must be quite expensive to go from Jerusalem to Tiberius by car.’ ‘Yes, it is.’ ‘How much is that then?’ ‘500 Shekels’ I replied. I felt like saying to him, ‘Would you like a printout of my bank account?’ But I just kept silent.”

I suggested to the taxi driver, “Maybe he wanted to know what it cost so he would have an idea of the how much gratitude he owes you.” He smiled and said, “I knew you were a Berdichever!” He carried on and said, “Then he started to ask me where I lived in Jerusalem. I practically said ‘Would you like to know how many square meters my apartment is?’ ” So I said back to the taxi driver, “Maybe he just wanted to know what sort of a person you were. After all, if you’re someone who lives in a rich neighborhood, so maybe you’re more than just an average taxi driver, and he should show you even more gratitude and honor than before!”

“Okay! You *are* a Berdichever! I caught you! But you know something? That’s the only way to live. When you look for the good in people, you create a power of good in this world.”

Ever since Korach, the Jewish People have often been plagued by *machloket* (rancorous dispute). And, in our own times we have preserved this “custom” in all its minutiae. Dissent and disapproval dog the heels of our efforts to bring Mashiach. We are too divided and divisive. On one end of the spectrum, efforts to turn the Orthodox world into a hermetic bastion and the wholesale rejection of the modern world have caused many youngsters to flee their homes and their religion as from a prison. And at the other end of the spectrum even the Orthodox world seems to bend over backwards to accommodate the latest fads in gender identification – behavior the Torah explicitly condemns as abomination.

Where do we go from here? Love our neighbor as ourselves, and hate the sin, not the sinner. As it says: “As I live, says G-d, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked one, but that the wicked one should turn from his way and live.” (Yechezkel 33:11)

“Moshe brought the people forth from the camp towards G-d...”

At the recent royal wedding, some enthusiasts camped out for six days before the event to get a prime spot to see the procession. Rashi says that it is the way of the world - that first the crowd gathers and then the monarch appears, but such was G-d’s love for His people that He came first to Mount Sinai and then waited for us.

If G-d is prepared to come all the way to us, shouldn’t we be prepared to at least go half way to others?

TALMUD TIPS

by Rabbi Moshe Newman

Chullin 44-50

Not Glatt

Rav Chisda said, "Who is a Torah scholar? One who 'sees a treifa for himself'."

The phrase chosen by Rav Chisda – “sees a *treifa* for himself” – requires clarification as to what it means. (And of course a Torah scholar also must be somebody who learns Torah with great dedication!)

Rashi explains this phrase that defines a Torah scholar to mean someone who sees a possible sign of his animal being a *treifa*, which would forbid him from eating his meat after shechita. Although this animal's owner has reason to forbid it and also reason to permit it, he is strict on himself and forbids it. This is despite the fact that if he would permit it he would have ample reason to do so, but chooses to forbid the meat to himself and suffer a monetary loss. This person, according to Rav Chisda, is a Torah scholar.

Tosefot writes that the significance of designating this person as a “Torah scholar” is one that has halachic ramifications for returning a lost object. Normally, a lost object is only returned to a person if the person can identify it properly, thereby showing that he is the owner who lost it. However, certain objects that are without identifying features, such as brand new kitchen glassware that has never been used, can be returned to a Torah scholar if he claims that he is certain that he recognizes the objects as being the objects that he lost. This concept is called *teviat ayin*.

This idea that Tosefot writes seems consistent with how Rashi defines a Torah scholar as being one who is strict to not eat from his animal if there is any doubt about its being completely kosher in order to avoid any prohibition. In the case of identifying a lost object by *teviat ayin*, this type of person would also not claim it to be his if had any doubt regarding his being the true owner.

The Maharsha, however, cites Rashi's explanation for the phrase “sees a *treifa* for himself,” and, in addition, offers another possible explanation. The Maharsha suggests that this phrase, which describes a Torah scholar, refers to a person who will only eat meat if he himself checks it to be certain that it is not a *treifa* and is kosher. He does not rely on any checking of the animal that is done by anyone else. No *hechsher* (*kashrut* supervision) is trustworthy to him except for his own personal halachic ruling.

The Maharsha extrapolates to connect this statement of Rav Chisda to an actual event that the *gemara* records after Rav Chisda's teaching. When Rav Elazar was invited to dine at the house of the Nasi (prince and leader of the Jewish people in the Babylonian exile), he declined to go to eat there. According to the Maharsha the reason was because Rav Elazar did not trust anybody else's *kashrut* supervision. The reason he gave for refusing was based on a verse in Proverbs (15:27) that states: “One who hates gifts will live.” He rhetorically told the Nasi, “Don't you want me to live?” Although his true reason for not eating there was that he relied only on his own *kashrut* supervision, it seems that he gave this particular excuse for not accepting the invitation in order not to insult the Nasi. (Sound like a familiar line, anybody?)

According to Rashi, however, Rav Elazar's refusal to eat at the house of the Nasi is for a different reason, and not because he didn't trust the *kashrut*. It appears that Rav Elazar's reason is more literal according to Rashi. He did not want to receive gifts – including gifts of food that would be eaten at the Nasi's table. This is because Rav Elazar was extremely careful to live according to the “good advice” taught by King Shlomo in Proverbs that “one who hates gifts will live.”

• *Chullin 44b*

PARSHA Q & A

1. Yitro had 7 names. Why was one of his names *Yeter*?
2. News of which two events motivated Yitro to come join the Jewish People?
3. What name of Yitro indicates his love for Torah?
4. Why was Tzipora with her father, Yitro, and not with Moshe when *Bnei Yisrael* left Egypt?
5. Why does verse 18:5 say that Yitro came to the desert – don't we already know that the *Bnei Yisrael* were in the desert?
6. Why did Moshe tell Yitro all that G-d had done for the Jewish People?
7. According to the Midrash quoted by Rashi, how did Yitro respond when he was told about the destruction of Egypt?
8. Who is considered as if he enjoys the splendor of the *Shechina*?
9. On what day did Moshe sit to judge the Jewish People?
10. Who is considered a co-partner in Creation?
11. "Moshe sat to judge the people, and the people stood before Moshe..." What bothered Yitro about this arrangement?
12. Why did Yitro return to his own land?
13. How did the encampment at Sinai differ from the other encampments?
14. To whom does the Torah refer when it uses the term "*Beit Yaakov*"?
15. How is G-d's protection of the Jewish People similar to an eagle's protection of its young?
16. What was G-d's original plan for *Matan Torah*? What was the response of the Jewish People?
17. How many times greater is the "measure of reward" than the "measure of punishment"?
18. How is it derived that "Don't steal" refers to kidnapping?
19. In response to hearing the Torah given at Sinai, how far backwards did the Jewish people retreat in fear?
20. Why does the use of iron tools profane the altar?

Answers

All references are to the verses and Rashi's commentary, unless otherwise stated.

1. 18:1 - Because he caused a *parsha* to be added to the Torah. *Yeter* means addition.
2. 18:1 - The splitting of the sea and the war against Amalek.
3. 18:1 - Chovav.
4. 18:3 - When Aharon met Moshe with his family on their way down to Egypt, Aharon said to Moshe: "We're pained over the Jews already in Egypt, and you're bringing more Jews to Egypt?" Moshe, hearing this, sent his wife and children back to Midian.
5. 18:5 - To show Yitro's greatness. He was living in a luxurious place; yet he went to the desert in order to study the Torah.
6. 18:8 - To draw Yitro closer to the Torah way of life.
7. 18:9 - He grieved.
8. 18:12 - One who dines with Torah scholars.
9. 18:13 - The day after Yom Kippur.
10. 18:13 - A judge who renders a correct decision.
11. 18:14 - Yitro felt that the people weren't being treated with the proper respect.
12. 18:27 - To convert the members of his family to Judaism.
13. 19:2 - The Jewish People were united.
14. 19:3 - The Jewish women.
15. 19:4 - An eagle carries its young on top of its wings to protect them from human arrows. So too, G-d's cloud of glory separated between the Egyptians and the Jewish camp in order to absorb Egyptian missiles and arrows fired at the Jewish People.
16. 19:9 - G-d offered to appear to Moshe and to give the Torah through him. The Jewish People responded that they wished to hear the Torah directly from G-d.
17. 20:6 - 500 times.
18. 20:13 - Since it is written immediately after "Don't murder" and "Don't commit adultery," it is derived that "Don't steal" refers to a crime carrying the same penalty as the first two, namely, the death penalty.
19. 20:15 - They backed away from the mountain twelve *mil* (one *mil* is 2000 cubits).
20. 20:22 - The altar was created to extend life; iron is sometimes used to make weapons which shorten life.

LOVE OF THE LAND

Selections from classical Torah sources which express the special relationship between the people of Israel and Eretz Yisrael

Metzada and the Italian Tourists

Many legends surround one of the most popular tourist sites in Eretz Yisrael, the ancient fortress of Metzada. Visitors to this site hear from the guides about the courageous stand made by Jewish rebels against the mighty Roman army and how they committed suicide rather than fall into the hands of those heathens.

During a visit to the yeshiva, one of Ohr Somayach's former students told an interesting story about a visit he made many years ago to Metzada together with his father. Ahead of them was a group of Italian tourists

led by a guide speaking their language. The father of our alumnus spoke fluent Italian, and when he heard the guide make a certain point he burst into uncontrollable laughter.

When he finally recovered, he explained to his son how funny it was, after all they had heard from their own guide about the courage of the Hebrew defenders, to hear the Italian guide say to his compatriots of Roman origin, as he pointed to one section of the fortress, "And this is where we came in."

PARSHA OVERVIEW

Hearing of the miracles G-d performed for *Bnei Yisrael*, Moshe's father-in-law Yitro arrives with Moshe's wife and sons, reuniting the family in the wilderness. Yitro is so impressed by Moshe's detailing of the Exodus from Egypt that he converts to Judaism. Seeing that the only judicial authority for the entire Jewish nation is Moshe himself, Yitro suggests that subsidiary judges be appointed to adjudicate smaller matters, leaving Moshe free to attend to larger issues. Moshe accepts his advice.

The *Bnei Yisrael* arrive at Mt. Sinai where G-d offers them the Torah. After they accept, G-d charges Moshe to instruct the people not to approach the mountain and to prepare for three days. On the third day, amidst thunder and lightning, G-d's voice emanates from the smoke-enshrouded mountain and He speaks to the Jewish People, giving them the Ten Commandments:

1. Believe in G-d
2. Don't worship other "gods"
3. Don't use G-d's name in vain
4. Observe Shabbat
5. Honor your parents
6. Don't murder
7. Don't commit adultery
8. Don't kidnap
9. Don't testify falsely
10. Don't covet.

After receiving the first two commandments, the Jewish People, overwhelmed by this experience with the Divine, request that Moshe relay G-d's word to them. G-d instructs Moshe to caution the Jewish People regarding their responsibility to be faithful to the One who spoke to them.

subscribe @ ohr.edu

to receive Ohrnet directly to your email each week

ASK!

Your Jewish Information Resource – www.ohr.edu

by Rabbi Yirmiyahu Ullman

In Search of Eden

From: Dov

Dear Rabbi,

Assuming the Torah's account of the Garden of Eden is literal: I'm wondering where the Garden was located, whether it exists anywhere in the world today, and if Mankind will ever return to the Garden.

Dear Dov,

The Torah's account of Creation, the Garden of Eden, and the story of Adam and Eve surely has many levels of simultaneous meaning, including the symbolic, metaphorical and esoteric. It would also be reasonable to assume that there is a literal level of meaning as well.

Thus, the Torah's seemingly geographical description of Eden should offer at a least a general indication of its location, which appears to be Mesopotamia: "And a river flowed out of Eden to water the garden, and from there it separated and became four heads. The name of one is Pishon; that is the one that encompasses all the land of Havilah...And the name of the second river is Gihon; that is the one that encompasses all the land of Cush. And the name of the third river is Hidekel (Tigris); that is the one that flows to the east of Assyria. And the fourth river is the Prat (Euphrates)." (Gen. 2:10-14)

This indicates that the Garden of Eden was generally in the Middle East, and possibly near the very fertile region between the Tigris and Euphrates rivers.

Interestingly, our sources teach that G-d actually formed Adam's body in the Land of Israel, breathed life into him there, and only afterward placed him in the Garden. The Talmud (Sanhedrin 38a-b) relates that G-d gathered earth from the four corners of the globe to fashion Adam's limbs, earth from Babylon for his torso, and earth from the Holy Land for his head. This took place in Jerusalem, on Mount Moriah, on the spot of the altar of the future Temple (Rashi, Gen. 2:7 from B.R. 14:8). Since the head is the superior part of the body, this indicates that the Holy Land is the most elevated Land. Yet, the fact the torso with its vital organs is related to Babylon indicates the importance of that land, and its aptness to the cradle of civilization and Eden.

This raises an intriguing question. While it's understandable that G-d would create Mankind in the Holy Land, why did he then remove them to the Garden, in Babylon?

One possible answer is that G-d brought Mankind into the world in a place that would instill within them the greatest potential for achieving spiritual perfection, the Holy Land. However, it was inappropriate that the "training ground" for realizing that perfection be the Land of Israel, precisely because of its elevated status. Rather, after having been formed with the substance of perfection, Mankind was placed in the Garden, which was also infused with great spirituality, to perfect themselves, after which time they would have been fit to enter the Holy Land forever.

This is comparable to the Jews receiving the Torah outside of Israel, where all their needs were miraculously provided for, such that if they had thereby perfected themselves in that realm they would have entered the Land of Israel in a state of eternal redemption.

However, Adam and Eve failed the task and trial of self-effected perfection and were banished from Eden. This initiated the much more circuitous route to redemption, to the return to Eden and then to the elevated spiritual state of the Holy Land, which humanity is still traversing.

After banishing them, G-d barred the entrance to Eden: "And He drove the man out, and at the east of the Garden of Eden He placed the *cherubim* and the blade of the revolving sword to guard the way to the Tree of Life" (Gen. 3:24). On this verse, Rashi explains that the sword frightened them from re-entering the Garden; and on Ex. 7:11 he seems to add that this revolving sword was actually a spinning ring of fire.

Accordingly, this revolving, sword-like, spinning ring of fire placed a portal of death between Mankind and Eden. And from then on the metaphysical plane of Eden, which had been infused in an earthly location, was removed from the physical realm, leaving its former place nothing other than ordinary, mundane geography. For this reason, "Eden" is not to be found anywhere in the world today.

So where is Eden?

It was removed to the other side of the revolving, sword-like, spinning ring of fire – i.e., on the other side of death. And that is the spiritual realm we call Heaven, or *Gan Eden*, the Garden of Eden. It is to this spiritual realm that the souls of the righteous enter to dwell until the time of Resurrection, when perfected souls will be removed from Eden and return to perfected bodies that are brought to life in the Holy Land, as was Mankind at its inception.

WHAT'S IN A WORD?

Synonyms in the Hebrew Language
by Rabbi Reuven Chaim Klein

Cut it Out (Part 2 of 2)

In last week's article, we discussed three forms of "cutting" Hebrew: *bokea*, *korea*, and several words derived from the biliteral root GIMMEL-ZAYIN (*gozer*, *gazit*, and more). In this installment we will continue that discussion, and sharpen the differences between another twelve words, which all refer to the concept of "cutting". In lieu of an elaborate introduction, let's cut right to the chase.

The most common word for "cutting" is *chaticha*. However, it should be noted that a *chaticha*-related word appears only once in the entire Bible (Dan. 9:24). Nevertheless, cognates of *chaticha* come up more often in later Hebrew writings. Rabbi Shlomo Pappenheim of Breslau (1740-1814) explains that *chaticha* primarily refers to the act of "cutting" something down the middle, thereby splitting it into two halves. Rabbinic Hebrew adopted the word *chaticha* and its cognate as the principle words for "cutting," and expanded the word's meaning to refer to all types of "cutting".

Rabbi Pappenheim explains that like the word *chaticha*, *batar* also refers to cutting something in half. More specifically, it refers to cutting an animal in half for the purposes of using that cut animal as a sign for a covenant/treaty between two parties. He explains that the word *batar* is related to *brit*, as both words have the same three consonants. In fact, Genesis 15 describes the Covenant Between the Pieces (*Brit Bein Ha'Betarim*) – an agreement between G-d and Abraham, which Abraham endorsed by following G-d's command to cut up certain animals and seal the deal. The prophet Jeremiah (in Jer. 34:18-19) also describes solidifying a treaty by cutting animals in half and walking through them. In all of these cases, the word *batar* is used.

With this in mind, Rabbi Pappenheim explains the meaning of the expression *harei batar* ("mountains of *bater*"), which appears in Song of Songs 2:17. That term refers to a pair of mountains which appear to have been originally formed as one, but were split from each other over time.

Another word for "cutting" is *natach* (or its verb form *minateach*). Rabbi Pappenheim explains that *natach* differs from *batar* in that it refers to cutting an animal into multiple pieces (not just two), and is not used for making a treaty, but for other purposes. For example, when a butcher sells different parts of an animal's body, or a cook

cuts up pieces of meat so they can fit in a pot, this is called *natach*. The Modern Hebrew word *nituah* ("surgery") is derived from this Biblical root.

The term *petitah* (found, for example, in Lev. 2:6) refers to breaking up something with one's bare hands. For instance, a baked good broken up into smaller parts is called *pat/pita* (one of several Hebrew words for "bread"). Rabbi Pappenheim explains that this term differs from *natach* not in the quality of the cutting, but in its focus. *Petitah/pat* focuses on the pieces which result from cutting, while *natach* refers to the whole body of that which was cut.

Interestingly, Rabbi Pappenheim explains that the two-letter root PEH-TAV, which makes up the core of *petitah*, is also related to the words *mefateh/pitui* ("convincing" or "cajoling"). When one needs to "convince" somebody else to acquiesce to his propositions, he has essentially "torn up" that person's feelings into different parts, with the person partially agreeing to him and partially disagreeing. On the other hand, when a person does something completely of his own volition, he is said to do it *b'lev shaleim* ("with a complete heart"), not with a "partial heart". Rabbi Pappenheim also expands on this idea to explain the etymology of the word *mofet* ("wonder" or "sign"), which serves to "convince" somebody of a certain reality.

Another word for "cutting" is *mohl/milah*. Rabbi Pappenheim explains that this term is reserved for cutting off the top of something. It is famously applied to *brit milah* ("circumcision"), which is the commandment of cutting off the foreskin (on the top of the male organ). It is also applied to cutting off the tops of stalks (Job 18:16, 24:24) and of grass (Ps. 37:2), and dulling the tips of arrows (Ps. 58:8). One who engages in this sort of cutting is called a *mohel*. I seem to remember reading somewhere once that the terms *mohel* or *milah* refer specifically to cutting something round, but I am unable to recall where I saw this idea.

Nonetheless, Rabbi Pappenheim writes something similar about a different word. He explains that *poleach* means to cut something open (see Ps. 141:7, Prov. 7:23), while *pelach* is that which has been cut out (see Song of Songs 4:3, I Sam. 30:12). Rabbi Pappenheim explains that the hallmark of a *pelach* is that it refers specifically to something "cut off" from a greater circular parent, such

that the shape of the *pelach* makes its obvious that it is cut from something circular or spherical. The shape of an orange segment or a slice of pizza can be described as a *pelach* (a “sector” in geometrical terms), and *poleach* refers specifically to cutting something in that fashion.

According to Rabbi Pappenheim, *ketev* refers to the type of cutting which does not penetrate the entire thickness of something to completely sever it. Rather, it is simply a cut that slices into the thickness, but not through-and-through. This is like a paper-cut, when one’s finger gets cut but is not completely severed. Rabbi Pappenheim explains that all four times that cognates of *ketev* appear in the Bible (Deut. 32:24, Isa. 28:2, Ps. 91:6, and Hos. 13:14), they refer to a type of illness that cuts one’s innards but does not sever them.

Another word for “cutting” is *primah/porem* (Lev. 13:45, 21:10). Rabbi Pappenheim sharpens the definition of *primah* by comparing it to *kriyah/korea*. Each act of *kriyah* makes another tear that separates one piece from the item-

at-large. However, with *primah*, one act of tearing causes multiple pieces to come off of the item in question. When one rips something made up of many smaller parts (e.g., cheap fabrics), one simple act of ripping already begins to unravel the entire item. That type of “tearing” or “cutting” is called *primah*.

Other words for “cutting” include: 1) *Gada* (“truncating”), which specifically refers to cutting something as a means of destroying it or rendering it useless. 2) *Ketzitzah* (“chopping”), which refers to the act of cutting something with one strong blow. Rabbi Pappenheim explains that the root of *ketzitzah* is the two-letter string *KUF-TZADI*, which means “end,” because through chopping an object into two parts one creates two new ends of it. 3) *Ketifah*, which refers to severing something which was only flimsily connected. It is the word used to refer to plucking or detaching a flower or other flora. 4) *Karet* also refers to “cutting,” and is used to refer to the punishment of spiritual excision. In a future essay I hope to address the etymology of *karet* and how it differs from another punishment called *ariri*.

MEZUZAH MAVEN

by Rabbi Ze’ev Kraines

Ablutions Inside a Bedroom

Q: I am a rabbi in an outreach community. A newly-religious family asked me to do a “house call” to see which of their doors need a mezuzah. I discovered that their master bedroom contains a bath, shower and a toilet, without any separating walls. Does this turn the entire area into a bathroom and disqualify the bedroom from mezuzah placement?

A: No. A bedroom is a multi-purpose room. The fact that people bathe and change in it does not turn it into a “bath-house,” and it is therefore obligated to have a mezuzah. Likewise, even though the room contains a toilet, it also has many other uses and is therefore obligated.

- Sources: Sources: Rema Y.D. 286:2; Sedei Chemed, Mem:119; Mishnah Berurah 83:13; Magen Avraham 40:2. Cf. Chazon Ish O.C. 17:4; Agur B’ohalecha 32:4:5

Got a mezuzah question or story? Email rabbi@ohrsandton.com or submit on my website mymezuzahstory.com. Free “Mezuzah Maven” book for every question or story submitted (when published in the near future!)

Moreover, some authorities hold that many of the *halachot* regarding toilets are not applicable to our modern flush mechanisms, where the bowl remains clean afterwards.

Nevertheless, in order to recite *Shema* or *berachot* within four *amot* of the toilet, it should be covered fully with a cloth, even if it is totally clean and odorless.

Since people sometimes undress in the room, the mezuzah should have an opaque cover, and if it is inside a bedroom of a married couple, it should have another covering aside from the opaque one.

LETTER AND SPIRIT

Insights based on the writings of Rav S.R. Hirsch
by Rabbi Yosef Herman

Inherited Impact

In the second of the ten commandments, G-d warns the people of Israel to be faithful in their observance, *for I am Hashem, your G-d, a G-d Who commands His exclusive rights; I remember the sin of parents for their children, for the third and fourth generation, for those who hate Me; And I practice loving-kindness unto thousands, to those who love Me and to those to keep My commandments.*

Two fundamental truths are taught here regarding Divine reward and retribution. First, G-d holds us accountable for our actions, and it is in our power to build our lives or ruin them, according to our adherence to his Law; there is no escape from judgment.

But the extension of judgment to subsequent generation demands our reflection. This second fundamental teaches that the weal or woe of children depends on the parents – all according to the measure of their virtue or vice. Children's life and fate are bound to that of the parents. Just as parents impart physical traits – desirable and undesirable, strengths and infirmities – so too do they impart spiritual ones, be it via nature or nurture.

This creates yet another incentive to aid our spiritual development. For the sake of our children we should preserve our own health; for the sake of our children we should act morally and charitable; for the sake of our children we should be spiritually vigilant and valiant.

But what of that pure soul of the child? What has that soul done to begin its journey as a fruit on the frail tree of its parents? The flawed propensities, weaknesses and defects of the parents have affected that child not only by inheritance or osmosis, but may also have compromised the child's upbringing by depriving him of a sound emotional environment. These present the child with a formidable task, and to overcome them, the pure soul of the child must test and prove its godlike power. The parents' sins may line the cradle of their infant, but that little citizen has the power to climb a hard steep path of trials until he prevails in the moral test.

And the journey of that fruit of a more righteous vine is just as noble. The goodness of his parents, their moral and spiritual purity and strength, form a rich and firm soil which becomes broader and firmer with the succeeding generation. This is the kindness that G-d bestows upon the offspring of those who are loyal to his Law.

Both outcomes for the next generation – the carrying over of sins, and the bestowal of kindness – are the attribute of the One G-d. He alone reckons our deeds, and He alone controls our fate. And the individual yearning, pure soul can achieve its perfection on the very road he has been placed.

OHRNET magazine is published by OHR SOMAYACH Tanenbaum College

POB 18103, Jerusalem 91180, Israel • Tel: +972-2-581-0315 • Email: info@ohr.edu • www.ohr.edu

Love of the Land, written by RAV MENDEL WEINBACH, zt"l • General Editor: RABBI MOSHE NEWMAN • Design: RABBI ELIEZER SHAPIRO / DANIEL FREEDMAN

© 1992 - 2018 Ohr Somayach Institutions - All rights reserved • This publication contains words of Torah. Please treat it with due respect. Editor's disclaimer: Ohrnet Magazine is not intended to be a source for halachic rulings. In any real and specific case one should consult a qualified halachic authority for a ruling.