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: 978-0-9725010-1-9 (Set: 978-0-9725010-0-2)
ISBN-10: 0-9725010-1-0 (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

Preface ix
Foreword xi

Bereishis 1
Noach 39
Lech Lecha 69
Vayeira 99
Chayei Sarah 139
Toldos 165
Vayeitzei 191
Vayishlach 223
Vayeishev 257
Mikeitz 285
Vayigash 317
Vayechi 339

Haftaros 365

Bibliography 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, Kabalah 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 that 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] Moose[3] 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 Goldberg [4], Moore [5], Herczeg [6] and Scherman[7]. 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 Kaplan[9], we have not omitted awkward words or abandoned translation for idiom. However, we have also rejected the opposite extreme exemplified by Scherman[7], 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 *Hisvaduyos,* 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 Solomon[13]:

> "*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 Sacks[14] 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, Solomon[15] 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 1946[16]:

> *"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 concepts[17]. Thus, virtually every one of the Rebbe's "*Rashi Sichos*" climaxes in a mystical interpretation based on the teachings of Kabalah 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 Kabalah 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 instruction[18]. 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 Parsha[19]. 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

Cantillation Marks / טעמי המקרא

פַּשְׁטָא֗ מֻנַּח֙ זַרְקָא֣ מֻנַּח֮ סֶ֣גוֹל֒ מֻנַּח֙ | מֻנַּח֙ רְבִיעִ֣י
מַהְפַּ֔ךְ פַּשְׁטָא֙ זָקֵ֣ף קָטֹ֔ן זָקֵ֥ף־גָּד֖וֹל מֵרְכָ֣א טִפְחָ֑א
מֻנַּח֙ אֶתְנַחְתָּ֣א פָּזֵ֔ר תְּלִישָׁ֥א־קְטַנָּ֖ה
תְּלִישָׁ֣א־גְדוֹלָ֑ה קַדְמָ֣א וְאַזְלָ֔א אַזְלָ֥א־גֵ֖רֵשׁ גֵּרְשַׁ֣יִם
דַּרְגָּ֣א תְבִ֣יר ׀ יְתִ֣יב פְּסִ֔יק | סוֹף־פָּסֽוּק׃ שַׁלְשֶׁ֣לֶת
קַרְנֵי־פָרָ֔ה מֵרְכָא־כְפוּלָ֖ה יֶ֣רַח־בֶּן־יוֹמ֑וֹ׃

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 end[2] of the reading. The scroll is then closed, he turns slightly to the right and says:

בָּרְכוּ אֶת יְיָ הַמְּבֹרָךְ׃

The congregation responds:

בָּרוּךְ יְיָ הַמְּבֹרָךְ לְעוֹלָם וָעֶד.

The person called to the Torah continues:

בָּרוּךְ יְיָ הַמְּבֹרָךְ לְעוֹלָם וָעֶד׃

בָּרוּךְ אַתָּה יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ מֶלֶךְ הָעוֹלָם, אֲשֶׁר בָּחַר בָּנוּ מִכָּל הָעַמִּים, וְנָתַן לָנוּ אֶת תּוֹרָתוֹ. בָּרוּךְ 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 beginning[3] 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:

בָּרוּךְ אַתָּה יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ מֶלֶךְ הָעוֹלָם, אֲשֶׁר נָתַן לָנוּ תּוֹרַת אֱמֶת, וְחַיֵּי עוֹלָם נָטַע בְּתוֹכֵנוּ. בָּרוּךְ 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

פרשת בראשית

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. 1*ff; ibid.* p. 326)

א א בְּרֵאשִׁית בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים אֵת הַשָּׁמַיִם וְאֵת הָאָרֶץ: ב וְהָאָרֶץ הָיְתָה תֹהוּ וָבֹהוּ וְחֹשֶׁךְ עַל־פְּנֵי תְהוֹם וְרוּחַ אֱלֹהִים מְרַחֶפֶת

א בְּקַדְמִין בְּרָא יְיָ יָת שְׁמַיָּא וְיָת אַרְעָא:
ב וְאַרְעָא הֲוַת צַדְיָא וְרֵיקַנְיָא וַחֲשׁוֹכָא פָּרֵשׂ עַל אַפֵּי תְהוֹמָא וְרוּחָא מִן קֳדָם יְיָ מְנַשְּׁבָא עַל

*ב' רבתי

רש"י

(ה) **בראשית**. אמר רבי יצחק, לא היה צריך להתחיל את התורה אלא מהחדש הזה לכם, שהיא מצוה הראשונה שנצטוו בה ישראל, ומה טעם פתח בבראשית, משום כח מעשיו הגיד לעמו לתת להם נחלת גויים[1], שאם יאמרו אומות העולם לישראל, ליסטים אתם, שכבשתם ארצות שבעה גויים, הם אומרים להם, כל הארץ של הקב"ה היא, הוא בראה ונתנה לכאשר ישר בעיניו, ברצונו נתנה להם, וברצונו נטלה מהם ונתנה לנו: **בראשית ברא**. אין המקרא הזה אומר אלא דרשני, כמ"ש רז"ל[2] בשביל התורה שנקראת ראשית דרכו[3], ובשביל ישראל שנקראו ראשית תבואתו[4], ואם בשת לפרשו כפשוטו כך פרשהו, בראשית בריית שמים וארץ, והארץ היתה תהו ובהו וחושך (וגו'), ויאמר אלהים יהי אור. ולא בא המקרא להורות סדר הבריאה לומר שאלו קדמו, שאם בא להורות כך, היה לו לכתוב, ברשאנה ברא את השמים וגו', שאין לך ראשית במקרא שאינו דבוק לתיבה שלאחריו, כמו בראשית ממלכת יהויקים[5], ראשית ממלכתו[6], ראשית דגנך[7], אף כאן אתה אומר בראשית ברא אלהים וגו' כמו בראשית ברוא, ודומה לו תהלת לדוד ה' אלי אתה, בהושע בראשונה של הקב"ה בהושע ויאמר ה' אל הושע וגו'[8].

(ה) **בראשית**. אמר רבי יצחק, לא היה צריך להתחיל את התורה אלא מהחדש הזה לכם, שהיא מצוה הראשונה שנצטוו בה ישראל, ומה טעם פתח בבראשית, משום כח מעשיו הגיד לעמו לתת להם נחלת גויים[1], שאם יאמרו אומות העולם לישראל, ליסטים אתם, שכבשתם ארצות שבעה גויים, הם אומרים להם, כל הארץ של הקב"ה היא, הוא בראה ונתנה לאשר ישר בעיניו, ברצונו נתנה להם, וברצונו נטלה מהם ונתנה לנו: **בראשית ברא**. אין המקרא הזה אומר אלא דרשני, כמ"ש רז"ל[2] בשביל התורה שנקראת ראשית דרכו[3], ובשביל ישראל שנקראו ראשית תבואתו[4], ואם בשת לפרשו כפשוטו כך פרשהו, בראשית בריית שמים וארץ, והארץ היתה תהו ובהו וחושך (וגו'), ויאמר אלהים יהי אור. ולא בא המקרא להורות סדר הבריאה לומר שאלו קדמו, שאם בא להורות כך, היה לו לכתוב, ברשאנה ברא את השמים וגו', שאין לך ראשית במקרא שאינו דבוק לתיבה שלאחריו, כמו ראשית ממלכת יהויקים[5], ראשית ממלכתו[6], ראשית דגנך[7], אף כאן אתה אומר בראשית ברא אלהים וגו' כמו בראשית ברוא, ודומה לו תהלת לדוד ה' אלי אתה, בהושע בראשונה של הקב"ה בהושע 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"?

1 תהלים קיא, ו 2 ב"ר א, ו 3 משלי ח, כב 4 ירמי' ב, ג 5 שם כו, א 6 בראשית י, י 7 דברים יח, ד 8 הושע א, ב 9 איוב ג, י 10 ישעי' ח, ד 11 עמוס ו, יב 12 ישעי' מו, י 13 ב"ר פי"ב

CREATION: THE FIRST DAY—LIGHT & DARKNESS

I *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" (בְּ 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 Cana'an.

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 מְרַחֶפֶת ("hovered") which contains the letters רפ"ח, 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.

עַל־פְּנֵי הַמָּיִם: ג וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים יְהִי אוֹר וַיְהִי־אוֹר: ד וַיַּרְא
אֱלֹהִים אֶת־הָאוֹר כִּי־טוֹב וַיַּבְדֵּל אֱלֹהִים בֵּין הָאוֹר וּבֵין
הַחֹשֶׁךְ: ה וַיִּקְרָא אֱלֹהִים | לָאוֹר יוֹם וְלַחֹשֶׁךְ קָרָא לָיְלָה
וַיְהִי־עֶרֶב וַיְהִי־בֹקֶר יוֹם אֶחָד: פ ו וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים יְהִי רָקִיעַ

אַפֵּי מַיָּא: ג וַאֲמַר יְיָ יְהֵי נְהוֹרָא וַהֲוָה נְהוֹרָא:
ד וַחֲזָא יְיָ יַת נְהוֹרָא אֲרֵי טָב וְאַפְרֵישׁ יְיָ בֵּין
נְהוֹרָא וּבֵין חֲשׁוֹכָא: ה וּקְרָא יְיָ לִנְהוֹרָא יְמָמָא
וְלַחֲשׁוֹכָא קְרָא לֵילְיָא וַהֲוָה רְמַשׁ וַהֲוָה צְפַר
יוֹמָא חָד: ו וַאֲמַר יְיָ יְהֵי רְקִיעָא בְּמֵצִיעוּת

רס"י

הכבוד עומד בחויר, ומרחף על פני המים ברוח פיו של הקב"ה ובמאמרו, כיוצה המרחפת על הקן, תקוב"ט בלע"ז: (ד) וירא אלהים את האור כי טוב ויבדל. לף זכה אלו לריכים לדברי אגדה[1], רואה שאינו כדאי להשתמש בו רשעים, והבדילו לצדיקים לעתיד לבא. ולפי פשוטו כך פרשתו, ראהו כי טוב, ואין נאה לו ולחשך שיהיו משתמשין בערבוביא, וקבע לזה תחומו ביום ולזה תחומו בלילה: (ה) יום אחד. לפי סדר לשון הפרשה

היה לו לכתוב יום ראשון, כמו שכתוב בשאר הימים, שני, שלישי, רביעי, למה כתב אחד, לפי שהיה הקב"ה יחיד בעולמו, שלא נבראו המלאכים עד יום שני, כך מפורש בברייתא דרבי[2]: (ו) יהי רקיע. יתחזק הרקיע, שלף על פי שנבראו שמים ביום ראשון, עדיין לחים היו, וקרשו בשני מגערת הקב"ה בשמרו יהי רקיע, וזהו שכתוב עמודי שמים ירופפו[3], כל יום ראשון, ובשני יתמהו מגערתו, כאדם שמשתומם ועומד מגערת המחייה

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. 1*ff; 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.

1 חגיגה יב. 2 ג, יא, יב 3 איוב כו, יא

[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. 7*ff*.)

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

בְּתוֹךְ הַמָּיִם וִיהִי מַבְדִּיל בֵּין מַיִם לָמָיִם: ז וַיַּעַשׂ אֱלֹהִים
אֶת־הָרָקִיעַ וַיַּבְדֵּל בֵּין הַמַּיִם אֲשֶׁר מִתַּחַת לָרָקִיעַ וּבֵין הַמַּיִם
אֲשֶׁר מֵעַל לָרָקִיעַ וַיְהִי־כֵן: ח וַיִּקְרָא אֱלֹהִים לָרָקִיעַ שָׁמָיִם
וַיְהִי־עֶרֶב וַיְהִי־בֹקֶר יוֹם שֵׁנִי: פ ט וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים יִקָּווּ הַמַּיִם
מִתַּחַת הַשָּׁמַיִם אֶל־מָקוֹם אֶחָד וְתֵרָאֶה הַיַּבָּשָׁה וַיְהִי־כֵן:
י וַיִּקְרָא אֱלֹהִים | לַיַּבָּשָׁה אֶרֶץ וּלְמִקְוֵה הַמַּיִם קָרָא יַמִּים וַיַּרְא
אֱלֹהִים כִּי־טוֹב: יא וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים תַּדְשֵׁא הָאָרֶץ דֶּשֶׁא עֵשֶׂב
מַזְרִיעַ זֶרַע עֵץ פְּרִי עֹשֶׂה פְּרִי לְמִינוֹ אֲשֶׁר זַרְעוֹ־בוֹ
עַל־הָאָרֶץ וַיְהִי־כֵן: יב וַתּוֹצֵא הָאָרֶץ דֶּשֶׁא עֵשֶׂב מַזְרִיעַ זֶרַע
לְמִינֵהוּ וְעֵץ עֹשֶׂה־פְּרִי אֲשֶׁר זַרְעוֹ־בוֹ לְמִינֵהוּ וַיַּרְא אֱלֹהִים
כִּי־טוֹב: יג וַיְהִי־עֶרֶב וַיְהִי־בֹקֶר יוֹם שְׁלִישִׁי: פ יד וַיֹּאמֶר

מַיָּא וִיהֵי מַפְרִישׁ בֵּין מַיָּא לְמַיָּא: ז וַעֲבַד יְיָ יַת
רְקִיעָא וְאַפְרֵישׁ בֵּין מַיָּא דִי מִלְּרַע לִרְקִיעָא
וּבֵין מַיָּא דִי מֵעַל לִרְקִיעָא וַהֲוָה כֵן: ח וּקְרָא
יְיָ לִרְקִיעָא שְׁמַיָּא וַהֲוָה רְמַשׁ וַהֲוָה צְפַר יוֹם
תִּנְיָן: ט וַאֲמַר יְיָ יִתְבַּנְשׁוּן מַיָּא מִתְּחוֹת שְׁמַיָּא
לְאַתְרָא חַד וְתִתְחֲזֵי יַבֶּשְׁתָּא וַהֲוָה כֵן: י וּקְרָא
יְיָ לְיַבֶּשְׁתָּא אַרְעָא וּלְבֵית כְּנִישׁוּת מַיָּא קְרָא
יַמְמֵי וַחֲזָא יְיָ אֲרֵי טָב: יא וַאֲמַר יְיָ תַּדְאֵית
אַרְעָא דְּתָאָה עִשְׂבָּא דְּבַר זַרְעֵיהּ מְזַדְרַע אִילָן
פֵּרִין עָבֵד פֵּרִין לְזְנֵיהּ דִּי בַר זַרְעֵיהּ בֵּיהּ עַל
אַרְעָא וַהֲוָה כֵן: יב וְאַפֵּיקַת אַרְעָא דְּתָאָה
עִשְׂבָּא דְּבַר זַרְעֵיהּ מִזְדְּרַע לְזְנוֹהִי וְאִילָן עָבֵד
פֵּרִין דְּבַר זַרְעֵיהּ בֵּיהּ לְזְנוֹהִי וַחֲזָא יְיָ אֲרֵי טָב:
יג וַהֲוָה רְמַשׁ וַהֲוָה צְפַר יוֹם תְּלִיתָאי:
יד וַאֲמַר יְיָ יְהוֹן נְהוֹרִין בִּרְקִיעָא דִשְׁמַיָּא

לק"י

עליו: **בתוך המים.** בתמצע המים, שיש הפרש בין מים העליונים לרקיע כמו בין הרקיע למים שעל הארץ, הא למדת, שכסא תלויס בתמהרו של מלך: (ז) **ויעש אלהים את הרקיע.** תקנו על עמדו, והיא עשייתו, כמו ועשתה את נפריהס: **מעל לרקיע.** על הרקיע לא נאמר, אלא מעל לרקיע, לפי שהן תלוייס בחויר. ומפני מה לא נאמר כי טוב ביום שני, לפי שלא היה נגמר מלאכת המים עד יום השליסי, והרי התחיל בה בשני, ודבר שלא נגמר חיזו בתילותו וטובו, ובשליסי שנגמרה מלאכת המים והתחיל וגמר מלאכה אחרת, לפל בו כי טוב שני פעמים, אחת לגמר מלאכת השני, ואחת לגמר מלאכת היוס: (ח) **ויקרא אלהים לרקיע שמים.** שא מים, שם מים, אש ומים, שערבן זה בזה ועשה מהם שמים: (ט) **יקוו המים.** שטותין היו על פני כל הארץ, והקוום בתוקיימום, הוא היה הגדול שבכל הימים: (י) **קרא ימים.** והלא יש אחד הוא, אלא חיזו דומה טעם דג הטולה מן היס בעבו לדג הטולה מן היס בתספימה: (יא) **תדשא הארץ דשא עשב.** לא דשא לשון עשב ולא עשב לשון דשא, ולא היה לשון המקרא לומר תעשיב הארץ, שמיני דשהיס מחולקין, כל אחד לעלמו נקרא עשב פלוני, ואין לשון למדבר לומר דשא פלוני, שלשון דשא הוא לציות הארץ כשהיא מתמלאת בדשאיס: **תדשא הארץ.** תתמלא ותתכסה לגוש עשביס, בלשון לע"ז נקרא דשא מרגריט"ן בלע"ז, כולן בערבוביא, וכל שורש לעלמו נקרא עשב: **מזריע זרע.** שיגדל בו זרע לזרוע ממנו במקום אחר: **עץ פרי.** שיהא טעם העץ בטעם הפרי. והיא לא עשתה כן, אלא ותולא הארץ וגו' ועץ עושה פרי, ולא העץ פרי, לפיכך כשנתקלל אדם על עונו נפקדה גם היא על עונה (ונתקללה): **אשר זרעו בו.** הן גרעיני כל פרי, שמהן החילן לומח כשנוטעין אותן: (יב) **ותוצא הארץ**

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. 1*ff*)

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 *God 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 *God 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 רוּחַ 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)

אֱלֹהִים יְהִי מְאֹרֹת בִּרְקִיעַ הַשָּׁמַיִם לְהַבְדִּיל בֵּין הַיּוֹם וּבֵין
הַלָּיְלָה וְהָיוּ לְאֹתֹת וּלְמוֹעֲדִים וּלְיָמִים וְשָׁנִים: טו וְהָיוּ לִמְאוֹרֹת
בִּרְקִיעַ הַשָּׁמַיִם לְהָאִיר עַל־הָאָרֶץ וַיְהִי־כֵן: טז וַיַּעַשׂ אֱלֹהִים
אֶת־שְׁנֵי הַמְּאֹרֹת הַגְּדֹלִים אֶת־הַמָּאוֹר הַגָּדֹל לְמֶמְשֶׁלֶת הַיּוֹם
וְאֶת־הַמָּאוֹר הַקָּטֹן לְמֶמְשֶׁלֶת הַלָּיְלָה וְאֵת הַכּוֹכָבִים: יז וַיִּתֵּן
אֹתָם אֱלֹהִים בִּרְקִיעַ הַשָּׁמָיִם לְהָאִיר עַל־הָאָרֶץ: יח וְלִמְשֹׁל
בַּיּוֹם וּבַלַּיְלָה וְלַהַבְדִּיל בֵּין הָאוֹר וּבֵין הַחֹשֶׁךְ וַיַּרְא אֱלֹהִים
כִּי־טוֹב: יט וַיְהִי־עֶרֶב וַיְהִי־בֹקֶר יוֹם רְבִיעִי: פ כ וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים
יִשְׁרְצוּ הַמַּיִם שֶׁרֶץ נֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה וְעוֹף יְעוֹפֵף עַל־הָאָרֶץ עַל־פְּנֵי

לְאַפְרָשָׁא בֵּין יְמָמָא וּבֵין לֵילְיָא וְיהוֹן לְאָתִין
וּלְזִמְנִין וּלְמֶמְנֵי בְּהוֹן יוֹמִין וּשְׁנִין: טו וְיהוֹן
לְנְהוֹרִין בִּרְקִיעָא דִשְׁמַיָּא לְאַנְהָרָא עַל אַרְעָא
וַהֲוָה כֵן: טז וַעֲבַד יְיָ יָת תְּרֵין נְהוֹרַיָּא רַבְרְבַיָּא
יָת נְהוֹרָא רַבָּא לְמִשְׁלַט בְּיוֹמָמָא וְיָת נְהוֹרָא
זְעֵירָא לְמִשְׁלַט בְּלֵילְיָא וְיָת כּוֹכְבַיָּא: יז וְיהַב
יָתְהוֹן יְיָ בִּרְקִיעָא דִשְׁמַיָּא לְאַנְהָרָא עַל
אַרְעָא: יח וּלְמִשְׁלַט בְּיוֹמָמָא וּבְלֵילְיָא
וּלְאַפְרָשָׁא בֵּין נְהוֹרָא וּבֵן חֲשׁוֹכָא וַחֲזָא יְיָ אֲרֵי
טָב: יט וַהֲוָה רְמַשׁ וַהֲוָה צְפַר יוֹם רְבִיעָאי:
כ וַאֲמַר יְיָ יִרְחֲשׁוֹן מַיָּא רְחֵשׁ נַפְשָׁא חַיְתָא
וְעוֹפָא דְפָרַח עַל אַרְעָא עַל אַפֵּי רְקִיעָא

לע"י

וגו'. אף על פי שלא נאמר למיניהו בדשתין בעווייהן, שמעו שנעשו בחילוקות על כך, ונשתו קל וחומר בעלמן, כדמפרש בגמרא בשחיטת חולין[1]: **(יד) יהי מארת וגו'.** מיום ראשון נברתו, וברביעי הוא עליכם להתלות ברקיע, וכן כל תולדות שמים וארץ נברתו ביום ראשון, וכל אחד ואחד נקבע ביום שנברא עליו, הוא שכתוב את השמים, לרבות תולדותיהם, ואת הארץ, לרבות תולדותיה: **יהי מארת.** חסר וי"ו כתיב, על שהוא יום מארה ליפול מסכרה בתימוקות, הוא שאמינו, ברביעי היו מתעניס על מסכרה שלא תפול בתימוקות: **להבדיל בין היום ובין הלילה.** משנגזר הואר הראשון, אגל בשבעה (ג"ר בג') ימי בראשית, שמשו הואר והחשך הראשונים שניהם יחד, בין ביום בין בלילה: **והיו לאתת.** כשהמאורות זוקין סימן רע הוא לעולם, שנאמר

מאותות השמים אל תחתו וגו'[2], בשעותיכם רצון הקב"ה, אין אתם נריכין לדאוג מן הפורענות: **ולמועדים.** על שם שעתיד, שעתידים ישראל להצטוות על המועדות, והם נמנים למולד הלבנה: **ולימים.** שמוש החמה חני יום ושמוש הלבנה חליו כרי יום שלם: **ושנים.** לסוף שם"ה ימים (ס"ו ורביע יום), יגמרו מהלכתם בי"ב מזלות המערתיים אותם, והיא שנה, וחוזרים ומתחילים פעם שניה לסבב בגלגל כמהלכן הראשון: **(טו) והיו למאורת.** עוד זאת ישמשו שיהיו לעולם: **(טז) המארת הגדולים.** שויה נברתו, ונתמעטה הלבנה, על שקטרגה ואמרה אי אפשר לשני מלכים שישתמשו בכתר אחד: **ואת הכוכבים.** על ידי שמיעט את הלבנה, הרבה לבדיה להפיס דעתה: **(כ) נפש חיה.** שיהא בה חיות: **שרץ.** כל דבר שהיו גדוה מן

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)

1 חולין ס. 2 ירמי' י', ב

The Fourth Day—Sun, Moon & Stars

1:14 God 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].)

רָקִיעַ הַשָּׁמָיִם: כא וַיִּבְרָא אֱלֹהִים אֶת־הַתַּנִּינִם הַגְּדֹלִים וְאֵת כָּל־נֶפֶשׁ הַחַיָּה | הָרֹמֶשֶׂת אֲשֶׁר שָׁרְצוּ הַמַּיִם לְמִינֵהֶם וְאֵת כָּל־עוֹף כָּנָף לְמִינֵהוּ וַיַּרְא אֱלֹהִים כִּי־טוֹב: כב וַיְבָרֶךְ אֹתָם אֱלֹהִים לֵאמֹר פְּרוּ וּרְבוּ וּמִלְאוּ אֶת־הַמַּיִם בַּיַּמִּים וְהָעוֹף יִרֶב בָּאָרֶץ: כג וַיְהִי־עֶרֶב וַיְהִי־בֹקֶר יוֹם חֲמִישִׁי: פ כד וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים תּוֹצֵא הָאָרֶץ נֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה לְמִינָהּ בְּהֵמָה וָרֶמֶשׂ וְחַיְתוֹ־אֶרֶץ לְמִינָהּ וַיְהִי־כֵן: כה וַיַּעַשׂ אֱלֹהִים אֶת־חַיַּת הָאָרֶץ לְמִינָהּ וְאֶת־הַבְּהֵמָה לְמִינָהּ וְאֵת כָּל־רֶמֶשׂ הָאֲדָמָה לְמִינֵהוּ וַיַּרְא אֱלֹהִים כִּי־טוֹב: כו וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים נַעֲשֶׂה אָדָם בְּצַלְמֵנוּ כִּדְמוּתֵנוּ וְיִרְדּוּ בִדְגַת הַיָּם וּבְעוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם וּבַבְּהֵמָה וּבְכָל־הָאָרֶץ וּבְכָל־הָרֶמֶשׂ הָרֹמֵשׂ עַל־הָאָרֶץ: כז וַיִּבְרָא אֱלֹהִים | אֶת־הָאָדָם בְּצַלְמוֹ בְּצֶלֶם אֱלֹהִים בָּרָא אֹתוֹ זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה בָּרָא אֹתָם: כח וַיְבָרֶךְ אֹתָם אֱלֹהִים וַיֹּאמֶר לָהֶם אֱלֹהִים פְּרוּ וּרְבוּ וּמִלְאוּ אֶת־הָאָרֶץ וְכִבְשֻׁהָ וּרְדוּ בִּדְגַת הַיָּם וּבְעוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם וּבְכָל־חַיָּה הָרֹמֶשֶׂת עַל־הָאָרֶץ: כט וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים

דִּשְׁמַיָּא: כא וּבְרָא יְיָ יָת תַּנִּינַיָּא רַבְרְבַיָּא וְיָת כָּל נַפְשָׁא חַיְתָא דְרָחִישָׁא דִי אַרְחִישׁוּ מַיָּא לְזִנֵיהוֹן וְיָת כָּל עוֹפָא דְפָרַח לְזִנּוֹהִי וַחֲזָא יְיָ אֲרֵי טָב: כב וּבָרִיךְ יַתְהוֹן יְיָ לְמֵימָר פּוּשׁוּ וּסְגוּ וּמְלוּ יָת מַיָּא בְּיַמְמַיָּא וְעוֹפָא יִסְגֵּי בְּאַרְעָא: כג וַהֲוָה רְמַשׁ וַהֲוָה צְפַר יוֹם חֲמִישָׁאי: כד וַאֲמַר יְיָ תַּפֵּיק אַרְעָא נַפְשָׁא חַיְתָא לְזִנָהּ בְּעִיר וְרִחֵישׁ וְחַוֹת אַרְעָא לְזִנָהּ וַהֲוָה כֵן: כה וַעֲבַד יְיָ יָת חַוֹת אַרְעָא לְזִנָהּ וְיָת בְּעִירָא לְזִנָהּ וְיָת כָּל רִיחֲשָׁא דְאַרְעָא לְזִנּוֹהִי וַחֲזָא יְיָ אֲרֵי טָב: כו וַאֲמַר יְיָ נַעֲבֵד אֲנָשָׁא בְּצַלְמָנָא כִּדְמוּתָנָא וְיִשְׁלְטוּן בְּנוּנֵי יַמָּא וּבְעוֹפָא דִשְׁמַיָּא וּבִבְעִירָא וּבְכָל אַרְעָא וּבְכָל רִיחֲשָׁא דְרָחִישׁ עַל אַרְעָא: כז וּבְרָא יְיָ יָת אָדָם בְּצַלְמֵיהּ בְּצֶלֶם אֱלָהִין בְּרָא יָתֵיהּ דְכַר וְנוּקְבָא בְּרָא יַתְהוֹן: כח וּבָרִיךְ יַתְהוֹן יְיָ וַאֲמַר לְהוֹן יְיָ פּוּשׁוּ וּסְגוּ וּמְלוּ יָת אַרְעָא וּתְקוֹפוּ עֲלָהּ וּשְׁלוּטוּ בְּנוּנֵי יַמָּא וּבְעוֹפָא דִשְׁמַיָּא וּבְכָל חַיְתָא דְרָחֲשָׁא עַל אַרְעָא: כט וַאֲמַר יְיָ הָא יְהָבִית לְכוֹן יָת כָּל

רש"י

כחרן קרוי ארץ. בעוף כגון זבובים, בשקיס כגון נמליס וחיפושין ותולעים, ובבריות כגון חולד ועכבר וחומט וכיוצא בהם וכן הדגיס: (כא) **התנינם**. דגיס גדוליס שבים. ובדברי מגדה[1] הוא לויתן וכן זוגו, שברחס זכר ונקבה, וכרג את הנקבה ומלחה לגדיקים לעתיד לבא, שאס יפרו וירבו, לא יתקיים העולם בפניהס: **נפש החיה**. נפש שיש בה חיות: (כב) **ויברך אותם**. לפי שמחסרים אותס וגדין מהס ואוכלין אותס, הוצרכו לברכה, ואף בחיות הוצרכו לברכה, אלא מפני הרחס שעתיד לקללה לכך לא ברכן, שלא יהא הוא בכלל: **פרו**. לשון פרי, כלומר עשו פירות: **ורבו**. אס לא אמר אלא פרו, היה אחד מוליד אחד ולא יותר, וכא ורבו שאחד מוליד הרבה: (כד) **תוצא הארץ**. הוא שפירשתי שהרי נגרת מיום רחשון ולא הוצרכו אלא להוציאס: **נפש חיה**. שיש בה חיות: **ורמש**. הס שרליס, שהס נמוכים ורומסים על כחרן ונרחיס כאילו נגררים, שאין הלוכן ניכר. כל לשון רמס ושרץ בלשונו קוגמודרי"ס: (כה) **ויעש**. תקנס בלגיונס בתיקונן ובקומתן: (כו) **נעשה אדם**. עטותנותו של הקב"ה למדנו מכאן, לפי שהאדס הוא דמות המלאכים ויתקנאו בו, לפיכך נמלך בהס, וכשהוא דן את המלכים הוא נמלך בפמליא שלו, שכן מליגו בתחתונ, 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 משמאילים לחובה, וכן בגזירת עירין פתגמא ובמאמר קדישין שאלתא, אף כאן בפמליא שלו נטל רשות, אמר להס יש בעליונים כדמותי, אס אין כדמותי בתחתונים הרי יש קנאה במעשה בראשית: **נעשה אדם**. אף על פי שלא סייעוהו ביצירתו, יש מקום למינים לגרות, לא נמנע הכתוב מללמד דרך ארץ ומדת ענוה, שיהא הגדול נמלך ונוטל רשות מן הקטן, ואס כתב תעשה אדס, לא למדנו שיהא מדבר עס בית דינו, אלא עס עלמו. ותשובתו כתובה בלדו, ויברא את האדס, ולא כתיב ויבראו: **בצלמנו**. בדפוס שלנו: **כדמותנו**. להבין ולהשכיל: **וירדו בדגת הים**. יש בלשון הזה לשון רידוי ולשון ירידה, זהר רודה בחיות ובבהמות, לא זהר, נעשה ירוד לפניהס והחיה מושלת בו: (כז) **ויברא אלהים את האדם בצלמו**. בדפוס העשוי לו, שהכל נברא במאמר והוא נברא בידיס, שנאמר ותשת עלי כפכה[2], נעשה בחותס, כמטבע העשויה על ידי רופס שקורין קוינ"ן, (ובכ"י קוי"ן) וכן הוא אומר תתכפך כחומר חותם[3]: **בצלם אלהים ברא אותו**. פירש לך, שאותו צלס המתוקן לו, צלס דיוקן יוצרו הוא: **זכר ונקבה ברא אותם**. ולהלן הוא אומר ויקח אחת מצלעותיו וגו'[4], מדרש אגדה שנבראו שני פרצופיס בריאה ראשונה ואחר כך חלקן. ופשוטו של מקרא, כאן כוללניות שנבראו שניהס בששי, ולא פירש לך כיצד בריינתן, ופירש לך במקום אחר: (כח) **ובשבשה**. חסר וי"ו, ללמדך שהזכר כובש את הנקבה, שלא תהא יולאת, ועוד ללמדך, שהאיש שדרכו לכבוש, מצווה על

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.).

1 בבא בתרא עד: 2 תהילים קלט, ה 3 איוב לח,יד 4 בראשית ב, כא

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 *God 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

הִנֵּה֩ נָתַ֨תִּי לָכֶ֜ם אֶת־כָּל־עֵ֣שֶׂב | זֹרֵ֣עַ זֶ֗רַע אֲשֶׁ֤ר עַל־פְּנֵי֙
כָּל־הָאָ֔רֶץ וְאֶת־כָּל־הָעֵ֖ץ אֲשֶׁר־בּ֣וֹ פְרִי־עֵ֑ץ זֹרֵ֣עַ זָ֔רַע לָכֶ֖ם
יִהְיֶ֥ה לְאָכְלָֽה: ל וּלְכָל־חַיַּ֣ת הָאָ֗רֶץ וּלְכָל־עוֹף֙ הַשָּׁמַ֔יִם וּלְכֹ֖ל |
רוֹמֵ֣שׂ עַל־הָאָ֑רֶץ אֲשֶׁר־בּ֣וֹ נֶ֔פֶשׁ חַיָּ֕ה אֶת־כָּל־יֶ֥רֶק עֵ֖שֶׂב
לְאָכְלָ֑ה וַיְהִי־כֵֽן: לא וַיַּ֣רְא אֱלֹהִ֗ים אֶת־כָּל־אֲשֶׁ֤ר עָשָׂה֙
וְהִנֵּה־טֹ֣וב מְאֹ֔ד וַיְהִי־עֶ֥רֶב וַיְהִי־בֹ֖קֶר יֹ֥ום הַשִּׁשִּֽׁי: פ ב א וַיְכֻלּ֥וּ
הַשָּׁמַ֖יִם וְהָאָ֑רֶץ וְכָל־צְבָאָֽם: ב וַיְכַ֤ל אֱלֹהִים֙ בַּיֹּ֣ום הַשְּׁבִיעִ֔י
מְלַאכְתֹּ֖ו אֲשֶׁ֣ר עָשָׂ֑ה וַיִּשְׁבֹּת֙ בַּיֹּ֣ום הַשְּׁבִיעִ֔י מִכָּל־מְלַאכְתֹּ֖ו

עִשְׂבָּא דְּבַר זַרְעֵיהּ מִזְדָּרַע דִּי עַל אַפֵּי כָּל
אַרְעָא וְיַת כָּל אִילָנָא דִּי בֵיהּ פֵּירֵי אִילָנָא
דְּבַר זַרְעֵיהּ מִזְדָּרָע לְכוֹן יְהֵי לְמֵיכַל: ל וּלְכָל
חַיַּת אַרְעָא וּלְכָל עוֹפָא דִּשְׁמַיָּא וּלְכָל דְּרָחֵישׁ
עַל אַרְעָא דִּי בֵיהּ נַפְשָׁא חַיְתָא יַת כָּל יְרוֹק
עִשְׂבָּא לְמֵיכַל וַהֲוָה כֵן: לא וַחֲזָא יְיָ יַת כָּל
דַּעֲבַד וְהָא תַקִּין לַחֲדָא וַהֲוָה רַמַּשׁ וַהֲוָה צְפַר
יוֹם שְׁתִיתָאי: א וְאִשְׁתַּכְלַלוּ שְׁמַיָּא וְאַרְעָא
וְכָל חֵילֵיהוֹן: ב וְשֵׁיצֵי יְיָ בְּיוֹמָא שְׁבִיעָאָה
עֲבִידְתֵּיהּ דִּי עֲבָד וְנַח בְּיוֹמָא שְׁבִיעָאָה מִכָּל

רס"י

פריה ורביה, ולא האכה: (כט) **לכם יהיה לאכלה ולכל חית הארץ.** השוה להם בהמות וחיות למאכל, ולא הרשה לאדם ולאשתו להמית בריה ולאכול בשר, אך כל ירק עשב יאכלו יחד כולם, וכשנתנו בני נח התיר להם בשר, שנאמר כל רמש אשר הוא חי וגו', כירק עשב שהתירתי לאדם הראשון, נתתי לכם את כל: (לא) **יום הששי.** הוסיף ר' בשעי, בגמר מעשה בראשית, לומר שהתנה עמהם על מנת שיקבלו עליהם ישראל חמשה חומשי תורה. דבר אחר, יום השעי, כולם תלוים ועומדים עד יום השעי, הוא שעי בסיון (ס"ח שבויום ו' בסיון שקבלו ישראל התורה נתחזקו כל יצירת בראשית ומשה כאלו נגזרה הטולם עתה וזהו יום השעי בכ"ח שאותו יום ו' בסיון) המוכן למתן תורה: (ב) **ויכל אלהים ביום השביעי.** ר' שמעון אומר, בשר ודם שאינו יודע עתיו ורגעיו, צריך להוסיף מחול על הקודש, אבל הקב"ה שיודע עתיו ורגעיו, נכנס בו כחוט השערה ונראה כאלו כלה בו ביום. דבר אחר, מה היה

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. 10*ff*.)

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 *The 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. 7*ff.*)

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

אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה: ג וַיְבָרֶךְ אֱלֹהִים אֶת־יוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי וַיְקַדֵּשׁ אֹתוֹ כִּי בוֹ שָׁבַת מִכָּל־מְלַאכְתּוֹ אֲשֶׁר־בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים לַעֲשׂוֹת: פ
[שני] ד אֵלֶּה תוֹלְדוֹת הַשָּׁמַיִם וְהָאָרֶץ בְּהִבָּרְאָם* בְּיוֹם עֲשׂוֹת יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים אֶרֶץ וְשָׁמָיִם: ה וְכֹל | שִׂיחַ הַשָּׂדֶה טֶרֶם יִהְיֶה בָּאָרֶץ וְכָל־עֵשֶׂב הַשָּׂדֶה טֶרֶם יִצְמָח כִּי לֹא הִמְטִיר יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים עַל־הָאָרֶץ וְאָדָם אַיִן לַעֲבֹד אֶת־הָאֲדָמָה: ו וְאֵד יַעֲלֶה

עֲבִידְתֵּיהּ דִּי עֲבָד: ג וּבָרִיךְ יְיָ יַת יוֹמָא שְׁבִיעָאָה וְקַדִּישׁ יָתֵיהּ אֲרֵי בֵּיהּ נַח מִכָּל עֲבִידְתֵּיהּ דִּי בְרָא יְיָ לְמֶעֱבַד: ד אִלֵּין תּוֹלְדָת שְׁמַיָּא וְאַרְעָא כַּד אִתְבְּרִיאוּ בְּיוֹמָא דִּי עֲבַד יְיָ אֱלֹהִים אַרְעָא וּשְׁמַיָּא: ה וְכָל אֵילָנֵי חַקְלָא עַד לָא הֲווֹ בְּאַרְעָא וְכָל עִשְׂבָּא דְּחַקְלָא עַד לָא צְמַח אֲרֵי לָא אַחֵית מְטָרָא יְיָ אֱלֹהִים עַל אַרְעָא וֶאֱנָשׁ לֵית לְמִפְלַח יַת אַדְמְתָא: ו וַעֲנָנָא הֲוָה סָלִיק מִן אַרְעָא וְאַשְׁקֵי יַת כָּל אַפֵּי

*ה׳ זעירא

רס״י

העולם חסר, ממוחה, נחת שבת נחת מנוחה, כלתה וגמרה המלאכה: (ג) **ויברך ויקדש.** ברכו בזמן, שכל ימות השבוע ירד להם עומר לגלגולת, ובשבי לחם משנה. וקדשו בזמן, שלח ירד כלל בשבת, והמקרא כתוב על שם העתיד: **אשר ברא אלהים לעשות.** המלאכה שהיתה רחויה לעשות בשבת, כפל ועשתה בשבי, כמו שמפורש בבראשית רבה[1]: (ד) **אלה.** המורים למעלה: **תולדות השמים והארץ בהבראם ביום עשות ה׳.** ללמדך שכלם נבראו בראשון. דבר אחר בהבראם, בה׳ בראם, שנאמר ביה כי צור עולמים, בני חותיות הללו של השם, יצר שני עולמים[2], ולמדך כאן שהעולם הזה נברא בה״א, (ס״ק כמו שה״א פתוחה למטה כך העולם פתוח לשבים בתשובה ועולם הבא נברא ביו״ד לומר שצדיקים שנמחזו זמן מועטים כמו י׳ שהיא קטנה בחותיות) רמז שירדו הרשעים למטה לרחוץ שחת, כה״ח זחת שסתומה מכל צדדיה, ופתוחה למטה לרדת דרך שם: (ה) **טרם יהיה בארץ.** כל טרם שבמקרא לשון עד לא הוא, וחיטו לשון קודם, וחיטו נפעל לומר הטריס כאשר יאמר הקדיס, וזה מוכיח, ועוד אחר כי טרם תירחון[3], עדיין לא תירחון. ואף זה תפרש עדיין לא היה בארץ, כשנגמרה בריאת העולם בשבי קודם שנברא אדם וכל עשב השדה עדיין לא נמח, ובני שכתוב ותולח, לא יצאו אלא על פתח קרקע עמדו עד יום שבי. ולמה כי לא המטיר, ומה טעם לא המטיר, לפי שאדם אין לעבוד את האדמה, ואין מכיר בטובתן של גשמים, וכשבא אדם וידע שהם לורך לעולם, התפלל עליהם וירדו, ולמחו החילוות והדשאים: **ה׳ אלהים.** כי הוא שמו, אלהים, שהוא שליט ושופט על כל העולם, וכן פירוש זה בכל מקום לפי פשוטו, כי שהוא אלהים: (ו) **ואד יעלה.**

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

1 יא, י 2 ישעי׳ כו, ד 3 שמות ט, ל

[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 in 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)

מִן־הָאָרֶץ וְהִשְׁקָה אֶת־כָּל־פְּנֵי הָאֲדָמָה: ז וַיִּיצֶר יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים
אֶת־הָאָדָם עָפָר מִן־הָאֲדָמָה וַיִּפַּח בְּאַפָּיו נִשְׁמַת חַיִּים וַיְהִי
הָאָדָם לְנֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה: ח וַיִּטַּע יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים גַּן־בְּעֵדֶן מִקֶּדֶם וַיָּשֶׂם
שָׁם אֶת־הָאָדָם אֲשֶׁר יָצָר: ט וַיַּצְמַח יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים מִן־הָאֲדָמָה
כָּל־עֵץ נֶחְמָד לְמַרְאֶה וְטוֹב לְמַאֲכָל וְעֵץ הַחַיִּים בְּתוֹךְ הַגָּן
וְעֵץ הַדַּעַת טוֹב וָרָע: י וְנָהָר יֹצֵא מֵעֵדֶן לְהַשְׁקוֹת אֶת־הַגָּן
וּמִשָּׁם יִפָּרֵד וְהָיָה לְאַרְבָּעָה רָאשִׁים: יא שֵׁם הָאֶחָד פִּישׁוֹן הוּא
הַסֹּבֵב אֵת כָּל־אֶרֶץ הַחֲוִילָה אֲשֶׁר־שָׁם הַזָּהָב: יב וְזהַב הָאָרֶץ
הַהִוא טוֹב שָׁם הַבְּדֹלַח וְאֶבֶן הַשֹּׁהַם: יג וְשֵׁם־הַנָּהָר הַשֵּׁנִי
גִּיחוֹן הוּא הַסּוֹבֵב אֵת כָּל־אֶרֶץ כּוּשׁ: יד וְשֵׁם הַנָּהָר הַשְּׁלִישִׁי

אַדְמְתָא: ז וּבְרָא יְיָ אֱלֹהִים יַת אָדָם עַפְרָא מִן
אַדְמְתָא וּנְפַח בְּאַפּוֹהִי נִשְׁמְתָא דְחַיֵּי וַהֲוַת
בְּאָדָם לְרוּחַ מְמַלְלָא: ח וּנְצִיב יְיָ אֱלֹהִים
גִּנְתָא בְּעֵדֶן מִלְקַדְמִין וְאַשְׁרֵי תַּמָּן יַת אָדָם
דִי בְרָא: ט וְאַצְמַח יְיָ אֱלֹהִים מִן אַרְעָא כָּל
אִילָן דִּמְרַגֵּג לְמֶחֱזֵי וְטַב לְמֵיכַל וְאִילַן חַיֵּיָא
בְּמִצְיעוּת גִּנְתָא וְאִילַן דְּאָכְלִין פֵּרוֹהִי חַכִּימִין
בֵּין טַב לְבִישׁ: י וְנַהֲרָא הֲוָה נָפִיק מֵעֵדֶן
לְאַשְׁקָאָה יַת גִּנְתָא וּמִתַּמָּן מִתְפָּרֵשׁ וַהֲוָה
לְאַרְבְּעָא רֵישֵׁי נַהֲרִין: יא שׁוּם חַד פִּישׁוֹן הוּא
מַקִּיף יַת כָּל אַרְעָא דַחֲוִילָה דִי תַמָּן דַּהֲבָא:
יב וְדַהֲבָא דְאַרְעָא הַהִיא טָב תַּמָּן בְּדֶלְחָא
וְאַבְנֵי בוּרְלָא: יג וְשׁוּם נַהֲרָא תִנְיָנָא גִּיחוֹן
הוּא מַקִּיף יַת כָּל אַרְעָא דְכוּשׁ: יד וְשׁוּם

רס"י

לענין ברייתו של אדם העלה התכוס, והשקה ענניס לשרות העפר, ונשרת אדם, כגבל זה שנותן מים ואחר כך לש את העיסה, לף כאן והשקה, ואחר כך ויצר: (ז) **ויצר**. שתי יצירות, יצירה לעולם הזה ויצירה לתחיית המתים, מגל שבשעה שאינה עומדת לדין, לא נכתב ביצירתה שני יודי"ן: **עפר מן האדמה**. לשר עפרו מכל האדמה, מארבע רוחות, שבשל מקום שימות שם, תהא קולטתו לקבורה. דבר אחר, נטל עפרו ממקום שנאמר בו מזבח אדמה תעשה לי[1], כלומי תהא לו כפרה ויוכל לעמוד: **ויפח באפיו**. עשאו מן התחתונים ומן העליונים, גוף מן התחתונים ונשמה מן העליונים, לפי שביום הראשון נבראו מים וארץ, שהי ברא רקיע לעליונים, שנאמר תרחב היבשה לתחתונים, ברביעי ברא מאורות לעליונים, בחמישי יצרו המים לתחתונים, כולם לברואת בו בעליונים ומתחתונים, ואם לאו יש קנאה במעשה בראשית, שיהיו אלו רבים על אלו בבריאת יום אחד: **לנפש חיה**. לף בהמה וחיה נקראו נפש חיה, לך זו של אדם חיה שבכולן, שמוסף

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. 24*ff*.)

1 שמות כ, כ 2 חבקוק א, ז 3 ישעי' יט, ט 4 שמות כא, כח

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* (וּפָשׁוּ)*"* (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* (פִּשְׁתִּים) *... shall be ashamed"* (Isaiah 19:9).

Gichon flowed and roared, and its roaring was very great, as in the verse: "If an ox gores (יִגַּח)" (*Shemos* 21:28), for he gores and roars while goring along.

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

Pras received its name because its waters are fruitful (פָּרִין) 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?

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)

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)

חֹפֵ֥ר הַ֖הֹלֵ֣ךְ קִדְמַ֣ת אַשּׁ֑וּר וְהַנָּהָ֣ר הָרְבִיעִ֔י הֽוּא־פְרָֽת׃ טו וַיִּקַּ֣ח יְהוָ֣ה אֱלֹהִ֔ים אֶת־הָאָדָ֖ם וַיַּנִּחֵ֑הוּ בְּגַן־עֵ֖דֶן לְעָבְדָ֥הּ וּלְשָׁמְרָֽהּ׃ טז וַיְצַ֣ו יְהוָ֣ה אֱלֹהִ֔ים עַל־הָאָדָ֖ם לֵאמֹ֑ר מִכֹּ֛ל עֵ֥ץ־הַגָּ֖ן אָכֹ֥ל תֹּאכֵֽל׃ יז וּמֵעֵ֗ץ הַדַּ֙עַת֙ טֹ֣וב וָרָ֔ע לֹ֥א תֹאכַ֖ל מִמֶּ֑נּוּ כִּ֗י בְּי֛וֹם אֲכָלְךָ֥ מִמֶּ֖נּוּ מ֥וֹת תָּמֽוּת׃ יח וַיֹּ֣אמֶר יְהוָ֣ה אֱלֹהִ֔ים לֹא־טֹ֥וב הֱיֽוֹת־הָאָדָ֖ם לְבַדּ֑וֹ אֶֽעֱשֶׂה־לּ֥וֹ עֵ֖זֶר כְּנֶגְדּֽוֹ׃ יט וַיִּצֶר֩ יְהוָ֨ה אֱלֹהִ֜ים מִן־הָֽאֲדָמָ֗ה כָּל־חַיַּ֤ת הַשָּׂדֶה֙ וְאֵת֙ כָּל־עוֹף֙ הַשָּׁמַ֔יִם וַיָּבֵ֖א אֶל־הָאָדָ֑ם לִרְאוֹת֙ מַה־יִּקְרָ֣א־ל֔וֹ וְכֹל֙ אֲשֶׁ֣ר יִקְרָא־ל֔וֹ הָאָדָ֖ם נֶ֣פֶשׁ חַיָּ֑ה הִ֥וא שְׁמֽוֹ׃ [שלישי] כ וַיִּקְרָ֨א הָאָדָ֜ם

נַהֲרָא תְּלִיתָאָה דִּיגְלַת הוּא מְהַלֵּךְ לְמַדִּינְחָא דְּאַתּוּר וְנַהֲרָא רְבִיעָאָה הוּא פְּרָת׃ טו וּדְבַר יְיָ אֱלֹהִים יַת אָדָם וְאַשְׁרִיהּ בְּגִנְתָּא דְּעֵדֶן לְמִפְלְחָהּ וּלְמִטְרָהּ׃ טז וּפַקֵּיד יְיָ אֱלֹהִים עַל אָדָם לְמֵימָר מִכָּל אִילָן גִּנְתָּא מֵיכַל תֵּיכוּל׃ יז וּמֵאִילָן דְּאָבְלִין פֵּירוֹהִי חַכִּימִין בֵּין טַב לְבִישׁ לָא תֵיכוּל מִנֵּיהּ אֲרֵי בְּיוֹמָא דְּתֵיכוּל מִנֵּיהּ מֵמַת תְּמוּת׃ יח וַאֲמַר יְיָ אֱלֹהִים לָא תַקִּין דִּיהֵוֵי אָדָם בַּלְחוֹדוֹהִי אֶעְבֵּד לֵיהּ סָמֵךְ לְקִבְלֵיהּ׃ יט וּבְרָא יְיָ אֱלֹהִים מִן אַרְעָא כָּל חֵיוַת בָּרָא וְיָת כָּל עוֹפָא דִּשְׁמַיָּא וְאַיְתִי לְוָת אָדָם לְמֶחֱזֵי מָה יִקְרֵי לֵיהּ וְכָל דִּי יְקָרֵי לֵיהּ אָדָם נַפְשָׁא חַיְתָא הוּא שְׁמֵיהּ׃ כ וּקְרָא

לע"י

(יד) **חדקל**. שמימיו חדין וקלין: **פרת**. שמימיו פרין ורבין, ומגרין את המדם: **בוש ואשור**. עדיין לא היו, וכתב המקרא על שם העתיד: **קדמת אשור**. למזרחה של אשור: **הוא פרת**. החשוב על כולם, הנזכר על שם ארץ ישראל: (טו) **ויקח**. לקחו בדברים נאים, ופתהו ליכנס[1]: (יח) **לא טוב היות וגו'**. שלא יאמרו שתי רשויות הן, הקב"ה בעליונים יחיד ואין לו זוג, וזה בתחתונים ואין לו זוג: **עזר כנגדו**. זכה עזר, לא זכה כנגדו להלחם[2]:

(יט) **ויצר וגו' מן האדמה**. היה יצירה היה עשייה האמורה למעלה ויעש אלהים את חית הארץ וגו', אלא בא ופירש שהטופות נצרפו מן הרקק, לפי שאמר למעלה מן המים נצרפו, וכאן אמר מן האדמה נצרפו. ועוד ללמדך כאן, שבשעת יצירתן, מיד בו ביום, הביאם אל האדם לקרות להם שם[3]. ודבדבי אגדה[4] יצירה זו לשון ריבוי וכבוש, כמו כי תצור אל עיר[5], שכבשן תחת ידו של אדם: **ובל אשר יקרא לו האדם נפש חיה וגו'**. סרסרו ופרסרו, כל נפש

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" (**לֹא טוֹב לְאָדָם הֱיוֹת לְבַדּוֹ**). In fact, however, the Torah

1 ב"ר פ"ז, ה 2 שם יז, ג 3 חולין כז: 4 ב"ר יז, ד 5 דברים כ, יט

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 הֱיוֹת 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.

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. 132*ff.*)

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.

שָׁמוֹת לְכָל־הַבְּהֵמָה וּלְעוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם וּלְכֹל חַיַּת הַשָּׂדֶה וּלְאָדָם
לֹא־מָצָא עֵזֶר כְּנֶגְדּוֹ: כא וַיַּפֶּל יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים | תַּרְדֵּמָה
עַל־הָאָדָם וַיִּישָׁן וַיִּקַּח אַחַת מִצַּלְעֹתָיו וַיִּסְגֹּר בָּשָׂר תַּחְתֶּנָּה:
כב וַיִּבֶן יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים | אֶת־הַצֵּלָע אֲשֶׁר־לָקַח מִן־הָאָדָם
לְאִשָּׁה וַיְבִאֶהָ אֶל־הָאָדָם: כג וַיֹּאמֶר הָאָדָם זֹאת הַפַּעַם עֶצֶם
מֵעֲצָמַי וּבָשָׂר מִבְּשָׂרִי לְזֹאת יִקָּרֵא אִשָּׁה כִּי מֵאִישׁ לֻקְחָה־
זֹּאת: כד עַל־כֵּן יַעֲזָב־אִישׁ אֶת־אָבִיו וְאֶת־אִמּוֹ וְדָבַק בְּאִשְׁתּוֹ
וְהָיוּ לְבָשָׂר אֶחָד: כה וַיִּהְיוּ שְׁנֵיהֶם עֲרוּמִּים הָאָדָם וְאִשְׁתּוֹ וְלֹא
יִתְבֹּשָׁשׁוּ: ג א וְהַנָּחָשׁ הָיָה עָרוּם מִכֹּל | חַיַּת הַשָּׂדֶה אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה
יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים וַיֹּאמֶר אֶל־הָאִשָּׁה אַף כִּי־אָמַר אֱלֹהִים לֹא
תֹאכְלוּ מִכֹּל עֵץ הַגָּן: ב וַתֹּאמֶר הָאִשָּׁה אֶל־הַנָּחָשׁ מִפְּרִי עֵץ־
הַגָּן נֹאכֵל: ג וּמִפְּרִי הָעֵץ אֲשֶׁר בְּתוֹךְ־הַגָּן אָמַר אֱלֹהִים לֹא
תֹאכְלוּ מִמֶּנּוּ וְלֹא תִגְּעוּ בּוֹ פֶּן־תְּמֻתוּן: ד וַיֹּאמֶר הַנָּחָשׁ

אָדָם שְׁמָהָן לְכָל בְּעִירָא וּלְעוֹפָא דִּשְׁמַיָּא
וּלְכָל חֵיוַת בָּרָא וּלְאָדָם לָא אַשְׁכַּח סָמֵךְ
לְקָבְלֵיהּ: כא וּרְמָא יְיָ אֱלֹהִים שְׁנָתָא עַל אָדָם
וּדְמֵךְ וּנְסִיב חֲדָא מֵעִלְעוֹהִי וּמְלִי בִשְׂרָא
תְּחוֹתָהּ: כב וּבְנָא יְיָ אֱלֹהִים יַת עִלְעָא דִּנְסִיב
מִן אָדָם לְאִתְּתָא וְאַיְתֵהּ לְוַת אָדָם: כג וַאֲמַר
אָדָם הָדָא זִמְנָא גַּרְמָא מִגַּרְמַי וּבִסְרָא מִבִּסְרִי
לְדָא יִתְקְרֵי אִתְּתָא אֲרֵי מִבַּעְלָא נְסִיבָא דָּא:
כד עַל כֵּן יִשְׁבּוֹק גְּבַר בֵּית מִשְׁכְּבֵי אֲבוּהִי
וְאִמֵּיהּ וְיִדְבַּק בְּאִתְּתֵיהּ וִיהוֹן לְבִסְרָא חָד:
כה וַהֲווֹ תַרְוֵיהוֹן עַרְטִילָאִין אָדָם וְאִתְּתֵיהּ וְלָא
מִתְכַּלְמִין: א וְחִוְיָא הֲוָה חַכִּים מִכָּל חֵוַת בָּרָא
דִּי עֲבַד יְיָ אֱלֹהִים וַאֲמַר לְאִתְּתָא בְּקוּשְׁטָא
אֲרֵי אֲמַר יְיָ לָא תֵיכְלוּן מִכָּל אִילַן גִּנְתָא:
ב וַאֲמַרַת אִתְּתָא לְחִוְיָא מִפֵּירֵי אִילַן גִּנְתָא
נֵיכוֹל: ג וּמִפֵּירֵי אִילָנָא דִּי בְמִצְיעוּת גִּנְתָא
אֲמַר יְיָ לָא תֵיכְלוּן מִנֵּיהּ וְלָא תִקְרְבוּן בֵּיהּ
דִּלְמָא תְמוּתוּן: ד וַאֲמַר חִוְיָא לְאִתְּתָא לָא

רס"י

חיה אשר יקרא לו האדם נפש, הוא שמו לעולם: **(כ) ולאדם לא מצא עזר**:
(כא) ויפל ה' אלהים תרדמה. כשהניחן, הניחן לפניו כל מין ומין, זכר
ונקבה, אמר, לכולם יש בן זוג ולי אין בן זוג, מיד **ויפל**[1]: **מצלעותיו**.
מסטריו, כמו ולצלע המשכן, זהו שאמרו שני פרלופין נברחו[2]: **ויסגור**. מקום
החתך[3]: **ויישן ויקח**. שלא ירהה תחיכת הבשר שממנו נברחה, ותתבזה עליו:
(כב) ויבן. כבנין, רחבה מלמטה וקלרה מלמעלה, לקבל הולד, כהולר של
חטים שהוא רחב מלמטה וקלר מלמעלה, שלא יכניד משאו על קירותיו: **ויבן
את הצלע לאשה**. להיות חשה, כמו ויעש אותו גדעון לאפוד[4], להיות
אפוד: **(כג) זאת הפעם**. מלמד שבא חדש על כל בהמה וחיה, ולא נתקררה
דעתו עד שבא על חוה[5]: **לזאת יקרא אשה כי מאיש וגו'**. לשון נופל על
לשון, מכאן שנברא העולם בלשון הקדש[6]: **(כד) על כן יעזב איש**. רוח
הקדש אומרת כן, לאסור על בני נח העריות[7]: **לבשר אחד**. הולד נולר על
ידי שניהם, ושם נעשה בשרם אחד[8]: **(כה) ולא יתבוששו**. שלא היו יודעים
דרך לניעות להבחין בין טוב לרע, ואף על פי שאתה בו דעה לקרות שמות,
לא נתן בו יצר הרע, עד אכלו מן העץ ונכנס בו יצר הרע, וידע מה בין טוב
לרע: **(ג א) והנחש היה ערום**. מה ענין זה לכאן, היה לו לסמוך ויעש לאדם
ולאשתו כתנות עור וילבישם, אלא ללמדך מאיזו סבה קפץ הנחש עליהם,
רמה אותם ערומים ועסוקים בתשמיש לעין כל, ונתאוה לה[9]: **ערום מכל**.
לפי ערמתו וגדולתו היתה מפלתו, ערוס מכל, אורר 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 שתשיבנו ויבא לדבר באותו הענין:
(ג) ולא תגעו בו. הוסיפה על המצוה, לפיכך באה לידי גרעון, הוא שאמר אל

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 junction 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.

1 ב"ר יד, ד 2 ברכות ס: 3 שם 4 שופטים ח, כז 5 יבמות סג. 6 ב"ר יח, ד 7 סנהדרין נח: 8 שם נח. 9 ב"ר יח, ו 10 שם יט, א

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 *They 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. 1*ff*)

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)

אֶל־הָאִשָּׁה לֹא־מוֹת תְּמֻתוּן: ה כִּי יֹדֵעַ אֱלֹהִים כִּי בְיוֹם אֲכָלְכֶם מִמֶּנּוּ וְנִפְקְחוּ עֵינֵיכֶם וִהְיִיתֶם כֵּאלֹהִים יֹדְעֵי טוֹב וָרָע: ו וַתֵּרֶא הָאִשָּׁה כִּי טוֹב הָעֵץ לְמַאֲכָל וְכִי תַאֲוָה־הוּא לָעֵינַיִם וְנֶחְמָד הָעֵץ לְהַשְׂכִּיל וַתִּקַּח מִפִּרְיוֹ וַתֹּאכַל וַתִּתֵּן גַּם־לְאִישָׁהּ עִמָּהּ וַיֹּאכַל: ז וַתִּפָּקַחְנָה עֵינֵי שְׁנֵיהֶם וַיֵּדְעוּ כִּי עֵירֻמִּם הֵם וַיִּתְפְּרוּ עֲלֵה תְאֵנָה וַיַּעֲשׂוּ לָהֶם חֲגֹרֹת: ח וַיִּשְׁמְעוּ אֶת־קוֹל יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים מִתְהַלֵּךְ בַּגָּן לְרוּחַ הַיּוֹם וַיִּתְחַבֵּא הָאָדָם וְאִשְׁתּוֹ מִפְּנֵי יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים בְּתוֹךְ עֵץ הַגָּן: ט וַיִּקְרָא יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים אֶל־הָאָדָם וַיֹּאמֶר לוֹ אַיֶּכָּה: י וַיֹּאמֶר אֶת־קֹלְךָ שָׁמַעְתִּי בַגָּן וָאִירָא כִּי־עֵירֹם אָנֹכִי וָאֵחָבֵא: יא וַיֹּאמֶר מִי הִגִּיד לְךָ כִּי עֵירֹם אָתָּה הֲמִן־הָעֵץ אֲשֶׁר צִוִּיתִיךָ לְבִלְתִּי אֲכָל־מִמֶּנּוּ אָכָלְתָּ: יב וַיֹּאמֶר הָאָדָם הָאִשָּׁה אֲשֶׁר נָתַתָּה עִמָּדִי הִוא נָתְנָה־לִּי

מִמֵּת תְּמוּתוּן: ה אֲרֵי גְּלֵי קֳדָם יְיָ אֲרֵי בְּיוֹמָא דְּתֵיכְלוּן מִנֵּיהּ וְיִתְפַּתְּחָן עֵינֵיכוֹן וּתְהוֹן כְּרַבְרְבִין חַכִּימִין בֵּין טַב לְבִישׁ: ו וַחֲזַת אִתְּתָא אֲרֵי טָב אִילָנָא לְמֵיכַל וַאֲרֵי אַסְיָ הוּא לְעֵינִין וּמְרַגֵּג אִילָנָא לְאִסְתַּכָּלָא בֵּיהּ וּנְסִיבַת מֵאִבֵּהּ וַאֲכָלַת וִיהָבַת אַף לְבַעֲלָהּ עִמָּהּ וַאֲכָל: ז וְאִתְפַּתָּחָא עֵינֵי תַרְוֵיהוֹן וְיָדְעוּ אֲרֵי עַרְטִילָאִין אִנּוּן וְחַטִּיטוּ לְהוֹן טַרְפֵי תְּאֵנִין וַעֲבָדוּ לְהוֹן זָרְזִין: ח וּשְׁמָעוּ יָת קָל מֵימְרָא דַיְיָ אֱלֹהִים דְּמְהַלֵּךְ בְּגִנְתָּא לְמָנַח יוֹמָא וְאִטְמַר אָדָם וְאִתְּתֵיהּ מִן קֳדָם יְיָ אֱלֹהִים בְּגוֹ אִילַן גִּנְתָּא: ט וּקְרָא יְיָ אֱלֹהִים לְאָדָם וַאֲמַר לֵהּ אָן אָתְּ: י וַאֲמַר יָת קָל מֵימְרָךְ שְׁמָעִית בְּגִנְתָּא וּדְחֵלִית אֲרֵי עַרְטִילָאִי אָנָא וְאִטְמָרִית: יא וַאֲמַר מַן חַוִי לָךְ אֲרֵי עַרְטִילָאִי אָתְּ הֲמִן אִילָנָא דִּפַקֶּדְתָּךְ בְּדִיל דְּלָא לְמֵיכַל מִנֵּיהּ אֲכָלְתְּ: יב וַאֲמַר אָדָם אִתְּתָא דִּיהַבְתְּ עִמִּי הִיא יַהֲבַת לִי מִן אִילָנָא

רס"י

תוסף על דבריו[1]: **(ד) לא מות תמותון.** דחפס עד שגגעב בו, אמר לה כשם שאין מיתה בגגיעב כך אין מיתה באכילה[2]: **(ה) כי יודע.** כל אומן שונה את בני אומנותו, מן הטע אכל וברח את הטועם[3]: **והייתם באלהים.** יוצרי עולמות: **(ו) ותרא האשה.** ראתה דבריו של נחש והגמון לה והאמינתו[4]: **כי טוב העץ.** להיות כאלהים: **וכי תאוה הוא לעינים.** כמו שאמר לה ופקחו עיניכם: **ונחמד להשכיל.** כמו שאמר לה יודעי טוב ורע: **ותתן גם לאישה.** שלא תמות היא ויהיה הוא ישא אחרת: **גם.** לרבות בהמה וחיה: **(ז) ותפקחנה וגו'.** לעניין האמור דבר הכתוב, ולא לעניין ראיה ממש, וסוף המקרא מוכיח: **וידעו כי עירומים הם.** אף הסומא יודע בעצמו ערום, אלא מהו וידעו כי עירומים הם, מצוה אחת היתה בידם ונתערטלו הימנה[5]: **עלה תאנה.** הוא הטע שאכלו ממנו, בדבר שנתקללו הוא ונתקנו[6], אבל שאר הפעים מגעוש 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.

1 משלי ל, ו 2 ב"ר יט, ג שם 3 שם 4 שמ 5 ב"ר יט, ו 6 ברכות מ. 7 תנחומא וירא פי"ד 8 סנהדרין לח: 9 בראשית ד, ט 10 במדבר כב, ט 11 ישעי' לט, א 12 ע"ז ה:

[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*)

מִן־הָעֵץ וָאֹכֵל: יג וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים לָאִשָּׁה מַה־זֹּאת עָשִׂית
וַתֹּאמֶר הָאִשָּׁה הַנָּחָשׁ הִשִּׁיאַנִי וָאֹכֵל: יד וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים |
אֶל־הַנָּחָשׁ כִּי עָשִׂיתָ זֹּאת אָרוּר אַתָּה מִכָּל־הַבְּהֵמָה וּמִכֹּל
חַיַּת הַשָּׂדֶה עַל־גְּחֹנְךָ תֵלֵךְ וְעָפָר תֹּאכַל כָּל־יְמֵי חַיֶּיךָ:
טו וְאֵיבָה | אָשִׁית בֵּינְךָ וּבֵין הָאִשָּׁה וּבֵין זַרְעֲךָ וּבֵין זַרְעָהּ הוּא
יְשׁוּפְךָ רֹאשׁ וְאַתָּה תְּשׁוּפֶנּוּ עָקֵב: ס טז אֶל־הָאִשָּׁה אָמַר
הַרְבָּה אַרְבֶּה עִצְּבוֹנֵךְ וְהֵרֹנֵךְ בְּעֶצֶב תֵּלְדִי בָנִים וְאֶל־אִישֵׁךְ
תְּשׁוּקָתֵךְ וְהוּא יִמְשָׁל־בָּךְ: ס יז וּלְאָדָם אָמַר כִּי שָׁמַעְתָּ לְקוֹל
אִשְׁתֶּךָ וַתֹּאכַל מִן־הָעֵץ אֲשֶׁר צִוִּיתִיךָ לֵאמֹר לֹא תֹאכַל מִמֶּנּוּ
אֲרוּרָה הָאֲדָמָה בַּעֲבוּרֶךָ בְּעִצָּבוֹן תֹּאכְלֶנָּה כֹּל יְמֵי חַיֶּיךָ:
יח וְקוֹץ וְדַרְדַּר תַּצְמִיחַ לָךְ וְאָכַלְתָּ אֶת־עֵשֶׂב הַשָּׂדֶה: יט בְּזֵעַת
אַפֶּיךָ תֹּאכַל לֶחֶם עַד שׁוּבְךָ אֶל־הָאֲדָמָה כִּי מִמֶּנָּה לֻקָּחְתָּ
כִּי־עָפָר אַתָּה וְאֶל־עָפָר תָּשׁוּב: כ וַיִּקְרָא הָאָדָם שֵׁם אִשְׁתּוֹ
חַוָּה כִּי הִוא הָיְתָה אֵם כָּל־חָי: כא וַיַּעַשׂ יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים לְאָדָם
וּלְאִשְׁתּוֹ כָּתְנוֹת עוֹר וַיַּלְבִּשֵׁם: פ [רביעי] כב וַיֹּאמֶר | יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים
הֵן הָאָדָם הָיָה כְּאַחַד מִמֶּנּוּ לָדַעַת טוֹב וָרָע וְעַתָּה | פֶּן־יִשְׁלַח
יָדוֹ וְלָקַח גַּם מֵעֵץ הַחַיִּים וְאָכַל וָחַי לְעֹלָם: כג וַיְשַׁלְּחֵהוּ יְהוָה
אֱלֹהִים מִגַּן־עֵדֶן לַעֲבֹד אֶת־הָאֲדָמָה אֲשֶׁר לֻקַּח מִשָּׁם:
כד וַיְגָרֶשׁ אֶת־הָאָדָם וַיַּשְׁכֵּן מִקֶּדֶם לְגַן־עֵדֶן אֶת־הַכְּרֻבִים וְאֵת
לַהַט הַחֶרֶב הַמִּתְהַפֶּכֶת לִשְׁמֹר אֶת־דֶּרֶךְ עֵץ הַחַיִּים: ס

וַאֲכָלִית: יג וַאֲמַר יְיָ אֱלֹהִים לְאִתְּתָא מַה דָּא
עֲבַדְתְּ וַאֲמָרַת אִתְּתָא חִוְיָא אַטְעֵינִי וַאֲכָלִית:
יד וַאֲמַר יְיָ אֱלֹהִים לְחִוְיָא אֲרֵי עֲבַדְתְּ דָּא לֵיט
אַתְּ מִכָּל בְּעִירָא וּמִכָּל חֵיוַת בָּרָא עַל מְעָךְ
תֵּיזֵיל וְעַפְרָא תֵּיכוֹל כָּל יוֹמֵי חַיָּיךְ: טו וּדְבָבוּ
אֲשַׁוֵּי בֵּינָךְ וּבֵין אִתְּתָא וּבֵין בְּנָיךְ וּבֵין בְּנָהָא
הוּא יְהֵא דְכִיר לָךְ מַה דַּעֲבַדְתְּ לֵיהּ מִלְּקַדְמִין
וְאַתְּ תְּהֵא נָטֵר לֵיהּ לְסוֹפָא: טז לְאִתְּתָא אֲמַר
אַסְגָּאָה אַסְגֵּי צַעֲרָיְכִי וְעִדּוּיָיְכִי בְּצַעַר תֵּלְדִין
בְּנִין וּלְוָת בַּעֲלַיִךְ תְּהֵא תְּאוֹבְתִיךְ וְהוּא יִשְׁלַט
בִּיךְ: יז וּלְאָדָם אֲמַר אֲרֵי קַבֵּילְתָּא לְמֵימַר
אִתְּתָךְ וַאֲכַלְתְּ מִן אִילָנָא דִי פַּקֵּדְתָּךְ לְמֵימַר
לָא תֵיכוֹל מִנֵּיהּ לִיטָא אַרְעָא בְּדִילָךְ בַּעֲמַל
תֵּיכְלִינַּהּ כָּל יוֹמֵי חַיָּיךְ: יח וְכוּבִין וְאִטְדִּין
תַּצְמַח לָךְ וְתֵיכוֹל יַת עִשְׂבָּא דְחַקְלָא:
יט בְּזִיעֲתָא דְאַפָּךְ תֵּיכוֹל לַחְמָא עַד דְּתֵיתוּב
לְאַרְעָא דְמִינָהּ אִתְבְּרִיתָא אֲרֵי עַפְרָא אַתְּ
וּלְעַפְרָא תְּתוּב: כ וּקְרָא אָדָם שׁוּם אִתְּתֵיהּ
חַוָּה אֲרֵי הִיא הֲוַת אִמָּא דְּכָל בְּנֵי אֱנָשָׁא:
כא וַעֲבַד יְיָ אֱלֹהִים לְאָדָם וּלְאִתְּתֵיהּ לְבוּשִׁין
דִּיקַר עַל מְשַׁךְ בִּשְׂרֵיהוֹן וְאַלְבֵּשִׁינוּן:
כב וַאֲמַר יְיָ אֱלֹהִים הָא אָדָם הֲוָה יְחִידִי בְּעָלְמָא
מִנֵּיהּ לְמִידַע טַב וּבִישׁ וּכְעַן דִּלְמָא יוֹשִׁיט
יְדֵיהּ וְיִסַּב אַף מֵאִילַן חַיֵּיא וְיֵיכוֹל וְיֵחֵי לְעָלַם:
כג וְשַׁלְּחֵיהּ יְיָ אֱלֹהִים מִגִּנְתָּא דְעֵדֶן לְמִפְלַח
יַת אַדְמְתָא דְאִתְבְּרִי מִתַּמָּן: כד וְתָרִיךְ יַת
אָדָם וְאַשְׁרֵי מִלְּקַדְמִין לְגִנְתָּא דְעֵדֶן יַת
כְּרוּבַיָּא וְיַת שְׁנַן חַרְבָּא דְמִתְהַפְּכָא לְמִטַּר יַת

(יג) **השיאני**. כטעני, כמו אל ישית אתכם חזקיהו[1]: (יד) **כי עשית זאת**. מכאן שאין מהפכים בזכותו של מסית, שאילו שלחו למה עשית זאת, היה לו להשיב דברי הרב ודברי התלמיד דברי מי שומעין[2]: **מכל הבהמה ומכל חית השדה**. אם מהמה נתקלל, מחיה לא כל שכן, כעמידו רבותינו מדרש זה במסכת כתורות[3], ללמד שימי עיבורו של נחש שבע שנים: **על גחונך תלך**. רגליים היו לו ונקללו: (טו) **ואיבה אשית**. אתה לא נתכוונת אלא שימות אדם כשיאכל הוא תאלה ותשא את חוה, ולא בא לדבר אל חוה תאלה אלא לפי שכנשים דעתן קלות להתפתות, ויודעות לפתות את בעליהן, לפיכך ואיבה אשית[4]: **ישופך**. יכתתך, כמו ותכות חותו[5], ותרגומו ושפית יתיה: **ואתה תשופנו עקב**. לא יכא לך קומה, ותשכנו בעקבו, ואף משם תמיתנו. ולשון תשופנו, כמו נשף בשם[6], כשהחם בא לנשוך הוא נושף כמין שריקה, ולפי שהלשון נופל על הלשון, כתב לשון נשיפה בשניהם: (טז) **עצבונך**. זה לער גידול בניס[7]: **והרנך**. זה לער העבור: **בעצב תלדי בנים**. זה לער הלידה: **ואל אישך תשוקתך**. לתשמיש, ואף על פי כן תין לך מלא לתובעו בפה, אלא הוא ימשול בך, הכל ממנו ואל ממך: **תשוקתך**. תאותך, כמו ונפשו שוקקה[8]: (יז) **ארורה האדמה בעבורך**. תעלה לך דגריס מרוריס, כגון זבובים ופרעושים ומלישים, משל ליונה לתרגום רעה, וכבריות מקללות שדים שיוק מכם: (יח) **וקוץ ודרדר תצמיח לך**. כאחרן, כשתזרענה מיני זרעים, תצמיח קוץ ודרדר קודם ועכביות, וכן נאכלים על ידי תיקון[9]: **ואכלת את עשב השדה**. ומה קללה היא זו, ולא נצרכה נאמר לו הנה נתתי לכם את כל עשב זורע זרע וגו', אלא מה תמור כאן ברשע הענין, תרורה באדמה בעבורך בעצבון תאכלנה, ואחר העצבון וקוץ ודרדר תצמיח לך, כשתזרענה קטניות או ירקות גינה, היא תצמיח לך קוליס ודרדרים ושאר עשבי השדה, ועל כרחך תאכלם: (יט) **בזעת אפיך**. לאחר שתטריח בו הרבה: (כ) **ויקרא האדם**. חזר הכתוב לענינו הראשון ויקרא האדם שמות, ולא הפסיק, אלא ללמדך שעל ידי קריאת שמות נזדווגה לו חוה, כמו שכתוב ולאדם לא מצא עזר כנגדו, לפיכך ויפל תרדמה, ועל ידי שכתב ויהיו שניהם ערומים, סמך לו פרשת הנחש, להודיעך, שמתוך שראה

---

1 דברי הימים-ב לב, טו 2 סנהדרין כט: 3 דף ז. 4 סוטה ט: 5 דברים ט, כא 6 ישעי׳ מ, ד 7 עירובין ק: 8 ישעי׳ כט, ז 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.*

רס"י

חוה. נופל על לשון חיה, שמחיה את ולדותיה, כתשר תאמר מה חווה לאדם[10] בלשון היה: **(כא) כתנות עור.** יש דברי אגדה אומרים חלקים כלפורן היו מדובקים על עורן. ויש אומרים דבר הבא מן העור, כגון למר המרגיש שהוא רך וחם, ועשה להם כתנות ממנו: **(כב) היה באחד ממנו.** כרי הוא יחיד בתחתונים כמו שאני יחיד בעליונים, ומה היא יחידתו, לדעת טוב ורע, מה שאין כן בבהמה וחיה: **ועתה פן ישלח ידו וגו'.** ומשיחיה לעולם, כרי הוא קרוב להטעות הבריות אחריו, ויאמרו אף הוא אלוה. ויש מדרשי אגדה, אבל אין מיושבין על פשוטו: **(כד) מקדם לגן עדן.** במזרחו של גן עדן, חון לגן: **את הכרובים.** מלאכי אבלה: **החרב המתהפכת.** ולה להט לאייש עליו מלכנוס עוד לגן. תרגום להט שנן, כמו שלף שננה ולשון לע"ז למ"ח. ומדרשי אגדה יש, ואני איני בא

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)

10 קהלת ב, כב