

ספר

נוראות הרב

חלק חמשה עשר

דרשות על ברכות מלכיות, זכרונות ושופרות,

קדושת יום הכיפורים, והגיונו של אדם

מאת מרן רבנו יוסף דוב הלוי סולובייציק זצלה"ה

Prepared, Translated and Edited by:

B. David Schreiber

©
B. David Schreiber, Esq.
September, 2005
Copyright Pending

Wholesale distribution of this and prior volumes is handled by Rabbi Yaakov Levitz
(718) 377-0047.

Dedication

This volume is dedicated in loving memory of Rabbi Dr. Walter S. Wurzburger, Zt"l. For the last three decades, Rabbi Wurzbuger served as the Rabbi of Congregation Shaaray Tefila, Lawrence, New York, and as a professor of philosophy at Yeshiva University. He was internationally recognized for his scholarly attainments, most notably as Editor of *Tradition*, the prestigious publication of the Rabbinical Council of America, a position he held for over 25 years.

As one of the first *talmidim* of the Rav, he absorbed and imparted much of the Rav's teachings. Like the Rav, he was a unique synthesis of Talmudic scholarship and global erudition. Despite his outstanding intellectual achievements, he was a very humble and modest individual. During the final weeks of his life, he insisted on calling all of his acquaintances to ask their *mechilah* in the unlikely event that he may have offended them.

Rabbi Wurzbberger Zt"l graciously offered to review the fourth *drasha*, "The Human Dialectic," חגיגתו של אדם, contained in this volume. I was amazed by the breadth of his comments on the *drasha*, his understanding of the cited Latin and Greek terms, his in-depth knowledge of esoteric philosophical concepts and his familiarity with obscure *midrashim*. His discussions with me were always coupled with humor and wit.

It was an honor and privilege to have known him and it is with reverence and humility that I wish to dedicate Volume 15 of ספר נוראות הרב to him.

יהי זכרו ברוך

Preface

Included in this volume are four *drashos* delivered by Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik *Zt"l* (reverently referred to as the Rav, by his countless students and admirers). The first two *drashos* (delivered in 1968 and 1971, respectively) explain the structure and motifs of the *Mussaf Shemonah Esrei* recited on ראש השנה. I have augmented these with selections from other *drashos*. The third *drasha* (delivered in 1955) deals with some of the motifs of *Yom Kippur* and is translated from Yiddish. The fourth *drasha* (delivered in 1971) discusses the human dialectic.

I have divided the *drashos* into numbered paragraphs and provided them with appropriate headings. A Table of Contents of the headings is found at the beginning of the volume.

In response to suggestions from readers, I have translated most of the citations from the *Talmud* and the Commentaries, as well as terms of art employed therein. These translations appear in italics. The translations are generally not literal. In addition, parenthetical comments made by the Rav and my suggestions for further references appear as footnotes at the bottom of each page. Since the *drashos* contain an exhaustive explanation of the *Mussaf Shemoneh Esrei* recited on Rosh Hashanah, I have appended a copy of that text at the end of this volume.

I am most grateful to Suri (Neufeld) Bender who invested an enormous amount of time and effort in preparing, typing and formatting this work.

I cannot adequately express my boundless appreciation to both my father, Dr. Aaron Schreiber, and my mother, Mrs. Rivka Schreiber. My parents invested so many countless hours on my *Torah* education that it is impossible for me to ever begin to repay them.

The following individuals (appearing in alphabetical order) painstakingly reviewed and edited different segments of this volume: Samuel Bergman, Danny Gross, Michael Pantazakor, Yonatan Reich, Rabbi Yitzchak Sladowsky and Joel Yarmak.

The audiocassettes for these *drashos* were supplied by Mr. Milton Nordlicht, who, single handedly, has collected and disseminated hundreds of audio tapes of the Rav.

Finally, I must express my admiration and gratitude to my wife, Shani, for her constant support in all of my endeavors, and to my children, Ari, Baila, Yitzy, Naomi and little Yitzchak, who spent hours of their vacation fastidiously researching the footnotes and graciously sacrificing their quality time to allow me to prepare this work.

I was most encouraged by the overwhelming reception accorded to the fourteen prior volumes of נראות הרב and hope that this volume will be similarly received. It is my foremost hope that I have portrayed the *drashos* in the best possible light, and that I be able to release *drashos* and *shiurim* of the Rav in the near future.

Lawrence, New York
September, 2005

B. David Schreiber, Esq.
516 561-8800
516 561-1003 FAX
david@schreiberesq.com

Table of Contents

מלכיות, זכרונות ושופרות אלול, תשכ"ט (ושונות)

<u>Paragraph</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	Introduction	1
2-6	The <i>brachos</i> of <i>malchiyos</i> , <i>zichronos</i> and <i>shofros</i> charge man to engage in קבלת עול מלכות שמים on different levels	1-4
7-10	The <i>brachos</i> each portray עול מלכות שמים on both the universal and individual levels	4-6
11-15	The <i>bracha</i> of either <i>malchiyos</i> or <i>zichronos</i> is merged with the <i>bracha</i> of <i>kedushas hayom</i>	6-9
16-19	The <i>bracha</i> of <i>malchiyos</i> should be merged with the <i>bracha</i> of <i>kedushas hashem</i>	9-12
20-25	<i>Malchiyos</i> expresses faith in the universal acceptance of G-d's sovereignty over both natural law and moral law	12-16
26-28	The <i>passuk</i> of בו מלך ותרועת depicts the Jews' periodic acceptance of G-d's sovereignty	16-18
29-31	The multi- <i>passuk</i> conversation between the פתחי עולם and the מלך הכבוד is classified as a single recital of <i>malchiyos</i>	18-21
32-36	The paragraph of ובכן תן פחדך portrays a pessimistic vision of man's redemption	21-24
37-39	The vision depicted by ובכן תן פחדך is of the destruction of evil	25-26
40-43	The conversation between the פתחי עולם and the מלך תיקון הרע and ביעור הרע marks the discord between הכבוד	26-28
44-46	The <i>bracha</i> of <i>zichronos</i> portrays השגחה פרטית and its moral imperatives	28-29
46-47	The <i>bracha</i> of <i>zichronos</i> describes that G-d exists in all dimensions of time	29-30

<u>Paragraph</u>		<u>Page</u>
48	The <i>bracha</i> of <i>zichronos</i> relates G-d's involvement with all of mankind	31
49-52	The two בריתות encompass both the individual Jew and the Jewish community	32-35
53	The bracha of shofros describes the physical manifestations of גילוי שכינה	35-36
54-57	The <i>halacha</i> requires that one experience גילוי שכינה in his daily life	36-39
58	Rosh Hashanah commemorates the joy experienced by confronting G-d	39
59-62	The <i>bracha</i> of <i>shofros</i> cites <i>passukim</i> depicting that <i>shofar</i> is the instrument of גילוי שכינה	39-42
63-68	<i>Shira</i> is recited on Rosh Hashanah after the <i>shofar</i> ushers man into the presence of G-d	42-46
69-70	The <i>halachic</i> imperative of לפני ה' must be cultivated	46-48

**ברכה של זכרונות
אלול, תשל"א**

<u>Paragraph</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	Introduction	49
2-3	Man is judged היום, on Rosh Hashanah, because he frivolously wasted כל יום, the other days of the year.	49-51
4-5	The <i>bracha</i> of <i>zichronos</i> contains the message that G-d accepts certain forms of ransom	51-52
6-10	The עקידה episode portrays the mechanics of פדיון	52-55
11-13	Though created by G-d, נוצר, Adam did not comply with G-d's instructions, לא נוצר	55-56
14-17	The first Rosh Hashanah set a precedent for each subsequent Rosh Hashanah	56-58
18	The <i>bracha</i> of <i>zichronos</i> portrays G-d's multi-dimensional omniscience	58-59
19	G-d judges man based upon remote principles of causality	59-60
20-24	G-d judges man based upon his impact on the future	60-62
25-28	G-d accepts as ransom the potential which lies in each individual	62-64
29-30	Modern man is vindicated solely by reference to both the past and future	64

**קדושת יום הכיפורים
אלול, תשט"ו**

<u>Paragraph</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	Introduction	65
2-3	The controversy whether the <i>kedushas hayom</i> of Yom Kippur is identified with Shabbos or with Yom Tov	65-68
4	The מצות היום are formulated in terms of שביתה	68-69
5	The <i>kedushas hayom</i> of Yom Kippur precipitates <i>kapparah</i>	69-70
6-7	Yom Kippur is constituted as a <i>taanis tzibbur</i>	70-71
8-9	Man can approach G-d through רוממות האדם which precipitates joy and optimism	71-73
10-11	Man can approach G-d through שפלות האדם, with pessimism and self-abnegation	74-75
12	Yom Kippur is a synthesis of רוממות האדם and שפלות האדם	75
13-15	<i>Tehillim</i> is comprised of chapters devoted to Torah study, hymns and supplication	75-76
16-17	<i>Piyutim</i> are comprised of Torah study, <i>shira</i> and <i>selichos</i>	76-77
18	<i>Selichos</i> are comprised of five components	78
19	Yom Kippur is characterized by both <i>shira</i> and <i>selichos</i>	78-79
20	<i>Shira</i> requires responsive reading	79-81
21-23	The <i>Shacharis</i> of Yom Kippur manifests both שפלות האדם and רוממות האדם	81-82

<u>Paragraph</u>		<u>Page</u>
24-26	The <i>viduy haaroach</i> and the <i>viduy hakatzar</i> correspond to the two motifs of Yom Kippur	82-84
27-28	The <i>viduy haaroach</i> is not recited during <i>Neilah</i>	84-85
29-30	The ramifications of characterizing Yom Kippur as primarily a <i>taanis tzibbur</i> or a Yom Tov	86-87
31	The <i>haftorah</i> of Yom Kippur morning differs from the <i>haftorah</i> of <i>Mincha</i>	87-88
32	Yom Kippur is transformed into a <i>taanis tzibbur</i> following the reading of the <i>avodah</i> service	88-89
33	Rosh Hashanah precedes Yom Kippur in order to allow man the opportunity to engage in a <i>cheshbon hanefesh</i>	89
34-36	Prior to Yom Kippur, man must assay a commentary on his life	90-91
37-39	<i>Cheshbon hanefesh</i> commences on Rosh Hashanah and reaches its apex with the <i>viduy</i> of Yom Kippur	91-93
40	The parameters of <i>bris</i>	93
41	Every Jew must identify with his past	94-95
42-44	One must receive inspiration from his youthful memories	95-97
45-48	Every Jew must also ensure the continuity of future generations	97-99

הגיונו של אדם
שבט, תשל"א

<u>Paragraph</u>		<u>Page</u>
1-7	The purpose of creation was the birth of man	101-104
8-12	Man acts erratically since he is a dual being, possessed of two contradictory souls	104-106
13-17	<i>Yahadus</i> maintains that the schism in man is a function of the Almighty's grand design and not of sin	106-107
18-19	Man is possessed of a dual awareness; man can be either man-subject or man-object	107-109
20-21	The I-subject analyzes the objectified I-object	109
22	<i>Hakadosh Baruch Hu</i> is both subject and object	109-110
23	The bifurcation between man-subject and I-object is a reality	110
24-25	Man-object is evaluated solely in relation to the outside world	110-111
26-29	"Thinghood" is marked by both vacuity and interrelatedness	111-113
30-31	<i>Chazal</i> teach that the world was created with the נ"ה letter to denote the effortlessness of G-d's creation	113
32	"Thing-hood" is marked by both vacuity and interrelatedness	113

<u>Paragraph</u>		<u>Page</u>
33	Man-thing is also vacuous and open	113-114
34	Man-thing is evaluated by his contributions to society since things are marked by interrelatedness	114-115
35-37	Man-thing is reactive, not proactive	115-116
38	Modern man's confusion is a result of his reduction to thing-hood	116
39-40	The characteristics which define man-thing	116-117
41	G-d ingrained the persona of man-subject in each person	117-118
42-44	The <i>Ramban</i> compares man-subject and man-object to the <i>halachic</i> concepts of שבועות and נדרים respectively	118-119
45	<i>Chazal</i> declare that עולם הבא was created with the letter יי"ד , a dimensionless point	119-120
46-47	Man-subject is defined as an intangible point	120
48	The psychological image projected by man-thing	120-121
49	Man-subject is a visionary; man-object is a pragmatist	121-122
50	Man-subject employs postulated logic to maintain greatness	122
51	<i>Yahadus</i> has accepted the roles of both man-subject and man-object as the grand design of G-d	122

<u>Paragraph</u>		<u>Page</u>
52	The first distinction between man-object and man-subject comes to expression in their divergent axiologies	122-123
53-54	<i>Yahadus</i> extols the intrinsic value of each individual	123-124
55-56	The individual must not be swayed by the errors of the community	124-125
57	<i>Chazal</i> emphasize the individual's role in rescuing the Jewish people	125-126
58-60	<i>Yahadus</i> also demands that the individual sacrifice himself for the community	126-127
61	Man-subject and man-object exercise different methods of logic	128
62-63	<i>Yahadus</i> promotes both empirical logic and postulated logic	128-129
64-67	Throughout history, Jews have sacrificed their lives in accordance with a mysterious immutable will	129-131
68-69	Gentiles urge Jews to abandon their man-subject orientation	131-132
70-71	Man-subject and man-object disagree as to the primacy of thought over deed	132-133
72-74	The <i>halacha</i> accepts both mathematical precision as well as ecstatic inspiration	133-135
75-79	<i>Yahadus</i> reconciles man-subject's emotions with man-object's deeds	135-137

דרשה על ברכות מלכיות, זכרונות ושופרות
מאת הגרי"ז הלוי סולובייציק זצלה"ה
אלול, תשכ"ט (ושונות)
נלקט ונערך על ידי ברוך דוד שרייבר

Introduction

(1) The *Mussaf* of Rosh Hashanah expresses the essence of Rosh Hashanah. Marked by the sounding of the *shofar* and the recitation of *piyutim*, the *Mussaf* powerfully communicates the motifs of Rosh Hashanah. In addition to the *brachos* which normally comprise the standard *tefillah* of *Mussaf*, the *Mussaf* of Rosh Hashanah also contains three additional *brachos*, namely, the *brachos* of *malchiyos*, *zichronos* and *shofros*. This *shiur* will first analyze certain themes common to these three *brachos*. It will then analyze the merger of one of these additional *brachos* with one of the standard *brachos*. The *shiur* will conclude with an exposition of the motifs portrayed by each *bracha* as well as an explanation of the *passukim* cited in each *bracha*.

The *brachos* of *malchiyos*, *zichronos* and *shofros* charge man to engage in קבלת עול מלכות שמים on different levels

(2) The first theme shared by the *brachos* of *malchiyos*, *zichronos* and *shofros* is that each *bracha* expresses a different facet of the *mitzvah* of קבלת עול מלכות שמים, *the acceptance of G-d's sovereignty*.

The *bracha* of *malchiyos* posits the theme that, by creating the world, G-d acquired a proprietary interest in the world.¹ G-d is, therefore, both the King and owner of the world. The *bracha* promotes קבלת עול מלכות שמים by exhorting man to comply with the will of G-d and to expurgate *avodah zara* and idolatry from this world. Though modern man has progressed enormously, *Yahadus* still regards him as an idol worshipper and maintains that this state will not be corrected until the arrival of the *Mashiach*.

(3) The *bracha* of *zichronos* portrays the motifs of *hashgacha* and *bris*. The motif of *hashgacha* and G-d's omniscience relates simply to G-d's judgment on Rosh Hashanah

¹ The *halacha* denominates this interest as אומן קונה בשבח כלי. See, e.g. ס"ק ד'.

of mankind, in general, and of the *Knesses Yisroel* in particular.² The *bracha* of *zichronos* postulates that *vis-à-vis Hakadosh Baruch Hu* all three dimensions of time, past, present and future, are merged into one unit. *Hakadosh Baruch Hu* can not be characterized as living either in the past, present or future. *Hakadosh Baruch Hu* transcends all three dimensions of time. Events which will occur in the future have already emerged. Events which lie in the past are still transpiring, and events which have not yet occurred are already in existence. No event is lost. No event dies with the tide of time. Every action has a reaction, an effect that ripples in time.³

(4) The motif of *bris* is more complex. The Torah describes two different בריתות entered into between *Hakadosh Baruch Hu* and *Knesses Yisroel*. The *passuk* writes:⁴ כי עם קדוש אתה, ובך בחר ה' *Rashi* comments:

קדושת עצמך מאבותיך, ועוד ובך בחר ה'.
*Your sanctity originates both with your ancestors and with
 your selection by G-d.*

The first phrase, קדושת עצמך מאבותיך, refers to the *kedushah* enjoyed by *Knesses Yisroel* collectively. This *bris* was concluded with the *Avos* and invests each member of *Knesses Yisroel* with *kedushah*. This *bris* precipitates the obligation to perform *mitzvos*. This *bris* is not voluntary. It is imposed upon each Jew at birth. Just as one born in the United States remains a United States citizen and can never legally renounce his citizenship, so, too, no Jew can divorce himself from his Jewish heritage.

The second *bris* is individualistic. It is predicated upon the person's own decision to comply with the laws of the Torah. Even though a מומר, an apostate who rejects the Jewish religion, is still classified as a Jew because of his membership in *Knesses Yisroel* obtained through the first *bris*, nonetheless, the מומר lacks the individualistic *kedushas yisroel* derived from the second *bris*.⁵ The *bracha* of *zichronos*, therefore, exhorts Jews

² The *Ramban* (פירוש לשמות: ייג, טיז) elaborates at length that G-d's השגחה of *Knesses Yisroel* is qualitatively different than His השגחה of all other creatures.

³ This theme is the subject of the דרשה על הברכה של זכרונות appearing on page of this volume.

⁴ דברים (י"ד, ב').

⁵ (in which this *passuk* is contained) is read prior to *Chodesh Ehul* in order to underscore that every Jew must renew both בריתות prior to Rosh Hashanah.

In ספר רשימות שיעורים למסכת שבועות ח"א (עמ' קמ"ו) the Rav cites the *Rambam* (פ"ב מהלכות תשובה ה"ב) who writes:

ויעיד עליו יודע תעלומות שלא ישוב לזה החטא.
*One who engages in teshuva must impanel G-d to witness his resolve
 never to repeat the iniquity.*

to engage in קבלת עול מלכות שמים by renewing the second *bris* on a daily basis, thereby preserving the integrity of the second *bris* and its attendant *kedushah*.

(5) The *bracha* of *shofros* portrays the phenomena of גילוי שכינה.⁶ It describes G-d's revelation at *Har Sinai* and details the גילוי שכינה which will prevail following the arrival of the *Mashiach*. It concludes with a depiction of the subtle גילוי שכינה which can be experienced even nowadays by discerning and sensitive individuals. The *Shulchan Aruch* commences with the exhortation, שויתי ה' לנגדי תמיד. Even in private, one must conduct himself as if he were standing in the presence of G-d. Unlike Western philosophy and other religions which espouse that man's moral duties are bifurcated into *kodesh* and *chol*, so that one's conduct at home differs from his conduct in the temple, *Yahadus* charges each Jew with the imperative of experiencing גילוי שכינה during each and every minute of his life. Each Jew must therefore adopt a uniform standard of conduct which reflects this sensation. The *bracha* of *shofros*, therefore, obligates each Jew to engage in קבלת עול מלכות שמים by conducting himself as if he were always in the presence of his Sovereign.

(6) The *tekios* which follow each *bracha* confirm that we accept upon ourselves the specific קבלת עול מלכות שמים defined by each of the *brachos*. In ancient times, the *shofar* was sounded whenever a monarch was installed. Similarly, the *shofar* is sounded on Rosh Hashanah to confirm our קבלת עול מלכות שמים of G-d's eternal sovereignty through each of: (i) *malchiyos*, our compliance with G-d's will, (ii) *zichronos*, our renewal of the second *bris*, and (iii) *shofros*, our commitment to experience גילוי שכינה and conduct ourselves accordingly. Furthermore, the *tekios d'meyushav* are marked as אֲתַעֲרוֹתָ דְלַעֲלִילָא, *the call to teshuva is initiated by G-d*. G-d evokes the first *bris* which established the *kedushah* of *Knesses Yisroel* collectively. G-d, therefore, serves as the *baal tokea* and calls out to the Jews, עורו ישנים משנתכם, "Those who are slumbering should awake. Those who have sunk into the abyss of sin must rise." The *tekios d'meumad* are characterized as אֲתַעֲרוֹתָ דְלַתְתָּא, *the reconciliation with G-d is initiated*

The Rav explains that one who sins revokes the second individualistic *bris*. The *kedushas yisroel* predicated upon this *bris* therefore dissipates. Thus, when repenting, the person must renew this individual *bris* with G-d and regain the lost *kedushah*. Accordingly, פרשת נצבים, in which the second *bris* was initially established, is read on the Shabbos immediately prior to Rosh Hashanah. See also ספר על התשובה (עמי 132). [Editor's Note]

⁶ The theme of the *bracha* of *shofros* is subtle. The mechanical recital of ten *passukim* in which the term "*shofar*" occurs cannot be the objective of this *bracha*.

by the Jews. Thus, each Jew serves as a *baal tokea*.⁷ Each Jew on his own volition renews his individual *bris* with G-d and accepts the קבלת עול מלכות שמים expressed in each of the *brachos* of *malchiyos*, *zichronos* and *shofros*.

The *brachos* each portray קבלת עול מלכות שמים on both the universal and individual levels

(7) Another theme common to the three special *brachos* of *malchiyos*, *zichronos* and *shofros*, is that each *bracha* deals first and foremost with the unique relationship between *Hakadosh Baruch Hu* and *Knesses Yisroel* and then expands that relationship and applies it to the rest of humanity. Thus, the *bracha* of *malchiyos* defines *Hakadosh Baruch Hu* as the ruler of *Knesses Yisroel* by citing the *passuk*:⁸

כה אמר ה' מלך ישראל וגואלו...
G-d, the King of Israel and its Redeemer speaks as follows...

The *bracha* describes G-d's rule as the sovereign of *Knesses Yisroel*, of the covenantal community. The Jewish nation was chosen by G-d and entered into a covenant with Him. The *bracha* of *malchiyos* concludes by describing G-d's ultimate role as the King of all humanity. The *bracha* universalizes the private motif of G-d as מלך ישראל by emphasizing that He is also מלך על כל הארץ. Of course, the universal recognition of G-d's sovereignty is an ideal that has not yet been achieved. Most of humanity does not yet recognize *Hakadosh Baruch Hu* as מלך על כל הארץ. The ignorant and the wicked still deny G-d's sovereignty. Nonetheless, we assert our belief that all of humanity will eventually acknowledge G-d as מלך על כל הארץ.

(8) The theme of universality is contained in the *bracha* of *zichronos* as well. That *bracha* details the ברית אבות, the specific relationship between *Hakadosh Baruch Hu* and *Yisroel*, and the ensuing judgment of *Knesses Yisroel* on Rosh Hashanah. It reads:

(כאמור) וזכרתי להם ברית ראשונים אשר הוצאתי אותם מארץ מצרים... ברוך אתה ה' זוכר הברית.
(As it is written) I will recall My covenant with the Jews of the Exodus... Blessed are You who invokes the covenant with the Jewish people.

⁷ ספר ימי זיכרון (עמ' 142) See.

⁸ ישעיהו (מ"ד, ו').

The *bracha* also describes the relationship enjoyed by *Hakadosh Baruch Hu* with the rest of humanity, and the resulting judgment of all mankind, אתה זוכר מעשי עולם ופוקד כל יצורי קדם. The *Ribbono Shel Olam* not only recalls events which transpired within the historical community of *Knesses Yisroel*, but also recollects events that occurred within the community of all mankind. The *bracha*, therefore, emphasizes וזכרת את נח באהבה וזכרת. The word "וגם" denotes that even though Noach was neither a party to, nor a beneficiary of, a *bris*, nonetheless, G-d's זכרון applied to him as a member of humanity at large.

(9) The vision of the universal recognition of G-d is again depicted in the *bracha* of *shofros*. The *bracha* of *shofros* explicates a single motif, גילוי שכינה, *the confrontation between man and G-d*. *Shofros* exhorts Jews to experience the phenomena of לפני ה'. The introductory phrase, אתה נגלית בענן כבודך...ובקול שופר עליהם הופעת, expresses the theme that *shofar* is the instrument of גילוי שכינה. *Shofar* facilitates the reconciliation between the *Ribbono Shel Olam* and man.⁹ The *bracha* commences with a description of the confrontation between the *Ribbono Shel Olam* and His chosen people at *Har Sinai*.¹⁰ It immediately adds, however, that in the eschatological era all of humanity will be confronted by G-d and will perceive the presence of G-d. It cites the *passuk*:¹¹

כל יושבי תבל ושכני ארץ כנשא נס הרים תראו וכתקע שופר
תשמעו.
*All of humankind will perceive G-d just as they are able to
see a banner placed on a high hill or hear the sounds of
trumpets.*

The messianic vision of גילוי שכינה is that humanity at large will see, recognize and be confronted by G-d.

The *bracha* describes the first incident of G-d's revelation, limited primarily to *Knesses Yisroel*, and concludes with the vision that גילוי שכינה will become universal, embracing all of mankind.

(10) In conclusion, each of the brachos of *malchiyos*, *zichronos* and *shofros* outlines a different component of the *mitzvah* of עול מלכות שמים. Each facet is first described in terms of the unique relationship with *Hakadosh Baruch Hu* enjoyed by *Knesses Yisroel*.

⁹ The Gemara relates: (מסכת ראש השנה דף כ"ו ע"א): *shofar transports the individual into G-d's inner chambers.*

¹⁰ Though G-d's revelation at *Har Sinai* was collaterally experienced by all of humanity, nonetheless, it was directed primarily at the Jewish people.

¹¹ ישעיהו (י"ח,ג).

It then universalizes this unique relationship by reference to the eschatological era, at which time these motifs will be realized by all of humanity and by every creature in the universe.

The bracha of either *malchiyos* or *zichronos* is merged with the bracha of *kedushas hayom*

(11) In order to understand the message of the *brachos* of *malchiyos*, *zichronos* and *shofros*, it is first necessary to analyze its integration within the *Shemoneh Esrei* of *Mussaf*. Generally, the *Mussaf Shemoneh Esrei* recited on Shabbos and Yom Tov contains seven *brachos*:

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| (i) <i>Avos</i> ; | (iv) <i>Kedushas Hayom</i> ; |
| (ii) <i>Gevuros</i> ; | (v) <i>Avodah</i> ; |
| (iii) <i>Kedushas Hashem</i> ; | (vi) <i>Hodaah</i> ; and |
| (vii) <i>Shalom</i> . ¹² | |

*Chazal*¹³ deduced from various sources that the *Mussaf* of *Rosh Hashanah* must contain three additional *brachos*, constituting the themes of *malchiyos*, *zichronos* and *shofros*. This would have resulted in the *Shemoneh Esrei* of *Mussaf* on *Rosh Hashanah* consisting of ten *brachos*: the seven *brachos* recited on Yom Tov and Shabbos, plus the three additional *brachos* of *malchiyos*, *zichronos* and *shofros*¹⁴. However, *Chazal* derived

¹² A copy of the *Mussaf Shemoneh Esrei* is appended to the end of this volume.

¹³ מסכת ראש השנה דף ל"א ע"ב.

¹⁴ The גרי"ח requires the recital of all nine (9) *brachos* during each *Shemoneh Esrei* of *Shacharis*, *Minchah* and *Maariv* recited on *Rosh Hashanah*.

In ספר הררי קדם ח"א (סימן ד'), the Rav notes that the *bracha* of *kedushas hayom* recited within the *Mussaf* of *Rosh Hashanah* enjoys a different status than the standard *bracha* of *kedushas hayom* recited on Shabbos and on Yom Tov. The standard *bracha* of *kedushas hayom* represents a *kiyum* of המאורע. It is recited in order to define the day as a Yom Tov. On *Rosh Hashanah*, however, the *bracha* of *kedushas hayom* is on parity with the *brachos* of *malchiyos*, *zichronos* and *shofros*. They are all derived from the same series of *passukim* in פרשת אמור (See מסכת ראש השנה דף ל"ב ע"א). The recital of the *bracha* of *kedushas hayom*, together with the *brachos* of *malchiyos*, *zichronos* and *shofros*, thus, collectively constitutes a specific obligation inherent in the *tefillah* of *Mussaf* on *Rosh Hashanah*.

In ספר הררי קדם ח"א (סימן כ"ה), the Rav expounds on this theme. Quoting the גרי"ח, he explains that with respect to the other *Yomim Tovim*, the *bracha* of *kedushas hayom*, as its name implies, reflects the *kedushas hayom*, the essential character of that Yom Tov. By contrast, *Rosh Hashanah* is endowed with a multi-faceted *kedushas hayom* consisting of *malchiyos*, *zichronos* and *shofros*. If so, consolidating either of these *brachos* with the standard *bracha* of *kedushas hayom* (i.e. by concluding the *bracha* with a double חתימה consisting of זוכר הברית or מלך על כל הארץ, together with either the phrase של קדש ישראל or (תרועת וכו' שובע קול) would not violate the general principle that disparate *brachos* should not be merged, inasmuch as each of these *brachos*, per se, reflects a dimension of *Rosh Hashanah*. Thus, any of these *brachos* may be appropriately incorporated within the *bracha* of *kedushas hayom*. The issue debated by the *Tanaitim* was

from other sources¹⁵ that the *Shemonah Esrei* on *Rosh Hashanah* may contain only nine *brachos*. *Chazal*, therefore, directed that one of the additional three *brachos* be consolidated with one of the other seven *brachos*. The *Tanaim* disputed the final format of this consolidation. Our practice conforms with the opinion of R' Akiva that the *bracha* of *malchiyos* is merged within the *bracha* of *kedushas hayom*. R' Shimon ben Gamliel proposed that the *bracha* of *zichronos* be merged within the *bracha* of *kedushas hayom*. R' Yochanan ben Nuri ruled that the *bracha* of *malchiyos* should be merged with another *bracha* entirely, namely, the *bracha* of *kedushas hashem*.

(12) According to both R' Akiva and R' Shimon ben Gamliel, the recitation of *malchiyos*, *zichronos*, *shofros* mandates that one of these *brachos* be incorporated within the *bracha* of *kedushas hayom*.¹⁶ They posit that since the *bracha* of *kedushas hayom* generally expresses the central motif of each holiday, it should likewise express the identity of the holiday of Rosh Hashanah. They disagreed, however, whether the primary motif of Rosh Hashanah is that of *malchiyos* or *zichronos*.¹⁷

(13) In truth, Rosh Hashanah embodies both these motifs: x) *malchiyos*, the day upon which G-d's sovereignty is affirmed, and y) *zichronos*, the day upon which G-d judges mankind and evokes the *bris* with the covenantal community.¹⁸ R' Shimon ben Gamliel

which of these *brachos* depicts the primary character of Rosh Hashanah and should preferably be merged with the *bracha* of *kedushas hayom*.

In ספר הררי קדם ח"א (סימן כ"ו) (אות י"א), the Rav notes that the *Rambam* omits the requirement to consolidate one of the *brachos* of *malchiyos*, *zichronos* and *shofros* with the *bracha* of *kedushas hayom*. (See פ"ב מהלכות תפלה ה"ו). The Rav infers that the *Rambam* maintains that the *Mussaf* of Rosh Hashanah does not require the recital of the *bracha* of *kedushas hayom* since the *bracha* of *kedushas hayom* is already subsumed under the *bracha* of *malchiyos*. Apparently, the *Rambam* maintains that the essential character of Rosh Hashanah is *malchiyos*. [Editor's Note]

¹⁵ הני תשע דראש השנה כנגד תשעה אזכרות שאמרה חנה בתפילתה (מסכת ברכות דף כ"ט ע"א).

¹⁶ R' Yochanan ben Nuri's opinion is analyzed infra, paragraph 16.

¹⁷ If Rosh Hashanah is primarily a day of *malchiyos*, then the *passuk* of יום תרועה, which defines Rosh Hashanah, is translated as the day on which the *shofar* heralds the coronation of the king. It would be similar to the *passuk* of ותרועת מלך בו, which most Rishonim interpret as referring to the sounds of the *shofar* which announce the king's arrival. If, however, Rosh Hashanah is primarily a day of *zichronos*, then the *passuk* יום תרועה denotes a day of זכרון effected by the instrument of the *shofar* (and has the identical meaning as the *passuk* זכרון תרועה).

¹⁸ As will be discussed, infra, paragraph 53, the *bracha* of *shofros* portrays the motif of גילוי שכינה. This motif is seemingly a product of *malchiyos* and *zichronos*. However, the *Gemara* did not suggest that the *bracha* of *shofros* be consolidated with the *bracha* of *kedushas hayom*. The *Gemara* states that the *bracha* of *kedushas hayom* may be recited only as the middle *bracha* or as the fourth *bracha*. It notes:

רבי אומר, (קדושת היום) עם מלכיות אומרה. מה מצינו בכל מקום ברביעית, אף כאן ברביעית. רשבי"ג אומר, (קדושת היום) עם הזכרונות אומרה. מה מצינו בכל מקום באמצע, אף כאן באמצע (מסכת ראש השנה דף ל"ב ע"א).

and R' Akiva disagreed as to which of the two constitutes the primary theme of Rosh Hashanah and which the secondary theme. In R' Akiva's opinion, the central motif of Rosh Hashanah is *malchiyos*. The very substance of the *kedushas hayom* of Rosh Hashanah expresses מלכותו של הקב"ה. In R' Shimon ben Gamliel's opinion, the essence of Rosh Hashanah is *zichronos*, the day in which the *bris* between *Knesses Yisroel* and the *Ribbono Shel Olam* is reestablished.

R' Shimon ben Gamliel conceded that in all of the other *tefillos* recited on *Rosh Hashanah*, the *bracha* of *kedushas hayom* is the standard *bracha* of:

או"י מלוך על כל העולם וכי

which concludes:

בא"י מלך על כל הארץ מקדש ישראל ויום הזכרון.

However, R' Shimon ben Gamliel ruled that in *Mussaf*, the *bracha* of *zichronos* should be merged with the *bracha* of *kedushas hayom*. In his opinion, the *Shemonah Esrei* of *Mussaf* was arranged as follows:

- (i) The first three *brachos*, concluding with the expanded *bracha* of *kedushas hashem* and the *תן פחדך* paragraphs;
- (ii) This was followed by the *bracha* of *malchiyos*, which contained the introductory paragraph of *ועל כן נקוה לך...* and the ten *passukim* culminating with the *passuk* of *שמע ישראל ה' אלוקינו ה' אחד*;
- (iii) The *bracha* of *malchiyos* concluded with the petition:

אלוקינו ואלוקי אבותנו מלוך על כל העולם כולו בכבודך...ודברך
מלכנו אמת וקיים לעד, ברוך אתה ה' מלך על כל הארץ.¹⁹

The *bracha* of *malchiyos* was followed by the *bracha* of *zichronos*, as merged with the *bracha* of *kedushas hayom*. It read as follows:

- (i) It commenced with: *אתה בחרתנו...ומפני חטאנו...ובחודש השביעי...*;
- (ii) It then introduced *אתה זוכר מעשי עולם...וגם את נח...כחול היס...*;
- (iii) This was followed by the compilation of the ten *passukim*;

Apparently, this requirement precludes the consolidation of the *bracha* of *kedushas hayom* with the *bracha* of *shofros*, since the *bracha* of *shofros* is neither the fourth nor the middle *bracha* of the *Mussaf Shemoneh Esrei*. [Editor's Note]

¹⁹ According to R' Shimon ben Gamliel, the conclusion of this *bracha* did not contain the words *מקדש ישראל* since that phrase is reserved for the *bracha* of *kedushas hayom*. Rather, the *bracha* of *malchiyos* exclusively depicted the motif that G-d is מלך על כל הארץ.

- (iv) The succeeding paragraph of the *bracha* of *zichronos* contained the petition:

אלוקנו ואלקי אבותינו זכרנו בזכרון טוב לפניך... וקים לנו ה'
אלוקנו את הדבר שהבטחתנו בתורתך... כאמור וזכרתי להם ברית
ראשונים וכי'.

- (v) This was immediately followed by the phrases normally contained in the *bracha* of *kedushas hayom*:

קדשנו במצותיך ותן חלקינו בתורתך, שבענו מטובך ושמחנו
בישועתך וטהר לבנו לעבדך באמת.

- (vi) The *bracha* concluded:

כי זוכר כל הנשכחות אתה הוא מעולם, ואין שכחה לפני כסא
כבודך, ועקידת יצחק לזרעו היום ברחמים תזכור, ברוך אתה ה'
זוכר הברית מקדש ישראל ויום הזכרון.

The *bracha* of הברית זוכר was thus consolidated with the *bracha* of *kedushas hayom*.

Our practice conforms with the ruling of R' Akiva. The structure of the *bracha* of *malchiyos*, as consolidated with the *bracha* of *kedushas hayom*, reads as follows:

- (i) אתה בחרתנו... ומפני הטאנו... ובחודש השביעי;
(ii) The introduction to *malchiyos*, consisting of the paragraph of לך ועל כן נקוה לך
and the compilation of the ten *passukim*; and
(iii) The *bracha* concludes with the final portion of the *bracha* of *kedushas hayom* recited during each of the other *tefillos* of Rosh Hashanah, namely,

אלוקנו ואלוקי אבותנו, מלך על כל העולם... קדשנו במצותיך ותן
חלקנו בתורתך... ברוך אתה ה' מלך על כל הארץ מקדש ישראל ויום
הזכרון.²⁰

The *bracha* of *malchiyos* should be merged with the *bracha* of *kedushas hashem*

(16) R' Yochanan ben Nuri rejected both R' Akiva's and R' Shimon ben Gamliel's proposals. He maintained that the *bracha* of *kedushas hayom* should be independent and separate. In order to maintain a nine – *bracha* structure, he proposed that the *bracha* of

²⁰ The Rav often quoted R' Chaim who ruled that, on Rosh Hashanah, the pronouncement of G-d מלך על כל הארץ is intrinsic to the essence of the day. It is inconceivable to celebrate Rosh Hashanah without simultaneously crowning G-d as the universal sovereign. Thus, the *bracha* of *kedushas hayom* recited during each of the *tefillos* must contain the phrase מלך על כל הארץ (ברוך אתה ה') immediately prior to the recital of מקדש ישראל ויום הזכרון. Accordingly, R' Chaim ruled that one who omits the phrase מלך על כל הארץ in any of the *tefillos* recited on Rosh Hashanah must repeat that *bracha*. This is in contrast to the ruling of the ספר חיי אדם (כלל כ"ד) and the שיערי תשובה (סימן תקפ"ב ס"ק ד') who limit this to *Mussaf*. See ספר ארץ הצבי (סימן ה') (אות ד'); ספר נפש הרב (עמ' ר"ב); ספר הררי קדם ח"א (סימן כ"ה) [Editor's Note]

malchiyos be merged with the *bracha* of *kedushas hashem* (i.e. the *bracha* of המלך (הקדוש). According to R' Yochanan ben Nuri, the paragraphs of ובכן תן פחדך, which constitute the prefatory components of the *bracha* of *kedushas hashem*, serve as the introduction to *malchiyos*²¹. R' Yochanan ben Nuri formulated the *bracha* of *malchiyos*, as merged with the *bracha* of *kedushas hashem*, as follows:

- (i) The *bracha* commenced with the introductory paragraphs of ובכן תן פחדך... ובכן תן כבוד... ובכן צדיקים יראו וישמחו...
- (ii) This was followed by the petition of ותמלך אתה ה' לבדך על כל מעשיך...²²; ובירושלים עיר קדשך
- (iii) The ten *passukim* of *malchiyos* were then recited, ככתוב בתורתך ה' ימלוך, followed by *passukim* from *Kesuvim* and *Naviim*, לעולם ועד וכו' ויהי בישראל מלך... ובדברי קדשך כתוב לאמר וכו' ועל ידי עבדיך הנביאים כתוב לאמר; ובתורתך כתוב לאמור, שמע ישראל ה' אלוהינו ה' אחד
- (iv) The *bracha* concluded:
 קדוש אתה ונורא שמך ואין אלוהה מבלעדך, ככתוב ויגבה ה'
 במשפט והקל הקדוש נקדש בצדקה. ברוך אתה ה' המלך הקדוש.²³

Following the recital of the *bracha* of *kedushas hashem*, R' Yochanan ben Nuri recited the *bracha* of *kedushas hayom*, commencing with אתה בחרתנו, followed by ומפני אלוהינו ואלוקי אבותנו מלוך על כל העולם and concluding with אלוהינו ואלוקי אבותנו מלוך על כל העולם.²⁴

²¹ Although R' Akiva's opinion prevailed, nonetheless, the מסדרי התפילה retained the paragraphs of ובכן תן פחדך and incorporated them within the standard text of the *bracha* of *kedushas hashem*. See: ספר חדושי רבינו מאיר שמחה למסי ר"ה דף ל"ב ע"א (עמוד ר"ל); ספר נראות הרב ח"י (עמ' 277); ספר חדושי רבינו מאיר שמחה למסי ר"ה דף ל"ב ע"א (עמוד ר"ל); ספר נפש הרב (עמ' ר"ב)

²² The succeeding phrase, ככתוב בדברי קדשך, ימלוך ה' לעולם אלוהינו ציון לדור ודור הלוקה, contained in our text of this *bracha* was subsequently introduced by the מסדרי התפילות in accordance with R' Akiva's practice. R' Yochanan ben Nuri, however, inserted at this stage the ten *passukim* of *malchiyos*, commencing with the *passuk* ועד לעולם.

²³ R' Yochanan ben Nuri did not conclude the *bracha* of *kedushas hashem* with the phrase מלך על כל הארץ even though this *bracha* incorporates the *bracha* of *malchiyos*. He apparently maintained that the sole word "המלך (הקדוש)" is an acceptable conclusion for the *bracha* of *malchiyos*.

²⁴ The Rav theorized that R' Yochanan ben Nuri employed the standard חתימה of מלך על כל הארץ, contained in all of the other *tefillos*, as the concluding statement of the *bracha* of *kedushas hayom*.

The Rav writes that, according to R' Yochanan ben Nuri, the *bracha* of *malchiyos* consisted of the paragraph of לך ואלוהינו יחד together with the ten *passukim*. The Rav adds that, according to R' Yochanan ben Nuri, the *bracha* of *kedushas hayom* concluded with the statement, בא"י מלך על כל הארץ; the phrase מלך על כל הארץ was not recited (neither in *Mussaf* nor in the other *tefillos*).

(17) R' Yochanan ben Nuri's rationale is that *malchiyos* should be recited on Rosh Hashanah at the very first suitable opportunity (i.e. that the *passukim* be placed within the framework of the very first *bracha* which expresses the motifs of *malchiyos*). Since, on Rosh Hashanah, two *brachos* contain *malchiyos* motifs, namely, that of *kedushas hashem* and that of *kedushas hayom*, R' Yochanan ben Nuri theorized that it is preferable to introduce all of the *passukim* of *malchiyos* in the *bracha* of *kedushas hashem*, the first of those two *brachos*.

(18) R' Yochanan ben Nuri conceded that the *tekios* are not sounded immediately following the *bracha* of *kedushas hashem*; the *tekios* are deferred until after the *bracha* of *kedushas hayom*. R' Akiva questioned this ruling:

אם אינו תוקע למלכיות, למה מזכיר.²⁵
*If the tekios are not sounded immediately following the
recital of malchiyos in the bracha of kedushas hashem, why
are the brachos and passukim not similarly deferred?*

There are two possible explanations for R' Yochanan ben Nuri's decision to both incorporate *malchiyos* within the *bracha* of *kedushas hashem* and yet defer the *tekios* until after the recital of the *bracha* of *kedushas hayom*. First, R' Yochanan ben Nuri maintained that it is more important that all of the sets of *tekios* sounded during the *Shemoneh Esrei* occur in immediate sequence, without interruption or separation by any *bracha* other than those of *malchiyos*, *zichronos* and *shofros*. If the *tekios* were to be sounded immediately following the *bracha* of *kedushas hashem*, as merged with the *bracha* of *malchiyos*, the intervening *bracha* of *kedushas hayom* (which is not merged with either *zichronos* or *shofros*) would interrupt the continuity of the *tekios*. The *bracha* of *kedushas hayom*, a *bracha* devoid of *tekios*, would intervene between the *tekios* of

In ספר הררי קדם ח"א (סימן כ"ז) (אות ה') In ספר הררי קדם ח"א (סימן כ"ז) (אות ה') the author offers another rationale for R' Yochanan ben Nuri's decision to sound the *tekios* following the *bracha* of *kedushas hayom*. He explains that, according to R' Yochanan ben Nuri, the *mitzvah* of *tekias shofar* requires the accompanying recital solely of the *brachos* of *kedushas hayom*, *zichronos* and *shofros*. The *bracha* of *malchiyos* merely complements the other *brachos*, but is not, per se, part of this obligatory recital. Indeed, the recital of the *bracha* of *malchiyos* is derived from another *passuk* entirely (i.e. פרשת בהעלותך, as opposed to the others derived from a *passuk* in אמור (פרשת אמור)). The *bracha* of *malchiyos* is, therefore, extrinsic to the integrated unit consisting of the *brachos* of *kedushas hayom*, *zichronos* and *shofros*. R' Yochanan ben Nuri, therefore, ruled that the *tekios* should be sounded following the *bracha* of *kedushas hayom* and not following the *bracha* of *malchiyos*. [Editor's Note]

²⁵ מסכת ראש השנה דף ל"ב ע"א The Rav's interpretation of this question is exhaustively discussed in: ספר נראות הרב (ח"ו עמ' 272); ספר הררי קדם ח"א (סימן כ"ז); מסורה (חוברת ב') (עמ' י"ד – ט"ז) [Editor's Note]

malchiyos and the *tekios* of *zichronos*. He therefore proposed that the *tekios* of *malchiyos* be sounded only following the *bracha* of *kedushas hayom*.²⁶

(19) R' Yochanan ben Nuri also reasoned that even though the *bracha* of *malchiyos* is merged with that of *kedushas hashem*, nevertheless, the succeeding *bracha* of *kedushas hayom* portrays another aspect of *malchiyos*. It is, therefore, more appropriate that the *tekios*, which in essence confirm the verbal prayers of *malchiyos*, be sounded at the conclusion of all of the *brachos* which explicate the multiple themes of *malchiyos* (i.e. the *bracha* of *kedushas hashem* as well as the *bracha* of *kedushas hayom*).²⁷

***Malchiyos* expresses faith in the universal acceptance of G-d's sovereignty over both natural law and moral law**

(20) Having analyzed the general structure of the *brachos*, it is now possible to understand the theme of each *bracha*.

The *bracha* of *malchiyos* commences with the sentence:

ועל כן נקוו לך ה' אלוֹקֵנו לראות מהרה בתפארת עוֹד,
We anticipate the day when You will be revealed in Your majestic splendor.

This paragraph expresses our faith and hope that humanity will ultimately experience G-d's power and grandeur at the universal level. The *bracha* stresses:

וְכָל בְּנֵי בָשָׂר יִקְרְאוּ בְשִׁמְךָ לְהִפְנוֹת אֵלֶיךָ כָּל רָשָׁעֵי אֶרֶץ. יִכִּירוּ וִידְעוּ
כָּל יוֹשְׁבֵי תֵבֵל...
All of humanity shall seek You; even the wicked shall return to You. Eventually, all of humanity shall recognize and perceive You.

It repeatedly emphasizes that all of humanity will eventually acknowledge G-d's absolute sovereignty.

(21) The *bracha* of *malchiyos* then states *כי המלכות שלך היא, the Kingdom is Yours*. It then supports this statement by citing three *passukim* from the Torah. The *passukim* are

²⁶ See ערוך לנר (שם) (ד"ה וכולל).

²⁷ As will be explained in paragraphs 32-39, the vision of *malchiyos* portrayed in the *bracha* of *kedushas hashem* differs markedly from that described in the *bracha* of *kedushas hayom*.

arranged in the order that they appear in the Torah. However, the arrangement reflects a conceptual structure as well.²⁸ The first *passuk*²⁹ cited is:

ה' ימלוך לעולם ועד,

G-d's reign is established forever.

Grammatically, the word ימלוך is not limited to the future tense; it may also denote the present tense. Thus, this *passuk* does not merely express the belief that G-d shall reign in the future forever and ever. Rather, the *passuk* explains that G-d is the Sovereign both presently and for eternity.³⁰ He rules the cosmic process. He rules history. He determines all events. G-d's eternal reign is a reality. It is not something that will be obtained only in the future. This *passuk*, therefore, bolsters the prior phrase, כי המלכות שלך היא, since it confirms that G-d is the present and eternal Sovereign.

(22) The *bracha* explores two distinct facets of G-d's sovereignty, only one of which is presently accepted by all of humanity. It asserts that G-d's reign expresses itself in the two laws which He formulated when creating the world, namely, the natural law and the

²⁸ The *Gemara* notes that the order of the *passukim* cited by the *Gemara* conforms to the *passuk* ה' מלך, ה' מלך, ה' ימלוך לעולם ועד, which first references the present, followed by the past, and concludes with the future. Thus, the *Gemara* arranged the order of the *passukim* as:

(i) ה' אלוֹקֵינוּ עִמּוֹ וְתִרְעַת מֶלֶךְ בּוֹ - present

(ii) וַיְהִי בִישׁוּרוֹן מֶלֶךְ - past

(iii) ה' ימלוך לעולם ועד - future

The *passuk* of ה' אלוֹקֵינוּ עִמּוֹ describes the present. The *passuk* of וַיְהִי בִישׁוּרוֹן מֶלֶךְ portrays the past and the *passuk* of ה' ימלוך לעולם ועד represents the future. He explains that the *passukim* are predicated upon the intensity of man's sensation of G-d's presence. With respect to humans, anything which is presently experienced is of greater significance than that which has been previously experienced. Something which has not yet been experienced is of lesser significance.

Likewise, on Yom Kippur, the *bracha* of the *kedushas hayom* cites three *passukim* which are also arranged in the same order of present, past and future. These *passukim* are:

(i) אֲנִי אֲנִי הוּא מוֹחָה פֶשַׁעַךְ לְבָדִי - present

(ii) מַחִיתִי כֶעֶב - past

(iii) כִּי בַיּוֹם הַזֶּה יִכַּפֵּר עֲלֵיכֶם - future

The *Gemara* notes, however, that, with respect to G-d, who exists in all three dimensions of time, and for whom the past, present and future are all equally and simultaneously experienced, the past has more significance than the future, and both the past and future have more significance than the present. The reason for this is that the past has already occurred, the future is regulated in the same manner as the past, and the present is merely a very small dimension in time. Yeshayahu therefore describes G-d, ה' אֵלֵינוּ, מֶלֶךְ יִשְׂרָאֵל, אֲנִי רִאשׁוֹן וְאַתָּה אַחֲרוֹן וּמִבְלַעֲדֵי אֵין אֱלֹהִים. The past is noted first, followed by the future, and concludes with the present. [Editor's Note]

²⁹ שמות (טיז, ייח).

³⁰ The Targum interprets ימלוך in both the present and future tense. He writes: ה' מלכותייה קאם לעלם ולעלמי. As noted, *supra*, footnote 24, the *Gemara* interprets this *passuk* in the future tense.

moral law. The *Rambam*³¹ explains that both the natural law and the moral law are comprised of the same principles and that these two laws regulate both human history as well as the cosmic order. Man, however, with his limited intellectual capacity does not understand the transition between the moral law and the natural law. That remains an enigma. Thus, many philosophers maintain that the natural law of the universe is indifferent to moral values. *Yahadus* rejects that view, even though *Yahadus* cannot fully rationalize the occurrence of evil and misfortune. *Yahadus* maintains that there is an undeniable transition from the divine moral law to the divine natural law. Often, it appears as if the natural law and the moral law are mutually exclusive, contradictory and irreconcilable. Nevertheless, one of the central tenets of *Yahadus* is that the natural law and the moral law form a single indivisible unit. The laws of the Torah and the *י"ג מדות* are not only abstract ideals; they are natural principles which guide the universe and the cosmic drama. Conversely, the natural law expresses a much higher law, namely, the moral law.

(23) At this time, the Kingdom of G-d is to be found solely in the natural law. The natural law is *רצונו הקדמון*, the primordial will which created and regulates all of creation, both organic and inorganic, both intelligent beings as well as the beasts in the field. The fact that nature behaves in accordance with certain regulated patterns is the premise upon which the natural law is based. Nature's unalterable behavior confirms *Hakadosh Baruch Hu's* absolute sovereignty. The *passuk* states:

השמים מספרים כבוד קל ומעשי ידיו מגיד הרקיע.³²
The heavens relate G-d's glory; G-d's creations span the heavens.

The *Midrash* comments:³³

שמה הארץ שנתה מדתה... שמה זרעתם חיטים ויצאו שעורים...
Has the Earth ever changed its pattern, its mode of behavior? Has anyone ever planted wheat and reaped barley?

³¹ ספר מורה הנבוכים ח"ג, פרק כ"י. See also ספר משך חכמה פ' משפטים (כ"ז, י"ב) who interprets the *passuk*, *כתבתי להורותם* as referring to G-d's applying the laws of the Torah in formulating the laws of nature. Thus, the phrase *כתבתי* refers to the הטבע. [Editor's Note]

³² תהלים (י"ט, א').

³³ פסיק (לקח טוב) פרשת האזינו (דף נ"ה ע"א).

The consistency and regularity of nature, the absence of anomalies, all attest to מלכותו של הקב"ה. Man has no control over the laws of nature. Man cannot interfere with nor alter the laws of the universe. As far as natural law is concerned, man has accepted G-d's absolute and eternal sovereignty. This element of faith is expressed in the *passuk* of ה' ימלוך לעולם ועד, *G-d's reign is established forever*.

The *passuk* ה' ימלוך לעולם ועד, thus, denotes that G-d currently is the King of the Universe. G-d sustains the universe and is responsible for the ongoing cosmic processes. He established the rules of nature and maintains its regularity. We, therefore, do not need to pray for the establishment of G-d's kingdom over nature. As far as the natural law is concerned, no one can rebel against G-d since no one can change the natural law. All humans are subject to and have accepted the natural law even though the natural law, at times, appears indifferent, quirksome and malicious. Natural law represents מלכותו של הקב"ה.

(24) The same is not true of the moral law. Had He elected, G-d could have imposed the moral law upon man in the same manner as He imposed the natural law. G-d could have created man as He did the angels, having no options other than to comply with G-d's will. G-d elected to grant man the absolute freedom and opportunity to comply with or reject the moral law. G-d provided man with unfettered בחירה חפשית, *free will*. Unfortunately, on the whole, man has at best accepted the moral law only partially, thereby rendering מלכותו של הקב"ה seemingly incomplete. Ironically, what interferes with מלכותו של הקב"ה is G-d's own decision that man be endowed with freedom of choice. Were man not endowed with freedom, there would be no contradiction, no collision, between man's will and רצונו של הקב"ה. But G-d, in His inscrutable wisdom, wanted man to be free. He challenged man to accept the moral law voluntarily.

(25) G-d's sovereignty over the moral law is, therefore, not yet universally accepted by the entire humankind. The *bracha* expresses our belief that in the future all of humanity will eventually crown the *Ribbono Shel Olam* as the King of the Universe. Man shall ultimately recognize and accept G-d's moral law in the same manner that it acknowledges G-d's sovereignty over the natural law. The *bracha* concludes that man's realization of G-d will inevitably occur since המלכות שלך היא, the Kingdom is Yours. Humanity already acknowledges G-d's sovereignty over natural law. The day will

eventually come when humanity will also acknowledge His sovereignty over the moral law. Just as G-d's sovereignty over the cosmos is undisputed even nowadays, so, too, G-d's dominion over the moral law will inevitably be accepted as well.

The *passuk* of ותרועת מלך בו depicts the Jews' periodic acceptance of G-d's sovereignty

(26) The *bracha* then cites another *passuk*³⁴ to associate the sovereignty depicted by ה' ימלוך לעולם ועד to the Jewish people:

ונאמר, לא הביט און ביעקב, ולא ראה עמל בישראל. ה' אלוקיו עמו
ותרועת מלך בו.
*He sees no iniquity in Yaakov nor evil in Yisroel. Yaakov's
G-d is with him. The sound of the trumpet heralding the
King's arrival is among him.*³⁵

This *passuk* reflects that Yaakov has distinguished itself. The chosen community occupies a unique position because this community has already recognized G-d and accepted the moral law. The *passuk* explains this, ותרועת מלך בו, *the sound of the trumpet heralding the king's arrival is among him*. Just as a trumpet announces a king's periodic visits to a city, so, too, *Knesses Yisroel* periodically experiences G-d's presence.³⁶ Everyone who hears the sounds of the trumpet heralding the king's arrival rises to greet and accept the king. This analogy suggests קבלת עול מלכות שמים, *the acceptance of G-d's sovereignty*. The Jewish people are confronted with *Hakadosh Baruch Hu* from time to time and become close to Him. However, for the time being, G-d's sovereignty is limited to the covenantal community. ה' ימלוך לעולם ועד is not recognized by anyone other than *Yisroel*.

³⁴ במדבר (כיג, כי"א).

³⁵ *Chazal* offered various interpretations of the phrase ותרועת מלך בו. Most commentators (see, e.g., ראבי"ע, ספורנו (חוקוני, חוקוני) interpret ותרועת מלך בו as the sound of the *shofar* which heralds the king's arrival. This analogy denotes קבלת עול מלכות שמים, the acceptance of G-d's sovereignty, as will be detailed in this paragraph. The *Targum* disagrees. He writes, ושכינת מלכהון ביניהון, He translates the word תרועה as ריעות, a friend. Thus, ותרועת מלך בו has the connotation of one who is the companion of the King.

The *Gemara* (מסכת ראש השנה דף ל"ב ע"ב) notes that the *passuk* of בו ותרועת מלך בו may be cited in either of the *brachos* of *malchiyos* or *shofros*. Apparently, *Chazal* understood that the sound of the *shofar* heralds the arrival of the monarch. They, therefore, sanctioned the *passuk's* incorporation within the *bracha* of *malchiyos*. On the other hand, *Chazal* also recognized that *shofar* serves as the instrument of גילוי שכינה. They, therefore, conceded that it may also be incorporated among the compilation of *passukim* contained in the *bracha* of *shofros*. Our text of the *bracha* of *malchiyos* employs this *passuk* to reflect that occasionally, from time to time, the Jews are motivated to confront *Hakadosh Baruch Hu* and become closer to Him.

³⁶ Paragraph 27, *infra*, clarifies why Yaakov's recognition of G-d is deliberately analogized to ותרועת מלך, the sound of the *shofar* which announces the periodic arrival of the king.

(27) There is a gradual ideological ascent from the theme expressed by ה' ימלוך לעולם (i.e. that G-d's sovereignty over natural law is already established) to that portrayed by ותרועת מלך בו (i.e. that G-d's sovereignty over moral law is recognized only by the *Knesses Yisroel*). The idea becomes increasingly enhanced with each succeeding *passuk* and reaches its climax with the third cited *passuk*,

ונאמר ויהי בישרון מלך...³⁷

G-d rules over the Jewish people...

The difference between the *passuk* ותרועת מלך בו and the *passuk* ויהי בישרון מלך is that the *passuk* ויהי בישרון מלך suggests an ideal of *malchiyos* that is more exalted, namely, the *Knesses Yisroel's* consistent recognition of G-d as their sole sovereign. In contrast, the *passuk* ותרועת מלך בו concedes that מלכותו של הקב"ה has not been realized consistently and uninterruptedly by *Knesses Yisroel*. Unfortunately, the history of *Knesses Yisroel* is not one of uninterrupted and unabated acceptance of עול מלכות שמים. Jews have had both ups and downs. Jews have often rebelled against G-d. The Torah characterizes the Jews as rebels, ה' ממרים הייתם עם ה'³⁸, during their forty year sojourn in the desert. One may infer from the analogy of the sounds of a *shofar* that the *passuk* depicts the *Knesses Yisroel's* only sporadic acceptance of G-d's sovereignty. A king who is constantly among his people does not need to be announced. The shout of the trumpet is unnecessary in the permanent capital of the monarch. If a king is always present, then, by definition, he never leaves the people. Since the *passuk* equates G-d's sovereignty with a trumpet which announces the king's arrival, the *passuk* implies that the Jews' acceptance of G-d has been intermittent. Thus, when G-d's sovereignty is acknowledged by *Knesses Yisroel*, it is a novel sensation, akin to the arrival of a newly crowned king. Jews fall, but inevitably rise again. Jews retain the talent, initiative and faith to rise ever again against opposing forces. This is the concept of *teshuva* and the message of ותרועת מלך בו. Whenever Jews have risen, the sound of the trumpet of the king was heard. Whenever Jews fell, whenever they sinned, the King disappeared.³⁹

The third cited *passuk*, ויהי בישרון מלך, denotes that G-d has resided, and will continue to abide, with ישרון forever. The zigzag lines along which Jewish History

³⁷ דברים (ליג, ה'). Most commentators write that ישרון refers to the Jewish people.

³⁸ דברים (טז, כ"ד).

³⁹ חטא is the act which causes *Hakadosh Baruch Hu* to absent Himself from His people.

previously developed will become a straight line, marked by G-d's permanent residence among His people.

(28) In conclusion, *הי ימלוך לעולם ועד* reflects the prevailing universal acceptance of G-d's sovereignty over the natural law; G-d's absolute rule over the cosmos. The *passuk* of *לא הביט און ביעקב* reflects the sporadic acceptance and rejection of the moral law by the Jewish people. Jewish history contains episodes of *חטא* followed by episodes of *teshuva*, of falling and rising, of coming close to G-d and then somehow drifting away from Him. At times, Jews heard the sound of the trumpet and responded. But on many other occasions, the trumpet was not blown because G-d was distant and removed.⁴⁰ Eventually, G-d's absence was ultimately reversed. G-d's *הסתר פנים* terminated and Jews again heard the sounds of the trumpet. Jews again experienced *קול הי אלוקים*⁴¹; they heard His footsteps. This process of acceptance and rejection has continued throughout Jewish history. The final *passuk*, *ויהי בישרון מלך*, depicts the complete and unabated reconciliation between the *Ribbono Shel Olam* and the Jewish people, and G-d's permanent residence among *Knesses Yisroel*. The arrangement of these *passukim* portrays a gradual progression which reaches its climax in the final *passuk*.

The multi-passuk conversation between the *פתחי עולם* and the *מלך הכבוד* is classified as a single recital of *malchiyos*

(29) The *bracha* then cites *passukim* from *Tehillim*. The first *passuk* cited is:

ובדברי קדשך כתוב לאמר, כי להי המלוכה ומושל בגוים,
The Kingdom is G-d's, and He is the ruler over all the Nations.

The words *מלך* and *מושל* are not synonymous. *מלך* denotes a sovereign who is voluntarily accepted by the people, a monarch who is invited to become the ruler. A *מושל* is a tyrant, one who forcefully asserts his authority over others. The ultimate ideal and goal of creation is, *המלוכה*, *כי להי המלוכה*, that people comply with the moral law in the same manner that they accept the natural law; that they accept G-d as a *מלך*, and not as a *מושל*. This ideal, however, is not yet realized. At the present time, *ומושל בגוים*, G-d rules as a

⁴⁰ This alienation by G-d is termed *הסתר פנים*. In recent history, the Nazi era is a stark example of *הסתר פנים*.

⁴¹ *בראשית (ג', חזי)*.

tyrant. G-d's natural law, imbedded in the universe, is imposed upon humankind, and G-d's moral law has not yet been accepted.

The *bracha* then cites the *passuk*:⁴²

ונאמר ה' מלך גאות לבש, לבש ה' עוז התאזר, אף תכון תבל בל
תמוט,
*G-d is crowned with pride and majesty as He regulates the
universe's existence.*

This *passuk* describes the natural kingdom of G-d. G-d is the ruler of the universe, אף תמוט. תיכון תבל בל תמוט. The natural law is imposed upon mankind; all humans are subject to its rules. It is impossible to free oneself from the authority and rule of natural law.

The next *passuk* cited is:⁴³

ונאמר שאו שערים ראשיכם והנשאו פתחי עולם ויבוא מלך הכבוד.
Allow the gates and doors to open and welcome G-d.

The *passuk* appeals to mankind to accept G-d with dignity. The term מלך הכבוד has the connotation of one who is invited, of one who is voluntarily accepted. The next *passuk* poses the question raised by rebellious man, מי זה מלך הכבוד, who is G-d? Why should man welcome and accept G-d? The next *passuk* immediately responds, ה' עוז וגבור ה', G-d is a warrior. In other words, G-d already rules the natural world; His will is unquestionably carried out and implemented by nature. Not only does man comply with the will of G-d in the natural sphere, but so does every creature, every grass, every flower, every blossom and every particle of dust. G-d is a מושל. He is a warrior, גבור מלחמה. If G-d wishes, He will forcefully overpower man. It is, therefore, useless to resist. The *passuk*, therefore appeals to man to accept G-d voluntarily. G-d wishes to be crowned as מלך הכבוד, as the sovereign over the moral law as well as over natural law, as a King who is voluntarily accepted by all.⁴⁴ This ideal will ultimately be realized. The next cited *passuk* predicts that at such time of universal acceptance,

ה' צבקות הוא מלך הכבוד.
*G-d will be treated as the King of dignity by all of humanity;
all humanity will crown Him as their king.*

⁴² תהלים (צ"ג, א')
⁴³ תהלים (כ"ד, ז')

⁴⁴ The sequence of this and the next cited *passukim* are more exhaustively discussed, *infra*, in paragraph 30 and in paragraph 40.

(30) Interestingly, the *bracha* of *malchiyos* cites only three *passukim* of *malchiyos* from the Torah and three *passukim* from *Naviim*. However, it cites numerous *passukim* from *Tehillim*. After citing *שאו שערים ראשיכם והנשאו פתחי עולם ויבוא מלך הכבוד* as the final and third *passuk* of *Tehillim*, it then cites the remaining three *passukim* of that chapter of *Tehillim*, as well.⁴⁵

- (א) מי זה מלך הכבוד? ה' עוזו וגבור ה' גבור מלחמה.
- (ב) שאו שערים ראשיכם ושאו פתחי עולם ויבוא מלך הכבוד.
- (ג) מי הוא זה מלך הכבוד? ה' צבקות הוא מלך הכבוד סלה.

The question is compounded in that the *Gemara*,⁴⁶ in discussing the *passukim* of that chapter, questions whether the *passuk* *מי זה מלך הכבוד וכו'*, an inquiry rather than a declarative statement, may be recited as one of the *passukim*. It appears from the *Gemara's* discussion that it is not even necessary to recite three complete *passukim*. It is merely necessary to recite three statements of *מלך*, even if all the statements are contained in a single *passuk*.⁴⁷ If so, the cited *passuk* *שאו שערים ראשיכם*, in which the word *מלך* appears, certainly constitutes an adequate recital of *מלך*. Why, then, are three additional *passukim* cited?

(31) The *Tosefta* formulates the issue differently, and the *Tosefta* apparently accepted this position. The *Tosefta*⁴⁸ discusses the number of recitals contained in the following four *passukim*:

- (א) שאו שערים ראשיכם והנשאו פתחי עולם, ויבוא מלך הכבוד.
- (ב) מי זה מלך הכבוד? ה' עוזו וגבור ה' גבור מלחמה.
- (ג) שאו שערים ראשיכם ושאו פתחי עולם ויבוא מלך הכבוד.
- (ד) מי הוא זה מלך הכבוד? ה' צבקות הוא מלך הכבוד סלה.

רבי יוסי אומר כל אחד ואחד בפני עצמו. רבי יהודה אומרן כלם כאחד.

R' Yossi maintains that each passuk constitutes a different recital of malchiyos. R' Yehuda disagrees. He maintains that all four passukim constitute a single recital of malchiyos.

According to R' Yehuda, the issue is not whether multiple repetitions of the term *מלך* in a single *passuk* constitute a single recital. The issue is also not whether the recital of

⁴⁵ All of these *passukim* are contained in פרק כ"ד תהלים.

⁴⁶ מסכת ראש השנה דף ל"ב עמוד א.

⁴⁷ The *Rambam*, however, rules that ten *passukim* must be cited (פ"ג משופר ה"ח). This is seemingly contrary to the *Gemara's* conclusion. See טור או"ח סימן תקצ"א.

⁴⁸ מסכת ראש השנה פ"ב ה"י א.

several *passukim* serves as a commensurate number of recitals. Rather, R' Yehuda maintains that a recital is obtained only if a theme of *malchus* is expressed fully. These four *passukim* collectively express a single theme. All four *passukim* are, therefore, classified as a single recital. The *passukim* collectively describe that Dovid addresses himself to humanity to open their hearts and accept the dominion of the מלך הכבוד. The term פתחי עולם refers to self-assured and arrogant man. The *passuk* exhorts arrogant man to receive the מלך הכבוד, to accept G-d's moral law and His commandments voluntarily. The entire conversation, question and answer, in both the first two *passukim* and the last two *passukim*, constitutes a single theme. They are therefore classified as only one recital. In contrast, the other cited *passuk* ה' מלך גאות לבש לבש ה' עז התאור is a complete semantic entity. Likewise, the *passuk* כי לה' המלוכה ומושל בגוים is a single integrated unit. Each of these *passukim* therefore constitutes a separate recital. However, the four *passukim* commencing with פתחי עולם and שאו שערים ראשיכם והנשאו פתחי עולם are not individual semantic units. The theme is not completed until the entire conversation, question and answer, contained in the four *passukim*, is completed. The מסדר התפילות accepted R' Yehuda's opinion that these four *passukim* constitute a single recital. They, therefore, cited all of the *passukim* as the final recital from *Tehillim*.⁴⁹

The paragraph of ובכן תן פתוך portrays a pessimistic vision of man's redemption

(32) As noted, the paragraphs of ובכן תן פתוך contained in our text of the *bracha* of *kedushas hashem*⁵⁰ initially served as the introduction to the *bracha* of *malchiyos* formulated by R' Yochanan ben Nuri.⁵¹ On the other hand, the paragraph of ועל כן נקוה constitutes R' Akiva's introduction to the *bracha* of *malchiyos*. Apparently, in addition to disagreeing whether to incorporate *malchiyos* within the *bracha* of *kedushas hashem* or within the *bracha* of *kedushas hayom*, R' Akiva and R' Yochanan ben Nuri disagreed as to the nature of man's ultimate acceptance of G-d in the eschatological era, when the vision of *malchiyos* will ultimately be fully realized. R' Akiva expressed his

⁴⁹ The מסדר התפילה probably was Rav, as indicated in the *Yerushalmi* which refers to the *Shemoneh Esrei* recited on Rosh Hashanah as צלותא דרב. The *Gemara* relates that Rav personally concurred with R' Yehuda's ruling of כולם כאחד.

⁵⁰ See paragraph 16.

⁵¹ That text was then followed by the compilation of ten *passukim* and concluded with the *bracha* of המלך הקדוש.

vision of *malchiyos* in the paragraph of ועל כן נקוה לך; R' Yochanan ben Nuri articulated his vision of *malchiyos* in the paragraphs commencing with ובכן תן פחדך.

(33) The difference between these two visions is striking.⁵² The paragraphs commencing with ובכן תן פחדך contain our petition that G-d compel man to accept and acclaim Him. This paragraph is predicated upon the pessimistic premise that man will never voluntarily acclaim G-d since man is stubborn, unintelligent, wicked and evil. The paragraph anticipates that G-d will coerce man to embrace His מלכות by causing man to live in crisis and to be confronted with catastrophe. By causing man to be frightened. By causing man to come face to face with complete destruction.⁵³ We, therefore, pray ובכן תן פחדך, *G-d shall instill His fear in all creation*. Man will accept G-d only if man is first pushed to the brink of complete annihilation. Without first experiencing dread and overwhelming fear, man will never accept G-d. Unless coerced, man will never acknowledge that evil is harmful and that an atheistic society lacks moral order.⁵⁴

⁵² In עמי קייג, the Rav explained that according to R' Yochanan ben Nuri the word ובכן is not to be understood in the imperative tense (i.e. "You should instill..."). Rather, it is to be understood as אני מאמין שתתן פחדך, we believe that in the eschatological era G-d shall instill His fear in all of mankind. The proof of this is the next paragraph ויבכך צדיקים יראו וישמחו which can only be understood as an expression of faith and not as an imperative. [Editor's Note]

⁵³ This depicts the more extreme scenario which will be enacted only if G-d's other attempts to induce man to return to Him will fail. However, G-d will initially merely cause man to fail in certain areas of his life, be it social rejection, financial ruin or depression. These frustrations can also lead man to accept G-d and acknowledge the truth. See, *infra*, paragraph 40.

⁵⁴ People often criticize religion as morally bankrupt. They point out that observant people have not obtained the optimal moral stature. Admittedly, people of faith have not always succeeded in developing their utmost potential. But it is wrong to maintain that religion has failed. To demonstrate religion's success, it is instructive to analyze the atheistic society of the former Soviet Union. The Soviet Union marked the first time in human annals that a מלכות הרשעה was founded, a government based upon atheism and the complete systematic rejection of religion. Atheism formed the substance of the political philosophy of the communist society. It was not just a corollary, a concomitant; nor was it a secondary motif. Communism was predicated exclusively upon atheism. The zeal and ardor with which the Soviets persecuted all kinds of faith and religion, and the wickedness and ruthlessness which they employed, was unparalleled in human history.

It is also instructive to compare Communist man with Western man. Admittedly, Western man lacks a great deal. Western man is not too honest nor overly good natured. However, one can at least address Western man. One can make moral demands of Western man. One can reprimand him. Western man will listen to criticism. He retains feelings of shame. He is embarrassed after engaging in something immoral. He will try to apologize and defend himself. Although this is not proper *teshuva*, since confession is indispensable for *teshuva*, Western man's attempts to justify his actions demonstrates that he has a conscience. Could one ever converse with the former Soviet Union? Could one ever reprimand its leaders? Did the Soviet leaders ever demonstrate shame or embarrassment? Their arrogance and ugliness were the product of atheism, of a society which was completely oblivious to moral values.

(34) The term פחד employed in this paragraph depicts, not merely fear, but horror and terror. The Torah describes פחד as follows:⁵⁵

ופחדת לילה ויומם ולא תאמין בחיך. בבוקר תאמר מי יתן ערב,
ובערב תאמר מי יתן בוקר, מפחד לבבך אשר תפחד.
*You shall be fearful day and night, and lose your zest for
life. You shall clamor for daytime during the bitter nights,
and look forward to nighttime during torturous days, from
the constant dread of your existence.*

פחד denotes much more than fear; פחד entails terror, the complete paralysis of human intelligence and zeal. פחד is experienced by one who lives in constant crises. The prayer ותן פחדך ה' אלקנו על כל מעשיך ואימתך על כל מה שבראת contains the petition that man be confronted with a series of terrifying calamities so that he will be compelled finally to acknowledge G-d. The term אימה, a synonym of פחד, characterizes man who is completely overpowered by a grisly horror, by man who is gripped by an irrational terror bordering on insanity. The situation depicted by the prayer of ותן פחדך is that humanity will live through a series of crises, marked by terror, horror, and total insecurity. Man will be seized by a constant feeling of doom and this will lead to man's universal acceptance of G-d's sovereignty.

ויראוך כל המעשים וישתחוו לפניך כל הברואים ויעשו כלם אגודה
אחת לעשות רצונך.
*All of creation will fear You and prostrate themselves
before You. They will form a single group to comply with
Your will.*

This is the vision of *malchiyos* expressed by R' Yochanan ben Nuri in the *bracha* of ובכן ותן פחדך.

(35) The vision expressed by R' Akiva's formulation of *malchiyos*, contained in the paragraph of ועל כן נקוה לך, is completely different. R' Akiva's vision of *malchiyos* is much more optimistic. He believes that man will ultimately accept G-d's sovereignty willingly. He therefore formulated the *bracha* of *malchiyos* without reference to fear and horror. The *bracha* of ועל כן נקוה לך contains the petition that the *Ribbono Shel Olam* should enlighten man. The *Ribbono Shel Olam* should enhance man's intelligence and sensitize man's conscience and heart, so that he will finally recognize מלכותו של הקדוש

⁵⁵ דברים (כ"ח, ט"ו)

ברוך הוא. The *bracha* לך נקוה ועל כן expresses the view that, on the contrary, man will redeem himself voluntarily. Thus, the prayer states:

להפנות אליך כל רשעי ארץ. יכירו וידעו כל יושבי תבל.
The wicked shall return to You (G-d). All of humanity shall recognize G-d.

There is no mention of coercion, no reference to fear and horror. On the contrary, man will suddenly understand and acknowledge the existence of G-d and rush to comply with His will.

(36) In other words, man will ultimately accept G-d's sovereignty in one of two ways, either voluntarily or through compulsion. ובכן תן פחדך portrays the vision in which man redeems himself only after he is traumatized, ובחימה אמלוך עלכם. It envisions the *Ribbono Shel Olam* establishing His kingdom by confronting man with the absurdity of man's life, by forcing man to acknowledge his complete worthlessness and compelling man to recognize his nonsensical pursuit of meaningless trivia. This is the vision of ובכן תן פחדך. On the other hand, the vision expressed in the *bracha* of לך נקוה ועל כן is that G-d shall establish מלכותו של הקדוש ברוך הוא, not through פחד, fear and terror, but by facilitating man's enlightenment and encouraging man to utilize the full potential with which he is endowed. These two approaches are dramatically different.⁵⁶

⁵⁶ A similar theme is expressed by the משך חכמה (פרשת שופטים : י"ט, ח'). He notes that the *passuk* states:
ואם ירחיב ה' את גבולך כאשר נשבע לאבותיך... כי תשמור את כל המצוה הזאת...
ויספת לך עוד שלש ערים...

At such time as G-d shall expand the boundaries of Eretz Yisroel, as promised to your ancestors, because you have complied with His will, then you shall designate three additional cities of refuge.

The משך חכמה questions the syntax of the *passuk* which conditions the expansion of *Eretz Yisroel* on two events which are not necessarily compatible, namely, the covenant with the *Avos* and the compliance with His will. Why are both conditions raised? What is the nexus between compliance and the expansion of *Eretz Yisroel*?

The משך חכמה explains that there are two different visions of the ultimate redemption of man in the eschatological era. *Yeshayahu* (סי, כ"ב) writes אחישנה and בעטה, *in its designated time and at the accelerated time*. This is interpreted by the *Gemara* (ע"א) to mean, לא זכו אחישנה, לא זכו בעטה, if the *Bnei Yisroel* are deserving, G-d will accelerate the arrival of the *Mashiach*; if they are not deserving, then the *Mashiach* will not arrive until the designated time. The משך חכמה theorizes that in the event that the *Bnei Yisroel* will merit an accelerated redemption, there will not be a change in the composition of nature; the world will continue to be governed by the natural principles which presently prevail. As the *Gemara* notes: (מסכת ברכות דף ל"ד ע"ב) אמר שמואל, אין בין עולם הזה לימות המשיח אלא שעבוד מלכות בלבד. However, in the event that man is not redeemed until the designated time, if man will not accept G-d voluntarily, then it will be necessary for G-d to overwhelm man and alter the entire human mode of existence in order to compel man to recognize G-d. That will be facilitated solely through a substantial transformation of nature and of human conduct. Man will be so overcome by G-d's presence that he will

The vision depicted by ובכן תן פחדך is of the destruction of evil

(37) There is another distinction between the *bracha* of ועל כן נקוה לך and that of ובכן תן פחדך. The *bracha* of ובכן תן פחדך contains the phrase:

ועולתה תקפץ פיה, וכל הרשעה כלה כעשן תכלה, כי תעביר ממשלת
זדון מן הארץ.
*Evil will be subdued, wickedness and evil will dissipate as
smoke, and the dominion of evil will completely vanish
from the Earth.*

Man will struggle with evil and destroy it: וככל הרשעה כולה כעשן תכלה, *wickedness and evil will dissipate as smoke*. The *bracha* of ועל כן נקוה לך depicts a different perspective. It envisions להעביר גלולים מן הארץ, *idols and false ideals will be rejected*. It does not mention the community of evil, the ממשלת זדון. Rather, it envisions that the אלילים, the idolatrous philosophies and false ideals, shall be abandoned. להפנות אליך כל רשעי ארץ, *the wicked will return to You*. In a word, the *bracha* of ועל כן נקוה לך exhorts man to engage in *teshuva*. By contrast, the *bracha* of ובכן תן פחדך petitions for the destruction of evil.

Sometimes man becomes so evil that he exceeds the limitations of *teshuva* and can no longer return to G-d. He becomes so corrupt that he can no longer be reformed. He must be destroyed. For example, *teshuva* was unattainable for the *Dor Hamabul*, *Sodom* and *Amorra*. The *Rambam* writes⁵⁷ that sometimes man may descend so deeply into the morass of evil, that *Hakadosh Baruch Hu* will prevent him from repenting and reforming his ways. One whose very substance is so thoroughly defiled and corrupt, whose entire personality has been contaminated by evil, forfeits the facility to engage in

be compelled to recognize G-d. If this will be the case, then ימות המשיח will be markedly different than עולם הזה.

The משך חכמה concludes that if אחישנה, if the arrival of *Mashiach* is accelerated because of man's voluntary acceptance of G-d, then it will be necessary to designate additional ערי מקלט, since the same rules of nature will prevail. The *passuk*, therefore, writes:

ואם ירחיב ה' את גבולך... כי תשמור את כל המצוה הזאת

G-d will expand the land of *Eretz Yisroel* only if man voluntarily complies with G-d's will. In such a scenario, the arrival of *Mashiach* will be accelerated, the rules of nature will remain unchanged, ויספת לך ערי מקלט, and it will be necessary to designate three additional ערי מקלט. Accidental homicides will continue to occur. However, if man is compelled by G-d to accept Him, then this *mitzvah* will not apply since the rules of nature will be so altered that there will no longer be situations of violence which would necessitate the construction of additional ערי מקלט.

See, however, רבי שמואל (רוזובסקי) למסכת מכות (דף י"ב ע"א) (סימן תי"ז) (הערה קכ"ו), who cites other opinions who dispute this portrayal. [Editor's Note].

⁵⁷ פרק ו' מהלכות תשובה ח"ג.

teshuva. He is doomed to total annihilation, both in this world and in the world to come. This is the vision of man contained in the *bracha* of **ובכן תן פחדך**. It does not contain a petition that man reform and engage in *teshuva*. Rather, it describes the hope that evil shall be completely eradicated. **ועולתה תקפץ פיה, וכל הרשעה כלה כעשן תכלה, כי תעביר**. ממשתל **זרון** מן הארץ. There is no *teshuva*; only the complete destruction and extermination of evil. At times, man is challenged to combat evil and destroy it. According to *Kabbalah*, the *mitzvah* of **מחה תמחה את זכר עמלק** represents the conflict between good and evil (in that *Amalek* personifies evil). Thus, **ובכן תן פחדך** is the prayer for **ביעור הרע**, the extermination of evil. Both evil and evil doers should completely perish from the world.

(38) On the other hand, the *bracha* of **ועל כן נקוה לך** envisions universal *teshuva* and recognition. **לתקן עולם במלכות שקי, וכל בני בשר יקראו בשמך**. No one should perish. No one should be exterminated. All of humanity should redeem itself, cleanse itself and return to G-d. Thus, **ועל כן נקוה לך** is a prayer for **תיקון הרע**. Man should be cleansed, reformed and redeemed.

(39) Both prayers represent the viewpoint of *Yahadus*. Both visions of *malchiyos* are correct. R' Yochanan ben Nuri maintained that the *passukim* of *malchiyos* should be recited within the vision of *malchiyos* depicted by **ובכן תן פחדך**, the petition for **ביעור הרע**, the extermination of evil. By contrast, R' Akiva merged *malchiyos* with the prayer for **תיקון הרע**, *teshuva*. Sometimes the vision of **ובכן תן פחדך** is more suitable; at other times, we must have faith in man. We must not despair. We must encourage man gradually to return to G-d until the final **גאולה** is obtained.

The conversation between the פתחי עולם and the מלך הכבוד marks the discord between ביעור הרע and תיקון הרע

(40) The *passukim* of *Tehillim* recited in *malchiyos* reinforce the two visions of *malchiyos*. The first cited *passuk* of **מלך הכבוד** **ויבוא מלך הכבוד** is an appeal for man voluntarily to permit the **מלך הכבוד** to enter his world. In theory, the **מלך הכבוד** can enter without man's assistance. G-d does not require man to open the gates for Him. But when *Hakadosh Baruch Hu* enters involuntarily, then **ביעור הרע** ensues. *Hakadosh Baruch Hu* then emerges as the G-d of war, **ה' גבור מלחמה**. On the

other hand, when *Hakadosh Baruch Hu* enters by invitation, when man voluntarily opens his heart to G-d, then *Hakadosh Baruch Hu* enters as מלך הכבוד, a kind and benevolent G-d, and not as נורא ואיום.

The first *passuk* appeals to man שאו שערים ראשיכם והנשאן פתחי עולם. The second *passuk* contains a slightly different request, שאו שערים ראשיכם ושאן פתחי עולם. The second *passuk* employs the verb "שאו", as opposed to the first *passuk* which employs the verb "והנשאן". The difference between והנשאן and שאו is that the verb והנשאן is in the נפעל tense and means to "be raised" or "elevated" by a third party. By contrast, the verb שאו is in the קל tense, and means "to lift oneself" on one's own volition. These two *passukim* also reflect the dual themes of *malchiyos*. If the way to *Hakadosh Baruch Hu* is paved with פחד, fear, horror or terror, then that presumes that man has not raised himself voluntarily. On the contrary, something caused him to be elevated and coerced to return to G-d. This is denoted by the first *passuk* והנשאן פתחי עולם (i.e. man will involuntarily be raised and be compelled to acknowledge G-d). Many people return to *Hakadosh Baruch Hu* because of distress, when they discover that their lives, which were previously devoid of *Hakadosh Baruch Hu*, are meaningless and frustrating. The *passuk* והנשאן פתחי עולם depicts man who engages in soul searching and realizes that the riches and fortune that he so painstakingly accumulated do not provide him with happiness. He realizes that his children are alienated from him and do not share his values. Some people are very stubborn; they lock their hearts and minds to sparks of *teshuva*, regret or contrition. In the privacy of their homes, they acknowledge that they have failed, but they refuse to concede this publicly. Others are not that stubborn. They do not block the gates and engage in *teshuva*. But it is not שאו פתחו עולם; it is והנשאן פתחי עולם. Their repentance is precipitated by frustration and failure. This is the vision of involuntary compliance expressed by the *bracha* of ובכן תן פחדך.

(41) The second appeal is שאו פתחי עולם. Man is exhorted not to wait for catastrophe to strike, for fear to overcome him, or for failure and frustration to overwhelm him. He is warned not to delay until a crisis unexpectedly shatters his dreams and visions. He is encouraged to return to G-d voluntarily, ושאן פתחי עולם, to embrace G-d voluntarily and engage in *teshuva*. This is the second vision expressed by ועל כן נקוה לך.

In conclusion, ועל כן נקוה לך and תיקון הרע portrays a vision of *teshuva*; the *bracha* of ובכן תן פחדך defines a vision of coercion, ביעור הרע. Both visions are accurate. At times *Beth Din* employs corporal punishment to compel recalcitrants to perform *mitzvos*. At other times, G-d extends a willing hand and arouses the person to return to Him voluntarily.

(42) The *bracha* of *malchiyos* then cites *passukim* from *Naviim*:

ועל ידי עבדיך הנביאים כתוב לאמר: כה אמר ה' מלך ישראל
וגואלו, אני ראשון ואני אחרון ומבלעדי אין אלקים.
*The prophets relate, "I am the G-d of Israel. I am the first;
I am the last. There is no other deity."*

The *passuk* stresses that G-d is מלך ישראל. For the time being, G-d is recognized solely as מלך ישראל. But, in fact, He is ה' צבקות, the G-d of hosts; He rules over every detail. There is not a single phenomenon which is not determined by G-d, ומבלעדי אין אלקים.

The final *passukim* portray a vision of G-d's universal acceptance.

ונאמר ועלו מושעים בהר ציון לשפוט את הר עשו והיתה לה'
המלוכה. ונאמר והיה ה' למלך על כל הארץ, ביום ההוא יהיה ה'
אחד ושמו אחד.
*In the end of days, G-d's name will be one. G-d will be
universally recognized as the Sovereign.*

(43) The *bracha* of *kedushas hayom* recited in all of the *tefillos* on Rosh Hashanah (as well as in the *Mussaf*) is a petition for *teshuva*.⁵⁸ It states ואלקני אבותנו מלוך על כל העולם כלו בכבודך...וידע כל פעול כי אתה פעלתו וכי עול מלכות שמים. Thus, *Chazal* viewed the essence of Rosh Hashanah as a day of *teshuva* and incorporated this fundamental precept within the *bracha* of *kedushas hayom* recited during each *tefillah* on Rosh Hashanah.

The *bracha* of *zichronos* portrays השגחה פרטית and its moral imperatives

(44) The motif of the *bracha* of *zichronos* differs from that of *malchiyos*. Unlike the *bracha* of *malchiyos* in which both motifs of ועל כן נקוה לך and ובכן תן פחדך constitute a homogeneous theme of the universal acceptance of G-d's sovereignty, the *bracha* of *zichronos* is multi-faceted. The ספר העיקרים writes that the *bracha* of *zichronos* reflects השגחה פרטית. *Hakadosh Baruch Hu* sees and remembers everything. It depicts the

⁵⁸ Interestingly, the text of this *bracha* was accepted by R' Yochanan ben Nuri even though he maintains that the more likely scenario is that of ובכן תן פחדך, the extermination of evil. [Editor's Note]

Ribbono Shel Olam as simultaneously concerned with both the universe as a whole, as well as with each person individually. *Prima facie*, the *Ribbono Shel Olam* should not be concerned with any single individual. The individual is a very insignificant creature and plays only a minor role in the cosmic or historical drama. Yet, G-d is aware of each person and judges him.

(45) The tenet of השגחה פרטית is twofold. First, it teaches that the *Ribbono Shel Olam* is concerned with each and every individual and with each and every single event in that individual's life. Second, it expresses the moral corollary that the communal good should never preempt the individual good. One should not devote all of his efforts to assist the entire Jewish community and not devote any time to help an individual. One should never discount the value of the individual. Since *Hakadosh Baruch Hu's* involvement in the world encompasses both השגחה פרטית as well as השגחה כללית, the same should also be true of man. One's universal concern should never conflict with his concern for the individual. Even though *Hakadosh Baruch Hu* rules the entire cosmic drama, from momentous events on earth to the insignificant flight of nebulae at the outskirts of the cosmos, He is nonetheless equally concerned with helping, caring for, and protecting each and every individual.

The *bracha* of *zichronos* describes that G-d exists in all dimensions of time

(46) The *bracha* of *zichronos* contains another message as well.

אתה זוכר מעשי עולם ופוקד כל יצורי קדם... אתה זוכר את כל
המפעל, וגם כל היצור לא נכחד ממך...
*You remember the entire cosmic process and judge all of
creation. You recall all events and account for each
creature.*

In Hebrew, the word כל can mean either the “whole” or “each”. In this sentence the word כל המפעל means the whole of creation, in its entirety. Yet, the next phrase וגם כל היצור (לא נכחד ממך), relates that each creature is remembered by Him. The conjunctive וגם, which bridges these two phrases, illustrates the difference in meaning between the first and second phrase.

The next sentence portrays a different perspective.

הכל גלוי וידוע לפניך הי אלקנו צופה ומביט עד סוף כל הדורות.

All is revealed to You; Your vision extends until the end of all generations.

This sentence expresses the tenet that time, in all three dimensions, past, future and present, is simultaneously revealed to the *Ribbono Shel Olam*. Though G-d is concerned with the endless and infinite future, nonetheless, *כי תביא חוק וזרון להפקד כל רוח ונפש*, He judges every inconsequential spirit and soul.

There is no difference between, on the one hand, the *Borei Olam's* concern with infinity itself, both in the physical sense, with respect to the boundless cosmos, and in the historical sense, with respect to all of the future generations, and, on the other hand, His concern for each and every individual. Both the collective as well as the individuals are remembered on this day.

להזכר מעשים רבים והמון בריות לאין תכלית.
You recall the activities of Your infinite creatures.

(47) The *bracha* of *zichronos* also portrays different nuances of the *השגחה* of *Hakadosh Baruch Hu*. It details the *hashgacha* at the level of cosmic rule and dominion, of the historical rule and dominion, encompassing all generations from the beginning of time until the end of days. It describes both the boundless *hashgacha*, infinite in its scope and breadth, as well as the *hashgacha* which is limited and confined to the individual, to the poor and seemingly worthless creature. The next sentence equates *כי זכר כל היצור* *בא*, referring to the entire creation, with *מעשה איש ופקדתו*, relating to each individual.

Basically, Rosh Hashanah is a day of *teshuva* for *Knesses Yisroel*, for all of humanity and for each person individually. On Rosh Hashanah there are two *חיובי תשובה*. On the one hand, since it is a *Yom Hadin* for the entire nation as a whole, as a multitude, the entire community must engage in *teshuva*. Furthermore, since each individual is judged on this day, each individual must engage in *teshuva*. The *bracha*, therefore, stresses *כולם* *מעשי*. *ואתה דורש מעשי כולם*. The communities, as well as the individuals, are judged. The entire humanity is therefore challenged to engage in *teshuva*.⁵⁹

⁵⁹ The Rav often spoke of the requirement that the community engage collectively in *teshuva* for *חטא* *הרבים* and that individuals engage in *teshuva* for *חטא היחיד*. See, e.g. (עמי 69). *ספר על התשובה*.

In a novel letter contained in (מהדוי ירושלים) *שו"ת צפנת פענח* (סימן כ"ב), *שו"ת צפנת פענח* points out that unlike all *מאכלות אסורות* where the volume of solids and liquids enjoined are uniformly established as a *כזית* or *רביעית*, respectively, the volume of liquids enjoined on Yom Kippur is *מלא לוגמיו*, a subjective

The *bracha* of *zichronos* relates G-d's involvement with all of mankind

(48) The *bracha* continues with a description of the Flood and G-d's rescue of Noah and his family.

וְגַם אֶת נֹחַ בְּאַהֲבָה זָכַרְתָּ, וְתַפְקְדָהוּ בְדִבְרֵי יְשׁוּעָה וּרְחֻמִּים, בְּהִבְיָאֵךְ
אֶת מִי הַמַּבּוּל לְשַׁחַת כָּל בֶּשֶׂר מִפְּנֵי רָעָם מַעַלְלֵיהֶם. עַל כֵּן זָכְרוּנוּ בְּאֵל
לְפָנֶיךָ....

Moreover, You lovingly remembered Noah. You recalled him with words of salvation and mercy when You caused the waters of the flood to destroy all creatures because of their evil misdeeds. Consequently, his memory was recalled by You...

Two questions present themselves. First, why is Noah introduced within the *bracha* of *zichronos*? Second, what does the word "וְגַם" (i.e., that Noah was also saved) contribute to this *bracha*?

Apparently, Noah was rescued for two reasons. First, through Noah, *Hakadosh Baruch Hu* saved humanity. Had Noah and his family drowned, the entire humanity would have perished. Second, Noah was saved as an individual, as someone who deserved to be rescued. The *passuk* writes:⁶⁰ כִּי אֹתָךְ רָאִיתִי צָדִיק בְּדוֹר הַזֶּה. Thus, the conjunctive וְגַם expresses that both rationale were equally applicable to Noah. Noah was rescued because G-d did not wish to exterminate all of humanity. The phrase וְגַם אֶת נֹחַ also extols Noah's individual merits. G-d saved Noah because He loved him. One cannot really love humanity as a whole. One can love only individuals. Thus, the phrase נֹחַ בְּאַהֲבָה זָכַרְתָּ relates exclusively to Noah as an individual. Noah was saved on his own account. Even if humanity could have been saved by another method, Noah would nonetheless have been spared.⁶¹

amount predicated upon the quantity of liquid which each person can hold in his mouth. On the other hand, the volume of solids enjoined on Yom Kippur is uniformly established as *כְּתוּבַת הַגִּטָּה*. He explains that the former subjective quantity of liquids corresponds to the *חֶטְא יַחִיד*, which varies from individual to individual, while the uniform quantity for solids corresponds to the *חֶטְא הַרְבִּים*, which remains the same for the entire community. [Editor's Note]

⁶⁰ בְּרֵאשִׁית (ז', א')

⁶¹ The *Rambam* (עמ' רמ"ו) (והפטי לפי בחר) (עמ' רמ"א) (עמ' ל"א) presents an elaborate *halachic* discussion of the parameters of G-d's *השגחה* of non-Jews. He notes that the *Rambam* and *Ravad* (פ"ב מהלכות אבות הטומאה ה"י) dispute whether an animal slaughtered by a non-Jew obtains the same level of *טומאת נבילה* as an animal which dies prior to being slaughtered. The *Ravad* maintains that the actions of non-Jews are *halachically* insignificant. Thus an animal slaughtered by a non-Jew is regarded as having died on its own and is impugned with *טומאת נבילה*. The *Rambam* maintains that a non-Jews' actions do

The two ברייתות encompass both the individual Jew and the Jewish community

(49) The *bracha* then describes the ברית אבות. It cites the *passuk*:⁶²

וישמע אלוקים את נאקתם ויזכר אלקים את בריתו, את אברהם
את יצחק ואת יעקב.
*G-d heard their groaning. G-d remembered His covenant
with Avraham, Yitzchak and Yaakov.*

This *passuk* can be understood in light of another *passuk*⁶³ which states:

ויאמר ה' ראה ראיתי את עני עמי אשר במצרים, ואת צעקתם
שמעתי מפני נוגשין, כי ידעתי את מכאוביו.
*I have seen the affliction of my nation in Egypt. I have
heard their shrieks of pain when he is tortured. I am aware
of his suffering.*

The latter *passuk* vacillates between the singular and plural. The word צעקתם is in the plural. But, נוגשין and מכאוביו are in the singular. Apparently, the *Ribbono Shel Olam* told Moshe that He was concerned with two separate issues. First, with the *Knesses Yisroel* as a whole, since if He would not redeem and liberate *Knesses Yisroel*, the covenantal community could not arise. Second, He was also concerned with the pain of each individual Jew.⁶⁴ The *passuk* should, therefore, be interpreted as follows:

ויאמר ה' ראה ראיתי את עני עמי אשר במצרים, ואת צעקתם,
*I have seen the affliction and cries of My nation, the
Knesses Yisroel, collectively.*

שמעתי מפני נוגשין,
*I have also heard the shrieks of pain of each individual
tortured Jew.*

have *halachic* significance. Thus, a non-Jew who slaughters an animal precludes the imposition of טומאת נבילה (on the Pentateuchal level).

The theorizer that this dispute is predicated upon the question of whether G-d's השגחה extends to each non-Jew individually or if G-d's השגחה embraces mankind collectively. If G-d's השגחה pertains to each person individually, then his actions are meaningful. In the above case, this would preclude imposition of טומאת נבילה, even though the action is still insufficient to permit the animal to be eaten. On the other hand, if G-d's השגחה does not relate to each non-Jew individually, then their actions are *halachically* meaningless and the animal is constituted as טומאת נבילה.

The theorizer extends this question to the debate (ירושלמי פ"ז סנהדרין ה"י) whether one must perform קריעה when hearing a non-Jew desecrate G-d's name (through גידוף) in the same manner as when hearing a Jew desecrate G-d's name. Again, the resolution is predicated upon the extent of G-d's השגחה for individual non-Jews. If the השגחה extends to each non-Jew individually, then the act of גידוף, which intends to usurp that השגחה (and to deny G-d's role) is culpable and requires קריעה. Otherwise, the גידוף is inconsequential, and קריעה is not required. [Editor's Note]

⁶² שמות (בי, כ"ד).

⁶³ שמות (גי, ז).

⁶⁴ A community, as a collective, cannot feel pain; only individuals experience pain.

Likewise, the initial portion of the cited *passuk* נאקתם את אלוקים, formulated in the plural, denotes that *Hakadosh Baruch Hu* responds to the cries of each individual. The concluding portion of that *passuk*, ויזכור אלקים את בריתו, formulated in the singular, portrays that G-d attends to the *bris* entered into with *Knesses Yisroel* as a whole. The covenant embraces both the *Knesses Yisroel*, collectively, as well as each person individually.

(50) The Torah describes two separate בריתות. The first *bris* is recorded in פרשת בחוקותי. It was entered into at *Har Sinai*. The second *bris*, recorded in פרשת נצבים, was entered into in *Arvos Moav*, in the fortieth year following the Exodus and immediately prior to Moshe's demise. While the first *bris* was finalized with the *Knesses Yisroel* collectively, as a community, the second *bris* was concluded with each individual separately. As the *passuk* stresses:⁶⁵

”אתם נצבים היום כולכם ראשיכם שבטיכם זקניכם שוטריכם...
ולא אתכם לבדכם אנכי כרת את הברית הזאת... כי את אשר ישנו
פה... ואת אשר איננו פה עמנו היום.”

You are all present, your leaders, chieftains, elders and judges... I am concluding a covenant not only with you... not only with those who are physically present but even with those who have not yet been born.

The second ברית כריתת was concluded with each individual separately. Moshe was compelled to enumerate each category of individuals to bind, not only the individuals who were physically present, but also the millennia of unborn individuals. Had the ברית כריתת been entered into with the people collectively, as a nation, it would have been unnecessary to enumerate each specific group, whether currently or hereafter existing. In contrast, when the *Ribbono Shel Olam* concluded the covenant at *Har Sinai*, He did not add וכי לבדכם וכו', to specifically include all unborn individuals, since the ברית כריתת was entered into with *Knesses Yisroel*, collectively, with the entire community as a corporate entity. *Chazal*⁶⁶ teach us אין ציבור מתים, the *Knesses Yisroel* as an entity will survive in perpetuity. The entire *Knesses Yisroel* remains bound under the ברית כריתת. For example, when the United States concludes a treaty with another state, it is unnecessary to specify that the treaty is binding upon both present and future generations. A treaty

⁶⁵ דברים (כ"ט, י"ג).

⁶⁶ מסכת תמורה דף ט"ז ע"א.

concluded between states embraces the present as well as the future generations. Likewise, the ברית סיני was entered into with קדוש וגוי, with the *Knesses Yisroel* in totality. גוי קדוש embraces all of its members. It was, therefore, unnecessary to specify ראשיכם, שבטיכם, זקניכם, *the leaders, chieftains, and elders*, since a nation's existence transcends that of the individuals which it comprises.

(51) The *bracha* then cites three *passukim* from *Tehillim*:

ובדברי קדשיך כתוב לאמר זכר עשה לנפלאותיו חנון ורחום ה'.
*G-d instituted reminders of His miracles since He is kind
 and merciful.*

In his *siddur*, R' Saadya Gaon⁶⁷ adds an additional *passuk*:⁶⁸

זכרו לעולם בריתו דבר צוה לאלף דור,
*Recall forever Your covenant with the thousands of
 generations of Jews.*

R' Saadia Gaon apparently reasoned that the *bracha* of *zichronos* requires the recital of *passukim* that petition G-d to remember the *bris*. The *passuk* זכר עשה לנפלאותיו contained in our text is, therefore, inadequate inasmuch as it does not call upon G-d to remember either the *Knesses Yisroel* or the *bris*.⁶⁹ He, therefore, selected an additional *passuk*, זכרו זכרו, in which we appeal to G-d to recall the *bris* with the Jewish people.⁷⁰

(52) In conclusion, the *bracha* of *zichronos* is a heterogeneous *bracha*. First, it discusses השגחה פרטית even in the absence of *bris*. G-d spared Noach even though He had not entered into a *bris* with Noach. G-d's השגחה is not limited to *Klal Yisroel*. G-d's השגחה extends to the entire world, to all of mankind. Everybody is under

⁶⁷ סידור ר' סעדיה גאון (עמי רכיג).

See *who notes that the Rav's practice was to recite the passuk זכר עשה לנפלאותיו* (עמי ר"ח) [Editor's Note]

⁶⁸ דברי הימים א' (ט"ו, ט"ו).

⁶⁹ It merely means that G-d instituted *mitzvos* which remind us of His miracles.

⁷⁰ The introduction to the *bracha* of *zichronos* speaks of זכרון in general, of השגחה פרטית and השגחה כללית, and describes how the *Ribbono Shel Olam* is concerned with the individual as well as with humanity as a whole. The *passukim* also speak of G-d's השגחה of both non-Jews and *Knesses Yisroel*. The *bracha* subsequently discusses the two בריתות טוב. The concluding *tefillah* of זכרו בזכרון טוב, however, is limited solely to the *bris*. It ignores the motifs of השגחה. Many of the עדות המזרח which therefore preface the concluding *tefillah* with the paragraph יעלה ויבוא וכי, which references the motifs of השגחה פרטית (Historically, יעלה ויבוא originated as the חתימה of *zichronos*). Subsequently, it was introduced into the *Shemonah Esrei* for *Yom Tov* and *Rosh Chodesh* as well). According to the text of the עדות המזרח, the חתימה of *zichronos* corresponds both to the introduction and to the *passukim*, since the paragraph יעלה ויבוא addresses itself to the individual, while השגחה פרטית as well as השגחה כללית. The petition of זכרונינו is addressed to the individual, while זכרונינו ופקדונינו is addressed to the community in general. It is unclear why in our text of *zichronos*, the חתימה ignores the motif of השגחה פרטית וכללית.

the protection and supervision of G-d, and G-d is concerned with each individual. Additionally, the *bracha* describes that G-d exercises a specific השגחה with *Knesses Yisroel*.⁷¹ This unique השגחה originates in the two בריתות entered into with each individual and with *Knesses Yisroel* collectively.⁷²

גילוי שכינה describes the physical manifestations of the *bracha* of shofros

(53) The *bracha* of *shofros* portrays three facets of גילוי שכינה. The first two forms of גילוי שכינה are the גילוי שכינה experienced in the past at *Mattan Torah* and the גילוי שכינה which will be realized in the future, in the eschatological messianic era, ביום ההוא יתקע. בשופר גדול. The *bracha* of *shofros* commences with a description of the גילוי שכינה experienced by the Jews at *Har Sinai*.

אתה נגלית בענן כבודך, על עם קדושך לדבר עמם. מן השמים
השמעתם קולך...
*You revealed Yourself in a cloud of glory to Your holy
people. From the heavens You allowed them to hear Your
voice...*

The *bracha* concludes with a description of the גילוי שכינה which all mankind will experience at the end of days, when the sound of the *shofar* will herald the arrival of the *Mashiach*. The latter form of גילוי שכינה to be recognized ביום ההוא will be characterized by עין בעין יראו. One will be able to see G-d, so to speak, and feel His presence, not only conceptually but physically as well. Just as the גילוי שכינה at *Har Sinai* assumed the form of actual sensory and auditory perception, likewise, the גילוי שכינה in the eschatological era will be a physical sensation and not a mere abstract concept. Man will actually see the *Ribbono Shel Olam's* majesty, perceive His glory, and sense His grandeur in a physical sense.⁷³ גילוי שכינה will be an almost physical sensation. G-d will expose Himself, not only through people's minds, but through their five senses as well. One will be able to touch Him, hear Him, see Him, feel Him and be with Him. It will be not only an intellectual abstract experience or a mystic-like experience; it will be a sensory

⁷¹ The unique השגחה enjoyed by *Knesses Yisroel* is elaborately discussed by the רמב"ן (פירוש לשמות : י"ג, ט"ז).

⁷² Additional facets of the *bracha* of *zichronos* are elaborately discussed in the זכרונות contained in this volume.

⁷³ Attempts by modern Jewish theologians to distort גילוי שכינה are due to a lack of faith and to ignorance.

experience, similar to the perception of colors and dimensions of objects. This is vividly portrayed by the imagery of the *passuk* cited in this *bracha*:

כל יושבי תבל ושוכני ארץ כנשוא נס הרים תראו, וכתקוע שופר
תשמעו.

One will perceive the presence of G-d as concretely as a banner waving on a hill and as loudly as the sounds of the shofar.

The גילוי שכינה is identified with תראו, *sight* and תשמעו, *sounds*. It will be experienced by man's five senses. It is impossible not to see a banner billowing on top of a hill, or not hear the piercing sound of a *shofar* blast. There is also nothing exceptional or miraculous about that. Likewise, the *passuk* promises that, in the eschatological era, one will see G-d in the same manner as one sees a banner on the top of a hill. In those days, everyone will hear G-d's voice, not as a mute internal voice, but as the normal external sound of a *shofar*. One's ears will respond to G-d's voice in the same manner as כתקוע שופר תשמעו, as one hears the piercing sound of a *shofar* blast.⁷⁴ This type of גילוי שכינה occurred at *Har Sinai* and will occur לעתיד לבוא.

The *halacha* requires that one experience גילוי שכינה in his daily life

(54) There is a third transitional type of גילוי שכינה which bridges the revelation experienced in the past with that to be revealed in the future. Unlike the גילוי שכינה at *Har Sinai* and that of לעתיד לבוא, which are of supernatural and apocalyptic proportions, this third form of גילוי שכינה is very subtle. It cannot be seen with the naked eye nor experienced with the senses. But, it is nonetheless very real. It is the גילוי שכינה experienced nowadays by discerning and sensitive souls. *Knesses Yisroel* could not exist without this form of גילוי שכינה. G-d's presence is a permanent concept, a constant experience in our lives. Even the *halacha* recognizes the sensation of גילוי שכינה. Of course, this transitional tepid form of גילוי שכינה is not marked by perception, physical sensations, or by G-d exposing Himself to our five senses. We are not yet worthy of this reality, of the גילוי שכינה of the eschatological era. However, the *halacha* has never abandoned the idea that each Jew must develop in himself the ability to experience the

⁷⁴ The *passuk* does not convey the message that one will merely see a banner and hear a sound of the *shofar*. That would not be remarkable. Rather, the imagery depicts the ordinariness of the manner in which G-d's presence will be seen and heard.

Ribbono Shel Olam. Though we can neither see G-d nor hear G-d, each Jew must still experience the presence of G-d. We must feel that we are not alone. The *Chovos HaLevavos* writes that even if one is lonely, even if he is isolated in the forest, he should nonetheless feel that someone is with him. There is an intuition, an experience, a sense that “I am with somebody.” This is the root of faith, of *emunah* in *Hakadosh Baruch Hu*. (55) It is easy to pay lip service to this concept, to mindlessly recite each day אני מאמין באמונה שלמה. That, however, is insufficient. A Jew is required to develop within himself the ability⁷⁵ to feel closeness with the *Ribbono Shel Olam*, to feel His breath in one’s face, to see Him in every phenomenon, in historical events and in the majesty of nature. One must perceive G-d, not only in miracles, but in natural phenomenon as well, and particularly in one’s own destiny.

(56) The sensation of experiencing that one is לפני ה' is a *halachic* imperative. There are many *halachos* which can be understood only in the context of this *halachic* norm. For example, *tefillah* does not exhaust itself in the mere recital of words. *Tefillah* requires something more than כוונה; *tefillah* requires that man feel that he is in the physical presence of G-d, כעומד לפני השכינה.⁷⁶ This *halachic* requirement is denominated as עבודה שבלב. One must actually feel that G-d is in his immediate physical proximity. This is not an abstract concept. It is an *halachic* imperative.⁷⁷ One’s heart must react and respond to this experience. Without the requisite *kavanah* which derives from this sensation, *tefillah* is meaningless.

Similarly, the *mitzvah* of *simchas Yom Tov* is described by the Torah as the joy obtained by being in the presence of G-d, לפני ה'. The Torah writes ושמחתם לפני ה' and ואכלת לפני ה'.⁷⁹ There is no greater *simcha*, joy, gaiety or hilarity than being able to sense that one is לפני ה'. One who becomes drunk, is not necessarily happy. On the contrary, inebriation often masks inner grief and disappointment; it is just a facade. Rejoicing fully

⁷⁵ This ability can be developed; otherwise, the *halacha* would not demand it.

⁷⁶ See חידושי רבנו חיים הלוי פי"ד מחלכות תפילה הי"א.

⁷⁷ If this *halachic* dictate would have exhausted itself merely in thought, in abstraction, it would be denominated as עבודה שבמוח, and not as עבודה שבלב.

See שיעור הגריי"ד למס' ראש השנה (מהדור' ר' צבי שכטר) (עמ' ס"ח) who elaborates on this theme and adds that the *mitzvah* of *shofar* is a facet of the *mitzvah* of *tefillah* (i.e. one must pray through the medium of the *shofar*). Thus, both *tefillah* and *shofar* have the facility of enabling, and indeed requiring, one to sense that he is לפני ה'. [Editor's Note]

⁷⁸ ויקרא (כ"ג, מ"א).

⁷⁹ דברים (כ"ג, ז).

is an inner experience of the mind. The emotion of joy need not manifest itself in physical activity, such as dancing, singing, or jumping. The *halacha* defines joy as the sensation that man experiences when he is close to his origin, the *בורא עולם*, when man feels rooted. He senses that he is not a mere transient being, a bubble floating with the tide, but that he is a stable permanent being. He is aware that someone guides and cares for him. It is difficult to define and circumscribe this sensation. Man can attain this sense of self-worth solely by being close to the *Ribbono Shel Olam*. One who rejoices without being close to the *Ribbono Shel Olam*, experiences only a superficial sensation which does not penetrate the depths and inner recesses of his personality. In fact, the genuine joy of being *לפני ה'* does not conflict with fear or with *teshuva*. The *mitzvah* of *simcha* applies on Yom Kippur as well. The *Rishonim* reconciled *simcha* with *viduy*, *charata*, and complete self-negation, self-disapproval and self-castigation. Since *simcha* is obligatory on Yom Kippur, one is required to sense that he is *לפני ה'*. Likewise, the *mitzvos* of *tefillah*, Yom Tov and Shabbos presuppose the sense of being *לפני ה'*.

(57) The same is true of one who studies the Torah. The *Gemara* tells us:⁸⁰

אחד שיושב ועוסק בתורה ששכינה עמו,
*A solitary individual who engages in the study of Torah, is
 transported into the presence of G-d.*

This statement does not merely describe the reward that awaits one who studies Torah. Rather, *Chazal* require man to experience the presence of the *shechina* and that is achieved through Torah study. One who delves into the intricacies of the Torah, who incorporates the Torah into his persona, will experience an intense spiritual sensation of being *לפני ה'*. One who is delighted when he resolves a complex *טוגיא* and recognizes that he has discovered something meaningful, something cleansing, derives a redemptive feeling of unparalleled rapture.

On a personal note, the Rav related⁸¹ that he could not have survived his prior year of triple *aveilus* without immersing himself in Torah and discovering in the Torah, not so much consolation, as redemption. *Aveilus* is experienced by one who thinks of himself as a transient being, as *היום כאן ומחר בקבר*. An *avel* is one who perceives that he is as uprooted as a twig tossed by the winds of a hurricane. The *avel* feels that no one is

⁸⁰ מסכת ברכות דף ו' ע"א.

⁸¹ In 1967, the Rav lost his wife, mother and brother. This *Shiur* was delivered in the following year, 1968.

aware of his birth nor concerned with his death. The *avel* senses that the world will exist just as it was before he was born, and it will continue after he dies. These are the sensations of *aveilus*. *Simcha* is the contrary sensation, and in times of distress one can draw on the solace of Torah to achieve the *simcha* of לפני ה'.

Rosh Hashanah commemorates the joy experienced by confronting G-d

(58) Rosh Hashanah celebrates the privilege of experiencing לפני ה'. The *kedushas hayom* of Rosh Hashanah is defined by *malchiyos*, G-d's coronation. This presumes that people sense that they are לפני ה'. In order to crown G-d, the people must first perceive Him.

There are two types of גילוי שכינה. One type of גילוי שכינה is objective. It is as objective, real and impersonal as nature. This occurred once at *Mattan Torah* and will again occur with the arrival of the *Mashiach*. The *halacha*, however requires that during the long interim period, man should experience a second type of גילוי שכינה, albeit a more muted and subtle גילוי שכינה. Though this type of גילוי שכינה does not have any physical manifestations, it can be discerned by sensitive individuals. One can experience the presence of *Hakadosh Baruch Hu* by engaging in Torah and *tefillah*.

The *bracha* of *shofros* cites *passukim* depicting that *shofar* is the instrument of גילוי שכינה

(59) Prior to introducing the *passukim* from *Naviim* describing the גילוי שכינה at the end of days, the *bracha* cites the required three *passukim* from *Kesuvim*. As noted, these *passukim* portray the גילוי שכינה experienced nowadays. It is inconceivable that, during the long interim period between *Mattan Torah* and *Mashiach*, *Hakadosh Baruch Hu* should be distant and removed from His people. It is incomprehensible that the past two thousand years should be marked by סילוק שכינה, of G-d being enveloped in transcendence and alienated from His people. The *passukim* from *Kesuvim* describe the present day phenomena of גילוי שכינה. In contradistinction to *Naviim* which prophesize the future, *Kesuvim* describe the present. ארוממך ה' המלך ואברכה שמך לעולם ועד, *Kesuvim* depicts the feelings, sentiments and emotions experienced by *Knesses Yisroel* nowadays.

Accordingly, the *bracha* cites *passukim* from *Kesuvim* to describe the present day גילוי שכינה.

(60) The first cited *passuk* reads:

עלה אלוקים בתרועה ה' בקול שופר.⁸²

G-d rises with the shout of the shofar.

According to the *Ramban*⁸³ this *passuk* refers to Rosh Hashanah. He explains that the word "תרועה" reflects מידת הדין, and the word "שופר" depicts מידת הרחמים. The *Ramban* maintains that Rosh Hashanah is characterized as דין ברחמים. Its core is comprised of דין, but its outer layers are enveloped with רחמים. This is symbolized by sounding a תקיעה both prior to and subsequent to the תרועה. The תרועה is bracketed by the two תקיעות, the פשוטה לאחרייה⁸⁴ and the פשוטה לפנייה.

The Torah often obliquely identifies תרועה with מידת הדין. For example, the *passuk* states:⁸⁵

וכי תבואו מלחמה בארצכם על הצר הצורר אתכם, והרעותם בחצוצרות.

And when you wage war in your land against your oppressors, you shall sound the trumpets.

תרועה is the response to הצר הצורר אתכם, to distress. The word תקיעה, on the other hand, manifests joy. For example, the *passuk* states:⁸⁶

וביום שמחתכם... ותקעתם בחצוצרות.

You shall sound the trumpets when you rejoice.

Thus, the cited *passuk* refers to *Hakadosh Baruch Hu* first as אלוקים (מידת הדין) and then as הוייה (מידת הרחמים). This symbolizes that Rosh

⁸² תהלים (מ"ג, ו) וי.

⁸³ דרשה לראש השנה (עמי ק"י) (מהדוי הרשלה); פירוש הרמב"ן לפי אמור (כ"ג, כ"ד).

⁸⁴ The writes that G-d's judgment is in effect רחמים since it is motivated by compassion for His people. On the first day of Rosh Hashanah, the reading from the Torah relates the episode of Yitzchak's birth. Yitzchak represents תוקפא דיניא. On the second day of Rosh Hashanah, the reading relates the story of the עקידה. This represents המתקת דין in that the דין of Yitzchak is ameliorated. He adds that Yaakov represents the merger of דין and רחמים and is represented by the מדה of תפארת. Thus, if the witnesses came to *Bais Din* prior to *Mincha* (which represents the amelioration of דין by the emergence of the מדה of תפארת), then Rosh Hashanah is established as a one day holiday. However, if the witnesses came subsequent to *Mincha*, and שירא was disrupted, then R' Yochanan ben Zakai instituted that both days be observed as Rosh Hashanah. In such a case, the דין extends for two days. However, inasmuch as a תקנת חכמים precipitates G-d's שמחה in the same manner as שירא (see ע"ב ע"ב), that measure of שמחה serves as המתקת הדין in respect of the second day. [Editor's Note]

⁸⁵ במדבר (י"ג, ט).

⁸⁶ במדבר (י"ג, י).

Hashanah commences with דין but subsequently converts it to רחמים.⁸⁷ The *Midrash* describes *Hakadosh Baruch Hu* as sitting on the throne of דין on Rosh Hashanah morning. After *Bnei Yisroel* sound the *shofar*, He replaces that throne with the throne of רחמים. The *malchus* on Rosh Hashanah eve is established upon the principle of strict justice, דין. After sounding the תרועה, the facet of אלוקים is transformed into הוייה, and the מידת הרחמים emerges.

(61) The *bracha* of *shofros* then cites the *passuk*:

ונאמר בתוצרות וקול שופר הריעו לפני מלך ה'.
*You shall sound the trumpets and shofar when in the
 presence of G-d.*

This refers to the sounding of *shofar* on Rosh Hashanah. *Chazal*⁸⁸ have derived from this *passuk* that in the *Mikdash* both the *shofar* and the trumpets are simultaneously sounded on Rosh Hashanah.⁸⁹

(62) The next *passuk* cited is

ונאמר תקעו בחודש שופר בכסה ליום חגנו, כי חוק לישראל הוא
 משפט לאלוקי יעקב.
*Sound the shofar on the holiday which is obscured. This is
 Yisroel's law and the G-d of Yaakov's judgment.*

The *shofar* will announce the arrival of *Hakadosh Baruch Hu* in the time of *Mashiach* just as it did when the Torah was delivered on *Har Sinai*. The *passuk* states,⁹⁰ קול שופר גילוי שכינה. Thus, *shofar* is the instrument which heralds the arrival of the *Shechina*. This is true even today. When one hears the *shofar* sounded on Rosh Hashanah, he must feel the presence of the *Ribono Shel Olam*, the unseen reality. The *Gemara* tells us:⁹¹

שופר כיון דלזכרון קאתי כלפני ולפנים דמי.
Shofar transports man to the throne room of G-d.

Tekias shofar transforms man's mundane environments and surroundings into the קדשים. *Shofar* is the instrument of גילוי שכינה.

⁸⁷ מידת הרחמים describes G-d when exhibiting הוייה; מידת הדין describes G-d when exercising אלוקים.

⁸⁸ . מסכת ראש השנה דף כ"ז, ע"א

⁸⁹ The rationale for this coupling is extensively analyzed in (עמ' 51) ספר נוראות הרב ח"א (עמ' 51).

⁹⁰ שמות (י"ט, ט"ז)

⁹¹ מסכת ראש השנה דף כ"ז ע"א

*Tosfos*⁹² cites the opinion of R' Shimshon ben Avraham, who writes that: לאחר סילוק תרועה גדולה, התפילה מריעין תרועה גדולה. The *teruah*, a long drawn out sound, represents *G-d's withdrawal from mankind*. This is predicated upon the *passuk*.⁹³

במשוך היובל המה יעלו בהר.
*Following the sound of the shofar, the Jews may ascend
Har Sinai.*

Thus, just as the extended sound of the *shofar* marked *G-d's* withdrawal from *Har Sinai*, so, too, the extended *teruah* marks *G-d's* withdrawal following Rosh Hashanah.

In conclusion, *shofar* is halachically related to גילוי שכינה. That is the message of the *Kesuvim* cited in ובדברי קדשן. During the long interim period, connecting our glorious past with our great future, there is a subtle גילוי שכינה. Man is unable to perceive the *Ribbono Shel Olam* with his five senses. However, there is a muted experience of גילוי שכינה which the *halacha* commands us to make a reality. We are required to encounter the *Ribbono Shel Olam*.

***Shira* is recited on Rosh Hashanah after the *shofar* ushers man into the presence of G-d**

(63) In accordance with the dictates of the *Mishnah*, the *bracha* of *shofros* cites three *passukim* from *Kesuvim*:

(א) עלה אלוקים בתרועה ה' בקול שופר.
(ב) בחצוצרות וקול שופר הריעו לפני המלך ה'.
(ג) תקעו בחודש שופר בכסה ליום חגנו.

Inexplicably, the *bracha* then cites all of the *passukim* comprising the final chapter of *Tehillim*, ונאמר הללויה הללו קל בקדשו, הללוהו ברקיע עוזו הללוהו בגבורותיו. These latter *passukim* do not seem to contribute anything meaningful to the *bracha*, and indeed seems to contravene the *Gemara's* ruling that only ten *passukim* should be recited. Moreover, the *Gemara*⁹⁴ writes that the ten *passukim* recited for each of *malchiyos*, *zichronos* and *shofros* correspond to the final chapter of *Tehillim*, in which the verb הללו is recited ten times. Why should the structure of the *brachos* of *malchiyos*, *zichronos* and *shofros* be dependent upon the number of times that the word הללו is repeated in that chapter?

⁹² מסכת ראש השנה (דף ל"ג ע"ב) תודייה שיעור.

⁹³ שמות (י"ט, י"ג).

⁹⁴ מסכת ראש השנה דף ל"ג ע"א.

discharge זכרון תרועה.⁹⁸ The primary requirement of the *mitzvah* of *shofar* is that it create an environment in which man finds himself לפני ה', face to face with the *Borei Olam*. The very moment that man finds himself לפני ה', in the inner chamber of G-d, he is obligated to engage in *shira*.

(65) The final chapter in *Tehillim*, הללויה הללו קל בקדשו, portrays this confrontation. When one enters the *Ribbono Shel Olam's* abode, when one stands face to face with Him, one declares הללויה הללו קל בקדשו, *praise G-d in His holy Temple*. One who is in the presence of G-d, is the equivalent of the angels in Heaven. The angels in Heaven offer *shira* since they are always in the presence of G-d. The *passuk* cites:

הללוהו ברקיע עוזו,
The angels sing shira in the heavenly abode.

The *Gemara*⁹⁹ describes that *shira* is initiated daily by the angels, and not by man. The text of *Kedushah* therefore reads:

נקדש את שמך בעולם כשם שמקדישים אותו בשמי מרום.
*We sanctify Your name, in the same manner as the angels
and celestial beings.*

The angels initiate *shira* because they are constantly לפני ה'. Likewise, man who enters the *Bais Hamikdash*, the physical house of G-d, also sings *shira*. Similarly, one who is suddenly transported into the presence of G-d, לפני ה', through the medium of the *shofar*, must also sing the same *shira* of הללויה הללו קל בקדשו.

(66) In other words, the recital of the chapter of הללו קל בקדשו constitutes a *kiyum* of the *mitzvah* of *shira*. It does not constitute one of the *passukim* of the *bracha* of *shofros*. All of the required *passukim* of *shofros* are recited prior thereto. Rather, once the Jew is transported into the presence of G-d through the sounds of the *shofar* and the recital of all of the required *passukim* of the *bracha* of *shofros*, once he experiences the sensation of being לפני ה' as if he were physically in the *Bais Hamikdash*, he is obligated to sing the chapter of הללו קל בקדשו, the *shira* sung by עולי רגל after entering the *Bais Hamikdash*.

⁹⁸ The *mitzvah* of *shofar* has two components: זכרון תרועה and יום תרועה. The *mitzvah* of יום תרועה exhausts itself in the technical performance of sounding the *shofar*. The *mitzvah* of זכרון תרועה is obtained by interpreting the *mitzvah* of *shofar* through the recital of the *brachos* of *malchiyos*, *zichronos* and *shofros*. This was a favorite topic of the Rav, explicated by him at length in numerous *shiurim*.

See, e.g. (עמי 39); ספר ימי זיכרון (עמי 141); ספר נוראות הרב ח"א (עמי 105); חייג (עמי 39).

⁹⁹ מסכת חולין דף צ"ג ע"ב.

The chapter of הללו קל בקדשו is in effect a *kiyum* of *shira*. It is a concomitant of experiencing לפני ה', and manifests the spiritual rapture obtained on Rosh Hashanah.

(67) The *bracha* of *shofros* concludes by citing three *passukim* from *Naviim*:¹⁰⁰

ונאמר והיה ביום ההוא יתקע בשופר גדול ובאו האובדים בארץ
אשור והנדחים בארץ מצרים והשתחוו לה' בהר הקודש בירושלים.
*On that day a great shofar will be blown. Those lost in the
land of Assyria and those cast away in the land of Egypt
will return, and they shall prostrate themselves before G-d
upon the holy mountain of Yerushalayim.*

It immediately cites the *passuk* וְהָיָה אֱלֹהִים בְּשׁוֹפָר יִתְקַע *Hakadosh Baruch Hu* Himself will sound the שופר גדול described in the prior *passuk*. Everyone will hear the voice of *Hakadosh Baruch Hu*. These *passukim* again depict that the גילוי שכינה of the eschatological era will replicate the גילוי שכינה experienced at *Har Sinai*.

The *brachos* speak of the ransom that Jews will pay in the future. Eventually, all Jews will return to G-d; not one Jew will be lost. Thus, the conclusion of the *bracha* of *shofros* discusses the rebuilding of the *Bais Hamikdash*, הביאנו לירושלים בית אר"א... מקדשך... We assert to G-d that, without Jews, there will be no drama of *shofros*. There will be no ransom, no hope, only a bleak future.

Thus, the *kedushas hayom* of Rosh Hashanah commences with the greatness of man, his descent into the abyss. He is ransomed temporarily. But, in the future, the complete reconciliation between man and G-d will be consummated.

(68) The *Ramban*¹⁰¹ questions how *Chazal* deduced that Rosh Hashanah is a *Yom HaDin*. He answers that the fact that Rosh Hashanah precedes Yom Kippur suggested to *Chazal* that Rosh Hashanah is a day of judgment. Though the experience of לפני ה' is initiated on Rosh Hashanah, it continues beyond Rosh Hashanah and concludes on Yom Kippur. The sensation of לפני ה' experienced on Yom Kippur is not precipitated by the *shofar*; it is derived through *teshuva*. The climax, the apex, of the לפני ה' experience is attained on Yom Kippur. The *Aseres Yemei Teshuva* are based upon the experience of לפני ה' initiated on Rosh Hashanah. The *Gemara*¹⁰² notes that the *passuk*¹⁰³ דרשו ה' בהמצאו קראוהו בהיותו קרוב, *seek G-d when he is near*, refers to:

¹⁰⁰ ישעיה (כ"ז, י"ג).

¹⁰¹ פירוש הרמב"ן לפרשת אמור (כ"ג, כ"ד).

¹⁰² מסכת ראש השנה דף י"ח ע"א.

אלו עשרה ימים שבין ראש השנה ליום הכיפורים.

On those days, G-d is very close to the Jews.¹⁰⁴

The halachic imperative of לפני ה' must be cultivated

(69) The experience of לפני ה', the sensation of being in the presence of the *Ribbono Shel Olam*, can be cultivated and developed. This sensation elevates the person, enhances his personality and allows him to reach previously unattainable spiritual heights. The sensation of לפני ה' should manifest itself particularly in the *tefillah* of Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur. By definition, the *mitzvah* of *tefillah* entails that one feel that he is לפני ה'. Since Rosh Hashanah is the day of an intensified לפני ה' experience, the *tefillah* of Rosh Hashanah must be meticulously performed. The *tefillah* must be recited with understanding and intelligence. One must realize that there are no superfluous words or statements.

The experience לפני ה' is further enhanced through the study of Torah, particularly of the *halachos* of Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur. If preceded by intensive Torah study and meaningful *tefillah*, the *kedushas hayom* of Rosh Hashanah will become the most exalted and noble sensation of the entire year.

(70) On a personal note, the Rav added that he descends from a very sober, level headed and perhaps overly rational family. This emphasis upon rationality and *halacha*, upon precise logic, and upon the reluctance to succumb or to surrender to any emotion when explaining or analyzing halachic concepts, did not prevent him or his forbearers from experiencing the *kedushas hayom* of Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur with their hearts and souls. It is absurd to assume that somehow the mind is in conflict with the heart. Only ignorant people believe that one becomes emotional only if not endowed with a high degree of intelligence and that intelligent people lack emotion. On the contrary, emotion unaccompanied by logic and perception is a transient sensation. It does not take long for such emotions to expire. Admittedly, emotions coupled with intellect are often not as loud as mindless emotions, which must be given vent by dancing, shouting or singing. The mind is modest and does not like loud talk nor loud people.

¹⁰³ ישעיהו (נחמה, ט).

¹⁰⁴ Interestingly, R' Yonasan Eibishutz recommended the omission of many of the *piyutim* from the *Shacharis* and *Mussaf* on Rosh Hashanah in order not to delay the performance of the *mitzvah* of *tekias shofar*. As noted, *shofar* ushers man into the presence of G-d, and this experience should not be postponed.

Emotions are plebeian; the mind is an aristocrat. One who engages in Torah is not precluded from experiencing emotions. His emotions will be somewhat muted, controlled and hidden; one should not disclose his emotions to others. Nonetheless, this will not diminish the emotion nor lessen its intensity. It certainly will not affect its beauty, splendor, and exaltedness.

The Rav vividly recalled hearing R' Chaim recite *Kiddush* on Rosh Hashanah. It left an indelible impression upon his mind. He remarked that in later years he would be unable to conjure the proper mood on Rosh Hashanah eve unless he would first reproduce and recall the *Kiddush* recited by R' Chaim. When R' Chaim recited the phrase *כי אתה אלוקים אמת ודברך מלכנו אמת וקים לעד*, the entire ambiance changed. One detected a stormy sea of emotion raging under R' Chaim's cerebral mask of sobriety and indifference. R' Chaim would be intensely experiencing the *לפני ה'* sensation. To R' Chaim, the *kedushas hayom* was not just an abstract concept; it was an experience, a reality. As a child, the Rav also heard R' Chaim recite *ובכן תן פחדך* as well as the *avodah* of Yom Kippur. The *avodah*, therefore, became integrated in the Rav's persona. R' Chaim would recite it calmly, without raising his voice. Watching R' Chaim during the *avodah*, one felt that R' Chaim had been transported to the Bais Hamikdash, and that he was physically *לפני ה'*.¹⁰⁵

The survival of *Knesses Yisroel* throughout the generations, throughout a millennia of persecution and abuse, in a myriad of hostile environs, is due to the Torah. But it is not just the Torah of our minds which allowed us to survive, but also the Torah of our hearts, to the great experiential tradition of being *לפני ה'* in the presence of the *Ribbono Shel Olam*.¹⁰⁶ Without this experience, the *Knesses Yisroel* could never have persevered. We must therefore make every effort to recreate the mood and emotion of being confronted with the *Ribbono Shel Olam* and enjoy the *לפני ה'* experience in the most intense fashion.

¹⁰⁵ Rabbi Walter S. Wurzbarger, Z"l, to whom this volume is dedicated, often related that he spent the *seder* with the Rav and the Rav's family on many occasions. What impressed him the most was not the Rav's elaborate and brilliant Torah excursions on the *Hagaddah*, but the way the Rav would break down in uncontrollable weeping while reciting the second portion of *Hallel*. Witnessing the Rav's overwhelming emotional depths was a most inspiring and unforgettable experience. It taught him the importance of *טעמו*, of experiencing G-d with one's heart, and not just with one's mind. [Editor's Note]

¹⁰⁶ One who has experienced the sensation of being *לפני ה'* will develop an inner revulsion against sin and a compulsion to perform *mitzvos* and study Torah.

תושלביע

•

דרשה על הברכה של זכרונות
מאת הגרי"ד הלוי סולובייציק זצלה"ה
אלול, תשל"א
נרשם ונערך על ידי ברוך דוד שרייבר¹

Introduction

(1) The subject of this exposition is the first *piyut* recited in the *Mussaf* of Rosh Hashanah, which so elaborately depicts the motifs manifested by the *bracha* of *zichronos*:

- (i) אפד מאז לשפט היום, בחון מעשה כל יום,
- (ii) גישת יקומים פני איום, דינם בו לפלס לפדיום.
- (iii) הראשון אדם בו נוצר, וצוה חק ולא נצר,
- (iv) זה מליץ כהרחיב בצר, חקקו למשפט ולדורות הונצר.
- (v) טיעת חוצב גבעות וצורים, ילדו בו מראש צורים,
- (vi) כיושבי נטעים המה היוצרים, ללמד בו צדק לעצורים.

(i) *On this day G-d dons his judicial robes in preparation for trial. He examines the deeds of each day of the year.*

(ii) *All creatures approach You with dread. You weigh their actions and redeem them.*

(iii) *Man was created on Rosh Hashanah. He also sinned on Rosh Hashanah.*

(iv) *G-d, acting in man's defense, widened the narrow path (and granted asylum to Adam). G-d ordained that day as an eternal day of judgment.*

(v) *The one who shaped the hills and rocks implanted a small sapling so that the ancient rocks could be fashioned.*

(vi) *The creators are equal to those who live among the planted trees and vindicate those who are trapped.*²

Man is judged היום, on Rosh Hashanah, because he frivolously wasted כל יום, the other days of the year.

(2) The first verse of the *piyut* states:

אפד מאז לשפט היום, בחון מעשה כל יום.
On this day G-d dons his judicial robes in preparation for trial. He examines the deeds of each day of the year.

¹ This segment initially appeared in the first volume of ספר נוראות הרב. I have substantially reworked and included it in this volume since it supplements many of the themes contained in the first *drasha*. [Editor's Note]

² I have provided a free and simplistic translation in order to introduce this complex *piyut* in an understandable setting. A more descriptive translation and analysis is advanced by the Rav in the succeeding paragraphs. [Editor's Note]

The *piyut* anticipates that man will attempt to suppress all thoughts of the *yom hadin* since nothing is more frightening than a trial of one's actions. People will, therefore, attempt to reassure themselves that the *yom hadin* will be deferred. The *paytan*, therefore, admonishes humanity: אפד מאז, "G-d is already dressed in His judicial robes. He is ready to start the trial. Judgment is imminent and unavoidable."

The final words of the four phrases comprising the first two verses present a dialectical tension. היום, *today*, contained in the first phrase, is contrasted with כל יום, *every day*, contained in the second phrase, and איום, *terror*, contained in the third phrase is contrasted with פדיום,³ *ransom*, contained in the fourth phrase. Moreover, though the two phrases לשפט היום and בחון מעשה כל יום seem duplicative, they each present different themes and both reflect a profound sense of irony. בחון מעשה כל יום does not mean that G-d judges today (i.e. on Rosh Hashanah) man's daily activities (i.e. כל יום). That would indeed be a mindless repetition of the prior phrase לשפט היום which already establishes that today is a day of judgment. Rather, the phrase בחון מעשה כל יום contrasts כל יום with היום. It criticizes man for not realizing that כל יום, any day, could have become היום, the singular day, the life altering day and/or the designated day. The phrase בחון מעשה כל יום, therefore, rebukes man for squandering the few precious days of his life in the mundane routine of כל יום and for not realizing that *each day* could have become היום, the special day. Man could, and therefore should, have treated כל יום, each day, with the same sobriety and seriousness that he treats היום (i.e. Rosh Hashanah), the day of judgment. The wasteful, unplanned, tiresome, repetitiveness of כל יום is the ultimate crime. *Yahadus* has a profound awareness of time. Man's primary offense is that he wastes the time he is allotted, his most precious gift. Man does not utilize his youthful vigor properly. He acts as if he has an infinite supply of כל יום, failing to realize that each day could have become the היום, the most important day in his life.

(3) Thus the phrase אפד מאז לשפט היום, בחון מעשה כל יום denotes that G-d judges man כל יום, on this special day, accounting for all of man's trivial and routine deeds on כל יום (i.e. each day). Man refused to recognize that each day could have been converted into something significant, the first day of a long life devoted to *Torah* and *mitzvos*. He dismissed any need to return to G-d or to make each day important. Man could have

³ The interplay between איום and פדיום is discussed in Paragraph 4.

saved himself by treating כל יום as היום. It is man's trivializing of every day, כל יום, the mortality of כל יום, the wasteful repetitiveness of כל יום, which is the source of fright on היום, on the day that he must account for his wastefulness.

The bracha of zichronos contains the message that G-d accepts certain forms of ransom

(4) The second verse of the *piyut* states:

גישת יקומים פני איום, דינם לפלס לפדיום.
All creatures approach You with dread. You weigh their actions and redeem them.

The terms איום and פדיום are contradictory. איום has the connotation of being fearsome, awesome, dreadful; it refers to G-d. On Rosh Hashanah man realizes that he will be convicted and therefore is fearful of G-d. The *passuk* tells us:⁴

האנוש מאלוקה יצדק, אם מעשהו יטהר גבר,
Can man be exonerated by G-d? Even the angels are fearful of G-d's verdict.

G-d's verdict would appear to be clear and irreversible; man cannot be acquitted.⁵ If G-d were to judge man, he would be found guilty. Thus, איום expresses man's complete confession of unmitigated guilt, with no hope of pardon. This fear finds expression in the oft-repeated term נורא. On Rosh Hashanah, man confronts G-d face to face and is terrified of the inevitable guilty verdict. Man has no defenses, no attenuating circumstances and no excuses. איום connotes G-d's approach and man's resulting dread and hopelessness.

(5) *Yahadus* never concludes with איום, despair and resignation. *Yahadus* promotes hope. Accordingly, the *verse* concludes

דינם בו לפלס פדיום.
G-d will weigh their actions and redeem them.

The word פדיום is synonymous with the word פדיון, a *ransom*.⁶ The sensations of איום and פדיום are mutually exclusive. One experiences איום, dread and horror, because he has no hope of פדיון, of being ransomed and pardoned. Conversely, one who anticipates redemption does not experience איום. This duality characterizes the central motif of

⁴ איום (די, ייז).

⁵ אם תמצה עומק הדין, מי יצדק לפניך בדין.

⁶ This is also the meaning of the word כופר.

zichronos. After being convicted, דינם בו לפלס פדיום, man is suddenly ransomed and redeemed. G-d accepts ransom from man.

The mechanics of פדיון are, however, complex. On the one hand, the *passuk* states:⁷

אח לא פדה יפדה איש , לא יתן לאלוקים כפרו.
Man cannot be redeemed; he cannot offer ransom to G-d.

In the same vein, another *passuk* states:⁸

ורב כפר אל יטך.
G-d rejects man's ransom attempts.

These *passukim* conclude that those who are convicted will be punished and condemned.

However, other *passukim* legitimize the concept that G-d accepts ransom. The *passuk* tells us:⁹

אם יש עליו מלאך מליץ אחד מני אלף.
G-d accepts ransom even if it is one in one thousand.

Apparently, G-d does accept certain forms of ransom even while rejecting other forms of ransom. Rosh Hashanah thus emerges as a day of ransom. Initially, man experiences איום, absolute horror. He acknowledges his complete and unmitigated guilt. He dreadfully anticipates a verdict of complete annihilation, leading straight to the grave. Man experiences total dejection and loss. At the last minute, man desperately offers a ransom and substitution, and G-d in His infinite grace accepts the ransom and pardons man.

Why? What prompts G-d to accept certain types of ransom?

The עקידה episode portrays the mechanics of פדיון

(6) The resolution to this enigma is contained in the story of עקידת יצחק.¹⁰ Since it serves as the prototype of acceptable ransom, ויעלהו לעולה תחת בנו, *Avraham offered the ram instead of Yitzchak*, the עקידה is central to the *kedushas hayom* of Rosh Hashanah. If G-d were to reject substitution, Rosh Hashanah would be a day of complete horror and terror, a day of complete self-negation. The ransom which G-d accepted instead of

⁷ תהלים (מייט, חי).

⁸ איוב (ליו, ייח).

⁹ איוב (ליג, כיג).

¹⁰ ספר ימי זיכרון (עמ' 191).

Yitzchak could not have been the ram; G-d was never interested in Avraham's offer of a mere animal. Rather, the פדין which G-d accepted were the events leading up to the עקידה. Those preliminary events and actions transformed the symbolic עקידה into a reality. G-d wanted Avraham to lose Yitzchak, and Avraham did, in fact, lose Yitzchak.

The עקידה epic is analogous to a patient who contracts an incurable and malignant disease. The doctors inform the patient's family of his terminal condition. At that moment, the family has essentially already lost their relative, even though the patient has not yet actually died. The family is so devastated by the news that when the actual death ultimately ensues, they feel relieved. They love the ill person; they cherish his company. Yet, they must watch him slowly deteriorate. They do not inform him of the seriousness of his condition. They lie to him and reassure him that he will quickly recover. They smile and laugh in order to conceal the severity of his illness from him. At the same time, they know that his grasp on life is tenuous. They would sacrifice anything for him; yet, they must helplessly witness his protracted demise. The excruciating and horrible experience of watching a loved one slowly and painfully deteriorate, suffer and die is much more terrible than death itself.

Likewise, when G-d told Avraham to sacrifice Yitzchak, Avraham was consumed with dread for three days. He never advised Yitzchak of his intended fate. He shrugged off Yitzchak's inquiries, *אמיה השה לעולה*? Avraham could not and would not disobey G-d's orders. Thus, Avraham lost Yitzchak as soon as G-d told him *והעלהו לעולה*, "Give him up; he is Mine." It was not necessary for Avraham actually to wield the knife and slaughter Yitzchak in order to comply with G-d's directive, *והעלהו לעולה*. Avraham lost Yitzchak as soon as G-d's communication was delivered to him. Consequently, when Avraham was suddenly advised not to harm Yitzchak, he felt as if he had been given a new son. He untied Yitzchak, placed him on the ground and regarded him as a stranger whom he had never met.

(7) The פדין related in the עקידה expresses that the imperative of *והעלהו לעולה* was reinterpreted and redirected. *והעלהו לעולה* no longer referred to Yitzchak's physical destruction, but to his metaphysical death. As far as Avraham was concerned, Yitzchak had already died before the three-day journey had even started. The *והעלהו לעולה*, which should have resulted in Yitzchak's physical destruction, was redirected to Avraham's

perception of his death. Yitzchak did not have to actually die; the איל was offered in his stead.

(8) The analogy is clear. G-d lays claim to all of man's assets. Man's talents, loved ones and riches all belong to G-d. G-d can take away whatever and whenever He chooses. G-d's claim is total and absolute. G-d could have demanded Yitzchak's physical destruction. G-d, however, accepted Yitzchak's metaphysical loss in substitution. That type of ransom is acceptable to G-d. The איל itself was not the actual instrument of ransom; it merely symbolized the substitution which consisted of Avraham having lost Yitzchak during the three long days that they traveled to הר המורייה, following G-d's demand of והעלהו לעולה.¹¹

(9) The *piyut* contains another message. It employs the term לשפט rather than לשפוט.¹² There is a significant difference between these two words. The word לשפט, a derivative of the word שפטים, denotes punishment of the guilty, the application of the law. The word לשפוט, a derivative of the word משפט, denotes a trial in which the defendant's guilt has not yet been determined and at which he may yet be acquitted.

Since the word לשפט, *to punish*, is employed, the phrase מאז לשפט היום translates as, "This day was ordained as the day upon which man is punished." In truth, man is *a priori* guilty, הן בקדושו לא יאמין. Man's guilt is never in doubt. Modern man is not accustomed to this type of thinking. He thinks that G-d owes him a debt. He complains to G-d whenever he is confronted by adversity. This is especially prevalent among Orthodox Jews who often rail against G-d when tragedy strikes. This contradicts the Torah perspective which teaches that man is guilty and, therefore, deserves whatever G-d accords to him.

(10) The concluding phrase of this verse is:

דינם בו לפלס לפדיום.

G-d will weigh their actions and redeem them.

¹¹ The *Gemara* (עיי"א) tells us that אפרו של יצחק צבור על המזבח, *the ashes of Yitzchak smolder on the altar*. This is understandable only if Yitzchak was actually offered on the מזבח, albeit in a metaphysical sense. See also (עמ' 47) ספר ימי וזכרון for an elaborate discussion of other forms of ransom demanded by G-d. [Editor's Note]

¹² The word שפט is the singular form of שפטים. In *Tanach*, the word most often used is שפטים, in the plural; the singular form שפט is rarely employed.

Man can pay ransom and avoid the full sentence. The typical ransom is similar to the עקידה which took place in the metaphysical sense, with Yitzchak's having survived physically. Thus Rosh Hashanah emerges not just as the day in which man's complete and unmitigated guilt is determined, but also as the day on which man's attendant ransom is accepted in lieu of a full sentence.

The sound of the *shofar*, of the ram's horn, is reminiscent of that original ram which was offered instead of Yitzchak. It symbolizes that, though guilty, man may avoid his fate by paying a ransom. The *piyut* continues, therefore, to describe the mechanics of this ransom.

Though created by G-d, נוצר, Adam did not comply with G-d's instructions, לא נוצר

(11) The *Tannaim* disagreed as to whether the world was created in *Tishrei* or *Nissan*. Nonetheless, the *paytanim* consistently accepted the opinion that man was created in *Tishrei*. For example, the *bracha* of *zichronos* contains the statement זה היום תחילת מעשיך, as well as the statement, also found in the *brachos* of *malchiyos* and *shofros*, היום הרת עולם. If so, the very first Rosh Hashanah occurred on Friday, the *Yom Hashishi* on which Adam was created. The third verse of the *piyut*, therefore, continues:

הראשון אדם בו נוצר,
Man was created on Rosh Hashanah.
וצוה חק לא נצר.
He also sinned on Rosh Hashanah.

Adam was told not to eat from the עץ הדעת, and he promptly violated that injunction.

(12) The ultimate achievement for a Jew is not merely בדרכי, *complying with G-d's laws*, but ובו תדבקון, *cleaving to G-d, communing with G-d*, serving as a מעון ¹³ לשכינה, *a prism through which G-d's glory is reflected*. Man must become an abode for the *shechina*, its ultimate resting spot. In essence, man is charged with becoming G-d's friend and companion. Similarly, the *passuk* ¹⁴ אלוקים הרועה אותי is interpreted as portraying that G-d is my companion, my associate. Man's task is to develop a close relationship with G-d.

¹³ פירוש הרמב"ן לדברים (י"א, כ"ב).

¹⁴ בראשית (מ"ח, ט"ו).

The *kedushas hayom* of Rosh Hashanah reflects this ideal - the potential friendship, companionship and association between man and G-d. Man was created to be the friend of G-d.¹⁵ Association with G-d, in and of itself, precipitates joy and celebration. Yet, on the very day he was created, וצוה חק ולא נצר, man alienated himself from G-d by violating the precept; the incipient companionship between man and G-d was abruptly terminated.

(13) Thus, on the very first Rosh Hashanah, man initially became the companion of G-d and then immediately lost that companionship; their friendship dissipated. The *piyut* contrasts the term נוצר, *created* (i.e. with respect to the creation of Adam) with (לא) נוצר, not complying (i.e. with respect to violating the injunction not to eat from the עץ הדעת). As a נוצר, a being created by G-d, man is expected to abide by the will of his Creator. Nonetheless, this creature לא נצר; Adam failed to comply with his Creator's instructions. Although he was a נוצר, he acted as a לא נצר.

Often, man refuses to comply with the will of G-d since he refuses to admit that he is a creation. At times, he views himself on equal footing with the *Ribbono Shel Olam*, והייתם כאלוקים. Man is too vain and proud to concede that he is a created being, and not a creator. By sinning, man usurps the Divine authority. This is modern man's primary folly. Modern man tries to control the universe, genetics, physics and astronomy. He dreams of ultimately ruling the cosmic drama and achieving immortality. On Rosh Hashanah, man commemorates the initial companionship between G-d and man, man's subsequent attempts to usurp and replace G-d, and the resulting alienation of man from G-d. We commemorate man's emergence as the צלם אלוקים, as well as his expulsion from the divine presence. Adam was found guilty on that first Rosh Hashanah. G-d could justifiably have punished Adam for trying to usurp G-d's role. Nonetheless, G-d, the intercessor and defender of all mankind, even of vain man who attempts to defy G-d and who alienates himself from G-d, intervened and spared Adam.

The first Rosh Hashanah set a precedent for each subsequent Rosh Hashanah

(14) In the fourth verse of the *piyut*, the *Paytan* describes the reason that G-d deferred Adam's punishment on that fateful Rosh Hashanah.

¹⁵ The word תרועה is interpreted as ריעות, *friendship (with G-d)*. See (כ"ג, כ"א) See תרגום אונקלוס פי בלק (כ"ג, כ"א).

זה¹⁶ מליץ כהרחיב בצר. חקקו למשפט ולדורות הונצר.
*G-d, acting in man's defense, widened the narrow path
(and granted asylum to Adam). G-d ordained that day as
the day of judgment.*

The phrase כהרחיב בצר, *G-d widened the narrow path (and granted asylum to Adam)*, refers to the *Midrash*¹⁷ which explains why Adam did not die after violating the injunction,

כי ביום אכלך ממנו מות תמות.¹⁸
You shall die on the day that you eat such fruit.

The *Midrash* answers that ביום refers to a day in the life of G-d, (i.e. one thousand years¹⁹) as opposed to a day in the life of man. Similarly, the phrase כהרחיב בצר, *G-d widened the narrow path*, in effect means that G-d extended the short day of מות תמות ממנו אכלך ביום, which would have otherwise dictated that Adam die on that very day, into a day in G-d's terms.

(15) If Adam deserved to die, why then was he pardoned? Adam certainly lacked the ransom that was available to Avraham? Indeed, the *Rishonim* debate whether Adam ever repented. It seems that Kayin was the first one to discover *teshuva* and that Adam lacked הכרת החטא. If so, why was he absolved? Modern man similarly lacks הכרת החטא. There can be no אתערותא דלעילא, *a reconciliation initiated by G-d*, without a prior אתערותא דלתתא, *a reconciliation initiated by man*. How then can modern man hope to be pardoned on Rosh Hashanah? Who redeems the unworthy?

The *Paytan* answers: זה מליץ. G-d suddenly switches roles - from judge to advocate. *Chazal* note the contradiction between the *passuk*²⁰ which states ה' יושב על כסא, *G-d sits on His throne*, and the *passuk*²¹ which states ה' נצב, *G-d stands*. They answer that initially G-d sits as a judge, but when He realizes that man is guilty, G-d immediately switches roles; he rises and serves as man's advocate.

(16) The question of who pays the required ransom and consequently how man is redeemed, is answered in the conclusion of this verse: חקקו למשפט ולדורות הונצר, *G-d*

¹⁶ The word זו refers to G-d, as in the *passuk*, וזה קלי ואנוחו.

¹⁷ מדרש תהלים פרק כ"ה

¹⁸ בראשית (ב', י"ז)

¹⁹ כי אלף שנים בעיניך כיום... (תהלים צ"ד) Indeed, Adam lived for one thousand years, less the seventy years he transferred to Dovid.

²⁰ ישעיהו (ו', א')

²¹ עמוס (ט', א')

ordained that day as an eternal day of judgment. Whatever occurred on that first mysterious Rosh Hashanah, לדורות הונצר, recurs every subsequent year. The day on which man was created, the day on which he sinned, was judged and found guilty, the day on which he was then ransomed and pardoned, that day is חקקו למשפט. That first day established a precedent for all subsequent generations. The entire series of events from guilt to ransom is replayed every Rosh Hashanah. לדורות הונצר, man lives through the same drama every subsequent Rosh Hashanah. Every year man begins by attempting to become the companion of G-d. He then rebels against G-d, is judged and found guilty. G-d then becomes man's defense counsel and ransoms him. Each Rosh Hashanah replays that sequence of the events: companionship, alienation, judgment and ransom.

(17) The question remains, how does evil man pay the ransom? What are the mechanics of the ransom? The answers to those questions are contained in the fifth verse of the *piyut*:

טיעת חוצב גבעות וצורים.
*The one who shaped the hills and rocks planted a small
 sapling.*²²

The *bracha* of *zichronos* portrays G-d's multi-dimensional omniscience

(18) The *bracha* of *zichronos* depicts a comprehensive view of creation from G-d's omniscient perspective. The *bracha* portrays three different facets of this omniscience. The first message of the *bracha* of *zichronos* is that when G-d views His creatures, He sees, not only those that currently exist, but also those that existed in the most distant past, at the twilight of creation, as well as those that have not yet come into existence. While man sees only the present, fleeting moment, G-d operates in three dimensions of time. The past and future are not a reality as far as man is concerned. What was yesterday is gone; what will happen tomorrow has not yet arrived. Man's time awareness is limited and reduced to a single dimensionless point, the present. This single dimension of time is fleeting and cannot be captured. Thus, in effect, man's awareness of time is non-existent. Unlike man, G-d's existence is infinite. G-d does not share man's division of time into three dimensions, since G-d views everything through the gaze of eternity.

²² The *Paytan* merely classifies and reformulates the answer provided in the *bracha* of *zichronos*. This answer encapsulates the message of Rosh Hashanah.

To G-d, all three dimensions merge into one. G-d sees the past and future as occurring in the present.

The *bracha* of *zichronos* depicts this tension. It relates:

אתה זוכר מעשה עולם ,

G-d remembers all creations.

The word *עולם* captures all three dimensions of time. Thus, this *bracha* declares that G-d remembers and judges His creations in all three time dimensions. It conveys the message that *עולם קדם*, *עולם הווה*, *עולם הבא*, G-d judges all those creatures that previously existed, even though they are no longer alive in the present. The *bracha* adds:

לפניך נגלו כל תעלומות והמון נסתרות שמבראשית,
*All secrets and hidden matters are known to You, from the
beginning of time, through the present and into the future.*

ואין שכחה לפני כסא כבודך. ואין נסתר מנגד עיניך.
*You do not forget the past. The future is not hidden from
You.*²³

The phrase *ואין שכחה* denotes that G-d has not forgotten those people who existed in the past. The phrase *ואין נסתר וכי* manifests G-d as recognizing the anonymous people who have yet to be born. The secrets of the future and the mysteries of the past are all revealed to G-d.

אתה זוכר כל המפעל. צופה ומביט עד סוף הדורות.
*You remember and are aware of creation. You look and
gaze into future and see everything which will occur.*

As far as G-d is concerned, there is no difference between potentiality and actuality. Whatever has potential, is actual and real. This is the first message of *zichronos*.

G-d judges man based upon remote principles of causality

(19) The second message of the *bracha* of *zichronos* is that G-d's judgment extends to the furthest reaches of causality. When man is judged on Rosh Hashanah, he appears before the Almighty, not as a lonely isolated being, but as part of a great cosmic drama. His deeds are examined and scrutinized, not just in relation to himself, but in light of past events which impacted upon him and upon the formation of his character and abilities. Man's actions are affected by his genetic code and by an endless chain of causality.

²³ The phrase *עולם קדם* refers to the past. The phrase *עולם הבא* refers to the mysteries of the future. Both the past and the secret are equally revealed to G-d.

When G-d judges an individual, He judges not only the person, but his parents, ancestors and everyone else who shared in his development and formation. G-d will judge not only the present society in which the individual is found, but all prior societies that had even an indirect influence on that individual. A deed in the very distant past may have influenced an individual's character hundreds of years later.

G-d judges man based upon his impact on the future

(20) The third message of *zichronos* is that G-d judges the individual with respect to the future as well. The past is determined by causality; the future is defined by its finality. Furthermore, the individual is placed within the frame of reference of events to occur in unspecified times in the future. The impact which this individual may have on future occurrences and persons is carefully scrutinized. G-d determines what, if anything, this individual will contribute to future generations. What future accomplishments can this individual be currently credited with? An individual may live in one generation, exert no influence on society and fail to accomplish anything during his lifetime. Nonetheless, he may have a profound impact upon future generations. A grandson of his may make a valuable contribution to the welfare of our people or to mankind.²⁴

In conclusion, a person is judged, not just by his deeds within the present dimension of time, but also by the deeds of both his forefathers as well as his unborn descendants. G-d takes into consideration the conditions and circumstances of the past which had their impact upon him. He also weighs man's present culpability vis-à-vis the future, weighing what impact that individual may have on future millennia. The individual is judged as the link between those who existed in the past and are no more, and those who do not yet exist. G-d judges both in retrospection and anticipation. An individual may be found guilty for not performing better; for wasting a great potential. However, G-d may apply mitigating factors to this sinful individual, since He sees that some future silent generation, perhaps thousands of years hence, will retroactively legitimize this individual's existence. Sometimes, the individual's existence is validated

²⁴ In other *shiurim*, the Rav explained that the statement ספרי חיים וספרי מתים פתוחים לפניו (מסכת ערכין דף י"ע"ב) does not only refer to those inscribed in the Book of Life and those condemned to die. It also denotes that even the dead are judged for actions performed during their lifetime, but whose consequences were not realized until that year. [Editor's Note]

and justified, solely in retrospect, thousands of years after his demise. At other times, even when one is found guilty, G-d nevertheless acquits him, since the guilt is not attributed solely to him. Certain events which occurred thousands of years prior to his birth contributed to his guilt.

(21) Retrospection and anticipation are the primary themes of *zichronos*. G-d judges individuals based, not only upon their own conduct, but on the future conduct of their descendents. That would be unthinkable in human courts. The immediate past, such as the defendant's home environment and poverty, are mitigating factors used in modern courts. But the distant past - and certainly the future - is never taken into consideration.²⁵ No one but G-d is omniscient. Only G-d can judge with retrospection and anticipation.

(22) The mitigating circumstance and the ransom that saves mankind lie primarily in the future. The past may explain, but the future provides the ransom. What saves man the usurper is his eternal endowment. Man cannot destroy himself even if he so wishes. Man retains an inner endowment implanted by G-d. Even though he is mired in filth, man's inner moral core is indestructible. No matter how deeply enmeshed in sin, regardless of how soiled and sordid, there remains in man something pure and noble which reflects eternity.

We need only revisit the עקידה to understand how, in an instant, the same ram which was נאחו בסבך בקרניו, *trapped by its horns*, can be saved. The ram portrays modern man. The horns reflect man's grandeur, creativity and power. Man is caught in the thicket of the mundane and cannot extricate himself. The same arrogant, vain and blasphemous man can, as the ram so many years before, be suddenly elevated and offered as a *korban*. Modern man's personality will change once he realizes that being a usurper causes him to lose everything good and that one must sacrifice everything for G-d.

(23) This is the role of *teshuva*. One can never predict man's actions. Even though one is so completely intoxicated and addicted to sin that he can no longer return to G-d, nonetheless, the unrealized nobility and incorruptible good that resides in the recesses of

²⁵ The נדב ואביהווא (במדבר: ג', ד') *passuk* which, when describing נדב ואביהווא, adds that: ובנים לא היו להם, *they were childless*. The חכמה משך explains that נדב ואביהווא were punished at that particular time solely because they were childless. If they had sired children, their punishment would have been deferred in order to protect those children. Unlike man, G-d's verdicts take into account even the collateral effect on third parties that will ensue as a result of the verdict. This again depicts the multi-dimensional range of G-d's judgment. [Editor's Note]

everyone's personality is transmitted to future generations. On Yom Kippur man is charged with regaining his stature and altering his character. Rosh Hashanah, however, is directed at the man who is not powerful or courageous enough to change his life. He can take comfort knowing that his potential will not be wasted; his incorruptible core will be transmitted to future generations.

(24) The *passuk*²⁶ tells us: מי יתן טהור מטמא, *Only G-d can extract purity from defacement.* Chazal²⁷ interpret this *passuk* as referring to Avraham, who was born to Terach. Avraham was a great visionary, endowed with enormous intellectual abilities and with unusual כוחות הנפש. He possessed discriminating judgment and precision, together with unlimited kindness. He derived these qualities from his parents. Terach did not realize his own potential; he wasted it. But, his moral core was indestructible, and this endowment was transmitted to his son, Avraham. Avraham's greatness is attributable to Terach, who in turn derived his endowment from his father Nachor. Only G-d can facilitate the extraction of טהור from טמא. Whatever is beautiful in man, is passed on to future generations. Man can never lose his greatness, even though, at times, he attempts to squander it.

G-d accepts as ransom the potential which lies in each individual

(25) Even as one gains insight into G-d's benevolence, the question remains, what ransom will G-d accept from us? What was the ransom offered by Adam, who did not even acknowledge his sin? Adam's ransom consisted of his great potential. Adam's great potential was not realized immediately. Adam's immediate descendents were not at all remarkable. Adam's great potential was realized only 20 generations later with the birth of Avraham. But on that first Rosh Hashanah, on that initial day of judgment, on that very first Friday, Adam was credited with Avraham. Though not prepared to sacrifice anything himself, Adam was credited with Avraham's readiness to offer Yitzchak as a sacrifice 20 generations later. G-d spared Adam because an anonymous descendant 20 generations later could arise only if Adam would not be condemned to immediate death.

²⁶ איוב (ייד, ב').

²⁷ מדרש רבה פרשת תולדות (י"ט, י"ז).

(26) This thought is expressed in the fifth verse of the *piyut*:

טיעת חוצב גבעות וצורים, ילדו בו מראש צורים.
*The one who shaped the rocks and hills (i.e. G-d),
implanted²⁸ a small sapling at that time, so that the
ancient rocks could be fashioned.*

The *טיעת*, *the implanted sapling*, refers to that special facility wherein man is regarded as if he were already born at the time when those first rocks were formed.

In other words, Avraham was, so to speak, regarded as having existed at the time that the first rocks were formed during the days of creation, as expressed in the sixth verse of the *piyut*:

כיושבי נטעים המה היוצרים, ללמד בו צדק לעצורים.
*The creators are equal to those who lived among the
planted trees and vindicate those who are trapped.*

Our ancestors are treated as though they lived at the time when the world was shaped. The phrase *המה היוצרים* further implies that the *Avos* are regarded as partners with G-d in shaping and creating the world. The *piyut* explains itself: *ללמד בו צדק לעצורים*. This concept was devised in order to vindicate and justify those who are trapped and cannot pay the ransom (i.e. Adam).

(27) The subject of the fifth verse is *חוצב*, the creator; the verb is *טיעת*. The verse teaches that G-d (the creator) implanted a potential in nature (i.e. the *Avos*, who are portrayed as *ילדו בו מראש צורים*), and that potential is deemed to have been born at the time that the world was created. *כיושבי נטעים המה היוצרים*. G-d invited the *Avos* to participate with him in forming the world. This was necessary in order *ללמד בו צדק לעצורים*, *to vindicate those who are trapped*. Even if man should sin, there will still be future generations (such as the *Avos*) to ransom and redeem him. The purpose of *יצירה* was realized in the *Avos*, who epitomized the principles of morality that G-d infused into nature.

The fifth and sixth verses should therefore be understood as follows: The One who shaped the rocks and hills implanted a potential in nature (i.e. man), with the result that the Patriarchs were deemed to have been born at the time of creation. They are regarded as having fashioned the world together with G-d. This concept is necessary to ensure that somebody will be able to ransom the sinner.

²⁸ *טיעת* means (He) implanted.

(28) Adam was ransomed since G-d judged him, not as an individual, but as the father of humanity. Thousands of years later, his descendant Avraham justified the pardon awarded to Adam. Thus, the drama of the עקידה is deemed to have occurred on the day of creation.

Modern man is vindicated solely by reference to both the past and future

(29) Adam had no past. Only the future could ransom him. On the other hand, modern man is ransomed by reference to both the past and the future. The message of *zichronos* is ועקידת יצחק לורעו ברחמים תזכור. We are too small to pay the ransom. We are not ready to participate in the awesome drama of עקידה. But Avraham already paid the ransom for us. G-d judges us, not only as individuals, but as descendents of Avraham.

On the other hand, we have the faith and trust that the future will also justify our existence. There is a great potential in each of us which will be ultimately realized by our descendants. The potential which G-d implants in every being will, in the future, be translated into deeds. The future, thus, validates our continued existence.

(30) The *bracha* of *zichronos* contains the petition: ופקדנו משמי שמי קדם. We ask G-d to help us realize the drama that occurred in the distant past as if it recently occurred. We also petition G-d to spare us on account of the future generations, of our unrealized potential. Finally, we exhort G-d to recall Avraham's decision to sacrifice his son, ותראה לפניך עקידה, and to accept a token ransom instead of complete punishment.

תושלביע

דרשה על קדושת יום הכיפורים
מאת הגר"ד הלוי סולובייציק זצלה"ה
אלול, תשט"ו
תורגם ונערך על ידי ברוך דוד שרייבר¹

Introduction

(1) Yom Kippur is designated by the Torah as a מקרא קודש, *a day of holy assembly*, and is included among the compilation of *moadim* contained in *Parshas Emor* and *Parshas Pinchas*. The Torah tells us:²

ובעשור לחדש השביעי מקרא קודש יהיה לכם, ועניתם את
נפשותיכם כל מלאכה לא תעשו, והקרבתם עולה לה'.
*And on the tenth day of the seventh month, you shall
declare a day of holy assembly. You shall afflict your souls.
You shall not perform any work, and you shall offer burnt
offerings to G-d...*

Yom Kippur's status as a מקרא קודש has multiple ramifications. It requires the offering of the *korban mussaf*. It also prohibits the performance of work, כל מלאכה לא תעשו, and mandates the observance of the five *innuyim*, ועניתם את נפשותיכם.³

In sum, Yom Kippur is a מקרא קודש similar to Shabbos and the other *Yomim Tovim*, albeit with certain permutations. Thus, the *bracha* of *kedushas hayom*, מקדש, has the connotation of a day on which the *korban mussaf* is offered, work is enjoined and the *innuyim* are observed.

The controversy whether the *kedushas hayom* of Yom Kippur is identified with Shabbos or with Yom Tov

(2) The precise nature of this מקרא קודש is the subject of a controversy among the *Rishonim*. The *Rambam* maintains that the *kedushas hayom* of Yom Kippur is in essence identical with the *kedushas hayom* of Shabbos. They are one and the same. There is no difference between the quality of the *kedushas hayom* of Shabbos and that of Yom

¹ This *shiur* was originally delivered in Yiddish. An excellent Hebrew synopsis of portions of this *shiur* appears in ספר מפניני הרב לרב צבי שכטר (עמי קלייה - קמ"א).

² במדבר (כ"ט, ז).

³ The *Rishonim* debate if the איסור דאורייתא applies to all of the עינויים or only to eating and drinking and if the penalty of כרת is imposed for violations of each of the עינויים. See, e.g., תוספות מסכת נדה (דף ל"ב ע"א) (ד"ה וכשמן); רמב"ם פ"א מהלכות שבת עשור ה"ה; [Editor's Note] . העמק שאלה (שאילתא קס"ז, א'); ביאור הגריפ"פ על סה"מ לרס"ג (עונש ג"ד);

Kippur. There are no features of either איסור or היתר which are contained in one but not in the other.⁴ Thus, the *Rambam* rules⁵ that whenever Yom Kippur and Shabbos occur on consecutive days, they constitute one single *kedushah*.^{6, 7}

⁴ In other *shiurim* (See, e.g., (תשלי"ג) שיעור ירחי כלה להגרי"ד) the Rav was troubled by this identification. He noted that the *bracha* of Yom Kippur concludes מקדש ישראל ויום הכיפורים, unlike the *bracha* recited on Shabbos which concludes מקדש השבת. The format of the *bracha* suggests parity between the *kedushah* of Yom Tov and that of Yom Kippur.

The *Rambam* (פי"א מהלכות שביתת עשר הי"ב) notes that when the *Rambam* describes willful violations of the laws of Yom Kippur, he writes חייבין על זדונה בעשור כרת. He refers to Yom Kippur as עשור, the tenth day. He does not refer to it as Yom Kippur. However, when describing unintentional violations of the laws of Yom Kippur, he writes, חייבין עליו קרבן חטאת ביום הכיפורים. The *Rambam* explains that the *Rambam* concurs with the view of רבי that Yom Kippur provides expiation for every sin, except for עבירה דיומא, violations of the laws of Yom Kippur, per se. Thus, one who willfully performs work on Yom Kippur will not obtain the *kapparah* of that Yom Kippur. The *Rambam* therefore denominates a day on which the violator will not receive *kapparah* as בעשור, a day deprived of *kapparah*, vis-à-vis the person who willfully performed מלאכה and thereby rejected the facility of *kapparah* of Yom Kippur. On the other hand, unintentional violations of the laws of Yom Kippur will be absolved even according to רבי. The *Rambam* therefore refers to the day in which the unintentional violation occurred as יום הכפורים. The Rav questioned this answer since it assumes that רבי maintains that an unintentional עבירה דיומא will be expiated on Yom Kippur even though unintentional violations nonetheless constitute an עבירה דיומא. The Rav noted that רבי never distinguished between willful and non-willful violations of Yom Kippur.

In (עמ' 12) ספר נוראות הרב חלק ו' (עמ' 12) the Rav explained that the *piyut* of R' Elazar Hakalir depicts Yom Kippur as endowed with a tri-partite *kedushah*. R' Elazar Hakalir maintains that the *kedushas hayom* which results in מלאכה איסור differs from the *kedushas hayom* which precipitates עינוי, and that both of these differ from the third *kedushas hayom* which results in *kapparah*. The Rav noted that the *Rambam* maintains that the *kedushas hayom* which precipitates מלאכה is one and the same with that which precipitates עינוי. The Rav went on to explain that it is for this reason that the איש עיתי was permitted to eat, if necessary to discharge his function of delivering the goat to the desert (See ע"א דף ס"ז ע"א). He reasoned that since the מלאכה איסור is suspended, as the איש עיתי actually carried the goat, in violation of an איסור הוצאה, likewise, the עינויים are also suspended. The Rav concluded by quoting the opinion of רש"י (מסכת יומא דף פ"א) who apparently disagreed. See also:

שיעור הגרי"ד למסכת קדושין (מהדו"ר ר' צבי שכטר) (עמ' ג'ד-י); מסורה חוברת ו' (עמוד כ"ג)

The *Rambam* (פי"א מהלכות יום טוב הכ"ב) discusses that there are two dimensions to Yom Kippur. One is the Yom Kippur obtained through קביעת בית דין (which relates only to the offering of *karbonos* and איסור מלאכה); the other relates to all of the other ימים מעוה.

In (עמ' 142) צפנת פענח (מהדו"ת) (עמ' 142) he adds that with respect to צום, the *Rambam* (פי"א משביתת עשור הי"א) writes: מצוה אחרת יש ביום הכיפורים, לשבות בו מאכילה ושתייה. However, with respect to מלאכה איסור, the *Rambam* writes: מצוה עשה לשבות ממלאכה בעשור (שם הי"א). He does not refer to the day as יום הכיפורים with respect to מלאכה איסור.

The *Rambam* (פי"א משביתת עשור הי"א) explains that *kedushah* of Yom Kippur vis-à-vis צום differs from the *kedushah* obtained vis-à-vis מלאכה איסור. The *kedushah* which precipitates צום originates with the *passuk* היום הזה בעצם, which infuses Yom Kippur with *kedushah* on the day which is actually the tenth day of Tishrei even if the *bais din* did not designate it as such. The term בעצם denotes unalterable definitiveness. In contradistinction, the *kedushah* of Yom Kippur which precipitates מלאכה איסור originates with its designation by the *bais din*. To underscore this, the *Rambam* stresses that the מלאכה איסור is effected only בעשור, on the date actually designated by *bais din*. By contrast, the צום is effected on יום הכיפורים, the actual day on which Yom Kippur should have taken place, irrespective of *bais din's* concurrence. The *Rambam* therefore denominates that day as יום הכיפורים, the day invested by G-d with the facility of *kapparah*.

The association of מלאכה איסור with קביעת בית דין is based upon the צפנת פענח theory that R' Akiva and R' Elazar dispute whether or not the מלאכה איסור enjoined on Yom Kippur and on the other Yomim Tovim is obtained automatically without any initiation by the *bais din*. He explains that in ראש השנה דף מסכת

(3) The *Gaonim* and the *Rosh* disagree.⁸ They maintain that the *kedushah* of Yom Kippur is identified with the *kedushah* of Yom Tov. It is not constituted as a *kedushah* of Shabbos. Thus, R' Shmuel bar Chafni Gaon and R' Shalom Gaon write that the *bracha* of the *kedushas hayom* recited on Yom Kippur should incorporate the entire paragraph of *והשיאנו ה' אלוֹקנו את ברכת מועדך* generally recited on Yom Tov.⁹ They reason that if Yom Kippur is included within the compilation of the *moadim* in *Parshas Emor*, it must share the *mitzvah* of *simcha* with the other *moadim*.¹⁰ Admittedly, the *מלאכות אוכל נפש* normally permitted on Yom Tov are enjoined on Yom Kippur, nonetheless, the parity between the *Kedushas Hayom* of Yom Kippur and that of Yom Tov is maintained with respect to the essential character of the *Kedushas Hayom*.¹¹ This is bolstered by the

(לי"ב), R' Elazar derives the *איסור מלאכה* from the word *מקרא קדש*. On the other hand, R' Akiva derives it from the word *שבתון*. The difference is that *מקרא קדש*, if associated with *איסור מלאכה*, presumes the invocation and establishment of the holiday by *bais din*. Thus, the *איסור מלאכה* is precipitated solely by *bais din* and not obtained independently. It is necessary for *bais din* to consecrate the day in order for the *איסור מלאכה* to take effect. However, if the *איסור מלאכה* is derived from the word *שבתון*, then the *איסור מלאכה* vests automatically and *bais din's* designation is not required. See also:

ספר מכתבי תורה (מכתב נ"ו ונ"ז).

This theory has ramifications which exceed the scope of this *shiur*. [Editor's Note]

⁵ יראה לי שהן כיום אחד וכקדושה אחת הם (פ"ח מהלכות עירובין הי"ל).

⁶ This has ramifications regarding the laws of *תחומין* and *תנאי*. Thus, if Yom Kippur occurs on Friday, one who places an *eruv* on Friday in one direction, may not alter the *eruv* for use in another direction on Shabbos, since both days constitute one indivisible *kedushas hayom*. This rule is predicated upon Yom Kippur and Shabbos merging as a single day of Shabbos. In contrast, whenever Shabbos and Yom Tov occur on consecutive days, the two *kedushos* do not merge inasmuch as the two *kedushos* are distinct from one another.

Another ramification relates to whether one who performs work on Yom Kippur is classified as a *מומר*, *an apostate*, in the same manner as one who performs work on Shabbos.

See *שו"ת בית הלוי* (ח"א) סימן י"ח; *שיעור ירחי כלה להגר"י* (אלול, תשל"ג); *ספר נוראות הרב ח"ו* (עמ"פ 4).

On a more practical note, in certain communities in Poland people would greet each other on Yom Kippur with the salutation of Good Yom Tov. In Lithuania, they did not utilize that greeting since they regarded Yom Kippur as endowed with the *kedushas hayom* of Shabbos. [Editor's Note]

⁷ Admittedly, Yom Kippur differs from Shabbos in that the penalty for deliberately violating Yom Kippur is *כרת*, and not *סקילה*, and in that it includes the observance of the *innuyim*. Apparently, these ramifications do not affect the definition of the *kedushas hayom*. They are only concomitants which are incidental to the *kedushas hayom*.

⁸ רא"ש פרק ד' דמסכת ראש השנה (סימן י"ד).

⁹ They write that *מנהג של שתי ישיבות*, which refers to the Yeshivos of סורא ופומבדיתא, adopted this practice.

¹⁰ According to the *Rambam*, the *mitzvah* of *simcha* is not practiced on Yom Kippur.

¹¹ In other *shiurim*, the Rav quoted some *Achronim* who write that in fact Yom Kippur is endowed with the *kedushah* of Yom Tov. However, since the *עינויים* are enjoined on Yom Kippur, the *מלאכות אוכל נפש* are also enjoined. Had the *עינויים* been permitted, *מלאכות אוכל נפש* would likewise have been permitted. They support this assertion from the *passuk* which merges the *איסור מלאכה* with that of *עינוי*. The *passuk* states:

וְכָל מְלָאכָה לֹא תַעֲשׂוּ בַעֲצַם הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה... בְּכָל הַנֶּפֶשׁ אֲשֶׁר לֹא תַעֲוֶנָה וּנְכַרְתָּהּ
מֵעֲמִיָּה (ויקרא כ"ג, כ"ט-ל).

*Mishnah's*¹² ruling that, unlike Shabbos which does not suspend *aveilus*, Yom Kippur cancels *aveilus* in the same manner as the other *Yomim Tovim*. The *Mishnah* apparently maintains that Yom Kippur's *kedushah* is more closely identified with that of Yom Tov than with Shabbos.¹³

The שבייתה are formulated in terms of מצות היום

(4) The *Rambam* inferred that the Torah's description of Yom Kippur as שבת שבתון enjoins not only the performance of *melacha* and the observance of the *innuyim*, but imposes an affirmative obligation of שבייתה, *cessation*. One must take concrete measures to avoid the forbidden activities. Thus, the *Rambam* writes:

שבת לענין מלאכה ושבתון לענין דברים אלו (העינויים).¹⁴
One must abstain from engaging in work and participating in pleasurable activities.

The word "כִּי", used in the conjunctive sense, associates the איסור מלאכה with the עינויים. The *Achronim* thus maintain that Yom Kippur contains elements of both Shabbos and Yom Tov. Under the aegis of מקרא קודש, Yom Kippur is endowed with *kedushas* Yom Tov, and מלאכות אוכל נפש are permitted. However, under the rubric of שבת שבתון, Yom Kippur is constituted as Shabbos, and the עינויים and the מלאכות אוכל נפש are therefore enjoined.

Interestingly, whenever the Torah describes the Shabbos characteristics of Yom Kippur, it refers to Yom Kippur as שבת שבתון. However, when portraying Yom Kippur's Yom Tov characteristics, the Torah refers to Yom Kippur merely as מקרא קודש.

The צפנת פענח פרשת יתרו (כ', ח') writes that Yom Kippur differs from Shabbos. With respect to Shabbos, each minute of Shabbos constitutes a new obligation to observe Shabbos. Therefore, the *Gemara* (יבמות דף יבב) writes that a minor who attains the age of majority during Shabbos is obligated to observe Shabbos from and after that moment, even though the prior moments were not marked with a normative obligation. The same is not true of Yom Kippur. One who was a minor at the commencement of Yom Kippur and attained adulthood during Yom Kippur, need not abstain from eating and drinking during the balance of Yom Kippur. He reasons that the Torah writes (with respect to צום), היום הזה, *a single unit*. If the observance of any portion of the unit is not obligatory, the balance of the unit is also not obligatory. (He concedes that this distinction may only apply to צום and not to מלאכה).

He adds that the *Gemara* (מסכת יומא דף פ"א ע"א) employs one *passuk* to enjoin the performance of work (and the עינויים) on Yom Kippur eve and another *passuk* to enjoin those same performances on Yom Kippur day (See תוספות ישנים (שם)). The צפנת פענח infers from this duplication that Yom Kippur is provided with two separate אוסרים, one with respect to the night and another with respect to the day. The *kedushah* of the day and the *kedushah* of the night are distinct. Therefore, one who was a minor on Yom Kippur eve, but attained adulthood during the night, would be obligated to fast during the day. [Editor's Note]

¹² מסכת מועד קטן דף י"ט ע"א.

¹³ R' Hai Gaon discontinued the practice in *Bavel* of reciting לשמחה מועדים... והשיאו... in the *bracha* of *Kedushas Hayom* of Yom Kippur. It is likely that this practice was discontinued in Europe after the Crusades. During that time of turbulence and persecution, many revisions were made to the *siddur*. For example, the recital of הרמ"א prior to *tefillas Mussaf* on Shabbos was instituted at that time.

¹⁴ פ"א מהלכות שבייתה עשור ה"ה. Many other editions of the *Rambam* contain a different text of this sentence.

relates solely to the day of Yom Kippur, and not to the eve of Yom Kippur. In addition, one who is permitted to eat on Yom Kippur (because of illness), nevertheless, obtains the *kapparah* of Yom Kippur.

In sum, the *kedushas hayom* of Yom Kippur which results in *kapparah* is distinct from the *kedushas hayom* of Yom Kippur which prohibits the performance of work and mandates the observance of the *innuyim*.

Yom Kippur is constituted as a *taanis tzibbur*

(6) As noted, Yom Kippur is categorized either as a Yom Tov or as Shabbos. However, Yom Kippur is also classified as a *taanis tzibbur* in the same manner as *Tisha B'Av* and the other *taaniyos tzibbur*. A *taanis tzibbur* is imposed as a response to צרה, *distress and calamity*. Yom Kippur, too, is an עת צרה since it is a *yom hadin*, the day on which all of mankind is judged. A day of judgment inevitably provokes anxiety and stress. Thus, מן התורה, Yom Kippur, the day on which man's fate is sealed, is categorized as a *taanis tzibbur*.²²

There is a fundamental difference between a mere day of *tzom* and a *taanis tzibbur*. *Tzom* and Yom Tov are not necessarily mutually exclusive concepts. Theoretically, it is not inconsistent for the Torah to require that one engage in *simcha* and simultaneously refrain from eating and drinking.²³ A *taanis tzibbur*, on the other hand, presupposes עת צרה. A *taanis tzibbur* is convened solely in response to distress and tragedy, which by definition precludes *simcha* and joy. As the *passuk* notes,²⁴

על הצר הצר אתכם...והרעותם בחצוצרות, ונוכרתם לפני ה'
אלוקיכם, ונושעתם מאויביכם.
*When you wage war in your land against an enemy who
oppresses you, you shall sound short blasts on the trumpets.
You shall be remembered by G-d and rescued from your
enemies.*

The *halachic* response to distress is to initiate the *mitzvah* of זעקה by sounding the מצות עשה לצעוק and abstaining from eating and drinking. The *Rambam* stresses,

²² It is also important to note that a *taanis tzibbur* is imposed in response to events which affect the entire community, and not to events which affect only individuals. Thus, Yom Kippur, a day of *tzara* for the entire humanity, is constituted as a *taanis tzibbur* מן התורה .

²³ For instance, on Yom Kippur, one is required to obtain the rapture and joy of being in the presence of G-d even though he is not permitted to eat or drink.

²⁴ במדבר (י, יז).

עת צרה, it is necessary to engage in זעקה. זעקה is distinct from *tefillah*. As the *Rambam* writes:²⁵

ודבר זה מדרכי התשובה הוא, שבזמן שתבא צרה ויזעקו עליה ויריעו, וידעו הכל שבגלל מעשיהם הרעים הורע להן...
Sounding the trumpets facilitates teshuva. Whenever confronted with disaster, they should cry out and sound the trumpets. This will enable them to realize that their evil deeds have precipitated the crisis.

The *Rambam* defines זעקה as wordless prayer, the prayer of an animal who bellows in pain. The *passuk* promises that one who engages in זעקה will obtain the benefits of ונוכרתם לפני ה' אלוכם and in complete redemption. Since Yom Kippur is classified as a *taanis tzibbur*, the *kapparah* granted on by Yom Kippur must relate to that specific ethos of צרה which causes Yom Kippur to become a *taanis tzibbur*. This component of *taanis tzibbur* is incompatible with Yom Tov.

(7) In conclusion, Yom Kippur manifests two contradictory motifs, *simcha* and *tzara*. Yom Kippur is endowed with a חלות שם תענית; it is constituted as a fast-day, inasmuch as it is a day of *tzara*, crisis. Yom Kippur is a day of זעקה, a day in which man reaches out to G-d in prayer and supplication, ממעמקים קראתיך ה'. On the other hand, Yom Kippur is also constituted as a Yom Tov and מקרא קודש. Interestingly, the motif of בצר ושבת experienced on Yom Kippur, which motivates man to engage in *teshuva*, מועדים לשמחה, since עד ה' אלוך, inevitably converts Yom Kippur into a day of joy, of שמחה, since man experiences relief at having obtained *kapparah* and expiation. R' Akiva, therefore, stresses, אשריכם ישראל לפני מי אתם מטהרים; *simcha* is obtained by one who realizes that his sins have been absolved.²⁶

Man can approach G-d through ריומנות האדם which precipitates joy and optimism

(8) These two seemingly mutually exclusive motifs, the rapture of מועדים לשמחה (or as R' Akiva²⁷ expresses it, אשריכם ישראל לפני מי אתם מטהרים), as opposed to the distress

²⁵ פרק א' מהלכות תענית ה"ב.

²⁶ In ספר נפש הרב (עמי שייך-שטיין) the Rav adds that the absolution of one's sins causes man to renew his relationship with G-d and to once again experience the sensation of being לפני ה'. This resurgence constitutes the most intense form of *simcha*. [Editor's Note]

²⁷ מסכת יומא דף פ"ה ע"ב.

and crisis of ומצאוך בצר לך, are predicated upon two different methods by which man can approach G-d. Man can approach G-d stressing that man is the most unique of creatures, רוממות האדם, or man can approach G-d as the lowest of creatures, שפלות האדם.²⁸

On the one hand, man can address G-d through רוממות האדם, as the exemplary creature created בצלם אלוקים. Dovid Hamelech stresses,²⁹

ותחסרהו מעט מאלוקים וכבוד והדר תעטרהו.
*You have endowed man with divine qualities. You have
invested him with majesty and grandeur.*

Chazal teach:³⁰

זכה אתה קדמת למלאכי השרת.
Man, if he acts appropriately, is greater than the angels.

Although the *Rambam*³¹ maintains that angels are superior to man, the *Chachmei Kaballah* disagree and maintain that man is superior to the angels. Man's approach to G-d with dignity and stature is marked by *simcha*. Man can approach G-d through elation and *simcha* when he recognizes that he is meritorious, that he can contribute to society, that his life is worthwhile and meaningful, and that his conduct has reached its potential. With this confidence and self-assurance, man may experience the *simcha* of being the paradigm of all of G-d's creations. When in the thrall of such exuberant sentiments, man may be secure that he is not merely biding time, nor mindlessly counting the days and weeks. Rather, he senses that he fills a need for society, and he develops self-confidence and *emunah* in himself.

Modern man lacks a sufficient degree of self-confidence. The Torah writes:³² ונח מצא חן בעיני ה'. Noach earned G-d's favor only after his fellow citizens acknowledged him as נח מצא חן בעיני ה'. Only after Noach obtained the approbation of his fellow man, was he able to win the confidence of G-d, ונח מצא חן בעיני ה'. Only a person who is מצא חן בעיני ה', who is satisfied with his accomplishments, self worth and stature, can eventually מצא חן בעיני ה', be vindicated by G-d. This is the reason why Jews experience *simcha* on

²⁸ See (עמ' 246) ספר נוראות הרב חיי (עמ' 246) for further discussion.

²⁹ תהלים (ח', ו').

³⁰ בראשית רבה (ח', א').

³¹ See also (ומקור החכמה פי בשלח (ט"ו, ג') (ומקור החכמה (אות א')) פ"ב מחלכות יסודי התורה הי"ז who proves that man's stature exceeds that of the angels from the angels' usage of the name הוי"ה first articulated by Adam. [Editor's Note]

³² בראשית (ו', ח').

Yom Kippur. Though אין שמחה אלא בבשר, joy generally expresses itself in material consumption, nonetheless, Yom Kippur, a day of material deprivation, is constituted as a day of *simcha*. In *Yahadus' weltanschauung*, *simcha* is not predicated solely upon eating and drinking. *Simcha* is precipitated to an even greater extent by one who senses that he is לפני ה', by one who confronts G-d and experiences the spiritually meaningful sensation of being in the presence of G-d. This experience infuses Yom Kippur with *simcha*. The *Mishnah* writes:³³

לא היו ימים טובים בישראל... כיום הכיפורים
There were no greater holidays than that of Yom Kippur.

On that day, Jews are reconciled with G-d, and communion with G-d inevitably produces the greatest degree of happiness and satisfaction.

(9) The *drashos* of the *Lekutei Torah*³⁴ dedicated to Yom Kippur are composed as a *Shir Hashirim* celebrating man's reconciliation with G-d. He writes that Yom Kippur is marked by the sentiment of,

מה יפית ומה נעמת אהבה בתענוגים³⁵
*How beautiful and pleasant is the love and yearning
between G-d and the Jewish people.*

This sensation was also expressed by R' Akiva, אשריכם ישראל לפני מי אתם מטהרים, *how fortunate are the Jewish people that they are purified by G-d*. Man obtains *kapparah* by entering before the presence of G-d, לפני ה', through רוממות האדם, through self-confidence, as the supreme and elite creature endowed with almost divine-like intellectual and spiritual talents. ותחסרהו מעט מאלוקים. This sensation precipitates the most intense form of *simcha* and elation.

It is for this reason that Yom Kippur suspends אבילות. On Yom Tov, the Jew is obligated to be in a joyous state of mind, ושמחת לפני ה' אלוך, and a day endowed with *simcha* cannot simultaneously be constituted as a day of אבילות. Likewise, Yom Kippur, the day in which man experiences לפני ה' תטהרו, the day in which man obtains a full reconciliation with G-d, is infused with *simcha*, which, perforce suspends אבילות.

³³ מסכת תענית דף כ"ד ע"ב.

³⁴ Authored by R' Shneur Zalman of Liadi.

³⁵ שיר השירים (ז, ז).

Man can approach G-d through שפלות האדם, with pessimism and self-abnegation

(10) As opposed to the joyous approach of רוממות האדם, man can approach G-d through humility, self-negation, and שפלות האדם. He engages in *teshuvah* and obtains *kapparah* and *taharah* through the negative sentiment of:

לא זכה אומרים לו יתוש קדמך.³⁶
*The unworthy man is reminded that even the mosquito
preceded him in creation.*

Man can sometimes feel that his life is meaningless, that he is spiritually and morally bankrupt, that he is merely turning the pages of the calendar in his inexorable march to death. This is acutely true of senior citizens who have passed the blossom of their youth, and whose energies have been dissipated. In their waning years, they suddenly awaken to the realization that they have accomplished little, if anything, meaningful. As a youth, man often behaves in a coarse and spiritually obtuse manner. However, as he ages, he senses that he is distant from G-d, רחוק מה'. At that moment, he experiences קלי קלי; he realizes that he has severed his connection with G-d. He senses that he is alienated from G-d and must now endeavor to reconcile with Him. At this point, he engages in ממעמקים קראתיך ה'. He cries out and begs G-d to extricate him from his spiritual abyss.

The *Rambam* writes³⁷ that on a *taanis tzibbur* the practice was,

נותנין אפר על... גבי ספר תורה,
The people would place ashes on the Sefer Torah.

This act demonstrates the community's acknowledgment that the Torah, which could have provided them with meaning, joy and fulfillment, has been ignored. Ashes were so placed since they have no redeeming value. They have no future. They can neither fertilize nor rejuvenate. Ashes reflect the void and emptiness that morally bankrupt man experiences, הבל הבלים. A wasted life is mere *vanity of vanities*.

³⁶ בראשית רבה (ח, א').

³⁷ (מסכת תענית דף ט"ו) *Mishnah*. This is based, in part, upon the *Mishnah* questions the placement of ashes on the *Sefer Torah* proper, in addition to the Ark, as expressed in the *Mishnah*. See ספר קרית מלך who provides a novel explanation derived from the תרגום ירושלמי on מגילת (ד, ג) אסתר. [Editor's Note]

(11) In sum, there are the two methods through which man can approach G-d on Yom Kippur: Yom Tov and joy, or *taanis* and distress. Man may seek G-d through *Shir Hashirim*, מה יפית ומה נעמת אהבה בתענוגים, and effect a complete reconciliation with Him; לפני ה' תטהרו. By contrast, man can attempt reconciliation with G-d through *aveilus*, the anguish cry of הצר הצורר אתכם, and through קלי קלי למה עזבתני.

Yom Kippur is a synthesis of רוממות האדם and שפלות האדם

(12) Yom Kippur uniquely synthesizes these mutually exclusive motifs. The paradoxical themes of *taanis tzibbur* and Yom Tov find expression on Yom Kippur. On the hand, man approaches G-d as the supreme being, ותחסרהו מעט מאלוקים. On the other hand, man can approach G-d as the lowliest creature, the יטוש קדמך and מה אנוש כי. Regardless of which method is employed, the ultimate goal is סוף דבר הכל נשמע. תזכרנו. The repentant Jew is pardoned and cleansed on Yom Kippur.

***Tehillim* is comprised of chapters devoted to Torah study, hymns and supplication**

(13) The dichotomy between רוממות האדם and שפלות האדם helps to explain many of the different themes expressed in the *piyutim* on Yom Kippur. A summary of the structure of the *piyutim* is necessary in order to isolate these themes. Just as the *Anshei Knesses Hagdolah* formulated the text of the *tefillos* from various *passukim*, likewise, the *paytanim* derived their themes from *Tehillim*. *Tehillim* is comprised of three different components. First, *Tehillim* contains chapters devoted to *Talmud Torah*, as well as instructional chapters which teach the *weltanschauung*, the philosophy and basic tenets of *Yahadus*. For example, the first chapter of *Tehillim* commences with the *passuk*:

אשרי האיש אשר לא הלך בעצת רשעים.
*Fortunate is the man is one who has not succumbed to be
counsel of the wicked.*

Tehillim teaches man how to conduct himself. It articulates the tenets of reward and punishment, השגחה פרטית, the faith that justice will ultimately prevail and that evil will be exterminated. It informs us that even though a righteous person may suffer, he will

ultimately be rewarded. Another example is the chapter³⁸ of ... קל... השמים מספרים כבוד קל... This chapter describes that G-d reveals Himself both through nature, in that the entire cosmic process complies with the will of G-d, and through Torah. It teaches that the Torah is the prototype of the world, the blueprint from which creation was implemented.³⁹ Similarly, the chapter of⁴⁰ תפילה למשה describes the utility of engaging in *teshuva* even in man's final moments of life, עד זכוכה של תשב אנוש עד דכא – שפלות האדם. It presents *teshuva* as a process commencing with feelings of worthlessness and self degradation and culminating with reconciliation with G-d.

(14) Other chapters of *Tehillim* are devoted to *shira*, such as הלל המצרי, the *hallel* of *Ashrei* and הללוי-ה הללו קל בקדשו. One who feels confident, who experiences ה' לפני, who is enveloped with the spirit of G-d, who is reconciled with G-d, must engage in *shira* and thank G-d, השמיעני את קולך. This is an instinctive and natural response. Man who is ebullient and inspired, expresses his emotions through song and dance.

(15) Yet other chapters of *Tehillim* are devoted to *techinah* and supplication, such as the chapter of קלי קלי למה עובתני⁴¹. These chapters are recited whenever man feels vulnerable, when surrounded by his enemies. Dovid often speaks of שונא, an enemy. Enemies are not necessarily humans. Anything which produces distress and anxiety is denominated as a שונא. Thus, the angel of death is an enemy; disease, illness and financial adversity are all enemies. Anything which preys on man's vulnerabilities is a שונא.

Piyutim* are comprised of Torah study, *shira* and *selichos

(16) Inasmuch as the *piyutim* are patterned after *Tehillim*, they parallel the three components which constitute *Tehillim*. Thus, *piyutim* contain chapters dedicated to *Talmud Torah*. They contain *midrashim*, *halachos* and many of the rules and regulations which govern each of the *moadim*. The *piyut* of R' Elazar Hakalir recited on *Succos*

³⁸ תהלים (י"ט, ב')

³⁹ See (א, א, א). The בראשית רבה (כ"ד, י"ב) explains that the *passuk* התורה והמצוה משך חכמה פרשת משפטים (כ"ד, י"ב) portrays that the words of the Torah are inscribed in the book of nature. The term *כתבתי* להורותם refers to the ספר הטבע. [Editor's Note]

⁴⁰ תהלים (צ"ג, ג')

⁴¹ תהלים (כ"ב, ב')

contains many detailed *halachos* of *succah* and *lulav*. The *piyut* of *Pesach* discusses the laws of *בל יראה ובל ימצא*; the *piyut* of *Shavu'os* discusses the *aseros hadibros*. *Piyutim* comprise eloquent and erudite *drashos*. Additionally, the *paytanim* wished to educate Jews in *Midrash* and so selected those *Midrashim* which would appeal to the masses.⁴²

The second component of *piyut* is *shira*. The paragraphs of *מעשה*, *אלוקים*, *אמרו* all offer majestic and grandiose *shira* and *shevach* to G-d. They describe in flowery detail the intricacies and grandeur of G-d and His universe.

The third component of *piyut* consists of *תחינות* and *בקשות*, *petition and supplication*. People often refer to this final component as *Selichos*.

(17) The *machzor* of the first day of Rosh Hashanah primarily contains the *piyutim* of R' Elazar Hakalir. The *machzor* of the second day of Rosh Hashanah consists of the *piyutim* of R' Shimon Hagadol. Some theorize that R' Elazar Hakalir resided in *Eretz Yisroel* at a time when Jews residing there did not observe Rosh Hashanah on both days.⁴³ Thus, they theorize that R' Elazar Hakalir prepared *piyutim* solely for a one day holiday. This theory is disproven by a reading of the Yom Kippur *machzor* which contains only a few *piyutim* authored by R' Elazar Hakalir, even though he undoubtedly authored many other Yom Kippur *piyutim*. Most of the *piyutim* contained in the *Machzor* of Yom Kippur were authored by the *קלונימוס* family, such as *אמרו לאלוקים*, *מעשה*, *אלוקנו*. Apparently, the *Knesses Yisroel* did not wish to give primacy on Yom Kippur to *piyutim* dedicated to learning, which mark R' Elazar Hakalir's *piyutim*. They elected instead to recite *piyutim* dedicated either to *shira* or *selichos*. Since Yom Kippur is the designated day of *selicha*, it is more appropriate to recite *piyutim* of *selichos* on that day.⁴⁴

⁴² Jews are familiar with *Midrash* primarily because of the *piyutim* and *Rashi's* commentary. Even Jews of the Far East who were not familiar with *Rashi's* commentary, were nonetheless, educated in the intricacies of *Midrash* by reading the *piyutim*.

⁴³ This is the subject of an extensive dispute between the *Baal Hamaor* and the *Ramban*. See:

המאור הקטן למסכת ביצה דף ג' ע"א (מדפי הרי"ף).

See also:

העמק שאלה (ט, ד); שו"ת אבני נזר (סימן תנ"א); ספר תורת רפאל חאו"ח (סימן ק"א); חוון איש חאו"ח (סימן ק"ל – קל"א); ספר הררי קדם ח"א (סימן ל"ד). [Editor's Note]

⁴⁴ Likewise, the ancient practice was to recite *Selichos* on *Tisha B'Av* morning in addition to the *Kinnot*. In later generations this was changed, and the chapters of *Selichos* were omitted. Apparently, the later generations regarded *Tisha B'Av* primarily as a *יום אבלות*; thus, *selichos* were not considered appropriate. See *רי"ן על רי"ף למסכת תענית דף ז' ע"א* (מדפי הרי"ף). [Editor's Note]

***Selichos* are comprised of five components**

(18) Parenthetically, it must be noted that *selichos* are in turn comprised of five different components.⁴⁵ The first component of *Selichos* is the recital of *י"ג מידות*, *the thirteen attributes of mercy*. The *Gemara* describes the utility of this recital:

כל זמן שישראל חוטאים יעשו לפני כסדר זה ואני מוחל להם.⁴⁶
*Whenever your children sin, they should recite the thirteen
attributes of mercy, and I will forgive them.*

The second component is *viduy*. The third component contains *passukim* from *Tanach* which relate to *viduy* and *selicha*. The fourth component is comprised of fragments of *tefillah* and petitions authored during the Second Commonwealth. The most prominent examples of these petitions are: *מי שענה זכוי* and *ענינו ה' ענינו*.⁴⁷ The fifth component contains *קינות*, which bemoan the *churban* and the attendant exile of the Jewish people. The final component contains supplication and petition, *techinah* and *bakasha*. Examples of these are the *לנו היה לנו*, *זכור ה' מה היה לנו*, and *במוצאי מנוחה*, and other chapters of petition and *techinah*.

Yom Kippur is characterized by both *shira* and *selichos*

(19) On Yom Kippur, both *selichos* and *shira* are recited to conform with the two conflicting motifs of Yom Kippur. *Shira* is recited whenever man experiences closeness with the *Ribbono Shel Olam*. On Yom Kippur, man senses that he is לפני ה'. He is suddenly enveloped with sensations of sanctity and rapture which emanate from being in G-d's presence, and is instinctually prompted to engage in *shira*, to thank and praise G-d. *Shira* is offered on Yom Kippur because on that day one is transported to the inner throne room of G-d, לפני ה'. *Shira* (and *השתחויה*, *prostration*) are required of one who enters the *Bais Hamikdash*.⁴⁸ It is a *kiyum* in *Mikdash*. However, it is unnecessary to enter

⁴⁵ *Selichos*, though not mentioned in *Chazal*, were certainly recited during the time of the *Mishnah* and *Gemara*.

⁴⁶ מסכת ראש השנה דף י"ז ע"ב.

⁴⁷ On other occasions the Rav noted that those chapters constitute *זעקה*, and not *tefillah*. They are the response of a terrified person who cannot articulate his needs and simply repeats the same words again and again. [Editor's Note]

⁴⁸ On other occasions, the Rav noted that the Vilna Gaon (*כ"ט, י"ז*) derives this obligation from the *passuk* (*שם*) *והשתחוית לפני ה' אלוך* which stipulates that those entering the *Bais*

physically the *Bais Hamikdash* in order to meet the *Ribbono Shel Olam*. On Yom Kippur, the *Ribbono Shel Olam* comes close to every Jew; everyone can obtain the same sensation of being in the presence of the *Ribbono Shel Olam*, לפני ה'. *Shira* is, therefore, required in response to that sensation of rapture and *simcha*.⁴⁹

On the other hand, *selichos* are also recited on Yom Kippur. As noted above, *Selichos* are petitions offered in response to crisis, בצר לך ומצאוך. On Yom Kippur, which is the ultimate עת צרה, one is also obligated to recite *selichos*.⁵⁰

***Shira* requires responsive reading**

(20) The structure of the *piyutim* of *shira* requires analysis. Each sentence constitutes a single integrated unit. Thus, the first sentence,

האותו ביד מדת משפט, וכל מאמינים שהוא קל אמונה

G-d exercises justice; all acknowledge that He faithfully judges humanity.

comprises one logical unit that portrays G-d's administration of justice. The same is true of the next sentence, which depicts G-d's awareness of man's hidden thoughts:

הבוהן ובודק גני נסתרות, וכל מאמינים שהוא בוהן כליות

G-d evaluates man's innermost secrets; all acknowledge that He judges man's private thoughts.

Likewise, the following sentence, which reflects G-d's prowess,

הגואל ממות ופודה משחת, וכל מאמינים שהוא גואל חזק

G-d redeems man from certain death; all acknowledge that He is the supreme power.

constitutes a single theme, and so on. Our practice is to combine a segment of the final portion of each unit with the initial segment of each succeeding unit. We, therefore, recite האותו ביד מדת משפט, וכל מאמינים שהוא קל אמונה, the final segment of the first unit, together with הבוהן ובודק גני נסתרות, the initial portion of the second unit. The same is true of all of the other *piyutim* of *shira*.

The rationale for this restructuring is that our *shira* replicates the format of the *shira* offered by the angels; כשם שמקדישים אותו משמי מרום, *we offer shira in the same*

Hamikdash to offer ביכורים must first prostrate themselves. See also page 43 of this volume. [Editor's Note]

⁴⁹ See ספר המצות לרמב"ן, שורש א', who remarks that *hallel* is recited on *Yom Tov* to express the sense of joy which one experiences on *Yom Tov*.

⁵⁰ The *avodah* represents the sole *piyut* on Yom Kippur consisting of *Talmud Torah*.

manner as the angels in heaven.⁵¹ The *shira* of the angels is structured as a responsive conversation between the angels, ונותנים באהבה רשות זה לזה. Prior to offering *shira*, each angel must first request and obtain the consent of the other angels. Similarly, the *shaliach tzibbur* must sanction the *shira* of the congregation, and the congregation must, in turn, approve the *shira* of the *shaliach tzibbur*. By definition, נתינת רשות is obtained when one commences a sentence, pauses, and allows the other to complete the balance of the sentence. By pausing prior to completing the sentence, one effectively sanctions the other to complete the sentence. The other person then completes the first sentence, commences the second sentence and pauses prior to completing it. This pause invites the first person to complete the second sentence, and so on.

For example, the *shaliach tzibbur* recites וקרא זה אל זה ואמר, which is the first half of a sentence. He does not complete the balance of the sentence, קדוש קדוש קדוש ה'. Instead he pauses and, thereby, expresses both his request from the congregation to engage in *shira*, as well as his consent for the congregation to engage in *shira*. The congregation then completes the sentence קדוש קדוש קדוש ה'. This recital constitutes their invitation to the *shaliach tzibbur* likewise to engage in *shira*. If the *shaliach tzibbur* were to recite וקרא זה אל זה ואמר and then immediately complete the sentence, קדוש קדוש קדוש ה', he would lack נתינת רשות, the congregation's assent for him to complete the sentence. The *shaliach tzibbur*, therefore, recites וקרא זה אל זה ואמר. He pauses, implicitly conveying his consent to the congregation to engage in *shira*. The congregation responds. It completes the sentence קדוש קדוש קדוש ה' and sanctions the *shaliach tzibbur* to continue *shira*. The *shaliach tzibbur* is then permitted to complete the sentence קדוש קדוש קדוש ה', and so forth and so on.

The same is true of the *piyut* וכל מאמינים. The *shaliach tzibbur* commences each sentence, pauses, and allows the congregation to complete the balance of the sentence. Thus, the *shaliach tzibbur* reads האוחז ביד מדת משפט, which is a נתינת רשות for the congregation to engage in *shira*. The congregation responds by completing the sentence, וכל מאמינים שהוא קל אמונה. The congregation then immediately recites the initial portion of the second sentence, הבוחן ובודק גוי נסתרות, and does not complete this sentence.

⁵¹ It is, therefore, customary to recite these *piyutim* while standing upright, the posture assumed by the angels. The more popular rationale that one should rise whenever the *Aron Kodesh* is opened is not *halachically* sound.

This serves as a נתינת רשות for the *shaliach tzibbur*. The *shaliach tzibbur* responds by completing the second sentence, וכל מאמינים שהוא בוחן כליות, and so on and so forth. Each of the *shaliach tzibbur* and the congregation commence a sentence, but neither completes it. Each pauses and directs the other to complete that sentence.⁵²

The *Shacharis* of Yom Kippur manifests both רוממות האדם and שפלות האדם

- (21) The *Shacharis* of Yom Kippur commences with the recital of *piyutim* of *shira* such as אין אדיר, אמרו לאלוקים, מעשה אלקנו, אדרת ואמונה, אין כמוך, אין אדיר, and the like. This culminates with *kedushah* ... כתר יתנו לך. *Shira* and *kedushah*, which both portray man who is in the presence of the *Ribbono Shel Olam*, reflect the motif of רוממות האדם, of אשריכם ישראל לפני מי אתם מטהרים and the optimistic mood of לפני ה' תטהרו.
- (22) After *kedushah*, the motif of לפני ה' תטהרו and the themes of *simcha* dissipate. The *bracha* of *yaaleh v'yavoh* and the *bracha* of *kedushas hayom* are then recited. This serves as a transition between the theme of מה יפית ומה נעמת, of אשריכם ישראל and לפני ה', of בצר לך ומצאוך, and the second motif of Yom Kippur, as a day of *tzara*, through the perspective of man as a worthless creature, שפלות האדם. In the first half of the *Shacharis*, Yom Kippur is described as a Yom Tov; in the second half it is depicted as a *taanis tzibbur*, marked by בצר לך ומצאוך. After *kedushah*, Yom Kippur emerges as an *Yom Tov* but concludes as a *taanis tzibbur*. Suddenly, and inexplicably, with the recital of *yaaleh v'yavoh*, a new theme, a new mood, is introduced. The optimistic sensations of לפני ה' תטהרו and אשריכם ישראל are suddenly replaced with the pessimistic and somber tones of *taanis tzibbur*, *selichos* and בצר לך ומצאוך. *Selichos* is a function of *tzara*, of a *taanis tzibbur*, which, in turn, reflects שפלות האדם. Since Yom Kippur is the ultimate *yom tzara*, *selichos* are recited at this juncture. The *piyutim* of אל תשליכנו, *do not cast us away*, and הנשמה לך והגוף שלך, *our body and soul belong to you*, all petition for the acceptance of *teshuva*; כל זמן שישראל חוטאים יעשו לפני כסדר הזה ואני מוחל להם. Thus,

⁵² *Minhagim* did not develop by happenstance. *Minhagim* are based upon rational prescriptions and rules.

following *yaaleh v'yavoh*, a new dimension of Yom Kippur emerges, namely, that of man in distress, of שפלות האדם, בצר לך ומצאוך.⁵³

(23) *Shira* may be recited by us only whenever *kedushah* and *shira* are offered by the angels.⁵⁴ On Yom Kippur Eve, *kedushah* is not recited since angels do not engage in *shira* at night. Yom Kippur Eve is characterized solely as a *taanis tzibbur*. Accordingly, it is an evening in which *selichos*, and not *shira*, are recited. The *piyutei selichos* reflect the עת צרה dimension of Yom Kippur, pessimistically depicting man as a worthless and insignificant being. It is an eve of שפלות האדם. In contradistinction to the experience of יעלה תחנונו מערב, *may our prayers this evening be accepted by You*, petitions G-d to accept our *tefillos* and is remarkably similar to the *passuk* קלי קלי למה עזבתני, *why has my G-d Forsaken me*. It petitions G-d to return to the Jewish people. All of the succeeding *piyutim*, such as שומע תפילה, הנשמה, לך, constitute *selichos*. It is an evening of *tzara*, characteristic of the *taanis tzibbur* component of Yom Kippur.

The *viduy haaroach* and the *viduy hakatzar* correspond to the two motifs of Yom Kippur

(24) *Viduy* is recited throughout Yom Kippur. A dispute arose between Rav and Shmuel with respect to the text of the *viduy*.⁵⁵ The *viduy* advanced by Shmuel is denominated as *viduy hakatzar*; whereas the *viduy* advanced by Rav is termed the *viduy haaroach*. Shmuel's *viduy hakatzar* contains the terse text אבל אנחנו ואבותנו חטאנו, followed by כי אמת עשית ואנחנו הרשענו and concludes with the phrase ואתה יודע רזי עולם, Rav's *viduy haaroach* commences with the more elaborate paragraph, וסתרי כל חי, *You are aware of humanity's secrets and each individual's designs*, and contains all of the על חטא sentences.

⁵³ In many communities, especially in Germany, the congregation would recite an entire *sefer* containing numerous chapters of *selichos*. In modern times, the *piyutim* of *selichos* have been curtailed. In many synagogues in Germany, the *Shacharis* of Yom Kippur would commence at 6:30 A.M. They would recite numerous *piyutim* of *shira* prior to *kedushah* and multiple chapters of *selichos* following *kedushah*. They would not complete *Maariv* until 72 minutes following sunset.

⁵⁴ *Kabbalah* teaches us that angels engage in *shira* solely during the daytime. *Shira* is recited at night only on the eve of *Pesach*, because the *passuk* expressly sanctions that nocturnal recital of *shira*, השיר יהיה לכם, כליל התקדש חג (ישעיהו: ל"י, כטי).

⁵⁵ מסכת יומא דף פ"ז ע"ב; אוצר הגאונים (שם) (סימן ק"ג): כתב ר' עמרם גאון מנהג יש בשתי ישיבות לומר אתה יודע ועל חטא...

(25) There is a basic distinction between the two *viduyim*. In the *viduy haaroach* of על חטא, posited by Rav, the person condemns his actions, but not his personality. The על חטא paragraphs merely detail the various sins committed by the person; they do not condemn the person as corrupt and irredeemable. Though in the paragraphs of על חטא לפניך, one confesses his multiple violations and iniquities, he does not impugn his persona. While acknowledging his misdeeds, he nevertheless maintains his dignity and manifests his self-assessment as an essentially worthy creature, albeit one who has sinned in multiple ways. One displays his conviction that he is redeemable and, therefore, petitions G-d in the same manner that Moshe petitioned G-d after the sin of the *meraglim*,⁵⁶ ונסלח לכל עדת בני ישראל ולגר הגר בתוכם כי לכל העם בשגגה. The word בשגגה employed by Moshe does not mean “inadvertently”; the sin of the *meraglim* was clearly committed intentionally. Rather, the word בשגגה denotes that the people’s inner souls were not corrupted by that sin. Of course, the people erred, but Moshe declared to G-d that they are redeemable.

In a word, the *viduy haaroach* originates in the motif of לפני ה' תטהרו. One who is able to confront his Creator is by definition redeemable. Though he has sinned, he now engages in *teshuvah* and regret; his soul remains pure and is susceptible to reformation. The great potential of רוממות האדם reasserts itself.

(26) In contrast, the *viduy hakatzar* comprised of the paragraph אשמנו does not identify any specific sins. There is no פירוט החטא. The word אשמנו presupposes unmitigated condemnation. We are guilty. We are corrupt. We are lost. We are worthless, debased and irredeemable. The *viduy hakatzar* originates in the motif of בצר לך ומצאוך, of a *taanis tzibbur*. The *viduy hakatzar* is recited by a person who feels corrupt, whose soul is blackened with sin, and who is vile and beyond salvation. It is offered by one who is consumed by טומאה, who recognizes that not only were his actions unscrupulous, but that his soul is depraved, perverted and corrupted by iniquity. The *viduy hakatzar*, therefore, concludes with the sentence כי אמת עשית ואנחנו הרשענו, we are evil, base and condemnable. This is the *viduy* of ממעמקים קראתיך ה', of one who is very far removed and remote from G-d. It is the petition of מן המצר קראתי קה, of one confronted with the crisis of an עת צרה, of a *taanis tzibbur*.

⁵⁶ במדבר (טי"ו, כ"ו).

The *viduy* of Shmuel is recited on every *taanis tzibbur*. It is not limited to Yom Kippur. Moreover, the *viduy* of the *taanis tzibbur* includes not only an individual condemnation but a collective indictment as well. We recite אבל אנחנו ואבותנו חטאנו. The *viduy* impugns not only the individual's sins, but also his ancestors' iniquities. This is based upon the *passuk*,⁵⁷

והנשארים מכם ימקו בעונם ואף בעונות אבותם אתם ימקו, והתודו את עונם ואת עון אבותם.

The few remaining members will be punished because of their sins and their ancestors' sins. They will repent both their sins and their ancestors' sins.

One confesses both his ancestors' iniquities as well as his own misdeeds. One admits that he is worthless, that his personality is irredeemable and that his ancestors were despicable and depraved. This is the *viduy* of תוכחה and of *eis tzara*. It is, therefore, recited on every *taanis tzibbur*. The *viduy* of a *taanis tzibbur* does not contain any petition for *kapparah*. One who is guilty and corrupt does not have the audacity to implore for expiation. The *viduy* of a *taanis tzibbur* merely acknowledges one's hopeless irredeemability.

Rav's *viduy haaroch*, however, is unique to Yom Kippur. It is not recited on a *taanis tzibbur*. It is not contained in any of the daily *selichos*; it is limited to Yom Kippur. It conforms to the motif of Yom Kippur as a day of reconciliation, a day of לפני ה' תטהרו. The entire paragraph of אתה יודע רזי עולם is predicated upon the premise that G-d has a unique relationship with man, the exemplar of all creatures, and is aware of all of man's deeds and iniquities. The *viduy haaroch* must, therefore, be followed by בקשת כפרה, a petition for complete expiation, supplications that G-d pardon all of the iniquities committed that year and infuse the repentant with *taharah*.

The *viduy haaroch* is not recited during *Neilah*

(27) During the *tefillah* of *Neilah*, the *viduy haaroch* is not recited. Only the *viduy hakatzar* is recited. The rationale for this is that the *tefillah* of *Neilah* does not correspond to the motif of Yom Kippur as a day of לפני ה' תטהרו. Rather, *Neilah* is predicated upon the *taanis tzibbur* dimension of Yom Kippur. *Neilah* is an additional

⁵⁷ ויקרא (כ"ו, ל"ט - מ').

tefillah that was recited on all *taaniyos tzibbur*, whenever the entire community engaged in a *taanis* collectively.⁵⁸ Inasmuch as *Neilah* is subsumed under the *taanis tzibbur* component of Yom Kippur, which reflects בצר לך ומצאוך and שפלות אדם, the *viduy* contained in this *tefillah* must correlate with the *taanis tzibbur* format. Therefore, *Neilah* contains the paragraph מה אנש כי תזכרנו, *lowly man is not deserving to be in G-d's presence*, constituting a complete condemnation of man. It adds, מה חיינו, מה צדקתנו, מה, *man's life, accomplishments and prowess are completely worthless and beyond salvation*. It concludes ומותר אדם מן הבהמה אין כי הכל הבל, *man has descended to the status of animals*. This portrays שפלות האדם in the most extreme sense. The optimistic *viduy haaroach* reflecting רוממות האדם may, therefore, not be recited during *Neilah*.⁵⁹

(28) *Chazal*, however, did not wish to conclude *Neilah* with the motif of *taanis tzibbur*, with a condemnation of humanity, with the pessimistic theme of מותר אדם מן הבהמה אין כי הכל הבל. *Chazal* insisted that Yom Kippur conclude on a positive, optimistic note, stressing the motif of תטהרו ה' לפני ה', רוממות האדם. *Chazal*,⁶⁰ therefore, introduced the following *tefillah* at the conclusion of *Neilah*:

אתה הבדלת אנוש מראש ותכירחו לעמוד לפניו.
*You have selected mankind and graced man with the ability
 to confront You.*

This paragraph reflects רוממות האדם. It describes that man was chosen over all other creatures to enjoy a unique relationship with G-d. One who is as contemptible as an animal, can not cry out שמע ישראל ה' אלוקנו ה' אחד, cannot articulate the petition that the who is presently solely the G-d of the Jewish people, will one day be accepted by all of humanity and will be acknowledged as ה' אחד. A person who is condemned to שפלות האדם can not express this type of universal *malchus*. *Neilah* must, therefore, conclude with רוממות האדם, with a statement stressing the uniqueness and greatness of man. The paragraph of אתה הבדלת אנוש מראש was, therefore, introduced at the conclusion of *Neilah* to express the optimistic hope in the irrepressible greatness of man. However, since the primary motif of *Neilah* is *taanis tzibbur*, the *viduy haaroach* may not be recited.

⁵⁸ ובכל תעניות... הציבור מתפללים תפילת נעילה (רמב"ם פ"ד מהלכות תעניות הי"ח)

⁵⁹ The *Gemara* (ibid.) writes that even Rav conceded to the omission of the *viduy haaroach* during *Neilah*.

⁶⁰ This institution is not mentioned in the *Gemara*. It was probably introduced by the רבן סבוראי.

The ramifications of characterizing Yom Kippur as primarily a *taanis tzibbur* or a Yom Tov

(29) The tension on Yom Kippur between *taanis tzibbur* and Yom Tov, between שפלות האדם and רוממות האדם, comes to expression in a dispute between the *Shulchan Aruch* and the *Rama*.

R' Akiva Eiger⁶¹ relates that one of his congregants took ill and was permitted to eat on Yom Kippur. In the morning, R' Akiva Eiger was asked if the patient may be called to the Torah. He permitted this and explained that the *krias hatorah* of Yom Kippur morning correlates with the Yom Tov dimension of Yom Kippur and not with the *taanis tzibbur* facet of Yom Kippur. It is, therefore, irrelevant that the patient was not fasting. He noted, however, that he was uncertain whether or not the patient would be permitted to be called to the Torah during the reading of *Minchah*. He was unsure if the *krias hatorah* of *Minchah* is predicated upon the Yom Tov aspect of Yom Kippur or upon the *taanis tzibbur* facet of Yom Kippur. If the latter, then one who has eaten may not be called to the Torah.

(30) The Rav discussed this issue with R' Hanoach Aigess at length.⁶² The Rav suggested to R' Aigess that the question whether the *krias hatorah* on *Minchah* corresponds to the *taanis tzibbur* or to the Yom Tov facet of Yom Kippur is, in fact, the subject of a controversy between the *Shulchan Aruch* and the *Rama*, as to whether the concluding *bracha* of the *Birchas Haftorah* recited after the *Minchah* reading should consist of the *bracha* of על התורה ועל העבודה or the *bracha* of ברוך אתה ה' מגן דוד.⁶³ The Rav theorized that the *Shulchan Aruch* maintains that the *krias hatorah* of *Minchah* corresponds to the Yom Tov facet of Yom Kippur. Thus, the *bracha* of על התורה ועל העבודה, which concludes with the *kedushas hayom* text, ברוך אתה ה' מקדש ישראל ויום

⁶¹ See שאלות ותשובות רע"א (חלק א', סימן כ"ד) (וביאור אחיזה בעקב (הערה ג)

[Editor's Note] . ספר מפניני הרב (עמי קל"ג); ספר הררי קדם ח"א (סימן נ"ט); שו"ת מרחשת ח"א (סימן י"ד)

⁶² Rabbi Aigess was the *dayan* in Vilna and author of שו"ת מרחשת . This issue is discussed by him in שו"ת מרחשת (שם)

⁶³ שו"ת א"י (תרכ"ב, ב'). The *Rama* rules that one should not to recite על התורה ועל העבודה . Thus, the final *bracha* concludes ברוך אתה ה' מגן דוד . In the Yeshiva of Brisk, the students did recite the *bracha* of על התורה ועל העבודה which concludes מקדש ישראל ויום הכיפורים . This was also practiced by R' Chaim, R' Moshe and the Rav. The Yeshiva of Volozhin, however, followed the *Rama*'s ruling and did not recite the *bracha* of על התורה ועל העבודה .

The Rav added that the standard tune is employed for the Torah reading of *Mincha*, in contrast to the special *Yomim Noraiim* tune used for the morning reading.

הכיפורים, is recited. The *Rama*, however, maintains that the *krias hatorah* on *Minchah* corresponds to the *taanis tzibbur* component of Yom Kippur. Thus, the *bracha* of דוד is recited, just as on the other *taaniyos tzibbur*.

The *haftorah* of Yom Kippur morning differs from the *haftorah* of *Mincha*

(31) The text of the two *haftorahs* read on Yom Kippur seems to corroborate the *Rama's* ruling. On Yom Kippur morning, the *haftorah* is recited from the book of Yeshayahu.⁶⁴ It commences with the *passuk*,

סלו סלו פנו דרך זרימו מכשול מדרך עמי.
*Pave a wide highway, free of all obstacles, and allow My
people to return to Me.*

It is a chapter saturated with optimism, of G-d's directive that all impediments be removed to enable man to repent and return to G-d. The *passuk* eloquently states,

שלום שלום לרחוק ולקרוב אמר ה' ורפאתיו.
*G-d calls out in peace to those far and near and offers to
cure them.*

The entire motif of this *haftorah* corresponds to the *simcha* of Yom Tov, לפני ה' תטהרו, to. It is replete with the hope, expectation and confidence that man and G-d will be reconciled forever. It depicts the prophet's faith in mankind. It portrays the much simpler method of *teshuva*, the *teshuva* initiated by G-d who descends to man and prompts him to repent. אשריכם ישראל לפני מי אתם מטהרים. In this *haftorah*, Yom Kippur emerges as a Yom Tov of joy and reconciliation between man and G-d.

On the other hand, the *haftorah* of Yona recited at *Minchah* is characteristic of a *taanis tzibbur*. Yona's attempt to escape from G-d is symbolic of man who wishes to shirk his responsibility and free himself of his obligation to comply with the Torah and *mitzvos*. Yona's petition ממעי הדגה is symptomatic of one who cries out to G-d ממעמקים, from the depths, of one who is distant and removed from G-d. Yona himself concedes,⁶⁵

קראתי מצרה לי אל ה' ויעניני מבטן שאול. שועתי שמעת קולי.
*In my distress from the darkest abyss, I have called out to
G-d. He responded and heard my voice.*

⁶⁴ פרק נ"ז – נ"ח.

⁶⁵ יונה (ב', ג').

This mood, representative of הצר הצורר אתכם, correlates with the *taanis tzibbur* motif of Yom Kippur. It is dark with pessimism and depicts man's descent into the abyss of sin. It describes one who is totally lost, irredeemable and hopeless. When Yona arrived in Nineveh, he encouraged the people to declare a fast day. The people complied. All men and animals refrained from eating and drinking. They donned rags, symbolizing שפלות האדם, man's loss of self dignity, man's reduction in stature and petitioned G-d to abate His decree.

In sum, the entire motif of Yom Kippur changes at the commencement of the *Mincha* Torah and Haftarah readings, from that of Yom Tov (corresponding to רוממות האדם and לפני ה' תטהרו) to that of *taanis tzibbur* (corresponding to שפלות האדם).

Yom Kippur is transformed into a *taanis tzibbur* following the reading of the *avodah* service

(32) In truth, the emergence of Yom Kippur as a *taanis tzibbur* occurs following the *avodah* service. Immediately following the recital of the *avodah*, we engage in קינה. We recite the mournful chapter which contrasts the majesty of the *Bais Hamikdash* with the squalor of *galus*:

אשרי עין ראתה כל אלה הלא למשמע און דאבה נפשנו
Fortunate are those who witnessed this splendor. Our hearts are filled with misery after learning of its destruction.

At this juncture, the entire theme of Yom Kippur shifts from לפני ה' תטהרו, from a day of *simcha*, to that of a *taanis tzibbur*, of קלי קלי למה עזבתני, and characterized as a day of distress, of הצר הצורר אתכם. At that juncture, *kinnos* are recited. We lament,

אבל עוונות אבותנו החריבו נוה... ומאז שחרב בית מקדשנו תנות
 צרות לא נוכל, שבר בכל יום ואנחה ...
Our ancestors' sins caused the destruction of the Bais Hamikdash... since its destruction we are besieged with unspeakable calamity... each day is marked with new tragedy...

This series of *kinnos* culminates with the tragic story of the ten martyrs, אלה אזכרה ונפשי עלי אשפכה, *my soul weeps when I remember these martyrs*. At this juncture, Yom Kippur shifts into a *yom aveilus*, into a day of הדברים האלה בצר לך ומצאוך כל הדברים האלה.⁶⁶

⁶⁶ Interestingly, the same transformation occurs on *Tisha B'Av* as well. In the morning, *Tisha B'Av* is characterized as a *yom aveilus*. However, immediately following the recital of the *kinnos*, *Tisha B'Av* is

Following the transformation of Yom Kippur into a day of *aveilus*, *shira* may not be recited. Thus, the *Minchah* of Yom Kippur does not contain any of the *piyutim* of *shira*. The *machzor* of *Minchah* consists primarily of *selichos*. The *Gaonim* instituted that the *מילות* be recited six times during *Minchah*. At that stage, Yom Kippur assumes the role of a *tannis tzibbur*. Following *Minchah*, *Neilah* is recited, which is again characteristic of a *taanis tzibbur*. It is only at the conclusion of *Neilah* that the theme reverts again. We once again regain our optimism, declare *אתה הבדלת אנוש מראש* ותכירהו לעמוד לפניך *You have selected mankind and graced man with the ability to confront you*, and conclude with the motif of *לפני ה' תטהרו*.

Rosh Hashanah precedes Yom Kippur in order to allow man the opportunity to engage in a *cheshbon hanefesh*

(33) Although Yom Kippur is a day of *selichah* and *mechilah*, it constitutes a single integrated unit with Rosh Hashanah. The difference between Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur is that on Yom Kippur one is obligated to recite *viduy*, while on Rosh Hashanah one is not permitted to engage in *viduy*. The Kabbalists teach that the issue of *חטא* should not be raised on Rosh Hashanah since the *Satan* is still dominant on Rosh Hashanah; the *Satan* is not banished until Yom Kippur.

R' Yisroel Salanter questioned why Yom Kippur is not observed prior to Rosh Hashanah. Would it not have been more appropriate for Yom Kippur, a day of *teshuva*, to precede Rosh Hashanah, the day on which man is judged, so that man be judged favorably, as one uncorrupted by sin?

converted into a *taanis tzibbur*. It is for this reason that *kinnos*, and not *selichos*, are recited on *Tisha B'Av* morning. *Kinnos* are more appropriate for a day of *aveilus*. However, at *Minchah*, *Tisha B'Av* assumes the role of a *taanis tzibbur*. The standard *krias hatorah* of *ויחל*, read on the other *taaniyos tzibbur*, is read on *Tisha B'Av* at *Mincha*, and many of the *aveilus* strictures (such as sitting on the floor) are relaxed. The *Rishonim* discuss at length whether *Neilah* should be recited on *Tisha B'Av* based upon the *Yerushalmi* (פייג *Yerushalmi* which debates whether *Tisha B'Av* is primarily a *taanis tzibbur* (in which case *Neilah* should be recited), or whether it is primarily a *yom aveilus* (in which case *Neilah* is not recited, since on a day of *aveilus*, a day of *תפילות*, *יום שתם תפילות*, excessive prayer is discouraged). See:

חידושי הרמב"ן למסי' תענית (מתורת האדם) (מהד"ו הרש"ר) (עמי מ"ו); שיעורי הרב על הלכות תשעה באב (סימן א', אות א'); מסורה חוברת ו' (עמי כ"ו); ספר הררי קדם חלק ב' (סימן רמ"ו); ספר נוראות הרב חלק י"א (עמוד 49).

[Editor's Note]

Prior to Yom Kippur, man must assay a commentary on his life

(34) It would seem that the Torah designates Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur as the Yom Tov of humanity, כל באי עולם יעברון לפניך כבני מרון, *all of humanity is reviewed by You*. Each person approaches G-d, and G-d evaluates whether or not that person deserves to carry the *Tzelem Elokim*. G-d ascertains whether or not that person has complied with the *bris yisroel* and maintained his human dignity.

(35) In response to the imminent judgment of Rosh Hashanah, man must author on Rosh Hashanah a ספר תולדות האדם, an auto-biography which chronicles all of his deeds, aspirations, hopes and plans for the future. On Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur, man must subject himself to *cheshbon hanefesh*. This entails writing a פירוש, *a commentary*, on one's life. Though most books are self-explanatory, this ספר requires exposition. The ספר תולדות אדם, the elucidation of each person's life story, can best be written by that person himself. He must honestly decide if his life is satisfactory or if it falls short of his goals and endeavors. On Yom Kippur, having completed one's assessment, man must then determine his goals for the coming year. If he analyzes himself truthfully, he will determine whether his life has been wasted, if he has accomplished what he was charged to achieve and if he has realized his G-d appointed tasks.

In sum, each person is obligated to engage in *cheshbon hanefesh* by writing a critique of his life.

(36) At times, man is acutely aware of his feelings and emotions; his thoughts are in the forefront of his consciousness. It is easy for him to write a commentary evaluating his goals and the extent to which he has achieved them. However, there are other times when man's subconscious suppresses any attempts at self-evaluation. He is unable to face or acknowledge his failures. Often, he is afraid or even embarrassed to formulate any commentary on his life since, to do so, he must be very honest with himself. He must be strong, self confident, assured and willing to acknowledge his failures and shortcomings. The *Gemara* writes,⁶⁷

אין מעמידין פרנס על הציבור אלא אם כן קופה של שרצים
תלוייה לו מאחוריו.

*One is not appointed to a position of authority, unless he
has been implicated in scandal.*

⁶⁷ מסכת יומא דף כ"ב ע"ב.

The same is true on Yom Kippur. A person may not recite *Neilah* unless he has extracted from his inner core a קופה של שרצים, a multitude of sins, failures and wasted opportunities, and has resolved never to repeat them. He must dig deeply into the very depths of his soul and engage in critical self evaluation. There are barely ten short days within which one can extract the קופה של שרצים.

Cheshbon hanefesh commences on Rosh Hashanah and reaches its apex with the viduy of Yom Kippur

(37) The *Gemara* writes,⁶⁸

כינור היה תלוי למעלה ממטתו של דוד. בא רוח צפונית ונושבת בו ומנגן מאליו.

A harp was suspended over Dovid's bed. Whenever the North wind blew, it would emit its musical sounds.

The *kinor* represented the intimate details of Dovid's life. He engaged in *teshuva* through a lengthy process of catharsis and repentance. People resist repentance. They mistakenly believe that they have succeeded in life and that their children will faithfully perpetuate their tradition. They compound this error by deluding themselves into believing that they have contributed meaningfully to society and that humanity has become enriched as a result of their existence. They persist in this deception, convincing themselves that they deserve to continue living. Man's role is to reverse this posturing and engage in honest introspection, self analysis and commence the process of *teshuva*. Dovid sinned in order to establish a precedent for *teshuva* for humanity.⁶⁹ His process of analysis and *teshuva* was lengthy, turbulent and difficult. *Viduy* can only be recited upon the conclusion of this process. One who recites *viduy* while still in a self delusional thrall, is analogous to one who is טובל ושרץ בידו. One must first remove the שרץ, renounce his wasted opportunities and sinful life. Only then, does he have the right to engage in *viduy*. It is demeaning for one to commence the process of *teshuva* while confronted with the valuelessness of his life and the futility of his existence. The רוח צפונית that blew across the *kinor* of Dovid symbolized the *yetzer hara*, מצפון תפתח הרע.⁷⁰ When Dovid sensed

⁶⁸ מסכת ברכות דף ג' ע"ב.

⁶⁹ מסכת שבת דף נ"ה ע"ב

⁷⁰ On *Shabbos Shuva* we read את הצפוני ארחיק מכם, which is symbolic of the *yetzer hara*. See מסכת סוכה דף נ"ב ע"א.

the approach of the רוח צפונית, he realized that the *yetzer hara* was attempting to overtake his life and mislead him. Dovid recognized the need to resist. He engaged in an elaborate *cheshbon hanefesh*, overcame the *yetzer hara* and commenced the process of *teshuva*.

(38) The *Yerushalmi* describes this episode somewhat differently. It writes,⁷¹

כינור היה תלוי כנגד חלונותיו של דוד.

A harp hung opposite Dovid's window.

Unlike the *Bavli* which employs the term "מטתו של דוד", the *Yerushalmi* utilizes the metaphor "חלונותיו של דוד". The מטתו של דוד described by the *Bavli* refers to the *cheshbon hanefesh* that one conducts on Rosh Hashanah. One should not jump start the process of *cheshbon hanefesh* by peremptorily confessing his sins without first ascertaining their scope and analyzing his deeds. Indeed, on Rosh Hashanah man does not yet appreciate the enormity of his iniquities and misdeeds. The purpose of Rosh Hashanah is to commence the process of self evaluation and analysis. It should conclude only when one acknowledges the magnitude of his misdeeds. By contrast, the חלונותיו של דוד described by the *Yerushalmi* refer to the completion of the *cheshbon hanefesh* on Yom Kippur. When Yom Kippur arrives, a person should already be intimately familiar with his life. He should already have written a commentary on his life, and can cry out to G-d, חטאתי עויתי פשעתי לפניך. Yom Kippur represents the conclusion of the process commenced on Rosh Hashanah. The labyrinth of self-introspection, the elaborate *cheshbon hanefesh* commenced on Rosh Hashanah, reaches its climax on Yom Kippur. On Yom Kippur man emerges from his reverie, runs to the window, and screams חטאתי עויתי פשעתי.

(39) Prior to the service on Yom Kippur, the *Kohen Gadol* sat in isolation for seven days, in לשכתו שבמקדש. This rule is prescribed by הלכה למשה מסיני. A *Kohen Gadol* may not declare חטאתי עויתי פשעתי if he has not previously engaged in seven days of *cheshbon hanefesh*, full of agony, turmoil and self-introspection. When the *Kohen Gadol* lay in bed, the *kinor* replayed all of his sins. It reminded him of the myriad of occasions on which he succumbed to the רוח צפונית. He would then engage in a long and intensive battle with the *yetzer hara*, analyze his life and perform a *cheshbon hanefesh*. After

⁷¹ מסכת ברכות פרק א' הלכה א'.

חטאתי engaging in seven days of *cheshbon hanefesh*, the *Kohen Gadol* could proclaim עויתי פשעתי לפניך. The vast chasm between *cheshbon hanefesh* and *viduy* is bridged by the seven days of self-examination commencing on Rosh Hashanah and concluding on Yom Kippur.

The parameters of *bris*

(40) Every person must find a formula for *cheshbon hanefesh* unique to his persona. Although there is no prototype, there are two items which form an integral element of every *cheshbon hanefesh*. In *Selichos* the word “*bris*” plays a very pivotal role. Likewise, the *bracha* of *zichronos* recited on Rosh Hashanah details the components of the *bris yisroel* and concludes ברוך אתה ה' זוכר הברית. When G-d comforts the Jews, He tells them:⁷²

וזכרתי את בריתי יעקב, ואף את בריתי יצחק, ואף ואת בריתי
אברהם אזכור, והארץ אזכור.

*I will remember my covenant with the Avos and with Eretz
Yisroel.*

Bris is an unusual term. It characterizes a treaty concluded between two individuals or entities. The distinctive characteristic of a treaty is that it is binding upon unborn generations as well as the original parties. When two countries conclude a treaty, it is assumed that it will be honored by the future citizens of each country. Legally, a treaty may not be rescinded by future generations. Avimelech noted:⁷³ אם תשקר לי ולניני ולנכדי. He advised Avrohom that their treaty would be binding upon future generations as well. Similarly, Moshe advised the Jewish people that the *bris* that he was about to conclude with them would be binding upon all subsequent generations of Jews.

ולא אתכם לבדכם אנכי כרת את הברית הזאת, כי אם את אשר
ישנו פה ואת אשר איננו פה עמנו היום.⁷⁴

*I am concluding this covenant not only with the present
generation, but also with all subsequent generations.*

The *Gemara* constantly emphasizes⁷⁵ מושבע ועומד מהר סיני *all generations are bound by the oath accepted on their behalf during the bris of Mattan Torah.*

⁷² ויקרא (כ"ו, מ"ב).

⁷³ בראשית (כ"א, כ"ג).

⁷⁴ דברים (כ"ט, י"ג – י"ד).

⁷⁵ מסכת שבויעות דף כ"א ע"ב.

Every Jew must identify with his past

(41) The *bris yisroel*, however, is much more complex than a simple treaty. A treaty is a legal, juridical contract. The *bris* of the Torah, though also a contract, has a much more profound implication. In addition to obligating subsequent generations, the *bris* of the Torah binds the Jew to the past, to his עבר. It summons the Jew's inner strength to identify and assimilate the past into his own personality. The distinct feature of the *bris yisroel* is the metaphysical facility of living in both the present as well as in the past. את אשר ישנו פה ואת אשר איננו פה עמנו היום.

One of the recurring themes in classical literature is of one who experiences amnesia and forgets his past. Amnesic people will spend enormous amounts of money and time in order to recollect even the few minutes or the few days which they have forgotten. It is traumatic for them to be unable to recollect even a short period of time. They sense a gap in their lives and will do anything to restore that recollection. The reason for this is that, by nature, man is impelled to identify with his past. The *passuk* writes:⁷⁶

כִּי אָדָם עֵץ הַשָּׂדֶה

Man is comparable to the trees of the forest.

Just as a tree has roots, so, too, each person must have roots. Without roots, man can not exist. Man's roots are his past, his family history, his heritage and his identity. One who forgets his past, feels unaffiliated, unidentified and completely lost.

The relationship between man and his parents is predicated upon this identification with the past. The Torah commands כְּבֹד אֶת אָבִיךָ, *one must honor his parents*, because man instinctively identifies with his past. Man can feel rooted to his past only if he honors his parents. The *bris yisroel* entails that man must integrate his past and his Judaic heritage into his personality. To live forever, man must identify with his parents and ancestors. The older the tree, the longer the roots. *Yahadus* teaches that man must identify, not only with his individual past, but with the history of the entire Jewish nation dating back to the time of the *Avos*. Moshe infused in all Jews, in all generations, the facility of being able to identify with this collective past.

⁷⁶ דברים (כ', י"ט)

Irreligious Jews in *Eretz Yisroel* may drive their cars on Shabbos, but still sacrifice inordinately for the sake of *שוב ארץ ישראל*. They often do not understand their motivations. The answer is *לא אתכם לבדכם אנכי כורת את הברית הזאת*. They feel the pull of the past, of the ancient *bris* of *Arvos Moav*.

This theme is also manifested in the *bracha* of *zichronos*, *אתה זוכר מעשי עולם*. One must incorporate his Jewish heritage into his personal life. There are many people who merely live for the present. They adopt the philosophy of:

האי עלמא כהילולא דמי.⁷⁷

This world is a party, to be enjoyed in a care-free manner.

They are entranced by the temporal pleasures of this world. They live from day to day with a care-free philosophy of freedom without responsibilities. They delude themselves into believing that they are enjoying life. But, in their heart of hearts, they realize that their lives are wasted. Whenever one who shares this philosophy engages in *cheshbon hanefesh*, he experiences pain and discomfort since it becomes readily apparent that his life has no meaning, no values. On Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur, Jews are exhorted to return to their past, *זכור ברית אבות*. When Jews hear the *kinor*, when they try to engage in a *cheshbon hanefesh*, they suddenly realize the emptiness in their lives resulting from having abandoned the *bris* and having severed their relationship with the past.

One must receive inspiration from his youthful memories

(42) On a personal note, the Rav noted the large impact which the *Gemara*, *Sifrei Chassidus* and *Sifrei Drush* had on his life, and how much they contributed to the quality of the *drashos* which he subsequently delivered on Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur.⁷⁸ Nonetheless, he observed that whenever he was moved to pray with intensity on Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur, whenever he wished to sense the shudder and the tremble of *Erev Yom Kippur*⁷⁹, it was not the *Torah* and *Drashos* which he had learned, nor the *Chassidus* which he had studied, which inspired him. Rather it was the seemingly minor memories and youthful impressions which provided him with the necessary inspiration.

⁷⁷ מסכת עירובין דף נ"ד ע"א.

⁷⁸ The Rav noted that the most erudite and spectacular *drashos* dealing with Yom Kippur are contained in the *ליקוטי תורה*, authored by R'Shneur Zalman of Liadi.

⁷⁹ One can not approach Yom Kippur without feeling the pangs of *Erev Yom Kippur* and realizing that he is morally bankrupt.

He would recall the haunting tune of the *kiddush* of Rosh Hashanah as chanted by R' Chaim Brisker and by his father. He would vividly recall R' Chaim intoning the phrase, *ודברך מלכנו אמת וקים לעד*. The memory of R' Chaim's resonant voice loudly declaring *על כל הארץ* would each year grip the Rav and impel him to *teshuva*. Though R' Chaim recited the *Kiddush* of Rosh Hashanah with the standard Yom Tov tune, nonetheless, R' Chaim's sincerity and fervor sent a shiver down the Rav's youthful spine. That shiver would resurface on each Yom Kippur. The Rav conceded that even if, G-d forbid, he would forget his learning, he could never forget R' Chaim's chanting *ודברך מלכנו אמת וקים לעד*. In order for the Rav to experience a religious resurgence, he would simply recall those youthful memories engrained in his soul.

(43) The *bracha* of *shofros* cites the *passuk*⁸⁰,

ויהי קול השופר תולך וחזק מאד.

The sound of the shofar became louder and louder.

The older one becomes, the louder the sound of the *shofar* and the more piercing the call to *teshuva*. It is irrational, but true. People hear many *kolos*, different sounds, during their lifetimes, but the *קול המונה של עיר*, *the cacophony of urban life*, overshadows all of the other sounds. The frivolous sounds of television and theater drown out the sounds of the *kol Torah*, the sounds of *mitzvos* and divert man from his ultimate goal. But the older one becomes, the louder becomes the sound of the *shofar* urging man to return to G-d. On each Yom Kippur night, the Rav would recall how his father remained awake the entire Yom Kippur night,⁸¹ studying the *עבודת יום הכיפורים*, and the tune that he would use to read the *Rambam*. Every Jew has youthful memories which grip him. It is part of the *זוכר הברית* to recall those memories, return to one's youth and regain the purity of his adolescence.

(44) To merge with one's glorious past, it is preferable to approach Yom Kippur with R' Akiva's vision of *לפני ה' תטהרו* than with the vision of *קלי קלי למה עזבתני*. In either case, however, *tahara* can only be obtained by returning to one's past. *זכור לנו ברית אבות*. *כאשר אמרת*. If we ask G-d to invoke the *bris avos*, we must likewise return to our own *bris avos*. People instinctively adhere to the traditions of their past. It is unnatural to

⁸⁰ שמות (י"ט, י"ט).

⁸¹ This was the Rav's practice as well. After he assumed the Rabbinate, he was compelled to sleep a little on Yom Kippur night in order to be alert enough to deliver his *drashos* on Yom Kippur day.

reject it. Many Jews have wastefully discarded their *Yahadus*, their heritage, in their frivolous pursuit of affluence. It is incumbent upon each Jew to reconfirm his legacy on Yom Kippur and devote his life to his G-d appointed tasks.

Every Jew must also ensure the continuity of future generations

(45) There is another dimension to the equation between man and tree, כי אדם עץ השדה, In addition to roots, a tree also has גוף, *branches which form a panoramic vista*.⁸² Chazal debate if או בתר נופו, whether the roots of a tree are more important than its expanse. A tree must have both roots and branches in order to exist and flourish. Likewise, it is insufficient for man to be merely involved in the past; he must also identify with the future. The roots are bound to the tree's past; the flowers and branches relate to its future. Likewise, the *bris yisroel* comprises both past and future. Nowadays, Jews are concerned with the *bris* of the past, but in the days of antiquity, in the time of Avraham and Moshe, they were concerned with the future. את אשר ישנו פה ואת אשר איננו. פה עמנו היום. Moshe was very troubled and wanted to ensure the continuity of the Jewish religion. Though אדם עץ השדה, man is bound to the past, nonetheless, he must anticipate the future and take all actions necessary to ensure that continuity. The past requires a future, and the future requires a past. Had Jews not identified with both the past and the future, the Jewish people could not have survived.

People often say incorrectly and sarcastically,

העבר אין, העתיד עדיין, ההווה כהרף עין, אם כן דאגה מנין,
The past is remote, the future has not yet occurred, the present is fleeting, why, then, should one be concerned?

Yahadus disagrees. *Yahadus* proposes:

העבר יש, והעתיד יש, וההווה גשר המקשר את העבר ואת העתיד.
אם כן, יש לדאוג.
The past exists. The future exists. The present is the bridge between the past and the future. Therefore, one should be concerned.

⁸² See ספר ימי זיכרון (עמ' 184).

(46) In Hebrew, the word זכרון does not merely mean to remember or to recollect the past. Rather, זכרון means to be concerned and worried about the future, and to commit oneself to the perpetuation of the future. Thus, the *passuk* reads:⁸³

הבן יקיר לי אפרים אם ילד שעשועים כי מידי דברי בו זכור אזכרנו
עוד.

*Is Ephraim a young playful child, that whenever I speak of
him, I recall him.*

If זכור means to remember, then the *passuk* proposes the ludicrous idea that one first speaks of the child and only then remembers him. The *passuk* should have been structured in the reverse order, ועל כן אדבר בו, כי זכור אזכרנו. Clearly, זכור אזכרנו does not mean to remember. Rather זכור אזכרנו means to love him, to be concerned about him, to be aware of him and to anticipate his future needs. Similarly the *passuk* ויזכור אותה ה' does not mean that G-d remembered her; G-d had never forgotten her. The *passuk* means that G-d became concerned and intervened in her affairs. He sympathized with her and answered her prayers.

Likewise, זכור לנו ברית אבות does not only petition G-d to remember the past. It also envisions that G-d will take steps to ensure the future. The future is crucial to Jewish existence. One who is concerned with the future, displays love for his children. The biologically instinctive love for one's offspring is common to both humans and animals. But the more sublime love of a father to his son expresses itself in *bris*. This is the *bris* of the future, of the נוף, *the branches*. One sees the future in one's children. All people sacrifice and work to educate their children, not for the present, but for the future, for the subsequent generations. Jews built *Eretz Yisroel*, not for themselves, but for their children. These sentiments all derive from *bris*. Every person is just a mere link in the long chain of the *mesorah*. Half the link is to the past; the other half of the link is to the future. The tree has roots, but the tree also has a נוף, *a majestic expanse*.

(47) Both the branches and the roots, both the *bris* of the past and the *bris* of the future, come to expression in the fear experienced by people on Yom Kippur. There are two words in Hebrew to describe loneliness: ערירות and בדידות.⁸⁴ The word ערירי differs from the word בודד. The word בודד has the connotation of one who is not social, who is isolated

⁸³ גרמיהו (לויא, י"ט).

⁸⁴ ספר ימי זיכרון (עמ' 187).

from society. He has no friends; he is, therefore, lonely. Likewise, the *passuk*, איכה ישבה בודד contrasts עם רבתי עם, *the populated city*, with the solitary individual, the בודד. The word ערירי has a different connotation. When Avraham said ⁸⁵מה תתן לי ואנכי הולך ערירי, Avraham was not complaining that he was friendless or lonely. Avraham was a נשיא אלוקים. He had many friends, many acquaintances. Numerous people clamored for his friendship. Rather, the word ערירי denotes metaphysical loneliness. It has the connotation of one who is uprooted, who has been severed from his past and has foreclosed his future. Avraham was concerned with the future, בן משק ביתי יורש אותי. Avraham was concerned that he was childless and had no future. To ensure one's future, to drive away and extinguish the feeling of ערירות, one must identify both with the *bris* of the past and the *bris* of the future, with both the roots and the branches. One is prompted to engage in *cheshbon hanefesh* after being reminded of this dual *bris*.

(48) In prior generations, people were motivated to conduct a *cheshbon hanefesh* and analyze each of their deeds and misdeeds. Modern man is less able to do this. He does not have the time for introspection nor the capacity for self analysis. He cannot write a commentary on his life. He is drugged and senseless. He is insensitive to his life's failures. People try to forget themselves and their worries by denial, by burying their heads in the sand and allowing life to pass them by. *Yahadus* does not tolerate indifference. *Yahadus* charges the Jew to engage in a *cheshbon hanefesh*, to determine whether or not, and how strongly, he is linked to the past, and whether his progeny will adhere to the Judaic tradition. When one stands during *Neilah* and states מה אנו, מה חיינו, מה צדקותנו, מה ישועתנו ומותר האדם מן הבהמה אין כי, he confesses that he has severed his links to the past and has extinguished his *bris* with the future. Such a person senses הכל הבל. He is indistinguishable from the animals who too have no *bris*, no link with either the past or the future.

During *Neilah*, a Jew must engage in *cheshbon hanefesh* and acknowledge his worthlessness. He must uncover his roots. It is never too late to return to one's past, regardless of age, regardless of status. One who both returns to his past and seals a pact with his future, will be assured of the *kapparah* of *Yom Kippurim*.

תושלביע

⁸⁵ בראשית (ט"ו, ב).

דרשה על הגיונו של אדם
מאת הגרי"ד הלוי סולובניציק זצלה"ה
שבט, תשל"א
נרשם ונערך על ידי ברוך דוד שרייבר¹

The purpose of creation was the birth of man

(1) This *drasha* seeks to provide an epistemological analysis of the nature of man.

The Torah tells us in the second chapter of *Beraishis*:²

אלה תולדות השמים והארץ בהבראם.

This text lends itself to a dual interpretation. *Rashi* writes:

אלה האמורים למעלה
The Passuk details the items described above (i.e. in the first chapter of Genesis).

According to *Rashi*, the *Passuk* is translated as follows:

These are the creations or the productions of heaven and earth.

Thus, the term תולדות refers to the various creations discussed in general by the Torah in the first chapter and which are here categorized into two classes: heaven and earth. According to *Rashi*, this *Passuk* serves as the concluding *Passuk* of the previous chapter. It refers to the events or the creations recorded in the first chapter which occurred during the six days and which led to the creation of the universe (i.e. the שמים וארץ).

(2) R' S.R. Hirsch disagrees. He notes that in Biblical semantics the word תולדות generally refers to results, not to causes; to developments, not to origins. The term תולדות has the connotation of offspring, of generations begotten, rather than of ancestry. R' Hirsch, therefore, suggests that the phrase אלה תולדות השמים וארץ בהבראם is translated in the following fashion:

These are the developments of heaven and earth after they had been created.

Unlike *Rashi*, who interprets אלה תולדות as referring to the emergence of the universe, R' Hirsch translates אלה תולדות as relating to the story of the universe after its creation.

¹ In order to preserve the tenor of this *drasha*, I have retained the first person tense used by the Rav.

² בראשית (ב', ד'). The succeeding paragraphs translate and explain this *passuk*.

According to R' Hirsch, the *Passuk* is not to be taken as the conclusion of the story of creation recorded in the first chapter, but as the beginning of a new story which the Torah is about to describe in the second chapter.

If the *passuk* is related, not to the previous chapter, but to the ensuing chapter, to whom specifically does the phrase תולדות refer? Which developments does the Torah discuss in this chapter? The answer is provided in the next *Passukim*, in which the Torah immediately begins to relate the story of man of Adam and Eve, for whose sake the world was created. In other words, the Torah tells us that the purpose of creation is to be found in man.

(3) One may ask: Why does the Torah tell us the story of the emergence of the universe? After all, the Torah's description is both mysterious and fragmented. Clearly, the description of the emergence of the universe was related in order to enable the Torah to tell us the more important story with which the Torah was primarily concerned, namely, the story of man. The story of heaven and earth, of the emergence of organic life, is merely an introduction to the more exciting story of man, his growth, his development, his victories and defeats, his wise, as well as absurd, decisions and deeds. With the beginning of the second chapter, the Torah concludes its narrative regarding the emergence of the physical universe and focuses its attention upon the תולדות, upon man, the objective of creation.

(4) The Torah dramatically portrays the dreariness and the desolation of a world without man. That world was desolate even though everything else had already been created. The Torah writes:³

וְכָל עֵשֶׂב הַשָּׂדֶה טָרָם יֵצֵא, כִּי לֹא הִמְטִיר ה' אֱלֹהִים עַל הָאָרֶץ
וְאָדָם אֵין לְעִבּוֹד אֶת הָאֲדָמָה.

The vegetation had not yet sprouted since G-d had not yet caused it to rain. Man was lacking and no one was capable of plowing the field.

The Torah tells us in simple but very meaningful words that the earth was uncultivated, since there was no one to till the ground. Apparently the Torah is of opinion that man is indispensable in this world. *Rashi* explains that *Hakadosh Baruch Hu* was not in need of man merely to cultivate the ground; the ground could have yielded its produce without

³ בראשית (ב"ה, ה')

man's interventions if *Hakadosh Baruch Hu* had so willed it. Rather, the earth was barren because man had not yet prayed for rain. *Hakadosh Baruch Hu* created man in order for him to pray. Apparently, nature without man is an absurdity. G-d harkens to the joyous song of successful man as well as to the shrieks of tortured man, suffering in agony. The phrase *יָנַח אֱדָם*, *man was lacking*, thus denotes the absence, not of working man, but of praying man. *Hakadosh Baruch Hu* wanted and longed to engage man in conversation. Only with the arrival of man, did *Hakadosh Baruch Hu* begin to give rain and show His concern for the world.

(5) Within this frame of reference, we understand why the Torah deems it necessary to repeat the story of the creation of man in the second chapter. The Bible critics made much of that repetition but failed to notice that the two stories supplement each other. The Torah retells the story of man in order to reveal a new aspect of man, indispensable for one's understanding of man's paradoxical history.

In the first chapter, the Torah narrates the origin of man within the context of the cosmic drama. Man appears as the final phase in the emergence of the physical universe. The Torah does mention, of course, in the first account that man was created in the image of G-d and that he was charged by his Maker with the task of controlling and ruling his environment. The position of man within the drama of universal creation as contained in the first chapter is a peripheral one, not a central one. Five and a half days were assigned to the emergence of the physical world, and only one half of the sixth day was assigned to the formation of man. The story in the first chapter, far from suggesting the anthropocentric teleology that man is the purpose of the world, has man appearing merely as one of the many creatures within the cosmic world order. Though capable, skilled and wise, nevertheless, man is only a creature.

In order that man be affixed in the center of the cosmic drama, he must become more than a creature. In the second chapter, the Torah moves man from the periphery to the center, by telling us that man is the objective of creation, and that as long as man was absent from this world, G-d did not cause it to rain or allow vegetation to grow.

(6) Having stated man's centrality in the second chapter, the Torah engages immediately in a narration of events and tells us the story of man, of the opportunities

which were offered to him, of his rebellion and ingratitude, his punishment and despair, the blessings which were bestowed upon him, and the curse with which he was burdened.

In a word, the Torah tells us the strange story of man with all its curves and zigzag lines, of man's regressive movements and forward leaps. Man appears here in a new role, not as a being on the periphery of the Biblical narrative of the emergence of the cosmos, but as a history - making being, in the very center of the narrative.

(7) This new declaration of man is formulated in the second chapter in the *passuk*:⁴

וַיִּצַר ה' אֱלֹקִים אֶת הָאָדָם עֹפֶר מִן הָאֲדָמָה וַיִּפַּח בְּאַפָּיו נֶשְׁמַת רוּחַ חַיִּים. וַיְהִי אָדָם לְנֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה.

G-d created man from the earth. He infused man with a soul of life, and man emerged as a living creature.

אונקלוס translates the phrase לנפש חיה as רוח ממללא, *a spirit endowed with speech*. The declaration of man as a singular, precious historical being necessitates the retelling of the story of his origin since this explains the paradoxality and erraticism of his historical performance.

Man acts erratically since he is a dual being, possessed of two contradictory souls

(8) The question arises: Why does man betray his Maker at certain times, while acting with gallantry and courage on other occasions? Why does man often violate basic principles, while manifesting honesty and abiding loyalty in other instances? Why the strange twist of the road along which the historical being travels? Why has man acted erratically throughout history?

As a cosmic being, man portrayed in the first chapter provides no answer. As such, man should have acted uniformly, consistently, reasonably and simplistically. He should have marched straight forward, without retreating from heights conquered and without surrendering points of vantage seized at high cost. The Torah is, therefore, compelled to re-tell the story of creation. The second chapter portrays man as a historical being in order to provide the answer to all those questions. It is only in the second chapter that the Torah resolves the puzzle of why man is a paradoxical, strange being.

(9) What is the answer contained in the second chapter?⁵ I believe that the answer is implicit in one word, namely וַיִּצַר, *He created*. The word וַיִּצַר contains two יו"ד, unlike

⁴ בראשית (בי, ז) (ז).

the ordinary spelling of that word with one יי"ד. *Chazal* explain that the additional letter יי"ד symbolizes duality; it denotes that man is a dual being. *Chazal* add:⁶

שתי יצירות: יצירה בעולם הזה, ויצירה בעולם הבא.
G-d created two worlds, the herein world and the world to come.

Man is a dual being in whom two souls abide. The Almighty allowed man to share in a double existential experience. Two personae accompany man like two ever-trailing shadows, each offering him an identity and a sense of belonging.

Man constantly struggles to ascertain which nature he should identify with. He asks himself whose offer he should accept and whose offer he should reject. This problem confronted man at the dawn of creation and still confounds man in modern times. Quite often, man is perplexed, not knowing with which nature to identify and to whom to pledge allegiance. This ontological duality⁷ continues throughout generations to haunt all human aspirations, decisions and actions. This duality is the primary reason for man's clumsy and cumbersome performance throughout history.

(11) *Yahadus* was the first to examine the dual creation of man. The duality is expressed, not only by the word וייצר, but in many other passages of the Torah.

Some scholars argue that *Yahadus* was not the first, and certainly not the only one, which was aware of a schism in man, of a dual existence or a two-fold existential experience in man. Some argue, and correctly so perhaps, that both Greek philosophers, particularly Socrates and Plato, as well as Christian theologians, were aware of the schism in man, or what theologians refer to as the "inner contradiction in man" and that the inner contradiction and schism in man has, in fact, become the cornerstone of Christian theological anthropology.⁸ In truth, even a cursory reading of Plato, St. Augustine and others tends to confirm the validity of this argument.

(12) I believe, however, that the refutation of this argument is as follows.⁹ There are two basic distinctions between the Judaic anthropology and the Hellenistic tradition or

⁵ In order to explain the answer contained in the second chapter, I must change roles and become a *maggid*.

⁶ בראשית רבה (יי"ד, ב').

⁷ I will later explain how the duality asserts itself in psychological terms. But, at this point, I must stress that the original duality which splits man is metaphysical, and not psychological.

⁸ Socrates and Plato spoke of the disharmony in man and of the conflict between body and soul, between the *nous* and *soma*. The Christian theologians were also aware of the split in man, in the duality in his being.

⁹ I still insist that *Yahadus* was not only the first one, but the only one who recognized this schism.

Christian theology. Both Greek philosophy and Christian theology spoke of the division in man between body and soul. The duality expresses itself in the simple fact that man comprises both body, a physical reality, and soul, a spiritual reality. *Yahadus*, on the other hand, maintains that this demarcation between body and soul is not the cause of the human duality. Rather, the cause of the human duality originates in the fact that two souls abide in each human being. Unlike Christian theologians who espoused that the schism is a result of the merger between flesh and spirit, *Yahadus* maintains that the schism is the product of two existential experiences, both of which are contained within the spiritual dimension of man. This is the first distinction between the classical concept of human duality and that of *Yahadus*.

***Yahadus* maintains that the schism in man is a function of the Almighty's grand design, and not of sin**

(13) The second distinction is that both Greek philosophy and Christian theology consider the duality in man a curse, the product of sin. In their view, the ideal state of man would express itself, on the contrary, in existential monism, in unity. Only after man committed the original sin of man, and fell from G-d's grace, did this inner contradiction develop within man. Prior to the original sin, Adam was a monistic creature and enjoyed unity. Hence, they theorize that man is supposed to reject the body and accept the spirit and, by so doing, will be saved from the duality which haunts him. Plato regards death as an act of liberation of the *nous*, the intellect, from the *thumos*, the spirit, allowing the latter to ascend into the world of ideas. Similarly, Christian theologians spoke contemptuously of the physical world.

(14) *Yahadus* did not recognize the chasm dividing body from soul. The duality consists, in the opinion of *Yahadus*, not in the fissure of body and spirit, but within man's spiritual dimension. *Yahadus* maintains that man's spiritual awareness is a two-fold one. This schism and duality were implanted by the creative hand of G-d in man's very awareness, and this duality rules human nature in its most intimate and remote recesses.

(15) The ramifications of the human duality are enormous. Within that framework, *Yahadus* casts an inquiring eye upon the human historical drama, replete with surprises and paradoxes, and explains that these occurred simply because the hero of the drama is a

dual being. G-d willed and stamped the duality of man at creation. It is not something that arose after Adam sinned.

Man is possessed of a dual awareness; man can be either man-subject or man-object

(16) Let us analyze the human dual ontological awareness. How does this duality assert itself? Given that the duality is not to be identified with the body/soul conflict, what defines the conflict which runs through the entire gamut of the human spiritual personality?

In order to understand this duality, I must introduce a statement from the *Rambam*.¹⁰

The *Rambam* writes:¹¹

הקב"ה מכיר אמתו ויודע אותה כמות שהיא. ואינו יודע בדעה שהיא חוץ ממנו כמו שאנו יודעים. שאין אנו ודעתנו אחד. אבל הבורא הוא ודעתו וחיייו אחד מכל צד ומכל פנה. שאלמלא הייה חי בחיים ויודע בדעה (חוץ ממנו) היו שם אלהות הרבה, הוא וחיייו ודעתו. ואין הדבר כן, אלא אחד מכל צד ומכל פנה ובכל דרך ייחוד. נמצאת אתה אומר הוא היודע, והוא הידוע והוא הדעה עצמה הכל אחד... ולפיכך אומרים חי פרעה וחי נפשך, ואין אומרים חי ה' אלא חי ה', שאין הבורא וחיייו שנים כמו חיי הגופים החיים...

Hakadosh Baruch Hu perceives His true being and knows it as it is, not with a knowledge extraneous to Himself, as is our knowledge. For our knowledge and ourselves are separate and distinct. But as for the Creator, Baruch Hu, His knowledge and His life are one, in all aspects, from every point of view, and however we conceive unity . . . If the Creator's knowledge and His life were extraneous to Him, there would be a plurality of deities, namely, He Himself, His life, and His knowledge. This, however, is not the case.

Hence, we conclude that G-d is the one who knows. He is the one who is known, and He is knowledge itself. All of these being one. He is one in every aspect, and in all ways in which unity is conceived. Scripture accordingly says, "By the life of Pharaoh," "By the life of my soul," but not "By the life of the Almighty." The phrase employed by Scripture is "As G-d lives," because the Creator and His

¹⁰ It is a very difficult passage, and we will not analyze it completely. I will isolate one idea from this passage. Without it, we cannot understand human duality, what it comprises or how it asserts itself.

¹¹ פ"ב מהלכות יסודי התורה ח"י The translation was provided by the Rav.

*life are not dual, as is the case with the life of living bodies or separate intelligences.*¹²

(17) I cannot explain the whole passage, but the basic idea which I wish to isolate is the lodestar of this lecture. The *Rambam* explains that the grammatical division into subject and object is not applicable as far as the Almighty is concerned. He reasons that this grammatical schism, if employed vis-à-vis G-d, would contradict the principle of His absolute unity.

(18) I will attempt to explain the *Rambam's* theory. Any logical judgment (or grammatical sentence) presupposes both: (i) a subject-knower who knows or attempts to gain knowledge of an object, as well as (ii) an object to be studied. All logical judgments or propositions presuppose a subject-knower, who quests for knowledge, as well as an object to be known by that subject. When I engage in a cognitive act, when I try to make a logical judgment, I encounter something which stands opposite me. If I want to say "This is a microphone," the microphone is the object, and I am the subject. The microphone is not part of me; it confronts me. There is a certain state of defiance between object-subject.¹³ I must probe into the object and ascertain its nature, behavioral patterns and so forth. Any cognitive gesture is related to the outside, to an alien object, to something extraneous. For example, when I say, "The table is painted brown," I am the subject-knower, who performs the act of cognition towards an extraneous object (i.e. the table).

(19) Regarding judgments about the external world, the grammatical-logical division of subject/object is self-evident. However, the situation changes when we shift from the knowledge of things and events outside of ourselves to self-knowledge. For instance, when I say, "My eyesight is very poor," I immediately remove myself from my optical organ, the eye. I am the knower. I am the subject who renders judgment about an object which is no longer identified with me. I am the knower; the eye is the object to be known. The very moment that I express my belief that my eyesight is poor or good, the eye is objectified. It has been severed from me both epistemologically and logically. It is not part of me since, by definition, the knower and the known can never merge. There is

¹² Interestingly, the *פרו תניי* quotes this passage and notes that the *Kabbalists* completely concur with this view.

¹³ The Latin word *objectus* denotes disapproval; the word *obicere* means to oppose.

always a gap, a chasm, separating the knower and the known, even though, physically, the eye is an integral organ of my body. Similarly, I can objectify my entire body. I can say something about my hands and legs. By doing so, I, subject-knower, separate myself from my body. The body thereby becomes an object of my inquiry and, as such, is no longer a part of me.

The I-subject analyzes the objectified I-object

(20) Since the process of knowing presupposes the alienation of the object from the subject, it is self-evident that the logical judgment relating to self-knowledge may also encompass one's entire personality, his soul, his I-awareness. For example, when one states, "I think. I am sad. I rejoice," then, immediately, the I-knower, the one who formulates the judgment, estranges himself from the I who does the thinking, from the melancholy I who is overcome by grief or from the enthusiastic I who is intoxicated with ecstasy. As soon as one makes a statement about himself, his self is objectified, severed and removed from him. Likewise, when one states, "I exist," he effects a total separation of the I-object from the I-subject who makes that statement. The I-subject is the one who judges, explores, and confronts defiantly the self objectified I.

(21) Since cognition is always an encounter between the I and the non-I, there is no genuine self-knowledge. When one attempts to engage in self-knowledge, the judgment which he forms will be related, not to the I who engages in self-knowledge, but to the non-I about whom he makes certain judgments. There can be no self-knowledge or self-awareness in the full sense. The subject/object confrontation in each logical performance is inevitable. Whatever one knows about himself belongs to a self who has severed his bonds and estranged himself from a self who stands opposite him and states, "I am I-object, and you are I-subject." This estrangement of the I-subject from the I-object is a basic principle of medieval philosophical theory.

***Hakadosh Baruch Hu* is both subject and object**

(22) Of course, the rule that every act of self cognition splits the personality into an object to be known and into a subject who seeks knowledge, cannot be applied to *Hakadosh Baruch Hu*. That rule would, if applied to *Hakadosh Baruch Hu*, contradict

His unity as well as His omniscience. According to the *Rambam*, this is the greatest mystery regarding *Hakadosh Baruch Hu*, namely, that there is no division into subject/object. *Hakadosh Baruch Hu* knows Himself as a subject and not as an object. Any severance between the I-subject and I-object would contradict אחדות הבורא. As the *Rambam* writes:¹⁴

שאלמלא הייה... יודע בדעה חוץ ממנו, היו שם אלוהות
הרבה.

*If Hakadosh Baruch Hu would know Himself as someone
extraneous to Himself, there would be many deities.*

With respect to *Hakadosh Baruch Hu*, הוא היודע, *He is the subject*, and at the same time, והוא הידוע, *He is the object*. Moreover, והוא היודע עצמו, *Hakadosh Baruch Hu's self-knowledge is truly self-knowledge*. Man's self-knowledge is an illusion. We do not know ourselves. We know somebody who has separated himself from ourselves.

The *Rambam* concludes that the human mind cannot comprehend this facet of the divine existence.

The bifurcation between man-subject and I-object is a reality

(23) Many logicians contend that the estrangement and alienation of the object from the subject is formal and can be understood only in terms of abstract epistemology. *Yahadus*, however, was of the opinion that this duality is not only of grammatical and epistemological significance; it is an experiential duality as well. The schism between I-subject and I-object is not only a mere grammatical split, not only an abstract division, not only an epistemological analysis; it is a reality. Man is divided into I-subject and I-object. Whatever is true in grammar, in epistemology, projects onto an ontology of man, onto a metaphysic of man. The bifurcation of man, the duality of the I-subject and I-object, influences human behavior, ethics and emotions. It serves as the guiding force in the development of human history.

Man-object is evaluated solely in relation to the outside world

(24) Man's duality expresses itself both at the metaphysical as well as at the psychological levels. As described in the first chapter of creation, man is a member of

¹⁴ Ibid.

the objective order. He is a cosmic being. He is enmeshed in the scheme of things and events. Man's awareness that he is a component of the cosmological system, united with his environment and the astro-worlds, embraces both his body and soul. Everything in man solidifies into a complete tangible here-and-now reality. By gazing at himself, man transforms the ever-changing *morphē* into "thinghood." He experiences himself as an object, as an objective being. Man-object engages in outgoing movement towards an order which is external to him. He is bent on receiving messages from an external world. The content of those impressions and messages, classified and interpreted by man-object's nervous system and intellect, is the *élan vital* of his existential experiences.

(25) When man-object thinks of himself, he does not think of his inwardness. Man-object has no introspection. He does not think of his inner core or of his essence. Rather, he thinks of himself in relation to the outside world, his friends and household, his political career, disease and certain forces rampant in the world. He is afraid of external things, of things which are outside of him. The content of his consciousness, of his awareness, consists exclusively of messages he receives from the outside world, transmitted to him through his nervous system, through his sensory and auditory input and so forth. But, the content of his awareness consists exclusively of messages conveyed to him by his external environment.

"Thinghood" is marked by both vacuity and interrelatedness

(26) There are two distinctive traits which mark the existential order of "thinghood." Firstly, openness due to vacuity. Secondly, responsiveness within the system. These two traits will each be analyzed.¹⁵

(27) The first trait of thinghood is that all things are observable. The essence of all things within the objective order is exposed either to the naked eye or to some sophisticated precision instrument. By definition, things lack inward dimension. They are characterized by outwardness and externality. A thing has no depth. The thing exists only at its surface. A thing has no existential center, no inner core.¹⁶ Likewise, each

¹⁵ The significance of these metaphysical statements will become apparent when they are translated into psychological terms in Paragraph 48, *infra*.

¹⁶ As noted in Paragraph 27, *infra*, a thing may possess a core in physical terms. However, in metaphysical terms, a thing lacks substance.

thing is merely an aggregate of many little things. It has no unity, no centrality. The thing consists of an infinite number of planes, each of which is merely a product of other two-dimensional things.

(28) From an epistemological viewpoint, all things are knowable. The outskirts of the cosmos, the flying nebulae, are all knowable. Though nature often codes its messages in puzzling ways, nonetheless, from an epistemological viewpoint, everything is comprehensible. There is not a single streak of paradoxality or irrationality which precludes one's comprehension of the world of thinghood. As emphasized, the thing has no hiding place; its surface existence is exposed to the public. There is no ontological privacy to the thing.

In conclusion, the first distinctive mark of the existential order of things, in contradistinction to the existence of man, is that things lack a core and are, therefore, exposed to view and observation.

(29) There is a second important characteristic of the existence of a thing, of an object. The reality of a thing is defined by interrelatedness. There are no lonely things. Things do not exist in isolation, but within a system, an all inclusive order, namely, the cosmic drama. Each thing is a prisoner of an order of thinghood. It can never liberate itself from that captivity. Within the system, the thing responds to stimulation; certain events provoke action and involve the thing in the dynamics of the system. However, things lack initiative and drive. Things are merely passive members of a system of matter and energy which often precipitate the things' reaction and reactivity. Hence, the reality of thinghood is manifested solely through its responsiveness to the system.

For example, I say, "The table exists." The existence of the table expresses itself in two ways. First, it occupies space; otherwise it would not exist. Second, the table exists solely as a component of the coordinate system known as space. It exists because it is interrelated within the system of the gravitational field. It exists because it exerts pressure on my nerves. My optic nerve is stimulated by the table reflecting light, and so forth and so on. The table does not exist in isolation.

In conclusion, the existence of thinghood expresses itself first in openness, due to its vacuity and emptiness, to its lack of a central core of dimension of depth, and second,

by interrelatedness. Things do not exist as isolated entities. They exist solely as part of a very powerful system, the system of things.

Chazal teach that the world was created with the letter ה"א to denote the effortlessness of G-d's creation

(30) Interestingly, *Chazal*¹⁷ comment on the *passuk*.¹⁸

אלה תולדות השמים והארץ בהבראם – בה"א בראם.
Heaven and earth were created with the letter ה"א.

(31) The letter ה"א was chosen for two reasons. First, the letter ה"א has a guttural sound. It is emitted solely by exhalation. The ה"א, thus, denotes the effortlessness of creation. The world came into existence when *Hakadosh Baruch Hu* כביכול exhaled. *Hakadosh Baruch Hu* did not expend any effort or engage in any performance. *Hakadosh Baruch Hu's* mere exhalation summoned the world into existence. In אקדמות, the author poetically writes:

באתא קלילא דלית בה מששותא.
*With a light letter, which is not concrete at all, He called
the world into existence.*

“Thing-hood” is marked by both vacuity and interrelatedness

(32) The letter ה"א has a second aspect. It is merely a surface, a plane, which is surrounded and bounded on three sides. There is no hidden essence to the ה"א, other than its mathematical measurements of length multiplied by width. Hence, the statement בראם בה"א means that the world of thing-hood, the world of objects, has merely a surface existence, just as the ה"א. The world is of a numerical quantitative nature. There is no quality to it, no content. A plane is a geometrical area, the product of simple multiplication. The plane, the ה"א, conceals nothing, contains no enigma or paradox and has no depth.

Man-thing is also vacuous and open

(33) In light of this analysis, man-thing is also constituted as a surface being. He lacks content. He has no inner core. His ontological awareness, his “I” consciousness, his

¹⁷ מסכת מנחות דף כ"ט ע"ב.

¹⁸ בראשית (בי, די).

existential experience, is at best very tenuous and slim. There is no thickness, no centrality, and no focus, to his existential experience. The latter is plain, open and vacuous.

I have often encountered a very strange phenomena in modern society.¹⁹ There is a certain openness to modern man. He has no modesty. Modern man will often publicly discuss intimate details of his life. Somehow, he is not embarrassed to pick up subjects or discuss topics or problems which should belong in the realm of his private intimate life. Modern man lacks צניעות, *modesty*.

This is so because modesty entails concealment. Modern man, however, is basically a man-thing. He experiences himself as a thing, as an object, as something concrete. As a man-thing, he has no inwardness. He consists merely of a certain number of planes. Everything about him is on the surface. Thus, there are no secrets. There is no privacy. There are no intimate phases in modern man's life.

That is why modern man is burdened with the curse of pornography. Pornography has existed since man was created. It as ancient as man himself and results from man's degenerate imagination. Modern pornography is unique in that the legislatures wish to legalize it. Powerful rampant forces in our society assert that the prohibition against pornographic literature is in conflict with constitutional liberties, with free speech. This phenomena has occurred since modern man experiences himself as man-thing, as man-object, and is, thus, open and vacuous.

Man-thing is evaluated by his contributions to society since things are marked by interrelatedness

(34) Man-object leads an open existence geared to multiple tasks. Modern man-thing, man-object, regards himself as a worker, as a producer of goods, as someone who is duty bound and born for one task only, to contribute his share to society. He is evaluated in terms of his accomplishments. Man-thing is a worker; אדם לעמל יולד. His existence exhausts itself in enriching society. Of course, the more goods he produces, the more diligent a worker he is, the more involved he is in the dynamics of society, the more

¹⁹ The term "modern" refers to the entire twentieth century and even to the latter half of the nineteenth century.

visible and the more conspicuous he becomes.²⁰ The greater his accomplishments, the greater his value.²¹

There is no other criterion since man-thing's existence is characterized, in addition to vacuity, by his interrelatedness, by his being a coordinate within a system, by being a part of something. There is no isolation in the world of things.

Man-thing is reactive, not proactive

(35) Man-thing's understanding of his awareness consists exclusively of the impressions he receives from the outside world. He has no introspection, no self knowledge. Man-object is not a creator of ideas. He receives messages from the world. Of course, with the aid of his nervous system and intellect, he classifies those messages and applies the knowledge he has accumulated to make his position firmer and produce a better quality of goods. However, his awareness does not consist of ideas originating in his mind. Man-object's awareness is on the receiving end. He is not productive. He receives and possibly even improves ideas. But, he is just a recipient, not a giver.

(36) In this context, the individual is completely forgotten. Man-thing can not exist in isolation. He lacks dignity and self worth, since he exists, not per se, but as a contributing member of a system, society, race or class. Whatever is visible through the medium of accomplishment is worthwhile and justified. Whatever is hidden, closed or intangible is non-existent.

(37) In other words, whenever an individual looks upon himself as a thing, submission to society is a foregone conclusion. Modern man does not believe in a soul at all. He looks upon himself only as a body. His I-awareness is an awareness of a physique, and not of a spiritual reality. Of course, as a body, he belongs to the world of things. To exist, is identical with his ability to work. As a matter of fact, political sovereignty is nurtured by the idea of man-object, of man-thing, whose own legitimacy is inherent, not in him,

²⁰ As noted, man-thing's existence consists of being open, observable and conspicuous.

²¹ From the viewpoint of man-object, as an experiential reality, in which man regards himself as a thing, as an object, the Marxist theory of productive man emerges. According to Marxism, man who is not productive forfeits his dignity. Man is supposed to produce material goods in order to enrich society. The entire philosophical anthropology of Marxism is that of man-thing, of man-object, of man being just a producer of goods. Man-object externalizes himself, objectifies himself, goes out toward the order and becomes a part of the system. Man-object is interrelated with others, and his existence is a façade, lacking an inner core.

but in his usefulness to a system. There is no individual independence within the state. This is true, not only of the corporate state, but of the most advanced political democracies, and even of those which have introduced basic civil liberties. The interests of the individual are always subordinated to those of the system, of society. All democracies in human annals have suspended human freedoms and human rights during times of crises. Why? Because the individual is irrelevant if the state is in danger. Man-thing is not just a figment of one's imagination but is a reality. Man's reduction to thing-hood may lie at the root of our modern day troubles, of humankind's modern crisis.

In conclusion, man-thing, though clever, intelligent and technologically advanced, is nonetheless merely a thing.

Modern man's confusion is a result of his reduction to thing-hood

(38) The confusion and complexities of the modern world are due partly to modern man's identification with the order of thing-hood, with an existence which expresses itself in vacuity, emptiness and desolation, with an existence which is reduced and defines itself in terms of material success, such as elaborate homes, multiple cars, jewelry, and paintings.

Apparently, however, modern man is not satisfied with being a thing. He wants to be something else, somebody else, more than just a thing. Typical of the man-thing ontology, is the Platonic theory of conceptual universalism that theorizes that a class exists and that the individual is just a shadow and is essentially nonexistent. It teaches that the *telos* of man-thing is to be found, not within him, but outside of him, within the system. Perhaps that is why some people today, both young and old, are perplexed. They want the existential goal of man to be found within man and not outside of man.

The characteristics which define man-thing

(39) There are numerous characteristics of man-thing. Since man-thing's very existential experience is not an individual one but is interwoven into the fabric of a system or society, he does not exercise much individual freedom. I am not referring to political freedom, about the right to vote or to elect leaders, but about metaphysical ethical freedom. The thinking of man-thing consists in acting, reacting, and complying

with definitive collective patterns designed and approved by a system, by society. Man-thing belongs to an establishment, no matter how discredited it may be. He accepts everything that is in vogue. The judgments and values are not his, nor unique to him. They belong to an all-embracing system, to the establishment.

Man-thing is not revolutionary. He believes that humankind is progressing slowly, gradually, in an evolutionary process that may take a millennium. Man-thing is fair, but not kind. He is honest, but not compassionate. He cherishes justice, but knows very little of love. He will help his fellow man, but without inwardly sharing the travails and misery of the unfortunate person to whom he extends help. His very being is outward oriented. He sees just the crust of reality. He never tries to penetrate into the inner core of reality. He is neither curious nor very precise. He has an understanding for detail since he is an exact being, but he knows nothing of the innumerable worlds of individual conception. He is concerned with just one world, namely, the world of thing-hood.

(40) *Chazal state:*²²

שתי יצירות, יצירה לעולם הזה ויצירה לעולם הבא
*G-d created two worlds, the herein world and the world to
come.*

The statement that G-d created man to live in this world denotes that G-d willed man to look upon himself as a thing, to become part of the natural cosmic order, and experience his rootedness in the soil of this world. The foregoing is the image projected by man-thing, as a reality, as an existential experience.

G-d ingrained the persona of man-subject in each person

(41) There is another person, a second existential experience, namely, man-subject. In contradistinction to man-thing, who is merely part of a system, man-subject is an intangible figure, remote from the scheme of thing-hood and phenomenal reality. Man-subject is present in the world of thing-hood, however, at the same time, does not completely belong to it. Man-subject is not really part of this world of activity. Though entangled among thing and events, he nevertheless feels from time to time as a stranger who is lonesome for his real home. At times, man transcends his own concreteness and thing-hood, and finds himself in the embrace of another reality, the reality of I-subject.

²² בראשית רבה (י"ד, ב').

The I-subject is a reality which cannot be defined. It is not a thing. The "I" is not something anymore. It is not a concrete reality, possessing gravity, stimulating the optical nerves. There is something in man which can never be caught in the crucible of objectification or converted into objectivity, into a thing.

The Ramban compares man-subject and man-object to the halachic concepts of שבועות and נדרים respectively

(42) The Ramban²³ describes the man-subject personality. He writes,

ואמר כי הוא נפח באפיו נשמת חיים להודיע... כי הוא רוח השם הגדול מפיו דעת תבונה. כי הנופח באפי אחר מנשמתו יתן בו... כי היא מיסוד הבינה... והוא מאמרם בספרי: נדרים, כנשבע בחיי המלך, שבועות, כנשבע במלך עצמו. ואע"פ שאין ראייה לדבר זכר לדבר, חי ה' וחי נפשך...

*This is the breath of the Almighty. Out of His mouth, we learn wisdom and intelligence. Whoever blows a breath into the nostrils of another, gives that person a part of his breath. That is what is stated in the Sifri. Whoever takes a vow is likened to one who swears by the life of the king. Whoever takes an oath, is equal to one who swears by the king Himself.*²⁴

The Ramban emphasizes that the *passuk* of נשמת חיים ויפח באפיו alludes to the principles of נדרים and שבועות, *vows and oaths*. נדר, an איסור חפצא, applies to man-thing, to man-object. שבועות, an איסור גברא, applies to man-subject, to I-subject. The Ramban concludes with the analogy of חי ה' וחי נפשך. He explains that G-d created man as a dual being, as both an object and as a subject, as both a thing and as an intangible personality. That division asserts itself in the halachic distinction between נדר and שבועה.²⁵

(43) At this juncture, we are confronted with man-subject whose existence differs markedly from that of man-object. Man-subject is not open. He is clandestine. He is elusive. Man-subject is not a member of an establishment. He is an individual. Man-subject does not suffer from existential boredom. Gone is the uniformity and the monotony of being to which the order of thing-hood is exposed. The existence of man-subject is unbounded, uncharted. It is intangible and mysterious. Whereas man-object is

²³ בראשית (בי, ז) זי.

²⁴ This translation was provided by the Rav.

²⁵ As noted, in paragraph 16, *supra*, the Rambam concurs with this theory as well.

an open book, man-subject can hide himself, disguise himself. He is not exposed to the inquiring eye.

(44) The Torah tells us:²⁶

ויתחבא האדם ואשתו מפני ה' אלוקים... ויקרא ה' אלוקים אל
האדם ויאמר לו איכה.
*Man and his wife, Eve, hid themselves before the
Almighty....G-d called unto man and asked him, "Where
are you?"*

Didn't *Hakadosh Baruch Hu*, the omnipotent, omniscient Lord of the universe, know where Adam and Eve were? Obviously, G-d's question was not asked on behalf of just Adam. G-d's question of איכה was raised on behalf of countless future generations, on behalf of the millennia of anticipated human history. "Where are you, and who are you?" Man is a mystery not only to his fellow man; he is also a mystery to himself. Whenever confused man addresses himself and asks איכה, "Where are you?", he merely imitates the words of the Almighty at the dawn of creation and human history.

Man in western civilization has forgotten the איכה. Man has allowed himself to be deceived by man-thing and has forgotten to ask איכה. He has, therefore, fallen to the brink of an abyss.

***Chazal* declare that עולם הבא was created with the letter יו"ד, a dimensionless point**

(45) Quite noteworthy is the second interpretation provided by *Chazal*.²⁷ They state that עולם הבא was created with the letter יו"ד, while עולם הזה was created with the letter ה"י. The letter יו"ד is dimensionless. The single point, per se, does not represent anything. It lacks thing-hood. It lacks reality, and it certainly lacks concreteness. Nonetheless, though the point, per se, is very elusive, it is the origin of all geometric figures. Ancient mathematicians asserted that by merely moving the point, one creates a line, and by thereafter moving the line, one creates a plane. Though intangible, dimensionless, imperceptible and unobservable, without the point, the geometric world cannot exist. The point cannot be explained, cannot be described, and cannot be

²⁶ בראשית (ג', ח')

²⁷ מסכת מנחות דף כ"ט ע"ב.

measured. It is not a concrete object at all. Yet, it is what some term the *archē*, the origin, the מקור, the *beraishis* of everything. The Kabbalists²⁸ refer to the point as:

נקודה קדמאה דלית מחשבתא תפיסה ביה.

The origin that the human mind is not able to place within any frame of reference or within any frame of thing-hood.

The discursive thinking of man has no categories to accommodate anything dimensionless, a something which is nothing. Yet, this nothing, this unreality, is the *archē* of reality.

Man-subject is defined as an intangible point

(46) The human I-subject, the human personality, is similar to the dimensionless point. Unlike the I-object, the I-subject has no dimension. It is not perceptible. *Chazal*²⁹ describe the *neshama* as נראה ואינו נראה, *the invisible reality*. If reality is defined as something which is interrelated within a system, something observable, something which stimulates the optic and acoustic nerves, something which can be touched, something which is extended in space and included within the coordinate system, then the I-subject is not real. Yet, the thing-hood of I-object cannot be imagined unless it is supported by I-subject.

(47) The awareness of man-object, man-thing, asserts itself in concrete symbols (i.e. "I exist because I move my finger; I exist because I touch my hand; I exist because I feel my forehead"). The awareness of man-subject is more difficult to describe. The awareness of man-subject comes to expression in his questing for something unknown to him, in his longing and yearning for something more beautiful, more sublime and more exalted. Man-object, on the other hand, does not quest for the impossible. He is very realistic. He is very precise. Unlike man-subject, he does not behold visions.

The psychological image projected by man-thing

(48) Let us analyze the descriptive psychology of man-subject. The psychological image that man-subject projects is completely different than the image of man-object or man-thing. In fact, it is the very antithesis of what objectified man strives for. Man-

²⁸ See, e.g. זוהר פרק א' (בראשית) דף מ"ט ע"א.

²⁹ מסכת ברכות דף י" ע"א

subject has inwardness. There is an existential inner core to him. He is not satisfied with a mere surface existence, with a vacuous reality. He thinks primarily in pictures. He beholds beautiful visions. He is unique, to the extent of being misunderstood. At times, he defies clichés and even sacrosanct institutions if his sensitive soul discerns hypocrisy in such clichés and institutions. He does not tolerate clichés nor grand eloquence. He is frank to the point of being discourteous. Unlike the emotions of man-thing, which have no roots and float upon the surface, man-subject's feelings are deep-seated. Neither man-thing's sadness, nor his joy, nor his hatred, nor his love, has any meaning. Today he is one's friend; tomorrow he is one's enemy.³⁰

Vacillation is characteristic of man-object whose symbol is א"ח, but not of man-subject, whose symbol is ט"ו, the dimensionless point. Man-subject's emotions are deep seated, consuming and, at times, violent and overwhelming. To him, the idea is everything; the word is of no significance. He enjoys a profoundly emotional life. To man-object, the opposite is true. The idea is nothing; only the word is important.

Man-subject is a visionary; man-object is a pragmatist

(49) Man-subject is not always fair, sometimes displaying extremism and even fanaticism. Man-object, on the other hand, is not a fanatic; he is not an extremist. Though not always fair, man-subject is often compassionate. He shares in the distress of his fellow man. He is not always just, but he is often seized by a great love and compassion. Unlike man-thing, whose sensations and impressions are accumulated gradually, man-subject's spiritual perception is abrupt. Contrary to man-thing, man-subject lacks precision and cannot employ the method of induction. However, he postulates and envisions the artistic, big stroke, performance. He lacks perceptivity for the detail, for the minutia. However, he is very sensitive to the grandeur of the whole, to the configuration, to the beautiful sweeping curves and straight lines ending in infinity. Contrary to man-thing, man-subject sees only the total design. Man-subject projects the outline, the grand conception, while man-thing fills in the details. Man-thing is sedate, self-righteous, and limited in his claims. Man-thing can distinguish between the possible

³⁰ Politicians would quip, "Be aware of your friends; they are your enemies of tomorrow."

and the impossible. Man-subject, on the other hand, is a visionary and quite often confuses the real with the unreal, the fantastic with the practical.

Man-subject employs postulated logic to maintain greatness

(50) The main distinction between man-subject and man-object concerns their logic. The logic of man-object, of man-thing, is an inductive, empirical logic. The task of man-thing's logic is to shield man from those practical blunders which can contribute to his defeat. The logic of man-subject is completely different. He takes advice, not from an empirical logic, but from an *a priori* postulated logic. This protects him, not from practical blunders, not from practical errors, but from that which may result in his loss of greatness. The *a priori* postulated logic is actually a logic of the pure non-practical will, a will which has its own reason and rules.

The highest authority for man-object is reason. The highest authority for man-subject is the will. Man-object is reasonable and rational; man-subject is voluntaristic, driven by a primordial will, governed by its own reason and logic.

***Yahadus* has accepted the roles of both man-subject and man-object as the grand design of G-d**

(51) *Yahadus* has adopted a unique attitude towards the two personae which abide in each of us. *Yahadus* has accepted both images of man. *Yahadus* concedes that man is bound, that man is a thing, a reality and an object. *Yahadus*, however, also maintains that man is a non-reality, a subtle idea, an intangible and imperceptible point. The duality in man was designed by the Creator. Man must be constantly aware of his antithetic character. He should experience the ontological dialectics which are interwoven in his very essence. Man must at times act as man-object, but at other times must act as man-subject. He must sometimes act as a thing, but at other times must act as an intangible personality. The task of the Torah is to teach man when to act as man-thing and when to act as man-subject.

The first distinction between man-object and man-subject comes to expression in their divergent axiologies

(52) There are three distinctions between man-subject and man-object.

The first distinction between man-object and man-subject asserts itself in the axiology of the individual. Man-object does not understand the individual. The individual serves society, the class. The existence of the individual is justified solely by his interrelatedness with his fellow man, the establishment, the system. Man-subject, on the other hand, believes in the intrinsic worth of the individual human being, regardless of his contributions to society, regardless of his accomplishments. Man-subject maintains that man is a dignified being simply because he is man. Man-object disagrees. Man-object maintains that man is a dignified being only if he produces goods, if he is a creator. Man-object maintains that the system is the supreme authority, and the individual exists solely to serve the system.

Yahadus extols the intrinsic value of each individual

(53) *Yahadus*, on the other hand, speaks of the dignity of the individual, of his inner worth and centrality. The individual is a king, not subordinated to any caste, system or establishment. He is the one whom *Hakadosh Baruch Hu* fashioned in His image. The Torah tells the story of the creation of lonely man, of the emergence of just one individual, upon whom *Hakadosh Baruch Hu* bestowed His blessings, not to serve the multitude, but to realize himself the teleology of the single individual. The second chapter of creation teaches that the teleology and purpose of the individual is realized through man himself. It cannot be realized by something external to man, because when Adam was created, there was no one else other than him. Thus, the teleology of Adam, of the individual, can be found in only one place, namely, in Adam himself. *Chazal* write accordingly:³¹

למה נברא אדם יחידי? לאמר לך כל המקיים נפש אחת כאילו קיים
עולם מלא.

*Why was man created alone? To teach that one who saves
a single life is deemed to have rescued the entire world.*

This statement is a declaration of the dignity of the individual. At creation, G-d created one man, not a class, not a species, not a community, but one lonely man, in order to establish firmly the dignity and the worth of the individual.

³¹ מסכת סנהדרין דף ל"ז ע"א

(54) G-d, however, demonstrated His love for the individual not only at the time of creation, but also when He called upon man to establish a covenantal community. Had G-d willed, He could have established the covenantal community with hundreds of millions of people. He could have awakened all of mankind from its lethargic idolatrous slumber and summoned them to enter into a covenant with Him. He did not do so. G-d emphasized time and again that the covenantal society will be formed slowly, piecemeal, not by mass conversions, but by the gradual education of children and grandchildren. G-d again demonstrated His love for the individual at Mount Sinai, when He addressed Himself to the small community of 600,000 Jews. To emphasize the importance of the individual, He employed the singular grammatical form, and not the plural form.³² G-d wished to underscore that He was addressing Himself, not to the community, but to each individual member of the community. It was worthwhile for *Hakadosh Baruch Hu* to abandon the recesses and depths of infinity and transcendence and exercise *מדת הצמצום*, *self-contraction*, on a small mound in the desert, in order to teach the Torah to a single Jew.

The individual must not be swayed by the errors of the community

(55) The *Ramban*³³ remarks that the singular form was employed in the Decalogue in order to teach the individuals how to resist opposition on the part of society. In cases of general apostasy, the individual must remain steadfast in his faith and loyalty and abide by the will of G-d, notwithstanding that the majority of people have abandoned their commitment. The G-d-Israel union does not require a community; a single individual is sufficient.³⁴

(56) One who studies *Tanach* is often confronted by a strange portrayal of situations of despair. *Tanach* often describes how the community has become intoxicated and has gone berserk. It depicts a community lost in its own confusion. All norms are ignored, and any sense of responsibility is abandoned. The intoxicated crowd moves like a sleepwalker straight into a yawning abyss. In a matter of seconds, the wrath of the

³² The *Aseres Hadibros* are formulated in the singular: אשר הוצאתיך וכיו'.

³³ ספר נוראות הרב חיים (עמי 124) פירוש הרמב"ן לפי יתרו (וייט, ייט).

³⁴ There are numerous *halachos* which irrefutably establish that *Yahadus* believes in the dignity of the individual.

Almighty is about to strike and destroy the people, its history, past, present and future. At the eleventh hour, at the final moment, when the crowd is on the brink of descending into a bottomless abyss, one individual emerges and halts the community's mad rush towards extermination. That individual may be a prophet, a priest, a teacher. But he is only an individual and nothing but an individual. One lonely man. He is not a man-thing, but man-subject. Man-mystery halts the multitude before they plummet into the abyss. The individual tames the crowd. If not for him, there would be no Jewish nation.

The community has lost its birthright on many occasions throughout history. The charismatic individual who is, if I may coin the term, a crisis-personality, emerges and resolves the crisis. A crisis-personality, a chosen individual, a prophet and redeemer, intervenes and rescues the people. Moshe during the golden calf episode and during the מרגלים scandal, Eliyahu at *Har HaCarmel*, Ezra, *Chazal*, etc. Throughout history, man-subject has emerged time and again to rescue the community.

***Chazal* emphasize the individual's role in rescuing the Jewish people**

(57) The *Passuk* states:³⁵

ואף גם זאת בהיותם בארץ אויביהם לא מאסתים ולא געלתים
לכלותם להפר בריתי אתם, כי אני ה' אלוקיהם
*Yet, for all of that, when they are in the land of their
enemies, I will not reject them or abandon them to destroy
them, or break My covenant with them, for I am the Lord
their G-d.*

The *Gemara* comments:³⁶

לא מאסתים – בימי כורש, שהעמדתי להם עזרא.
*“I will not reject them” - When Cyrus announced that the
Jews were free to rebuild the Bais Hamikdash and return to
their homeland, I caused a man named Ezra to organize
their return to Zion.*

לא געלתים – בימי החשמונאים, שהעמדתי להם מתתיהו וחמשה
בניו.
*“Or abandon them” – I did not abandon them in the days
of the Chasmonaim. I provided them with Matisyahu and
his five sons, who had the courage to declare war on the
Syrians.*

³⁵ ויקרא (כ"ו, מ"ד).

³⁶ מסכת מגילה דף י"א ע"א.

לכלותם – בימי טיטוס, שהעמדתי להם רבי יוחנן בן זכאי.
"To destroy them" – During the destruction of the Second
Commonwealth, I caused to arise the personality of R'
Yochanan ben Zakai, who saved Yavneh and perpetuated
Yahadus.

Interestingly, the *Gemara* does not state that G-d's grace asserted itself in that the Jews were saved from many crisis and disasters, such as the Babylonian exile, their oppression by the Hellenists or the Haman conspiracy. Rather, the *Gemara* details the names of the individuals to whom the Almighty assigned the task of helping the people. Why? Isn't the mere fact that the Jewish people were saved in these crisis sufficient to demonstrate that G-d has not forsaken the Jews?

Apparently, the *Gemara* emphasizes that the great act of mercy and grace asserted itself, not only in the fact that the Jews survived, but also in the emergence of great leaders, of individuals who lead the people. Without those individuals, the people would never have survived. The I-subject plays an important role in Jewish history. I am inclined to say that, in some respects, the I-subject *makes* history. He is responsible for history. His role is that of a crisis personality.

***Yahadus* also demands that the individual sacrifice himself for the community**

(58) However, if we take a look at another document in Torah, we encounter the reverse opinion. We read about the challenge of Esther, who is summoned

לבא אל המלך לבקש על עמה...³⁷
*To appear before the King and to plead with him on behalf
of her people . . .*

When Esther informed Mordechai that her entry into the inner court would most probably result in her death, Mordechai rebuked her. He told her to risk her life and to ready herself for the supreme sacrifice. He exhorted her to attempt to enter the inner court even though the danger was obvious, and her chances of success very slim. Why was she supposed to sacrifice her life?

(59) We must infer that the Torah demands of the individual that he sacrifice himself for the community. This is just the opposite of what the Torah tells us about the creation of the individual man, about the conclusion of the covenant with the individual man and

³⁷ אסתר (ד', ח').

about the role of the individual during crisis. The Torah teaches that, notwithstanding the paramount role of the individual, the individual is worthless if the destiny of the community is at stake.

Even the great Moshe was told by the Almighty:

לך רד כי שחת עמך.³⁸
*Descend the mount since the people that you brought out of
the land of Egypt have become corrupt.*

The *Gemara*³⁹ explains that the Almighty told Moshe,

כלום נתתי לך גדולה אלא בשביל ישראל.
*I have given you distinction only for the sake of the Jewish
people, and not for your sake.*

The Almighty told Moshe, “You are great. You are charismatic. You are courageous, illustrious and a prophet. You are inspiring. But all of that is only for their sake and not for your sake.” At that instant, Moshe was excommunicated by the edict of the Heavenly Court.

Why? What did Moshe do to deserve such treatment? *Chazal* explain that Moshe had not committed any crime. Yet, something horrible happened to Moshe, something which was about to destroy Moshe’s position in Jewish history. He lost the people, and a leader who loses the people loses his greatness. He is excommunicated by the Almighty. (60) This is not the philosophy of man-subject. Man-subject finds the reason for his existence within himself. He does not need any community. Here the philosophy of man-object, of man-thing, comes to expression. The idea exists, but for the sake of somebody else, namely, the covenantal community, for the multitude of slaves who went berserk, who became intoxicated and proclaimed אלה אלוהך ישראל.

In other words, *Yahadus* posits a dialectical philosophy with respect to the relationship between the individual and the community. On the one hand, *Yahadus* asserts that the individual reigns supreme, the teleology of being is to be found in him. On the other hand, *Yahadus* states that the community reigns supreme. The teleology of the individual’s existence is to be found in the community. That is the way G-d wishes us to think, and that is the way G-d formulated His philosophy in the eternal book, the Torah.

³⁸ שמות (ל"ב, ז')
³⁹ מסכת ברכות דף ל"ב ע"א

Man-subject and man-object exercise different methods of logic

(61) There is a second distinction between man-object and man-subject. The logic of man-object, man-thing, of modern Western man, is an empirical logic. Its main characteristic is clarity, distinctiveness and practicality. Pragmatism has been the philosophy of the United States for many years, since the days of Charles Peirce and William James. Pragmatism is the typical philosophy of man-object, man-thing. It preaches that truth is determined by whatever is useful. Whatever is scientifically acceptable, whatever one can utilize and take advantage of, is true. This is the logic of man-object, man-thing. For man-subject, on the other hand, logic is an *a priori* logic, an ideal logic. It is not the logic of the mind, but the logic of a strange mysterious will which drives one to do things which are unreasonable. It is a product of the free will which shapes the human personality.

***Yahadus* promotes both empirical logic and postulated logic**

(62) The question arises: Man-object has developed a rational logic. Man-object consults logic as to a single question only, namely, what is useful and what is not useful. Man-subject consults his logos for another question, namely, what is right, what is wrong. What should be, and what should not be. What is the approach of *Yahadus* to the conflict between the empirical logic versus an *a priori* voluntaristic logic, between the logic of facticity versus the logic of ideals, and between the logic of reasonableness versus the logic of free will?

(63) On the one hand, *Yahadus* has glorified the empirical logic, the logic of the intellect. Jews have been granted freedom to think with all the depth, penetration and exactitude of a great methodical research, namely, through תורה שבעל פה, *halacha*. In the field of *Talmud Torah*, תורה שבעל פה, Jews are rationalists, committed to the most progressive methods of thought classification, thought syllogism, conceptual interpretation, definition and unification. I do not believe that any branch of science provides a more advanced, precise, and exact thinking than the field of *halacha*. The scholar, the *talmid chacham*, enjoys unfettered freedom. No restrictions are imposed. No reservations or qualifications limit the creative processes of *Talmud Torah*. With

respect to the *halacha*, *Yahadus* insists upon absolute שלטון השכל, *unlimited and unrestricted rule by the intellect, by the logos*. No emotional considerations may interfere with clear *halachic* thinking. Prophetic interventions, biases, visions and secret communications have no place in *halachic* research, in *halachic* thinking. As far as Torah study is concerned, *Yahadus* has insisted upon intellectual monism and intellectual exclusivity. In many ways, the *halachic* scholar resembles the mathematician who builds his world exclusively from pure intellectual constructs and who bars emotional motifs from interfering with his way of thinking. In the field of *halacha*, the empirical precise logos reigns supreme. The logic and methodology of man-object dominates *halachic* thinking.

Throughout history, Jews have sacrificed their lives in accordance with a mysterious immutable will

(64) Yet, when analyzing Jewish history and Jewish historical experiences, we are confronted with a situation which is completely different. In matters pertaining to historical destiny, the Jews did not live by their logos, by their intellect. Rather, throughout history, Jews have lived by a mysterious will.⁴⁰ Jews acted, and are still acting, not in accordance with empirical logic, but in compliance with a secret, mysterious, clandestine will. Jews have always lived by a non-empirical set of rules. Jews postulated rules and lived by those postulated rules. Their historical thinking, their bold thrusts, their unqualified total dedication to a mysterious past and an unknown future, their unreasonable tenacity to survive as a unique spiritual entity, were not the product of a strict empirical logic which recognizes only the majestic, pragmatic and utilitarian logos.

For the empirical logician, there are no absolute norms for which he has to sacrifice his life. Man-thing does not recognize ultimate norms because for man-thing everything is relative, interwoven into the fabric of social mores and social ethos. Norms change, laws are amended, and there is no eternal way of life. Jews do not live by that logic. Jews are committed to absolute norms. Jews swim against the tide. The same people who in the field of *halacha* preach unlimited intellectualism and unrestricted

⁴⁰ I do not know how else to describe it. James speaks about the will to behave. Biologists speak about the will to survive. Jews have existed solely by virtue of this mysterious indefinable drive.

rationalism, are nonetheless, with respect to the field of historical experience and historical living, committed to a mysterious will, to certain transcendental powers, which determine their thinking and urge them to defy the entire world and its civilizations.

Man-thing refuses to accept a total commitment since he is liberal and history minded. He will acquiesce in the morality embedded in the historical rational experience, moving along with historical metamorphosis. He will never subscribe to an historical ethic. The norm either gains significance or loses its validity depending upon the social and economic changes in the system.

(65) To Jews, the norm is ultimate. In fact, even today, we still make basic historical decisions⁴¹ without consulting the practical intellect. If the practical intellect had a say in those decisions, we would have acted very differently. We did not consult the empirical logic prior to accepting an absolute commitment. We did not think out rationally the consequences of the obligations which we have taken on and of the commitments we have made. We were seized by strong transcendental powers, by a mysterious will, and we reached basic decisions suddenly, abruptly, without having engaged in inquiry and total examination.

(66) *Chazal* comment that, by saying *נעשה ונשמע*, the Jews achieved great heights.⁴² What is so wonderful about *נעשה ונשמע*? What exactly is the substance of *נעשה ונשמע*? Why do *Chazal* consider *נעשה ונשמע* as the central idea of an eternal people? What is the difference between *נעשה ונשמע*, and why is the order so significant?

נעשה ונשמע means that we make basic decisions without consulting our reason, our empirical logic. *נעשה* means that we commit ourselves; *נשמע* means that we will inquire only later. If the Jews had first said *נשמע*, and only subsequently uttered *נעשה*, they would never have accepted the Torah. Their empirical logic would have advised the Jews to steer away from the Torah.

Jews approached their allegiance to the Torah without deliberating. Jews throughout history have been determined to survive eternally no matter how high the cost and no matter how difficult it becomes.

⁴¹ This is true not only of the Jews in *Eretz Yisroel*, but also of Jews in the Diaspora. Important basic decisions about relationships between the Jewish community and the non-Jewish community, between the Jewish faith and the Christian church, are continually reached.

⁴² מסכת שבת דף פ"ח ע"א.

(67) Whose logic was accepted by the Jews, the logic of man-object or of man-subject? Again the answer lies in the dialectic. Both logics were accepted. In the field of *halacha*, the logic of man-thing, man-object was selected. In the field of historical experiences, the logic of man-subject, which is not logical at all, has prevailed.

Gentiles urge Jews to abandon their man-subject orientation

(68) The *passuk* writes:⁴³

שובי שובי השולמית. שובי שובי ונחזה בך. מה תחזו בשולמית
כמחולת המחניים.

*Return, return, oh Shulamite. Return, return, that we may
look upon you. The Shulamite responds, "What can you
see of the Shulamite as she dances between the camps?"*

The *Midrash* interprets this *passuk* as a dialogue between non-Jews and Jews. The non-Jew asks the Jew (portrayed as the *Shulamite*) to return to the universal community of cosmic man and man-object. They declare to her, "Enough soaring aloft to the glorious stars up high. Enough indulging in this indescribable inebriation of reality, in that saving madness, in that ecstasy of I-subject, who is a mystic, an artist, a genius, a prophet, and to whom the world is not just a collection of facts, but a living, feeling and questing organism. שובי שובי השולמית ונחזה בך. Return, oh *Shulamite*, and we will attempt to understand you. We will make an honest effort to rationalize your commitments, to bring them in accord with our empirical logic, with our utilitarian pragmatic logic, with the logic of man-subject, man-thing."

(69) The *Shulamite's* response to this challenge, to this reasonable invitation, is

"מה תחזו בשולמית כמחולת מחניים"

"What can you see in that *Shulamite*? You will never share her enthusiasm. You will always fail to grasp her determination and her readiness to sacrifice. You will never understand her intoxication and madness. She is כמחולת המחניים, as a gypsy dancer engaged in an interminable dance, in a mad rush, in an uncontrollable whirl. She is carried, willy-nilly, into vast boundless places, into unknown destinations. She can not stop dancing the eternal dance even if she so desires."

⁴³ . שיר השירים (ז', א)

This woman-subject, woman-mystery, clandestine *Shulamite*, enigmatic girl, eternal dancer, is the heroine of the great historical drama of the Song of Songs. Again, the dialectic of man was transformed by the Torah into the historical dialectic of the Jew.

The same dialectic is found in the story of Yosef. His multi-colored shirt was symbolic of his iridescent personality. Yosef personified that grand dialectic of two logics, of the organizer, the executive man of reason, on the one hand, and of the dreamer, the visionary, the prophet, the inspired personality, on the other. Yosef was a great executive. He was the prime minister of Egypt. He molded the grand Egyptian economy and organized its administrative apparatus. He made Egypt powerful, rich and influential. As such, he was not man-subject. Man-subject could not have accomplished that. Yosef was the ultimate man-object, man-thing. His logic was pragmatic and utilitarian. He was clever, reasonable and precise. He was the best representative of the establishment, of man-thing.

On the other hand, Yosef was also the בעל החלומות. Even after he reached maturity, even after Yosef attained prominence and power, he remained the same visionary. ויזכר יוסף את החלומות.⁴⁴ Yosef remembered. He still dreamed even while acting as prime minister. He nonetheless beheld a glorious vision of the sun, the moon and the stars. His soul was inspired. His intellect was exalted. He was carried away to an invisible mind. He was both man-object and man-subject. There was a schism in Yosef's personality, a split, a dichotomy. But in that dichotomy, in that contradiction, Yosef found his greatness.

Man-subject and man-object disagree as to the primacy of thought over deed

(70) The third distinction between man-object and man-subject, between thing and persona, between plane and point, is related to the problem of deed and thought.

There is an age old question. Which is the preferred, emotions or deeds? I-subject answers that man's inner emotion is primary; man's externality is of secondary significance. I-object states the reverse. To I-object, the deed is primary, and the intention, the emotion, the experience, is worthless.

⁴⁴ בראשית (מ"ב, ט"ו)

(71) *Yahadus*, on the one hand, has embraced the philosophy of man-thing, which prioritizes the deed. We cannot imagine an observant Jew who does not engage in action. Action in the *halacha* is central and indispensable. Without the physical performance, there is no religious observance. The *halacha* seeks to involve the body in the service of G-d. Therefore, she singles out physical acts and invests them with religious meaning and purpose. The *halacha* is concerned with the body and attempts the redemption of physiological functions which are insensate and meaningless, per se, and their elevation to the great heights of service and meaningfulness. The *halacha* places great emphasis on detail, in the same manner as does the man-thing, the executive, the banker, or the manager of a production plant. Minutiae are not to be contemptuously ignored and brushed aside. Non-compliance with a minor detail quite often invalidates the entire performance.

For example, an otherwise beautiful *esrog* which has been slightly punctured is nonetheless disqualified. If one should hold it, his act will not be rewarded at all, inasmuch as a single detail, albeit almost invisible to the eye, is lacking. Likewise, an ardent prayer, flowing from the depth of one's heart, saturated with zeal and fervor, will be invalidated if it should lack the phrase of ותן טל ומטר. *Prima facie*, that omission is not vital. It should not invalidate the prayer and render it null and void. Yet, it fails. Similarly, if sunset on Friday is at 6:05 p.m., a person who engages in work five minutes prior thereto is within his right; his action is not culpable. Yet, that person's engagement in the same activity five minutes later would carry culpability of great consequences.

The *halacha* accepts both mathematical precision as well as ecstatic inspiration

(72) Basically, the *halacha* has adopted a mathematical, scientific approach. Indeed there is an *halachic* mathematics. There are numbers and measurements with which the *halacha* is concerned. The *halacha* quantifies objects employing the same scientific method introduced in the days of Galileo and Newton.

Our enemies have accused us of pedantry, of paying undue attention to details. Our answer is that details dominate all disciplines. Isn't the engineer concerned with every minute detail, even though to the uninitiated eye they appear to be insignificant? Isn't the entire cosmic order created by G-d based upon pedantry? The same is true of

halacha. The image of man-thing who, as an executive, is preoccupied with details, is also projected by the *halacha*. Jews have accepted the precision and concern for detail from the man-thing, and have confirmed that action is central and indispensable. The *halacha* is a system of divine disciplines, and through disciplined action man rises above the brute and beast. And, of course, one cannot engage in disciplined action unless he pays attention to the details.

(73) The opposite, however, is also true. *Yahadus* is not only a system of divine disciplines which exhaust themselves solely in action. *Yahadus* is also a romance between G-d and the Jews, an adventure, a quest, a cleansing and cathartic experience, a steady movement. The *passuk*⁴⁵ states *שגיון לדוד, a great madness*. *Yahadus* is a madness from which we cannot free ourselves. There are *mitzvos* in the *halachic* system that relate, not to action, but to man's innermost emotional life, to man's depths and recesses which are unknown even to himself. Our critics say that the *halacha*, with its pedantry, with its undue attention to detail, obscures the vision of G-d. This claim is unjust and unfounded. The inner experience plays a central role in our world view. We serve *Hakadosh Baruch Hu* with our minds, with our hands, and also with our hearts. While the mind and the hands, thought and action are disciplined, precisioned and detailed, our hearts overflow with great passionate love which sweeps away all boundaries and inundates all environs.

(74) The divine disciplines are an inspiration, rather than a handicap, to the person in his quest for G-d. As noted earlier, *tefillah* is an example of *Yahadus*' attention to minutiae. Though even a small detail may invalidate the *tefillah*, nonetheless, *tefillah* defines the G-d-man confrontation; it is a dialogue. *Talmud Torah*, regardless of the intellectual precision and exactness which it requires, is, at the same time, a mystical rendezvous between the *shechina* and the student. Likewise, *simcha* on Yom Tov is tantamount to *לפני ה'*, to experiencing the divine quest, to tempering our feverish mental time, to obtaining a sense of heightened significance and purposiveness. The *לפני ה'* experience dictates that man sense the presence of the Almighty in every thing, in every event. Man must perceive G-d in the rolling tide, in the small pebble on the beach, in the beam of light penetrating through the cracks of his bedroom blinds every morning and in

⁴⁵ תהלים (ו', א').

the movement of one's index finger. *Yahadus* recommends that we experience G-d, not only in the starry skies, but in all living things as well. In the flowers and trees, and in the movements of one's own muscles.

The I-subject has not been rejected. The metaphysical dialectic was translated into an *halachic* dialectic. *Hakadosh Baruch Hu* wants man in general, and the Jew in particular, to engage in both, in action and in thought, in deed and in emotion, in accomplishment and in experience.

***Yahadus* reconciles man-subject's emotions with man-object's deeds**

(75) *Yahadus* seeks to reconcile the opposites. This reconciliation may not take place nowadays, but it will take place ביום ההוא, *on that final eschatological day*. A day that is slow in coming, but a day which inexorably approaches. Sooner or later, the day will arrive, and the ideal man will finally reconcile. Thing-hood with personality, subject with object, whim with intellect, deed with thought and action with experience, will finally and harmoniously reconcile.

(76) Every time that we step backwards after concluding the *Shemoneh Esrei* we recite the phrase:

עושה שלום במרומיו הוא יעשה שלום עלינו
*G-d who promotes peace in His abode should provide us
with peace.*

Chazal explain⁴⁶ that G-d makes peace between the archangels גבריאל-ל and מיכאל-ל. Why do these angels quarrel? Why do they engage in controversy? Why are they involved in a feud? The answer is that an angel is unlike man. The angel is a monistic being. There is no schism in the angel. There is no split in the angel. The angel is a harmonious being. The angel represents only one מידה, *one attribute*, of *Hakadosh Baruch Hu*. The archangel מיכאל-ל represents the attribute of חסד, of loving kindness, nursing, forgiveness and compassion. The arch angel גבריאל-ל represents the opposite divine attribute, namely, דין, justice, strictness, punishment and sometimes retribution. Of course, there is a dichotomy, an endless divide, separating גבריאל-ל and מיכאל-ל, love from kindness, mercy from retribution and warmth from strictness.

⁴⁶ מסכת זרדך ארץ, פרק שלום (הלכה ה')

But, in *Hakadosh Baruch Hu*, there is no dichotomy. There is no antithesis. The medieval philosophers referred to *Hakadosh Baruch Hu* as *coincidentia oppositorum*. In Him, all opposite are reconciled. In Him, all contradictions are resolved. In Him, thesis and antithesis merge into one. In Him, there is only harmony, שלום. Accordingly, after concluding *Shemoneh Esrei* and stepping backwards, we pray to *Hakadosh Baruch Hu* that the great eschatological day soon arrive, so that man may achieve harmony, resolve his duality and become *coincidentia oppositorum*. We recite שלום במרומי. In the same manner that there is a *coincidentia oppositorum*, מיווג המידות, in heaven above, likewise, הוא יעשה שלום עלינו, there should also be מיווג המידות, the reconciliation of opposites, on earth below.

(77) Shabbos is a symbol of that great cosmic harmony of *coincidentia oppositorum*, the reconciliation of opposites. In the evening, we offer the prayer, אתה קדשת את יום השביעי, *You have sanctified the seventh day*. Man is not mentioned in that prayer at all. The prayers detail השמים וכל צבאם, *the heavens with all of its hosts*. Man is merely one of the many hosts. He is a thing. He is a minute particle in the infinite cosmic process of creation. He is just an infinitesimal particle of ויכולו השמים. On Friday night, man appears and emerges as man-thing, interrelated with the other phenomenon, enmeshed in the cosmic order created by G-d.

(78) On Shabbos morning, the melody changes, the background is recast. On Shabbos morning, the prayers speak of the greatest individual, Moshe, the exemplar of all I-subjects, the most unique and singular human being. ישמח משה במתנת חלקו, *Moshe rejoices with his reward (of Shabbos)*. Moshe personifies man-subject, not man-thing. Moshe was the free being who embraced infinity itself. שמים, *the astro-world*, ארץ, *nature*, have little value in comparison with the great individual. On Shabbos morning, the I-subject emerges, the individual whose dignity is to be found, not in a system, but in himself.

(79) During *Mincha* we recite אתה אחד ושמןך אחד, *You are one and Your name is one*. G-d is one because G-d is both subject and object. In G-d there is no contradiction. G-d is one, because in G-d there is mercy and strictness simultaneously. There is חסד and רחמים, on the one hand, and דין and גבורה on the other hand; there is no contradiction. He is the *coincidentia oppositorum*. אתה אחד. In Him we find הרד ונצח, transient beauty

as well as eternity itself. You are one, and Your Torah, which was entrusted to us, leads us to the goal of *מי כעמך ישראל גוי אחד בארץ*. The split, the schism, the dichotomy will disappear and then Shabbos will emerge as *יום מנוחה וקדושה לעמך נתת*, *a day of perpetual harmony for the eternal people*.

תושלבי"ע

תהא נשמטנו צרורה בצרור החיים

