



# Ohr Yerushalayim News

ל אב תשע"ו - ראה - 3rd September 2016 - Volume 9 - Issue 6

## News This Week

### מזל טוב

Mazel Tov to Mr and Mrs Yisroel Meir Cope on the Bar Mitzvah this week of Benny. The Kehilla is invited to a Kiddush after Davening in the Shul Hall.

### חיים ארוכים

We wish חיים ארוכים to Mr Kalman Bookman on the Petira of his late sister Mrs Freda Cutler.

### Rov's Gemora Shiur

The Rov's Gemora Shiur is starting the 5th Perek of Pesochim this Monday, 5th September. Past and new participants are welcome!

### Evening Chabura

The evening Chabura resumes this Monday, September 5th at 8.15pm after Maariv. We will be starting Perek Sheini of Kesuvos and there will be a short Shiur Pesicha. anyone interested in joining or needing a Chavrusa should speak to either R' Moshe Aron Gurwicz or Noach Fletcher.

### Keep Us Up To Date

Have you moved house recently? if so please email us your new address so we can keep in touch [office@ohryerushalayim.org.uk](mailto:office@ohryerushalayim.org.uk).

## The Bigger Picture

Rabbi Pinchas Winston (Torah.org)

See, I set before you today a blessing and a curse. (Devarim 11:26)  
We left off last week talking about fear of G-d, its connection to the trait of chayn, and a question:  
"Ruach HaKodesh," which translates as "Holy Spirit," but is more than this . . . is something that Yosef clearly had, making him unique with regard to the plans of G-d for history. The only question is, didn't the other Talmudic rabbis also fear G-d? Unquestionably, just as Yosef's brothers' unquestionably feared G-d like their brother. Then what made the rabbis with Ruach HaKodesh different, and all the Yosefs of history for that matter?

The answer to this question emerges from a different discussion found in the Talmud:

Rav Yosef was "Sinai" and Rabbah was "Oker Harim," "an uprooter of mountains." The time came when they were required [to be head of the yeshiva in Pumbedisa]. They asked: Which has preference, "Sinai" or an "Oker Harim"? They answered: "Sinai," because everyone requires the bearer of wheat. (Brochos 64a)

The Talmud means that Rav Yosef knew all the Mishnayos and Beraysos, the basis of the Oral Law, as if from Sinai. Therefore, he is called "Sinai." Rabbah, on the other hand, "uprooted mountains," that is, he used his sharp power of reasoning to delve deeply into Talmudic discussions to arrive at the halachah.

After Rav Yehudah, the Rosh HaYeshiva of Pumbedisa, died, they needed either Rav Yosef or Rabbah to replace him. Therefore, they sent and asked the Chachamim of Eretz Yisroel which takes precedence. The Chachamim responded, saying that Sinai comes first, because everyone needs the "bearer of wheat." In others, they should appoint Rav Yosef as the new Rosh HaYeshiva in Pumbedisa because of his

comprehensive knowledge of Mishnayos and Beraysos, since they are the source of all halachah.

Ideally, a person should have as a global knowledge of Torah as possible, and also be able to delve deeply into Torah ideas. Both are crucial for a more complete Torah education, and will benefit the person and all those whom he teaches.

Not only this, but it is clearly possible for someone to end up understanding through "Iyun," deep investigation, what he may not have seen from a lack of "Bekias," faster, more superficial learning. It is also possible from Bekias to come to question certain ideas that might normally be the result of Iyun.

One fundamental difference between the two approaches can be understood through the story of Yosef and his brothers. In fact, they can represent both approaches to learning, Yosef being more the "Sinai" type and the brothers being more the "Oker Harim" type.

"Ironically," it was Rav Yosef, like Yosef HaTzaddik himself, who was "Sinai." Furthermore, he had to wait 22 years, like Yosef as well, before ascending to his position. Just a historical "coincidence"?

One of the most startling points in the story of Yosef and his brothers is how they could be so wrong about their brother. To be wrong about him was one thing. To be SO wrong about him, thinking that G-d rejected Yosef when in fact he held him in the highest esteem, is another story. This was the product of a difference between "Sinai" and "Oker Harim."

The difference becomes clearer when referring to "Sinai" by another name: The Big Picture. "Sinai" represents the totality of Torah, albeit not on the most detailed level. It represents the entire framework of Torah, which can be infinitely detailed on the level of "Oker Harim."

Each approach to Torah reveals something that the other does not, and each also has its own shortcoming. "Sinai," though providing a more complete glimpse of all of Torah can come up short on important details, especially when it comes to halachah. "Oker Harim" provides such details, but can leave a person with gaping holes in their overall Torah outlook only because they have yet to learn other areas of Torah. This is why the two approaches complement each other.

## The Week Ahead

### שבת פרשת ראה

1st Mincha / Candle Lighting  
2nd Mincha / Candle Lighting  
Shacharis  
סוף זמן ק"ש  
1st Mincha  
2nd Mincha  
3rd Mincha  
Rov's Shiur Hilchos Ellul / Y.N.  
Maariv & Motzei Shabbos  
Sun Rosh Chodesh  
Mon / Thurs  
Tues / Wed / Fri  
Mincha & Maariv  
Late Maariv

### שבת ראש חודש אלול

6.20pm / Not before 6.31pm  
7.40pm / No later than 7.40pm  
9.00am  
9.44am  
2.00pm  
6.00pm  
7.39pm  
Following  
8.44pm  
8.00am / 9.00am  
6.45am / 7.10am / 8.00am  
6.45am / 7.20am / 8.00am  
7.30pm  
10.00pm

It is also true that in some situations, one can be more relevant at the time than the other. The “pilpul,” i.e., the dialectics, of a Rosh HaYeshiva whose approach to learning is “Oker Harim” can be highly stimulating, but he may not be focussed enough on the overall direction of the yeshiva. A Rosh HaYeshiva whose approach is “Sinai” may not give the most fascinating classes, but he will have his finger on all aspects of yeshiva learning, and be a great resource for students with questions.

It's more than this, though. What follows may not be a Torah quote, but it articulates the point very well. It is talking about the scientific world, but the same predicament occurs in the Torah realm as well. It says: In short, the works of modern science, taken one by one, seem enough to dampen a person's hope for higher meaning. If religion's stock-in-trade is the inexplicable, the coming years don't look like boon times. This is half of the giant paradox, and it's one reason why the average scientist today is probably less religious than the average scientist of 50 or 100 years ago. The other half of the paradox comes from stepping back and looking at the big picture: an overarching pattern that encompasses the many feats of 20th century science and transcends them; a pattern suggesting, to some scientists, at least, that there is more to the universe than meets the eye, something authentically divine about how it all fits together.” (What Does Science Teach Us About G-d?; TIME Magazine, December 28, 1992)

This is the main advantage of the “Sinai” approach, not just with respect to Torah, but to life in general. Patterns. Patterns that reveal things about life that one may only find and understand after a lot of investigation. The only problem is that such investigation may take so long as to lessen the benefit of the insight, and may even result in disaster in the meantime.

Both Yosef and his brothers wanted the same thing. They wanted to continue on with the legacy of their ancestors and give rise to the Jewish nation that was destined to emerge from them. They wanted to create a people who could fulfill the purpose of Creation in the ultimate sense, and please their Creator as much as is humanly possible.

Yosef, with his “Sinai” approach, not only understood the ultimate plan of G-d, but was creative in ways to fulfill it, not just in his time, but in the future. This transformed him into a partner of G-d, and therefore someone to whom G-d shared deep secrets, someone through whom G-d could reveal the hidden.

The brothers with their “Oker Harim” approach only saw flaw in their brother. They were exacting, so-much-so in fact that they could only see Yosef as a threat to the family tradition, not as a creative extension of it. It was their “Oker Harim” approach that even allowed them to justify the killing of their brother after convening a Bais Din, and the deceiving of their father.

Had they continued with their approach, over time they would have come to see and understand what Yosef did. But, they didn't have that time. In the meantime their father was inconsolable, their food was running out, they were forced down to Egypt, and Shimon was taken captive by the viceroy there. In short, their “mountains” were being “uprooted,” but not the way they had planned.

When Yosef finally revealed himself, the brother were in shock. It wasn't just that Yosef was still alive and was actually second-in-command over Egypt, like his dreams foretold. It was more that with all of their pilpul and learning, that they could not see what was coming. It was then that they recognized all the hints Yosef had given to them along the way until that critical moment, and how they had missed them—completely.

This brings us to this week's parsha. It is called “Re'eh” because Moshe Rabbeinu is trying to get the Jewish people to see something they had yet to envision until that time: the bigger picture. Until then, they had panicked and sinned because they were stuck in the details of the smaller picture. He wanted to elevate their level of perception closer to his own, to give them the wherewithal to survive the challenges of Torah life after his life ended.

The secrets of G-d go to those who fear Him. More specifically, they

go to those who see reality on the level that He does, as much as is humanly possible.

## A Wayward City

Rabbi Yaakov Horowitz (Torah.org)

“V'lo yidbak beyodcha meumah min hacherem, ... v'nasan lecha rachamim verichamcha – No part of the banned property should adhere to your hand ... and Hashem will give you mercy and be merciful to you” (Devorim 13:18)”

One of the mitzvos of this week's parsha relates to an “Ir Hanidachas – A Wayward City.” This occurs when the majority of the members of a city become spiritually corrupt and worship idols. The Torah instructs us to destroy the city completely and not keep any of its spoils.

The juxtaposition of two parts of the pasuk cited above is striking – and requires some careful thought. The Torah warns us not to keep any part of the objects remaining from that city, and then informs us that He will bless us with mercy.

What is the connection between these two seemingly disparate phrases? Additionally, why does the Torah inform us that we will be blessed with the virtue of rachmanus – mercy at this time? If we are being instructed to perform a mitzvah of destroying an Ir Hanidachas', which requires firmness and fortitude, why are we being blessed with the quality of mercy at this time?

The Ohr HaChaim HaKadosh offers a powerful thought to explain the second part of the pasuk – the blessing of mercy. He maintains that Hashem created humans with an inborn sense of decency and caring. Throughout our lives, it is our mission to safeguard this feeling of compassion. When people engage in cruel behaviors, this innate decency erodes over time, leaving those people with less rachamim (mercy) as they spiral downward, committing even more acts of cruelty.

Therefore, explains the Ohr HaChaim, it was entirely appropriate to bless those who were involved in destroying the Ir Hanidachas with the quality of mercy. Although they were commanded to be firm in dealing with those who sinned against Hashem, they will still retain their original sense of kindness and decency, undiminished by their destruction of the Ir Hanidachas.

The blessing would, according to the Ohr Hachayim, go into effect only after the city was destroyed – when the people carrying out the will of Hashem would revert to their original state of chesed.

I would like to suggest a reason for the linkage of the two parts of the pasuk noted above:

1. The admonition not to retain any part of the spoils of the city, and
2. The blessing of rachamim for those involved in the destruction of the city.

We are instructed by our chachamim (sages) that all our actions be L'sheim Shamayim – that they be intended to do the will of Hashem. This is all the more important when our actions involve an act of firmness where destruction is involved. Perhaps the need for this level of L'sheim Shamayim may not be so self-evident when we are engaged in acts of kindness. But this is surely required when we raise the banner of kanaus (zealotry).

This may be the reason that Hashem instructs us to see to it that not one iota of the spoils of the city remain in our hands after we destroy the city and its contents. “V'lo yidbak beyodcha meumah min hacherem.” Hashem informs us that we need to see to it that all our zealous actions are of the purest nature. This was signified by not keeping any of the items in the city. I would like to suggest that this is the reason for this cited pasuk mentioning that Hashem will then “turn back from His wrath” (Devorim 13:18) – by observing these noble acts committed in His honor.

Only after our actions pass the litmus test of selflessness will we be worthy of the blessings of Hashem. Once we demonstrate that we have not gained materially by our zealous actions – only then will Hashem bestow upon us the bracha of “v'nasan lecha rachamim verichamcha.”

Hashem will then reward us with the quality of eternal mercy and kindness.