

What would you do with all the wealth you've ever dreamed of?  
 Do you think it would make you happy? Why hasn't it affected others that way?  
 Have you analyzed the pros and cons, or do you just follow the masses  
 instead of our wise kings, prophets and Rabbis?

1997  
2008  
11  
YEARS

# JewishTimes

Dedicated to Scriptural and Rabbinic Verification  
 of Authentic Jewish Beliefs and Practices

Volume VII, No. 32...July 18, 2008

WWW.MESORA.ORG/JEWISHTIMES

Download and Print Free

## IN THIS ISSUE

PARSHA: PINCHAS	I-3
FAILURE OF SUCCESS	I-5,6
STRICTLY SPEAKING	4
LETTERS	7

## SUPPORT THE JEWISHTIMES

EDUCATING 10,000 WORLDWIDE



WWW.MESORA.ORG/DONATE

## CANDLE LIGHTING 7/18

Boston	7:59	Moscow	8:44
Chicago	8:04	New York	8:06
Cleveland	8:39	Paris	9:29
Detroit	8:47	Philadelphia	8:08
Houston	8:04	Phoenix	7:19
Jerusalem	7:26	Pittsburgh	8:29
Johannesburg	5:17	Seattle	8:43
Los Angeles	7:45	Sydney	4:50
London	8:50	Tokyo	6:37
Miami	7:55	Toronto	8:36
Montreal	8:19	Washington DC	8:13

## Weekly Parsha

# Pinchas

RABBI BERNIE FOX

“Because he was zealous for his G-d and he atoned for Bnai Yisrael, he and his descendants after him will have a permanent covenant of priesthood.” (BeMidbar 25:13)

(continued on next page)

## Fantasy

# the Failure of Success



RABBI MOSHE BEN-CHAIM

The Talmud depicts a strange story (Avoda Zara 17a):

“Rabbi Elazar ben Dardaya didn’t leave a single prostitute on Earth that he never visited. On one occasion he heard of a certain prostitute in the cities of the sea who received a bag of coins (a large sum) as her fee. [So] he took a bag of coins, and crossed seven rivers [to be with her]. At the commencement of their encounter, she blew a breath from her mouth and said, “Just as this breath is impossible to return to its place, so too, Elazar ben Dardaya will never be accepted in repentance.” He went and sat between two mountains and hills and said, “Mountains and hills, beseech mercy upon me.” They responded, “Before we beseech mercy for you, you must beseech mercy on us, as it says, “Although mountains will move and hills will topple...[1]” He said “Heaven and Earth beseech mercy upon me.” They responded, “Before we beseech

(continued on page 5)

(Pinchas cont. from pg. 1)

## Weekly Parsha

# JewishTimes

Weekly Journal on Jewish Thought



The JewishTimes is published every Friday and delivered by email. Subscriptions are FREE. To subscribe, send any email message to: [subscribe@mesora.org](mailto:subscribe@mesora.org)

Subscribers will also receive our advertisers' emails and our regular email announcements.

**Contacts:**

We invite feedback or any questions at this address: [office@mesora.org](mailto:office@mesora.org)  
Ph(516)569-8888 Fx(516)569-0404

**Advertising:**

<https://www.Mesora.org/Advertising>

**Donations:**

<https://www.Mesora.org/Donate>

**Content at Mesora.org:****JewishTimes Archives:**

<http://www.Mesora.org/JewishTimes>

**Philosophy Archives:**

<http://www.Mesora.org/Philosophy>

**Weekly Parsha Archives:**

<http://www.Mesora.org/WeeklyParsha>

**Audio Archives:**

<http://www.Mesora.org/Audio>

**Interactive, Live, Audible Sessions:**

<http://www.Mesora.org/TalkLive>

**Database Search:**

<http://www.Mesora.org/Search>

Articles may be reprinted without consent of the JewishTimes or the authors, provided the content is not altered, and credits are given.

Parshat Balak ends with an account of Moav's attempt to corrupt Bnai Yisrael. The nation of Moav recruits the young women of the nation. They are sent into the camp of Bnai Yisrael with orders to seduce the men. Once the seduction is accomplished, the women entice the men to participate in idolatry.

This plan almost succeeds. The young women are successful in seducing some of the men. A princess of Midyan – Kazbi, the daughter of Tzur – actually succeeds in seducing one of the leaders of the shevet of Shimon – Zimri, the son of Salu.

Pinchas, the grandson of Ahron, intervenes. He executes Zimri and Kazbi while they are in the act of fornication.

Our parasha begins with an account of the rewards received by Pinchas. Among these rewards, Hashem promises Pinchas a permanent covenant of priesthood. What is the meaning of this blessing?

Superficially, it seems that this covenant endowed Pinchas and his descendants with the priesthood. They were made Kohanim. However, Pinchas was that grandson of Ahron. The descendants of Ahron were already chosen to serve as the Kohanim! What is Hashem giving to Pinchas that he does not already possess?

In fact, it is not at all clear that Pinchas and his descendants were already appointed as Kohanim. How is this possible? The Talmud in Tractate Zevachim discusses this issue. The Talmud explains that there are two opinions regarding the identity of the original Kohanim. The opinions differ on a simple question. Who were the original Kohanim? Were the only first Kohanim the sons of Ahron? Alternatively, did this group include all of Ahron's descendants alive at that time? What is the difference between these two possibilities? Pinchas was a grandson of Ahron. He was Ahron's descendant. However, he was not Ahron's son. According to the first opinion, only the sons of Ahron were the original Kohanim. Their descendants who were born subsequently also became Kohanim. However, descendants already born were not included in the Kehunah – the Priesthood. This means that Pinchas was

not one of the original Kohanim. Neither could his descendants serve as Kohanim. He was not a son of Ahron. His descendants could not claim descent from a Kohen.

According to the second opinion, all the descendants of Ahron were included in the original group of Kohanim. Pinchas was a grandson of Ahron. He was a descendant. Therefore, he and his children were already included in the Kehunah.[1]

Rashi adopts the first opinion. He indicates that Pinchas was not one of the original Kohanim.[2] Maimonides sides with the second opinion. He maintains that Pinchas was included among the original Kohanim.[3]

Our pasuk must be interpreted according to each of these opinions. According to the first opinion, our passage is easily understood. Pinchas and his children were not originally included in the Kehunah. At this point, he and his descendants are granted Kehunah. This was part of his reward for acting zealously on behalf of Hashem. In our pasuk, the Almighty creates a permanent change in the status of Pinchas and his descendants. They will now be Kohanim and have the same status as Ahron's sons and their progeny.[4]



However, according to the second opinion, our pasuk is not as easily understood. According to this opinion, Pinchas and his descendants already possessed the status of Kehunah. What new office is given to Pinchas in our passage?

Rabbaynu Avraham ibn Ezra proposes an answer to this question. He explains that the passage does not represent a promise of Kehunah. Pinchas and his descendants already had this status. Instead, in our pasuk, Hashem awards Pinchas the office Kohen Gadol. Pinchas and his descendants will hold this office.[5]

Gershonides observes that most of those who held the office of Kohen Gadol were descendants of Pinchas. However, there were exceptions. Some of those who served as Kohen Gadol were descendants of Itamar. How can these exceptions be reconciled with Ibn Ezra's interpretation of the pasuk?

Gershonides responds that Hashem did not tell Pinchas that every Kohen Gadol would be one

(continued on next page)



(Pinchas continued from page 2)

## Weekly Parsha

of his descendants. Instead, Hashem promised that this office would always be associated with the descendants of Pinchas. The office would never be transferred to a different family. At times, there would not be a fitting descendant of Pinchas to hold the office. Under such circumstances, the Kohen Gadol would come from the family of Itamar. Nonetheless, this interruption will only be temporary. The office will always return to the descendants of Pinchas.

Geshonides maintains that this is an example of a general principle. Hashem's blessings often involve some element of permanency. For example, kingship is awarded to the shevet of Yehudah. This does not mean that there will never be a king who is not from the shevet of Yehudah. Geshonides points out that such an interpretation is untenable. At times, there may not be an appropriate candidate for kingship from the shevet. Alternatively, sometimes the shevet will deserve to be punished. Under these circumstances, the kingship must temporarily be transferred to another shevet. This is not an abrogation of the blessing. This kingship always returns to Yehudah. Any interruption is temporary. The blessing does not promise that there will never be an interruption. It promises that the kingship will never be permanently removed from the shevet.[6]

**“Be an enemy unto the people of Midyan and strike them. For they acted as enemies towards you through their plotting. They plotted against you in the matter of Peor and in the matter of Kazbi the daughter of Tzur their sister who was killed on the day of the plague for the matter of Peor.”** (BeMidbar 25:17-18)

Hashem commands Moshe to treat the people of Midyan as enemies. Bnai Yisrael are commanded to make war with them. This is because Midyan allied with Moav. They joined in the plot to corrupt Bnai Yisrael.

The pasuk explains that Midyan shared responsibility for the “matter of Peor.” This phrase is not difficult to interpret. The women of Midyan and Moav attempted to induce the men of Bnai Yisrael to engage in idolatry. The idolatrous entity they introduced to Bnai Yisrael was Peor. The pasuk admonishes the people to strike Midyan in response to this nation's efforts to introduce the worship of Peor among Bnai Yisrael. However, the pasuk adds that the people of Midyan should also be treated as enemies because of the “matter of Kazbi the daughter of Tzur.”

This phrase is difficult to understand. Kazbi was one of the women recruited to participate in the seduction of the men of Bnai Yisrael. She was one of the specific women who were involved in the matter of Peor. It seems that the “matter of Peor” and the “matter of Kazbi” are two references to the same incident and evil. Why does the pasuk refer to the incident with both of these descriptions? Why is the incident described as the matter of Peor and as the matter of Kazbi?

The commentaries offer various answers to this question. According to Rashi, the pasuk is not only an admonishment to strike against Midyan. The pasuk is also a warning. Hashem commands Bnai Yisrael to wage war with Midyan and explains the urgency of this mission. Midyan is a dangerous adversary. This nation is completely committed to the destruction of Bnai Yisrael. What is the indication of this commitment? The nation sent Kazbi, the daughter of Tzur, into the camp of Bnai Yisrael. They assigned her the role of seductress and harlot. This is remarkable! Kazbi was the daughter of Tzur. Tzur was one of the kings of Midyan. The people of Midyan were willing to defile a princess in order to destroy Bnai Yisrael. This is indicative of extreme, self-destructive hatred.[7] Bnai Yisrael must protect itself from this desperate enemy.

Rabbaynu Avraham ibn Ezra offers a different explanation of the passage. He explains that the pasuk is providing an enumeration of reasons for the war Bnai Yisrael is to wage. The first reason is that Bnai Yisrael must respond to the actions already taken by Midyan. Midyan plotted against Bnai Yisrael. Midyan attempted to corrupt Bnai Yisrael. Second, Bnai Yisrael should be mindful of the future. Pinchas had killed Kazbi, the daughter of Tzur. Tzur was a king. His daughter was a princess. Surely, the people of Midyan would wish to avenge the death of their

princess! In short, Midyan had attempted to destroy Bnai Yisrael without provocation. Now, Midyan had an additional motivation – the death of their princess.[8] Bnai Yisrael must protect themselves from Midyan. They must strike their enemy before Midyan can again plot against them. ■

[1] Mesechet Zevachim 101b.

[2] Rabbaynu Shlomo ben Yitzchak (Rashi), Commentary on Sefer BeMidbar 25:13.

[3] Rabbaynu Moshe ben Maimon (Rambam / Maimonides) Mishne Torah, Hilchot Bi'at HaMikdash 5:12.

[4] Rabbaynu Shlomo ben Yitzchak (Rashi), Commentary on Sefer BeMidbar 25:13.

[5] Rabbaynu Avraham ibn Ezra, Commentary on Sefer BeMidbar 25:13.

[6] Rabbaynu Levi ben Gershon (Rabag / Gershonides), Commentary on Sefer BeMidbar, (Mosad HaRav Kook, 1998), p 141.

[7] Rabbaynu Shlomo ben Yitzchak (Rashi), Commentary on Sefer BeMidbar 25:18.

[8] Rabbaynu Avraham ibn Ezra, Commentary on Sefer BeMidbar 25:18.



meet Jewish singles!

click here

JewishCafe.com

Email and more, free for two weeks!

*Jessie Fischbein*

# Strictly *speaking*



My 12-year-old daughter doesn't like to wear socks in the summer. When she became bas mitzvah, she began to scrupulously adhere to hilchos tznius, the laws of modesty. Her sleeves, neckline, and skirt lengths reflect this. But socks are a chumra, a stringency, and she won't wear them.

You cannot imagine the difficulty this is causing in summer plans.

Where can I send my daughter where she can dress according to the standards of halacha and no more, but not come home with a boyfriend? (You may argue that it is possible to be in a co-ed environment and not become romantically involved. I agree that each child is different. I don't want to put my precocious, curious daughter into a co-ed environment and expect "hands off.")

Everywhere is either co-ed, or socks required. She finally found a place that appeared to require only the halachic requirements, and she came home in tears. It turns out that they are required to wear socks that meet the level of the skirt. To console her, she was told that she is serving Hashem.

Is it serving Hashem to be machmir and resentful, rather than adhere to the letter of the law and be relaxed and happy? Do we not have enough difficulty teaching a true concept of tznius to our adolescent young ladies, without imposing extras on them? Can we afford not to make a distinction between halacha and chumra, and only require halacha? Why must we strive for stringencies, and not be satisfied with modest young ladies who focus on inner tznius and dress according to the strict letter of the law?

How is it possible that there is no place for a good, but strictly halachic and not machmir bas Yisroel to go? Why is my daughter being told that sticking to the letter of the law (which is no small struggle for an attractive young lady) is not good enough?

My daughter respects authority and wants to do the right thing. She does not need this kind of pressure. These types of expectations can have a profoundly negative effect on a person's relationship with Hashem.

I had a similar situation with the Daily Halacha email (a wonderful program that sends a daily halacha directly to your inbox), regarding the custom to refrain from marital obligations on Shavuos. This was sent out, not described as a custom, but with the words "one should" refrain.

When I went to look it up (Shulchan Aruch with Mishnah Berura 240:MB7), I read the following: "All of this is only for a person who is full of yirah [awe of Heaven] and will not sin, chas v'shalom – but those whose inclinations are strong on them, and they think it is like an issur Torah, and through this will come, chas v'shalom, to a number of stumbling blocks, it is a mitzvah for them to have relations, even on Rosh Hashanah, since from tzad hadin [the strict letter of the law] it is not forbidden except on Yom Kippur and Tisha B'Av and during aveilus [mourning]."

This is a weighty point that the Mishna Berura makes, and we should think deeply about it. If we cannot distinguish between what is forbidden and what is machmir, then this will cause stumbling blocks. Particularly for those who have a strong inclination, if they are told that it is assur, there is a danger of them feeling that the entire Torah is too restrictive and stifling, and they may throw off the entire Torah. Whereas if they were aware of what was chumra and what was tzad hadin, they would not find it too stifling.

"Deracheha darchei noam," that the Torah's ways are ways of pleasantness, is a fundamental principle of the Torah. When did we become a society that seeks higher and higher stringencies, instead of admitting that many of us have strong inclinations and would find a more joyous relationship with Torah if we were encouraged to only keep the strict letter of the law?

Why are our schools encouraging adolescents and teenagers (and if they don't have strong inclinations, then I don't know who does) to be machmir, when we should be focusing on teaching the pleasantness and wisdom of the Torah lifestyle? How did it come to pass that the only "acceptable" role model is a counselor whose skirts touch her socks, and not a modest young lady who follows the tzad hadin requirements of hilchos tznius? ■



(continued from page 1)

## Fantasy

mercy for you, you must beseech mercy on us.” He said, “Sun and moon beseech mercy upon me.” They responded, “Before we beseech mercy for you, you must beseech mercy on us, as it says, “The moon will be humiliated and the sun will be shamed.[2]” He said, “Stars and constellations beseech mercy upon me.” They responded, “Before we beseech mercy for you, you must beseech mercy on us.”

Elazar then said, “The matter [repentance] truly depends [not on them] but on me.” He placed his head between his knees, he moaned in cries until his soul left him. A heavenly voice called out, “Rabbi Elazar ben Dardaya will receive the afterlife.” (For brevity, I did not quote all verses here)

Unless we believe in talking mountains and inanimate creations, we are forced to view this story as a metaphor. Certainly it is impossible to have slept with so many. So this story didn’t happen exactly as stated, but it very well might be depicting an actual person with an insatiable desire, spelling out fundamental lessons with exaggeration and metaphor. To excel in your process of thinking, the Rabbis crafted such metaphors for the purpose of analysis. So do not lose this opportunity by reading on immediately. Study this metaphor, think it over, and then come back and continue from the next line.

### The Metaphor

The first idea is that no man – not even one called Rabbi – is immune to sin. “For man is not righteous in the land that does good and doesn’t sin”. (King Solomon, Ecclesiastes 7:20) But this man’s sin was without satisfaction. That’s what it means by the fact that he slept with “every” prostitute. This refers to insatiability. This drive is generated not from reality, but from fantasy. For why did he need to change his partner each time he had intercourse? Pleasure has a range, and after a limited amount of time in any pleasure, we recognize that the next act will not offer an unexpected satisfaction. Unless, we are like this Rabbi...

Upon hearing some reputation of that woman in the cities of the sea, who was so costly, he imagined a satisfaction beyond compare. He spared no cost nor restrained any effort (traversing seven rivers) to experience this woman. This means that human lust can blind a person to reason. One might spend all his money, and exert himself for weeks, for a few minutes of pleasure. To us, it is incomprehensible. But this Talmudic portion wishes to teach of the capabilities of man, so we are aware, and guard against it.

We then read, “At the commencement of their encounter, she blew a breath from her mouth and said, “Just as this breath is impossible to return to its place, so too, Elazar ben Dardaya will never be accepted in repentance”. This is another proof that this is a metaphor, for why would a prostitute attempt at losing business? Now, what does this mean? And why with “this” prostitute does Elazar wake up to repentance?

A breath refers to the most intangible of objects. Elazar, although full of fantasy about this prostitute, faces the reality of how empty (like a breath) his fantasy truly is. She cannot provide the satisfaction he anticipated, for a fantasy surpasses reality by design. It was here and now that Elazar reached the height of what he felt the physical world could offer him, and it didn’t last.

It wasn’t special at all. It was over.

This is the identical fate most wealthy people face. After decades of striving, and earning millions, they finally travel to every imaginable location, buy the finest jewels, homes and autos, and eat the most exotic foods. And have experiences like Elazar. “Now what?” are the words they utter. They have nothing left in life to look forward to. They thought the physical life would provide the satisfaction they imagined. But for these poor souls who followed the dreams and advertisements of the masses, they wasted their lives on that, which cannot come true. Fantasized pleasures only live in fantasies.

### Turning Point

Now, attaining the “greatest of pleasures”, Elazar had nothing left to seek in his physically oriented life, the “breathless” void was intolerable...the thought of punishment finally rocks his world. He fears not being accepted by God in repentance. What does he do? He makes a mistake. He “beseeches” two mountains and valleys to seek out mercy for him. But mountains and valleys are inanimate. Plus, what can they do even if they were alive?

What this means is that Elazar blamed the physical world for his sins, as if they made him sin out of their tempting design. Beseeching the physical world at every turn, Elazar tried to defend himself before God. Of course he wasn’t talking to God. But he said in other words, “Let all creation be at fault”, as if they should come to his defense. But after much denial, Elazar ultimately realized that the matter truly rested on him.

Rabbi Heshy Roth explained so well: the physical world “responding” that Elazar in fact had to atone for them, means Elazar sinned against creation. That is, he misconstrued the true purpose of creation. Creation is to act as a means to study and approach God. Instead, Elazar abused creation to satisfy his lusts. Creation “responded” to Elazar that he had to atone for them, meaning, he had to correct himself by ridding his false view of the world’s

purpose, and that it could not possibly meet Elazar’s impossible, lustful expectations. In truth, no conversation transpired between Elazar and creation. This – as Tosfos says – merely means that this is how creation “could” respond. It would say to Elazar that he is accusing the wrong party for his lustful life. He should not accuse creation asking it to atone for him, but he must truly accuse himself, and atone for abusing creation.

The verses cited mean to say that man will distort creation, as did the idolaters who worshipped the sun and moon for example. Eventually, the sun and moon will be “ashamed”, meaning the worshippers will be exposed.[3] Thus, these verses address man’s distortion of creation...the exact meaning of the metaphoric response by the sun and moon. Just as idolaters will soon be shown as living a lie, in our metaphor, the sun and moon again accuse Elazar of living a lie.

Notable is the detail given about the first creations to which Elazar approached. All other subsequent creations, were simply addressed by Elazar as “he said” to the sun and moon.” But the Talmudic Rabbis formulated the first as “and he sat between two mountains and hills”. Why mention that he



(continued on next page)

(continued from page 5)

## Fantasy

sat? Just say, "he said" like all other cases. And why mention "two" mountains? Perhaps this detail describes Elazar's first attempt at seeking mercy. The Talmud metaphorically refers to the female body, as two mountains. This is sensible, as this would be Elazar's first line of defense, claiming the temptation of a woman's physique as too alluring to resist. "Sitting" between the two mountains also indicates an intimate relationship not seen in all other creations that he addressed. I thank my friend Josh for highlighting this distinction. And since next, Elazar addresses "heaven and Earth", we might ask why the redundancy...he already addressed the Earth in the "mountains and hills". But with our suggestion that two mountains refer to a woman, the question vanishes.

## Summary

In the end, we see that the more man satisfies his urges, the more he excites them. The Rabbis taught, "There is a small limb in man; if he starves it, it becomes full. If he feeds it, it grows hungry". (Tal. Succah, 52b) Hence, Elazar sought "every" prostitute.

Man becomes quite disturbed when he continues a path where physical gratification and success is his sole objective. For nothing in our imagination can be satisfied in the real world. So Elazar's encounter with the expensive prostitute ended in a void. Fantasies by definition are flawless, while the real world was not created to satisfy us physically, as an end. King Solomon said, "All is futile." [4] The Rabbis question how this wise king can oppose God's words that each day's creation was "good". They answered that God was talking about the proper use of the physical as a good. In contrast, King Solomon was addressing man's use of the physical for physical gratification,

and nothing more. In such a case, it is futile, and man will never be satisfied, as we see in Elazar's case.

If man is unfortunate enough to satisfy every wish, he will find nothing to live for after the last toy has been purchased. He will find a void. This is why the rich and famous who "have it all" really have nothing, and take drugs, drink, and destroy their lives. They know nothing else than what society trains everyone: "the physical is what you want". With no other idea about achieving happiness, they spiral downward seeking other physical pleasures and more stardom. But it's useless, and there is no escape. King Solomon was correct: seeking the physical is futile. The only way out is to come to terms with reality, as Elazar did. He finally accepted the matter as "depending on him".

The failure of success, is only when we seek success as an ends. But if we live in line with reality, we will not seek to die rich, but to live humbly, with our attention focused firmly on a life of wisdom. This will offer us the richest lives, and the deepest fulfillment and happiness. The fact that the rich are always traveling (translate as "escaping") while the Einsteins and Newtons of the world locked themselves in labs for weeks, teaches that one immersed in study and wisdom is most fulfilled. Vacations for the wise would be painful. Why leave what you love?! ■

[1] Isaiah 54:10

[2] Isaiah, 24:23

[3] Rashi quoting Targum Isaiah, 24:23

[4] Ecclesiastes, 1:1

# JewishTimes

*The Weekly Journal on Jewish Thought*

## It's better to give and to receive!

**Give:** Email a FREE subscription of the JewishTimes to a friend or relative and they'll also receive 2 free gifts at right: our 60 pg book Retrospective and the 32 pg Passover Special edition with astonishing imagery.

**Receive:** As you help grow our readership, more advertisers place ads. We pass that on to you in the form of your continued, free JewishTimes subscription. Plus, we'll give you these 2 publications! *Invite others today!*

[www.Mesora.org/Subscriptions](http://www.Mesora.org/Subscriptions)





## Letters



# Letters

from our

## READERS



## Letters

Mesora invites your questions, letters in response to articles, your own thoughts, or your suggestions for the JewishTimes.

*"The only poor question is the one not asked."*

Email us:  
[letters@mesora.org](mailto:letters@mesora.org)

### Devotion

**Reader:** Two questions.

Genesis 22, 13: "And Abraham went and took the ram and offered him up for a burnt offering."

Why didn't Abraham tell Yitzchak to go and fetch the ram, so he could have been a more direct participant in the mitzvah?

*Thank you,  
Chaim*

**Mesora:** Good question. At that moment, God rescinded His decree that Abraham slaughter Yitzchak. But Abraham did not recoil in gladness over having his son back. He loved God more than Yitzchak, and although prohibited from slaughtering Yitzchak, Abraham still yearned to serve God. Therefore, he offered the ram. Yitzchak was not part of the equation regarding Abraham's devotion to God. Abraham desired that his abbreviated act of worship still be performed via proxy. It was his act, not Yitzchak's act. ■

### False Notion

**Reader:** Question #2: In last weeks Parsha, Numbers 24, 5, "Balak," we read how Balaam, after observing the Israeli encampment, is swept away in rapt admiration, and says: "How goodly are your tents, O Jacob, Thy dwellings, O Israel!" Every morning, when we enter our synagogues, we read the above statement, which begins the prayer "How Goodly are your tents?" Further on in this prayer we say, "As for me, may my prayer to You, Hashem, be at an opportune time" (69:14). It is this reference to an "opportune time" that has me confused. Isn't it true that Hashem dwells in His Realm, which has no time? This approach sounds like how a man might approach another man of a higher rank or higher degree of notoriety, not to Hashem. It sounds too common, "I am sorry Hashem, did I catch you at a good time?" Is it possible that Hashem has good times and bad times? Maybe I am looking at this situation too critically.

"Exalted be the living G-d, and praised, He exists-unbounded by time is His existence." (Psalms 69:14)

This song summarizes the "Thirteen Principles of Faith" expounded by Rambam (Maimonides), his commentary to the Mishnah, Sanhedrin, chapter 10.

*Thank you,  
Chaim*

**Mesora:** Of course, God is above time, since time is His creation, as Maimonides taught. Time only applies to us.

This prayer – "Mah Tov" – which you quote, is

recited upon our entrance to the synagogue...God's Temple. We first cite prophetic words praising the Jews, "How good are thy tents Jacob". We thereby remind ourselves that Israel has real worth before God, as only God's prophecy can validate, and as these words to Bilam proved true. This worth of the Jewish nation thereby entitles us to approach God. King David said, "What is man that You are mindful of him, and the son of man that You should engage him?" This wise king expressed this very sentiment that man is really worthless before God, not a being worth God's engagement. Nonetheless, God validates our worth through Bilam's prophecy. But that was in the past.

What we have addressed thus far, is that Israel "can" have worth before God. But, do "we", "currently" have such worth? One must be arrogant to feel he does matter so much. We therefore pray that our prayers reach God at a "desirous time", for us. "Desirous time" means that "we" are desirous before God as we now approach Him beseeching our needs. That is, that we hope we are "now" fit (are at a good time or state of being) so as to receive a favorable response from God. ■

### Emotion

**Reader:** First, I would like to thank you for your dedication to the truth in face of all the distortion and so-called Judaism prevalent in our day. Your website has helped me greatly and I could not thank you enough. Secondly, I have a question, which has been bothering me for some time. How would you prove to someone that God couldn't have any emotions, without using any verses from the Bible?

*Thank you,  
Dan*

**Mesora:** If the questioner accepts God created everything, then this means before He created something, it did not exist. Hence, God created everything, including man; this includes emotions, as emotions are only found in man. So before God created man, there were no such things as emotions. Thus, God does not possess emotions.

Secondly, emotions are clearly tied to the physical world, while God existed prior to the physical world. Thus, He is not physical. Therefore, emotions cannot relate to God.

Furthermore, it is unwise to suggest something about a being of Whom we know nothing. Just as I would not say that John – a man I never met – is a crook, it is even more foolish to suggest anything about God's nature.

Thank you for your kind words Dan. ■