



Parshat Behar

No 1066:

12 Iyar 5765 (21 May 2005)

STARTING POINT

Counting Forty-nine and Counting Fifty - by Rabbi Amnon Bazak

There is a very clear and well known similarity between counting the Omer, about which we were told in the previous Torah portion (Vayikra 23:15-16), and the count of the years leading to the Yovel, which appears in this week's portion (25:8-9). In both cases, the command is to count "seven 'shabbatot'" – weeks in the case of the Omer, and annual cycles of the Shemitta with respect to the Yovel. In both cases, the final number of fifty has a special sanctity. With respect to the Omer, "until the day after the seventh week you shall count, fifty days" [Vayikra 23:16], and with respect to the Yovel, "you shall sanctify the fiftieth year" [25:10].

However, a closer look at the two passages reveals a fundamental difference between the two counts. The emphasis with respect to the Omer is to count fifty days, calculated as seven weeks, with Shavuot immediately following the next day: "And you shall count for you, the day after the holiday, from the day you bring the uplifted Omer, let there be seven full weeks. Until the day after the seventh week shall you count, fifty days." [23:15-16]. With the Yovel, on the other hand, the emphasis is to count forty-nine years, and this is then followed by sanctifying the fiftieth year: "And you shall count seven annual cycles, seven times seven years, and the seven groups of years will be forty-nine years. And you shall blow the sound of a shofar in the seventh month, on the tenth of the month. On Yom Kippur shall you blow a shofar throughout the land. And you shall sanctify the fiftieth year." [25:8-10].

This summary shows the essential difference between the two obligations of counting. The counting of the Omer is a long and continuous process, which begins "the day after the holiday," on the day that the sacrifice of the Omer is brought. This is "the first of your harvest" [23:10]. The process ends with the offer of the Bikurim, the first fruits, at the end of the first stage of the harvest on the land. In this count, the weeks that have passed by have no special significance, since there is nothing noteworthy about the end of each week. The count of weeks is mentioned only as an arithmetic device to clarify the counting of fifty days, until the process is complete. The Torah does not explain why the process ends after fifty days. Evidently, in addition to the correspondence with the agricultural process, the number fifty represents a complete whole. This is similar to other cases in the Torah, such as the number of righteous men with which Avraham began his prayers about Sedom (Bereishit 18:24), the number of loops and hooks in the curtains in the Tabernacle (Shemot 26:5-6), and the maximum monetary value of a man for purposes of donations to the Temple (Vayikra 27:3).

שבת

יגזג

In contrast, with respect to Yovel there is an explicit mitzva to first count forty-nine years, signifying the end of seven cycles of the Shemitta. This combined count is relevant for the end of the cycle of the Yovel. This is not one long process but a series of subsidiary steps, which in the end lead to the coming of the Yovel. The Torah portion of Behar emphasizes the number seven many times, implying that the number fifty is not important in itself but is simply the number that follows the important sequence of seven periods of Shemitta.

POINT OF VIEW

Random Thoughts After Yom Haatzmaut - by Rabbi Yisrael Rozen

"Let every man return to his family, and every man shall return to his heritage" [Vayikra 25:10].

Forbidden "Heretical" Thoughts

The 57th Yom Haatzmaut has passed, and from the point of view of religious Zionism it was characterized by harsh statements with respect to loyalty to the country, something which is usually an accepted aspect of our outlook. Difficult questions were asked "around the campfires" about whether to continue reciting the Hallel on Yom Haatzmaut, about making changes in the prayer for the State of Israel, and about flying the national flag, among other things.

In my opinion, such questions are marginal and have been asked by a small fraction of the religious Zionist camp. In some ways, they were born as "media slogans" in order to serve as a warning and as a show of strength. It may well be that one or more rabbis or heads of yeshivot made a declaration protesting the legitimacy of a government decision involving difficult national questions, since this decision has been based on defrauding the voters (and there is some truth in such a claim). In spite of this, any attempt to fan the issue into a bright flame and use it to show that the religious Zionist sector is about to "disengage" from the country as a whole is a great exaggeration.

This issue of Shabbat B'Shabbato
is sponsored in memory of
Irving Blachor ז"ל
איסר בן שמואל דוד
and
לז"נ
מרת הנא בת ר' מרדכי מנדל אלינער
ר' עוזר בן ר' שאול אלינער
הרב שמעון בן ר' זכריה סמנער

The mainstream rabbis of Gush Katif who continued to read and sing the Hallel on Yom Haatzmaut, as they have always done, were absolutely right, even though the future seems quite bleak at the present time. The establishment of the state of Israel, the ingathering of so many exiles into the country, the building of Jerusalem and the renewal of Torah centers in Israel, the salvation of Israel from its enemies, and the high level of economic, agricultural and commercial development – all of these factors are definite justification for praising the Almighty, even if they have not yet led to a final triumph. I have noted in the past that Mordechai rode the king's horse wearing royal garb on the outside, while this clothing covered the sackcloth and ashes that he wore underneath. This has been indicated by the sages: "He (Mordechai) has minted a coin. What images did it have? Sackcloth and ashes on one side, and a golden crown on the other" [Bereishit Rabba 39]. We Jews are used to contradictions, and the current one is no exception to the rule.

I also see the disagreements about modifying the texts of the prayers for the nation and for the IDF as marginal and as lacking any real substance. As far as I can see, they do not represent deep inner doubts but rather a search for headlines.

Acceptable "National" Thoughts

In spite of the above, there is a place for sharp introspection following this year's Yom Haatzmaut, connected to the essence of our country and not to the conflict between our view of the concept of the nation and our position with respect to the actions of the current government. What is the essence of the State of Israel?

I want to declare categorically that I am much more worried about the concept of the "people" than about the status of the "land." The worried thoughts that I feel this year, after Yom Haatzmaut, are not at all related to the issues of abandoning the area of Gush Katif, they are connected to simple questions of society and the nation. As long as the subject of "the land" and settlement were at the forefront of the national challenge, I was able to feel that this was an expression of a nationalistic yearning shared by most of the people living in Zion. However, if we would disassociate ourselves from the nationalistic point of view and ask a survey made up of one question – "What is the point (or the main challenge) of the State of Israel?" – the answers will be very far ranging and diverse. In fact, I have serious doubts whether very many people would be willing to answer such a question at all.

"Chabakuk came and summarized all the mitzvot in one principle" (see Makot 24a). I would also claim that a single phrase can summarize the entire issue: "A Jewish Country." However you would like to interpret this concept, it can at least serve as a focus and a unifying pattern. To my sorrow, I fear that in this day and age the yearning, the support, and the even the after-the-fact acceptance of this concept has greatly diminished. It would seem that many of the population of this country are not at all interested in living in a "Jewish Country" no matter how it will be defined, even if it is in as vague a way as possible. Even after the strong emotions of the patriotic Yom Haatzmaut and the unifying force of the Memorial Day for our heroes, I feel an increase of the voices of the middle

road: "Do not bother us with archaic concepts from the previous century, such as a Jewish country."

The Courts – The "Oppressor" of the Jewish Country

The institution that sets the tone for eliminating the concept of a Jewish country is the Supreme Court of the land. Its highest ideal is personal equality, and for the court this is much more important than the Jewish character of the State of Israel. The Supreme Court sees itself as taking precedence over democracy, the second half of the slogan, "Jewish and Democratic State." The court feels that it has the right to cancel laws that were passed democratically, and it not only declares but enthusiastically applies the principle that this completely secular court will declare that this is a "country of all its citizens." (I have even heard it claimed that this objective is the true meaning of the concept of "a Jewish country.")

Even if we ignore the Supreme Court, no matter how hard it is to hide from its anger, I find myself asking the following question: What "Jewish" challenge is there for our brothers who do not believe in the faith and who are not nationalistic in outlook? They are our brothers, there is no doubt about that, but where is the "Jewish focus" of their view of the country? What can be considered "Jewish" about the approach of the owner of a prominent newspaper who has proposed that the best policy is to become intertwined with the Palestinians and achieve peace with them by mixed marriages? Do he and I have any common ground, even at the very lowest common denominator?

We may also note the Midrashic link in the verse quoted at the beginning of this article between returning to a "heritage" and the accompanying return to the "family" (for example, see the commentary of the Meshech Chochma). This also clearly implies a link between the tribal heritage, the people and the land.

SERMON BY A GUEST

The Yovel as Realistic Utopia - by Rabbi Mordechai Zamir, Rabbi of Sedei Yaacov and the Yizrael Valley

Can we think of any other important mitzva in the Torah that was almost never observed, except for the mitzva of Yovel? Probably not. I am not referring to such mitzvot as destroying a city of idol worship or the death penalty for a rebellious son, about which we have been told that their main purpose was "to study in order to obtain a reward." In this case, we are discussing a mitzva with positive value. And the answer is that except for Yovel and its subsidiaries there was indeed no other mitzva that was almost never observed.

It is almost certain that no significant effort was ever made to observe this mitzva. This was true not only in the time of the First Temple but also in the time of the Second Temple, even though when this Temple was built the people signed a social-religious contract that they would observe the Torah and the mitzvot, explicitly mentioning the mitzva of Shemitta.

Why is this so? Why didn't the sages apply restricting laws in order to strengthen the mitzva of the Yovel? The most logical answer to this question is that this is such a great and awesome

mitzva that it is most relevant for the era of the end of the historic processes of building the nation and the land. This will only be in the time of the Mashiach, in the distant future.

In the Shemitta year, in the forty-ninth year of the count, the land was allowed to rest and all financial obligations were cancelled. In addition, in the Yovel, the fiftieth year, it was also necessary to free all the Jewish slaves and to return all the land to its rightful owners, by virtue of the original apportionment at the time of Yehoshua. This meant that the land should have been left untended for two years in a row. Without the miracle of G-d's blessing, to refrain for two consecutive years from working on the land could well have led to financial collapse and even starvation. If we also add to this formula the agrarian revolution, returning all property to the original owners (except for houses in a walled city), we can see the picture of what seems to be a utopian state.

In fact, the halacha restricts the application of this mitzva to an ideal historical situation, when all of Bnei Yisrael are settled on their land and every tribe knows its proper place. Therefore, "When the tribes of Reuven, Gad, and half of Menasheh were driven into exile, the Yovel was cancelled" [Arachin 32b]. This was a long time before the destruction of the First Temple. This is also taken into account by the Rambam. "The king, the Machiach, will rise up and restore the kingdom of David to its original glory. And he will build the Temple and gather in the remote exiles of Bnei Yisrael. All the laws will return in his days to the way they were in the past: sacrifices will be brought, and Shemitta and Yovel will be observed, with all the details as written in the Torah." [Hilchot Melachim 11:1]. As opposed to financial laws, which will resume their former status, this clearly implies that the Shemitta and the Yovel – laws that have economic, religious, and nationalistic consequences – will be fully observed for the first time only in the days of the Machiach.

Although the Yovel was never fully observed, its underlying philosophy has influenced Bnei Yisrael. Even today, the wonderful "slogans" of the Yovel echo in our ears: "Proclaim freedom in the land for all its inhabitants. [Vayikra 25:10]... The land will not be sold forever [25:23] ... Bnei Yisrael are my slaves [25:55]." These themes are an important part of our desire to become a nation of priests and a holy nation. Let us hope and pray that this will indeed come true in the near future.

TORAH, SOCIETY, AND GOVERNMENT

The Price is Proportional to the Remainder - by Rabbi Uri Dasberg

With joy in their hearts, the people left for an outing. Even though the bus was not full, 50 people had signed up for the trip, and this was enough to cover the cost, keeping the price per person moderately low. In the end, only 30 people went on the trip, but those who went along assumed that the missing people would still pay their part, since they had ordered seats in advance. But they were surprised at the end of the trip, when some of those who did not come along said that they did not owe any money at all. "If you did not have enough participants, you should have cancelled the trip," they said. Some of them claimed that a number of 40 participants would have been

sufficient to pay for the trip, so that they should be charged for 10 places and not for the full number of 20.

The readers will probably assume that field trips and buses are a modern phenomenon that cannot be found in the traditional halachic literature, but this is not true. Take the case of a small village that has only 10 Jews living in it. As the holidays approach, each man can be forced to stay home for the holiday or to pay the price of hiring somebody to replace him, so that there will be a minyan for the holiday prayers. But what if there are 11 men in the village, and two people want to leave? Who will be required to pay for hiring a visitor? Can one of the men claim that since he is leaving 10 men behind there is no problem, and the rest of the men have no hold over him?

According to the Shulchan Aruch (with clarification by the Mishna Berura), the two men must share the cost of hiring a replacement, but they are not required to help pay for the chazzan who will provide pleasant tunes for the men who remain behind in the village (Orach Chaim 55:21). All of the inhabitants of the town are obligated to make sure that there is a minyan for prayer, but they are only required to pay a total of one-tenth of the salary of a chazzan (that is, the two men must pay 1/20 each). Another possibility is that each man must pay 1/11 of the salary of a chazzan, as if he would have stayed home to enjoy the singing.

This can be compared to the case above, of an outing in a bus. Those who originally signed up for the trip can be compared to the inhabitants of the small village, who are all obligated to make sure that there will be a minyan for prayer. This means that they must all help to make sure that the trip takes place. Since the trip would have taken place with a minimum of 40 participants, every person who signed up must pay 1/40 of the total cost. However, it can be assumed in such a trip that there will be extra costs, over and above the cost of the bus itself (such as the guide, entrance fees to public sites, tips for the driver and the guide, etc). These costs should be divided among those who actually participated on the trip.

Reference: Rabbi Aharon Beck, "Techumin," volume 25

A LESSON FOR THE CHILDREN

Bnei Yehuda (Part 2) - by Rabbi Yikhat Rozen, Merkaz Neria, Kiryat Malachi

Summary of the previous chapter: A group of Jews from Tzefat purchased land in the Golan Heights about 120 years ago, in order to start an agricultural settlement. However, the Turkish authorities in Damascus delayed giving them formal approval of the sale...

In the end, the men did not wait for the formal document. They found an old building where they could live, and they started to work on the land. They were in high spirits, and they felt that they were privileged to actually settle on the holy land. The land started to produce its fruits.

However, it did not take long for the problems to begin. The Turks saw that the Jews had started to settle the land even though they did not have the proper credentials, and they tried to stop the expansion of the settlement.

"Perhaps we can bribe the officials to give us the approval," one of the members suggested. They all knew that in the corrupt Turkish regime, there was almost always a way to bribe an official. But where would they find the money for a bribe? After all, they had already used up all their money to buy the land!

After a very short time, the people were forced to leave. Their weeping and begging did not have any effect. The Turks insisted that without the formal "kushan" approving the sale they could not continue living at the site. But they did not have a kushan, and they were forced to pack their belongings and returned disappointed to Tzefat.

The eighteen members of the group decided that they would not give in to despair. They tried everything they could to obtain other land, perhaps something for which it would be easier to obtain approval. They collected contributions and tried to add something of their own. Finally, they managed to buy another plot of land on the Golan Heights. This time, with the aid of the local English representative, Laurence Olifant, they were able to obtain a kushan.

Enthusiastically, the members of the group went for a second time to establish a settlement. They called the place "Bnei Yehuda," and it was situated in the southern part of the Golan.

However, their troubles were not over. The land was very harsh. It was very fertile, but the Arabs had never worked the land in this area, and the earth was hard and full of stones. The Jews were not lazy. They removed the stones and stubbornly tilled the earth, slowly preparing it for planting. The day of the first planting was a holiday, and then they waited for the first rain to come. They continued to pray for more rain that would irrigate the land and grow some produce, for the first time after the long period of exile.

Finally, the earth indeed began to give its produce, as is written, "Those who plant in tears will reap with joy" [Tehillim 126:5]. The crop was good, but the settlement still needed financial help in order to stand on its own two feet. The settlers' organization began to collect contributions, and the settlement slowly began to stabilize.

But the troubles still continued. The settlement continued to exist for thirty-two years, in very difficult conditions. The settlers became sick, and many of them were forced to lie in bed with high fever for long periods of time. Many died of the sickness, and the cemetery slowly filled up. The site was far away from any other Jewish settlement, and it was very hard to bring supplies and medicine. As if this was not enough, the Arabs and Turks who lived nearby took advantage of every opportunity to do damage to the poor settlers.

In the First World War there was a change that gave the inhabitants of Bnei Yehuda a reason for hope. The British won the war against the Turks, and they took control of Eretz Yisrael. Everybody remembered the help that the Jews had received from Laurence Olifant, and they hoped that things would now improve.

(To be continued...)

THE WAYS OF THE FATHERS (Pirkei Avot) Chapter 6 Mishna 7 - by Rabbi Yehuda Shaviv

"Torah is great in that it gives life to those who observe it, in this world and in the next, as is written, 'For they provide life for those who find them and heal all of their flesh' [Mishlei 4:22]. In addition, 'It will be a medicine for your navel and a solace for your bones' [3:8]. 'It is a tree of life for anybody who upholds it and its supporters will be happy' [3:18]. 'It is a precious jewel for your head and a necklace for your throat' [1:9]. 'Put a precious jewel on your head, a crown of glory will protect you' [4:9]. 'A long life is in its right hand, and in its left is wealth and honor' [3:16]. 'For it will add to you many days and years of life and peace' [3:2]."

The beginning of this Mishna – "Torah is great" – is outwardly similar to the opening phrase of the previous one, but there is a difference. The last Mishna referred to obtaining possession of the Torah, that is, study and understanding. This Mishna, on the other hand, refers to fulfilling the demands of the Torah, "which gives life to those who observe it." Seven verses from Mishlei are brought as proof texts, but life is mentioned in only two of them: "They will provide life" [4:22], and "It is a tree of life" [3:18]. The last two verses mention "a long life." Perhaps these four verses serve as the framework that establishes the thesis. Thus, the first two verses mention life explicitly (the second verse serves as a bridge between these two), while the last two promise a long life. Perhaps two verses are referring to this world and two refer to the world to come. The two verses in the middle describe the Torah as a "jewel" on the head of one who studies or observes the Torah.

Based on the comparison with a necklace, it seems that the jewels on the head mean a crown. Perhaps these two verses are referring to the eternity of the world to come, as has been described by the Rambam. "This is what the early sages said: In the world to come there is no eating ... rather righteous people sit with their crowns on their heads and enjoy the glow of the Shechina... What they mean about the crowns on their heads is that the knowledge of what gave them the privilege of living in the world to come is their crown." [Hilchot Teshuva 8:2].

Thus, the first and last verses are related to this world, while the middle verses involve the world to come.

HOLY AND SECULAR

The Controversy About a Hyphen - by Rabbi Amichai Gordin

Kibbutz Naan, 1951: This was a scene of great tension in the discussions held in the Council of the Kibbutz Hameuchad, the United Kibbutz movement. The Council was discussing the members of the Mapai Party who lived in two kibbutzim, Ashdot Yaacov and Givat Hasheloshah. For ideological reasons, the members of Mapai left these two kibbutzim and established a new settlement. After a long discussion filled with mutual accusations, the Council decided to expel the Mapai members from the kibbutzim. When the decision was reached, the expelled members left the meeting in anger.

A few days later, the tragic split in the Kibbutz Hameuchad movement was finalized. The relationship between the two

groups was so bad that they could not work together in the same social framework. The feelings in all 80 kibbutzim of the movement were so bitter that the minority in each kibbutz was forced to leave the people with whom they had shared so much of their lives and to move away. Four kibbutzim where the forces were equally divided split into two.

We now move on to the conference of the Mapam Party in 1958. This was the site of an emotional and angry exchange. The subject of the discussion was one of great importance: whether to put a hyphen in the term "Marxism-Leninism" or not. Moshe Shamir, the author, led a group of youths who insisted that the hyphen must remain. Others just as stubbornly claimed that the hyphen must be removed, that the phrase should be "Marxism Leninism." The one who opposed both groups was Meir Yaari. He continuously beat his breast, decrying the "personality cult." Therefore, he declared that it was time to progress to the concept of "Marxism and Leninism."

In the long run, it is quite doubtful if the people of Ein Charod Ichud and those of Ein Charod Meuchad can explain what caused half of the members of the existing kibbutz to leave and to establish a new kibbutz, with a separate educational system. It is doubtful that many people today can understand the difference between "Leninism-Marxism" and "Leninism Marxism," and why with all the many problems that faced Israel at the time Moshe Shamir felt that he had to struggle to maintain the existence of the hyphen.

When we concentrate only on the present moment and the place where we happen to be, we often tend to forget that there are other things happening around us. If the people of Ein Charod would have lifted their heads beyond the Gilboa Mountains, they might have noticed that in relation to other events in the country their terrible struggle was not very significant. If the people of Mapam had been friendly with others who were not socialists, they might have understood that the exact definition of a proper socialist is not something that would ever be very important to the country as a whole.

The dynamic and stressful nature of life quite often leads us to forget our true place in the world, and we tend to feel that the abstract of the entire world is nothing more than what we can see under our own windowsill. This approach leads us to the feeling that every argument we have with our friends and colleagues is a dramatic chasm which can never be bridged. We are thus led to the conclusion that the entire world may be destroyed because our neighbor, who agrees with 99% of our own views, has one single thought that is not right.

In our own community, it has happened more than once that arguments about important matters have been given importance very much out of their true proportion. We forget the educational and ethical challenges that face us from the outside, and instead of meeting them we fall into the trap of arguments with our own friends, in our own synagogues. We are convinced that if we can only overcome the destructive idea of that religious Zionist person "over there," all our other problems will solve themselves – problems such as Reform conversions, growing examples of public Shabbat desecration,

and the tremendous lack of knowledge of Judaism within the country.

In his introduction to his commentary on Bereishit, the Natziv discusses a similar problem that occurred near the end of the era of the Second Temple. The following is a very brief summary, but it is recommended that the reader study the original text.

The praise "yashar" – upright – was used to explain the Almighty's decree to destroy the Second Temple, since the people at the time were convoluted and stubborn. This means that they were righteous and studied Torah, but they were not "straight" in their ways. Therefore, because of the unreasonable hate in their hearts, they suspected anybody who acted differently than they did of being a Tzeduki or an Apikores. This led to murder and all the other evils of the world, even including the destruction of the Temple.

This is so because the Almighty is upright, and he will not accept righteous people unless they adhere to the "straight" path, without intrigue – even if they are acting in the name of heaven. Otherwise, this path can lead to destruction of the settlement in the land.

THE CHAIN OF HALACHA

In Case of Doubt If One Counted the Omer - by Rabbi Yosef Tzvi Rimon, Rabbi of Southern Alon Shevut and a teacher in Yeshivat Har Etzion

What should a person do if he does not remember if he counted the Omer the night before? Similarly, what should one do if he does not know if he counted the correct number the previous night (which would invalidate the count)? Can he continue counting and reciting a blessing or not?

We have seen in the previous articles that the rabbis do not agree about the case of a person who definitely forgot to count the Omer for a full day. According to the BAHAG he should continue to count without a blessing, while the Tosafot feel that he should recite the blessing. The Shulchan Aruch rules that such a person should continue to count without a blessing (489:8).

With respect to a man who is not sure if he counted, the Terumat Hadeshen (37) writes that he should continue to count with a blessing, and the Shulchan Aruch agrees (489:8). According to the Pri Chadash, the reason is that there is a double doubt: It is doubtful if he counted or not, and even if he did not count, there is a doubt whether to accept the ruling of the Tosafot, to continue with a blessing even after missing one day. This was also quoted by the Mishna Berura (38), and the Pri Megadim uses this to show that a blessing can be recited in the case of a double doubt (Orach Chaim 143:5).

Rabbi Natanson, in his responsa "Shoel Umeishiv," asks why the rules of "chazaka" (a habitual practice) should not be invoked. This would imply that during the first thirty days, when the counting of the Omer has not yet become established as a habit, we can assume the person missed the count, while afterwards we might assume that the habit has become ingrained and he did count. Perhaps the best answer is that with

respect to the Omer we do not repeat exactly the same text every night. There is no "chazaka" with respect to something different added to prayers every night, since this is not a repetition of the same words every day.

In order to remember to count, the chazzan often counts out loud in the morning. This has been mentioned in various places, and it is probably a good practice.

The halacha can be summarized as follows:

- (1) If one forgets to count at night, he can count during the following day without a blessing, and then continue the remaining nights with a blessing.
- (2) One who forgets at night and the following day should continue to count without reciting a blessing.
- (3) One who is not sure whether he counted (or might have made a mistake in the count) can continue to count with a blessing.
- (4) In a place where there is a high probability that the count will be forgotten (for example: soldiers on active duty, women who count the Omer), it is a good idea for people to remind each other. Making it a regular practice to count in the day without a blessing is a very good idea.

According to the Zohar (Emor 97:2), one who does not complete the count of the Omer cannot be considered "pure" and he should not participate in the Torah. One who is "pure" when Shavuot arrives and has not missed in the count should study Torah on the eve of Shavuot. In this way, he will become attached to a high level of purity. Based on the Zohar, the SHELA writes that it is important to awaken the heart to have proper intentions, and in this way one can become holy and pure.

This implies that every day one should feel that the count of the Omer brings him one step closer to receiving the Torah. This explains why the count is increased every day and not done backwards, as in a countdown. Every day a person should rise higher than he was the day before. Let us try to make use of the days of the Omer to increase our strength and to rise in spiritual level. We should try every day to accept a new task related to our behavior, in Torah or in mitzvot, in an effort to achieve a high level of purity in our souls by the time Shavuot arrives.

צוותי מדע ותורה



This publication is distributed by the RELIGIOUS ZIONISTS OF AMERICA - MIZRACHI and by THE ZOMET INSTITUTE OF ALON SHVUT. It is an extract from SHABBAT B'SHABBATO, a weekly bulletin distributed in hundreds of synagogues in Israel and has been translated by Moshe Goldberg. If you are interested in sponsoring an issue of Shabbat B'Shabbato, contact the RZA Mizrahi office at 212-465-9234 or mizrachi@rza.org.

מזל טוב

RZA-MIZRACHI congratulates our newly elected National Officers

President

Rabbi Yosef Blau
New York

Chairman of the Board

Martin Oliner
Lawrence, NY

Vice Presidents

Dr. Ernest Agatstein
Los Angeles

Isaac Blachor
West Hempstead, NY

Martin Cohen,
Baltimore, MD

Dr. Chanania Gang
Yonkers, NY

Rabbi William Kanter
Chicago, IL

Rabbi Ariel Konstantyn
Westhampton, NY

Rabbi Shlomo Rybak
Passaic, NJ

Secretary

Mark S. Cohen
West Hempstead, NY

Treasurer

Asher Brukner
Teaneck, NJ

Assistant Treasurer

Michael Weinberger
East Brunswick, NJ