

The Rashi Database Project

GOALS: * Show that all Rashid comments are spontaneous, instant, effortless reactions of a native speaker to the biblical text.

*This is accomplished by skillful English translations instantly suggesting the Rashi comment to the reader PUBLICATION:
www.Rashibyomi.com/The_Rashi_Database_Project.htm from the Rashi website www.Rashiyomi.com

MAIN BIBLIOGRAPHY: DT = Doctoral Thesis (www.Rashiyomi.com/Rashibook.htm,

MG=Modern Grammar with Applications to Rashid (www.Rashiyom.com/Rashibook2.htm)}

COPYRIGHT STATEMENT: (c) Rashiyomi.com 2025, Dr. Russell Jay Hendel, www.Rashiyomi.com/copyrights.htm

ACCESS: The materials on this website are free; We accept no donations from anyone. Citation with Attribution is required.

DATE/AUTHOR: Jul 17th, 2025 Russell Jay Hendel DSJS, Ph.D.

VERSION NUMBER: Version 2, 2025 (v1,2023)

THEME, THIS ISSUE: *Rashi comments based on parallelism are presented along with comparative tables. Parallelism is a well-known literary method and occurs in all literature. Although some scholars opine that Rashi did not use parallelism, I successfully respond to these opinions in my Doctoral Thesis, Chapters 26-28.*

RASHI ID: *Ex15-06a, Ex15-06b, Ex15-06c, Ex15-06d, Ex12-21a, Ex12-21b, Ex12-22d, Ex12-22b, Gn14-23a, Gn14-23b, Gn14-24a, Dt26-05b, Dt26-09a, Dt26-09b, Dt22-04a, Dt22-04b, Dt26-05c, Ex23-05a, Ex23-05b, Ex23-05c, Dt24-14a, Dt16-19a, Dt16-19b, Dt16-19c, Nu18-09a, Nu18-09b, Nu18-09c, Nu18x09c, Nu18y09c, Nu18-09d, Nu27-07d, Nu27-11a, Nu29-06a, Nu29-06b, Nu29-06c, Lv02-01a, Lv02-02c, Lv02-02f, Lv02-01b, Lv02-02d, Lv02-02e, Lv02-01d, Lv02-01e*

PESHAT: THE SPONTANEOUS REACTION TO SKILLFUL ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS

WHAT IS NEW IN THIS ISSUE: *Rashi comments based on parallelism are presented along with comparative tables. Parallelism is a well-known literary method and occurs in all literature. Although some scholars opine that Rashi did not use parallelism, I successfully respond to these opinions in my Doctoral Thesis, Chapters 26-28.*

The Tables below begin to gather Rashi comments (so far in the database) where Rashi uses parallelism. As time goes on this digest will grow eventually encompassing all Rashi translations that exemplify parallelism.

Those few Rashis where Rashi is explicit are called the Metropolitan Rashis (and are asterisked) since they are like a major city with small suburbs connected to it; so too the Metropolitan Rashi comments with full explanation illuminate other similar Rashis where however Rashi is terse. Each table is explained in its place.

The idea of parallelism communicating by almost identical phrases with minor differences is an example of emphasis. Some Rabbinic authorities consider this homily and not the straightforward meaning (Peshat) of the text. However, starting with Muraoka's doctoral thesis, the idea of emphasis as part of the straightforward meaning of the text has gained acceptance in the academic world. Muraoka wrote about Emphatic Words while

in my paper Biblical Formatting, Jewish Bible Quarterly, 35(1), 2007, I extended Muraoka's ideas to Emphatic Structures including such familiar devices as bullets and repetitions.

Lv19-33a, Lv19-34a, Ex22-20a, Ex22-20b, Ex22-20c, Ex23-09a, Ex23-09b

Ex22-20 *A non-citizen: do not abuse or cramp him because you were non-citizens in Egypt*

Ex23-09 [Do not take bribes...] *Don't cramp the non-citizen, because you know the feelings of the non-citizen since you were non-citizens in Egypt*

Lv19-33:34 *When a non-citizen lives with you in your land do not abuse him. Like one of your citizens the non-citizen living with you should be; show caring towards him as for yourself, because you were non-citizens in Egypt*

Rashi Rule: Parallelism

Rashi Comment: Clearly, Ex22-20, Ex23-09, and Lv19-33:34 are saying the same thing in slightly different formulations. By using the parallelism principle, we get more precise insights into what *abuse* and *cramping* refer to.

The *climax* principle says that consecutive parallel passages are interpreted climactically:

- Do not *abuse* a non-citizen and [moreover]
- Do not *cramp* him Ex22-20.

The simplest approach to *climactic* interpretation is to say that

- *Abuse* refers to *verbal abuse* while
- *Cramping* refers to *monetary abuse*, e.g. *overcharging*.

The important point to emphasize is that

- Just using the dictionary does not help us; dictionary meaning does not distinguish that finely between *abuse* and *cramping*.
- Parallelism *creates* meaning by requiring *climactic* interpretation.

Having used Ex22-20 to understand the Bible's unique approach to *abuse*, *cramping*, we can then

- Interpret Ex23-03 *don't cramp a non-citizen* as referring to monetary abuse. And indeed, Ex23-01:02 is speaking about the prohibition of taking bribes thus clinching this approach
- Interpret Lv19-33:34 *don't tease non-citizens because you were non-citizens in Egypt [and remember how distasteful teasing was]* Here too the context is fully consistent with *verbal teasing* [since slaves didn't own anything anyway and it was the verbal abuse that bothered them].

Rashi additionally gives psychological insights: *Do not abuse (verbally) because the non-citizen can hit you back with verbal abuse*, However, we need not go into this further here.

Lv19x32b, Lv25-17a, Lv25-36b [There are 5 commandments which end with *fear your Lord*]

Lv19-14 *Don't put a stumbling block before the blind, fear your Lord, I am God.*

Lv19-32 *Honor the presence of seniority people, fear your Lord, I am God.*

Lv25-17 *Don't abuse your colleague, fear your Lord, I am God.*

Lv25-36 *Don't charge interest on loans, fear your Lord, I am God.*

Lv25-43 *Don't overwork a locked-in contracted worker, fear your Lord, I am God.*

Rashi Rule: Parallelism

Rashi Comment: Rashi explains the unifying idea that drives including *fear your Lord* in only these five commandments. Rashi explains *any commandment dependent on intent states Fear Your Lord since there is no way of proving violation*. For example, you could argue, *I wasn't abusing the person; I was giving constructive criticism*, or, *I didn't see the senior person as he passed by so I didn't stand for him*, or *I could loan my money to a non-Jew to loan it to Jews on interest and pay me part of the profit to circumvent the prohibition of loaning on interest*. Since the commandment fulfillment is based on *intent*, these verses state *fear your Lord* who knows your inner thoughts.

It is interesting that on Lv25-36, prohibiting charging interest on loans, Rashi's first explanation is *the verse says Fear your Lord because people are attracted to money and are tempted to charge interest*. However, I don't view this as a second alternative Rashi explanation; rather, the money temptation explanation is an oversimplified explanation based on only one example (and quite reasonable for that one example) while in the main (2nd) Rashi explanation, *any commandment whose fulfillment is based on intent*, Rashi successfully explains all five verses. Therefore, the first explanation is called *midrashic* in the sense that it is *oversimplified* while the second explanation which works for all 5 cases is the straightforward meaning of the text (*peshat*).

Lv19-32a, Lv19-32b, Lv19x32b

- *Stand up* [to offer a seat] *when in the presence of a sit-in* [lit. a very old person]
- *Show honor to seniority* [lit. elders]
- *Fear your Lord, I am God.*

Rashi Rule: Parallelism

Rashi Comment: By way of introduction, we explain the two synonyms for elderly people:

- *Za-ken*, corresponds to the English *senior*. It connotes someone with seniority who has acquired (*ka-nah*) a lot of experience in life and various subjects. In the Jewish context, the *za-ken* typically refers to a *Torah scholar* who has acquired much experience in matters of Jewish law and lore.
- *Say-Vah*, from the same root that means *sitting*, **Shin-Beth**, with the **Shin** replaced by a **Sin**, refers to a sit-in, a person whose level of fitness is so poor, that they find it difficult to get up from the sitting position. This is consistent with modern theory that states that a simple *sit-to-stand* test, counting how often a person can go from the sitting position to the standing position in 30 seconds, is sufficient to accurately predict expected life duration, the tendency to fall, and several other matters (A score of 9 or less makes you a *sit-in* an elder who is out of shape who is prone to falls and who is expected to live less)

Next, recall that parallelism *creates* meaning. It can also change the nuances of words in a sequence of parallel consecutive phrases. The argument is that since

- The 2nd part of the verse refers to *honor* implied by standing out of respect
- The 1st part of the verse refers to *intent to stand* but not standing itself; it is sufficient to show a token of this intent, say, by bending the hips forward in gesture to the elderly person to see if they want a seat.

Hence, the verse, *based on parallelism*, is interpreted to mean

- Gesture the intent of standing for a general *sit-in* and [moreover]
- Actually, stand in honor for a senior scholar.

This is in fact the law as codified in Rambam, in the *Shulchan Aruch*, and also is the interpretation provided by the *Sifray* and the Aramaic translation, *Oonkelos*.

Rashi adopts this translation. However, Ramban, who apparently was *unaware* of the parallelism principle and how *climactic parallelism* refines meaning, expresses surprise over the *Sifray*, *Oonkelos*, the Talmud (which adopts the *Sifray*), and Rashi. Because Ramban was unaware of this principle, he interprets *Stand before a sit-in* to mean that one must fully stand before a sit-in. Here, Ramban follows the *dictionary meaning* of *stand*; contrastively, Rashi, *Sifrey*, Talmud, and *Oonkelos*, follow the principle *climactic parallelism* which allows the parallel structure to modify meaning in order to achieve context *even* if this modification is not fully consistent with the ordinary meaning of the words. Thus, in this verse, *stand before a sit-in* is *reinterpretation* to mean *gesture to stand before a sit-in* referring to a bending at the waist forward when a sit-in passes by in order to offer them a seat should they want it.

Biblical Text: *Or flesh that has an inflammation, it was healed and in the spot of the inflammation there is a cloud-white-wound or a reddish snow-white wound; then it is seen by the Priest. The priest sees and its appearance is deeper than the (surrounding) skin and its hair has change to white: Then the priest declares it ritually impure, it is a leprous sound rising in the inflammation.*

- *If the priest sees: (a) there is no white hair in it or (b) it is not deeper looking than the skin but duller: then the priest secludes it for 7 days.*
- *If it spreads in the skin then the priest declares it ritually impure, it is a wound*
- *If it remains stable in its place, there is no spreading, then the priest declares it ritually pure; it is the scar of the wound*

Rashi Rule: Paragraph

Rashi Comment: To understand the Rashi, we start with a comment of the Sforno. Here, Sforno is not disagreeing with Rashi but adding supplementary comments not found in Rashi. Together, Rashi and Sforno facilitate understanding the text as a whole. To understand both Sforno and Rashi we review the paragraph structure of Lv13

- Lv13-1:8 Skin Leprosy
- Lv13-9:17 Skin Leprosy (entire body)
- **Lv13-18:23 Inflammation Leprosy**
- Lv13-24:28 Burn Leprosy
- Lv13-29:37 Beard-Face Leprosy
- Lv13-38:39 Skin non-Leprosy
- Lv13-40:44 Scalp Leprosy

Hence Sforno's comment: *This paragraph Lv13-18:23 deals with leprosy found in inflammations which has distinct laws from the leprosy found in the skin, beard, or even burns.*

Rashi supplements Sforno by explaining the medical terms used in Lv13-18:23 as well as the subject of the paragraph. Rashi explains 3 (medical) terms (one term receives two Rashi comments, one for an explanation based on Biblical verses with this word and one for an explanation based on old-French; we have combined these two Rashi comments):

- Rashi explains that the biblical *shchin* means *inflammation*. Rashi literally says *a language of heat* or perhaps a better translation, *a nuance of heat*. Here, Rashi does not translate *shchin* as meaning *heat* but rather intends that *the true translation of shchin is a word having something to do with heat*. In this case, *inflammation* would fit nicely since inflamed skin is normally hot. It is interesting that the next paragraph Lv13-24:28 deals with leprosy in *burns*. Rambam explains further the text by pointing out that we are dealing with a sickness or blow that caused removal of the skin. Initially the skin is pussy. Then, tissue begins to form. The skin has 3 layers; the biblical *inflammation* refers to the first layer of skin that begins to form. It is subject to the laws specified in Lv13-18:23.
- Rashi explains that the biblical term *tzareveth* means *scar tissue*. Sforno is of the opinion that the skin never grows back normally (citing doctors). But sometimes the skin does grow back without scar. In either case, once

the healing is complete, even with scar tissue, the laws of Lv13-18:23 do not apply (Instead the laws of skin leprosy apply).

- Rashi explains that the phrase *white-red* is an *idiom*. It is a coined term meaning in Hebrew, just as in English, a color that is borderline between white and red and more precisely refers to a reddish-white. Hence the Rashi comment, *the patch is not pure white but a mixture of white and red*. (English employs the same idiomatic construction (e.g. *blue-green*.)
 - Rambam further clarifies: *Take 2,4,6 or 8 drops of blood and place them in 4 cups of milk. The resulting reddish-white colors are the colors that are being spoken about.*
-
-

Rashi ID: Lv10-02a Lv16-02a Lv16-02b

The following, part of my doctoral thesis, and published in my article, *Enhancing Pedagogy and Biblical Exegesis with Emotional Intelligence*, which appeared in the, **Journal of Systemics, Cybernetics and Informatics** (2024) 22(6), 78-112, may be accessed at <https://doi.org/10.54808/JSCI.22.06.78>

Sometimes the bible will communicate hierarchies of principles by providing multiple accounts of the same incident. This delivery method is found in the three biblical passages depicting the death of Aaron, the High Priest's sons, who died on the very day that the Temple was inaugurated. Notice the disparate emphasis in these different passages which are not listed together but are in fact in two different books of the bible.

- **Lev. 10:1-11**: Aaron's sons die at the hands of God after offering incense voluntarily. The next biblical paragraph prohibits priests from serving in the Temple while drunk.
- **Lev. 16:1-2** describes their death as due to overfamiliarity with the Divine; approaching the Divine in the Temple with offerings cannot be done at all times but requires proper preparation.
- **Nu 3:4** emphasizes that Aaron's children who died left no children.

There are several approaches to such *collections* of alternate reports. Some secular bible scholars view the bible as coming from multiple sources and later unified. They point to these *collections* of disparate texts with alternative emphasis as supporting evidence. Modern scholars, not necessarily taking sides on the source nature of the bible, emphasize plurality of opinion. The multiple sources justify multiple perspectives and such multiple emphasis illustrating plurality of approach is intrinsically good and welcome.

However, plurality while normally praiseworthy can be bad if the multiple opinions obscure the underlying unifying theme and stages. This particular case is illustrative. The disparate passages and descriptions naturally give rise to a six-stage description of depressive episodes presented in the Table below.

As in the other examples presented in this section, the hierarchy of stages presented in the Table below facilitates the pastor, the psychologist, and the counselor from avoiding blame and being constructive when dealing with clients. A simple hypothetical example is illustrative: A person who comes to a pastor with an alcoholism problem is not blamed; rather the pastor skillfully explores Stage I and II activity as presented in Table 9: *Are you over ambitious? Even if you have elevated expectations have you sought friendship in a group that supports your ambitions?* The emotional intelligence, the sensitivity to where the person is at and a desire to relate to the person where they are, emphasizes and encourages constructive practices; the avoidance of blame is blatant, welcome, and a direct consequence of the biblical hierarchy. For the Bible and the pastor who follows the Bible's advice is not interested in blame but rather in classification. What stage is the person at? Can we avoid advancement to the next stage? Can the person after examining his goals and circumstances perhaps lower the stage which he currently occupies.

Table: Six Biblical Stages Connected with Depression

Stage	Brief Description	Supporting Verses
I	Over ambitious; elevated expectations	All 3 texts refer to Aaron's sons both by name and as <i>Aaron son's</i> emphasizing a nuance, they wanted promotion after their father's retirement or death.
II	Haughtiness - lack of socialization	The excessive brooding on elevated expectations (Stage I) can lead to social isolation. This is nuanced in Nu. 3:4 which mentions their lack of children (apparently because they didn't attempt to get married; no one was good enough for them!)
III	Depression	Depression is a natural consequence of voluntary social isolation (Stage II)
IV	Alcoholism	Depression often leads to substance abuse such as alcoholism. This is nuanced in Lev 10:1-11 (Immediately after the death of Aaron's sons we are given the biblical prohibition that priests who are drunk should not serve in the temple).
V	Unwanted behavior	As is well known, alcoholism often leads to unwanted behaviors. This is nuance in both Lev 10:1-11 and Lev 16:1-2 which mention offering inappropriately.

VI	Deleterious consequences	Unwanted behaviors frequently have deleterious consequences; in this case, it was their sudden death.
----	--------------------------	---

RASHI ID: *Lv06-02a, Lv06-03a, Lv06-04a*

Rashi ID: *Lv06-04a*

Biblical Text: See parallelism table on the next page.

Verse	Topic	Undress	Added phrase 1	Added phrase 2	Redress	Next service
Lv18-23:24	Yom Kippur Services	[After performing one Yom Kippur service] he undresses	And leaves his clothes there (1)	He immerses in water(1)	He redresses(2)	He does the next service
Lv06-04	Daily Gathering and removal of altar ashes	[After performing the service of gathering of altar ashes] He undresses	(3)	(1)	He redresses(2)	He removes the gathered ashes to a pure (3) place outside

Rashi Rule: Parallelism

Background: This Rashi comment is cited from the TB Yuma 27b. The Talmud *does* start off by comparing the *undressing* mentioned for the daily removal of alter Ash to the only other place in the Bible where *undressing* is mentioned in the Temple services, on Yom Kippur. Rambam (Chapter 2 of the Yom Kippur services) explains that the high priest performed both the *daily* services of the Temple as well as the *unique services* of Yom Kippur. In between *each* Yom Kippur and daily service, the high priest (i) removed his Yom Kippur apparel, (ii) immersed in water, and (iii) donned his high priest apparel. However, between two consecutive daily services or two Yom Kippur services he remained in the same clothes.

Application to the current Rashi: With this background we analyze the unusual undressing-redressing requirement of the gathering and removal of ashes. Although, as Ramban cites, there are Talmudic opinions that the removal of ashes is not a Temple service (just something that is done and therefore can be done in ordinary clothes), Rashi apparently notes that the ash disposal had to be to a pure place (see (3)) and therefore qualifies as a service.

From the lack of any mention (See (2)) of immersion and leaving his clothes for the ash disposal, Rashi concludes that this redressing was not an obligatory redressing as happened on the transition from Yom Kippur to ordinary daily services but rather a voluntary redressing to avoid soiling the garments worn during disposal with the ashes. Rashi in fact cites the Talmud who cites an analogy from the School of Rabbi Ishmael: *It is similar to waiters who cook in one set of clothes (or e.g. wear an apron) and then serve in another set of clothes. It is just simple etiquette.*

Rashi further clarifies (and the analogy with the waiters may help understand this) that Priests would leave their good clothes for services while worn out clothes were designated for ash removal. This way the good clothes remained good.

Ramban: Interestingly Ramban does not outright disagree with Rashi. His language is *I do not know from where Rashi our master derived that this redressing is voluntary*. Notice how his controversy is couched in terms of *maybe he had some derivation I am unaware of*. Our response to Ramban is as stated above: Nowhere in the Temple services do we find that consecutive similar services are done in different clothes. Moreover, when there were consecutive similar services there was an immersion between them. We find none of that here leading to the conclusion that this redressing was voluntary.

Ramban cites the Talmud that the redressing was possibly done in ordinary clothes and that the disposal (not the gathering of ashes) was not a Temple service. Neither the Talmud nor Rashi answers this but we have answered it by pointing out that the ashes must be disposed of in a pure place suggesting this disposal was a Temple service.

Summary: The main textual points motivating Rashi are the following:

- a) This biblical text is the only place where consecutive services are associated with a redressing.
- b) Unlike other redressings which require immersion in-between, no immersion is mentioned here.
- c) Other redressings mention *leave his garments* which is not done here.
- d) If the disposal was not a temple service the verse could simply say *He undresses and removes the altar ash to a pure place outside the camp*. The fact that redressing is explicitly mentioned is another support that this is a temple service (it would have been understood that if nothing was said that he could do so in his ordinary clothing).
- e) We (not Rashi nor the Talmud) have brought up that ritual purity is required at the place of disposal hinting that this too might be a Temple service.

Lv02-01a *When one of the masses offers a Minchah offering: pure will be his offering; he will pour on it oil, and place on it frankincense.*

Rashi Rule: Parallelism

Rashi Comment: Table Lv02-01 compares the subject in the introductory chapters (chapters 1-3) to various offerings.

Chapter	Topic	Introductory Text
Lv01-03	Elevation offering	If an elevation is <i>his</i> offering from cattle
Lv02-01	Minchah offering	When <i>one of the masses</i> offers
Lv03-01	Peace offering	If a peace barbeque is <i>his</i> offering

Lv02-01a: Comparison of the subject of the elevation, minchah, and peace offerings.

Notice that a pronoun (*his*) is not used by the Minchah, but rather the phrase *one of the masses*. Typical biblical commandments use the term *person (ish)*. The emphasis on *one of the masses* nuances that minchah offerings are typically brought by the masses, that is, poorer people, as the animal offerings can only be offered by people wealthy enough to own animals.

The actual Rashi language commenting on this is: *I (God) account to him as if he offered his soul to me*. Of course, this is a pun. Rashi's underlying intent is to show that the bible through the use of the term *one of the masses* is openly and explicitly encouraging the poorer people who may not own animals to volunteer offerings.

Lv02-02c,f *He [the offeror] brings it [the Minchah] to the priest; the priest fists from there a full fistful of its flour and oil*

Verse	Action	Type of fistful	fistful
Lv02-02	Priest fists	a full fistful	fistful
Lv06-08	Priest raises	in his fist	fist

Table Lv02-02c: Comparisons of types of fistful raised for Minchah.

Rashi Rule: Parallelism

Rashi Comment: As can be seen from the parallelism presented in Table Lv02-02c, the fistful must be both *full* and *inside*. Rashi explains that the priest takes a fistful fully fitting into the fist using the middle 3 fingers; in this way the *fistful* is both *full* and *inside*.

Rashi further comments that:

- The word *inside* implies that the fistful should be full but not overflowing.
- the requirement of a *full fistful* implies that if the Priest captures anything else besides flour and oil (such as salt or frankincense) then the fistful is not *full*; this would invalidate this particular Minchah.

I combined these two Rashi's since 3 Rashi comments are being derived from the same word. Rashi himself actually combines the first two comments in one Rashi comment.

[Note: The Talmud in Menacoth seems to derive these laws differently; Malbim also adapts the Talmud's approach; but I think the above approach straightforward and consistent with the language of the text.]

Lv02-01b *When one of the masses offers a Minchah offering: pure will be his offering; he will pour on it oil, and place on it frankincense.*

Rashi Rule: Paragraph-Bullets

Rashi Comment: The Rashi comment can be understood based on a principle of the Malbim (on Ex21 but not brought here) that when a paragraph has an *opening theme* followed by *several cases*, the *opening theme* is indicated with the Hebrew word *ki* while each case is indicated with the Hebrew word *im*. Although Malbim does not go into this explicitly, the paragraphs can be nested as actually happens here.

Using this principle the paragraph structure of Lv02 is presented in Figure Lv02-01b

(Ki) (I) When you offer a minchah, *pure* will be the offering
 (Ki) When you offer a minchah offering of *oven baked* (either)
 (II) Pure *challahs* mixed with oil, or
 (III) *Wafers* anointed with oil
 (IV) (Im) If a minchah on a *frying pan* if the offering, pure mixed with oil matzoh
 (V) (Im) If a minchah in a *pot* is the offering, pure in oil will it be made
 Come with any of the above minchahs to God;
 Bring it to the Priest
 He brings it near to the altar
 And the Priest raises from the Minchah its remembrance

Lv02-01b: Paragraph structure of Lv02. For clarification and inferences read the text.

The roman numerals I-V describe five types of offerings. There are many inferences that can be made from this paragraph structure.

Rashi however suffices with the obvious point that

- A person can vow to bring any particular minchah (e.g. I will bring a *frying pan* minchah)
- A person who vows simply to bring a minchah brings the *pure minchah* offering (Type I)

Rashi further clarifies that as is clear from the text, types II-V are all cooked in some fashion while type I is uncooked (and therefore, as Rashi points out, it is called the *pure minchah* offering since it only consists of *pure wheat* and *oil* without cooking). In other words, a person who vows to bring a minchah offering can specify any one of these offerings. If they just vow to bring a minchah offering then they are only minimally obligated to bring type I, the *pure* offering which is the first listed. Since this paragraph begins with Ki, its contents and procedures

Lv02-02d *He [the offeror] brings it [the Minchah] to the priest; the priest fists from there a full fistful of its flour and oil besides [lit. on] all the frankincense*

Verse	Action	Flour and oil	Frankincense
Lv02-02	Priest fists	a full fistful from its flour & oil	besides the frankincense
Lv06-08	Priest raises	in his fist from its flour and oil	and all the frankincense

Table Lv02-02d: Comparison of phrases in verses about taking flour, oil, and frankincense.

Rashi Rule: Parallelism

Rashi Comment: As can be seen from the parallelism presented in Table Lv02-02d, the fistful of the Minchah includes only flour and oil; to that, (*on* that or *besides* that) all the frankincense is also taken. In other words, the fistful includes only oil and flour but not frankincense.

Lv02-02e *He [the offeror] brings it [the Minchah] to the priest; the priest fists from there a full fistful of its flour and oil besides [lit. on] all the frankincense; and offers it on the altar*

Verse	Action	Flour and oil	Frankincense	Offering on altar
Lv02-02	Priest fists	a full fistful from its flour & oil	besides the frankincense	& offers it on altar
Lv06-08	Priest raises	in his fist from its flour and oil	and all the frankincense	& offers it on altar

Table Lv02-02e: Comparison of phrases in verses about what is offered on the altar

Rashi Rule: Parallelism

Rashi Comment: As can be seen from the parallelism presented in Table Lv02-02e, both the fistful of flour and oil as well as the frankincense are offered on the altar.

Lv02-01f, Lv02-02a

Rashi Rule: Parallelism

Rashi Comment: [NOTE: We combine Rashi comments Lv02-01f and Lv02-02a since they form one parallelism] Table Lv02-01f presents the parallel structure of Lv02-01:02

Subject - Verb in Lv02-01:02	Actions
When one of the masses	offers a minchah...
	He will pour on it oil
	He will place on it frankincense
	He will bring it to the <u>Priests</u>
He [the priests]	will take fistful of its oil and flour
	and offer it on the altar

Table Lv02-01f2: Sequence of actions with the doers of the action (column 1)

Rashi is simple and straightforward enough.

- The pouring and placing can be done by the offeror (one of the masses even though he is not a priest)
- But the acts of taking a fistful and the following acts must be done by a Priest.

Despite this simplicity Ramban demurs. Ramban uses the parallel construction of Lv01-08:09 presented in Table Lv02-01f2

Subject in Verb Lv02-08:09	Actions
The (offeror)	brings any of the above [five] Minchahs to God
	He brings it near to the Priest
He [the priest]	Brings it [the Minchah] near to the altar
	He raises the its remembrance from the Minchah
	And offers it on the altar

Lv02-01f2: Sequence of actions with the doers of the action (column 1). Cf. to table Lv02-01f1

Based on Lv02-01f2, Ramban cogently argues that *bringing near to the altar* is also done by the priest (and cannot be done by one of the masses). But if so, Rashi's statement "the priest starts activities from taking the fistful and thereafter" is incorrect as the priest starts activities from "bringing near to the altar."

Ramban therefore emends Rashi: Rashi's statement that *the priests responsibility is from the act of taking the fistful* should be emended to read *the priests responsibility in this paragraph Lv02-01:03 is from the act of taking the fistful*. Using this emendation of Ramban, Rashi is no longer contradicting the inferences from verse 8.

In passing I point out that many of my readings of Rashi are based on emendations similar to the Ramban's; that is, I frequently, based on examination of other verses point out that the scope of a Rashi statement must be limited to certain verses. I hope that this example of Ramban shows that this is really quite common and should create any problems about deviating from the Rashi text.

As already pointed out, we combined the two Rashi comments (Lv02-01f and Lv02-02a) since they are part of the same parallelism.

Lv02-01d,e *When one of the masses offers a Minchah offering: pure will be his offering; - he will pour on it oil, and*

- *he will place on it frankincense.*

Rashi Rule: Parallelism

Rashi Comment: [NOTE: We combine Rashi comments d and e since they form one parallelism]

The text as shown above requires two procedures: *anointing the Minchah with oil* and *placing frankincense on it*. Rashi explains

- The oil is poured on the entire Minchah
- The frankincense is simply placed on top without mixing

Rashi's derivation that oil is *poured on the entire Minchah* but frankincense is *place (one scoop) on the top (without mixing)* is assisted by two other parallelisms.

Lv06-07:11 repeats the Minchah procedures. Verse 8 is laid out in parallel fashion in Table Lv02-01d1

Phrase 1	Phrase 2	Phrase 3	#4	Phrase 5
The priest will raise with his fistful	From	the flour and oil	of	the minchah
	All	the frankincense	on	the minchah

Table Lv02-01d1: Parallel structure of Lv06-08

The comparison of phrases suggests that the oil is mixed with the flour so that Priest can only take *from* it while the frankincense is *on* the Minchah so the Priest can take all of it.

Additional support is found by a parallel comparison of oil in each of the five Minchahs presented in Table Lv02-01d2. This table confirms that a blob of oil was not simply placed on the Minchah but somehow mixed through its entirety.

Minchah Type	Phrase #1 with oil	Phrase #2 with oil
Pure wheat	Pour on it oil	
Oven baked loaves	wheat matzoh loaves mixed with oil	
Oven baked wafers	matzoh wafers anointed with oil	
Griddle	wheat mixed with oil	pour on it oil
Pot	wheat (soaked) in oil	

Table Lv02-01d2: Descriptions of oil in the five Minchah types.

VERSES: ***Ex21-02a, Ex21-02b, Ex21-02c, Ex21-03a, Ex21-03b, Ex21-03c, Ex21-03d, Ex21-04a, Ex21-05a***

Malbim presented the beautiful insight, discussed by me in a recent article, that the Bible indicates a bulleted list of sub-paragraphs using the *ki - im* paradigm whereby the Chapter

- Begins with *Ki (When (Ki) you purchase a Jewish slave)*
- Continues with *Im – if (im) single, if married, if given a wife by his master, if he refuses to leave*

Rashi then makes inferences from the fact that the list is bulleted: Each bullet contains a case distinct from the others. In making these inferences Rashi employs what reading specialists refer to as *inference vs. fact*. To clarify this, consider the sentence *Little Johnny changed his socks because he walked through a puddle*

*The answer to the question, *Who walked through the puddle*, is *Johnny* and is a **fact** found in the sentence

*Contrastively, the answer to the question, *Why did he change his socks?*, that is, *Because they were wet!* is an **inference** not explicitly *found* in the paragraph

Even though inferences are not found in the paragraph they are considered *peshat* the straightforward meaning of the paragraph. Inference questions are routinely found on reading comprehension tests. To acquire citizenship, to graduate elementary and high school, students are expected to have minimum reading proficiency which includes the capacity to make inferences.

With this background let us review the 4 bullets of the paragraph describing buying a slave. To assist in understanding Rashi, note that the word *wife* is used several times in the paragraphs sometimes referring to an actual Jewish wife and sometimes referring to a non-Jewish wife which the master asked the worker to marry to produce more help.

Here are the bullets of the paragraph:

- If he comes in single
 - If he is married his *wife* leaves with him (Rashi Ex21-03c,d: So this is a Jewish wife since she leaves with him; the enigmatic *leaves with him* is explained, not by her having to work for the master since she never lost her freedom, but rather, by the master having to support her since her husband, to destitute to pay off a theft he committed, can't support her; when her husband is free (and hence able to work again), his wife, or more precisely the support of his wife leaves with him, that is the master no longer must support her.)
 - If his master gives him a *wife* with consequent children, the master owns the wife and children when the worker completes his term and leaves to freedom (Rashi Ex21-04a: So, this is a non-Jewish wife, since otherwise the master would not have the right to retain her)
 - If he refuses to leave because he likes his *wife* (Rashi Ex21-05a: So this is the non-Jewish wife, since the Jewish wife (Which presumably he likes also) leaves with him not giving him a reason to stay; thus the non-Jewish wife whom he likes but is not leaving to freedom gives him a reason to stay and refuse to leave).
-

VERSES: Ex15-06a, Ex15-06b, Ex15-06c, Ex15-06d

Biblical text:

<i>Your right hand (1)</i>	<i>God</i>	<i>Adorned with might</i>	
<i>Your right hand (1)</i>			<i>Pulverizes (2) the enemy</i>

Notes:

(1) Notice how the first column is repeated while the 2nd-4th are not repeated giving the parallelism table a staircase-like design. Hence, the academics refer to this type of parallelism as staircase parallelism. Rashi gives and cites several examples of it throughout the bible.

Both Rashi and Ibn Ezra explain that staircase parallelism indicates repeated action. It is important to emphasize that Rashi, in this verse, derives the repetition, that is, God pulverizes the enemy again and again, from the conjugation of the word pulverize (See note (2)).

*Another important point is that Rashi goes a minor step more than Ibn Ezra. Staircase parallelism indicates more than just repetition according to Rashi; rather, it indicates unexpected repetition, a repetition you wouldn't have expected. In this verse, if one thinks about ordinary warfare, we think of an initial display of power which then winds down; however, God, unlike humans, does not have a winding down. God continually pulverizes with the same strength and power. To use Rashi's language and metaphor: *God's left hand* (weaker winding down) *becomes a right hand*.*

Rashi makes a comment that *according to the peshat of the verse*, God's right hand which is adorned with might smashes the enemy. *Here, readers mistakenly think peshat refers to the simple straightforward meaning of the verse, implying that other readings are homily.*

Not so. In my doctoral thesis I point out that the word *derash* has 7 flavors or meanings. I use the English example *drive*: The simple meaning of *drive*, is a means of motion. But the *nuanced meaning of drive, nuances to a native speaker, is drive a car*. It would be a mistake to say that *drive a car* is *derash* or *homily*; it is in fact the simple *peshat*, what the word *drive* means.

Hence, a conclusion of my doctoral thesis is that *peshat* could refer to the *simple meaning of the text*. But it can also refer to *the simpleton meaning of the text by a non-native speaker*. Thus in this verse, Rashi is explaining how a *simpleton* person untrained in poetic reading might read the verse totally ignoring the straightforward *peshat* meaning of the staircase parallelism.

Finally, we deal with a cryptic comment of Rashi: *When the Jews fulfill the will of God, His left hand becomes a Right hand*. To fully understand this, we look at its source in the *Midrash Rabbah*. The *Midrash Rabbah* contrasts our verse and a corresponding verse in La02-03

Your right hand God pulverizes the enemy
God withdrew his right hand for the enemy (to destroy)

The two verses contradict each other. Rashi following the Midrash explains

When the Jews do God's will, His left hand becomes a Right hand
When the Jews sin, He withdraws his Right hand.

In other words,

Ibn Ezra exclusively dealt with the meaning of *this* verse
Rashi dealt both with the meaning of this and other verses

(2) The verse uses the future conjugation, *tiratz*, *will pulverize*, to describe a present action. Hebrew grammar uses the future conjugation when it wants to indicate the *habitual*. The *habitual* refers to *repeated* activity. The verb *go* in the sentence *I go to work by train* does not indicate present, future, or past activity, but rather, indicates a *habitual* activity, something I always and repeatedly do. Hebrew indicates the habitual (among other ways) using the future conjugation on a present activity.

Thus Rashi derives the *repeated* nature of God pulverizing the enemy from the habitual, not from the staircase parallelism.

VERSES: Ex12-21a, Ex12-21b, Ex12-22d

Biblical text:

Ex12-21a, b	Verbs used	Remainder of verse
First half	Drag (i.e. designate) or(1)	
2 nd hand	acquire (literally <i>take</i>)	Herd animals by your families and slaughter the Passover offerings

Rashi text: (1) The biblical hebrew uses the prefix *vav* which normally indicates *conjunction* but can also refer to other connectives such as *disjunctive*. Rashi rejects

Drag (designate) and acquire herd animals by your families and slaughter the Passover

since it violates sequence: First you acquire and then you designate. Grammarians call this the *sequential and*. Hence the Rashi text interpreting it with an *or* instead of an *and*:

Drag (designate) herd animals (For the Passover offering) *provided* you own such animals;
If you don't so own, acquire them

Biblical text: Ex12-22b

	Verb (Activity)	Indirect argument
First half	Take a hyssop bundle and dip it into	the blood in the vessel(1)
Second half	And touch it to the lintel and two doorposts from	the blood in the vessel (1)

Rashi Text (Notes): (1)Rashi explains why the phrase *from the blood in the utensil* is repeated

- If the verse stated it only once, I would think that it suffices to have one dip and then 3 placements (on the lintel and two doorposts)
- By placing the phrase twice in the verse, there is emphasis that each *placement* should come from a separate dipping of the hyssop into the utensil with blood.

Verse: Dt26-09a, Dt26-05b, Dt26-09b

Verse	Event for which we thank God	Text of Verse
Dt26-05	Laban	A lost Aramean (no steady job) was my father (Jacob)
Dt26-05	Egypt at beginning (1)	He descended to Egypt with a few people and became numerous
Dt26-06	Egypt after we multiplied	The Egyptians mistreated us; but we prayed to the God of our fathers and who heard our prayers (and took us out of Egypt)
D26-09a	Temple (1)	He brought us to this place, The Temple (to offer the first fruit)
Dt26-09b	Israel	He gave us this land (Israel), a land of white-wines and fruit juices
Dt26-10	First Fruit offering	(So that) Now I have brought my first fruits that God gave me

NOTES: (1) Rashi takes Dt26-05:10 as a *list* of events in our history for which we must be grateful. Thus the first calamity we faced was Laban who mistreated Jacob. We then faced two calamities in Egypt: One when we came – we were very few in number and nevertheless grew; and the 2nd when the Egyptian enslaved us. Similarly, consistent with the principles of parallelism (which resemble a collection of bullets in English), Rashi takes *this* and *this land* as two distinct item. *This land* obviously refers to Israel while *this place* refers to the Temple since the Temple is called in several places the *place*, similar to *God* who is called the *place*, indicating that God is a *place for all* not just for those who are holy.

Verse: Dt22-04a, Dt22-04b, Ex23-05a, Ex23-05b, Ex23-05c (Ki TaytZay)

Dt22-04	Do not see	your <u>brother's</u> donkey or ox	Falling on the road	And ignore it	Get it up	With him
Ex23-05	Perhaps you will see	Your <u>enemy's</u> donkey	Resting under its burden	And you will abstain from	Abandoning	For him?
					Abandon	With him

	(1)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(3)
--	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

Table Dt22-04: Parallel study of the two verses commanding Jews to assist fellow Jews with animal loads

NOTES: (1) One verse uses a prohibition (*Do not see...and ignore*) while the other verse uses a rhetorical statement (*perhaps you will see and you will abstain from helping*). The rhetorical verse is used to counter the natural tendency not to want to help one's enemy. Rashi cites similar rhetorical approaches in Dt07-17:18 (*perhaps you will say these nations outnumber me how can I conquer them? (Rather) Do not fear them because God will help you*)

(2) The bible coins idioms here: *falling on the road* and *resting under its burden*. The bible uses further idioms *get it up* and *abandon for him*. Rashi explains that the two verses deal with two animal-burden situations:

- The animal can no longer move under its burden *and needs an unloading*
- The animal feel and its burden fell with him; *it needs a loading*.

The the two situations address needs of *loading* and *unloading* burdens from animal. A Jew is obligated to help with *loading* and *unloading* whether the animal belongs to a *brother* or *enemy*.

Note that using *get up* to refer to *loading the burden* is a rather natural idiom. Rashi explains that using the verb *ayin-zayin-beth* (abandon) in this verse means *to help the animal abandon its burden – to abandon (the animal's burden from the animal) for him (the owner)*. Rashi simply says that *abandon* here has a connotation of *helping*. But Rashi did not intend to say that *abandon* means *helping*; Rather Rashi looked at the combination *abandon for him* (not *abandon him*) which means *help the animal abandon (unload!) it burden for him, the owner*.

(3) Notice the change of prepositions *get up with him, unload for him, unload with him*. Rashi explains:

- *abandon for him* means *help the animal abandon its burden for him the owner, that is, unload the burden*
- *abandon with him* means that you only obligated to help if the owner participates. But if the owner slouches and doesn't want to help, you are no longer obligated *at all* to unload the animal. In other words, the commandment is to *assist* the owner (it is not primarily directed to the animal)
- Similarly, *get it up (load the burden on the animal) with him* means you are only obligated to *assist the owner loading the burden*; if the owner sits on the side you have no obligation.

Verse: Dt24-14a (*Ki Taytzay*)

Verse	Prohibited Activity (Verb)	Against Whom (Object)
Dt14-14	Don't withhold wages	<i>Of a poor person</i>
Lv19-13	Don't withhold wages	<i>Of your colleague</i>

Table 24-14a: From the fact that two different targets of withholding wages are given in two different verses Rashi infers that (i) if you withhold wages from a rich person, you only violate Lv19-13 while if you withhold wages from a poor person, you violate two biblical prohibitions (Lv19-13 and Dt14-14). When the parallelism occurs between non-consecutive verses we don't use the method of climactic parallelism.

Verse: Nu29-06a:b:c (*Pinchas*)

Introductory phrase	Activity (Verb)	Directed Against whom (Indirect Object)
These are the community leaders, Dathan and Aviram	Who instigated [the nation]	<i>against Moses and Aaron</i>
	During the instigation [of the nation]	<i>against God</i>

Table Nu26-09a:b:c: The parallelism shows two clauses both talking about the activity of *instigation*. Hence the Rashi comment, justified by the parallelism, that they committed two sins of instigation (one against God and one against Moses and Aaron). Other Rashi comments are indicated in brackets to clarify the flow of the text.

Verse: Nu27-07d,11a (Pinchas)

Case	Word used to indicate inheritance activity (Verb)	What is inherited (Object)	To whom the inheritance goes (Indirect Object)
Daughter of Tzlafchad's who had no sons	<i>Transfer</i>	Inheritance of Father	To daughter
Deceased person without sons but with daughters	<i>Transfer</i>	Inheritance of Father	To daughter
Deceased person with no children	<i>Give</i>	Inheritance of Father	To brothers of the deceased
Deceased person with no children and no brothers	<i>Give</i>	Inheritance of Father	To brothers of the father of the deceased
Deceased person with no children, brothers, or uncles	<i>Give</i>	Inheritance of Father	To the nearest family relative [on father's side]

Table Nu27-07d, 11a: Rashi comments on the different words used to describe the activities (verbs): *Transfer* and *give*: *Give* is used when males inherit since the inheritance is permanent. *Transfer*, with a nuance of possibly temporary, is used when females inherit since her male children inherit her upon death and these male children belong to the tribe of the father not the mother. Rashi comments are indicated in brackets: *family relative* is *from the father's side* since Jewishness is determined by the mother and tribal affiliation by the father.

Rashi Verses: Nu18-10a, Nu18-11a, Nu18-11b, Nu18-11c (Korax)

Biblical Text: *These are the gifts from the holy of holies....In the holy of holies you should eat it; all males may eat of it, it is holy of holies*

And this is the gifts of terumah for all waivings of the Jewish people: I have given it to you your sons and daughters forever; all ritually pure people in your house may eat it.

Rashi Comment: The following table arranges the underlined phrases in the above two verses in parallel fashion

Topic	Who may eat it	Verse	Where	Verse
Holy of Holies	Male	Nu18-10	In Temple	Nu18-10
Peace offering waivings (1)	All (2) Ritually clean (sons, daughters)	Nu18-11	In your house	Nu18-11

Table Nu18-10a: This table arranges the parallel verses Nu18-10 and Nu18-11 in parallel fashion. The parallelism shows two contrasts between *holy-of-holy* gifts and *peace-offering waivings* gifts: (i) One may only eat *holy of holy gifts* if male versus *waivings* which can be eaten by any ritually pure person; (ii) *holy of holy gifts* may only be eaten on Temple ground versus *waiving gifts* which can be eaten even in one's house.

NOTES:

- (1) I have combined the two Rashi comments into one. The word *terumah* is used both for percentages of grain harvests given to Priests as well as *peace offering raise-and-waived breast-and-thighs*. (The breasts and thighs of peace offerings are waived by the priest as part of the ceremony.) Since the verse mentions *waivings*, Rashi interprets the *Terumah* in the verse to refer to the peace-offering waivings.
- (2) Words like *all* are expansive. They are meant to include something extra. In this case Rashi explains that the word *all* refers to the Priests wife, she too may eat of the *peace offering waivings*.

The Sifsay Chachamim commentary wonders why Rashi used *all* to include the Priest's wife; after all sons and daughters are mentioned explicitly in the verse; would that not imply that the Priest's wife may also eat?

I would respond to the Sifsay Chachamim as follows: Sons and daughters have permanent relationships with the Priest which cannot be broken. Contrastively, the relationship of wife is potentially temporary since she could get a divorce and remarry. Therefore Rashi, by interpreting *all* to refer to *wife* emphasizes that if a woman is currently the Priest's wife she may eat of the waivings.

Rashi Verses: *Nu18-09a, Nu18-09b, Nu18-09c, Nu18x09c, Nu18y09c, Nu18-09d* (Korax)

Biblical Text: *These are the gifts (to the Priests) from (the time) of the fire*

- *All offerings*
- *All Minchahs*
- *All Sin offerings*
- *All Guilt offerings*

That they return to me.

Rashi Comment: The Biblical text at Nu18-09 lists the gifts God gives to the Priests from the Holy-of-Holy offerings. Table Nu18-09 presents the words used in the text, which offering they refer to, and the supporting verse showing that the Priest does indeed get these as gifts.

Verse	Offering Type in Verse	Translation	Supporting verses (Priest gets it)	Notes
Nu18-09b	All offerings	Peace offerings	Lv23-19:20, Lv07-14, Lv07-32:34	(1) (2)
Nu18-09c	All minchahs	Minchah offerings	Lv06-09 Lv07-09	(2)
Nu18x09c	All sin offerings	Sin offerings	Lv06-22, Lv06-19, Lv07-07	(2)
Nu18y09c	All guilt offerings	Guilt offerings	Lv07-06, Nu05-08, Lv07-07	(2)
Nu18-09d	That they return to me	Guilt offerings	Nu05-08	(3)

Table Nu18-09: The text of Nu18-09 listing Priestly gifts, the translation into the corresponding offering, and verses supporting the assertion that these are Priestly gifts.

NOTES:

(1) The supporting verses present a sequence of first offering the offering on the fire and then letting the Priests consume it. Hence, we have translated Nu18-09 *these are the gifts from the fire* to mean *these are the gifts from (the time) of offering them on the fire.*

(2) The Lv Chapters 1-5 lists the five *types* of offerings: *elevation, minchah, peace, sin, guilt*. Three of those terms are using in the verse: *minchah, sin, guilt* and hence the Rashi comment “These are understood as is.” I have broken this single Rashi comment into 3 separate Rashi comments. The remaining word *offerings* is a category not one of the offering types. Because the list is bulleted each bullet is interpreted distinctly and hence this term must refer to one of the two remaining offering types: *elevation, peace*. But elevation offerings are not consumed by Priests while Peace offerings are (as shown by the verses listed). Finally, since these are holy-of-holy gifts it must refer to the single Peace offering that is holy-of-holies, the one listed in Lv23-19:20. (The other peace offerings are simply holy because the owner offerors may eat of them but the offering at Lv23-19:20 is owned by the community who does not partake of it).

Regarding my assertion that this list is bulleted: I have explained in my article Biblical Formatting, (JBQ, 35(1), 2007) that the Biblical Author will indicate what a modern author would indicate by bullets by using a repeating keyword. In this verse the word *all* is repeated: *all offerings, all minchahs, all sin offerings, all peace offerings* and this justifies the bulleted list.

(3) The text literally says *all guilt offerings that they return to me.* Rashi says *this is the guilt offering of someone who stole from a convert who then died without obtaining his property back* (discussed in Nu05). In the discussion of that guilt offering the text uses the word *return (the guilt offering returned to God to the Priest (Nu05-08))*. Based on this linkage Rashi interprets *that they return to me* to refer to this guilt offering.

However, I believe this Rashi comment is just a mnemonic. Rashi’s interpretation, if taken literally would be very ungrammatical since *that they return to me* is an adjectival phrase modifying the offerings. Instead, I would simply say, that *all guilt offerings* includes all guilt offerings including the

special guilt offering of someone who stole from a convert who died without restitution. Rashi's mnemonic is just a reminder that this particular guilt offering is also included.

As to the rather unusual phrase offerings returned to me: that phrase simply contrasts that (i) we don't own our property; rather it is on loan from God and offerings are homage and return of God's property to Him and (ii) although God owns them, God chose to gift them as gifts to Aaron

Verse: Dt16-19a,b,c (Shofetim)

Prohibition word	Activity prohibited (Verb)	Rashi clarification
Don't	Cause deviation of justice	Don't cause any deviation of justice
Don't (even)	Show recognition	Even by smiling or speaking softly to one litigant over another
Don't (even)	Take bribes	Even if the bribe is given to reach the true verdict

Table Dt16-19,a,b,c: Rashi interprets the verse *climatically*. This is known as *climatic parallelism* under which each successive part of the parallelism is interpreted as *adding* to the previous part (as indicated by the word *even* inserted parenthetically). So (Row 1) besides not causing deviation of justice, (Row 2) don't even show recognition (by smiling or speaking in a friendly tone) to one litigant over another, and furthermore (Row 3) don't even take bribes if the briber asked you to decide the case truly.

When exercising *climatic parallelism*, it may take some reflection to understand the implications of *even if*. Here, the interpretation of Row 2 as *smiling* or *speaking softly* to one litigant is inspired by the word *recognition* (lit. recognize faces). Rashi does not interpret Row 3 to mean, as stated, don't take bribes to deviate justice, since the prohibition of deviating from justice is mentioned in Row 1. Hence Rashi interprets Row 3 to refer to a case *not* described in Row 1 as when a person gives you a bribe to decide the case truly.

VERSES: Gn14-23a, Gn14-23b

Verse	Verse Beginning / Intro	Parallel oaths	Verse Conclusion
Gn14-23	Abram said to the King of Sedom: I swear to Go (lit <i>I lift my hand to God, the Highest Almighty</i>)	- If (1) <i>from a string to a shoelace</i> - If (1) <i>I will take anything of yours</i>	(2) So you shouldn't say, " <i>I (am the one) who made Abram wealthy.</i> "

NOTES: (1) Note the repeating *if* (bolded). A repeating keyword like *if* indicates a bullet structure and hence the column "Parallel" oaths have been reformatted as bullets to reflect this. A bulleted list is used to emphasize distinctness among the bulleted items (which without the bullets would look like repetition). The context of the verse is the return of booty after the war Abraham had just waged to save his nephew. Motivated by this context Rashi interprets the distinctness of the two bullets as follows:

- *String to shoelace* indicates booty from the war (things likely to be taken in a war)
- *Anything of yours* indicates *personal remuneration* from the King's royal assets.

In other words, Abram says he will take neither compensation nor booty items.

(2)The “Verse Conclusion” column is parallel to the “Parallel Oaths” column as shown in the Table. This type of parallelism where the two parallel parts indicate *assertion* and *justification* is very common. The *justification* given *So it shouldn't be said that Abram became rich from the King of Sedom* is consistent with the parallel oaths that Abraham took abstaining from taking from the King of Sedom any type of compensation or a percentage of the booty.

VERSE: Gn14-24a

Gn14-24	Context-Previous Verse		
	Upon the King of Sedom offering Abraham a portion of the booty or compensation for his fighting the war, Abram states that <i>he will not take anything</i> and then continues <i>except</i>	Exactly what the staff (Abraham's servants who fought the war)	They will take their portion
		And the portion of the men who walked with me, Aner, Eshcol, and Mamre	

NOTES: Notice that there are two groups who will take compensation: (a) The actual soldiers (Abraham's servants) who fought the war (b) the other soldiers and staff who did not go into battle but for example watched possessions of those fighting until they returned. Abraham established a principle, later perpetuated by King David (1Ki30-24), that the fighting soldiers and remaining staff divide *equally* in every battle (even though the fighting soldiers may have worked harder or taken more risks).

VERSES: Gn28-20a, Gn28-20b, Gn28-20c, Gn28-21a, Gn28-21b, Gn28-21c, Gn28-22a, Gn28-22b

God's promise to Jacob (Gn28-15)	The <i>if</i> part of Jacob's vow (Gn28-20): <i>If...</i>	The <i>then</i> part of Jacob's vow (Gn28-21): <i>Then..</i> (4)	Ramban's mystical secret: The 3 items of the <i>then</i> statement correspond to the 3 items <i>unique</i> to the land of Israel
I'll <i>be with you</i> (1a)	He'll <i>be with me</i> (1a)	God will be my God	Prophecy [Principally occurs in Israel] (5)
I'll <i>watch</i> you wherever you go (1b)	He'll <i>Watch me</i> on this path that I go (1b)	This stone made into a monument will be a house of God	Temple [Only may be built in Israel] (6)
I'll <i>return you</i> to this land(1c)	I'll <i>return in peace</i> (2) to my father's house(1c) (3)	I will give 10% to you of all you give me	Levite Gifts [only required to be given in Israel]
I'll <i>not leave you</i> until I do all that I promised you (1d)	He'll give me <i>food</i> and <i>clothing</i> (1d)		

NOTES:

- (1) Gn28-20a Rashi explicit: That Gn28-20a through Gn28-21a corresponds to the four promises in Gn28-15
- (1a) Thus God's promise *I will be with you* corresponds to Jacob's vow *If God will be with me*
- (1b) Gn28-20b: God's promise *I'll watch you* corresponds to Jacob's vow *If God will watch me*
- (1c) Gn28-20c: God's promise, *I'll return you to this land* corresponds to Jacob's vow *If I'll return to my father's house.*
- (1d) Gn28-20d: God's promise *I will not leave you* corresponded to Jacob's vow *If God will give me food and*

clothing. Rashi bases the correspondence between *leave* and *food, clothing* on P037-28 "I have not seen a righteous person *left* and his children *seeking bread*. "

(2) God only promised to *return Jacob to this land* while Jacob in his vow states *If God will return me in peace to my father's house*. Rashi explains the extra clause *in peace* as follows: Jacob did not worry about returning to his father's house since he had been promised but he was worried that one of his children would defect. Hence *in peace* which comes from the root *complete* is a prayer *if God return's me complete*

(3) God's promises were actually in a slightly different sequence. We changed the sequence to correspond it to Jacob's vow.

(4) Our reading of Rashi is based on the Rashi on Gn28-21a where Rashi explicitly connects God's four promises to the first four items in Jacob's vow, in other words the *if* part of the vow (*If God fulfills these four promises then....*). Thus the last 3 items are the *then part* of the vow. Rashi in fact points out that the Hebrew letter *vav* when prefixed to a word can mean *if, and, but, etc*. In fact there is a delightful academic paper, *The 70 meanings of vav*. "

However, Rashi places this comment that *vav = then* before the 4th of God's promises rather than after it which is consistent with the Rashi comment on Gn28-21a and also consistent with the fact that the 4th promise *God will return me to my father's house* is a *condition* that *if God does* then I Jacob will reciprocate; it doesn't make sense to list something God does (*returning Jacob to this father's house*) as a consequence that Jacob will do. Hence, I think the placement of this Rashi comment (*vav = then*) should be after the comment.

(5) Gn28-21c Rashi says "His name will be on me from beginning to end" which Ramban interprets as the gift of prophecy

(6) Gn28-22b Rashi cites Gn35-01 that Jacob in fact offered offerings on this stone. But Rashi is not making this the only interpretation of the verse but rather one of many examples of it being a house of God. So the verse means that this will become a Temple (as Ramban says) and Rashi adds "We see Temple functions emerging immediately when Jacob returned."
