

The 10 RashiYomi Rules

Their presence in Rashis in AchRaY-QeDoShiM

Vol. 29#06 - Adapted from **Rashi-is-Simple**

(c) RashiYomi Incorporated, Dr. Hendel President, Apr 23rd, 2018

For the full copyright statement see the Appendix

Useful URLs:

Rashiyomi Website: <<http://www.RashiYomi.Com>>
This week's issue: <<http://www.Rashiyomi.com/rule2906.pdf>>
Former week's issue: <<http://www.Rashiyomi.com/rule.htm>>
Old weekly Rashis: <<http://www.Rashiyomi.com/rule.htm>>
Rashi short e-course: <http://www.Rashiyomi.com/RashiShortGuideHTMLBook.htm>
<<http://www.Rashiyomi.com/rule.htm>>
Hebrew-English Rashi: <http://www.chabad.org/library/bible_cdo/aid/63255/jewish/The-Bible-with-Rashi.htm>

GOALS

The goal of the Weekly Rashi Digest is to use the weekly Torah portion to expose students at all levels to the ten major methods of Rashi's commentary. Continual weekly exposure to these ten major methods facilitate the acquisition, familiarity, and facility with the major exegetical methods.

Hi

This year I am focusing on the presence of Jewish Law in verses and Rashi.

This week we continue learning Jewish laws derived from the Parshah even if Rashi did not cover all of them. We deal with the famous law prohibiting putting a stumbling block before the blind which is interpreted to prohibit giving bad advice and has lots of uses in contemporary society. Rashi did cover some of these laws and we cover the rest.

I will attempt to send out the Parshah over a week in advance.

Russell Jay Hendel, President, Rashiyomi

As usual, when making transitions in the Rashi Newsletter we welcome positive and negative comments as well as requests. Please send all comments to RashiYomi@GMail.Com.

Subscribe / Unsubscribe: Email

RashiYomi@GMail.Com <<mailto:RashiYomi@GMail.Com>>

Parallelism *Daily Rashi* Lv19-14b, Dt29-18a Apr 24- Apr 28, 2018

Background: David HaLivni Weiss, wrote a book, “*Peshat* and *Derash*, Plain and Applied Meaning in Rabbinic Exegesis,” Oxford University Press, 1998. In that book Dr. Weiss advances the idea that *Derash* was read into the text by the Talmudic sages. Dr. Weiss also suggests that the concern with the *Peshat*, simple meaning, was a later development.

However, Weiss totally ignores the very rich literature showing that exegesis emanates from sound principles. In fact, two books had been written on **Parallelism** about 10 years before he published this book and had he applied their methods he could have seen that his analysis was faulty. The two books are James Kugel, "The Idea of Biblical Poetry: Parallelism and Its History," John Hopkins University Press, 1998 (originally written in 1980) and Adele Berlin, "The Dynamics of Biblical Parallelism," 2nd Edition, Eerdsman, 2007 (Originally written in 1985).

To support his thesis that Talmudic exegesis ignores the simple meaning of the text and reads into the text desired exegesis Dr Weiss presents 3 examples one of which we cover today. The example deals with the prohibition of giving bad advice. What we try and do today is show how the laws derived from the Talmud can naturally be seen as emanating using the **Parallelism** method.

Before beginning, I take note that occasionally I meet someone such as happened last week who tells me that certain parts of the digests are "above him." I think this is because sometimes I take for granted some

of the advanced Talmudic methods. Therefore, I am going over the derivations in a much more leisurely pace today. I also will bring a summary table. I hope this clarifies these derivations. Also, if something in these digests could use more clarification, shoot me an email at Rashiyomi@GMail.com. Our goal is to please all our customers!

With this background let us begin.

Biblical Text:

- **Lv19-14** *In the presence of a blind person, do not put a stumbling block*
- **Dt27-18** *Cursed be him who misleads a blind person on the road.*

Verse	Curse / Prohibition	Verb	Blind person	Verb-activity	Where
Lv19-14b	(Don't)		<u>In the presence of a Blind person</u>	Don't place a <u>stumbling block</u>	
Dt27-18a	Cursed be	He who Misleads	A blind person	(misleads)	<u>On the road</u>
Rashi (Summary)			(1) Emphasis on <i>blindness</i> – even intellectually blind (2) Emphasis <i>in the presence</i> but not e.g. if it will reach the blind person indirectly through a second party	(3) Emphasis on <i>placing</i> – so not if already there (The <i>two-river side</i> law) (4) Emphasis on <i>stumbling block</i> – but not if stumble is not inevitable	(5) Emphasis <i>on the road</i> so it refers to physically stumbling the person

Rashi Text: We go beyond the Rashi text who deals with one of the five differences in these two verses. The verses are presented in parallel fashion below. We spend a long time on the narrative so people can see how the differences give rise to laws. We hope this will be clearer.

Notice how we numbered the Rashi derivations (1)-(5). We now go through each of these derivations very slowly so that the derivation will be clear. The reader should always refer back to the table

Difference (#5) in the table

From the phrase *on the road* we learn that the emphasis is *on the road* so the verse refers to a real physical stumbling block *on the road* which results in the blind person tripping.

This derivation is easy

- One verse says *don't mislead a blind person on the road*
- The other verse leaves out the word road

So, the parallelism emphasizes *on the road*. You are not just stumbling the person (perhaps intellectually) but actually stumbling the person *on the road*. So, the verse refers to actually placing a physical stumbling block before a blind person on the road leading to the person's fall

Difference (#1) in the table

Instead of saying *Don't place a stumbling block before the blind* it instead says *Before the blind don't place a stumbling block*. The difference is in the word order. Inference from word order is normally considered an advanced Talmudic method. So, I think this does deserve some examples.

What is the difference between **Lv19-14** and **Dt27-18**? The difference occurs in the order of words. Let us illustrate with some English sentences

1a1) Don't drive your car

1a2) It is the car that should not be driven

1b1) Don't drink sugary drinks

1b2) Sugary drinks should be not drunk

1c1) I watched the movie

1c2) The movie was watched by me.

These are three pairs of sentences which say the same thing but differ in word order. Can anything be inferred from the reverse word order. Of course, one can simply say that each of the sentence pairs are saying the same thing. But an important point of the **Parallelism** method is general emphasis. So, let us look at each sentence pair and see what the point of the emphasis could be

1a1/1a2) In sentence **1a2** there is emphasis on the car. So, a car should not be driven but perhaps a motorcycle or bike can be driven. On the other hand, if I only said sentence **1a1** it would be natural to generalize: Yes, don't drive your car but also don't drive a motorcycle.

True, the generalization is not mentioned. But most biblical verses are illustrative and by example. As Rashi in *Pesachim* 6a says you always generalize unless you are told not to. By placing the emphasis *on the car*, we indicate that a car should not be driven but motorcycles are ok (**1a2**). If I however, used ordinary word order (**1a1**) then it would be natural to generalize - don't drive cars or anything drivable.

1c1/1c2) In **1c2** the emphasis is on the movie being watched. So, the person actually watched the movie, not say, a TV replication of the movie. True, **1c1** mentions the movie, but maybe a TV version of the movie was watched. Again, we have the theme that biblical verses should be generalized unless we are told not to. And, reversing order is one way to indicate an emphasis of *do not generalize*.

We leave **1b1/1b2** as an exercise to be attempted by the reader. Try and figure out how you would generalize **1b1**) and how you would clamp down and be restrictive if you just saw **1b2**). If you even partially succeed in this then you have mastered this principle of Talmudic exegesis.

We can summarize as follows: *The "2" version has literal emphasis while the "1" version may allow generalization since that is the way the Bible should be read.*

Let us now apply this to **Lv19-14** and **Dt27-18**.

- **Lv19-14** *In the presence of a blind person don't place a stumbling block*
- **Dt27-18** *Don't mislead the blind on the way.*

So **Lv19-14** emphasizes *the blind person* while **Dt27-18** allows generalization. The Talmud does generalize **Dt27-18** and prohibits not only placing a stumbling block before the blind but it also prohibits giving a person bad advice since the person is intellectually blind to what could happen. We learn this from the change in order: *In the presence of the blind don't place a stumbling block* vs *Don't mislead the blind*. The verse *don't mislead the blind* without emphasis leaves oneself open to generalization, any blind person, even intellectually blind.

Difference #2) in the Table

Notice the difference in referring to the blind in the two verses

- **Lv19-14** *in the presence of the blind*
- **Dt27-18** *Don't mislead the blind*

So, the prohibition is only on (directly) in the presence.

What is an example of indirect? Here is a good example from the Talmud.

- I can't sell non-kosher meat to Jews since I am placing a prohibited product, non-kosher meat, before the spiritually blind
- But I can sell non-kosher meat to non-Jewish wholesalers even though they sell to Jews. Why? Because I am not placing the non-Kosher meat *directly* in the presence of the Jews but rather selling them indirectly through a non-Jew.

Lv19-14 makes it clear that the prohibition is only on direct selling but indirect selling is OK even if you know it might be resold. We learn this from the extra word *presence of the blind*. The extra word is in turn emphasized by the **parallelism**.

Differences #3-#4) in the table

Distinguishing between an *activity* and the *object* of that activity is a really advanced Talmudic method of exegesis. So, this definitely deserves some explanation. Again, we illustrate with some simple example pairs of sentences.

1a1) A ritually impure person sitting creates impurity

1a2) A ritually impure person sitting on a seat creates impurity

1b1) I was thirsty so I drank

1b2) I was thirsty so I drank a drink

1c1) The ballgame was exciting so we ate while we watched

1c2) The ballgame was exciting so we had lunch while we watched.

Again, perhaps all these sentence pairs are saying the same thing. However, the biblical style teaches through emphasis. So, we reread these sentence pairs with an emphasis on the nuances emanating from the verses.

Let us look at **1b1/1b2**: If you drank a drink you probably bought a Coke or an OJ (Orange Juice). While if you just drank maybe you went to a water fountain or placed your mouth under the faucet. The point here is that the mention of the object, drink, creates emphasis and specificity on something typically drunk.

Now let us look at **1a1/1a2**: You could sit on a log or garbage pail (**1a1**). However, sitting on a seat indicates sitting on something made for sitting (**1a2**).

In fact, this distinction is the basis for the biblical inferences on **Lv16-04**. There is an emphasis that it is not just the act of sitting but rather the act of sitting on something made for sitting. A ritually impure person who sits on say a pail or something not made as a seat does not transfer ritual impurity since the person *is* sitting but *is not* sitting on a seat.

1c1/1c2) I hope you are getting the method of this approach by now. **1c1** could refer to eating a snack while 1c2 has an emphasis on something substantive like a recognized meal, e.g. a lunch.

We now apply this method and approach to **Lv19-14** vs **Dt27-18**

- **Lv19-14** Don't place a stumbling block

- **Dt27-18** Don't deceive.

The emphasis in **Lv19-14** is on something that is actually a stumbling block and something given to the person. You are not just deceiving him but you are using a

known stumbling block and giving the person something. Here are the laws derived from this

Difference #3) in the above table

The *two-river side law*: Suppose I buy a ham sandwich for a fellow Jew who does not keep kosher. Then I have actually given a stumbling block (non-kosher food)

But suppose the ham sandwich is on the table within arm's reach at a party and I pass it to the Jew who does not keep kosher. Jewish law explains that I have not violated the prohibitions in **Lv19-14** and **Dt27-18**. Why? Because I have not *placed* anything. It was there anyway. To use the language of activities and objects we might respond

- True I did deceive him (gave him a ham sandwich)
- But I did not place before him anything. It was there anyway; I have not violated the prohibitions of placing a stumbling block.

This distinction is typically illustrated in the Talmud with a cup of wine on one of two sides of a river. If I cross the river and give the cup to someone who has vowed not to drink liquor I have violated placing a stumbling block before the blind (We are all blind with regards to liquor). But if the cup of wine is on the same side of the river I have not violated anything since I have not placed the cup; the cup was there. Hence the catchy name, "*the two-river side exemption*"

Difference #4) in the above table

There is only prohibition if what you place is a real stumbling block. Not if it is a possible stumbling block.

From the phrase *place the stumbling block* we infer that it has to be a real stumbling block. Suppose I sell a sieve to a Jew in the 7th year (which is observed in Israel these days). Suppose the Jew is suspected of violating the 7th year laws. Is it prohibited to so sell? After all this person can now harvest and sieve wheat with the sieve I sell him.

But the key test is *exclusivity*. Is the sieve *exclusively* used for a prohibited purpose? Is it a stumbling block? The Talmud (in this case the Jerusalem Talmud) points out that sieves can be used for household kitchen purposes. It is not exclusively used for prohibited field purposes. Hence, it is permitted to sell the sieve to the Jew suspected of 7th year violations.

Summary

I hope the above narrative makes the Rashi and Talmudic exegesis clearer. I have summarized the five laws in the table below to provide additional clarity. The numbers refer to the numbers in the Table on top.

Law	Verse inferred from	Text of Verse	How text implies law
(5) Prohibition of physically stumbling a blind person	Dt27-18	Mislead on road	So it is not a metaphor stumbling block but something on the road
(1) Prohibition of deceiving someone intellectually	Contrast of Dt27-18 Lv19-14	Contrast of *Don't mislead <i>blind</i> vs. *Before the <i>blind</i> don't place stumbling block	If the keyword, blind, is not placed up front, it invites reasonable generalization This is a rule about Biblical style that biblical verses are meant to be generalized unless you are told not to!
(2) Permission to sell to wholesaler who sells to Jews	Lv19-14	In the <i>presence</i> of a blind don't place a stumbling block	Emphasis on <i>presence</i> : So, selling to a middle man is permissible
(4) Two-side-river permissibility. You can hand a cup of wine to someone who has vowed against drinking wine if the cup of wine is right there	Lv19-14	Don't place a stumbling block before the blind (This contrasts with the more simple don't mislead the blind)	The prohibition is on <i>placing</i> the stumbling block. If it is already placed there you are not violating anything; you are not placing it, it was already placed.
(5) Permission to sell a sieve to a person on the 7 th year when field-sieving is prohibited since the sieve is not exclusively used for field sieving (maybe the buyer wants it for his kitchen use)	Lv19-14	Don't give a stumbling block before the blind (This contrasts with the more simple don't mislead the blind)	The prohibition is on placing an actual stumbling block. So, if the thing placed is not exclusively used for prohibited purposes you can place it.

THE 10 RASHI RULE CATEGORIES / THE 30 RASHIRULE

Copyright 2001, Rashiyomi Inc., Dr Hendel President, www.Rashiyomi.com/rules-01.htm

NOTE ON COPYRIGHTS:

This particular appendix, like many portions of the Rashiyomi website, are protected by a paid copyright. However, we clarify that the intent of Rashiyomi copyright statements is the intent expressed in the creative commons copyright statement, the full statement of which may be found at <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/legalcode> and the human readable summary which may be found at <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/>. The basic intent is: (1) **(by)** any citation of Rashiyomi explanations, rules etc should acknowledge the Rashiyomi website as the author by giving its URL: <http://www.Rashiyomi.com> (or the specific page on the website); (2) **(nc)** It is prohibited for anyone to use the material on this website for commercial use, that is to derive monetary gain from it; (3) **(sa)** while people are encouraged to cite paragraphs of explanations from Rashiyomi in their own works, they must share their works in a similar manner under the creative commons agreement, **cc by nc sa version 3.0**; they must cite the urls for the Rashiyomi website and the creative commons website. In short our intention is to facilitate distribution of Torah educational material and not inhibit that distribution with monetary interests or lack of acknowledgment. For precise legal details see the URLs cited earlier. The contents of this paragraph govern all future uses of Rashiyomi material and take precedence (or clarify and explain) already existing copyrights as well as permissions given in private emails.

=====

I-REFERENCE: Dt26-05d We went down to Egypt with a few people explained by Gn46-27: with 70 people

=====

II-MEANING / Lexicography / Dictionary: EXAMPLE (Connectives) KI means IF,PERHAPS,RATHER,BECAUSE,WHEN,THAT (Rashi on Gn18-15a Gn24-33a) **EXAMPLE (Nuances):** YDA means FAMILIAR, not KNOW (eg Dt34-10a) eg Gn04-01 Adam was FAMILIAR with his wife **EXAMPLE (Idioms)** ON THE FACE OF means DURING THE LIFETIME (Rashi on Nu03-04a Gn11-28a Ex20-03c Dt05-07a) **EXAMPLE (Synonyms)** *Marchesheth* means pot; *Machavath* means frying pan (Lv02-05a, 07a) **EXAMPLE (Homonyms)** SHAMAH can mean listen, hear, understand: (Gn42-23a) *They didn't appreciate that Joseph understood them* (Note: They knew he was listening) **EXAMPLE (Metonymy)** (Lv02-11a) *Don't offer ...any honey as sacrifices* RASHI: honey includes any sweet fruit juice

=====

III-GRAMMAR: EXAMPLE: BA-ah means CAME;ba-AH means COMING(Gn46-26a)
EXAMPLE: Hitpael conjugation has different rules if 1st root letter is Tzade (Gn44-16a)

=====

IV-PARALLELISM: (Ex20-04) Dont **POSSESS** the gods of others Dont **MAKE** idols RASHI: So both **POSSESSion & MAKING** of idols are prohibited

=====

V-CONTRADICTION: (Nu04-03, Nu08-24a)Levites start Temple work at 25; Levites start temple work at 30. RASHI: They apprentice at 25 but start actual service at 30.

=====

VI-STYLE: RABBI ISHMAEL RULES: EXAMPLE: (Simple verses should be generalized): (Rashi Pesachim 6) (Dt25-04a) *Dont MUZZLE an OX while THRESHING* RASHI: Dont STOP any WORKING ANIMAL from eating

=====

VII-FORMATTING: EXAMPLE (BOLD indicated by Repetition): Ex12-09c COOK COOK it in water (So COOKED-COOKED is understood the same way bold is understood by modern reader) RASHI: Preferred to COOK it in water; But COOK it at all costs(Even if you don't have water) **EXAMPLE: (BULLETS indicated by Repeating keywords)** (Ex03-11a) Who am I - **THAT** I should go to Pharaoh - **THAT** I should take the Jews out of Egypt RASHI: Repeated word **THAT** creates BULLET effect - Pharaoh was a difficult king (Bullet one) - Jews were not yet ready for freedom (Bullet two) **EXAMPLE (Climax assumed in any Biblical list):** (Dt19-11a) *If a man HATES, SPIES, CONFRONTS & KILLS.* RASHI: Bible identifies 4 stages to murder(indicated by capped words

=====

VIII-DATABASE: EXAMPLE: *God spoke to Moses to say over* introduces about 7 dozen biblical commandments; *God spoke to Aaron to say over* only introduces 2 commandments. RASHI: (Lv10-03b) Aaron was silent when his sons died because they served in the Temple drunk; hence he merited that the commandment prohibiting priests to work in the Temple drunk, was given to him

=====

IX-NON VERSE: EXAMPLE: (Use of Algebra)(Ex38-26b) *Temple donations of silver were 100 Kikar and 1775 Shekel from 630,550 half-shekels* RASHI: So one Kikar of silver = 3000 Shekel.

=====

X: SYMBOLISM: EXAMPLE: (Use of puns) Moses made a copper snake for people to look up to when bitten by snakes (so they should pray and recover) RASHI: (Nu21-09a) The Hebrew root for copper and snake are identical (Cf. The English *copperhead*) Moses made the metal snake copper colored to symbolize the snake

