יום שמחת תורה, ה'תשל"ז

סעיפים נא–סה

Say Shirah

Entebbe, the doctor, and the song Chizkiyahu did not sing

On Simchas Torah 1976, three months after the rescue at Entebbe, the Rebbe asked why some Jews still would not call it a miracle — and told the story of a king who lost the Redemption because he did not sing.

He then turned a debate about aggadah into two questions of plain halachah: must a freed hostage returning to Entebbe make the blessing over a miracle, and may a sick Jew go to the best doctor even if that doctor does not lay tefillin?

Fifty years later the sicha was printed for Simchas Torah 5787, before Sukkos — and opened in shuls four days after Israeli passengers pulled flydubai FZ1073 out of a dive and brought all 174 aboard home alive.

Prepared by **Shimon Rosenberg** · shimon@reshimu.ai

About this edition

How to read the English column

Bold type renders the Rebbe's words themselves. *Lighter italic is editorial elucidation* — a gloss, a source, a spelled-out step — woven into the sentence at the point a reader needs it. Read only the bold and you have the sicha; read both and you have the sicha taught. The elucidation carries no authority of its own; where it departs from the Hebrew, the Hebrew governs.

Genre and status

This is a **sicha** — a talk delivered at a farbrengen — not a maamar. It is a *hanachah bilti mugah*: a transcript prepared by listeners and not reviewed by the Rebbe. Yiddish phrases the Rebbe used are kept in the Hebrew column and translated in the English. This edition covers §§51–65, the final part of the Simchas Torah 5737 farbrengen, together with the letter the booklet prints as a supplement.

Why this sicha, this year

The Rebbe suffered a heart attack on Shemini Atzeres 5738, and there was no regular Simchas Torah farbrengen that year. Va'ad Hanachos BLahak, which publishes the farbrengens year by year, printed for Simchas Torah 5787 a further part of the farbrengen of 5737 (an account circulating this Sukkos, attributed to someone at Lahak, explains the choice this way and says the booklets were at the printer weeks earlier). The booklet's preface is dated Erev Chag HaSukkos 5787 — Friday, 25 September 2026. Five days later, on Chol HaMoed, flydubai FZ1073 was attacked from its own cockpit and saved by its passengers. The sicha had already been printed. Its subject is a hijacking, a rescue, and the duty to sing over a miracle. The avodah sidebars in this edition, marked `IN AVODAH · SIMCHAS TORAH 5787`, draw those lines. They are editorial and are kept separate from the text.

On the current event: Israeli officials described FZ1073 as an attempted terror attack by the co-pilot, not a classic hijacking. Some news outlets date it 1 October because of time zones; it took place on Wednesday 30 September 2026, 19 Tishrei 5787. Facts about the flight are drawn from contemporaneous reporting and listed in the Sources at the back.

CONTEXT

Fifty years, two rescues, one booklet

27 June 1976	Air France flight 139, Tel Aviv–Paris, hijacked after a stop in Athens; flown to Entebbe, Uganda.
Sun. 4 July 1976 · 6 Tammuz 5736	The IDF rescue at Entebbe. Over a hundred hostages freed. Lt. Col. Yonatan Netanyahu, who led the assault force, is killed. (Rebbe's note 389: "the freeing of the hostages in Uganda on 6 Tammuz.")
Summer 5736	The Rebbe speaks about Entebbe at several farbrengens ("two and three times," §53), including 20 Menachem Av (note 431). Some rabbanim sign statements that G-d does not perform miracles through Jews who do not keep mitzvos (§61).
Sun. 17 Oct 1976 · Simchas Torah 5737	This sicha: say shirah; ask the rabbanim two yes-or-no questions.
Shemini Atzeres 5738 · Oct 1977	The Rebbe suffers a heart attack during hakafos; there is no regular Simchas Torah farbrengen that year. (According to an account circulating this Sukkos, this is why Lahak printed a further part of 5737 for 5787.)
Fri. 25 Sept 2026 · Erev Sukkos 5787	The date printed on this booklet's preface (p. 2): "Erev Chag HaSukkos 5787," Va'ad Hanachos BLahak.
Wed. 30 Sept 2026 · 19 Tishrei 5787	Flydubai FZ1073, Dubai–Tel Aviv, 174 aboard, mostly Israelis. The co-pilot stabs the captain; the aircraft dives. Israeli passengers force into the cockpit, subdue the attacker, and help recover the aircraft, which lands safely at Tabuk, Saudi Arabia. All survive. Israeli officials describe it as an attempted terror attack.
Sat.–Sun. 3–4 Oct 2026 · Shemini Atzeres–Simchas Torah 5787	The booklet is opened in shuls. Its sicha, printed before the flight, is about a hijacking, a rescue, and the duty to say shirah.

CHART · THREE RESCUES, ONE QUESTION

Known to all — but has it become song?

c. 701 BCE

Chizkiyahu

185,000 Assyrians fall outside Jerusalem in one night. Everyone knows. The king does not sing — and the Geulah waits.

6 Tammuz 5736 · 1976

Entebbe

Over a hundred hostages freed in Uganda. Some say it cannot be a miracle, because the rescuers did not all lay tefillin. The Rebbe: say shirah.

19 Tishrei 5787 · 2026

FZ1073

174 aboard a diving airliner; passengers break into the cockpit and bring everyone down alive. A booklet printed before Sukkos is opened on Simchas Torah.

The argument at a glance

Fifteen moves, one demand. The Rebbe begins with unity, proves that aggadah binds, tells of a king who did not sing, and turns the story into two halachic questions no rav can avoid.

נא	Ahavas Yisrael is law; when the nations unite against Israel, Jewish disunity is a scandal — and Tishrei sets the year.
נב	Events instruct (Rambam, Baal Shem Tov); a revealed kindness — Entebbe — instructs even more.
נג	Why return to old news? Because the issue is how a Jew relates to every event. Enter: a Gemara story.
נד	"Ein meshivin al haderush": each part of Torah has its own rules — not license.
נה	PaRDeS ↔ four worlds; halachah descends from derush; a crooked derush makes a crooked halachah. So aggadah binds.
נו	Chizkiyahu did not sing over a public miracle; the missing recognition delayed the Geulah.
נז	We have no Chizkiyahu, but the content applies: when many call it a miracle, say shirah.
נח	The halachic test: must a returning Entebbe hostage bless "she'asah li nes"? Yes or no.
נט	The objection — "no miracle through non-observant Jews" — meets Chazal's rescuers and a medical question.
ס	Sharpened: a life in danger; the expert who credits himself vs. the pious non-expert.
סא	The rabbanim must rule; silence is a ruling; their own choice of doctors has answered already.
סב	"Medicine is natural" is rejected; the real difference favors the anonymous rescuers.
סג	Ask briefly — two questions, one word each — to block "wheat/barley" evasion.
סד	Not a personal letter: the Beilis stamp and the Boro Park mezuzah show form eclipsing content.
סה	Blessing: fearless rabbanim, a true ruling, peace, the four species as one — and Moshiach.

SECTION 51

סעיף נא

Ahavas Yisrael, now more than ever — and Tishrei is the head of the year

BEFORE WE READ

The sicha opens mid-farbrengen. Earlier that Simchas Torah (from §44 on) the Rebbe had spoken at length about ahavas Yisrael. Here he ties the theme to its moment: in the autumn of 1976 the nations seemed to be uniting against the Jewish people, and the Jewish people, of all times, were divided. The section sets the frame for everything that follows — the Entebbe rescue will be raised as a matter of unity first, and of miracles second.

What was said above *at this farbrengen* **(§44 and on) concerning ahavas Yisrael** *— love of a fellow Jew —* **is a continuation of what has been discussed many times recently: that there must be a special effort** *hishtadlus meyuchedes — not merely good will but deliberate, organized exertion* **in the matter of ahavas Yisrael.**

נא. האמור לעיל (סמ"ד ואילך) בענין אהבת ישראל — הוא בהמשך להמדובר כו"כ פעמים בזמן האחרון שצ"ל השתדלות מיוחדת בענין אהבת ישראל.

And by way of introduction: the matter of ahavas Yisrael must be present at all times and in all places *— it is not a seasonal mitzvah, nor one that depends on circumstances*,

ובהקדמה — שענין אהבת ישראל צ"ל בכל הזמנים ובכל המקומות,

[as our Rebbeim, our leaders, have instructed — beginning with Moshe Rabbeinu, who, when he wrote the entire Torah ("to its completion"), also wrote the verse "Love your fellow as yourself" *— the very Torah he transmitted carries this command inside it*; **and after that Rabbi Akiva (of whom Moshe Rabbeinu said that he was worthy that the Torah be given through him, as said above §46), who said that this verse is "a great principle of the Torah"; and down to the ruling of halachah in the poskim — the Rambam, the Alter Rebbe and the Tzemach Tzedek — and on to the later authorities and the latest of the later authorities** *— an unbroken chain from Sinai to our own generation, so that no one can say ahavas Yisrael is a "Chassidic emphasis" rather than law*],

[כהוראות רבותינו נשיאינו — החל ממשה רבינו, שבכתבו את כל התורה כולה ("עד תומם") כתב גם את הפסוק "ואהבת לרעך כמוך", ולאח"ז רבי עקיבא (שעליו אמר משה רבינו שראוי הוא שתינתן התורה על ידו, כנ"ל סמ"ו) שאמר שפסוק זה הוא "כלל גדול בתורה", ועד לפסק ההלכה בפוסקים — הרמב"ם ואדה"ז והצ"צ, ועד לאחרונים ולאחרוני האחרונים,]

and all the more so in recent times, when the nations of the world unite in order to embitter the lives of the Jewish people — "Why do the nations rage and the peoples plot in vain" (as said above, §22) — that then it is even more pressing and necessary that the Jewish people be in the mode of "all of us as one" *— the unity we ask for in Sim Shalom, "bless us, our Father, all of us as one"*; **for otherwise the question and challenge arises, "What is the difference between my son and my father-in-law's son?"** *— Leah's words at Reuven's birth as the Gemara reads them: Esav sold his birthright willingly and still hated Yaakov; Reuven lost his and*

ועאכו"כ בזמן האחרון, שאומות-העולם מתאחדים כדי למרר את חייהם של בנ"י, "רגשו גויים ולאומים יהגו ריק" (כנ"ל סכ"ב) — שאז נוגע ומוכרח עוד יותר שבנ"י יהיו באופן ד"כולנו כאחד", דאל"כ מתעוררת השאלה והקושיא "מה בין בני לבן חמי", אבל בכיוון הפכי: היתכן שהגויים, שע"ד הרגיל יש ביניהם תמיד פירוד ומלחמה כו', מתאחדים בבואם לדבר "על ה' ועל משיחו" (כ"זקני מואב וזקני מדין" בשעתם) — ואילו אצל בנ"י ישנו רח"ל היפך הענין דאהבת חנם, ואפילו היפך האהבה למי שעשה עמו טובה?!

did not resent Yosef — **but in the reverse direction** — *here the outsiders show the loyalty and the family shows the hatred*: **Is it possible that the nations — who ordinarily are always divided among themselves and at war, etc. — unite when they come to speak "against G-d and against His anointed" (like "the elders of Moav and the elders of Midian" in their time** — *two nations at perpetual war, who made peace with each other only to hire Bilaam against Israel*) — **while among the Jewish people there is, may the Merciful One save us, the very opposite of baseless love, and even the opposite of love toward one who has done him a kindness?!** *The last phrase is pointed: the Rebbe will soon speak of men who risked their lives to rescue Jews and were repaid with argument rather than gratitude.*

And if this is so regarding recent times in general — how much more so as we stand in the month of Tishrei, whose letters spell "reishis" — *beginning, first-fruit:* תשרי *rearranged is* ראשית *without the alef* **(as explained in the seforim), meaning that it is the "head" of the entire year; and the manner of conduct in this month influences the entire year** — *as the head directs the body, so what is done in Tishrei is drawn down into every day that follows*. **For this reason every matter in the month of Tishrei carries extra importance, "with greater dignity and greater strength" (and many times over) — so that it certainly matters even more that conduct be in the mode of ahavas Yisrael.**

ואם כן הוא בנוגע לזמן האחרון בכלל — עאכו"כ בעמדנו בחודש תשרי, אותיות "רשית" (כמבואר בספרים), היינו שהוא בחי' "ראש" של כל השנה כולה, ואופן ההנהגה בחודש זה משפיע על כל השנה כולה, שמטעם זה כל ענין בחודש תשרי הוא בעל חשיבות יתירה ביתר שאת וביתר עז (וכמה פעמים ככה) — שבודאי נוגע עוד יותר שההנהגה תהי' באופן של אהבת ישראל.

KEY POINT

Ahavas Yisrael is not a Chassidic emphasis. It runs from Moshe Rabbeinu through Rabbi Akiva to the Rambam, the Alter Rebbe and the Tzemach Tzedek. When enemies who are normally divided unite against us, our own division is the scandal.

SUMMARY · §51

Ahavas Yisrael is law, not mood — a chain from Moshe to the latest poskim. When the nations, normally at war with each other, unite against Israel, Jewish disunity becomes a scandal in reverse. And Tishrei, the “head” of the year, sets the tone for all of it: whatever is done now is done to the whole year.

Reading the times: Rambam, the Baal Shem Tov, and a revealed kindness

BEFORE WE READ

Before naming any event, the Rebbe establishes a method. The Rambam teaches that a calamity is never "mere chance" — it is a summons to examine one's own deeds. The Baal Shem Tov widens this: everything a Jew sees or hears, even in a newspaper, carries a lesson he did not yet know. The Rebbe adds the step that drives the whole sicha: if one must learn from trouble, then all the more from an open act of kindness. Footnote 389 names the event: the freeing of the hostages in Uganda on 6 Tammuz of the previous year — Operation Entebbe, 4 July 1976.

נב. בכל זה מיתוסף עוד יותר מצד ההוראות הגלויות מלמעלה שאנו רואים בזמן האחרון — עד כמה נוגע ענין האחדות.

To all this is added even more from the revealed instructions from Above that we have seen in recent times *— events that are not hints but plain lessons, legible to anyone who looks* **— showing how much the matter of unity matters.**

ובהקדמה, שכדי ללמוד הוראה ממאורעות הזמן, אין צורך אלא בשימת-לב לדברי הרמב"ם בריש הלכות תעניות, שכל מאורע שמתרחש בעולם (ועאכו"כ — ענין בלתי-רצוי) אינו "נקרה נקרית", אלא הוא הוראה שצ"ל "יפשפש במעשיו" [לא שיפשפש במעשי אחרים... אלא במעשיו הוא דוקא].

And by way of introduction: to learn a lesson from the events of the time, nothing is needed except paying attention to the words of the Rambam at the beginning of Hilchos Taanis *— the laws of fasting in a time of trouble*, **that every event that takes place in the world (and all the more so — an undesirable one) is not "a chance happening"** *— the Rambam calls the attitude that says "this is the way of the world, and this trouble just happened" a cruel one, because it lets people stay as they are*, **but is an instruction that one must "examine his deeds" [not that he should examine the deeds of others... but precisely his own deeds** *— the Rebbe's aside cuts against the reflex of reading every event as a judgment on someone else*].

וע"פ תורת הבעש"ט הידועה, שמכל דבר שיהודי רואה או שומע (בין אם שמע אודותיו מחבירו, ובין אם קרא אודותיו ב"עיתון"...) עליו ללמוד הוראה בעבודת ה', ודוקא הוראה כזו שעד עתה לא ידע אודותי' — מובן, שכשם שיש ללמוד הוראה מענין בלתי-רצוי (כדברי הרמב"ם הנ"ל), עד"ז (ועאכו"כ) יש ללמוד הוראה מענין שבו נראו בגילוי חסדי ה'.

And according to the well-known teaching of the Baal Shem Tov, that from everything a Jew sees or hears (whether he heard about it from his friend, or whether he read about it in the "newspaper"...) he must learn a lesson in the service of G-d — and precisely a lesson of a kind he did not know until now *— hashgachah pratis means the event was shown to this person for a reason, and a lesson he already knew would not need to be shown* **— it is understood that just as one must learn a lesson from an undesirable matter (as in the words of the Rambam cited above), so too (and all the more so) one must learn a lesson from a matter in which the kindnesses of G-d were seen openly** *— the Rebbe's footnote: "this refers to the freeing of the hostages in Uganda on 6 Tammuz last year." If trouble demands a response, a rescue demands one all the more — and the response a rescue demands is thanks*.

KEY POINT

The Rambam: no trouble is mere chance. The Baal Shem Tov: everything you hear, even in the newspaper, is a new lesson. The Rebbe: if trouble demands a response, a revealed kindness demands one all the more.

IN AVODAH · SIMCHAS TORAH 5787

This is the method the booklet's readers were handed on Simchas Torah 5787, four days after Flydubai flight FZ1073 came down safely in Tabuk. The Baal Shem Tov's words fit almost too well: "whether he heard about it from his friend, or read about it in the newspaper." Most of us learned of FZ1073 from a phone screen. The Rambam's warning applies as well: the cruelest reading is "it just happened." The first step the sicha asks for is small and hard — to refuse that reading out loud, and to ask what this, of all events, is asking of me.

SUMMARY · §52

No event is mere chance (Rambam). Every event a Jew hears of carries a new lesson for his avodah (Baal Shem Tov). And if trouble demands that we examine our deeds, an open kindness of G-d — the Entebbe rescue — demands at least as much of a response.

Why keep “cooking” over something weeks old?

BEFORE WE READ

The Rebbe raises the obvious objection himself. Entebbe was more than three months earlier, it had already been discussed two or three times, and some of the interpretations around it were partisan. Why return to it at a Simchas Torah farbrengen? His answer is that the question is not about one event. It is about how a Jew relates to anything that happens in the world, and that relationship holds for past, present and future. He then announces a story from the Gemara, which the next three sections prepare the ground for.

נג. לכאורה אינו מובן — מהו הצורך לעסוק עתה בלהט ובהתלהבות ("קאָכן זיך") במאורע שאירע לפני כו"כ שבועות?!

Seemingly it is not understood — what need is there now to engage with fervor and excitement ("kochn zich" — *Yiddish, literally “to boil oneself up”: to keep stirring a matter*) in an event that occurred many weeks ago?!

ובפרט — מאורע שיש בו פירושים שונים [חלקם — פירושים שיש להם מקום בשכל הישר, וחלקם — פירושים שהם היפך השכל הישר, מאחר שמקורם באנשים משוחדים כו'], וממילא אפילו בשעת מעשה יש צורך להביא ראי' על הצורך לעסוק במאורע זה; וא"כ, לאחר שכבר דובר עד"ז ב' וג' פעמים, ועאכו"כ לאחר שכבר עברו כו"כ שבועות — מה הצורך להמשיך "קאָכן זיך" במאורע זה?

And particularly — an event about which there are various interpretations [some of them — interpretations that have a place in straightforward reason, and some of them — interpretations that are contrary to straightforward reason, since their source is in people with an interest — *meshuchadim, literally “bribed”: whose stake in a conclusion bends their judgment, the Torah’s term for a judge who cannot see straight*, etc.], so that even at the time of the event there was a need to bring proof that it was necessary to engage with it at all; and if so, after it has already been discussed two and three times — *the Rebbe had spoken about Entebbe at earlier farbrengens that summer*, and all the more so after many weeks have passed — what need is there to continue "kochn zich" over this event?

אבל האמת היא, שההתעסקות בענין זה נוגעת לענין כללי — כללות הגישה לענינים שאנו רואים בעולם, והידיעה שכל ענין שמתרחש בעולם נוגע לא רק לגבי העבר, אלא גם בהווה, וגם בעתיד.

But the truth is that occupying oneself with this matter touches on something general — the entire approach to the things we see in the world, and the knowledge that every matter that happens in the world is relevant not only with regard to the past, but also in the present, and also in the future — *an event is not used up when the news moves on; the lesson it carries is meant to change how one acts from now on*.

והענין בזה — בהקדמת סיפור שהובא בגמרא, והנוגע להנהגה במעשה בפועל בזמננו (כדלקמן סנ"ו).

And the explanation of this — by first introducing a story brought in the Gemara, which bears on conduct in actual practice in our time (as will be explained below, §56).

ואף שסיפור זה הוא בחלק האגדה שבגמרא — הרי גם דרוש ואגדה הם חלק בתורה (שבעל-פה), וממילא יש ללמוד מהם הוראה בעבודתינו (כדלקמן).

And although this story is in the aggadah portion of the Gemara — derush and aggadah are also part of the (Oral) Torah, and therefore one must learn from them a lesson in our avodah (as below) — *this sentence is the hinge to the next*

two sections. Before telling the story, the Rebbe will prove that aggadah is not "just a nice homily" that a listener may take or leave.

KEY POINT

An event is not used up when the news moves on. The question is how a Jew relates to everything that happens — past, present and future.

IN AVODAH · SIMCHAS TORAH 5787

The news cycle answers the question the Rebbe asks here: by the time the booklet reached the shuls, FZ1073 was already "four days ago," and by next week it will be old. The Rebbe's answer for 1976 holds now. The question is not whether this event is still current. It is whether the way I relate to events — what I notice, what I thank for, what I let pass — has changed. That is relevant "in the present, and also in the future."

SUMMARY · §53

The objection: Entebbe is old news and politically charged. The answer: what is at stake is a Jew's whole stance toward events, which outlives any one of them. The vehicle will be an aggadic story — and first the Rebbe must show that aggadah carries binding instruction.

“Ein meshivin al haderush” — derush has rules of its own

BEFORE WE READ

A common maxim, attributed in the Arizal’s writings, says “one does not refute a derush” — no objection can be raised against a homiletic teaching. People often hear in it a license: derush can say anything. The Rebbe, recalling an earlier sicha of 13 Tishrei, reads it the opposite way. Each part of Torah — halachah, sod, remez, derush — has its own rules, so one may not refute derush using the rules of a different part. Halachah itself has internal boundaries of this kind: monetary law and ritual law are not derived from one another. The upshot is that derush is not arbitrary. It is disciplined, and therefore binding.

And by first introducing what was discussed above *— at the farbrengen of 13 Tishrei, the Rebbe’s footnote says* **in explaining what is written in the writings of the Arizal, "one does not answer against the derush"** *— ein meshivin al haderush*: **that the meaning of this is not that anyone can say a matter of derush however it occurs to him, even if it is not aligned with the truth (for the part of derush is one of the modes of learning in the Torah of truth, and it is impossible that it should be founded on foundations that are not true)** *— a Torah of truth cannot contain a compartment where truth does not matter*; **and it is obvious that also in the part of derush there are rules for how to expound in a way that is aligned with the truth of the matters.**

נד. ובהקדמת המדובר לעיל בביאור מ"ש בכתבי האריז"ל "אין משיבין על הדרוש", שאין הכוונה בזה שכל אחד יכול לומר ענין של דרוש ככל העולה על רוחו, אפילו אם אינו מכוון אל האמת (שהרי חלק הדרוש הוא אחד מאופני הלימוד שבתורת אמת, ולא יתכן שיהי' מיוסד על יסודות שאינם אמיתיים), ופשוט שגם בחלק הדרוש ישנם כללים איך לדרוש באופן המכוון לאמיתיות הענינים.

And the meaning of what is said, "one does not answer against the derush," is — that each of the parts of the Torah has rules of its own: rules special to the part of halachah, rules special to the part of sod *— the secrets, Kabbalah*, **to the part of remez** *— allusion*, **and to the part of derush** *— homiletic exposition*, **etc.,**

והכוונה במ"ש "אין משיבין על הדרוש" היא — שלכל אחד מחלקי התורה ישנם כללים בפ"ע: כללים מיוחדים לחלק ההלכה, כללים המיוחדים לחלק הסוד, לחלק הרמז ולחלק הדרוש כו',

[as we find within the part of halachah itself — that "one does not derive ritual law from monetary law" *— issura mimamona la yalfinan*, **because for monetary law there are rules of their own, and for ritual prohibitions — rules of their own, and if one uses the rules of "mamona" for matters of "issura" — he will arrive at a conclusion contrary to halachah** *— e.g., in questions of what is forbidden we follow the majority, but in money matters we do not (ein holchin bemamon achar harov); carry one domain’s rule into the other and one rules wrongly*; **and similarly "we do not learn the mundane from the holy"** *— chullin mikodashim la gamrinan*, **since they have different rules; and so too in many matters of Torah],**

[וכפי שמצינו בחלק ההלכה גופא — ש"איסורא מממונא לא ילפינן", כי לדיני ממונות ישנם כללים בפ"ע, ולדיני איסורים — כללים בפ"ע, ואם ישתמש בכללי "ממונא" לעניני "איסורא" — יבוא לידי מסקנא היפך ההלכה; ועד"ז "חולין מקדשים לא גמרינן", כיון שיש להם כללים שונים, ועד"ז בכו"כ ענינים שבתורה],

ולכן "אין משיבין" מחלק אחד שבתורה על חלק אחר, וכמו בדוגמא שבכתבי האריז"ל שם — שאין להקשות על ענין שבדרך הדרוש מענין שהוא בדרך החשבון שבתורה, כיון שלכל אחד מענינים אלו ישנם כללים שונים, והענינים כפי שהם ע"פ חשבון אינם בהכרח מכוונים על-פי כללי לימוד הדרוש.

and therefore "one does not answer" from one part of Torah against another part — as in the example in the Arizal's writings there *— the original context*: **that one may not challenge a matter that is by way of derush from a matter that is by way of the calculation in Torah** *— cheshbon: the numerical, chronological reckonings (counts of years, generations, measurements)*, **since each of these matters has different rules, and matters as they are according to calculation are not necessarily aligned with the rules of learning derush** — *so a homily that says "X lived in such-and-such generation" is not refuted by a chronology that says otherwise; each speaks in its own register*.

KEY POINT

"One does not refute a derush" does not mean anything goes. Each part of Torah has its own rules, as halachah does not derive ritual law from monetary law.

SUMMARY · §54

"One does not refute a derush" does not mean derush is unaccountable. It means each part of Torah — halachah, sod, remez, derush, even the numerical reckonings — has its own rules, and one may not refute one part with the rules of another, just as halachah does not derive ritual law from monetary law.

PaRDeS and the four worlds: why a crooked derush yields a crooked halachah

BEFORE WE READ

This is the theoretical center of the sicha's first half. The Arizal maps the four levels of Torah (PaRDeS) onto the four worlds — Atzilus/sod, Beriah and Yetzirah/remez and derush, Asiyah/pshat — and the four worlds descend one from another. So, the Rebbe argues, does Torah: the plain halachah is the end of a chain that starts in sod. He draws two consequences. First, the Gra's remark that one must know the secrets of Torah to rule correctly makes sense: confusion at the root shows up as error at the branch. Second, derush must be true, because halachah flows from it. A crooked derush cannot produce a straight halachah. The section turns an apparently abstract point into a weapon: the aggadah about Chizkiyahu, coming next, will carry halachic weight.

And there is another essential point in this:

נה. ועוד נקודה עיקרית בזה:

It is brought in the writings of the Arizal that the four worlds correspond to the four parts of PaRDeS of the Torah — *Pshat (plain meaning), Remez (allusion), Derush (exposition), Sod (secret)* — **the world of Atzilus** — *"emanation," the divine world still one with its Source* **corresponds to the part of sod in Torah, the world of Asiyah** — *"action," the lowest world, which includes our physical one* **corresponds to the part of pshat, and the worlds of Beriah and Yetzirah** — *"creation" and "formation," the intermediate worlds* — **correspond to the parts of remez and derush [according to the two opinions on the matter — which of them corresponds to the world of Beriah and which of them to the world of Yetzirah].**

איתא בכתבי האריז"ל, שד' העולמות הם כנגד ד' חלקי פרד"ס התורה — עולם האצילות כנגד חלק הסוד שבתורה, עולם העשי' כנגד חלק הפשט, ועולמות בריאה ויצירה — כנגד חלקי הרמז והדרוש [כב' הדעות שבדבר — איזה מהם כנגד עולם הבריאה ואיזה מהם כנגד עולם היצירה].

And it is explained there that the four worlds descend one from another — *mishtalshelim, the chain-like descent (hishtalshelus) in which each world is the source of the one below it*: **all the matters that exist in the world of Beriah — exist before this in the world of Atzilus, and from there descend to the world of Beriah; and similarly the matters in the world of Yetzirah descend from the world of Beriah, and the matters in the world of Asiyah descend from the world of Yetzirah. And the reason it is so in the worlds is because it is so also in Torah** — *Torah precedes the world and is its blueprint; the worlds have this structure because Torah does* — **that the part of pshat (corresponding to the world of Asiyah) descends from the parts before it, up to the part of sod (corresponding to the world of Atzilus).**

ומבואר שם שד' העולמות משתלשלים זה מזה: כל הענינים שישנם בעולם הבריאה — ישנם לפנ"ז בעולם האצילות, ומשם משתלשלים לעולם הבריאה; ועד"ז הענינים שבעולם היצירה משתלשלים מעולם הבריאה, והענינים שבעולם העשי' משתלשלים מעולם היצירה. והטעם שכן הוא בעולמות הוא לפי שכן הוא גם בתורה — שחלק הפשט (שכנגד עולם העשי') משתלשל מהחלקים שלפניו, עד לחלק הסוד (שכנגד עולם האצילות).

[And according to this one can understand what the Gra wrote in his commentary on Mishlei (as already printed in several places), that in order to rule a law according to its

[ועפ"ז יובן מ"ש הגר"א בפירושו למשלי (כנדפס כבר בכ"מ) שכדי לפסוק דין לאמיתתו בהכרח לידע סודות התורה — דלכאורה

אינו מובן מה הקשר בין שני הענינים: הרוצה לפסוק דין — עליו ללמוד פוסקים, ולהיות בעל זכרון טוב, ואם אינו זוכר — יעיין בפנים, או ישאל מישהו אחר, ואז יוכל לפסוק; אבל מה ענין סודות התורה לכאן?

truth one must necessarily know the secrets of the Torah — for seemingly it is not understood what the connection is between the two matters *— the Rebbe voices the skeptic's question in practical terms*: **one who wishes to rule a law — he must learn the poskim, and have a good memory, and if he does not remember — he should look it up inside, or ask someone else, and then he can rule; but what do the secrets of the Torah have to do with this?**

והביאור בזה הוא ע"פ הנ"ל: מי שאינו יודע את סודות התורה — יש חשש שידמה מילתא למילתא שלא כהוגן וכיו"ב; משא"כ כשיודע את הענין כפי שהוא בעולם הסוד, ש"לית תמן לא קושיא כו' ולא מחלוקת כו'" — הרי זה מסייע לו לפסוק את הדין בפשטות גם בעולם ההלכה (יהי' הביאור בזה אשר יהי'), כנ"ל שעניני ההלכה שבעולם העשי' משתלשלים משאר חלקי התורה].

And the explanation of this is according to the above: one who does not know the secrets of the Torah — there is a concern that he will compare one matter to another improperly *— medameh milsa lemilsa, the core act of halachic reasoning: deciding which case resembles which*, **and the like; whereas when he knows the matter as it is in the world of sod, where "there is no difficulty there... and no dispute..."** *— the Zohar's description of the Tree of Life, where all is unified (Raaya Mehemna, Zohar III 124b; explained in Tanya, Iggeres HaKodesh 26)* **— this helps him to rule the law plainly also in the world of halachah (whatever the explanation of this may be** *— the Rebbe leaves the mechanism open; the point is the dependence*), **as said above, that the matters of halachah in the world of Asiyah descend from the other parts of Torah].**

ומזה מובן ההכרח שגם ענין הדרוש צ"ל מכוון על-פי האמת:

And from this is understood the necessity that the matter of derush, too, must be aligned with the truth:

אם יהי' הדרוש מעוקם ומעוות ("קרום") — היינו שלדעת כל האחרים הוא מעוקם ומעוות, שהרי הדורש עצמו בודאי סבור שהדרוש הוא ישר ואמיתי... — בהכרח שישתלשל באופן בלתי-ישר גם בעולם ההלכה והמעשה, שהרי הענינים שבחלק ההלכה שבתורה משתלשלים מהחלקים שלפנ"ז, כולל — חלק הדרוש [כנ"ל שהעולמות משתלשלים זה מזה, וא"א שיהי' ענין בעולם העשי' שאין לו "מזל" בעולם היצירה שממנו משתלשל.]

If the derush will be crooked and twisted ("krum" *— Yiddish, bent*) **— meaning that in the opinion of all the others it is crooked and twisted, for the expounder himself certainly holds that the derush is straight and true...** *— the Rebbe's irony: nobody thinks his own reading is crooked* **— it will necessarily descend in a non-straight way also into the world of halachah and action, for the matters in the halachah part of Torah descend from the parts before it, including — the part of derush [as said above, that the worlds descend one from another, and it is impossible that there be a matter in the world of Asiyah that has no "mazal"** *— a root, a supernal source ("there is no blade of grass below that has no mazal above that strikes it and tells it, Grow!")* **in the world of Yetzirah from which it descends].**

וכיון שהכל מודים שעניני ההלכה שבעולם המעשה צריכים להיות מכוונים על-פי האמת, כפי שניתן למשה מסיני, ולא באופן ד"איש הישר בעיניו יעשה" — מובן שכן הוא גם בנוגע לענין הדרוש (שממנו

And since everyone agrees that the matters of halachah in the world of action must be aligned with the truth, as it was given to Moshe at Sinai, and not in the mode of "each man did what was right in his own eyes" *— the refrain of the book of Shoftim describing anarchy* **— it is understood that so it is**

משתלשלים עניני ההלכה שבעולם המעשה), שגם הוא צ"ל מכוון על-פי האמת.

also regarding derush (from which the matters of halachah in the world of action descend): it too must be aligned with the truth.

וממילא מובן ג"כ שמוכרחים להיות כללים קבועים בלימוד בדרך הדרוש (וכן בדרך הסוד וכו'), כי לולא היו כללים קבועים בדרך הדרוש — לא היו יכולים להיות כללים קבועים ואמיתיים גם בענין ההלכה, כי הדרוש שבתורה וההלכה שבתורה תוכנם אחד הוא, ורק אופן הלימוד הוא אחר.

And consequently it is also understood that there must be fixed rules for learning by way of derush (and likewise by way of sod, etc.), for if there were no fixed rules in the way of derush — there could not be fixed and true rules in halachah either, for the derush in Torah and the halachah in Torah — their content is one, and only the manner of learning is different *— this is the line the whole section was built to reach. Derush and halachah are one content in two registers; therefore the aggadah about to be told is not optional color but a statement of Torah with consequences for practice*.

KEY POINT

Torah descends like the four worlds — sod, then remez and derush, then pshat and halachah. A crooked derush makes a crooked halachah, which is why the coming aggadah binds.

CHART · §55

Four worlds, four layers of Torah — one chain

World		Layer of Torah
אצילות Atzilus	≡	סוד Sod — secret
▼ mishtalshel — descends		
בריאה Beriah	≡	רמז / דרוש Remez / Derush*
▼ mishtalshel — descends		
יצירה Yetzirah	≡	דרוש / רמז Derush / Remez*
▼ mishtalshel — descends		
עשיה Asiyah	≡	פשט · הלכה Pshat · halachah

**Two opinions on which of remez and derush corresponds to Beriah and which to Yetzirah. The Rebbe's conclusion: whatever reaches halachah has passed through derush — so derush must be straight.*

SUMMARY · §55

Torah descends like the worlds: sod → remez/derush → pshat/halachah. So the Gra is right that a posek needs sod, and derush must be straight, because a crooked derush yields a crooked halachah. Derush and halachah are one content in two modes — so the coming aggadah is binding.

Chizkiyahu did not sing — and the Geulah waited

BEFORE WE READ

Now the story. The Gemara in Sanhedrin (94a) relates that G-d wished to make King Chizkiyahu Moshiach and Sancheriv Gog-and-Magog, and the Attribute of Judgment objected: "David, who said so many songs and praises before You, You did not make Moshiach. Chizkiyahu, for whom You did all these miracles and who did not say shirah before You — You would make him Moshiach?" The Rebbe sharpens the puzzle. The miracle of Sancheriv's defeat was public: 185,000 Assyrian soldiers dead in one night outside Jerusalem. Nobody was unaware of it. Why should Chizkiyahu need to "announce" it in song? The answer is that knowing is not the same as recognizing. What was missing in Chizkiyahu was an inner, complete acknowledgment, and that lack delayed the Redemption for thousands of years.

And regarding our matter — learning a lesson for our time from a story brought in the (aggadah portion of the) Gemara.

נו. ובנוגע לענייננו — לימוד הוראה לזמננו זה מסיפור המובא ב(חלק האגדה שב)גמרא.

And by way of introduction: in every matter and event now taking place in the world, it is openly evident to the eyes of flesh — according to all the signs brought in tractate Sotah *— at its end (49b), the Mishnah's list of the marks of the generation before Moshiach: "chutzpah will increase..., the face of the generation like the face of a dog"* **— that we already stand in "the footsteps of Moshiach"** *— ikvesa diMeshicha, the final stretch of exile*, **and consequently there is a need to do everything to hasten the Redemption as much as possible.**

ובהקדמה, שבכל ענין ומאורע שמתרחש עתה בעולם, ניכר בגלוי לעיני בשר — לפי כל הסימנים המובאים במסכת סוטה — שעומדים אנו כבר ב"עקבתא דמשיחא", וממילא יש צורך לעשות הכל כדי למהר את הגאולה ככל האפשרי.

Now, one of the things that may, G-d forbid, prevent and delay the Redemption is understood from the story of the Gemara in Sanhedrin: "The Holy One, blessed be He, wished to make Chizkiyahu Moshiach *— and Sancheriv Gog and Magog, so the war with Assyria would be the war of the End of Days* **... the Attribute of Judgment said before the Holy One, blessed be He ... Chizkiyahu, for whom You did all these miracles (that he was saved from Sancheriv and was healed of his illness** *— the Rebbe's gloss names both miracles: the rescue of the city and the rescue of the king's own life*) **and who did not say shirah before You — You would make him Moshiach?"**

והנה, אחד הדברים שעלולים למנוע ולעכב ח"ו את ענין הגאולה מובן מסיפור הגמרא בסנהדרין: "ביקש הקב"ה לעשות חזקי' משיח .. אמרה מדת הדין לפני הקב"ה .. חזקי' שעשית לו כל הנסים הללו (שניצל מסנחריב ונתרפא מחליו) ולא אמר שירה לפניך תעשהו משיח".

And seemingly it is not understood what need there was for Chizkiyahu to say shirah: the miracle of the rescue from Sancheriv was revealed and known to all — everyone knew that Sancheriv had already conquered "all the cities of Yehudah" (except Jerusalem), and the camp of Assyria had already reached close to Jerusalem ("This very day he will halt at Nov *— within sight of the city; Rashi there: he hurried to*

ולכאורה אינו מובן מהו הצורך באמירת שירה ע"י חזקי': הרי נס ההצלה מסנחריב הי' גלוי וידוע לכל — הכל ידעו שסנחריב כבש כבר את "כל ערי יהודה" (מלבד ירושלים), ומחנה אשור הגיע כבר עד סמוך לירושלים ("עוד היום בנוב לעמוד גו'"), ובן לילה נתבטל כל הדבר, "ויצא מלאך ה' ויך במחנה אשור מאה שמונים וחמשה

אלף וישכימו בבוקר והנה כולם פגרים מתים"; וא"כ למה צריך חזקי' להכריז שיש צורך לומר שירה להקב"ה?

take it that same day ..."), **and overnight the whole thing was undone: "And the angel of G-d went out and struck in the camp of Assyria one hundred and eighty-five thousand, and they rose in the morning and behold, all of them were dead corpses"; if so, why must Chizkiyahu proclaim that there is a need to say shirah to the Holy One, blessed be He?** — *the miracle announced itself. Why add a song?*

ואעפ"כ רואים אנו, שהעובדה שחזקי' "לא אמר שירה לפניך" [ולא מפני שלא ידע אודות הנס (שהרי הנס הי' גלוי לכל, כנ"ל), אלא שחסרה אצלו ההכרה בפנימיות ושלימות הענינים (כפי שהי' צ"ל אצלו לפי מדריגתו)] — עיכבה את הגאולה למשך אלפי שנים!

And nevertheless we see that the fact that Chizkiyahu "did not say shirah before You" [and not because he did not know about the miracle (for the miracle was revealed to all, as above), but because he lacked the recognition of the inwardness and completeness of the matters — *hakarah bifnimiyus: knowing a fact is the head; recognizing it is when it reaches the heart and becomes song* **(as it should have been for him according to his level** — *the complaint is measured against Chizkiyahu's stature: from a king fit to be Moshiach, more was expected*)] **— delayed the Redemption for thousands of years!**

והיינו, שהטעם שעדיין לא בא משיח במשך אלפי שנים שעברו מימי חזקי' עד עתה הוא — לפי שנעשו לחזקי' "כל הנסים הללו" ולא אמר שירה על הנס!

That is, the reason that Moshiach has still not come during the thousands of years that have passed from the days of Chizkiyahu until now is — because "all these miracles" were done for Chizkiyahu and he did not say shirah over the miracle! — *the Rebbe states it without softening: an unsung miracle is not a neutral omission. It cost the world the Geulah.*

KEY POINT

Everyone knew about the miracle of Sancheriv. Chizkiyahu still did not sing — knowledge did not become recognition — and the Geulah waited thousands of years.

IN AVODAH · SIMCHAS TORAH 5787

The parallel to FZ1073 is close. Nobody needs convincing that something extraordinary happened on 19 Tishrei: a co-pilot stabbed his captain at 34,000 feet, the aircraft went into a steep dive (about 17,000 feet in two minutes, by one news reconstruction), passengers broke into the cockpit and pulled it out of the dive, and all 174 on board walked off the plane in Tabuk. Everyone knows. The sicha's question is Chizkiyahu's question: has it become shirah? The answer is concrete — a Birchas HaGomel by those who were aboard, a public "Baruch Hashem" and not only "what a story," a niggun at the farbrengen, a kapitel Tehillim said deliberately as thanks.

SUMMARY · §56

Chizkiyahu was fit to be Moshiach and was passed over because he did not sing over his miracles. The miracle was public, so the lack was not knowledge but inner recognition. That missing song delayed the Geulah for thousands of years — and we stand now at its threshold.

“Where is there a Chizkiyahu now?” — the comparison is in the content

BEFORE WE READ

An objection: the Gemara’s story concerns a king fit to be Moshiach and an angel who struck down an army. We have neither. The Rebbe answers with another Gemara: Rabban Gamliel serving drinks at his son’s wedding was compared to Avraham serving the angels, and even to G-d who “sets a table before every creature.” The comparison held because it concerned the content of the act, not the stature of the actor. So too here. The Rebbe is not saying someone in our generation is Chizkiyahu. He is saying: whoever hears that an event was a miracle is obligated, as Chizkiyahu was, to sing.

Seemingly there is room to ask: how can one learn a lesson from the story of the Gemara regarding our times — for we do not have now a "Chizkiyahu," and we do not have now an "angel of G-d" ("where is there now a Chizkiyahu, where is there now an angel of G-d?") who struck the camp of Assyria, on account of which we would be obligated to say shirah?

נז. לכאורה יש מקום לשאול: איך אפשר ללמוד הוראה מסיפור הגמרא בנוגע לזמנינו — והרי אין לנו עתה "חזקי'", ואין לנו עתה "מלאך ה'" ("וואו איז איצטער דאָ אַ חזקי', וואו איז איצטער דאָ אַ מלאך ה'"), שהכה את מחנה אשור, שמפני זה יהי' עלינו לומר שירה?

And the explanation of this — along the lines of the Gemara’s story that was told about Rabban Gamliel *— at the wedding feast of his son, standing and pouring drinks for the sages; Rabbi Eliezer objected that a Nasi should not serve them, and Rabbi Yehoshua answered*: **"We have found one greater than he who served — Avraham was the greatest of his generation, and it is written of him, 'and he stood over them'** *— serving the three guests* **... and shall Rabban Gamliel be-Ribbi not stand and pour for us? ...** *Rabbi Tzadok added:* **The Holy One, blessed be He, causes the winds to blow and raises the clouds and brings down rain and makes the earth sprout and sets a table before each and every one, and shall Rabban Gamliel be-Ribbi not stand and pour for us?", even though seemingly there is no room for comparison with Avraham Avinu and with the Holy One, blessed be He — for the comparison is with regard to the content of the matter (the conduct of "standing and pouring")** *— the analogy runs on the act, not on the stature of the one acting*.

וההסברה בזה — ע"ד סיפור הגמרא שאמרו אודות רבן גמליאל "מצינו גדול ממנו ששימש, אברהם גדול הדור הי' וכתוב בו והוא עומד עליהם .. ואנו לא יהא רבן גמליאל ברבי עומד ומשקה עלינו .. הקב"ה משיב רוחות ומעלה נשיאים ומוריד מטר ומצמיח אדמה ועורך שולחן לפני כל אחד ואחד, ואנו לא יהא רבן גמליאל ברבי עומד ומשקה עלינו", אף שלכאורה אין מקום להשוואה עם אברהם אבינו והקב"ה — כי ההשוואה היא בנוגע לתוכן הענין (ההנהגה ד"עומד ומשקה").

And so too in our case:

ועד"ז בנדו"ד:

The intention is not to say that in our generation there is a "Chizkiyahu," and that "the Holy One, blessed be He, wished to make Chizkiyahu Moshiach"...

אין הכוונה לומר שבדורנו ישנו "חזקי'", וש"ביקש הקב"ה לעשות חזקי' משיח"...

— certainly there are many who are worthy of this, but "why do you meddle in the secrets of the Merciful One?" —

— בודאי ישנם כו"כ הראויים לכך, אבל "בהדי כבשי דרחמנא למה לך"; מה שעלינו לדעת הוא רק שצ"ל "היום אם בקולו

the prophet Yeshayahu's rebuke to Chizkiyahu himself (Berachos 10a): what is hidden in G-d's plan is not ours to calculate; **what we must know is only that there must be "Today — if you will listen to His voice"** *— the Gemara reads this verse as the condition for Moshiach's coming "today"*, **and then Moshiach will come from "the gate of Rome"** *— where, per the Gemara (Sanhedrin 98a), he sits among the poor, waiting* **and redeem the Jewish people from the exile —**

תשמעו", ואזי יבוא משיח מ"פתחא דרומי" ויגאל את בנ"י מהגלות —

rather, the intention is to warn regarding the content of the matter of saying shirah — to those who do not know the words of the Gemara, or who have a doubt whether the aforementioned event (§52 *— Entebbe*) **falls within the category of a miracle over which one must say shirah — that since they hear from many that this event is a miracle, they must say shirah to the Holy One, blessed be He!** *— note the threshold. The Rebbe does not ask anyone to be personally convinced of the miracle before thanking. If many testify that it was a miracle, the doubt itself already obligates song.*

אלא הכוונה היא להזהיר בנוגע לתוכן הענין של אמירת שירה — לאלו שאינם יודעים את דברי הגמרא, או שיש להם ספק אם המאורע הנ"ל (סנ"ב) הוא בגדר נס שצריך לומר עליו שירה — שמאחר ששומעים מכו"כ שמאורע זה הוא נס, עליהם לומר שירה להקב"ה!

KEY POINT

No one claims we have a Chizkiyahu. The lesson holds by content: when many call an event a miracle, you owe shirah.

IN AVODAH · SIMCHAS TORAH 5787

The Rebbe's threshold matters for anyone uneasy about calling FZ1073 a nes. You need not decide in advance whether it was "natural" — a quick-thinking plumber, a dentist who stopped the bleeding, a British pilot among the passengers. The sicha says: when many say it was a miracle, the response owed is shirah. Outside Israel too, one account called it "12 minutes of madness" in which pilot and passengers saved a plane in mid-fall. That is the vocabulary of miracle even when the word is not used.

SUMMARY · §57

We have no Chizkiyahu and no angel, but the lesson holds by content, as Rabban Gamliel's serving was compared to Avraham's and even to G-d's. The Rebbe is not hinting at a Moshiach-figure. He is warning: once many testify that an event was a miracle, one must say shirah.

The test: a one-word answer from every rav — the blessing at Entebbe

BEFORE WE READ

Aggadah, the Rebbe anticipates, can be dismissed as "just homiletics," and his own teaching can be dismissed as self-promotion. So he proposes a test that cannot be dismissed: a plain halachic question, put to every rav in the world, answered in one word — yes or no. A hostage freed at Entebbe now wants to go back, since Uganda has reopened for business. When he arrives, is he obligated to say the blessing "Baruch she'asah li nes bamakom hazeh," or is the blessing forbidden as a berachah levatalah? If the halachah requires the blessing, then halachah has called Entebbe a miracle.

נח. אמנם, מכיון שדברי הגמרא האמורים לא נאמרו בתור הלכה למעשה, ואפשר לטעון שהם רק דרשות ופירושים וכו', ומסתמא יטענו שהכוונה באמירת דברים אלו היא להגדיל מעלת עצמו וחסרון זולתו, דבר שעלול להוביל לידי קנאה ושאר ענינים בלתי-רצויים —

However, since the words of the Gemara cited were not said as practical halachah, and one can argue that they are only expositions and interpretations, etc., and presumably they will argue that the intention in saying these things is to magnify one's own virtue and the deficiency of others — *that the Rebbe is scoring points against those who disagreed*, **something that could lead to jealousy and other undesirable matters —**

הנה אבן הבוחן בזה היא, ע"י שיפנו אל כל הרבנים בכל קצווי תבל (ועאכו"כ — במקום שבו ישנם ג' רבנים או יותר, שיש להם תוקף של בי"ד, עד כמה ששייך הדבר בזמן הזה), וישאלו אותם שאלה פשוטה, ובהוספה — שמבקשים שגם המענה יהי' (לא ברמזים, או באופן של דרוש וסוד כו', אלא) באופן פשוט, תיבה אחת בלבד: הן או לאו.

the touchstone in this is, by turning to all the rabbanim at all the ends of the earth (and all the more so — in a place where there are three rabbanim or more, who have the force of a beis din, to the extent this is applicable in our time — *three judges constitute a court, so their answer carries institutional weight*), **and asking them a simple question, with the addition — that one requests that the answer, too, be (not in hints, or by way of derush and sod, etc., but rather) in a simple manner, one word only: yes or no.**

ועל הרבנים מוטל שלא להתנהג באופן ד"כבשו פניהם בקרקע", אלא לקיים "לא תגורו מפני איש", ולהשיב על-מנת לפרסם שרב פלוני אמר כך וכך.

And it is incumbent upon the rabbanim not to conduct themselves in the mode of "they pressed their faces to the ground" — *the Gemara's phrase for judges who would not rule against a powerful man (Sanhedrin 19a–b)*, **but to fulfill "do not fear any man"** — *the Torah's command to judges (Devarim 1:17)*, **and to answer with the understanding that it will be publicized that Rabbi so-and-so said thus-and-thus** — *a ruling given in the open, with the posek's name on it*.

והשאלה היא: אדם שהי' בין החטופים ב"אנטבה", ועתה ברצונו לחזור ולנסוע לשם [כיון שעתה נפתח המקום לענינים של מסחר כו', ומניחים לבנ"י להכנס ולעסוק בזה, וישנה אפשריות להרוויח יפה] — האם מחוייב הוא בהגיעו לשם לברך ברכת הנסים ("ברוך שעשה לי נס במקום הזה"), או שמא אסור לו לברך ברכה זו, ואם יברך — תהי' ברכתו לבטלה?

And the question is: a person who was among the hostages in "Entebbe," and now wishes to go back and travel there [since the place has now been opened for matters of commerce, etc., and they allow Jews to enter and engage in it, and there is the possibility of earning well — *the Rebbe makes the case realistic, not hypothetical*] **— is he obligated, upon arriving there, to recite the blessing over miracles ("Blessed... who performed a miracle for me in this place"),**

or perhaps it is forbidden for him to recite this blessing, and if he recites it — his blessing will be in vain? *— the Gemara (Berachos 54a) rules that one for whom a personal miracle was done blesses whenever he reaches that place; a berachah levatalah, a blessing in vain, is a prohibition of taking G-d's name in vain. The question allows no middle ground.*

KEY POINT

Birchas hanes for a private miracle is halachah (Berachos 54a). If a returning Entebbe hostage must bless, halachah has called Entebbe a miracle. Yes or no.

IN AVODAH · SIMCHAS TORAH 5787

The 1976 question has a 2026 form, and it is a question to put to a rav, not one this edition answers. FZ1073 came down in Tabuk, Saudi Arabia. If a passenger ever returns there, or passes the place in the sky, what does halachah ask of him? More immediately: those who were aboard and survived a life-threatening event will want to ask their rav about Birchas HaGomel, the blessing said in public, before a minyan, for exactly this kind of rescue. Asking the question is already shirah. It is how the miracle enters halachah.

SUMMARY · §58

Aggadah can be waved away. A halachic ruling cannot. Ask every rav, in one word: must a rescued Entebbe hostage, returning there, bless "she'asah li nes bamakom hazeh," or is it a berachah levatalah? If he must bless, halachah itself has called it a miracle. And the rabbanim must answer openly and without fear.

The second question: may one go to an expert doctor who is not observant?

BEFORE WE READ

Now the Rebbe faces the real objection behind the controversy. Some had argued that since it is doubtful whether all the rescuers put on tefillin every day — and surely at least one did not that day — G-d could not have performed a miracle through them. The Rebbe first notes that the Oral Torah is full of rescues brought through non-observant Jews, even through the biryonim of Jerusalem, and that Chazal said of the "martyrs of Lud" that no creature can stand in their place. But because stories can also be called "derush," he turns to a question of plain halachah that touches every Jew: medicine. Halachah sends the sick to a doctor and lets one desecrate Shabbos on his word, and it distinguishes between an expert and a non-expert. Yet the expert doctor of our day, by temperament, often believes "my strength and the might of my hand" healed the patient.

נט. ויש להוסיף ולשאול את הרבנים שאלה נוספת, שאינה נוגעת רק למי שנוסע ל"אנטבה"... — ובהקדים:

And one should add and ask the rabbanim an additional question, which concerns not only one who travels to "Entebbe"... — and by way of introduction:

ידועה הטענה, שמאחר שישנו ספק אם כל אלו שעסקו בהצלת מאה החטופים מקפידים על הנחת תפילין בכל יום, ועכ"פ אחד מהם לא הניח תפילין באותו יום — לא יתכן שהקב"ה יעשה נס על ידו.

Known is the argument, that since there is a doubt whether all those who engaged in the rescue of the hundred hostages are careful about putting on tefillin every day, and at least one of them did not put on tefillin that day — it is impossible that the Holy One, blessed be He, would do a miracle through him *— the claim, published at the time, that a miracle requires a worthy agent*.

לאמיתו של דבר, טענה זו היא היפך כו"כ סיפורים שמצינו בתושבע"פ, שהקב"ה שלח הצלה לבנ"י ע"י יהודים שלא שמרו תומ"צ, ואפילו ע"י "בריוני", ועד שארז"ל על "הרוגי לוד" ש"אין כל ברי' יכולה לעמוד במחיצתם", כיון שמסרו נפשם להציל את כלל ישראל. ועד"ז בנדו"ד, שהמצילים מסרו את נפשם והעמידו חייהם בסכנה כדי להציל כו"כ מישראל.

In truth, this argument is contrary to many stories that we find in the Oral Torah, that the Holy One, blessed be He, sent rescue to the Jewish people through Jews who did not keep Torah and mitzvos, and even through "biryoni" *— the zealots of besieged Jerusalem, whom the Gemara (Gittin 56a) portrays harshly; yet it was Abba Sikra, "head of the biryonim," who arranged Rabban Yochanan ben Zakkai's escape from the city — the escape that saved Yavneh and its sages*, **and to the point that our Sages said of "the martyrs of Lud"** *— two brothers who took upon themselves a false accusation to save the whole Jewish community from a decree* **that "no creature can stand in their place"** *— their portion in the World to Come is beyond any other (Pesachim 50a)*, **since they gave their lives to save the Jewish people. And so too in our case, that the rescuers gave their lives and placed their lives in danger in order to save many Jews.**

אמנם, מכיון שאפשר לטעון שגם סיפורים אלו הם בדרך דרוש בלבד, ואין לדבר סוף, והרי אין ענין להרבות מחלוקת בישראל — יש להבטיח שהרבנים ישיבו גם על השאלה דלקמן, והיא:

However, since one can argue that these stories too are only by way of derush, and there is no end to the matter *— each side can produce stories, and the argument goes in circles*, **and there is no point in increasing dispute in Israel — one must**

ensure that the rabbanim answer also the following question, which is:

It is a clear ruling in the poskim *— Shulchan Aruch, Yoreh De'ah 336* **that when it comes to matters of medicine — may it be G-d's will that all Jews be healthy and not need this — one must turn to a doctor and conduct oneself according to his instructions, to the point that by the instruction of a doctor it is permitted to desecrate Shabbos even for a doubt, and a doubt of a doubt, etc., as explained in the laws of Shabbos and in the laws of Yom Kippur** *— OC 328 and 618*. **And it is explained there that among doctors themselves there are distinctions between an expert doctor and a doctor who is not an expert, etc.** *— e.g., on Yom Kippur the opinion of the expert outweighs the non-expert. Halachah weighs medical expertise, not the doctor's piety.*

פס"ד ברור הוא בפוסקים, שכשמדובר בעניני רפואה — יה"ר שכל בנ"י יהיו בריאים ולא יזדקקו לזה — יש לפנות לרופא ולהתנהג ע"פ הוראותיו, ועד שע"פ הוראת הרופא מותר לחלל שבת אפילו על ספק וספק ספיקא כו', כמבואר בהלכות שבת ובהלכות יוהכ"פ. ומבואר שם שברופאים גופא ישנם חילוקים בין רופא מומחה לרופא שאינו מומחה כו'.

Now, the nature of doctors in our time — even if we do not use the well-known language of the Mishnah *— "the best of doctors is destined for Gehinnom" (Kiddushin 82a), a line the Rebbe pointedly declines to quote in full* **— is that the doctor (if he is not a G-d-fearing Jew who believes that the Holy One, blessed be He, helps him) believes that "my strength and the might of my hand made me this wealth"** *— the Torah's description of the arrogance of success (Devarim 8:17)*, **being gifted in his mind and skilled with his hands ("he has a good head and a light hand"), and he has already been tested in this** *— his record proves it*;

והנה, טבע הרופאים בזמן הזה — אפילו אם לא ננקוט בלשון הידוע שבמשנה — שהרופא (אם אינו יהודי יר"ש, המאמין שהקב"ה עוזרו) מאמין ש"כחי ועוצם ידי עשה לי את החיל הזה", בהיותו בעל כשרון בשכלו ואומן בידיו ("ער האָט אַ גוטע קאָפּ און האָט אַ גרינגע האַנט"), וכבר נתנסה בזה,

and the proof — such-and-such a patient, about whom other doctors said that they can do nothing for him: one doctor did not know what to do, and another doctor even made his condition worse; whereas he succeeded in saving him, and now he walks in the street — not only "on his staff" *— the Torah's phrase for a recovered patient (Shemos 21:19), still leaning on a cane*, **but entirely healthy!...**

והראי' — חולה פלוני, שרופאים אחרים אמרו שאין בידם לעשות דבר למענו: רופא אחד לא ידע מה לעשות, ואילו רופא אחר — עוד הביא להחמרת מצבו; ואילו הוא הצליח להצילו, ועתה הולך הוא בשוק — לא רק "על משענתו", אלא בריא אולם!...

And the more he succeeds — the more he is likely (and indeed does in practice) to proclaim in a louder voice that his success is "my strength and the might of my hand" (as is human nature, that a small doctor is a small boaster, and a great doctor is a great boaster),

וככל שמצליח יותר — כך עלול הוא יותר (וכן עושה בפועל) להכריז בקול גדול יותר שהצלחתו היא "כחי ועוצם ידי" (כטבע האדם, שרופא קטן הוא בעל-גאוה קטן, ואילו רופא גדול הוא בעל-גאוה גדול),

and he brings proof that this is not mere imagination ("an imagined thing") — for everyone sees that he charges twice as much (or three times as much) as other doctors, and nevertheless everyone turns to him, since he is an expert.

ומביא ראי' שאין זה דמיון בעלמא ("איינגערעדטע זאַך") — שהרי הכל רואים שהוא גובה כפליים (או ג' פעמים ככה) מרופאים אחרים, ואעפ"כ פונים כולם אליו, להיותו מומחה.

And when a G-d-fearing Jew turns to a doctor who believes that his success is "my strength and the might of my hand," and even pays him double what he pays a G-d-fearing doctor (who is not as expert as he) — this strengthens even more the doctor's belief that his success is "my strength and the might of my hand," seeing that even "a frum Jew" comes specifically to him, and not to the G-d-fearing doctor *— so going to him seems to feed the very attitude the objectors say disqualifies him*.

וכאשר יהודי יר"ש פונה לרופא המאמין שהצלחתו היא "כחי ועוצם ידי", ועוד משלם לו כפליים ממה שמשלם לרופא יר"ש (שאינו מומחה כמוהו) — הרי זה מחזק עוד יותר את סברתו של הרופא שהצלחתו היא "כחי ועוצם ידי", בראותו שאפילו "אַ פרומער איד" בא דוקא אליו, ולא לרופא הירא"ש.

So, when a Jew falls ill, G-d forbid, and must turn to a doctor — the question arises: is it permitted for him to turn to this expert doctor, or perhaps it is forbidden for him to turn to him, and he must rather seek a doctor (less expert than he, but) G-d-fearing?

ובכן, כאשר יהודי נופל למשכב הי"ת, ועליו לפנות לרופא — מתעוררת השאלה: האם מותר לו לפנות לרופא מומחה זה, או שמא אסור לו לפנות אליו, אלא עליו לחפש רופא (מומחה קטן ממנו, אבל) יר"ש?

KEY POINT

G-d has always sent rescue through imperfect Jews — even through the head of the biryonim, who smuggled Rabban Yochanan ben Zakkai out of Jerusalem.

SUMMARY · §59

The objection: Entebbe could not be a miracle, because some rescuers did not lay tefillin. Against it, Chazal's stories of rescue through imperfect Jews — biryonim, the martyrs of Lud. But stories can be called derush, so the Rebbe brings a halachic case everyone faces: may a sick Jew go to the expert doctor who credits "my strength and my hand," or must he seek a less expert but G-d-fearing one?

The question, sharpened: a life in danger, two doctors

BEFORE WE READ

The Rebbe sharpens the medical question until the logic of the Entebbe objection is fully exposed. A Jew has a critically ill person at home. One option is a deeply observant doctor who prays three times a day and attributes every cure to Heaven, but who is not an expert in this condition. The other is a proven expert at a leading hospital, whose observance one does not know, or does know to be absent, and who credits himself. If G-d cannot send rescue through someone who does not lay tefillin, then going to the expert is not merely unwise; it is forbidden, because healing will not come through him. Put that way, the question answers itself — and the rabbanim are asked to answer it in halachah.

And to sharpen the question further ("in a sharper way"):	**ס.** ולחדד השאלה יותר ("אין אַ שאַרפערן אופן"):
One who has in his house a dangerously ill person, may the Merciful One save us — "a wound of the cavity" *— makah shel chalal, an internal injury, the halachic paradigm of life-danger for which Shabbos is set aside* **and the like — and before him stands the choice whether to rely on the kindnesses of G-d or to turn to a doctor,**	מי שיש בביתו חולה מסוכן ר"ל, "מכה של חלל" וכיו"ב, ולפניו עומדת הברירה אם לסמוך על חסדי ה' או לפנות לרופא,
and within this itself — the choice stands before him:	ובזה גופא — עומדת לפניו הברירה:
He can turn to a doctor who is not an expert in this field, but who is G-d-fearing to the utmost, puts on tefillin and prays three times a day, and believes and proclaims that he himself is nothing and the healing comes from Heaven, from the Holy One, blessed be He, who is "Healer of all flesh" *— the phrase of the Asher Yatzar blessing*,	באפשרותו לפנות לרופא שאינו מומחה בתחום זה, אבל הוא יר"ש בתכלית, מניח תפילין ומתפלל ג' פעמים ביום, ומאמין ומכריז שהוא עצמו אינו כלום והרפואה באה מן השמים, מהקב"ה שהוא "רופא כל בשר",
and even though he does not come to learn fear of Heaven from him but to be healed by him — it is explained in the teachings of Kabbalah and Chassidus that the success of the doctor in curing the patient depends on the kindnesses of G-d *— the doctor is a channel; the cure itself is a divine gift*, **and for this there must be teshuvah, since "there is no suffering without sin"** *— Shabbos 55a*; **and on account of these reasons it would seem one should seek specifically a G-d-fearing doctor, without investigating whether he is an expert doctor or not;**	ואף שאינו בא ללמוד אצלו יראת-שמים, אלא להתרפא על-ידו — הרי מבואר בתורת הקבלה והחסידות שהצלחת הרופא בריפוי החולה תלוי' בחסדי ה', ולזה צ"ל ענין התשובה, שהרי "אין יסורין בלא עון", ומצד טעמים אלו לכאורה יש לחפש דוקא רופא יר"ש, ולא לברר אם הוא רופא מומחה או לא;
and on the other hand — he can turn to an expert doctor, whose treatments are tested and proven (and the proof — that they use his services in such-and-such a hospital, etc.), without investigating whether this man is G-d-fearing, puts on tefillin and keeps Torah and mitzvos [and it is possible	ולאידך — באפשרותו לפנות לרופא מומחה, שרפואותיו בדוקות ומנוסות (והראי' — שמשתמשים בשירותיו בבית-מרפא פלוני כו'), מבלי לברר אם הלה הוא יר"ש, מניח תפילין ומקיים תומ"צ [ויתכן גם שיודעים כבר מיהו הרופא, ומכירים את כתובתו, ויודעים שאינו

מניח תפילין ואינו שומר תומ"צ], או שמא מאמין שהצלחתו היא "כחי ועוצם ידי", וע"י הפני' אליו עלול הוא להתחזק עוד יותר בשיטתו זו (כנ"ל),

that they already know who the doctor is, and know his address, and know that he does not put on tefillin and does not keep Torah and mitzvos], or perhaps believes that his success is "my strength and the might of my hand," and by turning to him he is likely to be strengthened even more in this view of his (as above),

וטענה נוספת (ע"ד הטענה הנ"ל בנוגע להצלת החטופים) — שמאחר שהלה מאמין שהצלחתו ברפואה היא "כחי ועוצם ידי", לא יתכן ש"רופא כל בשר" ישלח רפואה באמצעותו, וא"כ, לא זו בלבד שיש להימנע מללכת אליו כדי שלא לחזק את שיטתו, אלא שאיסור גמור ללכת אליו, כי על-ידו לא תבוא הרפואה!

and a further argument (along the lines of the argument mentioned regarding the rescue of the hostages) — that since this man believes that his success in medicine is "my strength and the might of my hand," it is impossible that "the Healer of all flesh" would send healing through him; and if so, not only should one refrain from going to him so as not to strengthen his view, but it is an absolute prohibition to go to him, because through him the healing will not come! *— this is the Entebbe objection carried into the clinic. If it is true for rescue, it is true for medicine.*

וממילא השאלה היא פשוטה — מהי חובתו ע"פ שו"ע: האם מחוייב הוא לפנות לרופא המומחה יותר, אף שאינו יר"ש, ולסמוך על הקב"ה שישלח את רפואתו ע"י הרופא המומחה — או שמא עליו לברר אודות יראת-השמים של הרופא (אף שאינו מומחה), ולסמוך על הקב"ה שישלח את הרפואה גם ע"י הרופא שאינו מומחה [שהרי העיקר הוא שמקיים את ציווי הכתוב "ורפא ירפא", "מכאן שניתנה רשות לרופא לרפאות", ואין נפק"מ אם הוא רופא גדול או קטן]?

And so the question is simple — what is his obligation according to the Shulchan Aruch: is he obligated to turn to the more expert doctor, even though he is not G-d-fearing, and rely on the Holy One, blessed be He, to send his healing through the expert doctor — or perhaps he must investigate the fear of Heaven of the doctor (even though he is not an expert), and rely on the Holy One, blessed be He, to send the healing also through the doctor who is not an expert [for the main thing is that he fulfills the command of the verse "and he shall surely heal," "from here we learn that permission was given to the doctor to heal" *— Berachos 60a: the Torah licenses medical practice, so recourse to a physician is not a lack of faith*, **and it makes no difference whether he is a great doctor or a small one** *— the argument for the pious non-expert, stated at its strongest*]**?**

וזוהי שאלה הנוגעת לפועל, מעשים שבכל יום — שהרי אין זה ענין שיכול להתרחש רק באפריקא... אלא הדבר נוגע לבנ"י בכל מקום שהם, בלונדון ובמלבורן וכו', ועאכו"כ בעיר כדוגמת ניו-יורק (ב"ברוקלין" או ב"מנהטן"), שיש בה כפליים ששים ריבוא מישראל ויותר, ומצד גדרי הטבע יש בה בכל יום כו"כ מישראל הנזקקים לרופא, ועכ"פ — אחד מישראל הנזקק לרופא.

And this is a question that concerns practice, daily occurrences — for this is not a matter that can happen only in Africa... *— a dry reference to Uganda* **but the matter concerns Jews wherever they are, in London and in Melbourne, etc., and all the more so in a city like New York (in "Brooklyn" or in "Manhattan"), which has twice six hundred thousand Jews and more** *— over 1.2 million, twice the number who left Egypt*, **and by the bounds of nature there are in it every day many Jews who need a doctor, and at least — one Jew who needs a doctor.**

KEY POINT

If G-d cannot send rescue through a Jew without tefillin, then going to the best doctor is forbidden. Nobody acts on that. The halachah sends us to the expert.

IN AVODAH · SIMCHAS TORAH 5787

Of the people credited with saving FZ1073, one is a plumber who said he knew what to do because he watches "Air Crash Investigation." Another is a dentist who stopped the captain's bleeding. A bank executive and others used headphone cords to restrain the attacker, and, by one report, a British pilot who happened to be aboard helped bring the plane down safely. None of them was chosen for his piety, and no one would refuse a lift from the man who pulled that aircraft out of its dive. The Rebbe's doctor question asks us to be honest about that instinct. We already believe, in practice, that Hashem sends rescue through whom He chooses. The sicha asks us to say so in words.

SUMMARY · §60

A life in danger; two doctors — the pious non-expert and the proven expert who credits himself. If Hashem cannot rescue through a Jew who does not lay tefillin, then going to the expert is forbidden. The question touches every Jew, every day, in every city: what does the Shulchan Aruch require?

The rabbanim must rule — and silence is also a ruling

BEFORE WE READ

The medical question is the test case for Entebbe. Whatever the rabbanim answer about the doctor, they have answered about the rescuers. The Rebbe insists it is not a figure of speech. Tomorrow morning a Jew will ask a rav which doctor to choose, and the rav must answer clearly. In a matter of life, there is no “stringency” and no “leniency”; either way, a life is at stake. A rav who says “we will rule when the case arises” has already ruled by his silence, and bears responsibility for anyone who avoids an expert because of it. Those who signed statements that G-d does not save through non-observant Jews bear that responsibility for their own followers and families. In fact they have already answered — by the doctors they themselves went to.

סא. ובכן, יפסקו הרבנים מהו הדין בשאלה זו ע"פ שו"ע, ובזה תהי' הבחינה בנוגע להמאורע ב"אנטבה" — האם אפשר לומר שהקב"ה שלח הצלה ע"י אלו שאינם מניחים תפילין וכיו"ב.

So, let the rabbanim rule what the law is in this question according to the Shulchan Aruch, and in this will be the test regarding the event in "Entebbe" — whether it is possible to say that the Holy One, blessed be He, sent rescue through those who do not put on tefillin and the like *— one halachic answer settles both questions*.

ואין זה ענין של מליצה גרידא ("גלייך-וועדטל"), אלא ענין הנוגע למעשה, שהאחריות עליו מוטלת על כתפי הרבנים — שהרי מחר בבוקר, כשיבוא אדם מישראל לרב פלוני בן פלוני [שהרי כשם שישנם כו"כ מישראל הבאים לשאול בעצתי לאיזה רופא לפנות, כך מסתמא שואלים גם אצל רבנים אחרים, או אצל ידידים טובים וכיו"ב], וישאל אצלו שאלה זו — יהי' עליו להורות לו הוראה ברורה,

And this is not a matter of mere rhetoric ("a gleich-vertel" *— Yiddish: a clever comparison, a quip*), **but a matter that concerns practice, the responsibility for which rests on the shoulders of the rabbanim — for tomorrow morning, when a Jew comes to Rabbi so-and-so son of so-and-so [for just as there are many Jews who come to ask my advice about which doctor to turn to** *— the Rebbe speaks from daily experience: Jews regularly asked him which doctor to choose*, **so presumably they also ask other rabbanim, or good friends and the like], and asks him this question — he will have to give him a clear instruction,**

ומכיון שמדובר בענין של פיקוח-נפש — לא שייך בזה להחמיר מספק, או לאידך — לומר ש"כח דהתירא עדיף", שהרי בכל אופן שיפסוק נוגע הדבר לפיקוח-נפש, ולא שייך בזה קולא או חומרא.

and since this concerns a matter of pikuach nefesh *— the saving of life, which overrides almost every mitzvah* **— there is no room here to be stringent out of doubt, or on the other hand — to say that "the power of leniency is preferable"** *— kocha deheteira adif, the Gemara's principle (Berachos 60a) that a lenient ruling shows greater confidence; here neither the stringent nor the lenient mode applies*, **for whichever way he rules, the matter concerns pikuach nefesh, and there is no question here of leniency or stringency** *— each option risks a life; the posek cannot hide behind “playing it safe”*.

ואם התשובה לשאלה תהי', שימתינו עד שיהי' הדבר נוגע למעשה, ואז יפסקו — הרי זו "תשובה" רק ע"ד הצחות, ותכליתה היא השתמטות מלהשיב ("כבשו פניהם בקרקע"); אבל אין זה פוטר אותם מאחריות, כי גם שתיקתם פסק-דין היא, ובזה מקבלים על

And if the answer to the question will be that they will wait until the matter becomes practical, and then rule — that is an "answer" only by way of wit, and its purpose is evasion of answering ("they pressed their faces to the ground"); but this does not exempt them from responsibility, for their

silence too is a ruling, and by this they take upon themselves the responsibility for those who will refrain from turning to an expert doctor because of their silence!

עצמם את האחריות על אלו שיימנעו מלפנות לרופא מומחה בגלל שתיקתם!

And likewise regarding those rabbanim who said and signed (regarding the event in "Entebbe") that the Holy One, blessed be He, does not send healing and rescue, etc., through a Jew who does not keep Torah and mitzvos — for from their words one can learn what their opinion is also regarding this question (obviously), and consequently they take upon themselves the responsibility for anyone who will not be healed of his illness because he did not want to turn to an expert doctor, saying (according to their words) that it is impossible that the Holy One, blessed be He, would send him healing through a Jew who does not keep Torah and mitzvos; and the matter may concern (even though he does not know about it) also the son or daughter of that very rav, and also himself!

ועד"ז בנוגע לאותם רבנים שאמרו וחתמו (לגבי המאורע ב"אנטבה") שהקב"ה אינו שולח רפואה והצלה וכו' ע"י יהודי שאינו שומר תומ"צ — שמדבריהם אפשר ללמוד מה דעתם גם בנוגע לשאלה זו (כמובן), וממילא מקבלים על עצמם את האחריות לכל מי שלא יתרפא ממחלתו מכיון שלא רצה לפנות לרופא מומחה, באמרו (ע"פ דבריהם) שלא יתכן שהקב"ה ישלח לו רפואה ע"י יהודי שאינו שומר תומ"צ, והדבר עלול להיות נוגע (אף שאינו יודע עד"ז) גם לבנו או לבתו של אותו רב, וגם אליו עצמו!

And one should add, that in truth these rabbanim have already answered this question themselves — for everyone knows to which doctor they went themselves, and to which doctor they send those who come to ask their advice!... — *conduct is testimony. What a person does when his own life is at stake reveals what he truly believes about how G-d sends help.*

ויש להוסיף, שלאמיתו של דבר רבנים אלו השיבו כבר בעצמם על שאלה זו — שהרי הכל יודעים לאיזה רופא הלכו בעצמם, ולאיזה רופא שולחים הם את הבאים לשאול בעצתם!...

So: those who will rule on this question, let them attach to their ruling also an explanation regarding the manner of their own conduct when the matter concerned them themselves — a week ago, a month ago, a year ago or two years ago: did they investigate whether there was a doctor who was more G-d-fearing, or did they investigate only whether there was a doctor who was more expert — and let them explain the reason for this conduct of theirs,

ובכן: אלו שיפסקו שאלה זו, יצרפו להפס"ד שלהם גם ביאור בנוגע לאופן הנהגתם כשהדבר הי' נוגע אליהם עצמם — לפני שבוע, לפני חודש, לפני שנה או לפני שנתיים: האם ביררו אם ישנו רופא שהוא יר"ש גדול יותר, או שביררו רק אם ישנו רופא שהוא מומחה גדול יותר — ויבארו את הטעם להנהגתם זו,

and let them explain, in a way understood by simple householders, without derushim and hints, etc., what the difference is between the fulfillment of the Holy One's mission (He who is "Healer of the sick of His people Israel" *— the Refa'einu blessing of Shemoneh Esreh*) **through the doctor, and the fulfillment of the Holy One's mission through the saving of lives — even the saving of "a single soul of Israel"** *— whoever saves a single Jewish soul is as if he saved an entire world (Sanhedrin 37a)* **(just as the matter of healing concerns an individual), and all the more so in our case, where they saved a hundred souls of Israel!**

ויסבירו באופן המובן לבעלי-בתים פשוטים, ללא דרושים ורמזים וכו', מהו החילוק בין קיום שליחותו של הקב"ה (שהוא "רופא חולי עמו ישראל") ע"י הרופא, ובין קיום שליחותו של הקב"ה ע"י הצלת נפשות — אפילו הצלת "נפש אחת מישראל" (כשם שענין הרפואה הוא בנוגע ליחיד), ועאכו"כ בנדו"ד, שהצילו מאה נפשות מישראל!

KEY POINT

In a matter of life there is no “safe” ruling, and silence is itself a ruling. Watch which doctors the objectors go to themselves.

SUMMARY · §61

The medical ruling is the Entebbe ruling. It is practical, since a Jew may ask tomorrow morning, and it is a matter of life, where neither stringency nor leniency offers shelter. Silence is itself a ruling. Those who signed that G-d does not save through the non-observant have already answered, by the doctors they choose. Let them explain the difference between a doctor’s shlichus and a rescuer’s.

“Miracle versus nature” — the distinction runs the other way

BEFORE WE READ

Some try to separate the cases: medicine is natural, so a non-observant doctor may serve; a miraculous rescue like Entebbe cannot come through a non-observant Jew. The Rebbe rejects the premise outright — as if the healing of a patient, let alone one in danger, depended on nature! If anything, the difference runs the other way. Going to a self-crediting doctor feeds his pride and his fees. The Entebbe rescuers gained nothing of the kind: their names were withheld for fear of reprisals, so they did not even have the satisfaction of being known as the ones who saved Jews. The Rebbe adds at once that this point is only an aside, not to be put into the question for the rabbanim, lest it become a pretext to avoid answering.

There are those who seek to distinguish between the two matters, arguing that only a rescue by way of miracle (like the event of "Entebbe") cannot be through a Jew who does not keep Torah and mitzvos, whereas healing is a natural matter. — May the Merciful One save us from such an opinion, that the healing of a sick person, and all the more so a sick person who is in danger, is a matter dependent on nature! *— for a Jew, healing is always from the “Healer of all flesh”; the doctor’s skill is the garment it wears, not its source*

סב. יש המבקשים לחלק בין שני הענינים, בטענה שרק הצלה בדרך נס (כמו המאורע ד"אנטבה") אינה יכולה להיות ע"י יהודי שאינו שומר תומ"צ, משא"כ רפואה שהיא ענין טבעי. — רחמנא ליצלן מהאי דעתא, שרפואתו של חולה, ועאכו"כ חולה הנמצא בסכנה, היא ענין התלוי בטבע!

In truth there is a difference between the two matters — in the opposite direction (as discussed *— at the farbrengen of 20 Menachem Av 5736, §35*):

לאמיתו של דבר ישנו חילוק בין שני הענינים — לאידך גיסא (כמדובר):

When one turns to a doctor who is not G-d-fearing — this causes the doctor to boast of his expertise, and to demand (and they also pay him) a higher fee, and they also tell others to turn to that doctor, being an expert, etc.;

כאשר פונים לרופא שאינו יר"ש — הרי זה גורם שהרופא מתפאר במומחיותו, ודורש (וגם משלמים לו) תשלום גבוה יותר, וגם אומרים לאחרים שיפנו לאותו רופא, להיותו מומחה כו';

whereas those who saved many Jews in the aforementioned event — they receive no honor from this, for it was forbidden to publish their names (except for those at the head, whose names would have been publicized in any case *— the political and military leadership, whose names were public in any case. The name of Lt. Col. Yonatan Netanyahu, who led the assault force and was the one soldier killed, also became known, and the operation was later named for him*), **because they fear revenge, etc.; and even the very pleasure of having it known that they merited to save Jews — even this pleasure they do not have, as said, that it is forbidden to publish their names!** *— their act was l’shem Shamayim in the most literal sense: no fee, no fame, no thanks they could hear*

משא"כ אלו שהצילו כו"כ מישראל במאורע הנ"ל — כבוד אינם מקבלים עי"ז, שהרי אסרו לפרסם את שמותיהם (מלבד העומדים בראש, ששמותיהם היו מתפרסמים בכל אופן), כיון שמתייראים מנקמה כו'; ואפילו עצם ההנאה מזה שיודעים על הזכות שזכו להציל אנשים מישראל — גם הנאה זו אין להם, כנ"ל שאסור לפרסם את שמותיהם!

— This distinction is said only as an addition, but the intention is not that they include it in the question that

they will ask the rabbanim, for they are likely to latch onto this detail alone, and use it to evade answering the question, etc. *— the Rebbe guards the clarity of the question even against his own best argument*.

— חילוק זה נאמר רק בתור הוספה, אבל אין הכוונה שיכניסוהו בשאלה שישאלו את הרבנים, כי עלולים להיטפל רק לפרט זה, ולהשתמש בזה כדי להשתמט מלענות על השאלה כו'.

KEY POINT

Healing is never "just nature." And the Entebbe rescuers took no fee and no fame — not even their names.

IN AVODAH · SIMCHAS TORAH 5787

Here the parallel to FZ1073 turns into a contrast, and it is worth noticing. The Entebbe soldiers were anonymous, and the Rebbe made a point of the fact that they were denied even the pleasure of being known. The FZ1073 passengers are named — Yaniv Hayun, Tzvika and Tali Manes, Shota Musaev, Asaf Rajuan — and Israel's President has nominated them for a civilian heroism award. That is to their credit and the country's. But the Rebbe's point still holds: honoring the messengers is not the same as thanking the Sender. Hayun himself told reporters, "It's something you do without thinking." The thinking, and the thanks, are left to us. And one more resonance, offered as fact rather than proof: in the Entebbe raid the Rebbe defended, Yoni Netanyahu led the assault force and was its one fallen soldier. Fifty years later it was his brother, as Prime Minister, who called the FZ1073 passengers heroes who prevented "a disaster of unbelievable proportions."

SUMMARY · §62

The "nature vs. miracle" split is rejected: healing is never merely natural. The real difference runs the other way. A self-crediting doctor gains fame and fees, while the Entebbe rescuers, unnamed for their safety, gained nothing — not even the pleasure of being known. But keep this aside out of the question, so no one can use it to dodge.

Two questions, one word each

BEFORE WE READ

The Rebbe knows how long talks get mined for side-points. “They claimed wheat, and he denied barley”: an opponent will not concede, but he will not deny the claim either. He will deny something else that was never said. So the inquiry to the rabbanim must be short, asking for a one-word answer — yes or no — to two questions. First, a former Entebbe hostage returning there: must he bless, or is it a berachah levatalah? Second, a question for every Jew everywhere: may one go to an expert doctor who is not G-d-fearing and credits his own strength, or only to a G-d-fearing one, even if less expert?

As discussed several times, when one speaks at excessive length, people of ill will are likely to come and give various interpretations, etc., and the result of this is — "they claimed wheat [and not 'and he admitted to barley' *— in the Mishnah (Shevuos 38b), one claimed for wheat who admits to barley is exempt, since he admitted something never claimed; the Rebbe's opponents do not even do that much* **— for a matter of admission is in general difficult to bring about... but] and he denied barley": he will deny, but not the things that were said ("wheat"), but other things ("barley")...** *— the classic evasion: refute a position nobody holds, and leave the real claim untouched*

סג. כמדובר כמה פעמים, כאשר מדברים באריכות יתרה, עלולים לבוא אינשי דלא מעלי ולומר בזה פירושים שונים כו', והתוצאה מזה היא — "טענו חטים [ולא "והודה לו בשעורים" — כי ענין של הודאה בכלל קשה לפעול... אלא] וכחש בשעורים": הלה יכחיש, אבל לא את הדברים שנאמרו ("חטים"), אלא דברים אחרים ("שעורים")...

And therefore the writing of the inquiry to the rabbanim should be in a way that requests that they answer briefly, in one word only — "yes" or "no" — to the two aforementioned questions:

ולכן כתיבת הפני' לרבנים תהי' באופן שמבקשים להשיב בקיצור, בתיבה אחת בלבד — "הן" או "לאו" — על שתי השאלות האמורות:

The first question (which indeed does not concern everyone, but it is a matter of Torah, and a halachic ruling is needed on it): a person who was among the hostages in "Entebbe," and comes to that place — must he recite the blessing over miracles, or perhaps this is an absolute prohibition and a blessing in vain?

השאלה הראשונה (שאמנם אינה נוגעת לכל אחד, אבל היא ענין בתורה, ונצרך פס"ד להלכה בזה): אדם שהי' בין החטופים ב"אנטבה", ומגיע לאותו מקום — האם עליו לברך ברכת הנסים, או שמא זהו איסור גמור וברכה לבטלה?

And the second question (which may concern every single Jew in every place, as above): is it permitted to turn to an expert doctor who is not G-d-fearing, and who claims that the healing is through "my strength and the might of my hand," or perhaps one should turn only to a G-d-fearing doctor, even if he is not an expert in medicine?

והשאלה השני' (שעלולה להיות נוגעת לכאו"א מישראל בכל מקום, כנ"ל): האם מותר לפנות לרופא מומחה שאינו יר"ש, וטוען שהרפואה היא ע"י "כחי ועוצם ידי", או שמא יש לפנות רק לרופא יר"ש, אף אם אינו מומחה ברפואה.

KEY POINT

Ask in one word, so no one can deny “barley” when the claim was “wheat.”

CHART · §§58–63

Two questions for every rav — one word each

1

The blessing at Entebbe

A freed hostage returns to Entebbe. Must he say *"Baruch she'asah li nes bamakom hazeh"*?

`YES → halachah calls it a nes`

`NO → the blessing is levatalah`

2

The doctor

A life is in danger. May one go to the **expert** who is not G-d-fearing and credits "my strength," or only to the **G-d-fearing** non-expert?

`EXPERT → Hashem heals through whom He chooses`

`G-D-FEARING ONLY → then the Entebbe objection holds`

The Rebbe's point (§61): one ruling answers both. Whoever sends a dangerously ill Jew to the best doctor has already conceded that Hashem saves through Jews who do not lay tefillin.

SUMMARY · §63

Long discussions invite evasion — denying "barley" when the claim was "wheat." So ask briefly, for one word each. 1) A returning Entebbe hostage: blessing, or berachah levatalah? 2) The expert who is not G-d-fearing, or only the G-d-fearing non-expert?

Why the Rebbe will not write the letter himself — a stamp, and a mezuzah

BEFORE WE READ

Given the gravity of the issue, the Rebbe says, he ought to write to all the rabbanim himself (he adds in Yiddish that this is "not said on Yom Tov," i.e., writing is not for now). But he recalls the Beilis trial in Kiev. The prosecutor, asked why he ignored a letter sent to him, answered that the stamp bearing the Czar's portrait had been pasted on upside down; having insulted the king's image, the letter's content no longer mattered. So it would be here: people would argue over the titles of address, read between the lines, and say it was done for the Rebbe's own honor. And he tells a "shocking story" to prove it. A G-d-fearing Jew in Boro Park was offered a mezuzah check. He refused: he had heard in shul that "the Lubavitcher" says to check mezuzos, while "the gedolei Yisrael" say not to, and he did not want to get into a dispute with them. Yet the Mateh Efraim, written by one of the gedolei Yisrael and printed before the Rebbe was born, records the custom of checking tefillin and mezuzos in Elul.

סד. מצד חשיבות הענין — הי' מן הראוי שאכתוב בעצמי ("ניט אום יו"ט געריידט") מספר שורות לכל הרבנים, לבקשם שיפסקו בשאלות אלו, ויפרסמו את פסק-הדין.

Because of the importance of the matter — it would have been fitting that I write myself ("not said on Yom Tov" — *the Rebbe signals that he is speaking of writing, which is not done on Yom Tov, only as a hypothetical*) **a few lines to all the rabbanim, asking them to rule on these questions, and to publicize the ruling.**

אבל לאח"ז נזכרתי במאורע שאירע בעת מעשה ביילים, שכששאלו את הקטיגור מדוע לא עיין במכתב ששלחו לו, השיב שה"בול" ("מאַרקע") — שעליו צורת הצאר ניקולאַי — הודבק על המכתב בצורה הפוכה, כשראשו למטה, ובזה ביזו את צורת המלך, וממילא כבר אינו נוגע מה נאמר במכתב...

But afterwards I recalled an incident that occurred at the time of the Beilis affair *— the 1913 blood-libel trial of Menachem Mendel Beilis in Kiev*: **when they asked the prosecutor why he did not look at a letter that had been sent to him, he answered that the stamp ("marke") — which bore the image of Czar Nicholas — had been stuck on the letter upside down, with his head downward, and by this they had disgraced the image of the king, and therefore it no longer mattered what was said in the letter...** *— the form becomes the excuse to ignore the content*

ועד"ז בנדו"ד: אם אכתוב את המכתב בעצמי — יתחילו להתווכח אם תואר הכבוד ("טיטול") נכתב כדבעי: אם הוא מכובד יתר על המדה — גם זה נחשב לחסרון, ואם אינו מכובד דיו — הרי זה כבר נורא ואיום ("איז דאָך גאָר אַ געוואַלד")... וימשיכו להתווכח אם המכתב מנוסח כדבעי, ויקראו גם "בין השיטין", ויטענו שהדבר נעשה "לכבודי" או "לכבוד בית אבא" וכו'.

And so too in our case: if I write the letter myself — they will begin to argue whether the title of honor ("titul") was written properly: if it is too honorific — this too is considered a deficiency, and if it is not honorific enough — this is already terrible and dreadful ("it's a real outrage!")... and they will continue to argue whether the letter is properly worded, and they will also read "between the lines," and they will claim that the thing was done "for my honor" or "for the honor of my father's house" *— Taanis 20a, the phrase of one who acts for personal or family prestige*, **etc.**

[והראי' לזה — ממעשה מבהיל:

[And the proof of this — from a shocking incident:

They approached a Jew in the neighborhood of "Boro Park" — a G-d-fearing Jew who keeps Torah and mitzvos — and offered him to check the mezuzos in his house *— part of the Rebbe's mezuzah campaign (mivtza mezuzah), launched in 5734*. **And he answered them that he heard in the synagogue that "the Lubavitcher" says one must check the mezuzos, whereas "the gedolei Yisrael" say that one need not check the mezuzos, and he does not want to enter into a dispute ("get himself mixed up") with "the gedolei Yisrael"!...**

פנו ליהודי בשכונת "באָרא-פאַרק" — יהודי יר"ש ושומר תומ"צ — והציעו לו לבדוק את המזוזות בביתו. והשיב להם, ששמע בבית-הכנסת שה"ליובאַוויטשער" אומר שיש לבדוק את המזוזות, ואילו "גדולי ישראל" אומרים שאין לבדוק את המזוזות, ואין ברצונו להיכנס למחלוקת ("זיך אַיינרייסן") עם "גדולי ישראל"!...

— The matter of checking mezuzos is brought in the sefer Mateh Efraim (who was among the gedolei Yisrael, and whose sefer was printed even before I was born... *— that is, the custom long predates any "Lubavitch campaign"*): **"There are men of deeds who are accustomed that in this month (the month of Elul) they examine the fine points of the mitzvos, to check and examine their tefillin and mezuzos, and whatever is found there to be damaged, etc." And yet this Jew claims that he does not want to check the mezuzos so as not to enter into a dispute with "the gedolei Yisrael"!].** *— the source of the instruction was set aside because of who was reported to be saying it; the person pushed the content aside, as the prosecutor did with the stamp*

— ענין בדיקת המזוזות מובא בספר מטה אפרים (שהי' מגדולי ישראל, וספרו נדפס עוד קודם שנולדתי...): "יש אנשי מעשה נוהגין שבחודש הזה (חודש אלול) מפשפשים בדקדוקי מצוות להיות בודק ובוחן תפילין ומזוזות שלהם, וכל אשר ימצא שם בדק כו'". ואילו יהודי זה טוען, שאינו רוצה לבדוק את המזוזות כדי שלא להיכנס למחלוקת עם "גדולי ישראל"!].

And therefore I do not intend to write the letter myself, but at least these questions should be asked publicly of all the rabbanim (including — of those rabbanim who said that it is impossible that the Holy One, blessed be He, would choose a Jew who does not keep Torah and mitzvos as an agent for the rescue of Jews through him), and to know what their answer is.

ולכן אין בדעתי לכתוב את המכתב בעצמי, אבל עכ"פ יש לשאול שאלות אלו ברבים אצל כל הרבנים (כולל — אצל אותם רבנים שאמרו שלא יתכן שהקב"ה יבחר ביהודי שאינו שומר תומ"צ כשליח להצלת בנ"י על-ידו), ולדעת מה תשובתם.

KEY POINT

An upside-down stamp let a prosecutor ignore a letter. A Lubavitch label let a Jew ignore the Mateh Efraim. Ask the question publicly, without anyone's signature on it.

SUMMARY · §64

The Rebbe declines to write the letter himself. As at the Beilis trial, where an upside-down stamp let the prosecutor ignore the letter, people would argue about titles and motives and never reach the content. Proof: a Boro Park Jew refused to check his mezuzos to avoid "disputing the gedolim," though the Mateh Efraim, one of those gedolim, records the custom. So let the questions simply be asked publicly, of everyone.

Without fear, one agudah — and “you shall rejoice before Hashem”

BEFORE WE READ

The sicha closes with blessings. May every rav and every gathering of rabbanim act in the spirit of “do not fear any man,” not the silence of “they pressed their faces to the ground” and “the rabbis were silent,” and answer the two questions according to the Shulchan Aruch. May there be a clear and true ruling, and peace in Israel. And may all Jews — the four kinds represented by the four species — prepare together as “one bundle” to greet Moshiach, so that the verse of the four species — “you shall rejoice before Hashem your G-d” — is fulfilled in the Beis HaMikdash.

And may it be G-d’s will that from now on every rav, and every association of rabbanim [the intention is not specifically "the Agudas HaRabbonim" *— the Union of Orthodox Rabbis of the US and Canada; the Rebbe heads off the reading that he is targeting one body*, **but any place where several rabbanim gather together], conduct themselves in the mode of "do not fear any man," and not in the mode of "they pressed their faces to the ground" and "the rabbis were silent"** *— the printed note points again to Gittin 56a: the sages who sat silent at Bar Kamtza’s humiliation, the silence that set the Churban in motion*, **but rather answer the two aforementioned questions — how the conduct in this should be according to the Shulchan Aruch.**

סה. ויה"ר שמכאן ולהבא כל רב, וכל איגוד של רבנים [אין הכוונה דוקא ל"אגודת הרבנים", אלא לכל מקום שבו מתכנסים כמה רבנים יחד], יתנהגו באופן ד"לא תגורו מפני איש", ולא באופן ד"כבשו פניהם בקרקע" ו"שתקי רבנן", אלא ישיבו על ב' השאלות האמורות — איך צריכה להיות ההנהגה בזה ע"פ שו"ע.

And may it be G-d’s will that there be (in this matter at least) a clear and true ruling, true to its truth *— emes l’amito, the Gemara’s phrase for a judgment that is correct not only formally but in substance*, **and may there be peace upon Israel,**

ויה"ר שיהי' (בענין זה עכ"פ) פסק-דין ברור ואמיתי, באמת לאמיתו, ויהי' שלום על ישראל,

and from now on let us prepare to greet our righteous Moshiach, all Jews together, in the manner of "one bundle" *— agudah achas, the Midrash’s image: the four species are bound as one so that each atones for the others* **— both those Jews of the category of the "esrog"** *— taste and fragrance: Torah and good deeds*, **and those of the category of the "lulav"** *— taste without fragrance: Torah without deeds*, **and those of the category of the "hadas"** *— fragrance without taste: deeds without Torah*, **and those of the category of the "aravah"** *— neither — and still indispensable; without it the mitzvah is not done*,

ומכאן ולהבא נתכונן לקבל פני משיח צדקנו, כל בנ"י יחדיו, באופן של "אגודה אחת" — הן אלו מישראל שבהסוג ד"אתרוג", הן אלו שבהסוג ד"לולב", הן אלו שבהסוג ד"הדס", והן אלו שבהסוג ד"ערבה",

and very soon indeed we will merit the fulfillment of the verse "And you shall rejoice before Hashem your G-d..." *— Vayikra 23:40, the verse of the four species and the joy of Sukkos* **in**

ובקרוב ממש נזכה לקיום הכתוב "ושמחתם לפני ה' אלקיכם גו'" בבית-המקדש, בביאת משיח צדקנו, בקרוב ממש.

the Beis HaMikdash, with the coming of our righteous Moshiach, very soon indeed.

KEY POINT

Esrog, lulav, hadas and aravah — bound as one bundle, or the mitzvah is not done. That is how we greet Moshiach.

IN AVODAH · SIMCHAS TORAH 5787

This Simchas Torah the hakafos danced with every kind of Jew in the circle. The sicha that waited in the booklet asks for three things to carry out of the shul. Say shirah: name the rescue of FZ1073 as Hashem's kindness, aloud, with a blessing or a kapitel or a niggun. Do not measure the miracle by the messenger: Hashem chose a plumber, a dentist and a banker, as in 1976 He chose soldiers whose tefillin no one checked. And bind the bundle: the unity the Rebbe asked for in Tishrei 5737 is the vessel for the song, and the song is the vessel for the Geulah.

SUMMARY · §65

A closing blessing: rabbanim who answer without fear; a clear, true ruling; peace in Israel; and all Jews — esrog, lulav, hadas and aravah — bound as one to greet Moshiach, so that "you shall rejoice before Hashem your G-d" is fulfilled in the Beis HaMikdash.

Hosafah — a letter, 1 Shevat 5730

BEFORE WE READ

The booklet appends, "as a supplement," a letter from the volumes of Igros Kodesh now being prepared. It prints the letter's opening and closing — its general body appears in Igros Kodesh — and, in full, its personal addendum. It is dated Rosh Chodesh Shevat 5730 (January 1970) and addressed to Rabbi Adin Even-Yisrael (Steinsaltz), identified by the editors in their footnote. It concerns the weekly Chassidus shiur of his group: since they have not yet begun a new cycle, and the Mitteler Rebbe's Toras Chaim only reaches the end of Shemos, the Rebbe suggests learning from the maamarim of Torah Or and Likkutei Torah — especially those the Tzemach Tzedek elaborates in Ohr HaTorah — and, for Tu BiShvat, the maamarim on planting.

B"H, Rosh Chodesh Shevat 5730, Brooklyn, N.Y. — To the distinguished... Rabbi Adin, sh'yichyeh *— Rabbi Adin Even-Yisrael (Steinsaltz), per the editors' note*. **Greetings and blessing! As we stand in the eleventh month, etc.** *— the body of this general letter for the month of Shevat is printed in Igros Kodesh and abbreviated here* **... With blessing for success and good tidings, M. Schneersohn.** *Then the personal addendum:* **Your letters were received. Since apparently a new course of study has not yet begun in their weekly shiur, and Toras Chaim of the Mitteler Rebbe was published only up to the end of Sefer Shemos** *— so the group cannot simply continue in it* **— therefore, in my humble opinion, it is fitting that they learn from the discourses of Torah Or and Likkutei Torah (and especially those on which there is an elaboration, etc., in Ohr HaTorah of the Tzemach Tzedek** *— so that the group can follow a maamar from the Alter Rebbe's text into the Tzemach Tzedek's expansion*). **And for Tu BiShvat, the discourses that speak about planting, etc., are fitting (as indicated in the index).**

ב"ה, ר"ח שבט ה'תש"ל,

ברוקלין, נ.י.

הוו"ח אי"א נו"נ עוסק בצ"צ כו'

הרב עדין שי'

שלום וברכה!

בעמדינו בעשתי עשר חדש כו',

...בברכת הצלחה ולבשו"ט

מ. שניאורסאהן

מכ' נתקבלו.

כיון שכנראה עוד לא התחיל סדר לימוד חדש בהשיעור השבועי שלהם ותו"ח לאדהאמ"צ הרי הו"ל רק עד סו"ס שמות — לכן לפענ"ד ראוי שילמדו מדרושי תו"א ולקו"ת (ובפרט אלה שיש עליהם ביאור וכו' באוה"ת להצ"צ). ולט"ו בשבט הרי מתאימים הדרושים המדברים בענין נטיעה וכו' (כמצויין במפתח).

FOR THE SHABBOS TABLE · BEREISHIS 5787

The song that waited fifty years

The Gemara says that Hashem wanted to make Chizkiyahu Moshiach. He had seen two miracles: his city was saved from an army of 185,000 in one night, and his own life was saved from a fatal illness. But he did not sing. The Attribute of Judgment objected — and the Redemption was put off.

The Rebbe asked a simple question about this story. Everyone in Jerusalem knew about the miracle; the corpses lay outside the walls. Why did Chizkiyahu need to sing it? His answer: knowing is in the head. Shirah is what happens when the knowing reaches the heart and comes out of the mouth. Chizkiyahu knew. He did not declare.

In 1976 the Rebbe applied this to Entebbe. Some refused to call the rescue a miracle because the soldiers who carried it out did not all keep mitzvos. The Rebbe's answer was a question anyone at the table can feel: if your child were critically ill, would you choose the most observant doctor, or the best one? Halachah sends you to the expert. We already believe Hashem heals through whomever He chooses. Then why not say so about a rescue?

This Simchas Torah, the sicha was printed in a booklet dated Erev Sukkos — before anyone had heard of flydubai FZ1073. On Chol HaMoed a co-pilot attacked his captain over Saudi Arabia, the plane dived, and a plumber, a dentist, a banker and their fellow passengers fought their way into the cockpit and brought everyone home. Then the booklet was opened in shul.

So here is the question for our table. We all know what happened on that plane. Have we sung? Not "what a story," but "Baruch Hashem" out loud. A blessing from those who were aboard, a kapitel Tehillim, a niggun at this table. Chizkiyahu's miracle went unsung, and we are still waiting. Ours does not have to.

AROUND THE TABLE

1. Why is knowing about a miracle not the same as saying shirah?
2. Would you choose the more observant doctor or the more expert one? What does that tell you about how you think Hashem sends help?
3. What would it look like for our family to "say shirah" this week?

Summary

The sicha opens with ahavas Yisrael: the nations, normally divided, unite against Israel, while Jews quarrel even with those who did them good. Tishrei, the "head" of the year, makes unity urgent (§51). Events are instructions — the Rambam forbids calling trouble chance, the Baal Shem Tov finds a new lesson in every report — and a revealed kindness like Entebbe instructs all the more (§52).

Why keep returning to Entebbe? Because what is at stake is a Jew's stance toward every event (§53). The lesson will come from an aggadah, so the Rebbe first shows that aggadah binds. "Ein meshivin al haderush" means each part of Torah has its own rules (§54). Torah descends like the four worlds, so halachah flows from derush, and a crooked derush yields a crooked halachah (§55).

The story: Chizkiyahu was fit to be Moshiach, but he did not sing over his miracles. The miracle was public; what was missing was inner recognition, and it delayed the Geulah for millennia (§56). We have no Chizkiyahu, but the content applies. When many say it was a miracle, one must say shirah (§57).

To cut through debate, the Rebbe proposes halachic tests answered in one word. Must a returning Entebbe hostage bless "she'asah li nes bamakom hazeh" (§58)? And, since some deny that G-d saves through non-observant Jews, may a sick Jew go to the expert doctor who credits his own skill, rather than the pious non-expert (§§59–60)? The rabbanim must answer, since silence is a ruling and their own choices of doctor already speak (§61).

The "nature versus miracle" distinction fails. If anything, the anonymous rescuers deserve more credit than the boastful doctor (§62). Ask briefly, so no one can evade (§63). The Rebbe will not sign the letter himself, lest form eclipse content, as with the Beilis stamp and the Boro Park mezuzah (§64). He closes with a blessing: fearless rabbanim, a true ruling, peace, and all Jews bound like the four species to greet Moshiach (§65).

Reshimu, Atzmut OS, and how these editions are made

Prepared by **Shimon Rosenberg** — shimon@reshimu.ai · reshimu.ai

> RESHIMU
>
> **Reshimu** builds runtime governance for autonomous AI agents — the Four Gates: a scope gate that holds an agent inside its boundary, an entity-grounding gate that refuses claims not traceable to a real source, an irreversibility gate that stops actions that cannot be undone, and a hand-off gate that decides when a human must be in the loop.

> ATZMUT OS
>
> **Atzmut OS** is the audit and escalation layer beneath the gates: it records what an agent was asked to do, what it did, which gates fired, and what was escalated to a person — so the work can be reviewed after the fact.

The text-fidelity method

1. **The printed page is the only source.** The Hebrew was taken from the booklet's own text layer, decoded line by line, and checked against rasterized page images; Yiddish words and their vowel points were confirmed from the images. Nothing is reconstructed from memory.
2. **Printed line breaks are preserved** in the Full Elucidated Edition, so page and line references match the booklet.
3. **Every footnote is reproduced as printed** and classified VERIFIED / AS CITED / flagged. Nothing is shown as confirmed unless it was opened and checked.
4. **Elucidation is typographically separated from translation.** Bold is the Rebbe's words; lighter italic is editorial.
5. **Nothing is asserted beyond what can be traced** to the printed source, a cited text, or a named news report.

Sources

- **Booklet (base text).** Va'ad Hanachos BLahak, "Hisvaaduyos — Yom Simchas Torah 5737, part 7," Shemini Atzeres–Simchas Torah 5787; chabad.org PDF CrdH13853690.
- **FZ1073 — narrative and timeline.** Al Jazeera, "12 minutes of madness: How Flydubai pilot, passengers saved plane midfall," 2 Oct 2026.
- **FZ1073 — passengers and recognition.** Kathmandu Post (AFP), "Israeli passenger says he knew what to do on flydubai plane after watching TV show," 2 Oct 2026.
- **FZ1073 — official statements.** The New Daily, "Flydubai flight details," 1 Oct 2026; CNN live coverage, 30 Sept 2026.
- **Calendar.** Hebrew–Gregorian dates computed with @hebcal/core.
- **Gemara and Tanach checks.** Sefaria (William Davidson vocalized Talmud; Miqra al pi ha-Masorah) — used to open and confirm the VERIFIED items only; not used as printed locators.

The corpus side of this work is published as **OpenChassidus**. Corrections and requests are welcome at shimon@reshimu.ai.

Colophon

Sicha of the Lubavitcher Rebbe, Simchas Torah 5737, §§51–65 (hanachah bilti mugah), from the Va'ad Hanachos BLahak booklet for Simchas Torah 5787. Translation and elucidation editorial. Prepared by Shimon Rosenberg — shimon@reshimu.ai. Published through **OpenChassidus**.

Contains words of Torah — please treat with respect and do not discard.

RESHIMU

New editions weekly.

reshimu.ai · sign up to receive them

Prepared by Shimon Rosenberg · shimon@reshimu.ai · Published through OpenChassidus