

A Job Only For A Frog

Upon the verse (-Exodus 7:26-27), *"If you refuse to let them leave, I will plague all your territory with frogs,"* Our Sages teach (-Shemot Rabba 10:1):

"That is what is written (-Ecclesiastes 5:8), 'But the advantage of a land is in every way,' ... Our Rabbis say: 'But the advantage of a land is in every way,' even items that you view as extraneous in the world, like flies, fleas, and mosquitos, they were included in the creation of the world, regarding which it is stated (-Genesis 1:31), 'G-d saw everything that He had made [and behold, it was very good].'*

**Footnote 4: "And the Midrash continues with, 'and the entire midrash as it is written in Vayikra Rabba (-Vayikra Rabba 22:2) and in 'This is the statute of the law (-Bamidbar Rabba 18:22).'* -See the noted there and in its commentaries."

-Vayikra Rabba 22:2: *"The Rabbis say: 'The advantage of land,' even things that you consider superfluous in the world, like flies, fleas, and gnats, they, too, are included in the creation of the world, as it is written, 'The heavens and the earth and their entire host were completed'"*

This portion is a continuance of the portion prior (22:1), *"That is what is written, 'The advantage of land is in every way.' Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Nechemya. Rabbi Yehuda said, 'Even matters that you consider to be superfluous for the world are beneficial for the world; palm fiber to make rope; a thorn bush to fence a garden."*

Yefei Toar explains that Rabbi Yehudah speaks only of that which is helpful to all, sick and healthy alike, while our sages are saying that also that which is for the purpose of the individual: from flies and fleas there is a medicinal purpose for the sick, and even in the 'harmful ones' there is the purposefulness of punishing the wicked.

Eitz Yoseph comments that The Rabbis are adding on to Rabbi Yehudah, who sees purpose, and thus, considered of the creation of the world, only that which seem superfluous, but not that which is harmful. While the Rabbis disagree doubly and see not just palm fibers, but even, (i) flies and fleas serve a medicinal purpose, and (ii) even 'harmful one' serve the purpose of punishing the wicked, and both are considered of the creation of the world.

-Bamidbar Rabba 22:2: *"The Holy One blessed be He accomplished His mission in all manners, and did not create anything for naught. At times He accomplishes His mission by means of a frog, at times, by means of a hornet, and at times, by means of a scorpion. Rabbi Chanin of Tzipori said, 'There was an incident involving a certain scorpion who went to perform the mission of the Holy One blessed be He across the Jordan. The Holy One blessed be He appointed for it a certain frog, and it crossed upon it. That scorpion went and stung the person. Likewise, there was an incident involving a certain reaper, who was reaping and gathering in the Beit Tofet valley. When the heat of the day came, he took some of the grass and tied it to his head. A large serpent came upon him, and he arose and killed it. A snake charmer passed by him, he saw that he had killed the serpent. He said to him, 'Who killed that serpent?' He said, 'It was I.' He saw the grass on his head. He said to him, 'Would you agree to remove the grass that is on your head? Then you can boast that you killed it.' He did so, approached it, and he did not manage to touch it before he fell apart, limb by limb... Sometimes it is by means of a hornet, as it is stated (-Exodus 23:28), 'I will send the tzira'ah before you.' Our Rabbis said: When the Holy One blessed be He sent the hornet before Israel to kill the Emorites, see what is written in their regard, 'I destroyed the Emorite from before them, whose height was like the height of cedars and who was strong as the oaks; I destroyed his fruit from above..."*

Eitz Yoseph explains (i) There is missing in the script, *"As it is written, 'The advantage of land is in every way' to teach me that in all manners..."* (ii) *"and did not create anything for naught"*: Saying both, that either they are needed medicinal purpose or they are needed for to save one from other greater 'harmful ones'. Thus, the 'harmful one' serve two purposes, either to punish the wicked, or for medicinal purposes o saving one's life. (iii) *"by means of a frog"*: even though the frog itself does not but or damage, as the story of Rabbi Chanin that it carried the scorpion. (iv) *"He saw the grass on his head"* that the grass on his head

protected him from the poison of the snake. And when he removed it, the venom of the snake caused, *"he fell apart, limb by limb."*

Perush Maharzu explains the connection between all of this and the portion of the Red Cow is that it explains how through the kohain taking small things, the red string, the hyssop, and the cedar wood, to sprinkle, the impure becomes pure. Thus, the Midrash shows us how 'little things' G-d does big outcomes.

The Yefei Toar explains the reason why the tzira'ah was used was because the Emorites were hiding, and in order to bring down those who held themselves mighty through small creature. So to the frogs to uproot the houses of the haughty Egyptian, that the frogs come up from the abyss to destroy them.

The point my bringing all of this is that with all of this in consideration, we will see how the Rebbe sees in all of this that the sages speak of three different categories of creatures, and how each ultimately serve a purpose.

"Rabbi Acha son of Rabbi Chanina said, 'Even items that you view as extraneous in the world, like snakes and scorpions, they were included in the creation of the world. The Holy One blessed be He said to the prophets, 'What do you think, that if you do not go on My mission I will have no emissary? 'But the advantage of a land is in every way.' I will accomplish My mission even by means of a snake, or even by means of a scorpion, or even by means of a frog.' Know that it is so, as were it not for the tzir'ah (hornet), how would the Holy One, blessed be He, exact retribution against the Emorites, and were it not for the frogs, how would He exact retribution from the Egyptians? That is what is written, 'Behold, I will smite [all your borders with frogs].'"

Question: (i) How can we say, *"and were it not for the frogs, how would He exact retribution from the Egyptians"*? Frogs are just one of the Ten Plagues?

Granted, concerning the, *"were it not for the tzir'ah, how would the Holy One, blessed be He, exact retribution against the Emorites,"* it was the first plague to dispel the Emorites (Canaanites), and in a manner that hit them exceedingly hard, as our Sages state (-See Sotah 36a; Rashi, Exodus 23:28; RaDa"K, Joshua 24:12), *"The tzir'ah did not cross the Jordan (River),"* rather, *"It stood on the bank of the Jordan and cast..."*, *"would strike them in their eyes, inject venom into them, and they would die."* However, the Plague of Frogs was not the first plague upon the Egyptians, which was the Plague of Blood. The Plague of Blood was a far harsher and worse for Egypt, for not only did it effect their drinking water, but so too, the sustenance and livelihood of the entire Egypt. In addition to this, after the Plague of Frogs there were yet another eight plagues, including the tenth Plague of the Firstborns, which led to the Egyptians letting Israel go, and even then, there was still the ultimate retribution at the Splitting of the Sea of Reeds, which caused the (-Exodus 14:28), *"not even one of them remained,"* Thus, how can we say, *"and were it not for the frogs, how would He exact retribution from the Egyptians"*?

(ii) In essence this isn't understood how we can say concerning G-d, *"and were it not for the frogs, how would He exact retribution from the Egyptians,"* when (-See Iggeret HaKodesh, Epistle 25), *"G-d has many agents,"* and (-Genesis 18:14), *"Is anything too wondrous for G-d,"* to fulfill His will?

Note: The Rebbe now explains the flow of the Midrash, putting in context what Rabbi Acha is saying.

Before stating the teaching of Rabbi Acha, the Midrash states, *"Our Rabbis say: 'But the advantage of a land is in every way,' even items that you view as extraneous in the world, like flies, fleas, and mosquitos, they were included in the creation of the world."* Simply speaking, the difference between what "Our Rabbis" are saying, and the opinion of Rabbi Acha is in the two details of what Rabbi Acha* is saying *"Even items... as extraneous... I will accomplish My mission."*

*Footnote 11: The Rebbe brings his source for this wording of the Midrash, while noting that in other places in the Midrash the Midrash Rabba there is different wordings, and so too in the Tanchumah, and the Rebbe concludes with, *"This is not its place (to explain this)."*

The words, *"they were included in the creation of the world,"* means to say that not only were these too created by G-d*, and that it was not created by itself, but rather, it means to say that their creation has a purpose for mankind.

**Footnote 13: The Rebbe entertains that maybe it is precisely to negate also the creations that breed of the fruit, such as maggots within flesh and worms within legumes. Noting to the Alter Rebbe's Shulchan Oruch: (-Orach Chaim, Laws of Shabbos 316:20), "One is liable for killing only when he kills a living being from a species that reproduces from male-female relationships. In contrast, one who kills swarming animals that come into being from feces, from fruit that has rotted, and the like, e.g., maggots that are in meat or beans, is exempt," and (-Yoreh De'ah 84:4, and further), "Worms that grow in fruit, in picked [fruit], they are permitted... worms found in pulses and beans beneath their shell, and the shell covers them from the outside, and when the shell is removed, they are found underneath it, are permitted...."*

Upon this our Rabbis say that even such things as flies, fleas, and gnats, which seem to be extraneous, in truth are for a purpose, and are included in the (-Shabbos 77b), *"Everything that the Holy One, Blessed be He, created in His world, He did not create anything for naught."* As the Talmud brings medicinal concepts that we have from a fly, gnat, etc..

And upon this Rabbi Acha comes to add, that even those creations that are extraneous in the sense that they are they do harm, also they have a purpose for mankind in that they are harmful. For many times through them people are protected from a greater harmful creature*.

**Footnote 17: The Rebbe points to the Talmud quote above. Which continues with:*

"Our Sages taught, 'There are five dreads, dread that the weak (cast) over (the) mighty: The dread of the mafgia (a small creature) over the lion; the dread of the mosquito over the elephant; the dread of the gecko over the scorpion; the dread of the swallow over the eagle; the dread of the kilbit (a small fish) over a whale.'"

After which Rabbi Acha adds yet an even greater purpose of the harmful creatures, that G-d fulfills His mission through them, to punish the wicked.

This is the simple understanding of the flow of this Midrashic teaching.

Question: (i) Being that the primary novelty Rabbi Acha is teaching is that also harmful creatures are, "included in the creation of the world," and that also through them G-d fulfills his missions, then why:

(a) Does he add frogs, which are not at in the category of harmful creatures and definitely not as that of serpents and scorpions.

(b) Furthermore, this comes as a novelty even upon the novelty of serpents and scorpions: "even by means of a frog."

(c) The proof of, "Know that it is so," he brings specifically from the (tzira'ah and the) frog, and it doesn't bring any proof from the serpent and the scorpion --as is brought in other midrashim, where the teaching of Rabbi Acha is brought.*

*(ii) What is the commonality between the mission of a prophet and the mission done through a serpent... frog, that, "The Holy One blessed be He said to the prophets, 'What do you think, that if you do not go on My mission I will have no emissary? '...I will accomplish My mission even by means of a snake, or even by means of a scorpion, or even by means of a frog'"? The mission fulfilled through the harmful creatures are that there be retribution upon the wicked. However, the mission of the prophets is not to punish, but that there be the revelation of G-d's word through his servants the prophets**

**Footnote 23: The Rebbe points that, "And therefore he is called a Novi." The Rebbe then directs us to, "Rashi, Exodus 7:1, and more (places)."*

Rashi, Exodus 7:1: "Every expression of נְבוּאָה (nevuah) denotes a man who publicly announces to the people words of reproof. It is derived from the root of (-Isaiah 57:19), 'I create the speech (נִבֵּא - niv) of the lips'; (-Proverbs 10:31), 'speaks (יָנוּב - yonuv) wisdom'; (Samuel I. 10:13), 'And he (Samuel) finished prophesying (מְהַיְסָוּת - mayhisnavus).' In Old French this is called predi(je) ir, advocate."

Explanation: The purpose of the plagues that G-d brought upon Egypt were not simply to punish them, but rather, for, as the verse (-Exodus 7:5) states, "An Egypt will know that I am G-d." Meaning, that the plagues were for the purpose that there be the revelation of divinity, the dimension of the Ineffable Tetragrammaton in Egypt. And this came about through the plagues breaking Egypt. And being that the Klipah (Husk) of Pharaoh

and Egypt is different, and stands separate, from all other *Klipot* (*Husks*), therefore, the primary retribution of Egypt came about through the *Plague of Frogs*, as will soon be explained.

Note: Impurities are called *Klipah/ot* which means *husk/s*, coverings.

All creations are made up of the *Light*, which is the *Spark of G-dliness*, which is the *lifeforce*, and of the *Vessel*, which is the *body* of the creation. It is the transparency versus the opaqueness of the *Vessel* that defines whether the creation is *Holy*, *Mundane*, or *Impure*. If the *vessel* has 1000% transparency, then the creation is *Holy*, and it isn't at all called by its *Vessel: Klipot*. If the *Vessel* is anywhere from 1-99% opaque, then it is called *Mundane*, called *Klipot Noga - Husk of Light*, being that the *Light* is not completely blocked out, and can be reached, rectified, and liberated, through the human using this creation in the service of G-d. However, if the *Husk* is 100% opaque, then it is *Impure*, called *The Three* Husks of Impurity*. The only way to engage with this creation is by not using it. Saying, "No!" because G-d forbids it, is how we alter the balance between Good and Evil in the universe.

The reason for "Three" comes from the three layers of (-Genesis 1:2) "Now the earth was (i) *Chaos*, (ii) *Empty*, and (iii) *Darkness* was upon the earth."

Note: At this point of the sicha, the presents a novel approach in which there are three categories of heresy, three categories of creation, and three categories of rectification.

Generally speaking, there are three categories among the heresy of the *nations of the World* against His Divinity, blessed be He, one lower than the previous*:

*Footnote 27: "See the division (of the three categories of heresy of the *nations of the World*) (slightly) in a different manner Sefer HaErchim CHaBaD Erech Nations of the World, Simon 11, Simon Kattan 1 (and there is explained)."

Here is a brief explanation of what it states there in Sefer HaErchim:

- (i) *Pious Among the Nations of the World*: A bit of self-nullification before G-d, perceive the *nothingness* of the *ex* before the *nihilo*. Because, there shines within them a bit of a ray of a ray of the angels of the *World of Action*, which are above their source: the *Seventy Ministers*. However, their self-nullification is totally an external one. For these, their transgression of one of the *Seven Noahide Laws* is but due to, "A spirit of folly entered them."
- (ii) *True idolaters Who Call G-d, the G-d of gods*: Those that acknowledge the existence of G-d, and yet rebel against, and transgress, G-d's will. Nevertheless, they acknowledge the truth, as a servant who acknowledges the existence of his master, and that he is his master's slave, only that he does not want to be nullified before his master. So too, this true idolaters see that G-d is greater than their idols, and that G-d is the cause of all causes, only that they don't want to serve G-d. Because the ray of divinity within them (and within their source, *The Seventy Ministers*), is completely and utterly concealed and hidden. Therefore: (a) Due to the ray of divinity within them they know their Master, however, (b) due to this ray being completely hidden and concealed, this knowledge of their Master is in the dimension of perception and acknowledgement from a distance only, and does not effect them at all to be serving G-d.
- (iii) *Absolute Heretics Against the Existence of G-d*: Who do not believe in the creation of the world. And these are worse than true idolaters. Because, their lifeforce from the *Klipot* that they receive is through the contraction dimension as that of 'hair', of which the lifeforce received is so detached from the lifeforce of the head and body, that when the hair is cut it feels no pain at all. Rather, it perceives itself as an existence of its own, as if it receives no flow from divinity.

(i) Those who deny but in *His Oneness*, blessed be He, however, "They call Him, 'G-d of gods,'" because, "they know and they perceive," that G-d is, "their lifeforce and their sustenance," and naturally, they do not rebel against G-d, as Balaam said (-Numbers 22:18), "I cannot transgress the mouth of G-d."

Note: "G-d's Oneness" is the deeper meaning in the phrase, "G-d is one," in which we do not only mean that there is only one G-d. Rather, we are proclaiming that there exists nothing other than G-d, for, "G-d is everything and everything is G-d." The simple meaning of this is that the *mass* of all existence is G-d, for G-d created all from His own beingness, through His *Ten Utterances* of, "And G-d said, 'Let there be..."

Let there come forth...."

To deny this *Oneness of G-d* is to create a duality in existence, that of a *Creator*, Who is, "*their life force and their sustenance*," of all *creations*, however, the *creations* are not but an extension of their *Creator's* existence.

- (ii) Those who acknowledge in the existence of G-d, that G-d is, "*G-d of gods*," however, they deny in that the sustenance and being brought into existence of all is dependent upon G-d. As Pharaoh said (-Ezekiel 29:3), "*My river is my own, and I made myself*," claiming that he alone made himself, his being in existence.

And the acknowledgement that G-d is, "*G-d of gods**," is only that there exists a power higher and stronger than his own, but not his existence is dependent upon this "*G-d of gods***."

*Footnote 33: After bringing a source that Pharaoh's saying, "*My river is my own, and I made myself*," is also that, "*only that they call Him, 'G-d of gods*,'" The Rebbe deals with a seemingly contradiction between what is being said here, that Pharaoh and this category, "*only that they call Him, 'G-d of gods*,'" and with what it states in Tanya:

"*And this is not a contradiction to what is stated in Tanya, ibid* (-Chapter 22): (-Isaiah 47:8; Zephaniah 2:15) '*saying: 'I am, and there is nothing besides me,' or, as in the statement (of Pharaoh): 'The river is mine, and I have made myself!' Which this is even more than Sennacherib And at least (we can with difficulty say) (that this is) like Sennacherib (the third category to be explained soon within), and if so, Pharaoh too denied in (G-d's being the) 'G-d of gods'*" - (the reason why this is not a contradiction to Pharaoh's "*only that they call Him, 'G-d of gods*" is) for '*The river is mine, and I have made myself!*' can be explained in many fashions: a) '*I am, and there is nothing besides me*,' as (explained) in Tanya, *ibid*, - However, this was not the intention of Pharaoh (for which reason Tanya does not write '*as the statement of Pharaoh*' (concerning quoting this verse of, '*I am, and there is nothing besides me*'), although that this is the way it is written in Torah Ohr and in Ohr HaTorah, (on Portion) Vaiera, *ibid*. Likkutei Torah, Song of Songs, *ibid*. and in many places) b) '*and I have made myself*' - (means,) also myself, and obviously the river, however, not (meaning) that '*I am, and there is nothing besides me*'. And this was Pharaoh's intention with his statement, as (is explained) within [And to note from Rashi's commentary Ezekiel (*ibid*, (verse) 3, and like this (it is explained) in many commentaries there) (that) '*I made myself* - (means,) with my strength and with my wisdom I made great my greatness and my rulership']

"However, to note from Sefer HaMaamorim 5704 (p. 94), '*Who said (Pharaoh) (both in one, that) 'I am, and there is nothing besides me the river is mine, and I have made myself!*' (so clearly Pharaoh is saying, '*I am, and there is nothing*,' and not that G-d exists and is, '*G-d of gods*' ?) - (and see Abarbanel (on) our Torah-portion, *ibid*, that Pharaoh denied also in the existence of G-d). And we may say that by Pharaoh there were changes from time to time, just as there were differences in his behavior towards the Children of Israel, however, in general, his primary dimension was that he said, '*The river is mine, and I have made myself*'. And this still needs contemplation.

The point that the Rebbe is making here is that there is no contradiction between the Tanya referring to the "*saying: 'I am, and there is nothing besides me,' or, as in the statement (of Pharaoh): 'The river is mine, and I have made myself*," in which Pharaoh is as that of Sennacherib, which will be the third category discussed here, in which there is the denial of G-d's existence altogether, and the sicha's saying that Pharaoh's statement of, "*The river is mine, and I have made myself*," is of the second category explained here, in which there isn't the denial of G-d's being the "*G-d of gods*".

The Rebbe explains that either, (i) "*I am, and there is nothing besides me*," was not the intention of Pharaoh, or (ii) "*and I have made myself*," does not mean that "*I am, and there is nothing besides me*." Rather, it means that, "*with my strength and with my wisdom I made great my greatness and my rulership*," or (iii) by Pharaoh there were changes from time to time, however, in general his primary dimension was that he said only, '*The river is mine, and I have made myself*'.

✕The Rebbe added a note on the Footnote concerning this:

"*Even though that in Tanya there he continues with, 'and not a complete denial of G-d, as it is stated in the Talmud that they call Him 'G-d of gods' (thus, how can we say that, 'and if so, Pharaoh too denied in (G-d's being the) 'G-d of gods'?)' - (the answer is that) it seems there he (the Tanya) is differentiating between, 'the essence and root of idolatry' ('that they call Him 'G-d of gods')*" to, '*true idolatry*' (to the lowest dimension of) - '*I am, and there is nothing besides me*'.

"*And therefore: Concerning the concept of 'the essence and root of idolatry' he wrote, 'and thereby, they separate themselves from the holiness of G-d, since they do not efface themselves before Him,*' however, before this he added (true idolatry, which, 'it does not

surrender itself at all to the holiness of G-d'), 'On the contrary, it soars aloft like an eagle, saying: 'I am, and there is nothing besides me'... That is why the Sages, of blessed memory, said that arrogance is truly tantamount to idolatry truly'.

"And to note of the difference of that in Tanya chapter 24, between (that which he says), 'the sitra achara' ('Other Side' than holiness) and the kelipah, which are called 'idolatry'... (that) is not clothed in a corporeal body and knows its Master and does not rebel against Him... Although it is called idolatry, they call Him, 'the G-d of gods'..., to that of (which he says), 'the person who does violate His (G-d's) will (that he) is greatly inferior to and more debased than the sitra achara and kelipah, which are called idolatry and 'other gods'..."

✕Note: The reason why impurities are called *Other Side* is because the possibility for impurity to exist is that its source is from the *other side* of holiness, which is another way to say that impurity exists from a *Back-to-Back* relationship with G-d, rather than a *Face-to-Face* relationship with G-d. A *Face-to-Face* relationship with G-d is to have a relationship of G-d's *Internal Will*, in which G-d is saying, "I want you." However, a *Back-to-Back* relationship is one which is a relationship with G-d's *External Will*, in which G-d is saying, "It is not you that I want, but of a possibility that you create," i.e. impurity creates the possibility of *Freedom of Choice*, in which man can chose not to chose impurity, to irradicate impurity, or to transform impurity into light and purity.

Another way to see this is that *Face-to-Face* is where G-d is giving Himself, while *Back-to-Back* is where G-d is pulling Himself, His Essence out of what He is giving, which is just an outer expression of Himself, but not Himself.

The point that the Rebbe is making here is that there is a difference between "true idolatry" and "the essence and root of idolatry": "the essence and root of idolatry" is, "and not a complete denial of G-d, as it is stated in the Talmud that they call Him 'G-d of gods'," however, when this descends into the, "person who does violate His (G-d's) will," of "true idolatry", then "On the contrary, it soars aloft like an eagle, saying: 'I am, and there is nothing besides me.'"

Therefore, "and if so, Pharaoh too denied in (G-d's being the) 'G-d of gods'," is speaking of Pharaoh's "true idolatry", while, Tanya's, "and not a complete denial of G-d, as it is stated in the Talmud that they call Him 'G-d of gods,'" speaks of Pharaoh's, "the essence and root of idolatry."

**Footnote 34: On that which the Rebbe states in the sicha that, "is only that the exists a power higher and stronger than his own, but not his existence is dependent upon this "G-d of gods," the Rebbe notes that this is like the parable brought in the maamar d'h Sa'ar Shechirah in Ohr HaTorah, NaCH, Vol II, p. 781, "of a servant who rebels against his master... that even though he acknowledges that he is a servant, and the other is his master and his king, only that he does not want to be nullified to him, and that the servant was not born from this master, but of another man and woman, only that for some reason the other became his master."

(iii) (The third category among the heresy of the *Nations of the World* is,) Those who completely deny, G-d forbid, the existence of G-d, as that of Sennacherib, who, "exceedingly disgraced and cursed." He denied that there is a *Living G-d*, that, "There is no G-d of gods".

Among these three categories, even though, externally, the third is the worst of all, being that these absolutely deny the existence of G-d, nevertheless, there is also a greater fault in the second category of, "My river is my own, and I made myself," even compared to the third category.

In the first category, where, "that they call him, 'G-d of gods,'" they perceive the way G-d is, "their lifeforce and their sustenance," and therefore, they do not transgress His will, blessed be He. They acknowledge that there is an existence of G-d*.

*Footnote 36: The Rebbe explains how, if these people do not transgress G-d's will, then how can they believe that G-d is but a, "G-d of gods". "And the Sons of Noah ae not prohibited from "The Partnership." Meaning that while a gentile is prohibited in believing that there is only a different god than G-d, nevertheless, they are not prohibited from believing in a "partnership," in which they believe that there are other gods as well, only that G-d is the, "G-d of gods".

Even in the third category, within this itself that they are contraire, and actively deny the existence of G-d, this shows that the concept of G-d "touches" them, which is why they are searching to be contraire to the existence of G-d*, and to deny the existence of G-d. Thus, through their denial and being contraire itself, we know** that

there is such a concept of the existence of G-d, Who reaches even to such an extremely lowly place, meaning, even to those who fight to deny His existence.

Not so, however, with Pharaoh, who says, "My river is my own, and I made myself." He is claiming that, "*his existence is of his own.*" Through him the existence of G-d is completely not mentioned. For that which Pharaoh, "*calls Him, 'G-d of gods,'*" has nothing to do with him --as explained earlier. His existence is unto itself, "*I made myself.*" Pharaoh feels himself as a ex and thing, absolutely for himself. And therefore, in his existence itself there is expresses no relationship --not even a negative relationship of fighting to deny-- with G-d.

**Footnote 37: The Rebbe points out that which is stated in Sefer Torat Shalom (p. 10. And see also Kuntres HaTefila, Chapter 8), concerning the virtue of the Animalistic Soul called "Ox", being that it gores and kicks against G-dly concepts, over the Animalistic Soul called "Goat" ("being that nothing bothers him, he is not amazed by anything").*

The Rebbe then directs us to look into Likuttei Sichos, vol 10, p. 11, where the concept of the, "existence of darkness" and the absence of light is explained. There, in Footnote 30, the Rebbe explains that the too objectives for bringing into existence darkness can only apply to the existence of darkness, but not to the, absence of light, for the existence of darkness, being that it is contraire to, and fighting light, it has a relationship with light, and it is possible to transform it. Not so with the absence of light. And concerning the absence of Light the Tzemach Tzedek told the RaSHBaTZ that we need to push it away, being that there is no existence of darkness that we can transform into Light.

***Footnote 38: The Rebbe explains this which through his fighting the existence of G-d, we know that there is an existence of G-d: "And maybe we may say that this is from the perspective of the Holy Sparks that exist within them (and so too with all the other kelipot), for the dimension of klipah in itself which is separated from the oneness of G-d, and is not a dimension of existence at all, for they are in the dimension of absence of existence."*

The point that the Rebbe is making here is that the klipot are made up of the klipah in itself, and of the Holy Spark within it, that is its lifeforce. The klipah in itself, which is separated from G-d, and thus, is in essence but the dimension of an, "absence of existence". Only the Holy Spark within the klipah is an existence. Thus, the outcome of the klipah's fighting the existence of G-d, in which ultimately the only existence of klipah is the divinity within it, thus, ultimately, it leads to knowing that there is an existence of G-d.

Note: The Rebbe is now going to explain how these three categories of the Nations of the World's concerning the existence of G-d also exists within the creatures of the world, as well.

As there are these three categories among the *Nations of the World* concerning the existence of G-d, so too, in kind, we find among the creatures of the world.

There is the rule (-Shabbos 77b), "*Everything that the Holy One, Blessed be He, created in His world, He did not create anything for naught.*" So too, it is logical every action of G-d for a purpose and a goal, and that this purpose is noticeable in everything that G-d has created. And this is definitely so, for it is far more so than as by a human, by who we see that when a craftsman makes an object, its purpose is noticeable within the form of the object.

The purpose of all of creation is, "*Everything that G-d created in His world, He did not create but for His glory,*" that creation should reveal Divinity. This happens through this that we see within creation the benefit that each creature gives to all of creation, which is the purpose and goal of this individual creature. This shows us that there is a Craftsman which made it, which His power and will are felt within this creature that He crafted. In actuality, however, in order that there exist *Freedom of Choice*, not in every creature is the purpose of its creation openly noticeable. And in this, there are different categories within creation.

Note: With this understanding, the Rebbe now goes through the teachings of our Midrashic teaching.

Category One: Our Rabbis say, "even items that you view as if extraneous in the world, like flies, fleas, and mosquitos," which seemingly they are of no benefit, in truth, "they were included in the creation of the world, regarding which it is stated (-Genesis 1:31), 'G-d saw everything that He had made and behold, it was very good*.'" They are not in vain, as the Talmud itself (-Shabbos 77b), states the beneficial actions of these*

creatures: *He created flies... tzira'ah...*" Therefore, they too are included within the, "*Everything that G-d created in His world, He did not create but for His glory.*" Through them the Creator is revealed --showing us that there is a Craftsman which made it, which His power and will are felt within this creature that He crafted.

 *Footnote 41: In Shemot Rabbah, the wording is, "as if - כאילו. In Vayikra Rabba, Kohelet Rabbah, and Bamidbar Rabbah this word isn't there.

 **Footnote 43: In Shemot Rabbah, the words, "and behold, it was very good" are not written. However, the commentaries *Toldot Noach* and *Biurei HaRY" P* explain these words as the intention of the Midrash. In VaYikra Rabba and Kohelet Rabbah the verse (-Genesis 2:1), "*And it was completed (the heavens and the earth and all their hosts),*" is brought, instead of this verse.

 Category Three: Upon this teaching of "Our Rabbis" comes Rabbi Acha and innovates that also the creatures that, not only that they (seemingly) don't bring any benefits, but that they, to the naked eye, bring the opposite of a benefit, they are harmful creatures, "*such as serpents and scorpions,*" they too are, "*they were included in* of a benefit, they are harmful creatures, "*such as serpents and scorpions,*" they too are, "*they were included in the creation of the world,*" and therefore, are included in the rule, "*Everything that G-d created in His world, He did not create but for His glory.*" For this in itself, that within them there is some content which says something about this ("He did not create but for His glory"), albeit, something contraire (*harmful creature*) shows that this creatures existence is not an existence that knows not of the existence of its Creator. It is not a creature that knows only of itself, "*Here I am, here I was*". Rather, there is a knowledge within it of a *Creator* who can place within them this content, or its contraire.

With this we understand why Rabbi Acha says, "*view as extraneous in the world, like snakes and scorpions, they were included in the creation of the world. The Holy One blessed be He said to the prophets, 'What do you think, that if you do not go on My mission I will have no emissary? 'But the advantage of a land is in every way.' I will accomplish My mission even by means of a snake, or even by means of a scorpion*": With this Rabbi Acha is coming to emphasize how these creatures were not just not created for nothing, but also, "*For His glory.*" That even through them G-dliness is revealed in the world. As like, as in kind, of how G-dliness is revealed in the world through the prophets. For when we see that through a serpent or a scorpion that one is saved from a danger, and in particular when the serpent or scorpion comes to punish the wicked, it is revealed that even a harmful creature --which has the contraire of a "*benefit*" of G-d's creation, which are all, "*very good*"-- was also created by G-d, to the point that within it there is good, because she is a created by the *Source of Goodness*, this reveals its power of the Creator within it.

 *Footnote 44: The Rebbe points out the teaching in Bereishit Rabbah (-9:9), "*Very Good': This is the Angel of Death.*" Meaning, that thus we see that harmful creatures are included within, "*And G-d saw all that He had made, and behold it was very good.*"

 **Footnote 45: The Rebbe here points out, "*that within it there is good,*" is even greater than the concept of Ecclesiastics, "*The advantage of light (that comes) from (a transformed) darkness,*" in which the advantage is from the light. While here we are saying that there is "*very good*" within the darkness itself.

 Category Two: Separated from all of the above mentioned creatures is the frog. From the perspective of its creation, we see in it now benefit at all. There is no noticeable benefit that mankind has from it, not even one of contraire. This is a creature that has no content that would reveal that there is a Craftsman Who made it, nor even that there is a knowledge of such a possibility (that it has a Creator Who made it, as part of the purpose of all of creation). This is Rabbi Acha's next innovation that, "*And even through a frog,*" which means, "*were it not for the frogs, how would He exact retribution from the Egyptians?*"

Pharaoh and Egypt were an existence which not only doesn't reveal the existence of G-d, but says, "*My river is mine and I made myself.*" How was it revealed that even Pharaoh and Egypt should know that, "*I am G-d,*" and more than this, that their very capability of saying that their existence is from themselves, comes only because at the very moment of them saying this they have a lifeforce that comes from (albeit through a magnitude of contractions) from the *Source of Life*, the Essence of G-d, which G-d's existence is (-Iggeret HaKodesh, Epistle 20), "*Whose Being is of His Essence; He is not, heaven forbid, brought into being by some other ilah (cause) preceding Himself.*"

--This is as is explained in general concerning all of ex ("a something") being brought into existence, which has a paradigm of, "*their existence is from themselves.*" This paradigm within the genetics of the ex is only because *creatio ex nihilo* (the creation of something from nothing) comes only directly from, "*Whose Being is of His Essence; He is not, heaven forbid, brought into being by some other ilah (cause) preceding Himself.*"--

This --that an existence of Pharaoh and Egypt: Not even fighting that there may be an existence of a G-d, but just the belief of, "*Their*

existence is of themselves," "My river is mine and I made myself," should reveal that the knowledge "I am G-d," exists within it-- is revealed through the *Plague of Frogs**. For the *frog* is the creature from among all living creatures in this world, is an existence in which there is no recognizable purpose (as it exists by gnats, etc.), and in general, not even the purpose of harmfulness** (as it exists by serpents and scorpions), and as explained previously, "It has no cause and reason," for which it should be an existence.

*Footnote 49: Not so concerning the *Plague of Locust*, which are possible food for people (which is why there did not remain one locust (at the termination of the *Plague of Locust*) in all of Egypt, so that the Egyptians have no enjoyment of the locust.

And also concerning the *Plague of Lice*, even though lice is absolutely extraneous, nevertheless, lice are harmful (and causes illness). The Rebbe refers here to two Talmudic teachings (-Eiruvin 65a), "Rava said, 'If I am bitten by a louse, I can no (longer) learn (in my usual manner),' and (-Baba Metzia 107b), "Thirteen matters (of praise) were stated with regard to (a meal of) bread (eaten in) the morning... it kills any louse in (his) intestines." Thus we see that lice is an existence of purpose, albeit a harmful one.

The Rebbe goes on to point out concerning lice from the Talmud (-Yevomos 80b): "The existence of lice in hair is when there is the completion of development of the human, which the sign for this the growth of hair ((mystically explained as) that are drawn form the overflow of intellect) and nails. And it is from the recement of the hair that lice come."

**Footnote 50: The Rebbe explains that even according to the teachings that there was great damage done by the bodies of the frogs, nevertheless (i) there is nothing explicitly explained of such in the simple meaning of the Scripture concerning the *Plague of Frogs* concerning them doing any damage, and there is either self-understood or explicitly stated in the verses concerning the other plagues, or (ii) to the least, this is not the nature or characteristics of the frogs (according to RAV"E mentioned earlier in Footnote 18) as the nature or characteristics of the other plagues, other than that this by the frogs was a (miracle?) special unusual concept.

It is precisely through the frogs, which went on the mission of G-d, and with even greater commitment than the other creatures of the other plagues --for the frogs went even, "and in your ovens," upon which our Sages teach (-Shemot Rabbah 10:2), "from the frogs did Channania, Mishal, and Azari extrapolate a fortiori upon themselves, and descended into the burning oven," rather than to betray G-d--, there was the, "retribution for Egypt." It is the *Plague of Frogs* the broke even this unique klipah of Egypt, "My river is mine and I made myself," and it was then revealed the, "And Egypt will know that I am G-d." The *Plague of Frogs* revealed that it comes from the (Ineffable Tetragrammaton) of G-d, "Whose Being is of His Essence; He is not, heaven forbid, brought into being by some other ilah (cause) preceding Himself."