



# Likkutei Sichos

Volume 23 | Pinchas | Sichah 2

## The Lean King

---

Translated by Rabbi Mendel Marcus

**General Editor:** Rabbi Eliezer Robbins | **Senior Editor:** Rabbi Lazer Danzinger

**Content Editor:** Rabbi Zalmy Avtzon

© Copyright by Sichos In English 2024 ◊5784

A note on the translation: Rounded and square brackets reflect their use in the original *sichah*; curly brackets are interpolations of the translator or editor. The footnotes in curly brackets are those of the translator or editors and do not correspond to the footnotes in the original. Words in bold type are italicized in the original text.

Considerable effort has been made to ensure the accuracy of the translation while maintaining readability. As in all translations, however, the possibility of inadvertent errors exists.

**Your feedback is appreciated — please send it to [info@projectlikkuteisichos.org](mailto:info@projectlikkuteisichos.org)**

## MAY HASHEM APPOINT A MAN

In this week's *parshah*, the Torah recounts how Moshe implores Hashem,<sup>1</sup> “May Hashem... appoint a man over the assembly.” Hashem responds, instructing Moshe to “take to yourself Yehoshua, son of Nun... and lay your hand upon him.” So this is what Moshe did — “He laid his hands upon him....”

About appointing a king, Rambam says:<sup>2</sup> “Ideally, a king should be appointed only by a court of seventy elders, together with a prophet, **as Yehoshua** was appointed by Moshe and his court.” This ruling proves that Rambam maintains that Yehoshua's appointment (recorded in our *parshah*) was considered the appointment of a king.<sup>3</sup>

If so, we must clarify:<sup>4</sup> Rambam himself later rules that “when a king is appointed, it is done with anointing oil.”<sup>5</sup> As such, why don't we find that Yehoshua was anointed?

[True, although Moshe had the rank of a king, he was not anointed with this oil as Rambam rules.<sup>6</sup> Nevertheless, {anointing was unnecessary for Moshe because} Moshe attained this station **before** the laws of a king or the anointing oil were given.]

---

<sup>1</sup> *Bamidbar* 27:15-23.

<sup>2</sup> *Mishneh Torah*, “*Hilchos Melachim*,” ch. 1, par. 3.

<sup>3</sup> The same point is implied in *Mishneh Torah*, “*Hilchos Sanhedrin*” (end of ch. 18) — that he qualified as a king. Similarly, this is stated explicitly by *Rashbam* on *Bava Basra* 75a, on the words “Woe to her”; *Yoma* 73b, *Rashi*, s.v., “he”; *Rashi* on *Devarim* 33:17; et al. (See citation in *Ambuha D'Sifri* on *Sifri Zuta*, *Bamidbar* 27:21; *Torah Sheleima*, addendum to *parshas Yisro* (vol. 15), end of sec. 2.)

<sup>4</sup> This question is asked by the *Minchas Chinuch* in his notes on *Mishneh Torah*, “*Hilchos Melachim*,” *ibid*.

<sup>5</sup> *Mishneh Torah*, “*Hilchos Melachim*,” ch. 1, par. 7.

<sup>6</sup> *Mishneh Torah*, “*Hilchos Beis HaBechirah*,” ch. 6, par. 11; and similarly, in *Rabbeinu Chananel* and *Rashi* in *Shavuos* 15a; the midrash cited by *Ramban* on *Devarim* 33:5; also see *Zevachim* 102a.

## 2.

### THE HOUSE OF DAVID

Seemingly, this could be explained<sup>7</sup> based on another ruling of Rambam — that “for all time, we do not (use the anointing oil) except to anoint... kings from the House of David.”<sup>8</sup> Therefore, since Yehoshua was not a king from the House of David, he was not anointed.

However, according to **Rambam** himself, the above answer is no answer: The source that Rambam brings for the above-mentioned halachah — “When a king is appointed, he is anointed with anointing oil” — is from the verse,<sup>9</sup> “Shmuel took the vial of oil, he poured it on his head and kissed him.” This verse discusses the anointing of **Shaul**, who did *not* belong to the Davidic dynasty. Thus, Rambam maintains that Shaul was anointed with the anointing oil.<sup>10</sup>

This tells us that when Rambam says, “When a king is appointed, he is anointed with anointing oil,” Rambam refers to **every king**, even those not from the House of David. [This view is also implied by the unqualified wording of Rambam — “When **a king** is appointed.”] And as for his ruling that “for all time, we do not {use the anointing oil} except to anoint... (and) kings from the House of David” — this rule took effect only **after**<sup>11</sup> “David was anointed king and (thereby he) acquired the crown of kingship... **for himself and his male descendants** forever.”<sup>12</sup>

Our original question returns: Why don’t we find that Yehoshua (who also had the title of a king according to Rambam) was anointed, as was Shaul (according to Rambam)?

---

<sup>7</sup> See *Ambuha D’Sifri* on *Sifri Zuta*, *Bamidbar* 27:21.

<sup>8</sup> *Mishneh Torah*, “*Hilchos Klei Hamikdash*,” ch. 1, par. 7; and similarly, in “*Hilchos Melachim*,” ch. 1, par. 10.

<sup>9</sup> *Shmuel Alef*, 10:1.

<sup>10</sup> Unlike the *Radak* there, who writes, “this was not anointing oil... rather *afarsimon* (balsam) oil”; the commentators on *Horayos* 11b discuss this at length; also see *Likkutei Sichos*, vol. 25, p. 111, fn. 59; further discussion is beyond our scope.

<sup>11</sup> See also *Krisos* 5b, Rashi, s.v., “*ve’lo*”: “From when David came....”

<sup>12</sup> *Mishneh Torah*, “*Hilchos Melachim*,” ch. 1, par. 7.

### 3.

#### MOSHE'S SONS

This difficulty can be resolved by first elucidating the midrash<sup>13</sup> that discusses Moshe's petition,<sup>14</sup> "May Hashem... appoint...": The midrash explains that Moshe had assumed "that my sons would inherit my glory (his high position)."<sup>15</sup> Hashem responded:

"He who tends a fig tree will enjoy its fruit."<sup>16</sup> Your sons were occupied with their personal concerns and not involved in Torah study. Yehoshua... since<sup>17</sup> he served you with every fiber of his being, he is worthy to serve the Jewish nation.

At first glance, this midrash is puzzling: Since Moshe's sons were "occupied with their personal concerns and not involved in Torah study," how had Moshe believed that his sons would inherit his "glory"?

We can't resolve this simply by proposing that with his request, "May Hashem... appoint a man over the assembly," Moshe was referring (not to "a man" who will teach Torah to the Jewish nation, but rather, as he says **explicitly** in his request)<sup>18</sup> a king "who shall go out before them and come in before them"<sup>19</sup> — **to battle**. For this reason, Moshe had assumed that "my sons will **inherit** my glory" (even though they were uninvolved in Torah study) because the halachah is that "kingship is passed down by **inheritance**."<sup>20</sup>

However, if this was the limited scope of Moshe's petition, Hashem's response — "He who tends a fig tree will enjoy its fruit.' Your sons sat with their own {concerns} and were not involved in Torah study" — is bewildering. In this context, Torah study is irrelevant! We are discussing the inheritance of **kingship** here!

---

<sup>13</sup> *Bamidbar Rabbah*, ch. 21, par. 14; *Midrash Tanchuma*, parshas Pinchas, par. 11; also, see Rashi on the verse.

<sup>14</sup> *Bamidbar* 27:16.

<sup>15</sup> Rashi there.

<sup>16</sup> *Mishlei* 27:18.

<sup>17</sup> Wording used in *Bamidbar Rabbah*, *ibid.*; *Midrash Tanchuma*, and Rashi, *ibid.*, use different wording.

<sup>18</sup> *Bamidbar* 27:17 and in Rashi there; *Sifri* and *Sifri Zuta* there.

<sup>19</sup> {*Bamidbar* 27:17.}

<sup>20</sup> *Mishneh Torah*, *ibid.*

## 4.

### A FITTING SUCCESSOR

To resolve this question, we must preface with a teaching in *Megaleh Amukos*<sup>21</sup> that addresses the apparent redundancy in the passage, “...who shall go out before them and come in before them,” (and then) “who shall take them out and who shall bring them in.”<sup>22</sup> *Megaleh Amukos* explains that Moshe envisioned “two people leading” the nation. “Namely, one man appointed by the nation who would go out before them **in battle**... and one who would take them out {lead them} **in Torah**...” And Hashem responded, “**that one man** will lead them... Yehoshua, who will be their king *and* Head of the Court of Israel<sup>23</sup> — their Sage in Torah matters” — because “two kings can't serve with one crown....”<sup>24</sup> “There can be one leader of a generation and not two.”<sup>25</sup>

On this basis, we can also explain the above-mentioned midrash: Since Moshe assumed that two leaders would be appointed — one serving as king and the other as the “Head of the Court of Israel” — he, therefore, was hoping that one of his sons would inherit the role of **kingship**.

However, Hashem desired that “**one man** will lead them” (an individual who would serve as both the king and the “Head of the Court of Israel”). And to disseminate the Torah, the candidate had to be qualified (“He who tends a fig tree will enjoy its fruit”).<sup>26</sup> Because Moshe’s sons were not up to par (since they “were not involved in Torah study”), they could inherit no part of their father’s “glory.”

---

<sup>21</sup> *Megaleh Amukos*, first explanation — cited in *Yalkut Reuveni* on *parshas Pinchas*, on this verse; also see *Kli Yakar* on *Bamidbar* 27:18.

<sup>22</sup> {*Bamidbar* 27:17.}

<sup>23</sup> {In the original Hebrew, “*av beis din*.”}

<sup>24</sup> *Chullin* 60b (cited by Rashi on *Bereishis* 1:16).

<sup>25</sup> *Sanhedrin* 8a (cited by Rashi on *Devarim* 31:7) — concerning **Yehoshua**.

<sup>26</sup> See *Bamidbar Rabbah*, ch. 21, par. 9 {for the *midrashic* explanation of this verse.}

Only Yehoshua, who was dedicated to the Torah, not only to the study of the Torah but also to the **service**<sup>27</sup> of the Torah,<sup>28</sup> was qualified to be Moshe's successor.

## 5.

### LEADERSHIP AND KINGSHIP

However, (based on the explanation of *Megaleh Amukos*), we can now explain Hashem's reasoning for rejecting Moshe's idea "that there should be two people leading." Although "two kings can't serve with one crown," the emphasis is on **one** crown. {Two leaders with two *separate* crowns, however, wouldn't be an issue.} Furthermore, we, indeed, find that in later generations, this arrangement was common — the role of monarch was filled by one leader, and the Head of the Court was served by another. As Rambam writes: "The sage (from among the members of the Sanhedrin) possessing the greatest knowledge is appointed as the head over them... And he is called the **Nasi**<sup>29</sup> ... **and assumes the position of Moshe, our teacher.**"<sup>30</sup> A second man is crowned as the king "who shall take them out..." The king is responsible for attending to the needs of the people, and so on. [In fact, the king was not *allowed* to take part in the Sanhedrin — "A king of Israel may not be part of the Sanhedrin."<sup>31</sup>]<sup>32</sup>

From this point, we can deduce the following explanation: Torah leadership and sovereign leadership are two entirely **different** types. Accordingly, such an organizational hierarchy does not contradict the rule that "there can be one leader of a generation and not two."

---

<sup>27</sup> {"Service" in this context refers to serving a Torah scholar and spending time in his company.}

<sup>28</sup> See *Radal on Bamidbar Rabbah*, ch. 21, *ibid.*

<sup>29</sup> {Lit., "leader" — in this context it refers to the head of the Sanhedrin, the leading authority in Torah matters.}

<sup>30</sup> *Mishneh Torah*, "*Hilchos Sanhedrin*," ch. 1, par. 3.

<sup>31</sup> *Mishneh Torah*, *ibid.*, ch. 2, par. 4; and similarly in *Malchei Beis David* (there, par. 5).

<sup>32</sup> Similarly, in the era following the destruction of the Temple, there was an exilarch who resided in Babylonia (in place of a king — *Mishneh Torah*, *ibid.*, ch. 4, par. 13) and a *Nasi* who resided in Eretz Yisrael, as our Sages' taught (*Sanhedrin* 5a; *Horayos* 11b; also see Rashi on *Bereishis* 49:10) "here {in Babylonia} a scepter {with the authority to govern} and there {in Eretz Yisrael} a staff {weaker, with limited power}"; and the scholarly discussion concerning Rabbi's question (*Horayos*, *ibid.*) "In a case where I {commit an unwitting transgression} what is {the halachah? Do I bring a sin-offering} of a goat?" is well-known. Elaboration is beyond our scope..

But if that is true, then our earlier question remains: Why couldn't the appointment of a king be distinct from that of a "Head of the Court" in this context? Why, instead, was it necessary that "one man will lead them... Yehoshua"?

## 6.

### DIFFERENT MODES OF TRANSMISSION

The suggested explanation:

In his Introduction to *Mishneh Torah*, Rambam records how the Oral Law was transmitted, generation to generation, from Moshe to Rav Ashi. When listing the Sages receiving the tradition from their predecessors, Rambam is particular each time, writing that each received it from the previous recipient **"and their court"** (or **the contemporaries** of the previous recipient). As Rambam elucidates elsewhere, with this phraseology, he emphasizes "that the transmission was from 'many to many,' and not from a single individual to another."<sup>33</sup>

However, we find one exception — Yehoshua. In discussing Yehoshua, Rambam **alters** his usual wording and writes, "Many elders received from Yehoshua" (**without** adding "and his court" or the like).

The reason for this change can be understood from the wording used by Rambam earlier {in his *Introduction*}: "Moshe, our teacher, taught the Oral Law in its entirety in his court to the seventy elders. Elazar, Pinchas, and Yehoshua — all three of them received the tradition from Moshe. {In particular, Moshe} **transmitted** the Oral Law to Yehoshua, Moshe's chief disciple, and **instructed him** regarding it."<sup>34</sup> In other words, Yehoshua not only received the Torah from Moshe (as did Elazar, Pinchas, and the seventy elders), but he, in particular,

---

<sup>33</sup> In his letter to Rabbi Pinchas, son of Rabbi Meshulam, the Judge — printed in *Mishneh Torah, Sefer HaMada* (Yerushalayim, 5724) in a footnote.

<sup>34</sup> {Introduction to *Mishneh Torah*.}

received the **transmission** of the (entire) Oral Law from Moshe. As the mishnah says:<sup>35</sup> “Moshe received the Torah at Sinai, and transmitted it to Yehoshua” — specifically, Yehoshua was instructed regarding it.

Consequently, Rambam does not use the expression “and his court” regarding Yehoshua because Yehoshua exclusively received the transmission of the Torah, and only *he* received the entire Oral Law from Moshe.

This now tells us that Moshe and Yehoshua were essentially different from the leaders of Sanhedrin of later generations: Yehoshua and Moshe were alike in that the transmission of the entire Oral Law was from and to (both of) them **individually**.

This contrasts with a *Nasi* of the Sanhedrin who “assumes the position of Moshe, our teacher” (as mentioned above). The similarity between the leaders of Sanhedrin and Moshe was only in terms of them serving as the “head” over the Sanhedrin (because they were “the wisest among them”), just as Moshe was “above” the seventy elders.<sup>36</sup> However, regarding the “transmission of the Torah,” they did **not** “assume the position of Moshe.” The Torah was transmitted through the **entire** court “from many to many.”

## 7.

### LAYERS OF LEADERSHIP

This helps explain the difference between the later generations (when the king and “Head of the Court” were two separate leaders) and the era of Moshe and Yehoshua:

Although “the *Nasi* {leader} of the Sanhedrin holds the highest position of Torah authority,”<sup>37</sup> he is, nonetheless, not on par with a **king**. A king is defined

---

<sup>35</sup> Beginning of *Avos*; also see *Meiri* in his Introduction to *Avos*: In his {Moshe’s} old age... he transmitted the secrets of the Torah and its laws, along with the entire Oral Law to Yehoshua.

<sup>36</sup> See Mishnah in beginning of *Sanhedrin* (2a).

<sup>37</sup> The wording of Ramban on *Shemos* 22:27.



as a man “who has only Hashem, his L-rd, over him.”<sup>38</sup> Not only “is no one superior to him in his sovereignty,”<sup>39</sup> but furthermore, a king is the **only** ruler. He doesn’t need to collaborate with others (“one leader of a generation, and not two,”<sup>40</sup> as discussed above). There can only be one king.

This role is different from the role of the leader of the Sanhedrin. By being a member of the Court of **Seventy-one** (and only due to his being “the greatest among them in wisdom” is he appointed as “leader”), his leadership is of a different category than that of the king. Therefore, having a leader of the Sanhedrin does not conflict with the king’s sovereignty {leadership}. Consequently, their relationship is not viewed as “two kings” or “two {leaders}.”

However, when it comes to Moshe and Yehoshua, **their** “leadership” in the sphere of Torah was based (not only on being *Nasi* of the Sanhedrin but also) on the fact that “Moshe received the Torah at Sinai and transmitted it to Yehoshua,” *This* was the level of a king’s leadership.

Therefore, if we had indeed split the leadership roles “so that there would be two people... one man... {a supreme leader} in battle and another {a supreme leader}... in Torah,” it *would* have constituted a scenario of “two kings” who serve “with one crown... two leaders.”

---

<sup>38</sup> *Sifra*, Vayikra 4:22; *Horayos* 10a, in the mishnah; also, see *Horayos* 11b.

<sup>39</sup> The wording of Rambam in *Mishneh Torah*, “*Hilchos Shegagos*,” ch. 15, par. 6.

<sup>40</sup> In line with the beginning of the Gemara’s teaching (*Sanhedrin* 8a [cited by Rashi on *Devarim* 31:7]): Take a rod and strike the people upon their heads.

## 8.

### A JEWISH KING

However, this conclusion requires further clarification: Ultimately, these two roles wield different types of authority — “Who shall take them out in battle... and Torah?” (as discussed in Section 5). Why would such an arrangement be considered “two kings... with **one** crown”?

We can posit the following explanation:

Rambam writes about a king’s purpose: “His aspiration and intent should be to promote the true faith and fill the world with justice, destroying the power of the wicked and waging the wars of Hashem. For the entire purpose of a king’s appointment is to execute justice and wage wars.”<sup>41</sup> Meaning: The role of a king (over the Jewish nation) is not one of merely supplying his nation with their material needs and so forth.<sup>42</sup> Instead, his role is built upon and relates to the fulfillment and elevation of the Torah — “to promote the true faith,” to fulfill the laws of the Torah — to the extent that even the wars he must wage are “wars of **Hashem**.”<sup>43</sup>

Accordingly, the role of a king is the perpetuation of the role of the High Court: The High Court consisted of members who were the “pillars of halachic instruction from where the statutes and judgments issue forth for the entire Jewish people.”<sup>44</sup> The role of a king was to ensure that the laws of the Torah proclaimed by the High Court should be obeyed.

[Therefore, the law is that “it is a mitzvah for the king to honor students of Torah. When the Sanhedrin and the Sages of Israel enter the king’s presence, the king should **stand before** them...,”<sup>45</sup> since he “receives {benefits}” from them.

---

<sup>41</sup> *Mishneh Torah*, “*Hilchos Melachim*,” ch. 4, par. 10.

<sup>42</sup> See *Berachos* 3b.

<sup>43</sup> To note from *Mishneh Torah*, “*Hilchos Melachim*,” ch. 3, par. 1: “He must write a Torah scroll... **when he goes to war**, it must accompany him.”

<sup>44</sup> Wording of Rambam in *Mishneh Torah*, “*Hilchos Mamrim*,” ch. 1, par. 1.

<sup>45</sup> *Mishneh Torah*, “*Hilchos Melachim*,” ch. 2, par. 5.

(Similarly,<sup>46</sup> “the king stands before the *Kohen Gadol*... when he consults with **the *urim vetumim*** on behalf of the king.”)<sup>47</sup>

Only in terms of the **authority** the king exercises **over the nation** do we say that he “has only Hashem, his L-rd, over him” and “in his sovereignty, none is superior to him.” Therefore, “in public, before the people at large, **he should not... rise** before anyone... so that the fear of him will be implanted in everyone's hearts....”]<sup>48</sup>

For this reason, a king and Torah leadership are not two separate spheres of authority (unrelated to each other). Instead, they are integrated. If they were to be separated, it would be considered “two kings... **with one crown.**”<sup>49</sup>

## 9.

### SEMICHAH VS ANOINTING OIL

We can now understand why Yehoshua was appointed by *semichah*<sup>50</sup> and not by anointing:

Since a king is a “recipient” from the Supreme Court (the institution from where the rulings of Torah emerge), as discussed above, understandably, when it comes to the leadership of Yehoshua (and similarly, of Moshe) who possessed **both** aspects of leadership (both a king and the ultimate leader in the sphere of Torah, analogous to a king, as discussed above), his role as king was an **extension and by-product** of his leadership **in Torah**.

---

<sup>46</sup> {*Mishneh Torah*, “*Hilchos Melachim*,” ch. 2, par. 5.}

<sup>47</sup> {The *urim vetumim* was worn by the *Kohen Gadol* and would answer questions with Divine Guidance, *ruach hakodesh*. The commentaries dispute whether the *urim vetumim* were the stones embedded in the breastplate worn by the *Kohen Gadol* or a piece of parchment inserted inside the breastplate (see *Likkutei Sichos*, vol. 11, p 135 ff and the footnotes there).}

<sup>48</sup> *Mishneh Torah*, “*Hilchos Melachim*,” ch. 2, par. 5.

<sup>49</sup> This would only be an issue when the authority in the realm of Torah is equivalent to the authority of a king. By contrast, this does not apply to the Nasi of the Sanhedrin who does not hold the same level of authority as a “king,” as stated in Sec. 7 above.

<sup>50</sup> {Lit., “laying of the hands.” Moshe rested his hands upon Yehoshua’s head, thereby initiating him as the next leader.}

In other words, Yehoshua's primary focus was his leadership in the sphere of Torah — "transmitting" the entire Torah to the Jewish people. Aside from this role, he *also* had a king's authority — to enforce the rules of the Torah among the Jewish nation.

For this reason, Yehoshua's appointment was accomplished by *semichah*: The anointing that a king requires is intended to officially install the individual as the sovereign, as demonstrated by the anointing of King Shaul, referenced in the Rambam's proof. In contrast, Yehoshua's kingship, alluded to by the verse, "He who tends a fig tree," was **primarily** the role of a Torah leader. Therefore, he was appointed to his role by ***semichah***, an act linked with the Torah specifically. Only in the context of Torah study (and halachic instruction) is it said,<sup>51</sup> "*smuchin* {ordained} one from the other," "*smuchu* {ordain} us," and the like.

## 10.

### WHO WAS FIRST?

In light of the above-mentioned explanation, it is now clear that the teaching of the midrash<sup>52</sup> that Shaul was "the first king" does not contradict Rambam's assertion (also found in several midrashim)<sup>53</sup> that both Moshe and Yehoshua were treated halachically as a king. But the type of kingship of Moshe and Yehoshua was of a completely different class than the kingship of Shaul and David: For Moshe and Yehoshua, their sovereign leadership was *secondary* to their Torah leadership.

This also helps us understand why the rule that a king must be anointed with the anointing oil isn't mentioned explicitly in the Torah. After all, this is perplexing: Since anointing a king is an explicit mitzvah, which encompasses

---

<sup>51</sup> *Mishneh Torah*, "Hilchos Sanhedrin," beginning of ch. 4; *Sanhedrin* 14a.

<sup>52</sup> *Vayikra Rabbah*, ch. 26, par. 7; and this is the **halachic ruling** in *Kessef Mishneh*, "Hilchos Melachim," ch. 1, par. 10 (which seemingly contradicts Rambam's statement in *Mishneh Torah*, "Hilchos Melachim," ch. 1, par. 3 that Yehoshua was a king); also see Rashi on *Bereishis* 36:31.

<sup>53</sup> See what cited in *Ambuha D'Sifri* on *Sifri Zuta*, *Bamidbar* 27:21 and the midrash quoted by *Ramban* on *Devarim* 33:5.

several provisions, the Torah should have also stated how kingship should be initiated — through the anointing oil (just as the Torah specifies that both the *Kohen Gadol* and the *Kohen Mashuach Milchamah*<sup>54</sup> must be anointed with the anointing oil)!

In light of the above explanation, this can be resolved: As **Torah** initially organized it, kingship — for Moshe and his successor, Yehoshua — signified that the king was also the leading **Torah** authority. Therefore, he did not need to be anointed<sup>55</sup> {since he was inducted through the *semichah* process}.

The rule that a king was appointed exclusively by anointing oil was established only later when Saul needed to be coronated.

— From talks on Shabbos *parshas Chayei Sarah* and Shabbos *parshas Vaera*, 5743 (1983)

---

<sup>54</sup> {A special kohen whose role was to address and inspire the Jewish troops before they went into battle. The role itself is described in the Torah, particularly in *Devarim* 20:2-4. The Kohen Mashuach Milchama would speak with the deploying soldiers, encouraging and reminding them that as they went into battle, Hashem was with them.}

<sup>55</sup> Analysis is necessary regarding King Mashiach, who will also have these two personas — king and teacher (see *Sefer HaMitzvos {Derech Mitzvosecha}* by the Tzemach Tzedek, “*Mitzvas Minui Melech*,” ch. 3; *Likkutei Sichos*, vol. 19, p. 170; see also Rambam’s wording in “*Hilchos Teshuvah*,” end of ch. 9), whether he requires anointing, or *semichah* — as with Yehoshua. It requires inquiry as to why the name “Mashiach” is derived from the word *meshichah* {anointing}, and not from the word “*lemoshcha*,” meaning, for greatness (*Zevachim* 91a, and the sources cited there; see *Sifri, Bamidbar* 18:8). Perhaps there will be two stages {to the process of Mashiach’s rise to authority and leadership}. Further discussion is beyond the scope of this work.