



Likkutei Sichos

Volume 15 | Vayechi | Sichah 3

Leaders Do

Translated by Rabbi Y. Eliezer Danzinger

© Copyright by Kehot Publication Society

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. Bolded words are italicized in the original text.

Considerable effort has been made to ensure the accuracy of the translation, while at the same time maintaining readability. The translation, however, carries no official authority. As in all translations, the possibility of inadvertent errors exists.

Your feedback is needed — please send all comments to: info@projectlikkuteisichos.org

1.

REUVEN FORFEITED THE PRIESTHOOD AND THE MONARCHY

On the passage,¹ “Reuven, you are my firstborn... superior by raising, and superior by might. Haste like water—do not take more,” Rashi quotes the following phases and explains:

superior by raising – “You were fit to be superior to your brothers with the priesthood; an expression denoting *raising* up the hands, וְשִׂאוֹת כַּפַּיִם [to recite the priestly blessing].”

and superior by might – “[i.e., superior] with kingship.... And what caused you to lose all these [advantages over your brothers]?”

Haste like water – “The haste and the confusion with which you hurried to show your anger... therefore...”

Do not take more – “You shall no longer receive all these superior positions that were suited for you....”

The *Targum*² explains the passage: “You were worthy of receiving *three* portions: the right of the firstborn, the priesthood, and the monarchy,” but you were not granted them. (This passage is interpreted similarly in *Tanchuma*,³ and in *Bereishit Rabbah*.⁴)

We need to understand: The verse also mentions the birthright. Why, though, does Rashi interpret the phrase, “do not take more” as only referring to “superior by rank and superior by might”—priesthood and monarchy⁵—but *not* to the advantage mentioned at the beginning of the verse, “Reuven, you are my firstborn”?⁶ On the contrary— the phrase “you are my firstborn” gives us the reason why Reuven was worthy of receiving the priesthood and the monarchy.

¹ *Gen.* 49:3-4.

² *Onkelus*; similarly *Targum Yonatan ben Uziel*, and *Targum Yerushalmi*, *ad loc.*

³ Our *parsha*, sec. 9.

⁴ Our *parsha*, 98:4; 99:6. Also, in *Aggadot Bereishit*, sec. 82 (83).

⁵ See also the *Ohr HaChaim*, *ad loc.*

⁶ R. Eliyahu Mizrahi says, “Though the *Targum* mentions also the birthright of the firstborn, this remark is not based on the verse, but is his own opinion.” The reason R. Eliyahu Mizrahi says this is because the *Targum*’s remark concerning the birthright was made on the phrase “superior by rank and superior by might” {and not on the opening clause of the verse, “Reuven, you are my firstborn”}.

We cannot say that Rashi maintains that from the perspective of *pshat* the birthright was *not* taken from Reuven, since an explicit passage says otherwise:⁷ “And the sons of Reuven, the firstborn of Israel... but when he defiled his father's bed, *his birthright was given* to the sons of Yosef....”

Moreover, a few verses earlier {in our *parshah*} Rashi himself, in one of his interpretations, writes,⁸ “*One portion* refers to the *birthright*, and indicates that his (Yosef's) sons should take two shares.” And even before this verse, in *parshat VaYishlach*,⁹ Rashi comments, “*Yaakov's firstborn*: Firstborn in regard to inheritance; firstborn to perform the service; firstborn regarding the counting.¹⁰ The birthright was given to Yosef only in respect to the tribes, in that he founded two tribes.”¹¹ That is, the birthright “in respect to the tribes” was appropriated from Reuven (because “he lay with...”¹²), and given to Yosef.

2.

A QUESTION OF DISCRIMINATION

Seemingly, we could answer: The specific use, by the verse, of the phrase, “do not take more, תוֹתֵר” (to refer to “all these” advantages that Reuven forfeited) implies that the verse means to exclude only those advantages concerning which the term *superior*, יתרוֹת, applies—“superior, יתֵר, by raising; and superior, יתֵר, by might”—priesthood and monarchy. In contrast, since Scripture does refer to the birthright as a “superior” position, יתֵר,¹³ it is not excluded by the phrase “do not take more, תוֹתֵר.”¹⁴

Nonetheless, this proves (from the *phraseology* of Scripture) only the import of the verse. Namely, the verse here is addressing Reuven's loss of the birthright. The difficulty, however, remains as to the reason for discriminating: Why treat the birthright differently than the priesthood and the monarchy? Why speak only

⁷ *I Chronicles* 5:1.

⁸ On *Gen.* 48:22.

⁹ *Gen.* 35:23. And see Rashi on *Gen.* 29:32.

¹⁰ When the names of the tribes were enumerated, he was always counted first.

¹¹ Ephraim and Manasseh.

¹² *Gen.* 35:22.

¹³ In the Tanchuma, *ad loc*, it is explained that the word יתֵר refers to the birthright, but obviously this is not the plain meaning.

¹⁴ Perhaps this is the intention of Rabbi Eliyahu Mizrahi, when he writes “the birthright is not included in *raising* or *might*.” See there.

about Reuven's loss of the priesthood and the monarchy, and *not* about his loss of the birthright (“in respect to the tribes”)?

3.

DIFFICULTIES WITH RASHI'S REMARKS ON “MY SON, YOU WITHDREW”

On the verse,¹⁵ “A cub [and] a grown lion is Yehudah. From the prey, my son, you withdrew,” Rashi goes on, and explains:

From the prey, מטרף – “From what I suspected of you, (namely) that ‘Yosef has surely been torn up; a wild beast has devoured him.’¹⁶ This referred to Yehudah, who was likened to a lion.”

my son, you arose, עלית – “you withdrew, סלקת, yourself and said,¹⁷ ‘What is the gain {if we slay our brother and cover up his blood}?’ Similarly, {Yehudah withdrew} from {and thereby averted} Tamar’s execution, when he confessed,¹⁸ ‘She is right; it¹⁹ is from me....’”

Since Rashi mentions, “similarly, from Tamar’s execution,” in his remarks on the phrase “my son, you arose,” and not on the phrase “from the prey,” it is understood that the case involving Tamar is apparently not linked to “from the prey” (i.e., {it does not imply} from the execution of Tamar; unlike the Midrash that interprets “from the prey, מטרף” – “from the slaying, מטרפה, of Tamar”) but is rather linked to the phrase “my son, you *withdrew*.” The *withdrawal* alludes also to another instance of Yehudah’s disengagement {besides his withdrawal from the plot to murder Yosef}—from bearing any responsibility for inflicting capital punishment on Tamar.

But something is unclear: The phrase, “my son, you arose,” comes after the phrase “from the prey.” If so, how can we differentiate, and explain that the phrase “my son, you arose” alludes to two incidents, whereas the phrase “from the prey” alludes to only *one*?

¹⁵ Gen. 49:9.

¹⁶ Gen. 37:33.

¹⁷ Gen. 37:26.

¹⁸ Gen. 38:26.

¹⁹ Her pregnancy.

Moreover, another point needs to be cleared up: In general, from the perspective of the plain meaning of Scripture, what proves that Yaakov was referring also to {the incident where Yehudah averted} the execution of Tamar,²⁰ and not just to {the plot in which the brothers sold Yosef, and misled their father to believe} “Yosef has surely been torn up”?¹⁶ For (unlike the Midrash²¹) Rashi does not present these incidents as two distinct interpretations, but rather adds this {second incident concerning Tamar} as a continuation {of the same interpretation}: “*similarly*, from Tamar’s execution”?

4.

TWO SORTS OF PREY

The first question, we can answer as follows: In fact, “prey” does allude to both the incident with Yosef and the incident with Tamar. Even so, Rashi only mentions the incident with Tamar, “similarly, from Tamar’s execution,” in his comments on “my son, you withdrew” in order to clarify *how* “prey” could also be alluding to the incident in which Yehudah averted Tamar’s execution. To fully understand this idea, we have to first explain something else:

There are two ways to {parse and} understand the sentence “From the prey, my son, you arose”:

1. The phrase “my son” modifies “prey”: “From the prey, {i.e., who was} my son (Yosef)—you (Yehudah) arose.”²²
2. “My son” is the subject of the verb “arose”:²³ “From the prey”—from the matter of *prey*²⁴—“my son (Yehudah), you arose.”

If we accept the first interpretation – that “my son” modifies “prey – then it is impossible to interpret the phrase “from the prey, *my son*” as also referring to Tamar.²⁵

²⁰ See the supra-commentary of *Devek Tov* and *Maskil Le’Dovid*.

²¹ *Bereishit Rabbah* ch. 99. (Cf. *Tanchuma*, *ad loc.*, and *Bereishit Rabbah* ch. 98.)

²² See *Tanchuma*, *loc. cit.*; and *Shechel Tov*, *ad loc.*, and others.

²³ See *Targum Yonatan*, *ad loc.*, and others. Also see *Rashbam*, *as loc.*

²⁴ See *Chezkuni*, *ad loc.*

²⁵ See *R. Eliyahu Mizrachi*, and *Divrei Dovid*, *ad loc.*

Therefore, before Rashi can add, “similarly, from Tamar’s execution...,” he must explain the words, “my son, you withdrew, עלית” to clarify that they are connected. {That is, “my son” is appositional to the subject “you,” referring to Yehudah—and not to Yosef.} For this reason, Rashi also quotes from the verse, “my son,” even though for the purposes of the interpretation “you withdrew, סלקת, yourself,” it would suffice just to quote the phrase “you arose.” Rashi also quotes “my son,” {to teach us that this phrase is the subject—not the object,} for only in this way can prey be understood as also referring to the incident with Tamar.

Rashi is compelled to interpret “my son” as being connected to {i.e., the appositional subject of the verb} “arose” because: Yaakov intended here to praise Yehudah. And since even without adding the words “my son” we would understand that “prey, טרף” alludes to Yosef, as we find elsewhere the term טרף used in connection with him, so therefore if טרף was referring to Yosef, this would not contribute to Yehudah’s praise—just the opposite: Emphasizing that the prey was *Yaakov’s son* would lessen the praise, suggesting that it was only for this reason that Yehudah had removed himself from the plot.

Therefore, the simple explanation of the verse is like the second way: “From the prey—my son (Yehudah) you arose.”

But based on what we’ve explained earlier, we need to understand: Although the word “prey” *might* be alluding to the incident with Tamar, what compels Rashi to say that *prey* actually does allude to both incidents? Especially, considering that in the narrative concerning Tamar, the term טרף is not mentioned!

5.

DIDN'T REUVEN ALSO “WITHDRAW” FROM THE “PREY”?

In order to resolve these problems, we need to first clarify a general difficulty here: The monarchy forfeited by Reuven was given to Yehudah, as it says in *Chronicles*,²⁶ “Because Yehudah prevailed over his brothers, and the one appointed as prince was to be from him.” Yaakov alluded to this when he blessed

²⁶ *I Chronicles* 5: 2.

Yehudah,¹⁵ “A cub [and] a grown lion is Yehudah.” Commenting on this verse, Rashi²⁷ explains that the verse refers to the monarchy that was conferred upon him ({i.e., Yehudah’s progeny,} David,²⁸ Solomon, etc.). The reason why the monarchy was given to Yehudah can be found within the words of the blessing itself—“From the prey, my son, you withdrew,”²⁹ as Rashi explains in the conclusion of his commentary on this phrase: “Similarly, {Yehudah withdrew} from {and thereby averted} Tamar’s execution...; *therefore*, ‘he crouched, lay down, etc.’ {This blessing was fulfilled in the time of Solomon, *every man under his vine, etc.*}”

What’s not understood: Yehudah virtue in preventing Yosef’s murder, by arguing,¹⁷ “What is the gain,” was demonstrated also by Reuven, as related in *parshat Va’yeishev* that Reuven told his brothers,³⁰ “Let us not deal him a deadly blow.” Furthermore, Yehudah’s virtue in confessing his involvement in the incident concerning Tamar,¹⁸ “She is right; it is from me...,” was also demonstrated by Reuven, through his repentance for having “profaned [Him Who] ascended upon my bed.”³¹ As Rashi explains in *parshat Va’yeishev*,³² “When Yosef was sold, Reuven was not there, for it was his day to go and serve his father.... He was busy with his sackcloth and his fasting for having disarranged his father’s bed.”

Moreover, in both instances, Reuven’s virtues seem greater than those of Yehudah’s:

1. Yehudah rescued Yosef from death not with the intention of freeing him, but with the intention of selling him to the Ishmaelites. Consider, too that (a) Yehudah then had the opportunity to free Yosef. As Rashi remarks, Yehudah’s brothers complained to Yehudah,³³ “Had you instructed us to free Yosef, we

²⁷ Also see Rashi’s commentary on the above cited verse in *Chronicles*.

²⁸ Rashi understands the phrase “a cub, a grown lion,” as referring to two distinct animals. (In contrast to *Targum Ben Uziel* and *Targum Yonatan* who render the phrase in Aramaic as “a cub, the *offspring* of a lioness. That’s why Rashi cites *Targum Onkelus*, to negate these other renditions.) But although Yehudah was figuratively compared to both a lion cub and a full grown lioness, we find two corresponding stages of monarchy only in King David’s reign.

²⁹ See also the *Baal Turim* on this verse. See also the homiletic expositions of our Sages: *Michilta*, *Be’Shalach* 14:22; *Midrash Tehillim*, *mizmor* 76:3; *Tosephta Brachot* 14:16; *Tanchuma*, on our *parsha*, sec. 10; *Bereishit Rabbah* 99:8; and elsewhere.

³⁰ *Gen.* 37:21. See also *Gen.* 42:22.

³¹ *Gen.* 49:4.

³² Rashi on *Gen.* 37:29.

³³ On *Gen.* 38:1.

would have obeyed you.” (b) When Yehudah argued, “What is the gain,” this implies, as Rashi notes, “What *monetary* profit.” Meaning, Yehudah did not agree to Yosef’s execution because they wouldn’t turn a profit. That’s why Yehudah suggested that they should *sell* Yosef to the Ishmaelites, and thereby make *money*.³⁴

In contrast, Reuven sought to return Yosef to Yaakov, as the Torah explicitly says,³⁵ “in order to save him from their hands, *to return him to his father.*”

2. Concerning Yehudah’s confession in the incident with Tamar – (a) we find only a single declaration “She is right; it is from me.” (b) *The principal distinction*: Had Yehudah not confessed, Tamar would have been killed, along with her unborn twins.³⁶ Naturally, Yehudah had little choice but to come clean.

In contrast, we find: (a) For years after his sin, Reuven continued his penance, as the selling of Yosef occurred some *nine* years after Reuven had disarranged his father’s bed. (b) Reuven, in his penance, is described by Rashi as being,³² “busy with his sackcloth and his fasting.” (c) The act of “having disarranged his father’s bed” was carried out by Reuven with the intention of defending his mother’s honor.³⁷ His motives were so sincere that this act of his was not considered to be a sin. As Rashi remarks,³⁸ “all of them {Yaakov’s sons} were equal, and all of them were *righteous*, for Reuven had *not* sinned.” That’s why “even at the moment of his blunder, [Scripture] calls him the firstborn.”³⁹ Still, Reuven persisted in his profuse penitence.

In light of all this, we are faced with the following perplexing problem: Why should Yehudah’s behavior, viz., “From the prey, my son, you withdrew,” justify Yehudah being deemed *more* worthy of monarchy than Reuven?

³⁴ See *Chidushei Aggadot Maharsha* on *Sanhedrin* 6b.

³⁵ *Gen.* 37:22; see Rashi, *ad loc.*

³⁶ As Rashi comments on *Gen.* 38:25, “{Please recognize your Creator} and do not destroy three souls.”

³⁷ See Rashi on *Gen.* 35:22, “Reuven came and protested his mother’s humiliation.”

³⁸ Rashi, *ibid.*

³⁹ Rashi *ibid.*, v. 23.

6.

TWO CONSEQUENCES FOR TWO ASPECTS OF HIS WRONGDOING

The matter will be understood by clarifying what Yaakov told Reuven: “*Haste like water*—do not take more.” Rashi comments, “And what caused you to lose all these [advantages over your brothers]?” *Haste like water*, “The haste and the confusion with which you hurried to show your anger... therefore:” *Do not take more*, “You shall no longer receive all these superior positions....” “And what is the haste by which you acted hastily?” And Rashi goes on to give his interpretation of the phrase, “because you mounted your father’s bed.”

From the continuation of Rashi’s explanation, it is understood that Reuven forfeited “all these superior positions” not strictly on account of having mounted his father’s bed. Rather it because of his *haste like water*, “the *haste* and the confusion with which you hurried to show your *anger*.” It’s just that the haste expressed itself—as Rashi says, “And *what* is the haste...”—when he mounted his father’s bed.⁴⁰

In other words, by prefacing, and emphasizing separately the expression “Haste like water,” Rashi implies that Reuven’s misdeed of ‘disarranging Yaakov’s bed’ consisted of two elements: 1) the disarrangement itself, 2) his acting impetuously—“haste like water.”

Both parts carried its own distinct, detrimental consequence: 1) For disarranging his father’s bed, Reuven lost the right of the first-born to found two tribes. As it says in *Chronicles*,⁷ “And when he defiled his father’s bed, his birthright was given to the sons of Yosef,” and as Rashi points out in *Parshat VaYishlach*,⁴¹ “the birthright was given to Yosef.” 2) For acting impetuously, by being too quick to show his indignation, Reuven forfeited his entitlement to “all these superior positions,” i.e., priesthood and monarchy.

⁴⁰ See the question of the *Or HaChaim*, and other commentators, on this verse.

⁴¹ See footnote 9.

The explanation is as follows: There is a difference between priesthood and monarchy, on one hand, and being the firstborn, on the other. The virtues associated with priesthood and monarchy are expressed chiefly (and especially, in the subject at hand) in connection with someone else, in one's relationship with others: The nature of a king, "who will go forth before them,"⁴² is to be concerned about the needs of his nation, and the like. As Rashi comments *here*,¹⁵ on the word, *gur*, cub: "who took {Israel} out {to battle} and brought {them back} in," and on the phrase, "crouched, lied down"—"{The Jewish nation lived securely} each man beneath his grapevine, etc. (*I Kings* 5:5)" The same is true of the priesthood. One of the main functions of a Kohen, as Rashi explains here on the phrase, superior by raising," is the reciting of the priestly blessings. Similarly, it is the responsibility of the *Kohen* to teach the people the laws of the Torah, as it says,⁴³ "And you shall come to the... *kohanim*... and you shall inquire, and they will tell you the words of judgment.... According to the law they instruct you...."

In contrast, being a firstborn is a virtue in relationship only to oneself, not in relationship with anyone else. And because of his prominence, a firstborn receives a double share of the inheritance, and other similar privileges.

This explains the different consequences for the two aspects of Reuven's misdeed mentioned above: Reuven's *hastiness to show his anger*, "haste like water"—the moment he felt that his father's sleeping quarters should be in Leah's tent, his ire was aroused about someone else's affairs, and he immediately vented his anger by moving his father's bed—was an action impelled by a trait diametrically opposed to the trait of having concern for the welfare of another person. Accordingly, his punishment was in kind, forfeiting the priesthood and the monarchy.⁴⁴

⁴² *Num.* 27:17.

⁴³ *Deut.* 17:9, 11.

⁴⁴ See, too, the commentary of the *Abarbanel*.

In contrast, Reuven's fall precipitated by disturbing the location of his father's bed was indicative of a mistake in Reuven's thinking. He had reasoned that owing to his mother's dignity ("Should my mother's sister's handmaiden be a rival of my mother?"⁴⁵), his father's bed should be in Leah's tent. Since this error in judgment reflected only his own deficiency; therefore, he lost the prominence linked with his own person—the right of the firstborn.

In light of the above, we can now understand why according to Rashi, and to the straightforward understanding of the text, the right of the firstborn was not taken away entirely from Reuven (he remained the firstborn in terms of inheritance, etc, having lost only the right of the firstborn in so far as having an additional tribe come from him), whereas the priesthood and the monarchy were taken away from him *completely*.

The act of disturbing his father's bed was itself not so grievous, since his intention was to end to his mother's humiliation. This is born out by Rashi's comment, "Reuven did not sin," and "even at the moment of his fall, he is called the firstborn." Moreover, Reuven repented earnestly for 12 years, preoccupied the whole time with his sackcloth and fasting. So that's why only the birthright concerning the tribes was taken from him.

8.

YEHUDAH—VIRTUOUS IN RELATION WITH OTHERS; REUVEN, INHERENT VIRTUE

This clarifies why the monarchy was given to Yehudah because of the virtue he possessed, alluded to by the verse, "from the prey, my son, you withdrew" – even though Reuven possessed a greater virtue than Yehudah, as was explained.

The difference between "from the prey, my son, you withdrew," said of Yehudah, and the actions of Reuven is the following: The acts of Yehudah, alluded to by the phrase, "from the prey, my son, you withdrew," resulted in concrete deeds that saved the lives of others. Yehudah's plea "What is the gain...?" persuaded his brothers to spare Yosef's life. They agreed to remove

⁴⁵ Rashi on *Gen.* 35:22.

Yosef from the pit containing snakes and scorpions.⁴⁶ And by proclaiming, “She is right,” Yehudah had exonerated Tamar from her death sentence.

True, Reuven’s remorse and drive were greater than those of Yehudah’s. However, this was a virtue only vis-à-vis himself, not in relation to the welfare of someone else. Although Reuven has argued with his brothers not to kill Yosef, but to only throw him in the pit so that he could return later and rescue Yosef, this plan never came to fruition. In *fact*, this plan hadn’t protected *Yosef* from the danger of starvation, only from being killed outright. Consider, too, that looming in the pit were snakes and scorpions.

While we can safely say that from the vantage point of the simple meaning of Scripture Reuven was unaware of this danger,⁴⁷ and cannot be held responsible, yet the *fact* remained that Yosef’s life was still very much in peril.

The same applies regarding Reuven’s repentance, “”—this had no bearing on anyone else. Moreover, had Reuven not been engrossed in his sackcloth and fasting when Yosef was sold, it is quite possible that Reuven would have been able to devise some successful stratagem to save Yosef,⁴⁸ just as earlier, Reuven had been successful in persuading the brothers not to kill him. It was precisely because of his *self-absorption*—even if regarding exalted matters: his sackcloth and fasting—that Yosef’s sale was possible.

As such, specifically the actions of Yehudah, “from the prey, my son, you withdrew”—taking a stand for the sake for *someone else*, and confessing in order to save *someone else*—prove that he was worthy of monarchy. In contrast, Reuven was worthy, in general, to possess the right only of the firstborn, because of the inherent virtue of his profound repentance. But he was not worthy to retain the right of *monarchy*.

In light of the above, we can readily understand why Rashi interpreted the verse, “from the prey, my son, you withdrew,” as referring to two episodes: the sale of Yosef and the incident with Tamar. Yaakov had wanted to underscore the

⁴⁶ See Rashi on *Gen. 37:24*.

⁴⁷ As the Ramban comments, *ibid*.

⁴⁸ Possibly, Reuven could have freed Yosef from the pit when his brothers had gone “to eat bread.” See Rashi on *Gen. 37:22; 29:32*.

superior quality of Yehudah over Reuven, for which reason the monarchy, “a cub [and] a grown lion,” was transferred from Reuven to Yehudah. And since there are *two* areas in which Reuven’s virtue shines—in his desire to save Yosef, and in his penitence for disturbing his father’s couch—it makes sense that Rashi should point out Yehudah’s virtues in *two* areas.

9.

THE LESSON: LOVE FOR A FELLOW JEW

The lesson from all this is readily understood: A Jew should not be satisfied to work only for his own perfection. A Jew is obligated to also be busy with love for a fellow Jew, doing something beneficial for someone besides himself. Moreover, love for a fellow Jew, “comprises the totality of Torah.”⁴⁹ Therefore, even if the person himself is not on as lofty a level as someone else who is entirely devoted to pursuing his own advancement and self-improvement, nonetheless, by being busy with the welfare of the other, he is connected with “*the totality of Torah.*”

This point becomes more obvious when we consider the consequences of the two paths of Reuven and Yehudah:

Perhaps, because Reuven was “busy with his sackcloth and his fasting,” the sale of Yosef became possible, as did the Egyptian exile, the beginning and root of *all subsequent exiles*.⁵⁰ In contrast, although not on the same lofty level as Reuven’s repentance, Yehudah’s declaration, “She is right; it⁵¹ is from me” is pivotal to the redemption from exile: As a result, Perez, פרץ, was born. And from him the Davidic monarchy emerged,⁵² and eventually, King Mashiach will emerge. Concerning Mashiach it says – “The breaker, הפורץ, has gone up before them.”⁵³ Mashiach will be the final Redeemer, who will *break* through all the fences of exile, and usher in the true and complete redemption, very, very soon.

-From a talk delivered on *Shabbat Parshat Vayechi*, 5730

⁴⁹ *Tanya*, ch. 52 (see *Shabbat* 31a).

⁵⁰ For all the kingdoms [under which the Jewish people were later exiled] are called after the kingdom of Egypt (*Bereishit Rabbah* sec. 16, par. 4; see also, *Sefer HaMaamarim* 5709, s.v. “Kol Dodi,” at the beg.).

⁵¹ Her pregnancy.

⁵² Book of *Ruth*, at the end.

⁵³ *Micah* 2:13; *Aggadat Bereishit*, end of sec. 63; Rashi on *Bereishit Rabbah*, sec. 85, par. 14.