

ParShaT **BoH** - One Pager Series

<https://www.Rashiyomi.com/rule3415.pdf> Adapted from The Rashi Newsletter,

(c) Rashiyomi.com Jan 2021, Dr. Hendel, President,

Full statement of copyright is found at www.Rashiyomi.com/copyrights.htm

Rashi #1, #2, #3 : Biblical Text:Ex12-08:09a,b,c,d: Eat the meat [The Passover lamb] on that night, roasted with Matzoh on bitter vegetables. Don't eat partially roasted, or cooked in water, but rather roasted

Rashi Text: #1 Partially roasted: A food that is not roasted completely is called *na* (the Biblical word used)

Rashiyomi Explanation: Rashi here explains the dictionary meaning of the biblical word, *na*. Rashi accomplishes this explanation using Arabic, similar to the approach used by modern scholarship. Interestingly, *na* also means *please*. This corresponds to the English idiom *buttering someone up*. In Hebrew *na, please*, means *partially warming him up* (roasting him/her to the idea).

Rashi Text: #2: Cooked: "Don't eat" applies to *cooked in water*.

Rashiyomi Explanation: To appreciate Rashi consider the following two sentences

- A) Eat the Passover lamb A1) neither partially roasted A2) nor cooked in liquid
- B) Don't B1) eat the Passover lamb partially roasted, or B2) cooked in liquid

Sentence A) is clearer; English uses the *neither nor* construction to indicate that both are negated. Sentence B, admissible in both English and Hebrew, looks, at least grammatically, as if it is saying *Either B2 or Not B1*. Of course, this would not make sense here (The statement *either it should be cooked or don't partially roast* does not make sense). Rashi simply clarifies that the Biblical text which uses form B, should be read as form A

Rashi Text: #3: Cooked: Is only water cooking prohibited? What about cooking in other liquids? Therefore the biblical text says *cooked* (the word is repeated in the Bible) to emphasize any type of liquid cooking

Rashiyomi Explanation: In my article *Biblical Formatting* (JBQ, 35(1), 2007) I advocate capturing the biblical repeated verb (cooked cooked) by using underline, italics, or bold. In the biblical text cited above I used *italics*. I argue that italics in English and a double verb in Hebrew both indicate *unspecified emphasis*. The unspecified emphasis in turn indicates *in all cases* including a liquid not water. The Bible mentions cooking in water since this is the usual way cooking is done and/or is preferred.

In passing, the Talmud (TB BM 31a), lists 8 examples where a double verb indicates unspecified emphasis. The Rabbi Ishmael school summarized the rule as follows: *The Torah speaks in human terms* [in other words, just as humans repeat to indicate unspecified emphasis so too God repeats for unspecified emphasis] This rule is not unique to Rabbi Ishmael. Rabbi Akivah formulates the rule as follows: *The Torah speaks in expansive and restrictive terms*; a repeated verb may be *expansive* (more meaning than typical) or *restrictive* (less narrower meaning than usual). Both Rabbi Akivah and Rabbi Ishmael agree. Someone asked me this week (I still get questions though rarely; Rashiyomi@gmail.com invites all questions) about Rabbi Akivah and the legal philosophy of John Marshal, an American jurist who taught that the primary legal text, - the Constitution for US law and the Torah for Jewish law - was *sufficient* to solve all problems without adding outside sources. This is correct. By using *human phraseology* which indicates *unspecified emphasis* or by using both *expansive and restrictive language*, the Torah leaves room for interpretation encouraging Torahitic sufficiency.

The 8 Talmudic examples are as follows: #1, #2) smite smite the city by sword (If swords are not available they are still put to death), #3, #4) return return the pledge to the borrower (return in all circumstances even if the borrower did not sue in court), #5) open open your hands to the poor of your city (*open open* expands the charity obligation to poor in other cities also), #6) give give to the poor (even if they need only a small amount), #7) give give (a fairwell gift) to your slave when going free (whether you made money or lost money from this slave (but if you lost money you can give a smaller amount (Talmud as interpreted by the Ramban), #8) loan loan according to his need (Interpretation #1: Whether he has need or not; Interpretation #2 (not in Talmud); even multiple times)