

בס"ד

THE RASHI OF THE WEEK

Week of

Parshas Shemos

18 Teves, 5785 – January 18, 2025

Compiled from the works of
Rabbi Menachem Mendel Schneerson
The Lubavitcher Rebbe

by
Rabbi Shmuel Mendelsohn
North Miami Beach, FL

A Project of
Vaad L'Hafotzas Sichos
Copyright 2025©

An Outline of the Rebbe's Explanation of Rashi Parshas Shemos

Likkutei Sichos Volume 16, Pages 1 – 12

Rashi in His Own Words

שמות א' - ח': ניקם מלך חדש על מצרים אשר לא ידע את יוסף:

רש"י ד"ה ויקם מלך חדש: רב ושמאל חד אמר חדש ממש. וחד אמר, שנתחדשו גזרותיו: ואשר לא ידע: עשה עצמו כאלו לא ידע:

Shemos 1:8: A new king arose over Egypt, who did not know Yosef.

Rashi Heading - A new king arose: (There is a difference of opinion between) Rav and Shmuel. One says that he was a new (king), and the other states that his decrees were new. **Who did not know:** he acted as if he did not know him.

Synopsis

Our Torah portion, Shemos, tells us how the enslavement of the Jewish people began in Egypt. We went "from riches to rags" because the Egyptians, led by Pharaoh, plotted against us. Our Parshah tells us that a new king who did not know Yosef arose over Mitzrayim, and Rashi explains this by quoting from the Talmud. Two of our Sages, Rav, and Shmuel, differ in opinion. One says that the Torah is discussing a new king, and the other says it was the same king, but he changed his decrees.

Since the Torah tells us that a new king arose, why would we think it does not mean an actual new king? Furthermore, why does Rashi need to give us two explanations? The rule is that there is a difficulty in the first explanation, which the second answers, and vice versa. However, his first explanation is closer to Peshat than the second. How does that apply here?

The explanation is as follows. The Sages explain that the reason for saying that it was a new king is that the Torah says, "A new king arose over Egypt." The second opinion is that the Torah does not explicitly state that the old king died. The Torah usually discusses the ruling of kings, not their arising. Therefore, there is an advantage to each opinion. However, each view also has a drawback.

The Torah said it was a new king; hence, it seems clear it *was* a new king. According to the second opinion, we must explain that since a king rules by royal decrees, a new king can mean new laws. However, that is further from Peshat. Additionally, if the Torah discusses the same king with new regulations, how can it be that he didn't know Yosef? This difficulty forces Rashi to explain, "and he did not know Yosef," meaning that he *behaved* as if he did not know Yosef.

Furthermore, the difficulty with the first explanation, that the Torah does not say "and he ruled," is, in truth, not all that difficult. The Torah is not a book of the history of Egyptian kings! Based on the above, we can see why Rashi offered us two explanations and the reason for their order.

THE RASHI OF THE WEEK

Rashi's Explanation

This week, we begin reading and studying the second book of the Torah, Shemos. This book tells of the Jewish people's enslavement in Egypt and our ultimate redemption. At the end of last week's Parshah, we read that the Jews were welcome guests in Egypt. This was because Yosef saved Egypt from starvation during the seven years of famine. In our portion, Shemos, we learn that the Egyptians enslaved us. The entire Jewish Nation immigrated to Egypt, and Egypt gave them the choicest land in which to dwell. We went from that elevated status last week to becoming slaves in this week's portion. How did this change come about?

In our Torah portion, we read¹, "The Jewish people were fruitful and swarmed and increased and became very, very strong, and the land became filled with them." Therefore, the Torah says², "A new king arose over Egypt, who did not know about Yosef." He feared that the Jews might become a fifth column. That is how our trouble began. Rashi cites the words from the verse "a new king arose" and comments that "(there is a difference of opinion between) Rav and Shmuel. One says that he was a new king, and the other says that (only) his decrees were new." Furthermore, Rashi cites the words from the verse "who did not know." Rashi explains, "he acted as if he did not know him."

Difficulties in Understanding Rashi

We have explained several times that when Rashi offers more than one explanation for a verse in the Torah, there is some difficulty in the first explanation. We do not find that particular difficulty in the second explanation. However, his second explanation is even more difficult, so the first is closer to Peshat. We need to understand what is problematic about each of Rashi's explanations. Additionally, we need to know why the first is more compatible with Peshat.

Another difficulty is that Rashi's heading states, "A new king arose." We know that Rashi is extremely precise with his language, and this is even so in the words appearing in his comments heading. He only includes the words he is explaining, and it seems he is merely describing the word "new." Why does he cite "a (new) king arose" in his heading?

We have also explained earlier that Rashi rarely cites the particular Sage he is quoting. When he does so, it is to answer a question that would (only) bother an exceptionally bright student. We must understand what Rashi adds to our understanding of the verse by telling us Rav and Shmuel's opinions.

The Explanation

Rashi's source for this is the Talmud³. The Talmud explains the reason for each position. It says, "The one who says that he was a new king says so because the Torah says the words 'new king.' The reasoning of

1. Our Parshah, Shemos 1:7.

2. Our Parshah, Shemos 1:8.

3. See the Talmud Eiruvim 53, a and Sotah 11, a. See also the Midrash Shemos Rabbah Chapter 1, 8.

THE RASHI OF THE WEEK

the one who says that it was not a new king, but his decrees were new, is because the Torah does not say that 'the old king died and the new king ruled.' " The Torah uses the expression that a new king "arose." Generally, the Torah uses the word "ruled." Because the Torah does not use this word, it is logical to infer that we speak about the same king who ruled previously. However, we see from the Torah's words that something was new. Since a king leads through royal edicts or decrees, he understands that only the directives change.

Rashi explains Peshat, which is the simple meaning of the verse. Why is it that he based his comments on the Talmud? The reason is simple; the Talmudic reasoning here is, according to Peshat, the Torah's simple meaning. The first opinion focuses on the words "new king," and the second opinion focuses on the word "arose," as opposed to "ruled." This also explains why Rashi includes "a new king arose" in the header. Both opinions are derived from the entire phrase.

Even though we can see the reason behind each view, the first is closer to Peshat for the following reasons:

1. Since we explain the verse's simple meaning, it is more logical to say it was a new king. After all, the Torah does say that "a new king arose."
2. According to the second explanation, we must also explain the words "who did not know Yosef." If he was the same king, he knew Yosef. Rashi also explains the words "who did not know Yosef." He explains that the Torah says he *acted* like he did not know Yosef. However, as we mentioned earlier, Rashi is very particular about the words he uses in his comments' headings. Rashi adds the word "and" to his heading, writing, "*And* who did not know Yosef." He connects these comments to those he made earlier, namely the second opinion of his previous explanation. According to the first opinion, however, those words present no difficulty.
3. The basis of the second opinion is that the Torah uses the word "arose" rather than "ruled." There is a relatively simple explanation for this. The Torah speaks about the king of Egypt and is not trying to teach us the history of gentile kings!

From the above, we can see why the first opinion, which Rashi quotes, is closer to Peshat than the second. That is the reason that he mentions it first.

We still need to understand why Rashi mentions Rav and Shmuel by name. The explanation is that the verse "a new king arose ..." tells us the reason for the following verse⁴. "Get ready; let us deal shrewdly with them! If they continue to increase, and we become involved in a war, they may join our enemies, and we must

4. Our Parshah, Shemos 1:9.

THE RASHI OF THE WEEK

leave our land."

Even according to the opinion that this Pharaoh was a new king, it is impossible to say that he was not aware of what Yosef had done. He was the king of Egypt, just one generation after Yosef saved the entire Nation. He must have been familiar with Yosef's actions!

Also, even a young child understands that he had no reason to suspect that the Jews would become a fifth column. Pharaoh and his advisors knew how good Egypt was to the Jews. Pharaoh had taken Yosef out of prison and made him the second in command of Egypt. Not only that, but he had even declared that no one might make a move without Yosef's permission⁵. Later, when all the Jews arrived in Egypt, Pharaoh gave them the best land in Egypt to dwell, the land of Goshen⁶. Even a generation later, it would not be natural for the Jews to repay goodness with evil. Anyone can understand that Pharaoh did not believe that the Jews would join with their enemies, and it was merely an excuse for evil behavior.

The question is what sort of evil it was. One can be evil in his relationship with G-d or with his fellow man. Was Pharaoh's sin mainly directed against Hashem or the Jews? Rashi answers this question (or alludes to the answer) by naming Rav and Shmuel, as will be explained.

The Talmud says⁷ that when there is an argument in the Talmud regarding prohibitions, we rule according to Rav. When there is an argument regarding monetary law, the Halachah follows Shmuel. The rabbis of the Middle Ages explain this as follows⁸. Both Rav and Shmuel were experts in all areas of Torah law. However, since Shmuel was involved continuously with monetary law, he attained the most significant depth of their true meaning. The same is true of Rav regarding laws related to prohibited items. What is the difference between these two areas of Jewish law? Prohibitions concern what the Torah says about our relationship with Hashem. Monetary issues concern Torah law regarding our relationship with our fellow man. Hence, when Rav encountered a problem, he could explain it as related to our relationship with G-d or our fellow; he was more inclined to approach it as it affected Hashem's relationship with us. On the other hand, Shmuel was more willing to link it to our relationship with each other.

According to Shmuel, he was the same king; the only thing which changed was his decrees. Based on Shmuel's focus on interpersonal laws, Pharaoh had an excuse⁹ he felt he could use with Hashem. Yaakov, our forefather, showed Pharaoh honor as a king. All of the Jews accepted Pharaoh's leadership. Furthermore, he displayed kindness by giving us the land of Goshen. Therefore, he had (at least in his own opinion) an excuse

5. Parshas Mikeitz, Bereishis 41:44.

6. Parshas Vayigash, See Bereishis 47:6 and 47:11.

7. See Bechoros 49, b.

8. See the Rosh to Tractate Bava Kama, Chapter 4, Paragraph 4.

9. The Hebrew – Talmudic word for excuse is "Amaslo - אמתלא." The Rebbe often quoted that it is a contraction of two words; "Emes Lo – אמתלא meaning "not true."

THE RASHI OF THE WEEK

to deal with the Jews as he wished. He felt that "we owed him." However, regarding his relationship with the Jews, he had no "excuse" whatsoever. The Jews, especially Yosef, had showered him with kindness. Shmuel explained the verse according to his position. He focused on Torah law regarding the relationship between one Jew and another. Hence, he understood the "new king" as the original king who passed new edicts.

On the other hand, Rav thought it was a new king. That being the case, he had no "excuse" for mistreating the Jews. He did not rule when the Jews arrived in Egypt, and the Jews never accepted his rule. He never showed us any kindness whatsoever. Hence, his wickedness was in his relationship with Hashem. He, therefore, found that Pharaoh sinned against Hashem. Consequently, he understood that the "new king" was, in fact, an actual new king¹⁰.

A Deeper Lesson from Rashi

We must be aware that there is no difference between the two, whether he is the same old king or a new king. If he is the king of Mitzrayim, he is interested in causing hardships for Jews¹¹. Moshe Rabbeinu spoke to Pharaoh to work within nature. However, we may not pay attention to any decree that hinders our Torah study, Torah observance, and providing our children with a proper Torah education. As a result, we will merit having children who are indeed members of the "Army of Hashem." As Hashem redeemed us from Mitzrayim, so will we merit the complete redemption through our righteous Moshiach!

(Adapted from a talk given on Shabbos Parshas Shemos, 5736)

I hope you gained as much by reading this as I did by translating and adapting it.

Click here to dedicate a week, a month, or a year to the Rashi of the Week.

You can find us on the web at www.RebbeTeachesRashi.org.

You can find our blog [here](#).

10. The Rebbe cites other instances where Rashi writes "Rav and Shmuel; one says ... and the other says ..." He demonstrates how the same pattern applies. He also uses a different pattern to explain all of the arguments between Rav and Shmuel in the Talmud, but that is not according to Peshat.

11. Bereishis Rabbah Chapter 16, Section 4, tells us that the Hebrew word for Egypt, Mitzrayim is derived from the word מיצר - Meitzar, which means a strait – a difficult situation.

**DEDICATED IN HONOR OF
THE LUBAVITCHER REBBE**

* * *

IN HONOR OF

the Soldiers of Tzivos Hashem **Chaim, Aiden Oded, and Zacharya Matan** שיקחי Morris

May they merit to be a source of Chassidic pride
to their family and a Torah light to their community

*

DEDICATED BY THEIR PARENTS

Rabbi & Mrs. **Menachem M. and Chaya Mushka** שיקחי
Morris

* * *

IN LOVING MEMORY OF

Mr. **Sholom Dovid** Hacoen **Mankes**

Passed away on 11 Teves, 5776

May His Soul be bound in the Eternal Bond of Life

*

DEDICATED BY HIS FAMILY

Mr. and Mrs. **Yonatan Itsik** Hacoen and **Shaindel Miriam** שיקחי **Mankes**

* * *

IN HONOR OF

Mrs. Esther שתחי **Sharabani**

May she go from strength to strength
in health, happiness, Torah, and mitzvot

*

DEDICATED BY HER SON

Mr. Gershon (Geri) שי **Bentov**

מוקדש לזכות

כ"ק אדמו"ר נשיא דורנו מליובאוויטש

* * *

לזכות

חיילי "צבאות השם"

חיים, עדן עודד וזכרי' מתן שיחיו

מאריס

*

נדפס ע"י הוריהם

הרה"ת ר' מנחם מענדל וחי' מושקא שיחיו

מאריס

* * *

לעילוי נשמת

ר' שלום דוד בן ר' יצחק הכהן ע"ה מנקס

נפטר ביום י"א טבת ה'תשע"ו

ת. נ. צ. ב. ה.

*

נדפס ע"י משפחתו

ר' יונתן איציק הכהן וזוגתו מרת שיינדל מרים שיחיו מנקס

* * *

לזכות

מרת אסתר שתח' שרבני

לאריכות ימים ושנים טובות עד ביאת גואל צדק

ומתוך בריאות הנכונה ולשנת ברכה והצלחה בגו"ר

*

נדפס ע"י בנה

ר' גרשון שי' בן טוב