

## Parshat Yitro 5777

### 'The 2 Sets of Aseres Hadibros'

#### What Appeared on Each Set of Luchos?

Although not so easy to comprehend, it should be remembered that whilst the first dibros were written down in Yisro and the second in Va'eschanan, they were given by Hashem together – *Zachor v'Shamor b'dibbur echad*. But in respect of the 2 sets of luchos, the first given on Shavous and the second on Yom Kippur, what was on those respective luchos? Did they have the exact same writing? There are 3 opinions:

1. Moshe took the dibros written in Parshas Yisro and either amplified them or changed the wording to teach us new droshos or included the other words that Hashem had said.
2. Both sets of luchos had both sets of dibros on them i.e. each of the luchos may have had 10 dibros – those of Yisro on one side and those of Va'eschanan on the other side and not 5 & 5 as is normally assumed.
3. The first luchos were written exactly as in Parsaha Yisro and the second luchos as in Va'eschanan.

#### Statistical Comparison & The Word טוב

	Yisro	Va'eschanan	DIFFERENCE
Word count	172	189	17

In respect of the third above opinion, one of the many questions is why was לך ייטב omitted from the first dibros? This was asked of Rebbe Chiya bar Abba. It is learned from Sotah 40a that Rebbe Chiya bar Abba was a tremendous Boki in Halachah, but less so in Agadata. So he sent the questioner to a Boki in Agadata who gave him the answer that טוב was not in the first luchos because they were destroyed. טוב could not therefore be incorporated in the first dibros, which were written exactly as in Yisro, on the first luchos themselves. This was because, as they were to be smashed, the consequences would have been disastrous - as it could have resulted in the final annihilation of טוב from Yisrael. The Gemara's conclusion however is that the second dibros which were written exactly as in Va'eschanan, on the second set of luchos, remained intact and hence they could incorporate the word טוב.

#### What did Hashem Actually 'Say' - *Zachor v'Shamor b'dibbur echad*?

The matter of what was actually written on the 2 sets of luchos (albeit a matter of dispute) has now been reviewed, but not with what Hashem actually said. Ibn Ezra is firmly of the opinion that Hashem said only what is in Yisro; Va'eschanan is an amplification by Moshe. Ramban in Va'eschanan appears to agree according to peshat. However following Chazal, who say *Zachor v'Shamor b'dibbur echad*, he disagrees with Ibn Ezra and holds, at least in the case of Shabbos, that Zachor was written on both luchos - and Shamor was said by Hashem at the same time, but not written on either set i.e. only Zachor was written (see Ramban Yisro 20:8 and Va'eschanan 5:12). Radvaz (Volume 3 s 549) disagrees strongly – Zachor and Shamor both appeared.

#### Which Comes First – Acquiring a House, then Marriage OR Marriage, then Acquiring a House?

Another important variation occurs in the last commandment. In Yisro it first mentions not to covet ones friend's house and only then does it refer to his wife. But in Va'eschanan it starts with the wife and then mentions the friend; it also changes the second verb (to covet) from תחמד to תתאוה and adds in one's friend's field (שדה). Ibn Ezra (following his general principle that Va'eschanan only expounds on Yisro) says that Hashem mentioned in Yisro the friend's' house first, for sensible people first buy a house and only then get married (and finally they take servants and acquire animals to plough their fields). This is compared to Devarim 20:5-7, from which the Gemara in Sotah 44a derives, that one should first build a house, then plant a vineyard and only then marry. Moshe, however, in Va'eschanan considered it differently. A youth's desire to take a wife is stronger than that to purchase a house, so he put them in that order.

#### תאוה v תמדה

As to the difference between תמדה and תאוה, Rashi in Va'eschanan appears to hold that there is none. Rambam in Gezeleh and Avedah 1.9 & 1.10 however makes a distinction and counts them as 2 separate mitzvos. תאוה refers to the desire of the heart, but it remains an unrealised dream. תמדה however is where action has been taken to secure the coveted article and this end is successfully achieved - whether through payment or by other (possibly nefarious) means. Ozneyim la Torah points out that לא תתאוה was even more, and especially, relevant to the dibros in Va'eschanan, as indeed too was שדה – the fields not mentioned in Yisro. When B'nai Yisrael were on the point of entry into Eretz Yisrael, where they were going to acquire possessions and wealth, they were instructed to eradicate any covetousness from their heart before it would have a chance to evolve (i.e. when it was only an embryonic תאוה). This was in order to bring to a halt such a potential averah at the earliest opportunity before it could develop into the more repulsive and abhorrent ת