

**Parshat VaEtchanan - Shabbat Nachamu  
Are there Really Ten Commandments?**

Simon Wolf

Everyone knows that there are Ten Commandments, but how do they really know? Are you so certain that there are ten commandments? How many commandments do you count?

**דברים פרק ה**

- (ו - ז) אֲנֹכִי יְקַוֶּה אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֲשֶׁר הוֹצֵאתִיךָ מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם מִבֵּית עֲבָדִים לֹא יִהְיֶה-לְךָ אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים עַל-פְּנֵי:
- (ח) לֹא-תַעֲשֶׂה-לְךָ פֶסֶל כָּל-תְּמוּנָה אֲשֶׁר בַּשָּׁמַיִם מִמַּעַל וְאֲשֶׁר בָּאָרֶץ מִתַּחַת וְאֲשֶׁר בַּיָּם בְּמַיִם מִתַּחַת לְאָרֶץ:
- (ט) לֹא-תִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה לָהֶם וְלֹא תַעֲבֹדֵם כִּי אֲנֹכִי יְקַוֶּה אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֵל קָדָם פְּקֹד עֹן אָבוֹת עַל-בְּנֵים וְעַל-שְׁלִשִׁים וְעַל-רַבְעִים לְשָׁנָיִ:
- (י) וְעֵשֶׂה חֶסֶד לְאֶלְפִים לֹאֲהַבִּי וּלְשֹׂמְרֵי <מצותו> מִצְוֹתַי: ○
- (יא) לֹא תִשָּׂא אֶת-שֵׁם-יְקַוֶּה אֱלֹהֶיךָ לְשׂוֹא כִּי לֹא יִנְקֶה יְקַוֶּה אֶת אֲשֶׁר-יִשָּׂא אֶת-שֵׁמוֹ לְשׂוֹא: ○
- (יב) שְׁמֹר אֶת-יוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת לְקַדְּשׁוֹ כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְקַוֶּה אֱלֹהֶיךָ:
- (יג) שֵׁשֶׁת יָמִים תַּעֲבֹד וְעֵשִׂיתָ כָּל-מְלֹאכְתְּךָ:
- (יד) וַיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי שַׁבָּתוֹ לִיקַוֶּה אֱלֹהֶיךָ לֹא תַעֲשֶׂה כָל-מְלֹאכָה אֹתָהּ וּבִנְיָ וּבִתָּךְ וְעַבְדְּךָ וְאִמָּתְךָ וְשׂוֹרְךָ וְחֹמְרְךָ וְכָל-בְּהֵמָתְךָ וְגֵרְךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּשַׁעְרֶיךָ לְמַעַן יָנוּחַ עַבְדְּךָ וְאִמָּתְךָ כַּמִּוֶּה:
- (טו) וְזָכַרְתָּ כִּי-עַבְדָּהּ הָיִיתָ בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם וַיֹּצֵאֲךָ יְקַוֶּה אֱלֹהֶיךָ מִשָּׁם בְּיַד חֲזָקָה וּבְזִרְעוֹ נְטִייה עַל-פְּנֵי צִוָּה יְקַוֶּה אֱלֹהֶיךָ לַעֲשׂוֹת אֶת-יוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת: ○
- (טז) כִּבֵּד אֶת-אֲבִיךָ וְאֶת-אִמְךָ כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְקַוֶּה אֱלֹהֶיךָ לְמַעַן יָרִיכְךָ יְמֶיךָ וְלִמְעַן יֵיטִב לְךָ עַל הָאֲדָמָה אֲשֶׁר-יְקַוֶּה אֱלֹהֶיךָ נָתַן לְךָ: ○
- (יז) לֹא תִרְצַח ○ לֹא תִנְאַף ○ וְלֹא תִגְזֹב ○ וְלֹא תַעֲנֶה בְרֵעֶךָ עַד שׂוֹא: ○
- (יח) וְלֹא תַחְמוֹד אֲשֶׁת רֵעֶךָ ○ וְלֹא תַתְאֲוֶה בֵּית רֵעֶךָ שְׂדֵהוּ וְעַבְדּוֹ וְאִמָּתוֹ שׂוֹרוֹ וְחֹמְרוֹ וְכָל אֲשֶׁר לְרֵעֶךָ: ○

If one looks at the Ten Commandments in both Parshat Yitro and Parshat Va'Etchanan, it is not obvious that there are actually ten commandments. For instance, by the Mitzvah of Shabbat, how many commandments are there? In Parshat Yitro there seem to be two commandments, one is Zachor (זכור את יום השבת), to remember the Sabbath and to sanctify it and another is Lo Taaseh Kol Melacha (לא תעשה כל מלאכה), to desist from all work. Without any preconceived notions, one would likely count thirteen or fourteen commandments<sup>1</sup> rather than ten. Well then, why does every depiction of the Luchot show Ten Commandments? The truth is that the question is somewhat disingenuous since the Torah states in two places that there were Ten Commandments conveyed by God to the people

at Har Sinai and inscribed upon the Tablets. Once in this week's Parsha<sup>2</sup> and then again in Parshat Eikev.<sup>3</sup> The real question, which is much harder to answer, is given that there are Ten Commandments, which of all the commandments listed in the Aseret HaDibrot are the Ten Commandments and how do we know that those are the correct ten? In order to gain some insight into this matter, we are going to take a slight detour to discuss the last of the Ten Commandments – Lo Tachmod, do not be jealous, and then return to the difficulty raised with regards to the enumeration of the Ten Commandments.

**שמות פרק כ**

(יג) לֹא תַחְמוֹד בֵּית רֵעֶךָ ○ לֹא תַחְמוֹד אֲשֶׁת רֵעֶךָ וְעַבְדּוֹ וְאִמָּתוֹ וְשׂוֹרוֹ וְחֹמְרוֹ וְכָל אֲשֶׁר לְרֵעֶךָ: פ

The first thing to note with regards to the commandment of Lo Tachmod is that it is formulated differently in Parshat Yitro than it is in Parshat Va'Etchanan. Than in and of itself is not necessarily an issue since as the Ibn Ezra points out there are numerous differences between the two narrations of the Aseret HaDibrot.<sup>4</sup> What is more striking is the change in the verb chosen to express the restriction. In Parshat Yitro, it uses the verb Lo Tachmod (לא תחמוד) twice whereas in Parshat Va'Etchanan it denotes the restriction once as Lo Tachmod (לא תחמוד) and then in the second instance, it says Lo Tit'aveh (לא תתאוה). The easiest way to explain this difference would be to assume that there are different gradations of jealousy. Just like there is a qualitative difference between kidnapping (stealing a person) and theft, so too there is a marked distinction between jealousy of another's wife and their possessions. While that logic would be substantiated by the division of the objects of the jealousy in Parshat Va'Etchanan, the Torah in Parshat Yitro partitions the objects of jealousy in a completely different sequence. One could suggest that in Yitro, the Torah also maintains a hierarchy, but rather than dividing the two categories, it first presents the general principle that one may not be jealous of anything in their friend's possession and then in the second Lo Tachmod it proceeds to list all the items in a hierarchal order starting with the wife of the other individual.<sup>5</sup> The Ibn Ezra suggests that Shmot speaks to the normal progression of a person's life, first they build a house, then they take a wife

<sup>1</sup> נראה שיש 13 צווים בפרשת יתרו ו14 בפרשת ואתחנן (אם גם מונים את "זכרת" במצות שבת)  
<sup>2</sup> וַיִּגְדַּל לְכֶם אֶת-בְּרִיתוֹ אֲשֶׁר צִוָּה אֶתְכֶם לַעֲשׂוֹת עֲשֶׂרֶת הַדְּבָרִים וַיִּכְתְּבֵם עַל-שְׁנֵי לְחֹת אֲבָנִים (דברים י, ג)

<sup>3</sup> וַיִּכְתֹּב עַל-הַלְחָת כַּמְּכַתֵּב הָרִאשׁוֹן אֶת עֲשֶׂרֶת הַדְּבָרִים אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר יְקַוֶּה אֱלֹהִים בְּהָר מִתּוֹךְ הָאֵשׁ בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא לְיִתְנֵם יְקַוֶּה אֱלֹהִי (דברים י, ד)  
<sup>4</sup> אבן עזרא הארוך כ,א (בחילת פירוש)  
<sup>5</sup> יש משהו דומה ברמב"ן דברים ה, ז... והוסיף ביאור בדבור לא תחמוד שהקדים האשה, בעבור כי יצר לב האדם רע מנעוריו באשה יותר מן הכל

and then they accumulate possessions.<sup>6</sup> On the other hand, in Moshe's presentation of the Aseret HaDibrot in Parshat Va'Etchanan he speaks to the natural desires of man. The youngsters first cherish a wife and then a house and wealth. Both of these explanations are plausible, but it then ignores any distinction between the verb Tachmod (תחמוד) and Tit'Aveh (תתאוה). Rashi confirms this understanding when he explains that the words Tit'Aveh and Tachmod are synonymous.<sup>7</sup>

The Gemara teaches that a person who is an outright thief loses their believability when it comes to taking an oath in court (מיגו דחשיד).<sup>8</sup> On the other hand, if we can find any justification for the person acting in this manner, we will excuse his behavior as being an aberration rather than the person being considered untrustworthy. For instance, if one denies an outstanding loan, we do not assume he is a thief which would cast aspersions on the veracity of his oaths, but rather we assume he is trying to duck his lender until he has sufficient funds to repay the outstanding debt. Whereas, if the person denies being in possession of an object deposited with him and witnesses testify to the contrary then we assume he is a thief and a liar because there is no excuse for his repudiation. The Gemara then asks how can we then ask an individual caring for deposits, who claims that they were stolen and who will have to make restitution for the missing objects, to take an oath that he is no longer in possession of the objects. If we suspect that he stole the deposit then his oath should no longer carry any weight. The Gemara suggests that people justify their behavior by saying that since I am paying for the object (making restitution for his claimed negligence) then it is not really stealing because the owner is not suffering any monetary loss. That solves the issue of theft, but then the Gemara queries, is not the person still in violation of the restriction of Lo Tachmod.<sup>9</sup> The Gemara concludes that people think that the violation of Lo Tachmod only applies if one does not compensate for the object. The simple understanding of the Gemara is that this is

a mistaken assumption of people with regards to understanding the restriction of Lo Tachmod and in reality one is in violation of the precept whether or not they pay for the object. Interestingly, the Tosafot suggest that this is not a mistaken assumption, but rather what the people think is actually the true nature of the restriction and that Lo Tachmod only applies when one does not compensate for the object they desire.<sup>10</sup> Irrespective of which approach you take, it is clear that both Rashi and Tosafot believe that Lo Tachmod is only violated if one acts on their feelings. It is not enough to be jealous, one needs to either abscond with the coveted object or compensate an unwilling seller for the object desired. Their position is supported by the Midrash Halacha<sup>11</sup> which compares the Lo Tachmod in the Aseret HaDibrot to the Lo Tachmod found by the gold and silver adornments of idols (לא תחמוד כסף וזהב ולקחת לך)<sup>12</sup>. Just like by the idols, one is only in violation of the restriction if one takes the gold and silver, so too one is only in violation of Lo Tachmod if one acts on their jealousy (מה להלן עושה מעשה אף כאן) (שעושה מעשה). This seems to be the view of many on the Monei Ha'Mitzvot like the Smag (סמ"ג)<sup>13</sup>, the Yeraiyim (יראים)<sup>14</sup> and the Semak (סמ"ק)<sup>15</sup>. In conclusion, all these commentators believe that the restrictions of Lo Tachmod and Lo Tit'Aveh are synonymous and that they can only be violated when one's thoughts manifest themselves in action.

The Rambam, on the other hand, believes that there is a substantive difference between the negative precept of Lo Tachmod and Lo Tit'Aveh and that is why the Torah differentiates the language of their presentation.<sup>16</sup> Lo Tachmod is the restriction against plotting and conniving to obtain that which belongs to another individual and then successfully carrying out those nefarious plans to acquire the object, whether one pays for it or simply steals it. That is in consonance with the Mechilta that requires one to take action to be in violation of Lo Tachmod. In addition, the Rambam suggests that Lo Tit'Aveh is a separate restriction which is violated by the

<sup>6</sup> אבן עזרא הארוך כ,א (בסוף פירושו) וגם מובא ברמב"ן שמות כ,יב וגם עיין רמב"ם הלכות דעות ה,יא אבל ממיכה ב,ב נראה שזה לא מוכרח  
<sup>7</sup> רש"י דברים ה,יז לא תירוג אף הוא לשון חמדה, כמו (בראשית ב, ט) נחמד למראה, דמתרגמין דמרג למחזי. יש לעיין בראייתו של רש"י כי בבראשית ב,ט מופיע גם המלה "תאוה" וגם המלה "נחמד" ואונקלוס מתרגם אותם "אסו" ו"ומרג" שמראה על שינוי ביניהם וגם זה המקום היחיד שאונקלוס מתרגם חמדה כמרג ובשאר מקומות בתורה הוא מתרגם אותו כחמדה (שמות כ,יג לד, כד ודברים ז,כה)

<sup>8</sup> בבא מציעא ה:  
<sup>9</sup> עיין רש"י שם הא קא עבר בלא תחמוד - מה לי חשוד על לא תחמוד, מה לי חשוד על לא תגזול, נימא: מיגו דחשיד עליה, חשיד אשבוטתא!

<sup>10</sup> עיין תוספות שם וגם סנהדרין כה: ד"ה מעיקרא  
<sup>11</sup> מכילתא דרבי ישמעאל יתרו - מסכתא דבחדש פרשה ח

<sup>12</sup> פסילי אלהים תשרפון באש לא תחמד כסף וזהב עליהם ולקחת לך פן תוקש בו כי תועבת יקוק אלקיך הוא (דברים ז,כה)

<sup>13</sup> סמ"ג לאוין סימן קנח כתוב בעשרת הדברות לא תחמוד וכתוב שם (דברים ה, יח) עוד לא תתאוה והכל אחד...

<sup>14</sup> יראים סימן קטו (דפוס ישן רנד) חומד נקרא שחומד דבר חברו ולקוחו בעל כרחו ונותן דמים או בעקיפין בא עליו שלא כדין, אבל חומד במחשבה בלא מעשה אינו עובר בלא תחמוד...אלמא חומד ולקוח בעל כרחו של חברו ונותן דמים נקרא חומד, ועליו נאמר לא תחמוד וכתוב לא תתאוה פי' אחד לאלו ב' לאוין ושנה הכתוב עליו לעבור עליו בב' לאוין

<sup>15</sup> סמ"ק מצוה יט...מכל מקום נראה שאף בלב אסור, אך אינו נגמר להתחייב עליו עד שעשה מעשה ובדיהיב דמי חייב אחת, ובדלא יהיב דמי חייב שתיים. ונראה דלא תחמוד ולא תתאוה הכל אחד הוא וכפל מלה הוא

<sup>16</sup> ספר המצוות לרמב"ם מצוות לא תעשה רסה-רסו וגם במשנה תורה הלכות גזלה ואבדה בכותרת ובפרק א הלכות ט-יב ובספר החינוך מצוות לח ותטז

mere desire and coveting of that which belongs to someone else.<sup>17</sup> He supports his contention with another Mechilta that indicates that the differing languages come to restrict the desire (תאוה) independently of the acquisition (חמוד) of the coveted object.<sup>18</sup> As an aside, the Rambam mysteriously quotes many Midrashei Halacha that were not found in the Midrashim that were currently widely available. As part of the uncovering of the Cairo Geniza, there was a discovery of the Mechilta D'Rashbi (מכילתא) from the school of Rabbi Akiva that differed from the Mechilta that was commonly available, which is the Mechilta D'Rabbi Yishmael (מכילתא דרבי ישמעאל). That discovery suddenly revealed a source that was known to have been available to many of the Rishonim, but thought to have since been lost. It was also instrumental in helping to clarify and understand many of these inexplicable Midrashic quotes of the Rambam, including the one cited above. The Rambam sees the different verbs as pointing to different forms of violations. Lo Tit'Veh is violated by merely having jealous thoughts or plans to acquire a desired object. The actualization of those thoughts adds an additional violation of Lo Tachmod and if the object is taken without compensation it results in a third violation of Lo Tizol. While the Rambam's explanation is compelling in its ability to explain the difference in verbiage, it fails, as both the Smag<sup>19</sup> and the Ibn Ezra<sup>20</sup> point out, because the objects of the verbs seem to imply that there is a greater stringency applied to the possessions of another party (לא רעך לא תחמוד אשת) than to their wife (תתאוה בית רעך רעך).<sup>21</sup>

The Smag and the Ibn Ezra both see the restrictions as being synonymous. Above, it was already noted that the Smag follows the view of many of the Rishonim that Lo Tachmod is only violated if action is taken to bring the improper thoughts to fruition. On the other hand, the Ibn Ezra concludes exactly the opposite, that there is only one negative precept and that is a restriction against having improper thoughts of jealousy and coveting.<sup>22</sup> The Ibn Ezra rails against those that

think that the Torah cannot command one to control their thoughts only their actions.<sup>23</sup> He then explains the proper attitude one must have in order to avoid these improper thoughts of envy. Any wise person knows that the spouse they marry and the material possessions which they have are all allocated from God and not dependent on their intelligence or capabilities. Therefore, it is senseless to desire that which belongs to others, because if God does not will those items for such a person, no force, thoughts or ruses will ever help them to acquire those objects. He compares it to the village pauper who realizes that there is no way he will marry the princess. She is out of his league and thoughts or desires of marrying her are as fanciful dreams as growing wings to be able to fly. Reasonable people do not covet that which is not within their reach. They are happy with that which has been apportioned to them and trust that God will provide them with what they need and that which is good, proper and appropriate for them. The Sefer Ha'Ikarim has a similar view in that the latter five commandments deal with proper social behavior to uphold to civil society.<sup>24</sup> It speaks of one's obligation to not encroach upon the rights of others and the need to protect the other person from your causing them physical damage to their body (לא תרצח, לא תנאף) and to their possessions (לא תגנוב). It then enjoins one to desist from causing damage to others through speech (לא תענה) and thoughts (לא תחמוד).

What is so interesting about the Ibn Ezra's rejection of those that thought that Lo Tachmod and Lo Tit'Veh are differentiated restrictions is that he tells us that those opinions believe that the ninth commandment is Lo Tachmod and the tenth commandment is Lo Tit'Veh. The Ibn Ezra summarily dismisses their view and states that "as I will explain further on, Anochi (אנכי ה' אלקיך) is the first of the Ten Commandments." This would not be so remarkable since that is the commonly accepted view of the majority of the exegetes. Parenthetically, the Ibn Ezra was extremely poor and he jokingly wrote about himself that his Mazal was so bad that if he entered into the burial

<sup>17</sup> נראה שהראב"ד גם מסכים שהוא לא משיג על דברי הרמב"ם האלו במשנה תורה וגם אפשר שזוהי דעת הרמב"ן (דברים ה', ז) וגם רבינו יונה (שערי תשובה שער ג,מג)

<sup>18</sup> מכילתא דרשב"י כ"ד... לחייב על תאוה בפני עצמה ועל חמדה בפני עצמה איזו היא תאוה... מניין התאוה אדם סופו לחמוד שנאמר לא תתאוה ולא תחמוד מניין חמד אדם סופו לגזול...

<sup>19</sup> סמ"ג לאוין סימן קנח ולא יתכן לומר כן כי כתוב בדברות (ואתחנן) לא תחמוד אשת רעך ולא תתאוה בית רעך ולפי דבריו החמיר בבית מבאשת איש, אלא החימוד והתאוה הכל לאו אחד וכן פירשו אונקלוס, לא תרוג וכן (בראשית ב, ט) וחמד למראה מתרגמין דמרגג למחזי וכן פירש רבינו שלמה (ואתחנן) כי הכל אחד אבן עזרא הארוך שמות כ,א גם זה דברי הבל, כי מה טעם יזכור הגזל עם הבית לבדו, והנה לא הזכיר האחרים עמו. והנה אתן לך מדברי משה רבינו שאלה לא דבר נכונה. הנה השם אמר לא תחמוד בית רעך, ומשה אמר לא תחמוד אשת רעך (דבר' ה, יח). ולפי דעתם שלא תחמד השני הכתוב בפרשה הזאת הוא בלב, והראשון

גזלת הבית. והנה משה הפך הדבר, כי אמר עם ולא תתאוה בית רעך, ואמר עם לא תחמד שהוא הגזל אשת רעך. והנה נשחת טעמם

<sup>21</sup> צ"ל לפי הרמב"ם (וגם לפי מכלתא דרשב"י) שהלא תתאוה רק מפרט ומגדיר את האיסור של לא תחמוד ולא מתקשר ישיר לנשוא ובעין זה ברמב"ן דברים ה', ז'... וביאר כי יכנס בכלל חמדה אפילו התאוה

<sup>22</sup> אבן עזרא הארוך כ"ג

<sup>23</sup> שם וגם דברים ה', ז' וגם בספר החינוך מצוה תטז... שזה הדבר אינו כן, ולא יאמרו אותו זולתי הטפשים הרעים והחטאים בנפשותם, כי האמנם ביד האדם למנוע עצמו ומחשבותיו ותאוותיו מכל מה שירצה

<sup>24</sup> ספר העיקרים מאמר שלישי פרק טו ואחר כן שב להזהיר על הדברים הכוללים שהם הכרחיים אל האנשים בבחינת חיותם והתקיימם במדינה כדי שישלם הקבוצ המדיני... שישמור את גוף חבריו... ושישמור ממונו... ושישמור הדבר שהוא כמוצק בין גופו וקנינו וזהו אשתו... כי גם צריך שיזהר שלא יזיקו אפילו בדבור... וגם לא במחשבה, וזהו לא תחמוד...

business (חברה קדישא) people would stop dying. In order to make a living and solicit sponsorships he therefore penned multiple commentaries on the Torah. In Shmot, we have his longer (פירוש הארוך) and shorter (פירוש הקצר) commentaries. Surprisingly, the Ibn Ezra in his alternate commentary to Shmot, hints at the fact that he does not necessarily subscribe to this generally accepted view.<sup>25</sup>

The Ibn Ezra in this week's Parsha explains that the word Chemed (חמד) has two meanings in the Torah.<sup>26</sup> One is theft, extortion and the taking of another's possessions through force and blackmail.<sup>27</sup> The other is desire of the heart that is never actualized.<sup>28</sup> He then makes an amazing statement that the first Lo Tachmod in Shmot is the ninth commandment and the second Lo Tachmod is the tenth commandment.<sup>29</sup> The best proof to that, he continues, is that Moshe switched one of the Lo Tachmods from Shmot to Lo Tit'aveh in Va'Etchanan. This is the opinion that the Ibn Ezra dismissed in his longer commentary to Shmot and hinted at in his shorter commentary to Shmot.<sup>30</sup> Well then, if that is case, which of the first eight commandments does the Ibn Ezra remove to only have Ten Commandments? Shockingly, the answer is the first commandment.

There is strong evidence to support this view of the Ibn Ezra. Firstly, the commandment of Anochi (אנכי ה' אלקיך) has no active demand in it. On the surface, it is simply a statement of fact, a given article of faith. In addition, returning to the question earlier as to how do we know which of the ten commandments are the Ten Commandments? The simplest division would be to look at the paragraph delineators in the Torah. The Aseret HaDibrot are divided up into ten paragraphs (פרשיות סתומות) that are indicated by a Samech (o) in the printed Chumashim. If you look carefully, Anochi and Lo Iyeh are in a single Parshia, while Lo Tachmod is divided into two Parshiyot. Obviously, most Rishonim argue on this stance, including the Ibn Ezra himself in Sefer Shmot. They believe that Anochi is a command, not just a given, and there are mitigating factors that might necessitate the combining of the first two commandments into a single Parshia, including the fact that they are unique in their being heard by Bnei Yisrael directly from God. If one does subscribe to that view, then one has to

explain why Shabbat is only one commandment and why Lo Tachmod is divided into two Parshiyot.

In summary, we saw three views in the commentators as to what is the definition of the negative precept of Lo Tachmod. Either acting on one's improper thoughts or having those improper thoughts or both of those possibilities. The restriction of Lo Tachmod speaks to the importance of having the right mindset and outlook so that one minimizes the possibility of encountering the pernicious and destructive forces of jealousy and coveting. As the verse in Mishlei says, "Jealousy is rot to the bones."<sup>31</sup> In addition, we saw that it might pay to take another look at the Aseret HaDibrot and not just take for granted that there are Ten Commandments. That means the next time someone asks you, "what are the Ten Commandments?" You can answer, "Well, it depends!"

Shabbat Shalom

<sup>25</sup>אבן עזרא הקצר שמות כ,ב מספר עשרת הדברים על דעת כל המפרשים שהראשון הוא דבור אנכי והשני לא יהיה לך, ואני אגלה לך דעתי בפרשת אתחנן.

<sup>26</sup>דברים ה,יז וכך ולא יחמוד איש את ארצך (שמות לד, כד). כי אם אין פירושו כן, הנה תהיה הארץ רעה, ולא בא הכתוב אלא לשבח

<sup>28</sup>לשון תאוה בלב ולא תצא לפועל

<sup>29</sup>אחרי זה הוא מביא אפשרות אחרת...או בית רעך כלל שיכול להטעים לפירושו של הרמב"ם והרמב"ן ולא להפריד אותם לשני דברות

<sup>30</sup>אבן עזרא הארוך כ,א

<sup>31</sup>ח"י בשרים לב מרפא ורקב עצמות קנאה (משלי יד,ל)