

"He (the unintentional murderer) shall flee to one of these cities (of refuge) and live." (19:5)

The importance of *hju*, "*he shall live*," is underscored by the *Rambam* in *Hilchos Rotze'ach* 7:1 where he states, "*A student who is exiled to the cities of refuge, his Torah teacher is exiled with him, as it says in the Torah, 'He shall live; make it for him that he shall live.'*" For those who are wise and who seek wisdom (of *Torah*), the inability to learn *Torah* properly (without their *rebbe*) would be like death. This same *halachah* is applicable in the event a *Torah* teacher is exiled; his students are exiled with him. Conversely, when addressing the needs of the *eved Canaani*, the gentile slave who was exiled, the *Rambam* states that the master is not subject to supporting him. This is based upon the *Talmud* in *Gittin 12a* which derives from *hju*, "*he shall live*," that it is sufficient simply to provide for the slave. This can be accomplished through the slave's labor in the city of refuge.

We have before us two disparate interpretations of the word *hju*, "*he shall live*". In regard to a *rebbe* and *talmid*, we are to go to the limit to provide for them so that they shall "live". Concerning the slave, however, as long as he has enough to "live," it is sufficient. Do not these variant interpretations represent some sort of double standard?

Horav Boruch Ber Leibowitz, zl, presents a distinction between material and spiritual needs as the rationale supporting these two interpretations. When we provide material needs, it is sufficient for one to have only the bare necessities of food and shelter. When man's spiritual dimension is the subject of our concern, when his *Torah* study is in question, no limitations apply. The *Torah* is *Toras Chaim*, the *Torah* of life. It is one's essence, and, consequently, we can never view it as a luxury. After all, is air a luxury?