

INTERNET PARSHA SHEET
ON MIKETZ CHANUKA 2 - 5760

To receive this parsha sheet in WP 6.1 file (readable by Word), send e-mail message to cshulman@cahill.com & crshulman@aol.com

From: torahweb[SMTP:torahweb@torahweb.org] To: weeklydvartorah@torahweb.org Subject: Rav Mordechai Willig - Shabbat Chanukah [From last week]

RAV MORDECHAI WILLIG SHABBAT CHANUKAH

The Gemara (Shabbat 28a) states that an under bar or bat mitzvah katan who lit ner Chanukah did nothing, meaning that other household members cannot fulfill their obligation through him or her: But a woman can certainly light for the household, as women are obligated in ner Chanukah for they too were involved in the miracle of Chanukah.

The Shulchan Aruch (675:3) quotes these rules, and adds: Some say that a katan who reached the age of chinuch, education, can light for others: The reason is that Chanukah is a rabbinic obligation, and a katan is also obligated miderabanan.

The Mishna Brurah (13) says that the Shulchan Aruch omits the view that a katan who reached the age of chinuch may read for a gadol concerning the megilla on Purim, which is also rabbinic: Therefore, [the similar situation] is rejected on Chanukah as well. However, one can distinguish as follows:

A katan's action cannot discharge a gadol's personal obligation, such as megilla, but on Chanukah the mitzvah is on the household and as long as the candle has a status of ner Chanukah, such as that of an educable katan, it fulfills the obligation of the households.

Our custom is that every male lights with a bracha to fulfill the mitzva better, as mehadrin. The Mishnah Berurah (9) adds that a woman may make a bracha on her additional ner Chanukah, as she can on any other time-dependent mitzvot aseh such as lulav and sukkah. This statement is very difficult. A woman is obligated in ner Chanukah, and must make a bracha even if she may not make a bracha on sukkah and lulav, as the Shulchan Aruch rules, and is the Sephardic custom.

The answer is that a woman is not required to perform the additional level of mehadrin. But, this too is difficult. Why is she different from a man?

Apparently, women's involvement in the Chanukah miracle obligates them to publicize the miracle. This obligation, known as pirsuma nissa must be obvious to any onlooker. It is obvious that a person is looking at a ner. It is not obvious that halachically one person's lighting fulfills the lighting obligation of all household members. Therefore, women are included only in the obligation of looking at ner Chanukah not lighting the ner. Of course, if a woman lives alone she must light a ner in order to see it. However, she has no obligation to light as such.

As a result, the idea of mehadrin, that all household members light separately, is incumbent only on men who are required to light. Women need not do so. If they volunteer, they can make a bracha just as when they volunteer to fulfill sukkah and lulav.

In many homes women do not volunteer to light their own mehadring ner- why is that? The Mishna Berurah says (677:16) that a married woman is not included in mehadrin. If she volunteers, her bracha may be a bracha levatala. Therefore, even single women do not volunteer, to avoid either bracha levatala or disappointment over discontinuing lighting ner Chanukah upon their marriage.

From: Rabbi Yissocher Frand[SMTP:ryfrand@torah.org]
"RAVFRAND" LIST - RABBI FRAND ON CHANUKAH

B'S'D'A Thought on Chanukah

We celebrate Chanukah on the twenty-fifth of Kislev, to commemorate the rededication of the Beis HaMikdash [Temple] by the Chashmonaim [Maccabees] after it had been defiled by the Syrian-Greeks. However, the Medrash tells us of another event that happened during this time of year that is also worthy of the name 'Chanukah' [dedication].

The Medrash tells us that the Mishkan [Tabernacle] was finished on the twenty-fifth day of Kislev. The Jewish people had received the command to construct the Mishkan on the first Yom Kippur (tenth of Tishrei), immediately after Moshe descended from Mt. Sinai with the second set of Tablets (following the sin of the Golden Calf). The process of gathering the materials, building all the component parts, and preparing the Mishkan for assembly took approximately 10 weeks; the completion date being the twenty-fifth of Kislev. Although the Mishkan was ready on that date, it was not actually erected until more than three months later, on the first of Nissan.

The Medrash says that the fact that the Mishkan was "ready to go" on the twenty-fifth of Kislev is another reason for celebrating this holiday of Temple Dedication (Chanukah) on this particular date. Apparently, according to this Medrash, when we light the menorah on Chanukah, we are not only supposed to think about the Chashmonaim and the rededication of the Beis HaMikdash. Rather, there is an additional Chanukah that we are supposed to be thinking about, that the Mishkan was finished and was ready for assembly on this date as well.

The obvious question is: why didn't they assemble the Mishkan on the twenty-fifth of Kislev? If the Mishkan was ready for assembly, why did they wait? Furthermore, if there was no dramatic culmination of the building process on Chanukah -- then what is the point of remembering that the preparations were completed then?

Rav Nissan Alpert offers a beautiful insight. The lesson to be learned from the fact that the Mishkan was ready to be built on the 25th day of Kislev, but was not erected until Rosh Chodesh Nissan, is that Judaism is not a "bottom-line religion". If Judaism were such a religion then all the efforts and preparation for assembling the Mishkan would be secondary. "Just put it up, and let's use it."

That is not the way Judaism works. Judaism is a religion of effort. One must try. One must engage in the human actions necessary to accomplish a goal. Results are not up to us and G-d does not demand results. G-d only demands effort.

This is what the delay teaches us. If immediately upon completion of the effort, we had been given the command to erect it right then, the message would be that the donations and efforts for all those months were only for a utilitarian purpose. The message would be "The end result is all that counts."

In Judaism, the mere effort -- doing everything that was involved in gathering the materials and constructing the components of the Mishkan in the Dessert -- is itself a major accomplishment in the eyes of G-d. So much of Judaism is like that.

This is particularly true for individuals who work in the field of spiritual outreach (Kiruv). We all think in terms of "Have we helped someone yet?" We all would like to think that we can invite a Jew who is unfamiliar with Judaism for a single meal and he will walk out the door a committed Jew for life. The tendency is to think, "If I did not help him to change, it was a wasted effort."

We put our children in a Jewish Day School; we pay tuition; we learn with them. However, they do not always turn out the way we would want them to.

Are these failures? In the secular world that would be failure. "If you can't produce results, you're fired!" But in Judaism, all G-d asks is that we "do". Results are up to G-d.

This is the lesson of the Mishkan. The Mishkan was completed on the 25th of Kislev. There was no need to assemble the Mishkan

immediately because the preparation in and of itself was already a great accomplishment.

This, too, is what the message of Chanukah is all about. If people were strictly interested in results, then the 'few' would never have challenged the 'many'. "What is the sense of fighting an enemy that greatly outnumbers us? It is futile. Why fight? How can we realistically expect that the weak shall defeat the mighty? Why should we even go through the effort if we have no hope for success?"

Similarly, they only had one small jug of oil, why even try lighting the Menorah on that first night? It would not last until a new supply of oil could be prepared. Why not just wait until there is enough oil? Why bother lighting it for even one night, if the job can not be completed?

But the Chashmonaim knew the lesson of Judaism. We must try and make the effort, independent of any expectation of seeing results. If the Chashmonaim had a "bottom-line" attitude, we would not have had the miracle of Chanukah. Rather, the Jewish attitude is to do our best at whatever we are supposed to do. That is the attitude that gave us the holiday.

"A song to the Dedication of the House, to David" [Tehillim 30:1]. This Psalm refers to the Beis Hamikdash, the Temple. However, David HaMelech [King David] did not build the Beis HaMikdash. David HaMelech's son Shlomo built it. And nonetheless, it is a song to the dedication of the House, to DAVID. David HaMelech wanted to build the House. He waged the necessary battles that paved the way for the Beis HaMikdash to be built. Therefore G-d considers it his Beis HaMikdash. In Judaism it is the effort that counts.

Personalities and Sources HaKesav v'Hakabbalah (1785-1865) [Rav Yaakov Tzvi Mecklenburg]; Koenigberg, Germany. Rav Nissan Alpert (died 1986) Rav of Aguda of Long Island; Maggid Shiur, Yeshivas Rabbeinu Yitzchak Elchanan.

Transcribed by David Twersky; Seattle, Washington
twerskyd@aol.com Technical Assistance by Dovid Hoffman;
Yerushalayim dhoffman@torah.org

Visit <http://www.yadyechiel.org/> This write-up was adapted from the hashkafa portion of Rabbi Yissocher Frand's Commuter Chavrusah Torah Tape series on the weekly Torah portion. Tapes or a complete catalogue can be ordered from the Yad Yechiel Institute, PO Box 511, Owings Mills MD 21117-0511. Call (410) 358-0416 or e-mail tapes@yadyechiel.org or visit <http://www.yadyechiel.org/> for further information. RavFrand, Copyright © 1999 by Rabbi Y. Frand and Project Genesis, Inc. Project Genesis: Torah on the Information Superhighway learn@torah.org 17 Warren Road, Suite 2B <http://www.torah.org/> Baltimore, MD 21208 (410) 602-1350 FAX: 602-1351

From: Kenneth Block [SMTP:kenblock@worldnet.att.net] Subject: NCYI WEEKLY DIVREI TORAH - MIKETZ

Parshat Miketz Shabbat Chanukah
RABBI MARC PENNER

YOUNG ISRAEL OF HOLLISWOOD, NY

This Shabbat we light not one, but two sets of candles. On the simplest level, the light of the Shabbat and Chanuka candles serve a functional purpose. In the case of the Shabbat candles, we add to our oneg Shabbat. The light provides for shalom bayit by steering us around household disasters. Chanuka candles, as we know, publicize the Chanuka miracles to our family and all those in our surroundings.

Light in the Jewish tradition has a metaphysical dimension as well. The midrash tells us that light is a manifestation of the Divine. "Oteh ohr kesalma" - G-d "wears" light as His garment. "Yaer HaShem panav eilecha" G-d casts light upon us as He cares for our needs.

Where there is an additional light, there is a greater sense of the presence of HaShem. In this sense, we can look upon the lights of Shabbat and Chanuka with greater understanding. The Shabbat candles lit on the dining room table inside the home serve to invite G-d into our homes. Rav Soloveitchik, z"tl, explained in one of his famous yarzeit shiurim that while on the rigalim (holidays) we go to G-d's home (the Beit HaMikdash) on Shabbat we host His presence in our homes. The

lighting of neirot Shabbat serves not only to help us bring in the Shabbat from an halachic standpoint, but also to create a feeling of holiness in the home.

Rabbi Adin Steinsaltz explains that even the nature of the flame is significant. On erev Shabbat we light the stillest flame possible. Two (or more) almost motionless fires represent the tranquility that we feel on Shabbat in G-d's presence. As Shabbat leaves, the flickering (of many wicks) havdala candle lets us feel the turmoil of entering the days of chol (weekday).

What about neirot Chanuka? The candles, placed outside on our windowsills, serve not to bring HaShem into our homes, but to bring Him to those on the street.

As the original menorah, lit perhaps outside of its usual place (bechatzrot kodshecha) to provide additional light to those far away, the menorah serves to bring the light of Torah to those far away from Yiddishkeit.

Rabbi Ben Zion Firer notes that the relative importance of each set of candles is clear. As the Gemara tells us in Masechet Shabbat "ner beito v'ner Chanuka" - if one only has the funds for one set of candles - "ner beito adif." The Shabbat candles take precedence over neirot Chanuka. Perhaps, the Gemara is telling us that one must first create a Torah environment in the home and only then can one effectively spread it to others.

Perhaps, he adds, it is fitting that these two lights with two different purposes are lit by different people. Shabbat candles are lit by the wife or mother alone, for shalom bayit requires that the children follow their parents. Furthermore, as the akeret habayit, she sets the tone of G-dliness in the home. Neirot Chanuka, however, serve to take Torah out to the street and are thus lit by all - especially the children.

Who better to help carry the flag of the Torah than those filled with enthusiasm and zeal? The light on the children's faces helps magnify the brightness of neirot Chanuka and reflect that light upon others.

A happy Chanuka to you and all to all of Klal Yisrael.

A project of the National Council of Young Israel 3 West 16th Street, New York, NY 10011 kenblock@youngisrael.org

From: Shlomo Katz [SMTP:skatz@torah.org]

HAMAAYAN / THE TORAH SPRING EDITED BY SHLOMO KATZ
Miketz

Sponsored by the Vogel family on the yahrzeit of Miriam bat Yehuda Laib a"h (Mary Kalkstein)

Today, the last day of Chanukah is known as "Zot Chanukah." This name is taken from one of the verses in the Torah reading for the eighth day of Chanukah (Bemidbar 7:84), "Zot chanukat ha'mizbeach . . ." "This was the dedication of the altar . . ." R' Zvi Elimelech of Dinov z"l (died 1841) elaborates on the significance of that name and of the day:

The Torah reading for the eighth day of Chanukah (the maftir, when it falls on Shabbat) begins with the sacrifice brought by the prince of the tribe of Menashe. The twelve tribes correspond to the twelve months, and the month that corresponds to Menashe is Cheshvan. (This is true when one counts Nissan as the first month and counts the tribes in the order that they traveled in the desert and also brought their sacrifices, as related in the Torah reading for Chanukah.)

Cheshvan is the month when, according to tradition, the Bet Hamikdash will be rebuilt. (The first Bet Hamikdash was dedicated in Tishrei, which corresponds to Ephraim, while the second Bet Hamikdash was rededicated in Kislev, which corresponds to Binyamin. Thus, all three Temples were or will be dedicated in months that are connected with the children of Rachel, the "Akkeret Ha'bayit"/"Mistress of the House" [i.e., the Temple].)

On the eighth day of Chanukah, when we read about the sacrifice of

Menashe's descendant, we allow ourselves to look forward to the future redemption, which also is connected with Menashe, as explained above. We say, "This is the dedication" - Let us soon see the Temple's final dedication. (Bnei Yissaschar)

...
"Then Reuven said to his father, 'You may slay my two sons if I fail to bring him [Binyamin] back to you.'" (42:37)

Rashi writes: Yaakov did not accept Reuven's proposal because he said, "This is a fool who proposes that I kill his sons. Are they not also my sons?"

Yet, when Yehuda later proposed (43:9), "I will personally guarantee him; from my own hand you can demand him; if I do not bring him back to you and stand him before you, then I will have sinned to you for all time," Yaakov agreed. Why didn't Yaakov respond, "Are you not my son? I do not want you to lose your share in the World-to-Come!" [This was Yehuda's proposal - that he would not find eternal rest if he did not bring Binyamin back.]

R' Baruch Sorotzkin z"l (1917-1979; Rosh Yeshiva of the Telshe Yeshiva) explains: Yehuda laid everything he had on the line. He was sure that, with G-d's help, he would return Binyamin to their father. Reuven did not demonstrate that level of trust in Hashem. Reuven had four sons; thus, when he offered only two of his sons as a guarantee, it appeared that he was not sure he would succeed in his mission.

R' Sorotzkin continues: Bitachon/trust-in-Hashem is the absolutely indispensable prerequisite to success in serving Hashem. The classic work Chovot Halevavot teaches that one cannot serve Hashem if one does not have peace of mind, and one cannot have peace of mind if he lacks bitachon, the belief that no one can harm you in any way unless that is the will of Hashem. (Ha'binah Ve'ha'berachah p. 95)

... Hamaayan, Copyright © 1999 by Shlomo Katz and Project Genesis, Inc. Posted by Alan Broder, ajb@torah.org .
<http://www.torah.org/learning/hamaayan/> .
<http://www.acoast.com/~sehc/hamaayan/> . Donations to HaMaayan are tax-deductible. Project Genesis: Torah on the Information Superhighway
learn@torah.org 17 Warren Road, Suite 2B Baltimore, MD 21208
(410) 602-1350

<http://www.jpost.co.il/Columns/Article-4.html> Thursday, December 9, 1999 __ 30 Kislev 5760 __ Updated Thu., Dec. 09 11:40
SHABBAT SHALOM: MIGHT MUST SERVE RIGHT BY RABBI SHLOMO RISKIN (December 9)

"And Joseph knew his brethren but they knew him not. And Joseph remembered the dreams which he dreamed of them, and said unto them: 'You are spies, to see the nakedness of the land you have come.' " (Gen. 42:8-9)

How can we understand the bitter enmity felt by Joseph's brothers when they decided to be rid of him? To be sure, sibling rivalry is not uncommon - but not to the extent of a willingness to actually do away with the "chosen darling" forever! And after all, here in the Torah we are dealing with the children of Jacob-Israel, the grandchildren of Isaac and Abraham. Moreover, even when Judah suggests that Joseph not be allowed to die in the pit but rather be sold unto Egypt, he adds the words: "for he is our brother, our very flesh." (Gen. 37:27) Given the inherent cruelty of a sale into slavery, do these words not sound hypocritical?

It's understandable that the brothers are perplexed by Joseph, an arrogant "megalomaniac" who dreams of dominating them. He is apparently cut from a different cloth, an aristocratic dreamer among down-to-earth shepherds. But there is also an ideological dimension to their opposition. They see themselves as the heirs of the tradition of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob - nomads who travel with their sheep through the length and breadth of Israel, with plenty of time to meditate with

their new-found God. And suddenly here is Joseph and his dreams, abhorrent to them not only because of their provocative message of domination, but also because of their content: sheaves of wheat, which evoke the different and difficult back-breaking life of the farmer. Gone is the time to repeat family history and pray to the Divine, traded in for the more modern, pagan and scientific advance known as farming.

And his second dream only compounds their fear: the sun, moon and stars evoke a cosmopolitanism which is a far cry from family traditions centered in a promised homeland! From the brothers' perspective, Joseph represents a foreign strain, a threat to the family patrimony, an antibody much more akin to Ishmael and Esau than to the pastoral orientation of Isaac and Jacob. And until this point in the Bible, the good sons have been strengthened by cutting them off from the evil sons. The descendants of Cain are isolated out, the evil generation of Noah is inundated by a flood, Ishmael is banished and Esau is excluded from Israel. In a similar fashion, the brothers see their duty to be the elimination of this mutant strain called Joseph.

Hence, as Rabbi Mordechai Elon points out, although Joseph regards his siblings as brothers - he goes off in search of them despite the apparent danger, the text reiterating his brotherly concern (Gen. 37:16, 17) - they never so much as refer to him as "brother." For them, he is a "him," an "other." Indeed, when Joseph is sent to inquire about his brothers' welfare, he meets an unidentified man who attempts to guide him: "The man said, they have journeyed hence..." (Gen. 37:17), and Rashi comments that they had "traveled away from the brotherhood," confirming the split.

The exception is Judah. He understands the danger of the message which Joseph is communicating, but reminds his brothers that neither Ishmael nor Esau were killed; they were merely separated out, banished from Abraham's household. It is enough to have him disappear into Egypt. Joseph our brother is to be sold, but not slain.

And the brothers truly hear and internalize Judah's words. In this week's portion of Miketz, for the first time, they actually begin to identify Joseph as "our brother."

Arriving in Egypt during the famine which has affected Canaan, their presence arouses attention, and they are accused of being spies. In their defense, they relate the tale of their family, including the existence of a younger brother, Benjamin. When the Grand Vizier (Joseph) commands them to leave one of their number as hostage until they return with Benjamin, the brothers sense that God is punishing them: "We are guilty concerning our brother, in that we saw the distress of his soul, when he implored us, and we would not hear; therefore is this distress come upon us." (Gen. 42:21)

From their use of the term "our brother" we can conclude that a new relationship is about to be formed. The brothers have indeed repented via a vis Joseph! They now recognize him as a sibling - albeit as a dangerous sibling who had to be banished.

But Joseph has to be sent away - with his gifts of technology and administration, his dreams of universalism - only if he insists on dominating the tradition and Israel-centeredness of his brothers. If Joseph would accept a subservient position, using his intellect and vision for the greater glory of Torah, then the family could indeed be united and the seeds for ultimate redemption could be sown.

"And Joseph said to his brothers: 'Come close now to me' " and Rashi comments: "He showed them that he was circumcised." (Gen. 45:4) Joseph is not only identifying himself physically; he is telling them that he shares their fate. He is subjugating his science and his universalism to the mission of the Abrahamic vision. Joseph too has repented from his earlier arrogant dreams.

Hanukka leaves us with a parallel message - and therefore it always comes during these Torah portions. It begins with a civil war between brothers, Hellenist Josephians versus Religionist Judeans. It concludes with the vision of the Menora, the light of Torah reigning supreme, but

with the support of the seven branches and seven lights of the wisdoms of the world. Only wisdom together with, but subservient to, the God-inspired ethics and morality of Torah can bring true freedom.

Shabbat Shalom and Happy Hanukka

peninim@jen.co.il PENINIM ON THE TORAH BY RABBI A. LEIB SCHEINBAUM PARSHAS MIKEITZ

It happened at the end of two years to the day, and Pharaoh dreamed. (41:1) The commentators explain that the "two years" that preceded Pharaoh's dream is a reference to the two years that followed Yosef's interpretation of the dreams of Pharaoh's chamberlains. After two years the chief cup-bearer "remembered" how Yosef had successfully interpreted his dream. The Midrash explains the word "mikeitz," as "keitz sam la'choshech," Hashem ended the darkness to which Yosef had been subjected, and he was subsequently taken from prison. The Bais Halevi comments that this parsha serves as the key to understanding Divine Providence, to comprehending the true concept of sibah and mesovev, cause and effect.

Horav Matisyahu Solomon, Shlita, explains this in the following manner: Simply, one would say that the course of events seems apparent. Pharaoh had a strange dream, which no one could interpret for him acceptably. The chief cup-bearer finally remembered that there was a gifted young Jewish slave in jail who could successfully interpret dreams. He suggested to Pharaoh that he might ask Yosef to interpret his dream. The rest is history. The sibah, cause and reason, for initiating the cycle of events "seems" to be Pharaoh's dream. The pasuk doesn't indicate this when it says, "It happened at the end of two years to the day." This implies that the cause was the fact that two years had passed; Yosef's tenure in prison had come to an end. Thus, Pharaoh had a dream that would eventually facilitate Yosef's release from prison. The "sibah" is Yosef's need to be released - not Pharaoh's dream. On the contrary, Pharaoh dreamed because Yosef was destined to be released!

We derive from here that our concept of cause and effect is distorted. What we think is the cause is, for the most part, the effect and visa versa. The sibah, cause for everything that occurs, is Hashem's decree. Throughout Jewish history, from our very first episode of galus, exile, we have experienced incidents of hester panim, Divine concealment, in which Hashem hides His presence and guiding Hand. He causes people to perform actions inadvertently that are irrational and unexplainable. This is part of His sibah, cause, for "arranging" a certain result. Hashem does not punish us for a shogeg, inadvertent action. The Ramban claims that in mechiras Yosef, sale of Yosef, everyone was taken to task for their inadvertent actions. Yosef erred in misjudging his brothers, wrongly accusing them of transgression. They also misconstrued Yosef's actions as reflecting hostile and aggressive attitude towards them. They were both chastised for their misconceptions. Yaakov Avinu also erred in assuming that the brothers hated Yosef. Yaakov was not punished for his error. Ramban remarks that there is a profound lesson to be derived herein. Hashem causes every "shegagah," involuntary action/error, for a reason. Each one of the errors of Yosef and his brothers serves to teach us this lesson. This is why one is not responsible and is not punished for a shegagah: because he errs in response to Hashem's will.

Horav Solomon cites an incredible passage in Chazal which corroborates this idea. The Talmud in Gittin 56 quotes the dialogue between the Caesar and Rabbi Yochanan ben Zakai that preceded the destruction of the Bais Hamikdash. The Caesar instructed Rabbi Yochanan, "tell me, what do you want and I will grant it." Rabbi Yochanan responded, "Give me a doctor to heal Rabbi Zadok. Give me Yavne and its scholars, etc." The Talmud questions why he did not ask Caesar to spare Yerushalayim. Chazal respond that when Hashem makes a decree, when He wants something to happen, it happens. Suddenly, all the wise men become deficient. To paraphrase Horav Solomon, "This is

an example of hester panim, Hashem's concealment; people do things that are not ordinary or rational." What we are being taught is simple: There are incidents or situations in life when we notice people who are -- to the best of our knowledge -- normal, intelligent human beings acting in a manner totally out of character. We must view these irrational moments as Divinely ordained. Before we disparage a person, we should reflect on the source of his behavior.

...

From: OHR SOMAYACH [SMTP:ohr@virtual.co.il] * TORAH WEEKLY * Highlights of the Weekly Torah Portion Parshat Miketz ... Sparks in the Dark

"And the emaciated and inferior cows ate up the first seven healthy cows. They came inside them, but it was not apparent that they had come inside them, for their appearance remained as inferior as at first." (41:20-21)

It's amazing. However far a Jew strays from his or her roots, you'll still find a menorah burning in their window. There may be a Chanukah bush at the other end of the living room, there maybe cheeseburgers on the table. But while there's a little spark of Judaism left, a Chanukah menorah still shines there in the window.

When the Ancient Greeks defiled the Holy Temple, they overlooked one little flask of oil. It was that little flask, untouched and untainted, which allowed the Menorah to blaze into light when Judah Maccabee and the Hasmoneans defeated the might of Greece and the Jewish People returned to the Holy Temple.

Inside every Jew there is a little spark of holiness, a flask of pure oil, a light that never goes out. All the "Greeks" of history, in all the lands of our exile, have tried to sully that oil, to put out that little light, but it can never be extinguished. How many millions of our people have given up their lives for that little spark? Evil may trumpet its vainglory to the skies, but it can never put out that light.

If you think about it, probably the biggest miracle of all is that evil itself can exist. The definition of evil is "that which G-d doesn't want." If the whole world is no more than an expression of G-d's will, how can evil exist?

This is a secret which the mind of man may contemplate but never fathom. Maybe one approach is that evil can only exist by virtue of some spark of holiness wrapped inside it that gives it its life force, its ability to exist at all.

In this week's Parsha we read: "And the emaciated and inferior cows ate up the first seven healthy cows. They came inside them, but it was not apparent that they had come inside them, for their appearance remained as inferior as at first." (41:20-21)

In the above verse, the emaciated and inferior cows symbolize the forces of evil. The healthy cows represent the forces of holiness. The emaciated cows eat up the healthy cows and yet, from the outside, the spark of holiness is totally undetectable: "It was not apparent that they (the healthy cows) had come inside them..." Nevertheless, it is the spark of holiness which gives them their life force.

The Jewish People are in their darkest exile. G-d's presence is so hidden we don't even see that His concealment is concealed. We live in a double-blind world where evil seems to thrive; where tragedy abounds; where selfishness and materialism have eaten to the very core. Yet, in the heart of all this evil -- there is a holy center. Without that component of sanctity, evil would cease to exist in a second. For by itself, evil can have no toehold in existence.

But that holy spark burns on in the heart of the Jewish people. The menorah represents the heart of the Jewish People, and in that heart burns a little flame that cannot go out. Any day now, that spark will burst into a fire that will consume all the crass materialism like so much straw, and then we will no longer light our menorahs in the windows of

New York, London and Buenos Aires. Any day, the kohen gadol will once again enter the Holy of Holies and re-light the lights that have burned in holy Jewish Hearts through millennia, sealed inside that flask that can never be sullied or spoiled. Sources Sfat Emet

Written and Compiled by Rabbi Yaakov Asher Sinclair General Editor: Rabbi Moshe Newman Production Design: Eli Ballon Ohr Somayach International 22 Shimon Hatzadik Street, POB 18103 Jerusalem 91180, Israel E-Mail: info@ohr.org.il Home Page: http://www.ohr.org.il

From: Jeffrey Gross[SMTP:jgross@torah.org] Weekly-halacha for 5760 Selected Halachos Relating to Parshas Miketz

BY RABBI DONIEL NEUSTADT

A discussion of Halachic topics related to the Parsha of the week. For final rulings, consult your Rav.

CHASAN AND KALLAH: THE SEVEN FESTIVE DAYS

For seven days after their wedding, the chasan and kallah continue to joyously celebrate their marriage. Indeed, the seven days following a wedding are considered like a "private Yom Tov" for the chasan and kallah(1). It is important that the young couple, along with their families, study the following laws and customs before the wedding so that they start off their married life in accordance with the halacha:

OBLIGATION OF SIMCHAH

The chasan is obligated to spend time with his bride and make her happy for the entire seven festive days. [Even if the chasan or the kallah was previously married, the couple is still obligated to perform the mitzvah of simcha for seven days. If, however, both the chasan and kallah were previously married, then they are obligated to engage in the mitzvah of simcha for only three days(2).]

The chasan and kallah must eat their meals together(3). The chasan should limit his Torah study during this time, i.e., he should not immerse himself in intricate texts but rather engage in less demanding area of study(4). If the kallah does not mind, however, he may study whatever he chooses(5).

The chasan and kallah dress in their better clothing (bigdei kavod)(6). It is a mitzvah for others to make the chasan and kallah happy and to praise them throughout the entire seven festive days(7). It is permitted for a chasan and kallah to visit the sick and to comfort mourners during this time(8).

WALKING ALONE

A chasan may not walk unaccompanied outside [in the street or in the market place] during the seven festive days, and neither may a kallah(9). Two reasons for this prohibition are given: 1) A chasan and kallah must be carefully watched so that mazikim do not attack them(10); 2) It is not befitting the honor of a chasan and kallah to walk out alone during their first week of marriage. The following rules apply:

The prohibition applies even during the day(11) and even if there are many people in the street(12).

They are not to go out even to shul(13) or for the performance of any other mitzvah, unless that mitzvah must be fulfilled and no one else is available and they cannot go together(14).

The chasan and kallah may go outside together even if they are not accompanied by others(15).

According to one opinion, the chasan or kallah should not even be alone inside the house during these seven festive days; they must be accompanied by at least one person at all times(16).

WORK

The chasan and kallah(17) are prohibited from doing any work or engaging in any business for the entire seven days. This prohibition stands even if the kallah allows the chasan to work.

There are different opinions in the poskim regarding the type of "work" that is prohibited. Some maintain that only work that entails tichah (toil) or is very time consuming (such as most labors which are prohibited on Chol ha-Moed) is prohibited(18). Others, however, hold that even light housework, except for work entailed in food preparation, is prohibited(19).

A chasan and kallah may deposit their gifts in the bank and may go shopping for household appliances and furniture(20).

It is permitted for the chasan and kallah to do any work or engage in any business if otherwise they would incur a loss (melechtes davar ha-aveid) and no one else can take care of it for them(21).

According to most poskim, a chasan and kallah are allowed to take a haircut during this time(22).

SHEVA BERACHOS

Nowadays, it has become common place for a newlywed couple to be regaled at least one festive meal a day by their relatives and friends during the first week of marriage. At such a festive meal, seven additional blessings (Sheva Berachos) are recited after Birkas ha-mazon is completed, provided that several conditions, which will be enumerated in next week's column, are present.

It must be stressed, however, that while the basic concept of Sheva Berachos is recorded in the Talmud(23) and codified in Shulchan Aruch, there is no obligation for a chasan and kallah to partake in this type of meal. Indeed, in earlier times many communities did not celebrate Sheva Berachos at all(24), and some communities never even heard of it(25). Some poskim even question whether or not this type of meal is considered a seudas mitzvah(26). Accordingly, while it is recommended by some poskim(27) for the chasan and kallah to partake in Sheva Berachos at least once a day(28), and this has become the common practice(29), it is

by no means an obligation(30). If they so desire, they may eat by themselves or with their immediate family and no Sheva Berachos will be recited. When Sheva Berachos meals become a source of stress, strain or strife for the couple or their families, they should be advised that such meals are absolutely not required. Many people are not aware of this.

The seven festive days begin immediately after the chupah. There are three possible timetables:

If the chupah takes place at night, that night and the day after are considered day one, followed by another six nights and days.

If the chupah takes place by day (any time before sunset) then that day is considered day one, and that night plus the next day is considered day two. This is so even if the yichud and the actual meal took place entirely at night(31).

If the chupah takes place after sunset but was completely over before the stars came out (during bein hashemashos) some poskim consider that day as day one(32) while others hold that the first day begins only that night(33).

On the seventh day of the seven festive days, Sheva Berachos should be recited before sunset(34). If that cannot be arranged, some poskim allow reciting Sheva Berachos up to 40 minutes past sunset [in the United States](35), while many other poskim are stringent and do not allow reciting any one of the blessings even one minute after sunset(36).

FOOTNOTES: 1 While Shivas yemie hamishte is a Rabbinical obligation (Rambam Hilchos I'shus 10:12), see Rambam Hilchos Avel 5:1 that it was originally enacted by Moshe Rabbeinu. See also Rashi and Ramban Bereishis 29:27. 2 Chelkas Mechokek 64:4. 3 While it is permitted for the kallah to be mochel and allow the chasan to spend time or eat by himself during the seven festive days (Rama E.H. 64:2) it is not recommended and it is not customary that she do so (Chupas Chasanim 14:2). 4 Chida in Shiyurei Brachah E.H. 64. 5 Tzitz Eliezer 12:73. 6 Pirkei d'R' Eliezer 16, quoted by Aruch ha-Shulchan E.H. 64:3. 7 Pirkei d'R' Eliezer 16; Yalkut Shimoni Shoftim 70. 8 B'tzeil ha-Chachmah 2:44. 9 While Shulchan Aruch mentions this prohibition only for the chasan, Aruch ha-Shulchan, based on the Talmud, includes the kallah as well. 10 Talmud, Berachos 54b. 11 Radal to Pirkei R' Eliezer 16. 12 Harav Y.S. Elyashiv (Beis Chasanim 17). The Sefardim, however, permit going out during the day when there are people on the street. 13 Beis Shemuel E.H. 64:2 quoting the Perishah 14 Ya'avetz (Migdal Oz, pg. 11). 15 Harav Y.S. Elyashiv (Beis Chasanim 17). 16 Aruch ha-Shulchan E.H. 64:3. 17 Shulchan Aruch mentions this prohibition only for the chasan, and some poskim maintain that this is so (see Kisei Eliyahu 64:1; M'harsham 3:206), but others hold that the kallah is included in this prohibition as well (Minchas Pitim 62). 18 She'alas Yavatz, vol. 2, 185. 19 Chida in Shiyurei Berachah 64. Tzitz Eliezer 11:85 and 12:73 quotes this view and prohibits even writing, unless he is writing Torah thoughts. Harav Y. Kamenetsky is quoted as orally instructing a chasan not to carry a heavy suitcase up the stairs (Emes l'Yaakov E.H. 64:1). 20 Harav Y.S. Elyashiv (Beis Chasanim 14:12). 21 Chazon Ish E.H. 64:7; Yavias Omer 4:8. Other poskim are more stringent. 22 Yavias Omer 4:8 and 5:38. 23 Kesuvos 7b, based on pesukim in Megilas Ruth. 24 M'haril (Hilchos Nissuin) quoted in Sova Semachos, pg. 12. 25 Teshuvos Chasam Sofer E.H. 122, regarding the community of Frankfurt. In later times, however, the custom changed even in Frankfurt (Harav Y. Martzbach, quoted in Sova Semachos, ibid.). 26 Pri Megadim O.C. 444:9. See, however, Mishnah Berurah 640:34 who clearly considers this type of meal as a seudas mitzvah. 27 See Rav Pa'alim E.H. 4:6 and Yavias Omer 3:11. 28 According to some early authorities, it was customary to do so twice a day (Maseches Sofrim 11:11). The 98 blessings gained according to this custom have the power to "sweeten" the 98 curses recorded in the Tochachah in Parshas Ki-Savo (Chidushei ha-Rim). 29 Among the ashkenazim. Sefaradim, however, generally celebrate a Sheva Berachos only if the meal takes place at the home of the chasan and kallah or their parents. 30 This custom does not have the binding power of a minhag which must be upheld, since it is relatively new and is not based on any binding source. 31 This is the consensus of most poskim. Moreover, as long as the chupah began before sunset, even if the blessings themselves were recited after sunset, the day that the chupah began is considered day one. 32 Sova Semachos, pg. 13 quoting several poskim. 33 Pischei Teshuvah E.H. 64:12; Harav M. Feinstein (oral ruling quoted in Oholei Yeshurun, pg. 25). 34 Sha'arei Teshuvah O.C. 188:7; Pischei Teshuvah E.H. 64:12 and many other poskim. 35 Harav M. Feinstein (oral ruling quoted in Oholei Yeshurun, pg. 25). See also Sefer Bein Hashemashos 10:11 who allows b'dieved to recite the blessings up to 17 minutes after sunset [in Eretz Yisrael]. 36 Sova Semachos 1:3; Yavias Omer 5:7; Harav S.Z. Auerbach (Shemiras Shabbos K'hilchasah 59:18); Harav Y.S. Elyashiv (Beis Chasanim 7:13). [If the chupah took place during bein hashemashos, a rav should be consulted.]

Weekly-Halacha, Copyright © 1999 by Rabbi Neustadt, Dr. Jeffrey Gross and Project Genesis, Inc. The author, Rabbi Neustadt, is the principal of Yavne Teachers' College in Cleveland, Ohio. He is also the Magid Shiur of a daily Mishna Berurah class at Congregation Shomre Shabbos. The Weekly-Halacha Series is distributed L'zchus Doniel Meir ben Hinda. Weekly sponsorships are available - please mail to jgross@torah.org. Project Genesis: Torah on the Information Superhighway learn@torah.org 17 Warren Road, Suite 2B Baltimore, MD 21208 (410) 602-1350 FAX: 602-1351

[PLEASE DONATE TO PROJECT GENESIS]

From: Yaakov Menken[SMTP:yamenken@torah.org] Happy Chanukah! A Mitzvah is a candle and the Torah is light, say the Sages. Project Genesis spreads the light of Torah, in your life and that of so many others. Your mitzvah of Tzedakah, righteous giving, today, is the candle that helps spread the light tomorrow. ... Let me share with you perhaps the most remarkable letter we've ever received in response to a financial appeal -- from a woman named Liliana. She writes: "As an average Romanian citizen, not only that I don't have a bank account, but also my income is low enough to make the \$100 gift you were talking about an unreachable dream for me. As a Romanian with a good salary I make about \$400 per month, which is not much when one has to support a household - I live with my retired mother who has a monthly income of about \$60! So I would like you to understand that if til now I didn't respond to your

donation requests, it wasn't because I don't want to, because I'd love to bring my share of contribution for your work. I do appreciate everything you do, and it does mean a lot to me, as the Judaica resources here, in Romania, are more than limited. The moment I'll find a way to be able to help, you will know. Til then I'm afraid I can't contribute with anything more than my prayers and good thoughts." Of course we only ask those that can afford it to give. And only you can answer whether you are able. If you can, please invest in Torah, today. We've set a target of \$40,000 for our Chanukah appeal. It isn't at all unreachable -- if 400 subscribers, less than 1 in 75, give \$100, then there we are. But it's not going to happen -- unless _you_ help. Let me invite you to make that gift of \$100, to participate in the Project Genesis Membership Club. As part of our Membership Club, you will join a special mailing list to receive updates with information on our activities and to send in your suggestions.... You might also choose to become a Friend of Project Genesis, with a donation of \$250. We need 160 friends like you to meet our goal! As a token of our appreciation, we'll send you Rabbi Frand's newest book, "Listen to Your Messages," as well as all the benefits of our Membership Club. At the same time, please don't underestimate the value to us of a \$10 "student subscriber" donation, or \$36 to become a contributing subscriber. Donations of any amount indicate your support for our innovative program of outreach and education. Donations are now easier than ever before - just go to <http://www.torah.org/support/> and make a credit card donation using our secure server. You may also reach us via: Fax to 888 -PG-LEARN, or +1-410-602-1351, or Phone: 888-WWW-TORAH, or +1-410-602-1350. You may also send your check drawn on a US bank, to: Project Genesis 17 Warren Rd, Suite 2B Baltimore, MD 21208 Please: write your email address in the memo section! ... Yaakov Menken Rabbi Yaakov Menken menken@torah.org Director, Project Genesis (410) 358-9800 <http://www.torah.org> learn@torah.org

From: RABBI NOSON WEISZ [SMTP:NWeisz@aish.edu] Subject: MAYANOT - MIKETZ - MY BROTHER, MY SELF "My Brother, My Self" by Rabbi Noson Weisz

For twenty-two long years Jacob mourned Joseph.

Joseph was kidnapped at age 17 and rose to power in Egypt at age 30. Then came seven years of plenty and two lean years before he was reunited with his father. During this entire time, Joseph was a mere six days travel away from Hebron, where Jacob lived. Why didn't he let his father know he was safe?

The other even more puzzling question is: Why didn't Isaac -- the father of Jacob and the grandfather of Joseph -- reveal the secret? According to the chronology presented in Genesis, Isaac died twelve years after the kidnapping, and he knew what had happened. (See Rashi, Genesis 37:35)

And finally a third question must be asked: Why didn't G-d tell Jacob?

The Midrash provides a clue:

The brothers said: "Let us take an oath of silence between us lest someone tell our father Jacob what we have done." Judah said, "Reuben isn't present and this type of oath requires the presence of ten." [There were twelve brothers, but Benjamin was too young to be with them, Reuben was missing, and they couldn't count the victim, Joseph, which left only nine.] What did they do? They made G-d the tenth party to the oath not to inform Jacob. Thus G-d, about whom is written, He informs Jacob about his concerns (Psalm 147) did not report this matter to Jacob because He was bound by the oath. [Midrash Tanchuma, Vayeshev 2]

The answer to the series of questions above is that no one could tell Jacob because they were all sworn to secrecy. But by what authority did the brothers impose this oath of silence on their victim Joseph, on Isaac, and even on G-d Himself?

By the authority invested in the unity of Israel. What does unity of Israel mean? We shall explore this issue presently.

The unity of Israel is the earthly reflection of the unity of G-d. Three times a day a Jew recites a prayer called the Shema, which makes the following statement:

Hear O Israel: the Lord is our G-d, the Lord is One. [Deuteronomy 6:4]

The Hebrew word for "one" is echad, spelled: aleph -- with the numerical value 1; chet -- with the numerical value 8; daled -- with a numerical value 4. That adds up to a total of 13 -- Jacob, plus his 12 sons (including the 6 sons of Leah, the 2 sons of Rachel, and the 4 sons of the maidservants). This is the unity of Israel which reflects the Oneness of G-d.

But the essence of Israel is not simply to reflect G-d's unity. Israel aims to form a dynamic spiritual bond with G-d, so that together they can be referred to as one. Such a bond can be attained only by a nation not by individuals. Indeed, the very purpose of the formation of the nation of Israel was to attain this spiritual union with G-d.

The prelude to the Covenant of Sinai was G-d's declaration:

"You shall be to Me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation." [Exodus 19:6]

G-d entered into this covenant with the Jewish nation and not with individual Jews.

In a secular world the success of a society is measured by how much individuals benefit from engaging in social concourse; the greater the slice of the social pie that can be distributed to individual members in return for their investment in the social group, the more successful the society. Social harmony is a means to an end. Its fruits are enjoyed by individuals in their own separate capacity.

In a Jewish world, the rewards of social concourse are only available to the individual in terms of how much he can blend with the entire social group. Social harmony is the goal itself. It is only through such harmony that Israel is one, and it is only a unified Israel that connects with G-d. The goal of individual ambition is to attach oneself successfully to the overall unifying force of Israel. Such ambition must be restrained when its expression can only be attained at the cost of the unity of Israel.

We find an example of how much damage an individual's ambition can cause in one of Joseph's most illustrious descendants, Jeoboam ben Nevat, a member of the tribe of Ephraim.

It happened at that time, while Jeroboam was leaving Jerusalem, the prophet Ahijah the

Shilonite found him on the way; he was clothed in a new garment, and the two of them were alone in the field. [Kings 11:29]

The Talmud comments:

Just like a new garment has no defect, the Torah scholarship of Jeroboam was totally free of defects. Another interpretation of a new garment: they came up with new insights that no ear had previously heard. And the two of them were alone in the field: all other scholars were like blades of grass in comparison. Some say: the secrets of the Torah were revealed to them like an open field. [Sanhedrin 102a]

We are presented with a brilliant individual, far superior to even the most talented Jews, selected to rule on the basis of merit, similar in all respects to his illustrious progenitor Joseph.

But this same Jeroboam was the cause of the ultimate destruction of the Temple and the loss of Jewish autonomy. When he came to power, he made the following calculation: if he allowed the Jews to keep up the practice of the tri-annual pilgrimage to the Temple in Jerusalem, he would ultimately forfeit his kingdom. Only the kings of David's line were allowed to sit in the Temple; all others had to stand. The people would thus see the Davidian king, Rechavom, sitting on his throne in the Temple while he, Jeroboam, was forced to stand like everyone else. They would ultimately return their allegiance to the house of David and cast him aside. He therefore put soldiers on the roads to Jerusalem, and prevented Jews from making their pilgrimage. As the people were used to the custom of making pilgrimages, however, he felt compelled to provide an alternative to ensure the success of his plan. He therefore set up an image of a Golden Calf in the North and South of the country as alternative pilgrimage sites. [Talmud, Sanhedrin, 101b]

This idolatrous practice destroyed the unity of the Jewish people. It was having one Temple, one altar, and a single High Priest that allowed for Israel's unity with G-d. Thus Jeroboam put his personal ambition above the ideal of a unified Israel, and ultimately caused the severance of Israel's connection with G-d.

The brothers suspected Joseph of similar motives. They recognized his individual superiority, but Jewish unity had a higher value for them. It was their unanimous judgment that Joseph was putting his own ambition above the principle of unity. Therefore he had to be cast out. They recognized the fact that their father did not agree, as it was he who singled Joseph out and awarded him his special status in the family, and therefore Jacob had to be left out of their decision.

G-d's acceptance of their oath of silence represents the transition of Jewish leadership from the patriarchs to their children. Jacob himself was the initiator of this change some time earlier when his daughter Dina was raped, and he let his sons do all the talking.

From that point onward begins the story of the unfolding rivalry between Judah and Joseph, a rivalry that has yet to be satisfactorily resolved.

As the sons assumed leadership over Israel, G-d was also bound by their consensus. The sale of Joseph was not a hot-headed crime of passion, but a deliberately considered action of the Jewish people, in an area that lay within their jurisdiction. G-d remained neutral. On the one hand G-d was busy advancing Joseph's career in Egypt, but on the other hand He followed the majority decision that imposed the oath of silence. Indeed, even Joseph adhered to the oath of silence. The path back to acceptance was not to involve Jacob, but to demonstrate to his brothers his dedication to Jewish unity. It was their consensus that constituted the leadership of Israel at this point, and it was them he had to persuade to allow him back.

With this as a background, let us now consider Joseph's dramatic elevation in Egypt.

Joseph was summoned from his cell to interpret pharaoh's dream. At this point he is a mere prisoner who has yet to be appointed pharaoh's advisor. But we find that he offers the pharaoh some apparently unsolicited advice.

Joseph said to pharaoh: "Now let pharaoh seek out a discerning and wise man and set him over the land of Egypt. Let pharaoh proceed and let him appoint overseers on the land, and he shall prepare the land of Egypt during the seven years of abundance." Then pharaoh said to Joseph, "Since G-d has informed you of all this, there can be no one as discerning and wise as you. You shall be in charge of my palace and by your command shall my people be sustained; only by the throne shall I outrank you." [Genesis 41:33-40]

Nachmanides points out a very perplexing point in this passage. Since Joseph was not summoned to give pharaoh advice, how did he presume to do so? And why did pharaoh reward so lavishly what was an extremely presumptuous act?

Nachmanides goes on to explain that the advice was in fact part of the interpretation of the dream. In effect, Joseph informed pharaoh that the seven fat years and seven lean years had nothing to do with Egypt. G-d would send Egypt fourteen years of crops to feed the country for the next fourteen years, only He would send all these crops in seven years. The intent of the Divine policy was neither to harm nor benefit Egypt, which would be left in a neutral position economically. G-d had other considerations in mind.

G-d's plan was to force the children of Israel into the Egyptian exile, after setting them up properly under the rule of Joseph. Thus Joseph's elevation was over the Jewish people rather than over Egypt. The pharaoh simply did what he realized he should do.

Joseph regarded his elevation as an appointment by G-d to rule over the Jewish people as foretold by the dreams of his youth. (See Genesis 37) And he patiently awaited the arrival of his brothers.

But he also had concerns about their commitment to Jewish unity. When he saw that Benjamin had taken his place in his father's affections and did not show up with the rest of his brothers, he wondered if his brothers' earlier actions had been prompted by their unwillingness to accord to the two sons of Rachel the special status that was rightfully theirs in the Divine scheme.

As Jewish history shows, the descendants of Rachel -- through Joseph (and his sons Menasheh and Ephraim) and through Benjamin -- played a crucial role. The Jewish leader of the conquest of the land of Israel was Joshua, from the tribe of Ephraim. The first king of Israel was Saul, from the tribe of Benjamin. When the schism took place in the Jewish kingdom, the Kingdom of Israel was formed by Jeroboam of the tribe of Ephraim, and it remained under the control of this tribe throughout its history. The main physical resources of the Jewish nation

were thus under the control of Ephraim throughout Jewish history. What is more, the tribe of Benjamin remained with the tribe of Judah following the schism, ensuring the presence of Rachel's children in the kingdom of Judah as well. Without one of Rachel's children in charge, the spiritual unity between G-d and Israel cannot have physical expression.

The Temple, symbolic of the flow of Divine energy into Israel, stood in Benjamin's portion of Israel, and the Tabernacle that preceded it stood in the portion of Joseph.

The smooth physical functioning of the unified Jewish people involves placing the children of Rachel in the position of the Chief Executive Officer of corporate Israel. This means entrusting them with the executive powers of the Jewish people. Joseph was not convinced that his brothers, led by Judah, were willing to do this. He wanted to observe how they reacted to a threat to his brother Benjamin's security and so he put them to the test. They passed with flying colors.

The leadership of the Jewish people was formally handed over by the dying Jacob to Judah. Thus the symbol of Jewish unity, and therefore the focus of the spiritual union between G-d and Israel was in the hands of Judah, and specifically the descendants of David.

Judah is in charge of Israel's spiritual might, but Joseph controls the physical manifestation of this spiritual power. Both Judah and Joseph possess a claim to Jewish royalty. Because to the Jewish nation spiritual relationships are always supreme, the king who is the symbol of Israel's spiritual unity always has to come from the line of Judah. But Judah has to surrender the management over Israel's physical resources to Joseph.

The relationship between Judah and Joseph is often complex and touchy. If they are in perfect unity, Israel prospers, but if they are at odds with each other, their rivalry often causes severe problems, up to and including total corporate dissolution of the Jewish people as an independent physical entity.

'You are my sheep, the sheep of my flock, you are Adam, and I am your G-d,' declares the Lord G-d. [Ezekiel 34]

The Talmud interprets: "You Israel are called Adam." [Yevomos 61a]

The collective Israel is a single human being, Adam. Through the unity that comes from its relationship with G-d, achieved through its allegiance to His Torah, the entire Jewish nation assumes the guise of a single individual, a level of oneness that only people whose ambitions are purely spiritual can attain.

But an individual has a head and a heart -- thoughts and emotions. Only when the head and the heart are in harmony can the latent power of the human being express itself in all its majesty. For this to happen in Israel, both Joseph and Judah must recognize their proper place.

That is what happens in this week's Torah portion -- a model for the rest of Jewish history.

Updates on the Dulberg sisters at: <http://www.aish.edu/issues/dulberg.htm>

(C) 1999 Aish HaTorah International - All rights reserved. Email: webmaster@aish.edu Home Page: <http://www.aish.edu>

From: Yeshivat Har Etzion's Israel Koschitzky Virtual Beit Midrash [SMTP: yh@vbm-torah.org] CHANUKA 5760 For more articles related to Chanuka, see our webpage:

<http://www.vbm-torah.org/chanuka.htm>

STUDYING GREEK WISDOM

BASED ON A SHIUR BY HARAV AHARON LICHTENSTEIN

Translated and adapted by Rav Eliezer Kwass

The Sages speak in a number of places about a decree against studying Greek wisdom. This article explores many of the essential issues relating to this decree.

The mishna (Sota 49b) states: "During Vespasian's War they decreed [against] the groom [wearing] a wedding crown ... During Titus' War they decreed [against] the bridal crown and also that one should not teach his son Greek wisdom."

The gemara (ibid.) quotes a beraita: "The Sages taught: During the siege in the Hasmonean war, Hyrcanus was outside [the walls of Jerusalem] and Aristobulus was inside. Every day [the Jews] would send out a box of dinar coins and they would send the daily sacrifice in return. [Inside Jerusalem,] there was an old man who knew Greek wisdom. He spoke [with the besieging forces outside] with Greek wisdom and said to them, 'As long as the Jews are involved in the Temple service, they will not fall into your hands.' The next day they lowered the box of coins and they sent them up a pig [instead of the daily sacrifice]. When it reached halfway up the wall, it dug its hoofs into the wall and the land of Israel trembled four hundred parasangs. At that time they said, 'Cursed is the man who raises pigs, and cursed is the man who teaches his son Greek wisdom.'" The time of the decree mentioned by the beraita - the Hasmonean period - seems to contradict that mentioned in the mishna - Titus' War. The war against Titus was at the very end of the Second Temple period, while the episode during the Hasmonean war preceded the destruction of the Temple by over 130 years.

This discrepancy can be resolved in two ways: 1. the decree did not take hold at first and then was reissued in the time of Titus (Rash, Commentary to Mishna Pe'ah 1:1); 2. the original decree might have been a temporary measure, while the second was established as a permanent halakha for generations to come. We find other examples of temporary decrees: the penalizing of the Levites in the times of Ezra (Yevamot 86b); the prohibition for the generation of Rabbi Yehuda Hanasi against accepting a stolen object returned by a thief (Rabbeinu Tam, Bava Kama 94b).

REASON

1. The simple reading of the mishna and gemara quoted above is that the decree was a reaction to the event in the time of the Hasmoneans and to the destruction of the Temple. There does not seem to be anything wrong with Greek wisdom per se; rather, decreeing against teaching it was a way of reacting to what happened either by

remembering the destruction or by refusing to identify with the culture connected with the tragedy. 2. On the other hand, if Greek wisdom is value-neutral, why ban it because of one episode? The beraita's use of the image of the pig, identified with impurity, indicates that Greek wisdom is itself problematic. 3. A different approach: The context within which Greek wisdom appears in the mishna implies that it is a kind of adornment. "... They decreed [against] the groom [wearing] a wedding crown, ... the bridal crown and also that one should not teach his son Greek wisdom." Greek wisdom was perhaps considered an ornament, similar to (in recent times) knowing how to speak French or play the piano. The Yerushalmi (Pe'ah 1:1) supports this: "It is permissible to teach one's daughter Greek wisdom because it is an adornment (takhshit) for her." Again, with this approach, there is nothing inherently bad about Greek wisdom. The decree was made essentially against frills.

SCOPE

The gemara in Sota concludes that "the Greek language is distinct from Greek wisdom." In other words, they decreed against Greek wisdom and not against studying the Greek language. Rigid definitions are not given for "language" and "wisdom." One could take either a minimalist or maximalist approach to defining the two terms. "Language" might be used in its most constricted sense (spoken language), leaving everything else (literature, culture and the like) prohibited under the decree. On the other hand, "wisdom" might mean only Greek philosophy, whereas literature and culture would fall under the broader category of "language."

The gemara also says that learning Greek wisdom was permitted to the house of Rabban Gamliel because they were "close to the government" and needed it. It seems that they had not only a practical or pragmatic need but, because of their associations with the government, they were required to be connected with their culture and lifestyle. [What defines a "need" would have to be clarified.]

WHAT IS "GREEK WISDOM"?

Rashi (Menachot 64b) defines Greek wisdom as "things hinted at" (remizot). Likewise, the Rambam (in his Commentary on the Mishna) calls it "hints and riddles." This seems to refer not to standard wisdom, the sciences and humanities, but rather to some secret, esoteric wisdom.

The Rivash (#45) was asked to define Greek wisdom, "whether it refers to those famous books about the natural world and about what is beyond it (physics and metaphysics)?" He responded that they are not included in the decree. In his opinion, "Greek wisdom" means to speak in Greek in a way that the common folk will not understand, using riddles and obscure language... (However, he raises the possibility that it still might be fitting to avoid studying Greek scientific works for another reason, "Do not stray after idols.")

With regard to modern times: The Rambam writes that Greek language and wisdom has been forgotten: "This matter has, no doubt, been lost, and does not exist today in the world ..." (Commentary to the Mishna, Sota). Concerning the language, he writes (Hilkhot Tefillin 1:19): "[Ancient] Greek has already faded away, been corrupted and lost."

LEARNING GREEK WISDOM AND THE COMMANDMENT TO LEARN TORAH

The gemara (Menachot 99b) raises another problem with studying Greek wisdom. "Ben Dama asked Rabbi Yishmael: Someone like me, who has learned the whole Torah - is it permissible to learn Greek wisdom? He responded: B 'You should meditate on it (Torah) day and night' (Yehoshua 1). Go and see if you can find a time that is neither day nor night, and then learn Greek wisdom! This opinion conflicts with that of Rabbi Shmuel bar Nachmani ... Rabbi Yonatan says: This verse is not an obligation or a commandment, but rather a blessing."

Here also there does not seem to be any essential value problem with Greek wisdom. The question raised in the gemara concerns the obligation of TORAH STUDY. The question of apportioning time could have come up with regard to swimming or hiking, for that matter. The gemara concludes that if the obligation to learn Torah applies "day and night," there is no time to learn Greek wisdom. If there is no such obligation, then it is permissible.

The Yerushalmi contains a similar passage, but adds the following, "Does not Rabbi Yishmael teach that the verse 'You should choose life,' refers to learning a trade? Based on this (his reading of the verse, 'You should meditate on it day and night'), there is no time to learn a trade!" They conclude that the source for the decree against Greek wisdom is "because of informers (who hand over Jews to the authorities)."

Even if the obligation to learn Torah applies day and night, it is still possible that one could fit in time for learning Greek wisdom. The Ran (Nedarim 8a) holds that one is obligated to learn "day and night ACCORDING TO HIS ABILITY." There are certain basic needs that a person must meet, and the rest of the time should be filled with Torah study.

Learning a trade is considered one of these needs, as the Yerushalmi says. The Ra'avan writes that despite the prohibition against embarking on a sea voyage three days before Shabbat, it is permissible for one's trade. Rashi writes (Bava Metzia 30b) that the verse "You should inform them of the path in which they should walk" refers to teaching one's children a trade. Studying Greek wisdom might, if it has some worth, also be considered a legitimate need, which (according to the Ran's approach) would not detract from one's fulfillment of the obligation to "learn Torah according to one's ability."

It seems that the Torat Kohanim introduces another element to the decree. On the verse in Acharei Mot, "Perform My statutes and keep My laws to WALK IN THEM," the midrash comments: "Walk in them - make them paramount and not secondary. Walk in them - your dealings should be only through them, not mixing anything else in the world with them. You should not say, 'I have learned the Torah of Israel; I will now go and learn the wisdom of the nations of the world.' The verse says, 'Walk in them,' so that you should not abandon them."

The Torat Kohanim's approach is broader than the gemara's decree; it speaks of the wisdom of the nations of the world and not only about Greek wisdom. The focus is not on

laxity in Torah study, but rather on MAKING THE TORAH SECONDARY (tafel). Placing something else at the center of one's focus is problematic. "Walk in them - make them paramount and not secondary."

Here also, there does not seem to be an essential value problem with foreign wisdom, but rather a concern that a person will say, "I have learned the Torah of Israel; I will now move to another discipline, of equal worth to Torah." Here the Sifra sets down, "You must not abandon them."

If so, there might be situations where learning the wisdom of other nations is sanctioned, as long as they would contribute to a person's service of G-d. One must constantly maintain a consciousness that he stands with both feet in the world of Torah and is firmly planted in it.

[This article is adapted from a student's summary of a shiur given on Motzaei Shabbat Parashat Miketz 5747 and was not reviewed by Harav Lichtenstein. Harav Lichtenstein has treated this subject in a number of articles, most recently in his contribution to the volume "Judaism's Encounters with Other Cultures," ed. Rabbi Jacob J. Schacter (Aronson, 1996).]

Yeshivat Har Etzion Israel Koschitzky Virtual Beit Midrash Alon Shevut, Gush Etzion 90433 E-mail: Yhe@vbm-torah.org or Office@etzion.org.il

<http://www.jpost.com/1999/Supplements/Shabbat/shabbat.xcgi>

TENACITY OUTDOES WHATEVER'S IN'

BY RABBI BEREL WEIN

The doggedness of the Jewish people is our primary trait. A long time ago - about 2,165 years ago - a band of Jews waged a guerrilla war against the Syrian-Greek armies and government that controlled the Land of Israel. The war was successful and eventually the Syrian-Greeks loosened their grip on the country. The Jewish kingdom of the Hasmoneans existed for more than a century. During this period the early Tannaim began their work and the study of Torah spread among the masses of Israel. But in historical terms the Hasmonean triumph was short-lived and certainly temporary. It is therefore strange that this event - the original Hasmonean victory - should be the focus of a commemorative holiday that has survived the ages. Imagine the British still celebrating Washington's defeat on Long Island or the French still commemorating Napoleon's victory at Austerlitz. The Jews are certainly a strange people! That is why I've always felt that Hanukka must commemorate more than the passing event. It marks a fundamental lesson that we learned then and has since become part of the core Jewish makeup. It is the lesson of tenacity, the lesson of being unimpressed and undaunted by the changing mores and fashions of popular opinion and society. The doggedness of the Jewish people is our primary trait. As for the question of who is a Jew - and I mean this philosophically rather than halachically - it is eventually decided by the possession of that trait of tenacity. Moses characterized Israel as "a stiff-necked" people. That description is not entirely pejorative. Our survival till today, the fact that we still celebrate Hanukka, and that neither the Greeks nor the Romans are around any longer to commemorate their victory over Judea, is simply due to a test of wills, a struggle of tenacity. I am convinced, therefore, that Hanukka, perhaps more than any other holiday in the Jewish calendar, speaks loudly to our generation.

THE State of Israel, after the monumental achievements of its armed forces, its economy, and technological development, its ingathering of the exiles from all corners of the earth, its intellectual and scholarship development in Torah and in all secular fields of study and inquiry, has somehow become tired. This is understandable, for its citizens have borne such great burdens for so long that it would be naive to expect no relaxation of our tenacity and will to succeed. And yet it is sad to see a young generation that has no sense of the tenacity and stiff-neckedness that created the state and preserved the Jewish people throughout the ages. In last week's Ha'aretz magazine section there was a long article about this generation. It was entitled "Dope, sex, and post-Zionist thrills - The young clubbers of Tel Aviv are out for only one thing: the ultimate high." The magazine breathlessly reports: "They're young. They're intelligent. They dance, they do drugs and they make love. It's all happening on the local - and already world-famous - club scene, where a whole generation is in revolt." And the article concludes: "...the roar of liberation emitted by that secularism is heard loud and clear. And it says a lot about some sort of broad uprising by the Israeli youngsters of the millennium against a host of demands that are hurled at them. Against a whole system of imperatives and codes and constraints that they are no longer ready to accept...." Those gathered here [at the club] have come to worship freedom, liberation, the breaking of every taboo. The discarding of every boundary. The crossing of every threshold." Well, someone should tell this brave new generation that it's all been tried before: the 1920 Weimar Republic society, Paris between the wars, the American flappers of the 1920s, and the Beat Generation of the 1960s. And all of those thrills and freedom and liberation only led to world catastrophes, broken lives, deep societal divisions, and astronomical bills for individual and national rehabilitation. Who in Israel is going to pay for detoxifying these druggies? What sort of people will these twentysomethings be when they reach their forties and fifties? Why should they be glorified by the media for their self-destructive and essentially antisocial behavior? Of course, they don't represent the danger to Israeli society that the hated haredim do. Still, we are entitled to ask who is going to pick up the bill for their youthful suicidal behavior? I guess that as always, the old, backward, unliberated, tenacious Jews will have to do so. Hanukka teaches us that we have seen all of this before. The Syrian-Greeks also had great sex and dope clubs and also broke every taboo. And there were plenty of young Jews - Hellenists and others - who flocked to their parties and cause. But these taboo-breaking Jews, who obviously lacked Jewish tenacity, also lacked Greek tenacity. Eventually the realities of life, of implacable enemies, and the wasting results of all types of addiction, of moral emptiness, and the absence of standards and values destroyed the Greeks and the Hellenist Jews with them. And the tenacious Jews, even in the midst of exile and physical defeat, continued to light their little candles every Hanukka. And so we shall continue - for that is the Jewish thing to do.

From: Rabbi Jonathan Schwartz jschwrtz@ymail.yu.edu Subject: The Internet Chaburah -- Parshas Miketz/Chanuka Pt. II

Prologue: Miracles are miraculous. If they weren't, we watch them happen and unknowingly undermine their significance. When reflecting upon the Nes of Chanukah, we remind ourselves to reflect on the power of finding enough oil to burn in the Menorah for a night and struggle to explain why we add another night of candle lighting if the candle burning was natural on the first night anyway (See Beis Yosef and Sefer Ner L'Meah for 100 answers to this dilemma). Clearly, we like to define miracles as out of the ordinary in order to accord them the proper position they seem to deserve. Recognizing this tendency, one could ask how we bot her to celebrate Chanukah at all. After all, the Midrash Tanchuma notes that the oil in the Menorah regularly burned for a whole year without replacement. If that is the case, it should be no greater miracle to see the same oil burn for 8 days. Why celebrate a miracle that was commonplace in the Beis HaMikdash during this season?

In his classic style, Rav Yoel Teitelbaum (Kuntrus Chiddushei Torah L'Chanukah) ztl. offers an answer while offering insight into the spirit of Chanukah. The Satmar Rebbe explains that the spirit of Chanukah (and the battles described in the HaNeiros Hallalu) refer to battles of the spirit - battles between the Yetzer Tov and Yetzer HaRa that were rampant during the period of Hellenist control over the land of Israel. During these challenging personal crises, things that appear to be regular daily events become miraculous when they take place. During tumultuous times as these, the ability to light candles in the Menorah is a miracle and the ability to see candle lighting as a miracle is a miracle itself. The lesson of Chanukah was the ability of Jews to show themselves that in the end, the true Jewish spirit will win out over the battles of the evil spirit and miracles can be recognized even when they are normally commonplace.

The Nes of Chanukah carries important lessons for Jews. Hence, an integral component of the Mitzva of candles is the aspect of publicizing the miracle (Pirsumei Nissa). From traditional standpoints, it appears as if the publicity is significant to Jews alone. However, in its most basic terms, publicity of the miracle should be achieved if one glorifies the holy name of Hashem to non-Jews as well. After all, isn't that the lesson we learn from Yosef's sojourn in the land of Mitzrayim and his ascent to royalty? This week's Chaburah examines the ability of one to fulfill the Mitzva of Pirsumei Nissa among non-Jews alone. It is entitled:

A Public Publication?: Pirsumei Nissa for Non-Jews

Among the various issues that become highlighted during the season of Chanukah, is the issue of Pirsumei Nissa, the need to publicize the miracle of Chanukah. The means for that publication seems to involve an internal (See Internet Chaburah, Parshas VaYeshev, 5760) and an external component. For this reason, we light our candles in the doorway or in the window, to publicize the miracle of Chanukah. The question arises as to what one should do if he is in a situation where his Menorah will not be seen by Jews. Is he able to fulfill Pirsumei Niss simply by placing his Menorah in the window in order to allow non-Jews to see his candles or does Pirsumei Nissa require the ability for Jews to see his Menorah.

The Gemara that seems to surround the answer to this question appears in Shabbos (21a). The Gemara there discusses how long candles must remain lit. The Gemara determines that the Ner Chanukah must remain the entire time that people are found in the street. That time is determined by the amount of time it takes the Turmidaeim to get home. Rashi explains that the Turmidaeim were non-Jewish vendors who supplied candles and wood to the townspeople. These vendors were the last to leave the streets, since they remained until all of the townspeople completed their purchases. As long as these people remain, the obligation to light candles remains.

Based upon Rashi, it seems that one can fulfill the obligation of Pirsumei Nissa even to non-Jews. Rav Eliyashiv Shlita (See Shevut Yitzchak at end of Chapter IV) is quoted as being of this opinion. He notes that the simple understanding of Rashi is that the last people in the market were these non-Jews and still, the obligation to keep candles lit applies so long as they are in the market. Thus, one clearly sees that the obligation to publicize the miracle of Chanukah applies to publication to non-Jews as well. The question is why? This question is further strengthened when one considers the fact that Megilla and the Story of Yitziyas Mitzrayim, both have the obligation of Pirsumei Nissa attached to them and still neither can be fulfilled by simply reading to a Non-Jew. Why would the rules for Chanukah be different?

Rav Moshe Feinstein Ztl. (Igros Moshe, Orach Chaim IV, 105:7) cites the Chemed Moshe as proof that there is no Pirsumei Nissa when one lights candles and publicizes the miracle to non-Jews alone. He explains the Talmud by noting that the reason the Gemara chose the time of lighting until the Turmidaeim come home has nothing to do with publicizing the miracle to them. Rather, so long as they are in the market, there must be Jews in the market buying goods from them. Once they are home, clearly the markets are closed. Pirsumei Nissa for Chanuka, Megilla and Haggada are all equally non-applicable to non-Jews.

However, how are we to reconcile those who disagree with Rav Moshe's position viz a viz Chanuka versus Pesach and Purim? Different answers have been suggested.

First, Rav Soloveitchik ztl. has been quoted (Noraot Harav) as noting two distinct differences between Chanuka and Purim and Pesach. According to the Rov, Pirsumei Nissa is a Kiyum HaMitzva. The Pirsumei Nissa of Purim is achieved through the reading of the Megilla. The Pirsumei Nissa of Pesach can only be achieved through the reading and learning of the texts of the Haggadah. Both aspects of pirsumei Nissa are achieved through the study of Torah. Non-Jews cannot be included in the Torah as they have no obligation or relation to Torah. On Chanukah, the Pirsumei Nissa is achieved through optical perception of the candles. Perception and display can be achieved by Jews and non-Jews alike. Hence, even non-Jews are included.

A similar answer might be suggested based upon an article concerning the issue of Pirsumei Nissa written by Moreinu Harav Mordechai Willig Shlita (Zichron Harav). Rav Willig cites the Avnei Nezer (Siman 511) who notes that the Pirsumei Nissa on Purim is not achieved by the active reading of the Megilla, rather by the listening. Similarly, the mere reciting of the

Hagadda is not enough to fulfill the Pirsumei nissa it involves. Rather, it is the Shaila V'Teshuva, the responsive reading and listening that completes the Mitzva. These two aspects of Pirsumei Nissa involve both an active and a passive component - a reader and a listener. Clearly, in order to fulfill one's obligations here, both must be Jewish. However, when the issue is lighting the candles of Chanuka, the Pirsumei Nissa does not have a passive component to it. It merely requires one to light. Thus, the one who sees the candles can be Jewish or Non-Jewish and the lighter has fulfilled his obligation of publication.

The Rov offered a second possibility based upon Derush. Unlike Purim and Pesach, the challenge to Chanuka was purely spiritual. Whereas on Purim and Pesach, the publication of a miracle to a Non-Jew would be merely perceived as a testimony to a nation's survival instinct, the miracle of Chanuka stands to remind the world that Jews stand up for their religion. Since this idea is a public declaration foreign to the nations of the world, it serves them to recognize the miracle as well. As a result the Pirsumei Nissa of Purim and Pesach require Jews who will not dismiss the miracles as survival. Chanuka's motivation was too supernatural for even the non-Jew to not recognize it.

Battala News

Mazal Tov to Akiva Distenfeld and Aviva Graff upon their recent engagement.

Mazal Tov to Rabbi and Mrs. Moshe Crystal upon the birth of a baby boy.

From: Rabbi Kalman Packouz [SMTP: packouz@aish.edu] To: Rabbi Packouz's ShabbatShalom List I received this story from my father. I liked it and hope that you will, too! Happy Hanukah! Warmly, Rabbi Packouz

Young private Winneger was with the U.S. Army as it marched through Europe at the end of World War II. His unit was assigned to a European village with the orders to secure the town, search for any hiding Nazis and to help the villagers in any way they could.

Winneger was on patrol one night when he saw a figure running through a field just outside the village. He shouted, "Halt or I'll shoot." The figure ducked behind a tree. Winneger waited and eventually the figure came out and figuring that Winneger was no longer nearby, went to a spot near a large tree and started to dig. Winneger waited until the figure had finished digging and was once more on the move before he stepped out and again shouted, "Halt or I'll shoot!" The figure ran. Winneger decided not to shoot but to try to catch the thieving figure. He shortly caught up with the figure and tackled it to the ground.

To his surprise he found he had captured a young boy. An ornate menorah had fallen from the boy's hands in the scuffle. Winneger picked up the menorah. The boy tried to grab it back shouting, "Give it to me. It's mine!" Winneger assured the boy that he was among friends. Furthermore, he himself was Jewish. The boy who had just survived several years of the Holocaust and had been in a concentration camp was mistrustful of all men in uniforms. He had been forced to watch the shooting of his father. He had no idea what had become of his mother.

In the weeks that followed, Winneger took the young boy, whose name was David, under his wing. As they became closer and closer, Winneger's heart went out to the boy. He offered David the opportunity to come back to New York City with him. David accepted and Winneger went through all the necessary paperwork and officially adopted David.

Winneger was active in the New York Jewish community. An acquaintance of his, a curator of the Jewish Museum in Manhattan, saw the menorah. He told David it was a very valuable historic European Menorah and should be shared with the entire Jewish Community. He offered David \$50,000 for the menorah.

But David refused the generous offer saying the menorah had been in his family for over 200 years and that no amount of money could ever make him sell it.

When Chanukah came, David and Winneger lit the menorah in the window of their home in New York City. David went upstairs to his room to study and Winneger stayed downstairs in the room with the menorah.

There was a knock on the door and Winneger went to answer. He found a woman with a strong German accent who said that she was walking down the street when she saw the menorah in the window. She said that she had once had one just like it in her family and had never

seen any other like it. Could she come and take a closer look? Winneger invited her in and said that the menorah belonged to his son who could perhaps tell her more about it. Winneger went upstairs and called David down to talk to the woman and that is how David was reunited with his mother.

This is retelling from memory (so some of the details may be wrong) from a true story told by Rabbi Allan Gerald Tufts to the congregation at Matthew Weil's Bar Mitzvah, Temple Shalom, Levittown

From: Mordecai Kornfeld [SMTP: kornfeld@netvision.net.il] INSIGHTS INTO THE DAILY DAF brought to you by Kollel Iyun Hadaf of Yerushalayim daf@dafyomi.co.il, http://www.dafyomi.co.il

YEVAMOS 2 - dedicated by Rabbi Ari and Esther Maryles of Chicago in memory of her grandfather, Rav Chaim Mauer zt"l whose life was dedicated to helping people both physically and spiritually. YEVAMOS 3 & 4 - dedicated by Dr. Eli Turkel (of Raanana) and family; may they be blessed with much Nachas from their children and grandchildren. YEVAMOS 5 - generously sponsored by Lee and Marsha Weinblatt of Teaneck, N.J. -- may Hashem protect them and all that is theirs! Free gift to *all* donors -- D.A.F.'s unique new bookmark; a concise chart of all the basic Rishonim on each Maseches of Shas Send donations to 140 -32 69 Avenue, Flushing NY 11367, USA

Yevamos 3b

THE SOURCE FOR THE PROHIBITION OF DOING "YIBUM" WITH THE "TZAROS" OF A "TZARAH" QUESTION: The Beraisa teaches the source for the prohibition against doing Yibum with the Tzaros of one's Achos Ishto (wife's sister). The Beraisa says that this prohibition is derived from the extra phrase in the verse, "...Lo Sikach *li'Tzror*" -- "You may not take a woman in addition to her sister *to make them co-wives (Tzaros) to each other*" (Vayikra 18:18), which teaches that one may not marry the Tzaros of a woman who is an Ervah to him, even in a situation of Yibum (as derived from the Gezeirah Shavah of "Aleha"). The Beraisa asks from where do we know that the Tzaros of a Tzarah are also prohibited? The Beraisa answers that the verse says "Litzror" when it could have said "Latzur" (with one Reish), and thus it includes the Tzaros of a Tzarah.

Why is it necessary to derive the prohibition of Tzaros of a Tzarah from a verse? Once the Tzarah herself cannot do Yibum (because she is the Tzarah of an Ervah), she remains Asur to her husband's brothers because of the Isur of "Eshes Ach" (the wife of one's brother). Therefore, she is exactly the same as any other Ervah, and her Tzarah should be no different than a normal Tzarah of an Ervah!

Even though the Isur Ervah here is that of "Eshes Ach" which is usually suspended in a situation of Yibum, the Mishnah tells us in another case -- "Eshes Achiv sheLo Hayah b'Olam" -- that the Isur of "Eshes Ach" is able to prohibit her to the brother with whom she would have otherwise done Yibum, and the Gemara does not find it necessary to ask for a source for this. In that case, a brother who was born *after* his older brother died childless may *not* do Yibum, since they were not in the world at the same time, and thus his older brother's wife remains Asur to him as an "Eshes Ach," and her Tzaros are also Asur to him because they are Tzaros Ervah. Similarly, the Gemara should not need a source for the Tzaros of a Tzarah. In fact, RASHI (DH v'Eshes Achiv) compares the exemption from Yibum of Tzaros of a Tzarah to the exemption of Tzaros "Eshes Achiv sheLo Hayah b'Olam." Why, then, does the Gemara need a verse to teach us this Isur?

Furthermore, later (8b), when Rashi discusses the opinion of R' Ebbi, who finds another source for the exemption of Tzarah from Yibum but does not give a source for the exemption of Tzaros of a Tzarah, Rashi (DH Im Ken) says that R' Ebbi does not need a verse to teach that Tzaros of a Tzarah do not do Yibum, "because she is the Tzarah of an 'Eshes Ach'!" Why, then, is it necessary here to prove from a verse that Tzaros of a Tzarah are exempt from Yibum? (REBBI AKIVA EIGER)

ANSWERS: (a) The Gemara itself actually cites an opinion that concurs with Rebbi Akiva Eiger's question, and says that no verse is needed to teach that Tzaros of a Tzarah may not do Yibum. The Gemara (13a) asks, "How do we know [that Tzaros of a Tzarah do not do Yibum]? Rav Yehudah says that we learn it from the word 'Litzror'. Rav Ashi says that it is logical [and no verse is needed]." Rav Ashi's opinion is exactly like Rebbi Akiva Eiger suggests!

Why, though, does the Gemara there ask for the source of the Isur of Tzaros of a Tzarah, if the Beraisa here (3b) clearly states that it is learned from a verse? In addition, how could Rav Ashi argue with the Beraisa and give a different source?

The VILNA GA'ON in his Hagahos here points out that the Girsas of many Rishonim did not include this line about Tzaros of a Tzarah in the Beraisa. According to that Girsas, there is no question on the Beraisa, nor on Rav Ashi, since neither one says that a verse is needed to teach the Isur of Tzaros of a Tzarah. Rather, Rebbi Akiva Eiger's question is on Rav Yehudah: why does he argue with Rav Ashi and try to find a source in a verse?

The RITVA (13a) says that Rav Yehudah agrees with Rav Ashi that no verse is needed to teach this Isur. He only mentions the verse as a scriptural support for the logic that prohibits Tzaros of a Tzarah (like an Asmachta). Rav Ashi explains what Rav Yehudah's real logic is, and they are not arguing at all. Accordingly, there is no question on Rav Yehudah, nor on Rav Ashi.

However, this is clearly not the approach of many other Rishonim. Rashi here (3b, DH Litzror, and 2b, DH Kach Tzaros Tzarasah) clearly says that according to Rav Yehudah, the source is from a verse and is *not* something we would know from logic.

In addition, TOSFOS (2a, DH Ad Sof) explains that the Girsas in the Beraisa should include the line about Tzaros of a Tzarah, and that both Rav Yehudah and Rav Ashi agree that the

source for the Isur of Tzaros of a Tzarah is the verse of "Litzror." The argument later (13a) involves whether or not the Isur of the secondary Tzaros applies ad infinitum ("Ad Sof ha'Olam"); the Isur of those additional Tzaros is derived from logic or from a verse. According to Tosfos, Rabbi Akiva Eiger's question can be asked according to both Rav Yehudah and Rav Ashi. Why do the Amora'im seem to agree that it is necessary to have a verse to teach the Isur of Tzaros of a Tzarah?

(b) The verse does not say that the Tzarah of the Ervah does not fall to Yibum at all and has no "Zikas Yibum." It only says that the brother cannot do Yibum with the Tzarah, and she is Asur to him with a punishment of Kares (8a). We know that whenever there is an Isur Kares standing in the way of doing Yibum, it is also prohibited to do Chalitzah, as we find in the Gemara later (20a) and in Rashi (2b, DH v'Eshes Achiv). We know, therefore, that the brother may not do Yibum nor Chalitzah with the Tzaras Ervah.

If he is the only brother surviving, then there cannot be any Zikah of Yibum, because if there is, then she will never be able to remarry, since she is Zekukah to Yibum but cannot do Yibum nor Chalitzah. Rather, since the brother cannot do either act, there is no Zikah and the woman may marry anyone she wants.

However, when there are other brothers, perhaps the Zikah takes effect on the entire household as a whole, and once she is Zekukah to some of the brothers, she is also Zekukah to all of them. One brother -- the one to which this woman is an Ervah or a Tzarah of an Ervah -- cannot remove the Zikah by doing Yibum or Chalitzah. Any of the other brothers, though, can do Yibum or Chalitzah and thereby remove the Zikah from the entire household, and also remove the Isur of "Eshes Ach" for all of the brothers. And just like he removes the Zikah from the other brothers, he also removes the Zikah from the brother who could not do Yibum. Since the Tzaras Ervah was Zekukah to that brother, she will not become Asur with the Isur of "Eshes Ach." She will be like any other woman who is able to fall to Yibum more than once -- if the first brother who married her died childless, and then the second brother who married her through Yibum died childless, and so on. (In other words, this woman is considered to be an "Eshes Ach b'Makom Mitzvah," which does *not* stand in the way of doing Yibum.)

This is why we need a verse to teach us that the Tzaros of a Tzarah are prohibited, and there is no Zikah whatsoever (for either the Ervah or for the Tzaros) to the brother who is related to them as an Ervah.

This differs from the case of "Eshes Achiv she'Lo Hayah b'Olam." In that case, we do not need a verse to show that there is no Zikah to the brother who is born after the first brother died and his wife fell to Yibum. We do not need a verse because the verses regarding Yibum in the Torah refer only to when the brothers were alive together, and not to when a brother was born after the first brother died. It is obvious that the younger brother is not included in the Zikah.

This is not the case, though, with regard to the Tzarah of an Ervah. The verses do not exclude the Tzarah in the discussion of Yibum. Instead, a different verse, not related to Yibum, teaches that she does not do Yibum. Since it is learned from a different source, there is room to doubt whether the verse of "Litzror" is teaching us that she is not in the Parashah of Yibum in the first place (and she is excluded from Zikah), or whether it is telling us that she is in the Parashah of Yibum, but the Torah says that she is not able to do Yibum or Chalitzah (but she has Zikah).

The same can be said according to Rabbi (8b). According to Rabbi, the verse that teaches that a Tzarah of an Ervah does not do Yibum is in the Parashah of Yibum itself. Since the verse excludes her from the Mitzvah of Yibum, there is obviously no reason to assume that there is any Zikah for the Tzarah of an Ervah, and that is why it is not necessary to bring a verse to exempt the Tzaros of a Tzarah according to Rabbi.
