



BS"D

To: parsha@groups.io
From: cshulman@gmail.com

INTERNET PARSHA SHEET
ON VAYISHLACH - 5782

parsha@groups.io / www.parsha.net - in our 27th year!
To receive this parsha sheet, go to <http://www.parsha.net>
and click Subscribe or send a blank e-mail to
parsha+subscribe@groups.io Please also copy me at
cshulman@gmail.com A complete archive of previous
issues is now available at <http://www.parsha.net> It is
also fully searchable.

Sponsored in memory of **Chaim Yissachar z"l** ben
Yecheil Zaydel Dov

Sponsored in memory of **R' Yisrael Yaakov (Halpert)**
ben Dovid Chaim z"l

Sponsored in memory of **Nachman Daniel z"l** ben Aryeh
Tzvi

To sponsor a parsha sheet contact cshulman@parsha.net
(proceeds to tzedaka)

from: **Rabbi Yitzchok Adlerstein**
<ravadlerstein@torah.org>
to: targumim@torah.org
date: Nov 17, 2021, 4:45 PM
subject: Reb Yeruchem - Alone Needn't Mean Lonely
Reb Yeruchem

By Rabbi Yitzchok Adlerstein
Parshas Vayishlach
Alone Needn't Mean Lonely

Based on Daas Torah by R. Yeruchem Levovitz

Yaakov remained alone. A man wrestled with him till
daybreak.[2]

Just as "Hashem alone will be exalted on that day,"[3] so
too is Yaakov described as being alone/levado. That is
what Chazal say,[4] although to us the comparison
sounds like apples and oranges. Other than the spelling of
the same word, there does not seem to be anything that
the two instances of "alone" have anything in common.

At the end of time, Hashem will be the only deity
recognized and served. Furthermore, He will be exalted
for this, i.e. people will understand that He does it all
alone, without having to call on Nature, people, or
anything else. What does that have to do with the fact that
Yaakov was left alone on the wrong side of the river, and
could call on no one for assistance when he was mugged –
although he very much could have used the help?

The midrash is telling us that one of the midos of HKBH
is levado. The Torah describes Creation, and Hashem's
relationship with it. It speaks of an assortment of
heavenly beings, all His "helpers," as it were, in fulfilling
His commands. While we understand that we cannot take
descriptions of "help" to Hashem literally, they point to
His somehow sharing a space with other things and
beings. There is one midah, however, which we can call
"levado." It refers to aspects of Himself that applied
"before" there was a Creation. And, as the line in Adon
Olam has it, after everything else is spent, "levado
yimloch" – alone He will reign. This aloneness does not
apply to any of His other midos. In effect, it stands above
all of them.

To some small but important extent, Yaakov shared that
midah going in to the fight with Esav's angel. He rose to
a level of self-containment, complete independence of
relying on others. It was specifically a Yaakov who was
fully alone that could struggle the entire evening with that
malach and never go down.

Bil'am foresaw: "It is a nation that dwells alone, and is
not reckoned among the nations." [5] Targum Yonoson
understands this as, "It is a nation that, by their being
alone, will in the future inherit the world, because they do
not concern themselves with the ways of the other
nations." Can it be that that our greatest claim to olam

habo will be avoiding the ways of the non-Jews? Yet, upon reflection, we should question how it was that our ancestors were able to withstand the urge in so many places and times to blend in with their cultural surround. How did they resist the temptation to gain more acceptance by imitating the ways of non-Jews? There must have been – and continues to be – such a strong pull to share their world! The source of their strength, indeed, was this midah of levado inherited from our avos. They all became alone-ers, proud individualists who refused to attach themselves or follow others.

The Mishnah[6] teaches, “Who is the wise one? He who learns from everyone. Who is mighty? He who conquers his own inclinations. Who is rich? He who finds happiness in his own portion. Who is honored? One who honors others.” All of these make the touchstone of success something that is internal, rather than external. If a person could only become wise if he finds the proper teacher, what will become of the person who cannot find a teacher? But if he has the capacity to learn from everyone he encounters, then he can always access wisdom, without dependence upon others. The greatest wisdom is accessible from within, and not dependent on relations with others.

If strength depends on the ability to overpower another, what strength can a person possess when he faces someone indeed stronger than himself? If strength, however, can be measured independently of others, if it can relate entirely to himself, then he can show true strength in vanquishing his yetzer hora.

If wealth is determined by net worth relative to that of other people, no person can ever be truly secure in it. His assets are always subject to risk factors that can undo him. But if it can be measured independently of others – if the only frame of reference is himself – a person can be wealthy in the happiness that his own lot brings him. Honor that comes from the accolades of others ceases if others refuse to express their adulation. But if honor can come from the capacity to bestow it upon others, there are limitless opportunities to do so, and honor will never evade him.

These examples show the power of the levado trait on the individual. Multiplied across the entire Jewish nation, the independence it produces allow us to stay the difficult course of history till the arrival of geulah at the end.

1. Based on Daas Torah by R. Yeruchem Levovitz, Bereishis pgs. 205-206 ↑ 2. Bereishis 32:25 ↑ 3. Yeshaya 2:11 ↑ 4. Bereishis Rabbah 77:1 ↑ 5. Bamidbar 23:9 ↑ 6. Avos 4:1 ↑

Reb Yeruchem © 2020 by Torah.org.

Permission is granted to redistribute, but please give proper attribution and copyright to the author and Torah.org. Both the author and Torah.org reserve certain rights. Email copyrights@torah.org for full information. Torah.org: The Judaism Site Project Genesis, Inc. 2833 Smith Ave., Suite 225 Baltimore, MD 21209 <http://www.torah.org/> learn@torah.org (410) 602-1350

from: Rabbi Yissocher Frand <ryfrand@torah.org>

to: ravfrand@torah.org

date: Nov 17, 2021, 10:58 AM

subject: Rav Frand - The Torah Forbids Plowing With a Shor and a Chamor Together

***Rabbi Yissocher Frand - Parshas Vayishlach
The Torah Forbids Plowing With a Shor and a Chamor
Together***

This week’s parsha contains the terrible story that happened to Dina bas Yaakov. She was captured and violated by Shechem, who then wanted to marry her. Rabbeinu Bachaye brings the following Medrash Tanchuma. Shechem told Yaakov: I know that your grandfather Avraham was a prince, as it is written “A prince of Elokim are you in our midst” (Bereshis 23:6) and I also am a prince in this land. Let the daughter of a prince marry a prince. It is a perfect match.”

Yaakov responded that a Nasi (Prince) can only be a “Shor” (ox). Avraham is referred to as a “Shor” as it is written “And Avraham ran to the cattle” (Bereshis 18:7) and it is written “...and many crops come forth by the strength of an ox (rov tevuos b’koach shor)” (Mishlei 14:4). Yaakov insisted that it was not a good match. My grandfather was a prince who was a Shor (ox) and you are a Chamor (donkey)! (Shechem’s father was named Chamor.) The Torah decrees “You shall not plow with a Shor and a with a Chamor together” (Devorim 22:10). In effect, Yaakov told his potential mechutan, “I’m sorry, the Torah forbids a combination of a Shor and a Chamor. We can’t make this Shidduch.”

In order to explain this rather perplexing Medrash, we need to introduce a concept that we mentioned in past

years. In the beginning of Parshas VaYishlach, Rashi says that Yaakov instructed his messengers to tell Eisav, “I have been living with Lavan, and I tarried until now.” Rashi famously elaborates: During this time, I did not become a distinguished officer but I have been a mere stranger. There is no justification for you to hate me based on jealousy of the blessing my father gave me that “You shall be a ruler over your brother.”

“I know you still hate me for taking the Brochos that our father thought he was giving to you. But listen, they did not help me at all. Thirty-four years later, I am still a stranger living on the road. All these years later, and I have no dominion whatsoever over my brother. I am a nobody, and you have no reason to be jealous of the blessings I received.”

Rashi elaborates on the words “And I have oxen and donkeys, cattle, male and female servants” (Bereshis 32:6) as follows: Father said I would be blessed with the dew of heaven and the fat of the earth, but my property is neither from the heaven nor from the earth. Again, Yaakov emphasizes to Eisav that the blessings were not fulfilled, there was nothing for Eisav to be jealous about, and, in fact, it could be that Eisav got the better half of the deal by taking the lentil soup—at least that was something concrete.

There are several problems with this Rashi. For instance, Rav Moshe Feinstein asks that the Brochos that Yitzchak Avinu gave to Yaakov were a nevuah (prophecy). Is Rashi suggesting that Yaakov is denying the veracity of this nevuah? Is he saying that Yitzchak was wrong? Is he, Chas v'Shalom, accusing Yitzchak of uttering a false prophecy? Rashi cannot be saying that Yaakov was suggesting that these prophetic brochos were worthless. Second, brochos are never fulfilled instantaneously. The fact that Yaakov has not yet seen the benefit of these blessings in no way diminishes their value or significance. The truth of the matter is that it took hundreds of years for them to be fulfilled. Yaakov's descendants were in Egypt for 210 years, and they were in the Wilderness for another 40 years. The Blessings were really not fulfilled until the time of Shlomo haMelech. What is Yaakov telling Eisav – the blessings are worthless because they were not fulfilled? Wait! They will yet be fulfilled in full!

When someone starts a business, he should not expect to make his fortune within the first six months of opening

the business. Bill Gates started Microsoft in a garage in Seattle, Washington. He did not become a billionaire overnight. It takes time. Everything takes time. It is only in our generation that we expect instantaneous results. Cooking is too slow, so we need to microwave our food. Postal services are too slow, so we need to send faxes. Faxes are too slow so we need to send email. Everything needs to be this instant. But that is not the way all of life works, and it is certainly not the way ruchniyus works. So, we have two questions: 1) Theologically, how could Yaakov say that the prophetic blessings were not fulfilled, and 2) Of course they were not fulfilled YET – give them time to reach their historical moment of fulfillment! The explanation is that Yaakov knew exactly with whom he was dealing—Eisav. The Sforno in Parshas Toldos shares a very important principle, not only about Eisav, but about wicked people in general. The Sforno interprets the pasuk “Sell to me like the day (ka'yom) your birthright” (Bereshis 25:31) as follows: You, Eisav, live for the day—for today. You put so much effort into today's work that you are now so exhausted so you can't even tell the difference between a bowl of soup and the color red. There is no doubt that you will not be able to perform in the function of the firstborn to minister before the L-rd Almighty, to do that which is appropriate for a bechor.

Yaakov tells his brother, “This job is not for you. You are a “ka'yom” man! You are a man that lives for today.” The difference between tzadikim and reshaim is that reshaim live for the moment. They want instant gratification. They don't have the long view. Yaakov, on the other hand, had a long view of life. He knows that not everything is instantaneous. Some things take time. If you take the view that the bechora will eventually entail the Service of Hashem and a permanent job in the Beis HaMikdash, then it means something. This is how a tzadik views the matter. Yaakov tells Eisav “I know you have no interest in being the bechor, because you are only a “Ka'yom man.”

This is the general approach of virtually all reshaim. They trade an Olam Kayam (a permanent world) for an Olam Over (a transitory world). When people are faced with the dilemma of choosing the pleasure of the moment or choosing the long-term view at the cost of deferring instant gratification, people that don't possess a sense of

spirituality always choose the TODAY. They don't look at the long view.

Yaakov knew this facet of Eisav. He certainly knew very well that the brochos would take hundreds of years to be fulfilled. But that did not make a difference to him. He was willing to wait. On the other hand, he understood with whom he was dealing. He knew that if Eisav still did not see fruits of this blessing after 34 years, he would consider them worthless.

Yaakov was talking Eisav's language when he sent the message to Eisav: Look what happened to me... I am just a ger. I have no land. I have received neither blessings of heaven nor earth these past 34 years. However, Yaakov himself understood that he was in it for the long haul, and was in no way denying the value or validity of these blessings.

Rav Avrohom Bukspan of Miami uses this concept to suggest an interpretation of the Medrash that Rabbeinu Bechaye quotes. (I am a Shor and you are a Chamor and the Torah says a Shor and Chamor cannot plow together. Therefore, Dina and Shechem cannot marry each other.) What is the difference between the avodah of a Shor and that of a Chamor? The work that an ox does is for the future. Oxen plow the field, making it fit for sowing. In the spring, a farmer plows his field to prepare it for planting. It takes months for wheat to grow but the oxen are out in the field long before the seeds are even placed into the ground. The avodah of the shor is for the future. What is the avodah of a Chamor? A donkey schleps things. The farmer has a load he needs to take from point A to point B, so he puts it on the donkey who does the work of schlepping it for him. The difference between the ox and the donkey is the difference between the long view and the short view. The Shor is an animal whose whole function is to serve what is going to come in the future. The Chamor serves today's needs: I need to get this load to my house or to the barn or to the market right now! This is what Yaakov Avinu said to Shechem ben Chamor: I am a Shor and you are a Chamor. We are not compatible and cannot be harnessed together because the Torah prohibits plowing with an ox and donkey under one yoke. There is a second difference between an ox and a donkey. An ox chews its cud; a donkey does not chew its cud. Why does an animal chew its cud? It regurgitates the food over and over and over. It does not just eat a meal and that is the end of it. The food it consumes is a meal that

goes on and on, by virtue of the constant regurgitation of the cow or ox or other kosher animals. This is also an aspect of looking at the long view.

Yaakov tells Shechem – we are not a match because I am a Jew and you are not a Jew. A Jew looks at life based on what is going to be down the road. We take the long view of life and history. You are a Chamor. Just like a donkey looks only at the present – that too is the way you view life. This is not a compatible Shidduch.

I heard that Rav Moshe Soloveitchik (from the famous Soloveitchik family), who was Rav in Zurich Switzerland many years ago, was once counselling a couple who were having marital problems. The husband came to Rav Soloveitchik and said "My wife is making a mistake. She just isn't right! We can't come to terms." Rav Soloveitchik responded, "Maybe your wife is not right. But if you have Shalom and the house is tranquil then your children and grandchildren will grow up in such an environment and will be different people – much better people! Take the long view of life. The view of a Jew is always the long-term view. "Granted, your wife may be wrong in this argument. But if you take the long view of things and consider the effects of long term Shalom Bayis, it is far more important than the short-term victory over your wife in proclaiming 'I was right!'"

The whole point of being a Jew is that we are not into it for instant gratification, or just for the here and now. We are in it for the future as well. Therefore, he advised this congregant to give in to his wife, because in the long run, it will be for the best.

That is the difference between Yaakov and Shechem.

That is the difference between Yaakov and Eisav. That is the difference between a Yid and a non-Yid.

*Transcribed by David Twersky; Jerusalem
DavidATwersky@gmail.com*

*Technical Assistance by Dovid Hoffman; Baltimore, MD
dhoffman@torah.org*

*This week's write-up is adapted from the hashkafa
portion of Rabbi Yissochar Frand's Commuter
Chavrusah Series on the weekly Torah portion.*

*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.*

Torah.org: The Judaism Site Project Genesis, Inc. 2833
Smith Ave., Suite 225 Baltimore, MD 21209
<http://www.torah.org/learn@torah.org> (410) 602-1350
Rav Frand © 2020 by Torah.org.

from: **The Rabbi Sacks Legacy Trust**

<info@rabbisacks.org>

date: Nov 17, 2021, 2:18 PM

subject: The Parable of the Tribes (Vayishlach)
Covenant and Conversation - Essays on Ethics

The Parable of the Tribes (Vayishlach)

Rabbi Jonathan Sacks

From beginning to end, Genesis chapter 34 tells a terrifying story. Dina, Jacob's daughter – the only Jewish daughter mentioned in the entire patriarchal narrative – leaves the safety of home to go out to “look at the daughters of the land.” (Gen. 34:1) She is raped and abducted by a local prince, son of the king of the town known as Shechem.

Jacob learns of this fact but does nothing until his sons return. Dina's brothers Shimon and Levi immediately realise that they must act to rescue her. It is an almost impossible assignment. The hostage-taker is no ordinary individual. As the son of the king, he cannot be confronted directly. The king is unlikely to order his son to release her. The other townspeople, if challenged, will come to the prince's defence. It is Shimon and Levi against the town, two against many. Even were all of Jacob's sons to be enlisted, they would still be outnumbered.

Shimon and Levi therefore decide on a ruse. They agree to let Dina marry the prince, but they make one condition. All the male members of the town must all be circumcised. The men of Shechem, seeing long-term advantages to an alliance with this neighbouring tribe, agree. The men of the town are weakened by the operation, and their pain is most acute on the third day. That day, Shimon and Levi enter the town and kill the entire male population. They rescue Dina and bring her home. The other brothers then plunder the town. Jacob is horrified by their actions. “You have made me odious to the people of the land,” he says. (Gen. 34:30) What then were we supposed to do, ask the two brothers? “Should we have left our sister to be treated like a

prostitute?” With that rhetorical question, the episode ends and the narrative moves elsewhere. But Jacob's horror at the action of his sons does not end there. He returns to it on his deathbed, and in effect curses them: “Simeon and Levi are brothers— their swords are weapons of violence. Let me not enter their council, let me not join their assembly, for they have killed men in their anger and hamstringed oxen as they pleased. Cursed be their anger, so fierce, and their fury, so cruel! I will scatter them in Jacob and disperse them in Israel. (Gen. 49:5-7)

The story of Dina is an extraordinary passage. It seems to lack any kind of moral message. No one comes out of it well. Shechem, the prince, would seem to be the chief villain. It was he who abducted and raped Dina in the first place. Hamor, his father, fails to reprimand him or order Dina's release. Shimon and Levi are guilty of a horrendous act of violence. The other brothers engage in looting the town.[1] Jacob seems passive throughout. He neither acts nor instructs his sons on how to act. Even Dina herself seems at best to have been guilty of carelessness in going out into what was clearly a dangerous neighbourhood – recall that both Abraham and Isaac, her grandfather and great grandfather, had feared for their own lives because of the lawlessness of the times.[2]

Who was in the right and who in the wrong are left conspicuously undecided in the text. Jacob condemns his sons, but his sons reject the criticism.

This debate continued and was taken up by two of the greatest Rabbis in the Middle Ages. Maimonides takes the side of Shimon and Levi. They were justified in what they did, he says. The other members of the town saw what Shechem had done, knew that he was guilty of a crime, and yet they neither brought him to court nor rescued the girl. They were therefore accomplices in his guilt. What Shechem had done was a capital crime, and by sheltering him the townspeople were implicated.[3] This is, incidentally, a fascinating ruling since it suggests that for Maimonides the rule that “all Israel are responsible for one another” (Shavuot 39a) is not restricted to Israel. It applies to all societies. As Isaac Arama was to write in the fifteenth century, any crime known about and allowed to continue ceases to be an offence of individuals only and becomes a sin of the community as a whole.[4]

Nahmanides disagrees (in his commentary to Gen. 34:13). The principle of collective responsibility does not, in his view, apply to non-Jewish societies. The Noahide covenant requires every society to set up courts of law, but it does not imply that a failure to prosecute a wrongdoer involves all members of the society in a capital crime.

The debate continues today among Bible scholars. Two in particular subject the story to close literary analysis: Meir Sternberg in his *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative*[5] and Rabbi Elchanan Samet in his studies on the parsha.[6] They too arrive at conflicting conclusions. Sternberg argues that the text is critical of Jacob for both his inaction and his criticism of his sons for acting. Samet sees the chief culprits as Shechem and Hamor.

Both point out, however, the remarkable fact that the text deliberately deepens the moral ambiguity by refusing to portray even the apparent villains in an unduly negative light. Consider the chief wrongdoer, the young prince Shechem. The text tells us that “his heart was drawn to Dina, daughter of Jacob; he loved the young woman and spoke tenderly to her. And Shechem said to his father Hamor, ‘Get me this girl as my wife.’” (Gen. 34:3-4) Compare this with the description of Amnon, son of King David, who rapes his half-sister Tamar. That story too is a tale of bloody revenge. But the text says about Amnon that after raping Tamar, he “hated her with intense hatred. In fact, he hated her more than he had loved her. Amnon said to her, ‘Get up and get out!’” (2 Samuel 13:15). Shechem is not like that at all. He falls in love with Dina and wants to marry her. The king and the people of the town readily accede to the Shimon and Levi’s request that they become circumcised.

Not only does the text not demonise the people of Shechem, it also does not paint any of Jacob’s family in a positive light. It uses the same word – “deceit” (34:13) – of Shimon and Levi that it has used previously about Jacob taking Esau’s blessing, and Laban substituting Leah for Rachel. Its description of all the character – from the gadabout Dina to her excessively violent rescuers, to the plundering other brothers and the passive Jacob – the text seems written deliberately to alienate our sympathies. The overall effect is a story with no irredeemable villains and no stainless heroes. Why then is it told at all? Stories do not appear in the Torah merely because they happened. The Torah is not a history book. It is silent on some of the

most important periods of time. We know nothing, for example, about Abraham’s childhood, or about thirty-eight of the forty years spent by the Israelites in the wilderness. Torah means “teaching”, “instruction”, “guidance”. What teaching does the Torah want us to draw from this narrative out of which no one emerges well?

There is an important thought-experiment devised by Andrew Schmookler, known as the parable of the tribes.[7] Imagine a group of tribes living close to one another. All choose the way of peace except one that is willing to use violence to achieve its ends. What happens to the peace-seeking tribes? One is defeated and destroyed. A second is conquered and subjugated. A third flees to some remote and inaccessible place. If the fourth seeks to defend itself, it too will have to have recourse to violence. “The irony is that successful defence against a power-maximising aggressor requires a society to become more like the society that threatens it. Power can be stopped only by power.”[8]

There are, in other words, four possible outcomes: [1] destruction, [2] subjugation, [3] withdrawal, and [4] imitation. “In every one of these outcomes the ways of power are spread throughout the system. This is the parable of the tribes.”[9] Recall that all but one of the tribes seeks peace and has no desire to exercise power over its neighbours. Nonetheless, if you introduce a single violent tribe into the region, violence will eventually prevail, however the other tribes choose to respond. That is the tragedy of the human condition.

As I was writing this essay in the summer of 2014, Israel was engaged in a bitter struggle with Hamas in Gaza in which many people died. The State of Israel had no more desire to be engaged in this kind of warfare than did our ancestor Jacob. Throughout the campaign I found myself recalling the words earlier in our parsha about Jacob’s feelings prior to his meeting with Esau: “Jacob was very afraid and distressed” (Gen. 32:8), about which the Sages said, “Afraid, lest he be killed, distressed lest he be forced to kill.”[10] What the episode of Dina tells us is not that Jacob, or Shimon and Levi, were right, but rather that there can be situations in which there is no right course of action; where whatever you do is wrong; where every option will involve the abandonment of some moral principle.

That is Schmookler's point, that "power is like a contaminant, a disease, which once introduced will gradually but inexorably become universal in the system of competing societies." [11] Shechem's single act of violence against Dina forced two of Jacob's sons into violent reprisal, and in the end everyone was either contaminated or dead. It is indicative of the moral depth of the Torah that it does not hide this terrible truth from us by depicting one side as guilty, the other as innocent. Violence defiles us all. It did then. It does now.

fw from hamelaket@gmail.com
from: Destiny Foundation/Rabbi Berel Wein
<info@jewishdestiny.com>
reply-to: info@jewishdestiny.com
subject: Weekly Parsha from Rabbi Berel Wein
Weekly Parsha VAYISHLACH 5782
Rabbi Wein's Weekly Blog

We seem to find our father Jacob always in some sort of flight. He flees from the wrath of his brother Eisav and spends decades in exile in the house of Lavan. Eventually, he is forced to flee from Lavan when it becomes obvious to him that dishonesty, corruption, and idolatry that characterize the house of Lavan endanger Jacob's physical and spiritual survival, as well as that of his family.

Because of all of this, he flees the house of Lavan to try to return to his home in the land of Israel. Pursued by Lavan, Jacob eventually mollifies Lavan, and continues his journey. But now he regards himself as a fugitive, constantly in danger and subject to constant threats from outside enemies from whom he cannot seemingly escape.

The encounter with his brother Eisav, as described in this week's Torah reading, is the culmination of Jacob's realization of all his fears, and of the futility of his repeated attempts to flee and escape. Rashi points out that Jacob devised a plan of three options regarding the forthcoming encounter with Eisav: to purchase goodwill with money, with a prayer to heaven to help them escape trouble, and, if necessary, physical self-defense to preserve his life and his family.

It is noteworthy that the option of fleeing, of running away, does not appear in the literature as being an option that Jacob considered in this instance. He apparently is

done running, and now turns to face his problems and his adversary, head-on, face-to-face.

Jacob is pre-empted by a mysterious confrontation with the angel of Eisav before the actual encounter with his brother. That encounter comes upon him suddenly and unexpectedly, and it is a threat that he cannot escape from. Jacob wrestles with his adversaries but in the ensuing struggle, Jacob is injured. He prevails though and emerges triumphant, so much so, that his adversary is forced to bless him and acknowledge his greatness. It is this encounter with the angel that, somehow, brought home to Jacob the futility of attempting to escape the meeting with his brother. Jacob. He decides to confront his problems and not avoid them, and devises three options as to how he will encounter Eisav, but also confront him.

There are many problems in life – and, in fact, life is a series of problems – that we often attempt to deal with by ignoring them or fleeing from them. This tactic rarely proves successful. Eventually we all must meet up with our own Eisav, or at least with the angel - and ideas that the angel represents. Judaism has never attempted to escape from the world. Instead, it has always attempted to face it, argue, and debate, teach, and instruct, and retain its faith and values. History has shown us how impossible it is to avoid confrontation – certainly in the realm of ideas, beliefs, and normative behavior. Being able to face up to a problem and its ramifications is the first step towards being able somehow to solve or overcome the problem, with an adequate resolution.

Shabbat shalom
Rabbi Berel Wein

fw from hamelaket@gmail.com
from: Rabbi Yochanan Zweig <genesis@torah.org>
to: rabbizweig@torah.org
date: Nov 17, 2021, 5:27 PM
subject: Rabbi Zweig on the Parsha - A Tragic Choice
Insights Parshas Vayishlach - Kislev 5782
Yeshiva Beis Moshe Chaim / Talmudic University
Based on the Torah of our Rosh HaYeshiva HaRav
Yochanan Zweig

This week's Insights is dedicated in memory of Ze'ev ben Mordechai Avraham. "May his Neshama have an Aliya!"
All I Ever Wanted...

And Eisav said, “I have plenty, my brother; let what is yours remain yours.” Yaakov said, “Please, no! If I have gained favor in your eyes then accept my tribute [...] inasmuch as I have everything.” He urged him and (Eisav) accepted it (33:9-11).

This week’s parsha features the long anticipated showdown between Yaakov Avinu and his brother Eisav. Yaakov expended much time and effort preparing for the encounter with his brother, not knowing if Eisav would receive him as a friend or as a foe. One of the ways that Yaakov approached the upcoming encounter with his brother was to try to appease him with a large gift of animals and servants.

When Yaakov finally came face to face with his brother, Eisav declined the generous gifts from Yaakov and said, “I have plenty — you keep what is yours.” Yaakov countered that Eisav should accept his gifts because he already had everything that he needed.

Chazal point out the marked difference between the brothers’ perspective on their possessions; Eisav saying that he has a lot and Yaakov saying that he has all that he needs.

From the plain reading of the text one would presume that the philosophical difference between Yaakov and Eisav’s perspectives is that Yaakov felt that he didn’t need anything because he had everything he needed while Eisav felt that he had plenty but was still looking for more. In other words, Yaakov was satisfied with his lot in life while Eisav had an insatiable appetite for more. This is how Yaakov knew that he could entice Eisav to accept his tribute.

But Rashi doesn’t interpret Eisav’s comment in that manner. Rashi (33:11) contrasts Yaakov’s comment with that of Eisav’s: “Yaakov said ‘I have all that I require’ while Eisav retorted in a haughty manner; ‘I have plenty,’ which implies that I have much more than I need.”

Meaning, Rashi sees Eisav’s perspective as being one of conceit. What about Eisav’s comment implies that he’s arrogant? Furthermore, if Eisav really was saying that he had more than he needed, then why would Yaakov feel that his continued urging would get Eisav to acquiesce? Rashi is giving us a remarkable insight into how some people view the possessions with which Hashem has blessed them.

When Yaakov Avinu said that Hashem gave him all that he needed, he was really explaining that whatever

Hashem had given him had a purpose and his role was to use the money responsibly. Therefore, whatever Hashem gave him was by definition all that he needed. If he were to be given more money, then it would just mean that he had more to accomplish.

By contrast, Eisav said that he had more than he needed and there was no overarching purpose to using whatever he had. Therefore, if he had more than he could utilize in the moment, then he had more than he knew what to do with. His goal wasn’t to use what he had for the sake of something outside of himself, rather his goal was to collect more than what he needed because, in his worldview, having more meant that he was more. Thus, Eisav was in the business of accumulation for his own grandiosity. This insight into Eisav’s psyche was exactly what Yaakov seizes upon and was the principle upon which he based his entreaty.

Unfortunately, many individuals fall into this trap and collect assets for the simple purpose of accumulation. When a person doesn’t live in a theocentric universe then everything that he collects is about his needs and, essentially, about himself. People often fool themselves into thinking that they are collecting assets for altruistic reasons. However, the ultimate litmus test is whether or not they begin with a clearly defined vision of what they want to do with the resources or if they merely focus on warehousing resources. Chazal take it a step further by saying that collecting money for the sole purpose of leaving it over for your children is also not correct (see Gittin 47a) as we find in Tehillim (49:11), “That the fool and the stupid alike perish and leave their wealth to others.”

Frum - Not Frumpy

And Dinah, the daughter of Leah, whom she had borne to Yaakov, went out to look over the daughters of the land [...] (34:1).

After Yaakov Avinu’s encounter with his brother Eisav, Yaakov journeyed to Succos. He settled in the area adjacent to the city of Shechem, where he bought a plot of land (interestingly enough, Avraham Avinu’s first stop in the land of Israel (12:6) was also there).

The Torah goes on to relate how Yaakov’s daughter Dinah went out to explore the women of the area and in the process was abducted and subsequently violated by Shechem, the son of the chief of the city. This led to a violent confrontation when the children of Yaakov went

to retrieve their sister and avenge the wrong, which resulted in the total annihilation of the city's adult male population.

Rashi (ad loc) is bothered by the Torah's description of Dinah as the daughter of Leah (as opposed to the daughter of Yaakov as well). Rashi explains that Dinah had the attribute of "צאנית" — a woman that goes out," which she inherited from her mother Leah who also had this attribute as we find, "Leah went out to meet him" (30:16). Thus, concludes Rashi, "like mother like daughter."

Rashi's implies that this is a negative character trait that somehow, at least in part, factored into the circumstances surrounding Dinah's abduction. Many commentaries criticize Rashi's implication and characterization of Leah as being immodest (see Abarbanel and others ad loc) and actually cite proofs that Leah was indeed quite modest. In fact, the Gemara (Eruvin 100a) quotes the above incident referring to Leah being "forward" with her husband Yaakov as being the reason that she gave birth to their son Yissochar — father to some of the greatest people in Moshe Rabbeinu's generation. Moshe had instructed Bnei Yisroel to appoint qualified men to serve alongside him as judges. He stipulated that they must find men with three qualities: 1) wisdom 2) intuitive understanding 3) men of known prominence. Men with two of the qualities were easily identified, but they were unable to find men with intuitive understanding outside of the tribe of Yissochar. Thus, Leah's attribute of being "forward" with Yaakov led to the remarkable outcome of having descendants with intuitive understanding. What is the connection?

Rashi (Devarim 1:13) explains the difference between having wisdom and having intuitive understanding with a "real life" illustration: A wise person is like a rich money changer who competently conducts his business and when he doesn't have any business he sits and waits for customers. By contrast, a person who has intuitive understanding is like an enterprising money changer; if he doesn't have any business, he goes out and brings in new business. In other words, a person of intuitive understanding has an inborn initiative. This clarifies how Leah's forwardness (taking initiative) translated into having children with intuitive understanding. Yet, we must reconcile this attribute of being forward with her attribute of modesty.

Man was created with an inner drive to connect to something outside of himself. This connection is a path to growing beyond one's own limitations and allows man to feel fulfilled and accomplished, which is a large aspect in the purpose of creation. This inner drive is what compels man to find a mate and build a life from that coupling. There are two components to this drive: the physical and the emotional. In a perfect union, these two components merge and fulfill the entirety of man's inner drive. A woman's role in this process is to appeal to both aspects of man's desires and truly guide the man to a better life together. A woman's intuitive understanding in this process of building the man's home and life (not to mention his fragile psyche) is beyond the grasp of ordinary men, whose focus is on accomplishments in the outside world beyond the home. Thus, it is only with the woman's validation of the man that he can confidently go out and conquer the world.

In order to create this perfect union, a woman needs to attract a man by connecting on an emotional level while also reassuring him that the accomplished, insightful, refined woman before him actually desires him. This is a delicate balancing act. Unfortunately, many insecure women try to short circuit this process by merely appealing to a man's most base physical desire by advertising themselves as available in a physical manner. The unhappy consequences of this is that a proper respect for the woman is never fully realized and this leads to a most imperfect union.

This is the Jewish value of modesty: A woman develops herself into an incredible human being who dresses with class and elegance, as befits a woman of stature. In terms of dress think royal family instead of Kardashians family. When a woman of such respectability makes herself "available" to her husband, she is actually building him up, expressing that such an impressive person wants to be with him only. This validates and empowers him to achieve in the world outside the home.

Undoubtedly, this attribute of real modesty, which Jewish mothers have been modeling for thousands of years, has led to the remarkable accomplishments of the Jewish people throughout history.

Talmudic College of Florida

Rohr Talmudic University Campus

4000 Alton Road, Miami Beach, FL 33140

fw from hamelaket@gmail.com
from: Ohr Somayach <ohr@ohr.edu>
to: weekly@ohr.edu
subject: Torah Weekly

***Ohr Somayach :: Torah Weekly :: Parsha Insights
For the week ending 20 November 2021 / 16 Kislev 5782***

Rabbi Yaakov Asher Sinclair -

www.seasonsofthemoon.com

Parashat Vayishlach

A Minimal Attention Span

"Yaakov was left alone and a man wrestled with him until the break of dawn." (32:25)

We live in an era of distraction. Television advertising and music video driven by big BPM (bucks-per-minute) have accelerated the cutting rates of film and video to the microsecond. The ubiquitous cell phone interrupts thoughts, conversations and lives. Many do not think anymore — just surf through their thoughts. Now this and now this and now this. How long can a normal person hold an idea in his head? Everyone is invited to try it. Whoops? Try again! How long can the average person concentrate on an idea without any other thought intruding? Ten seconds? Twenty? Twenty is pretty “Olympic” in my own experience.

In this week’s Torah portion, an incorporeal spiritual force (trans. angel) attacks Yaakov and wrestles with him until the dawn. This angel was the protecting force of the nation of Esav. Why did the angel of Esav not attack Avraham or Yitzchak? Why did he wait for Yaakov? This world stands on three pillars: On kindness, on prayer and on Torah. The three Patriarchs represent these three pillars: Avraham is the pillar of kindness, Yitzchak, the pillar of prayer, and Yaakov, the pillar of Torah. The Torah is the unique possession of the Jewish People. No other nation in the world has the Torah. Therefore, an attack on Torah is the one that hits at the heart of Judaism.

The angel of Esav attacked Yaakov because he knew that the most effective way to destroy the Jewish People is to deter them from learning Torah.

Even though the angel of Esav was unsuccessful in his fight with Yaakov, he managed to damage him in the thigh. The thigh is the place in the body that represents

progeny and the continuation of Jewish continuity. In the era before the arrival of the Mashiach, Esav will try to make it very difficult to educate our children with Torah. Torah demands commitment, application and concentration. The essence of Torah study is to be able to contain several ideas in one’s head and to synthesize and counterpoint these ideas. A distracted person cannot learn Torah. Our era is one in which distraction has become an industry.

In the generation before the Mashiach in which we currently find ourselves, maintaining a minimal attention span will be a gigantic battle in itself. May we all be successful with the help of Heaven.

© 2020 Ohr Somayach International

fw from hamelaket@gmail.com

<http://www.israelnationalnews.com/Articles/Author.aspx/1199>

Chief Rabbi Ephraim Mirvis

chiefrabbi.org

Chief Rabbi Ephraim Mirvis

Dvar Torah Vayishlach: The legacy of those who perished in the Holocaust

17 November 2021

I have always been saddened by the fact that Holocaust victims have no matzeiva. You can’t visit a cemetery and see a tombstone over a grave for them as one does for all others. Yet I derive some chizuk, some support, from the beautiful teaching in Parshat Vayishlach. Here the Torah provides the details of the sad passing of Rachel. She was buried in Bethlehem, Beit Lechem, and one can visit her tomb to this very day. Indeed the Torah refers to the place of her burial by saying (Bereishit 35:20),

“Hi matzevet kevrat Rachel ad hayom,” – “This is the memorial to the burial place of Rachel to this very day.”
Burial Place

Now some of our commentators ask about a redundant word here. The Torah could have said, “Hi matzevet Rachel,” – “This is the memorial of Rachel.” Why does it say, “Hi matzevet kevrat Rachel,” – “This is a memorial of the burial place of Rachel”?

The Sefer Chomat Aish explains beautifully. He cites the teaching of Chazal, our Sages, who say, “Ein osin nefashot letzaddikim. Divreihem hein heim zichronam.” – “There is no need to make a matzeiva, a

memorial in stone, for outstanding people. Their words and their deeds, that is their everlasting memorial.” Indeed this is so very true, because the true impact, the legacy of such people continues to exist in people’s hearts and in people’s minds. In turn, they pass it on to the generations to come and that’s how great people continue to live forever.

Now we can understand why the Torah does not say, “Hi matzevet Rachel,” – “This is the memorial of Rachel.” It is because Rachel has a far greater memorial than a memorial in stone. Rachel’s legacy has endured within our hearts and our minds for all time and that’s why the Torah says, “Hi matzevet kevurat Rachel.”

The essence of that place is as a memorial in stone marking the place where she was buried, and that’s the place which we can come to in order to pay our respects to her.

Legacy

With regard to the six million precious Jewish souls who perished in the Holocaust, it is beyond words to explain. But in truth, they continue to live on through us. The torch of their Judaism and their good deeds is borne aloft by us with pride, guaranteeing that despite the efforts of our enemies to destroy us, am Yisrael chai – through our efforts and our faith, the people of Israel live on forever. Despite the fact that there are no matzeivas for them, nonetheless the victims of the Shoah, will remain alive within us for all time.

Shabbat shalom.

Rabbi Mirvis is the Chief Rabbi of the United Kingdom. He was formerly Chief Rabbi of Ireland.

fw from hamelaket@gmail.com

from: Rabbi Chanan Morrison

<chanan@ravkooktorah.org>

to: rav-kook-list@googlegroups.com

subject: [Rav Kook Torah]

Rav Kook Torah

Vayishlach: The Service of Pillars and Altars

Chanan Morrison

Having survived the confrontation with Esau and his private militia, the mysterious nighttime struggle at Penuel, the abduction of his daughter Dinah, and the battle against the city of Shechem — Jacob finally made his way back to Beth El. Twenty years earlier, Jacob had

stayed overnight in Beth El, dreaming of angels and Divine protection as he fled from his brother Esau. Now he would fulfill his decades-old promise to worship God in that holy place.

In preparation for this spiritual journey, Jacob instructed his family:

“Remove the foreign gods that are in your midst. Purify yourselves and change your clothes. Then we will rise and ascend to Beth El. There I will construct an altar to God, Who answered me in my hour of trouble, and Who accompanied me in the path that I took.” (Gen. 35:2-3) The first time Jacob had come to Beth El, he erected a matzeivah, a pillar with which to worship God. Now, Jacob built a mizbei'ach, an altar. What is the difference between worshipping God with a pillar or with an altar? The Torah later prohibits erecting a matzeivah, even if it is to be used to worship God (Deut. 16:22). The Sages explained that the matzeivah “was beloved in the time of the Patriarchs, but abhorred in the time of their descendants“ (Sifri Shoftim 146).

What brought about this change in status?

Service of the Klal

The difference between a matzeivah and a mizbei'ach is primarily a physical one. A matzeivah is a single large stone, while a mizbei'ach is an altar constructed from many stones. The switch from pillar to altar indicates a paradigm shift that took place in the way God was to be served in the time of the Patriarchs and in the time of their descendants.

Each of the three Avot — Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob — had his own unique way of serving God. Abraham served God with his overriding traits of love, kindness, and hospitality. Isaac served God with awe and submission, traits he acquired at the Akeidah. And Jacob, “the scholarly man who dwelled in tents [of Torah],” served God through Torah study.

In the time of the Patriarchs, each of the Avot was the leading light of his generation. His special trait dominated the era; his path of serving God was the appropriate path for that time. This period was aptly represented by the metaphor of the matzeivah: a single stone, a single way of serving God.

When Jacob returned to the Land of Israel, however, the situation had changed. He arrived at Beth El with twelve sons, the twelve tribes of Israel. No longer was there a single spiritual path for the generation. This was the start

of a new era: the service of the klal, the collective, in which each individual fills a particular role in order to reach a common national goal. Each of Jacob's sons developed his own way of serving God, based on a unique combination of the spiritual paths of the three Avot.

To fully function, the Jewish nation requires a variety of talents and fields of expertise. Spiritual leadership, in the form of teachers of Torah and kohanim, came from the tribe of Levi. Kings and national leaders arose from Judah. Issachar excelled in producing scholars and judges. Other tribes specialized in commerce, agriculture, and national defense.

The altar Jacob built from many stones upon his return to Beth El embodied the new paradigm of serving God. This was no longer a time of a single, uniform service of God. There were now many paths to serve God, which joined together in one altar, as all aspired toward the common goal of Divine service.

"Change Your Clothes"

With these divergent paths to serve God, however, a new problem arose. Each group may come to believe that its path is the most important and belittle the efforts of others. As they prepared to worship God with the multiple-stone mizbei'ach at Beth El, Jacob realized that it was necessary to take special measures to unite his family.

Jacob therefore instructed his family, "Remove the foreign gods in your midst." The Sages taught that the evil inclination is a "foreign god" (Shabbat 105b). Jacob pleaded that they remove the evil inclination which convinces us that others are "foreign." He wanted his family to recognize that, on the inside, the disparate members of the Jewish people are united in purpose and soul. For this reason, the Torah refers to Jacob's family as "seventy soul" (Ex. 1:5), in the singular, emphasizing that the souls of Israel are united at their source.

It is only the externals — our deeds and actions — that separate us. Therefore Jacob requested that his family purify themselves by changing their clothes, by removing the superficial exterior which conceals our true inner unity.

Then, Jacob announced, we will be ready to ascend to Beth El and worship God together. There we will serve God using a mizbei'ach, composed of many stones and

many paths — but all working together toward the same ultimate goal of serving God.

(Sapphire from the Land of Israel. Adapted from Midbar Shur, pp. 74-75)

Copyright © 2021 by Chanan Morrison

fw from hamelaket@gmail.com

from: Torah in Action /Shema Yisrael

<parsha@torahinaction.com>

subject: Peninim on the Torah by Rabbi A. Leib Scheinbaum

Shema Yisrael Torah Network

Peninim on the Torah - Parashas Vayishlach

...פרשת וישלח תשפ"ב

ויאבק איש עמו עד עלות השחר

And a man wrestled with him until the break of dawn. (32:25)

It was in middle of the night that Yaakov *Avinu* encountered a "man" who fought with him until he was bested by the Patriarch. We know that this was no ordinary man – and no ordinary fight. This was none other than Eisav's Heavenly angel, and the battle was one which represented the forces of evil against the forces of good. The angel representing Eisav lost the fight, but, throughout the millennia, he has not thrown in the towel, as he has attempted at every available juncture to turn the tide against Yaakov's descendants. The question that confronts the reader is, "Why Yaakov?" Avraham *Avinu* and Yitzchak *Avinu* preceded Yaakov, and apparently Satan did not challenge them. What was it about the third Patriarch that spurred such a Heavenly reaction? Apparently, Satan felt that Avraham and Yitzchak's qualities and ways of serving Hashem did not present a danger to his plan of destroying the spiritual growth of Judaism and its adherents. Yaakov did, thus requiring an open challenge to the Patriarch and everything that he represented.

The various commentators, each in his own inimitable manner, respond to this question. *Horav Elchanan Wasserman, zl*, explains that it was Yaakov's *koach haTorah*, power of Torah study, that outweighed Avraham's power of *chesed* and Yitzchak's power of *avodah*, prayer/service, to Hashem, because, in the long run, these two paths of serving Hashem would not

guarantee Jewish survival. Torah study has been, and continues to be, our only antidote to the forces of evil promoted by the *yetzer hora*/Satan and the various guises through which he seeks to sever our spiritual connection with Hashem.

Alternatively, it was Yaakov's ability to confront and expose the forces of evil for what they are that presented the greatest challenge to Satan and his plans for the spiritual ruin of the Jewish People. Yaakov *Avinu* was subject to – and compelled to address – the two primary forces of evil represented by Eisav and Lavan, two individuals who wrote the book on evil and set the standard for all malicious people to follow. The symbol of Eisav is the *chazir*, pig, who presents its split hooves, which is one of the signs of a kosher animal. He would have us ignore its other sign (lack of chewing its cud) which obviates its *kashrus*. Eisav does not want to be known as evil. He acts under a cloak of respectability, friendship, brotherhood and love, until he is able to ensnare the unknowing and gullible in his tentacles, after which it is too late.

Growing up in the Patriarchal home of Yitzchak and Rivkah *Imeinu*, Yaakov had the dubious opportunity to have a ringside seat to observe Eisav in all his surreptitious, charlatan, evil. He saw him masquerade as a *tzaddik*, righteous person, when Eisav spoke to his father, and then quickly change into his “street” clothes when he was about to act out his evil self, plundering, murdering and acting with complete moral abandon. Yaakov had seen his true colors. As a result, he knew what to look for and how to recognize the evil that was Eisav's trademark.

Another form of evil which Yaakov was forced to confront and live with for over two decades was that of Lavan *ha'Arami*, his father-in-law, who was infamously known for his ability to swindle and lie. Lavan did not put on a show. He had nothing to hide, because he did not care. He always had a reason to justify his ignominious activities. When Yaakov confronted him for switching daughters on him, Lavan calmly (with a smile) replied, “We do not act this way here, to give the younger daughter prior to the older one.” He had no qualms about lying. This is how he lived. If Yaakov did not like it – he could leave. This form of unvarnished evil, wrought by one who had no compunction to conceal his unsavory, malicious goals was the backdrop to the life our Patriarch experienced for over twenty years.

Yaakov excelled in dealing with Eisav, not allowing his clandestine, underhanded evil to influence him. He also was able to leave Lavan's home, with its lies and justification of every and any immoral activity, holding his head high, proclaiming that he continued to observe all 613 *mitzvos*. Neither Eisav nor Lavan tarnished his spiritual sphere of operations. Do we need a greater and stronger adversary over which the *yetzer hora* must triumph? Satan had no room for error; he had to take down Yaakov, for he was a threat to his future propagation of evil in all its insidious forms. Yaakov triumphed because he had the power of Torah, the power of *emes* – which go hand in hand. With Torah as our lodestar, and the *emes* it generates, we will triumph over Eisav, Lavan and their minions.

We have no dearth of Torah stories, but I could not resist the following story (The Story Rolodex). A young couple living in an upstate New York community enjoyed the peace and quiet that was one of the caveats of living in a near-rural community. On the other hand, while there was a sizable Jewish population in the city, they had yet to succeed in establishing a viable Jewish day school. The parents were frustrated that, like the others, they were forced to send their children to the local public school and augment their religious education at home. One day, the father met what appeared to be a devout religious Jew. After speaking with him, he acknowledged that this man was a bona-fide scholar. After sharing with the man his problem concerning his sons' lack of a meaningful Jewish education, the man offered to tutor the boys on a regular basis. The father was overjoyed. His sons would finally receive a Jewish education.

The next day, the father accompanied his sons to the man's home for their first Torah lesson. A few hours later, the boys left for home. It was not a long walk. It was marred, however, by the presence of a group of teenage delinquents who were bent on harming the young boys. They punched and slapped the two boys, pulled their *peyos* and stole their *yarmulkes*. They topped off their malevolence with name-calling. The two boys ran home, dirty and tear-streaked. After relating the incident to their father, he explained to them that the alternative was not learning Torah and growing up ignorant of Torah, which ultimately would affect their entire religious outlook and practice. Tomorrow, they would return to the

rebbe. Hashem would protect them. *Baruch Hashem*, they were more humiliated than hurt. Things would work out.

The next day, as the previous day, the father accompanied them on their walk to the *rebbe's* home. Five minutes into their walk, they froze in their tracks as they saw a large black dog preventing them from going forward. Their father assuaged their fears, "A dog will not bother you if you leave it alone." They continued walking, albeit nervously, and they looked back to notice the dog walking obediently beside them. The hoodlums, who had yesterday ruined their day, were out in force, but stood by without making a move for fear of the dog's reaction.

At the end of their learning session, the boys were surprised – but heartened – to see the dog waiting for them under a tree situated on the *rebbe's* lawn. This went on for one year, with the dog meeting them daily, accompanying them to their Torah lesson, and then walking them home. At the end of the year, the boys went off to *yeshivah*. Shortly after the boys left, their father discovered the dead carcass of the dog on the street. He had served them well.

There is an incredible postscript to this story. Apparently, this was no ordinary dog. When the story of the dog was related to the *Ribnitzer Rebbe, Horav Chaim Zanvil Abramowitz, zl*, he remarked that the dog was a *gilgul*, transmigration, of a *Yid* who had not spent sufficient time learning Torah during his lifetime. By accompanying the boys, thus enabling them to learn Torah, he restored and fulfilled his own mission, and was now granted entry into *Olam Habba*, the World to Come, where he received his due reward.

**על כן לא יאכלו בני ישראל את גיד הנשה עד היום הזה
Therefore Bnei Yisrael are not to eat the Gid
ha'nasheh, displaced sinew on the hip-socket,...to this
day. (32:33)**

When Eisav's angel saw that he could not best Yaakov *Avinu*, he made one last attempt at maiming the Patriarch by striking his *gid-hanashe*. To commemorate this battle, Yaakov's descendants are prohibited from consuming the nerves/sinew which are included under the rubric of *gid ha'nashe*. The commemoration of the miracle of Yaakov's triumph in battle over the forces of evil seems counterproductive. *Issur achilah*, prohibition from eating, is a *shev v'al taaseh*, passive form of celebrating the miracle, the direct opposite of the manner in which we

celebrate the many miracles which are part of our continued existence. *Horav Moshe Feinstein, zl*, explains that while we have the ability, resolution and fortitude to withstand the vicissitudes and challenges of the exile which will undoubtedly generate much-deserved reward, we still pray to Hashem that we should not be challenged by the *nisyonos*, trials, associated with exile. Indeed, this is why we ask Hashem (*Birchos Ha'Shachar*), *v'al t'vienu... liyidei nisayon*, "Do not bring us into... the forces of challenge." Thus, the commemoration of the miracle is passive: We ask that we not be tested.

The *Rosh Yeshivah* also derives from here that it is more praiseworthy not to fall prey to prohibition than to perform a *mitzvah*. Sadly, there are those who complacently perform *mitzvos*, which has been their lifestyle since early youth. To refrain from executing an *aveirah*, however, to distance oneself from sin – specifically because this is the *ratzon Hashem*, the will of G-d – is more laudatory.

ויקחו שני בני יעקב שמעון ולוי אחי דינה איש חרבו... ויהרגו כל זכר

And two of Yaakov's sons, Shimon and Levi, Dinah's brothers, each (man) took his sword... and killed every male. (34:25)

In his commentary to *Nazir 29b*, *Rashi* comments based upon the *Midrash* that Levi was thirteen years old at the time that he and Shimon took vengeance on the men of Shechem. Wherever the Torah uses the word *ish*, man, it refers to someone over the age of thirteen years. Likewise, we find that Betzalel, architect of the *Mishkan*, was thirteen years old when he made the *Mishkan*. Concerning him, the Torah writes, *Ish ish mimelachato*, "Each (man) of them from his work" (*Shemos 36:4*). Additionally, we find that the *Rambam* reiterated the *halachah* that the age of thirteen years constitutes *ish* status. *Horav Eliyahu Schlesinger, Shlita*, explains the rationale for this. The *Zohar HaKadosh (Shemos 128)* writes: *man gabeir d'is al yitzrei ikri ish*, "One who conquers (is stronger than) his (evil) inclination is considered an *ish*." David *Hamelech* told Shlomo, *v'chazakta v'hayissa l'ish*, "You should strengthen yourself and become a man" (*Melachim 1:11*), which is interpreted by *Targum Yonasan*, "A person who has the power to overwhelm his *yetzer hora/sin*." When one achieves *ish* status at age thirteen, he becomes a *bar daas*, has sufficient mature intelligence and responsibility.

Rav Schlesinger takes the concept of *ish* up one notch, explaining that when one reaches the age of thirteen years, he becomes a *metzuveh v'oseh*, he is commanded to perform *mitzvos*. It is no longer extra-credit. It is an obligation. *Chazal (Bava Kamma 87:1)* teach *Gadol ha'metzuveh v'oseh mimi she'einu metzuveh v'oseh*, "Greater is he who is commanded and performs the *mitzvah* than he who carries out the *mitzvah*, even though he is not commanded to do so." *Tosfos (Kiddushin 31:)* explain that one who understands that his actions count, that he must carry out the *mitzvah* appropriately to the full extent of the law, will be anxious that he do it correctly, unlike the one who performs the *mitzvah* because he wants to. He knows that if he did not act accordingly – it is not the end of the world. He does not worry. He is not anxious.

Horav Shmuel Rozovsky, zl, explains that one who is a *metzuveh v'oseh* lives his entire life – every moment of his existence – in fear, worrying that perhaps he did not make the grade. His anxiety extends far beyond the *mitzvah* that he is performing; rather, it permeates his entire being, knowing that he has a responsibility towards Hashem, to carry out His command to its fullest potential. Thus, the advantage that the *metzuveh v'oseh* has over his counterpart is not simply with regard to the actual *mitzvah* that he is now carrying out, but rather, it is all about his mindset – the *metzuveh v'oseh* has a totally different temperament. A Jew who is an *ish* is one who worries, who is in a state of concern with regard to his *frumkeit*, religious observance. "Am I practicing as well as I should?" "Am I performing *mitzvos* in the manner that Hashem expects of me?" "Am I making Hashem proud of me?" *Metzuveh v'oseh* is a lifelong experience that permeates every aspect of a Jew's life. This also defines *gadlus*, religious maturity. If a day passes in which he has not acted as a *metzuveh v'oseh*, then he was a *kattan*, underage, and not a *bar daas*. We begin each day with the realization that we are fulfilling our religious mandate to serve Hashem as mature, observant Jews. This is our mission. This is our responsibility to Hashem.

ויהי בהקשתה בלדתה ותאמר לה המילדת אל תיראי כי גם זה לך
בן

And it was when she had difficulty in her labor that the midwife said to her, "Have no fear, for this one, too, is a son for you." (35:17)

The *Brisker Rav, zl*, observes that Rachel *Imeinu's* fear was not of dying, but rather, her anxiety resulted from her agonizing over losing a *shevet*, tribe, in *Klal Yisrael*. Thus, when the midwife told her, "Have no fear, this child will carry on your legacy as one of the *Shivtei Kah*, tribes of Hashem, Rachel calmed down and was prepared to confront her mortality.

The *Brisker Rav* expressed a similar idea following the European Holocaust. He related to *Horav Eliezer Palchinsky, zl*, that not a day passes that he is *masiach daas*, diverts his attention, from thinking about his family members who did not survive the calamity. *Rav Palchinsky* said that this was a *tzaras ha'rabim*, an anguish that affected the collective Jewish people. The *Rav* countered, "True, but never for a moment do I divert my attention from them."

He added that *Yaakov Avinu* mourned over *Yosef* for twenty-two years. Certainly, he had never been *masiach daas* and ceased to mourn. Otherwise, the *Shechinah*, Divine Presence, would have returned to him. As soon as this would occur, the Patriarch would have known that *Yosef*, was, in fact, alive. (The *Shechinah* does not rest upon one who is depressed.) Apparently, *Yaakov* never stopped thinking of *Yosef*.

Rav Palchinsky asked, "But *Yaakov* mourned over the loss of a *shevet*; thus, he was inconsolable, while the *Rav's* pain is personal." (He implied that personal pain should be consolable.) The *Brisker Rav* replied, "Every one of my sons is like a *shevet* to me, because each one has the potential to raise up a generation of *ovdei Hashem*, who will serve Hashem." What we should derive from this comment is the Torah approach to raising our children. Each one represents awesome potential. Each of them represents the repository of our legacy and the future of our people.

Va'ani Tefillah

נצור לשוני מרע... פתה לבי בתורתך – *Netzor leshoni meira...*

Pesach leebee b'sorasecha. Guard my tongue from evil... open my heart to Your Torah.

At the end of the day, the *tefillah, Netzor leshoni meira*, "Guard my tongue from (speaking) evil, and my lips from speaking deceitfully; to those who curse me, let my soul be silent; and let my soul be like dust to everyone; open my heart to Your Torah; then my soul will pursue Your *mitzvos*" is frightening. The *Chida, zl (Kikar l'Adon)*, writes that one should think over very carefully what he

says and to Whom he is speaking. He asks for humility, but he is demanding in every way of others, unforgiving regarding the slightest infraction to his honor. Deep down, he views himself as a prince among princes and everyone else as serfs and lackeys. How is he not afraid to utter the words, “And to those who curse me, let my soul be silent,” when in fact, he is onerous and difficult to please. Humility? He asks that his soul be like dust, when he acts as if he is better and deserves to be more elevated than those around him. He petitions Hashem to open his heart in Torah. Does he immediately open a *sefer*, volume of Torah, and learn from it? He claims that he seeks the pursuit of *mitzvos*, but when the opportunity to perform a *mitzvah* presents itself, he is too lazy, too busy, in a rush. How can he reiterate these words thrice daily and ignore their meaning and imperative? We must mean what we say and, likewise, say what we mean. Otherwise, our petition lacks veracity. This is why it is so frightening.

Sponsored in memory of

Rabbi Louis Engelberg ז"ל נפטר ה' כסלו תשנ"ח ז"ל

Mrs. Hannah Engelberg ז"ל נפטרה ג' טבת תשמ"ב ז"ל

.ת.ג.צ.ב.ה.

Etzmon and Abigail Rozen and Family

Hebrew Academy of Cleveland, ©All rights reserved

prepared and edited by Rabbi L. Scheinbaum

<https://yated.com/>

“I Have Everything”

Rabbi Yitzchok Tzvi Schwarz

November 17, 2021

The words of the Chofetz Chaim could seem so simple and at the same time be very profound. They were understood by the hamon am, the poshute people, and yet giants of the generation like Rav Chaim Ozer Grodzensky and Rav Elchonon Wasserman could sit with him for hours, enthralled by his words. Here is just one example of both simplicity and profundity at the same time. During the momentous encounter between Yaakov Avinu and Eisav, the latter inquired about what Yaakov’s intentions in sending him the gifts.

He answered, “To gain favor in my lord’s eyes.”

Eisav said, “I have a lot. My brother, let what you have remain yours.”

But Yaakov said, “No, I beg you! ...Please accept my gift, which was brought to you for Hashem has been gracious to me and as I have everything.”

About this, the Chofetz Chaim comments: Eisav said, “I have a lot, my brother.” But Yaakov said, “I have everything.” How revealing these statements are. Just a slight difference in expression. Eisav has a lot, but Yaakov has everything, yet it reflects a vast chasm between them in their varying outlooks on life. By Eisav saying that he has a lot, he is testifying, ‘But I still want more. I am still lacking for additional acquisitions.’ This is so in tune with man’s natural inclinations. One doesn’t leave this world having acquired even half of his desires. “One who has 100 coins desires 200. And one who has 200 aspires for 400” (Koheles Rabbah 3:13).

Not so Yaakov Avinu. He is graced with the middah of *histapkus bemaat*, being content with just a little. He has everything and doesn’t need more. Eisav’s tendency is to always want more of *Olam Hazeih*, whereas Yaakov is satisfied with what he has (Chofetz Chaim Hachodosh Al HaTorah).

Let us analyze these words of the Chofetz Chaim, because there is more to them than meets the eye. One might ask: It wasn’t so difficult for Yaakov to be satisfied with what he had, for he was blessed with riches that we can’t even imagine. All of the avos hakedoshim were wealthy, but it seems from the pesukim that Yaakov was the wealthiest of them all.

Regarding Avrohom it says, “Now Avrom was very laden with livestock, silver, and gold” (Bereishis 13:2). About Yitzchok it says, “The man became great and kept becoming greater until he was very great. He had acquired flocks and herds and many enterprises...” (ibid. 26:13-14). But in describing Yaakov Avinu’s wealth, the Torah uses the words *me’od, me’od*: “The man became exceedingly prosperous and he attained productive flocks, maidservants, servants, camels, and donkeys” (ibid. 30:43). In fact, the Medrash says that his wealth so expanded that it was a sampling of *Olam Haba* (Yalkut, Vayetzei, remez 130).

Yaakov’s satisfaction with his lot was not so incredible, for indeed he had everything. But such a question is based on a lack of understanding of the inner nature of man. What would one say if he were delivering a hesped on Avrohom Avinu? That he publicized Hashem’s name to the extent that at one time He was merely G-d of heaven,

but through Avrohom's efforts, He became the G-d of the earth. That he was willing to die al kiddush Hashem in the flaming furnace. That he was willing to bring Yitzchok, his beloved son, as a korban. That he was exemplary in the mitzvah of chesed. That he passed the Asarah Nisyonos with flying colors. The list goes on. Yet, what is the Torah's description of Avrohom when he was niftar? What is Hashem's eulogy on his beloved one? "And Avrohom expired and died at a good old age, mature and content, and he was gathered to his people" (Bereishis 25:8). "Mature and content"?! This is the sole praise that the Torah gives to the av hamon goyim, who is described as the biggest man among the giants (Yehoshua 14:15)?

The Ramban explains this praise: "He realized all of his heartfelt requests and he was content with all of the good. This relates the chesed of Hashem with tzaddikim and the good middah that they possess, not aspiring for luxuries, as it says about them: 'the desire of his heart you have granted him' (Tehillim 21:3), and not what it says about others: 'a lover of money will never be satisfied with money' (Koheles 5:9).

But even after the Ramban's explanation, we remain baffled as to why this should be the sole praise that characterizes Avrohom's life.

Rav Simcha Zissel Broide, Chevroner rosh yeshiva, in his classic sefer Sam Derech, explains how powerful are the urges of man. It is a force so mighty that if one is not aware of it and does not work at checking it and taming it, it can totally overtake him and steer him far away from the proper path. "His wants are never satisfied" (Koheles 6:7). "Jealousy, lust, and glory remove a man from the world" (Avos 5:28).

No matter how much a person has acquired, he always has a desire for more. The more he has, the more he wants, and he will never stop wanting. Rav Elya Lopian compared this to one who is very thirsty and drinks herring brine to quench his thirst. This will only make him more thirsty, and the more of it he drinks, the thirstier he gets. And this doesn't only apply to just any rich man. It even applies to the giants of giants. For deep in the caverns of one's heart, the yeitzer hara is constantly at work, tugging and pushing and trying to convince him that he always needs more. "The heart is the most deceitful of all, and it is fragile – who can know it?" (Yirmiyahu 17:9).

Only those who are constantly working on themselves, those who always strive for spiritual growth, have a keen awareness of what lurks in the heart of man. And after gaining this awareness, they regularly put in the effort to squelch these forces that try to distract them and come between them and Hashem. Avrohom Avinu constantly humbled himself before Hashem. He appreciated every small chesed and said that he wasn't worthy of it. When Hashem said to him, "I will bless her (Sarah); indeed, I will give you a son through her. I will bless her and she shall give rise to nations, kings of peoples will rise from her," Avrohom said to Hashem, "O' that Yishmoel might live before you!" Rashi explains: "If only Yishmoel lives. I am not worthy of receiving such reward" (Bereishis 17:16-19).

The ten nisyonos came at different intervals of Avrohom's life, but they all happened at a given moment and they passed. Avrohom's submission, his humbling himself before Hashem and purifying his neshomah, was his life's occupation at every moment. And it took this dedication to subjugate those powerful forces within that threatened to derail him. "He who is greater than his friend, the greater is his yeitzer hara" (Sukkah 52a). Avrohom, through hard work, was up to the task. But even with the great efforts he put forth, he still needed the chesed of Hashem to remain satisfied.

This is why the Torah chooses this, mature and content, as his one outstanding attribute, because it encompasses his entire essence, humbling himself before Hashem and squelching the inner fire of his passions. This lesson was passed down to Yaakov Avinu, who became even wealthier, and his battles to be content were even harder. But in the end, he was able to proudly declare, "I have everything!"

This is the way the avos hakedoshim lived their lives. Their vast wealth did not detract from their penimiyus. To the contrary, it made them greater, as they thanked Hashem for every small chesed. And they passed this legacy down to us. Unfortunately, our being in golus for so many years has caused us to pick up ideas that are alien to our mesorah. The drive to acquire every comfort imaginable is a middah of Eisav, the antithesis of the ways of Yaakov...

<https://yated.com/>
What Life is All About

Rabbi Pinchos Lipschutz

November 17, 2021

Ever since Yaakov's showdown with Eisov, that saga has been providing Yaakov's progeny with a prototype for dealing with an enemy in his various guises. Sometimes the enemy presents himself as a friend, sometimes as a brother or a protector, and sometimes as a concerned colleague or the government. Other times, the evil one is apparent in his hatred and enmity.

Sometimes, we hold ourselves back and other times we allow the yeitzer hora to control our actions. Yaakov provides guidance for us in such instances as well.

The posuk relates that after separating his family and possessions into two camps in preparation for an onslaught from Eisov, Yaakov was left alone:

“Vayivoseir Yaakov levado” (Bereishis 32:25).

Rav Nosson Wachtfogel would recount that he only met the Chofetz Chaim one time. Hearing that the tzaddik hador was in the area, he made his way there to hear his words of inspiration. He would say that he was surprised that for an hour, the Chofetz Chaim discussed only one point. For one hour, the Chofetz Chaim told the crowd that each person should work on himself to attain the level where his avodah emanates from within himself, not from copying others, not from being swept along with the crowd, not by observing the actions of someone else or from being concerned about what another person will think of you. A person must work on himself so that he can daven without looking around to see what others are doing and how.

The Chofetz Chaim told his audience that this is learned from the avos, Avrohom, Yitzchok and Yaakov, whose devotion came from within and not from copying anyone else.

“Vayivoseir Yaakov levado.” Yaakov was virtually alone. By himself, he developed into the great av of the shevotim and of Klal Yisroel. He did so by absorbing the lessons of his great father and by dedicating all of his time and effort to Torah as a yosheiv ohalim, and then, later, while in the yeshiva of Sheim V'Eiver.

With this, we can understand the Medrash (Bereishis Rabbah 77:1) that quotes Rav Brachya in the name of Rav Simon, who said that similar to the posuk referring to Hakadosh Boruch Hu which states, “Venisgov Hashem levado” is the posuk in this week's parsha that says about

Yaakov, “Vayivoseir Yaakov levado.” Levado indicates that, like Hashem, he was by himself.

The teaching is explained on many different levels, but we can understand it according to the statement of the Chofetz Chaim. A person has to be able to be great independently. Yaakov Avinu reached that level of achievement. And so must we.

We have to be able to withstand the various pressures that are brought upon us in this world, which lead many people to live their lives conforming to certain social norms and standards. People who cannot afford to keep up with the Cohens extend themselves as they portray a level of financial success that they don't come close to. Without sufficient self-respect and self-worth, they seek the acceptance of others and endeavor to earn favor in the eyes of other people. Everything they do is not for themselves, but for others. The home they live in, the car they drive, and the clothes they and their children wear are all to impress their friends and neighbors.

They can never achieve inner happiness and satisfaction, for their satisfaction is totally dependent on the views and opinions of others, not the result of their own achievements. They have no goals for themselves to reach, enjoying a feeling of accomplishment, for they are always trying to impress others.

“Vayivoseir Yaakov levado.” Yaakov succeeded in vanquishing the malach of Eisov, as well as Eisov and Lovon, because he was secure in the knowledge that what he was doing was proper. He had no interest in impressing them, but rather in defending and fighting for the truth, as the posuk states, “Titein emes l'Yaakov.” The middah of Yaakov is emes, truth.

We must be honest with ourselves and not allow outside influences and considerations to impress us. We must ensure that we are not compromised by the subterfuge that is so prevalent in the olam hasheker...

<https://seforimblog.com/2021/11/haftaros-of-vayetze-and-vayishlach-a-mistake-rectified/>

Haftaros of Vayetze and Vayishlach – A Mistake Rectified

Haftaros of Vayetze and Vayishlach – A Mistake Rectified[1]

By **Eli Duker**

There had been one practice throughout the Jewish world concerning the Haftara of Vayishlach until the print

revolution. The book of Ovadia is the Haftara listed in every Haftara list, including the one in the Rambam's Seder HaTefillos in the Mishneh Torah, MS Ginsburg Moscow of the Machzor Vitry,[2] Etz Chaim (written in London on the eve of the Edict of Expulsion),[3] Abudarham,[4] and the list of Rabbi Shmuel Hanagid, cited in the Sefer HaEshkol.[5] It is also the Haftara in the "Emes" piyyut written by Rabbi Shmuel Hashelishi[6] and the "Zulas" piyyut written by Rabbi Yehuda B'Rabi Binyamin.[7] This is also the Haftara listed in all chumashim in manuscript[8] and in all Cairo Geniza fragments⁹ that I have seen.

This was also the practice of those who followed the triennial cycle in Eretz Yisrael,[10] the Haftara for the sidra of Vayishlach Yaakov was from the book of Ovadia. The reason for the Haftara is clearly due to it being a prophecy about Edom, and Edom is discussed in depth in the parasha.

The universal practice in all communities was to read from the book of Hoshea for the Haftara of Vayetze, but not everyone read the same verses. In all Geniza fragments[11] the Haftara begins at 11:7, "Ve'ami seluim." In the fragments with a clear end to the Haftara I have found 3 that end at 12:14,[12] which is similar to what appears in the list of in the Rambam's Seder HaTefillos, making it a classic Haftara of exactly twenty-one pesukim. One source has it end at 13:4,[13] which is the "Zulas" piyyut written by Rabbi Yehuda B'Rabi Binyamin for this parasha,[14] as well as in the Sefer HaShulchan, written by a student of the Rashba. The reason for the Haftara is due to the verse "Vayivrach Yaakov," which is clearly related to the events of the parsha, as well as, possibly, the mention of "Bes El" in 12:5

There were two different Ashkenazi practices in the pre-printing era. One was to begin at 12:13, "Vayivrach Yaakov," and to read until the end of the book. This is the Haftara found in MS Ginsburg Moscow of the Machzor Vitry,[15] Etz Chaim,[16] and in 12 of the 16 Ashkenazi chumashim in manuscripts I checked. Outside of Ashkenaz this was the practice among the Romaniots. It is also found in the "Zulas" piyyut of Rabbi Shmuel Hashelishi,[17] who lived in Eretz Yisrael in the 10-11 centuries and belonged to a community that read the Torah according to the annual cycle (although the Haftara ends there at 13:4, making it a Haftara of just seven

verses!). It was also the Haftara for the sedra of "Vayetze Yaakov" in the triennial cycle of Eretz Yisrael.[18]

The secondary practice in Ashkenaz, which I found in three chumashim in manuscript, was to read starting from 11:7. One manuscript has the Haftara ending at 12:14,[19] and the other two end at 13:5.[20] The latter is the practice of the Ashkenazi community of Amsterdam.[21]

The first printed chumash with Ashkenazi Haftaros was the Soncino, printed in Brescia in 1492. It had the Haftara beginning at 12:13, following most other Ashkenazi sources. The 1517 Bomberg chumash, printed in Venice, has printed Haftaros according to both the Ashkenazi and Sephardi practices, and has the Haftara for Vayetze beginning at 11:7. After 13:5, the word "כאן" in written, followed by something that was erased (in the microfilmed copy of the Israel National Library) followed by "ההפטרות לספרדים," that this is where the Haftara ends according to the Sefardi practice, which is quite normative. But before 12:13, at the front of the page, the words "הפטרות וישלח לאשכנזים" appear. The Haftara of Vayishlach in that chumash is from Ovadia, without any instructions, indicating a discrepancy between the two practices. It is clear that a mistake was made here, as Hoshea 12:13 is an Ashkenazi Haftara for Vayetze, not Vayishlach.

The 1517 chumash did not sell well among Jews, likely because its editor, Felix Pratensis, was a Jewish convert to Christianity.[22] In 1524 Daniel Bomberg published another chumash, this time with Yaakov ben Chayim ibn Adoniya as his editor, and this edition was much more popular among Jews. It is essential an entirely different book, as this editor did not rely on the first edition, yet, the Haftaros were, by and large, copied from the first edition, with only minor changes. Concerning our topic, the Haftara for Vayetze is 11:7, without any indication that there are other practices. Right before 12:13 it is written "כאן מתחילין הפטרות וישלח האשכנזים" with no indication where Sephardim finish the Haftara. Here too, Ovadia is listed as the Haftara for Vayishlach, without any instructions indicating that there is a discrepancy between communities.

The popularity of the chumash (already called "Mikraos Gedolos") created a situation where a new reality was created. The Ichenhausen chumash, published in 1544,

merely copied the Haftaros and their instructions from the second Bomberg chumash.

By contrast, another Venetian publisher, Marco Antonio Giustiani, also in 1544, went even further, and wrote in his chumash concerning the Haftara from Ovadia as “הפטרת וישלח כמנהג בני ספרד”. The instructions in this chumash created three changes:

It shortened the Sephardi Haftara for Vayetze and ended it at 12:12, a verse that discusses the Israelites performing pagan sacrifices and the ramifications of this, an extremely inappropriate way to complete a Haftara.

It ignored the widespread Ashkenazi practice to begin the Haftara of Vayetze from 12:13. Instead, it has them all starting at 11:7 (as well as completing the Haftara at 12:12, which was unheard of).

It created a new Ashkenazi Haftara for Vayishlach, from Hoshea, which has nothing to do with the parsha at all, and did away with the reading from Ovadia, which had been a universal practice until that time.

Not all chumashim “ruled” in such a manner. In the Lublin chumash of 1517, the original Ashkenazi Haftaros of Hoshea 12:13 for Vayetze and Ovadia for Vayishlach were listed. Likewise, the Levush, published in 1590, listed these Haftaros as well.

Soon after, we begin to see many chumashim following the new practice. For example: Manitoba – 1589, Frankfurt am Main – 1662, Venice – 1684, as well Haftara books published in Frankfurt Oder in 1685 and in 1708. Yet, I found chumashim from this period with the original Ashkenazi Haftaros, but they were both printed in Prague, which is known to have kept the original practice, as will be discussed below.

The first to point out the error of the new chumashim was Rabbi Avraham Gombiner, in his commentary, Magen Avraham, on Orach Chayim of Shulchan Aruch in siman 428:[23]

מה שכתב בחומשי' ויברח יעקב לפ' וישלח ט"ס הוא ושייכ' לפ' ויצא ((לבוש))

Magen Avraham was first published in 1692, after the author's passing. He does not explicitly mention what the Haftara for Vayishlach is, but as he cites the Levush, it is clear that he meant it is from Ovadia, as with the exception of the new practice of reading Hoshea 12:13 for Vayishlach, which the Magen Avraham clearly rejects, Ovadia was the only known Haftara for Vayishlach.

Nevertheless, chumashim printed after the publication of the Magen Avraham continued to list Hoshea 12:13 as the Ashkenazi Haftara for Vayishlach.[24] Even the chumash published by R' Shabs ai Bass, author of the Sifsei Chachamim and publisher of Magen Avraham, had this as well.

In 1718 the book “Noheg Katzon Yosef” by Rabbi Yosef Yozefa Segal was published, a work on the practices of German communities in general and Frankfurt am Main in particular. He wrote the following concerning parashas Vayetze:[25]

כתב בלבוש החור ס' תרס"ט שהפטרה של סדר זו הוא ויברח יעקב, והפטרת וישלח הוא ועמי תלואים, עיין שם. והנה באמת במקומות שמחלקים שתי פרשיות אלו מהושע לאמרם לשתי הפטרות משתי שבתות אלו היה הדין עם הלבוש להקדים המאוחר ולאחר המוקדם. דכד נעיין ביה שפיר נראה שכתוב ויברח יעקב “ובאשה שמר” שהוא מלשון ואביו שמר את הדבר, כלומר המתין עד שתנא ראויה לביאה, או ששמר את הצאן בעד האשה, שהוא מעין פרשת ויצא. ובעמי תלואים כתיב וישר אל המלאך ויוכל, שהוא על שם הכתוב כי שרית עם אלקים ועם אנשים ותוכל הכתוב בוישלח. א”כ למה לנו ליתן את של זה בזה ושל זה בזה? ואפשר שיצא משבשתא זו מפני ששתי הפטרות אלו הם סמוכים בקרא, ועמי תלואים מוקדם במקרא, לפיכך שמו המוקדם במקרא לפרשת ויצא המוקדמת, והמאוחר לפרשת וישלח המאוחרת. והמנהג בק”ק פ”פ שמפטיירין בויצא מן ועמי תלואים עד סוף הנביא, דהיינו שתי הפטרות אלו ביחד, שמספר מה אירע ליעקב. ועיין מה שכתבתי בפרשת וישלח

It is written in the Levush Hachur siman 769 that the Haftara for this seder is “Vayivrach Yaakov,” and the Haftara for Vayishlach is “Ve’ami seluim.” In reality, places that divide the Haftara from Hoshea in order to read it as two Haftaros over two Sabbaths should follow this Levush and read the latter part first and the earlier later, as when one looks examines the matter one see it says in “Vayivrach Yaakov” (the words) “he guarded his wife,”[26] which is similar to, “and his father kept the matter in mind,”[27] meaning [Yaakov] waited until she was fit for marriage, or it means he guarded the sheep in order to marry the woman, which is similar to parshas Vayetze. And in “Ve’ami seluim” it is written “he strove with an angel and prevailed,” which is based on the verse “for you have striven with beings divine and human and prevailed,” which is written in Vayishlach. Therefore, why should we read them in the opposite order? It is possible that this mistake occurred because these Haftaros are adjacent to each other, and “Ve’ami seluim” appears first. Therefore, they put the first Haftara for Vayetze,

which is the earlier parsha, and the latter one for the later Vayishlach. But the practice in Frankfurt is to read “Ve’ami seluim” until the end of the book, meaning to read both Haftaros together.

This piece is rather difficult to comprehend.

First, the Levush says nothing of the sort. The author proceeds to try to explain the mistake that developed due to the Levush, who did not write what is ascribed to him.

He recommends reversing the orders of the Hoshea Haftaras, rather than recommending that Ovadia be read, which he cites later as the practice in Frankfurt.[28]

He claims that the Frankfurt practice is to read from 11:7 until the end of Hoshea for Vayetze. All other sources claim that the practice there was to read from 12:13 for Vayetze and to read Ovadia for Vayishlach, and there is no other source for this “double Haftara” anywhere.

The Rav of Frankfurt, Rabbi Yaakov, author of the Shav Yaakov, wrote an approbation for the book “Noheg Katzon Yosef,” but after he found many errors he asked Rabbi Yehuda Miller, the author’s father-in-law, to fix the errors.[29] Some later printings of the book included these corrections in a booklet called “Tzon Nachalos,” where he wrote that the author was indeed mistaken with regard to the practice in Frankfurt.[30]

In 1729, eleven years after the publication of Noheg Katzon Yosef, Rabbi Yitzchak Aizik Mis wrote a commentary on the Haftaros known as Be’er Yitzchak, which was published in Offenbach, a town quite close to Frankfurt. He listed there various halachos and practices connected to Haftaros. He wrote there:[31]

בכל החומשים נפל טעות שציינו להפטרות ויצא ועמי תלואים ולפ’ וישלח ויברח יעקב וצריך להיות לפ’ ויצא ויברח יעקב לפי שבו כתיב ובאשה שמר שהוא מעניינא דפרשה ששמר את הצאן בעד האשה ולפ’ ושילח ועמי תלואים לפי שבו כתיב וישר אל מלאך ויוכל וגו’ שהוא מעניינא דפ’ כי שרית עם א-הים ועם אנשים ותוכל ובק”ק פרנקפורט דמיין אומרים לפ’ ויצא ועמי תלואים וגם ויברח יעקב ולפ’ וישלח חזון עובדיה

All of the chumashim have a mistake, as they cite the Haftara of Veyetze as “Ve’ami seluim” and that of Vayishlach as “Vayivrach Yaakov ,” while the Haftara for Vayetze should be “ Vayivrach Yaakov ,” as is written there “he guarded a wife” which is the matter of the parsha where (Yaakov) guarded the sheep for the wife’s

sake, and that of Vayishlach should be “Ve’ami seluim,” as it is written there he strove with an angel and prevailed, which is the matter of “for you have striven with beings divine and human and prevailed.” In Frankfurt am Main they say “Ve’ami seluim” and “Vayivrach Yaakov ” for Vayetze, and “Chazon Ovadia” for Vayishlach.

It is clear that he did not just copy this out of the Noheg Katzon Yosef, as he views what is printed in chumashim as a mistake, while the Noheg Katzon Yosef mistakenly attributed it to the Levush. But it seems likely that his (erroneous) statement concerning the Frankfurtian practice does come from there.[32]

The famous printing press in Amsterdam, Proops, published a chumash in 1712 with similar Haftaros for these parshiyos to the Venice chumashim, but in another chumash, the 1734 edition, in the Haftara for Vayetze before 12:14 it is written כאן מתחילין האשכנזים פרשת ויצא while for Vayishlach, Ovadia is listed as the Haftara for Sephardim, with no mention of the Ashkenazi practice at all. It is likely that the publisher, who published a Shulchan Aruch with Magen Avraham,[33] was aware of the comment there concerning the mistake in the chumashim about the Haftara of Vayetze, but someone along the line did not realize the ramifications of this and just left Ovadia as the Haftara for Sephardim alone. The 1754 Proops chumash cited the Venteian Haftaros, possibly as the best method to correct the error of the earlier chumash omitting an Ashekenzi Haftara for Vayishlach. But in the chumash they published in 1762, the following appears before the Haftara for Vayetze, Hoshea 11:7:

והמנהג הנכון לאשכנזים להפטרות ויצא ויברח יעקב וכן כתוב באחרונים

Before Hoshea 12:14 the following appears:

כאן מתחילים האשכנזים הפטרות וישלח, והמנהג הנכון לאשכנזי זהו הפטר’ ויצא ועמי תלואים שייך להפטר’ וישלח

It seems that the so-called “acharonim” mentioned here are the Be’er Yitzchak and the Noheg Katzon Yosef.

These Haftaros appear in later Proops chumashim in 1767 and 1797, as well as in another Amsterdam chumash, published in 1817 by a doctor named Yochanan Levi. Other chumashim of the period continue to cite the Haftaros as they were listed in the Venice chumashim.[34]

Rabbi Shlomo Ashkenazi Rappaport of Chelm, in his *Shulchan Atzei Shitim*, wrote that the Haftara for Vayetze is Hoshea 12:14, and the Haftara for Vayishlach is from Ovadia, and in his *Zer Zahav* commentary he wrote:[35] ויברח יעקב – ודלא כמו שגרשם בחומשים בטעות ויברח יעקב לפרשת (וישלה דשייך לפ' ויצא (ס' תכ"ה

This is clearly based on Magen Avraham.[36] It seems that his opinion concerning the Hafatros was not accepted in his day.[37]

Eighteenth-century Amsterdam was major center of Hebrew printing, and Proops was quite famous in terms of print quality, and in particular for using new methods for marketing their books.[38] Books from there were shipped to Danzig, from where they made their way into Eastern Europe. [39] Proops' books were very popular there, which enabled them to raise the necessary funds to print a new edition of the Talmud Bavli[40] Rabbi Avraham Danziger, having grown up in the city, would have likely been exposed to the many sefarim published by Proops, and it is likely that he had their chumashim. The first edition of his *Chayei Adam* was published anonymously in 1810, and the matter of these Haftaros is not raised there, but in the second edition, published in the author's lifetime in 1819, is it written:

מה שכ' בחמשים הפטרת וישלה ויברח יעקב הוא טעות אלא בויצא מפטירין מן ויברח עד ויכשלו במ ובוישלה מפטירין מן ועמי תלואים (וגם מקצת ויברח יעקב עד ומושיע אין בלתי (תכ"ה

What was the source for this statement of the *Chayei Adam*? It does not seem likely that it is Noheg Katson Yosef, as that book had been published only once, a century earlier.[41] It is also not likely to be the *Be'er Yitzchok*, which was published in faraway Offenbach. It seems reasonable that he was exposed both to the Proops chumashim (or others with those Haftaros), as well as other chumashim with the Venetian Haftaros, which he saw as mistaken, and when he referred to “what is written in the chumashim,” he did not mean all of them.

The publishers of this of this edition, Menachem Mann and Zimmel, published a chumash for Ashkenazim in 1820 with Hoshea 14:12 as the Haftara for Vayetze and 11:7 for Vayishlach, likely following what was the ruling of the *Chayei Adam* at the time.

The next edition of the *Chayei Adam* was published in 1825, several years after the author's death. As it had the same publisher, it seems unlikely that any changes were made by anyone but him. It is written there:

מה שכ' בחומשים הפטרת וישלה ויברח יעקב הוא טעות אלא בויצא מפטירין מן ויברח עד סוף הושע (ואח"כ פסוקים מיואל ואכלתם אכול וכו' וידעתם וכו' ג"כ מטעם לסיים בטוב) ובוישלה מפטירין מן ועמי תלואים וגם מקצת ויברח יעקב עד ומושיע אין בלתי ועפ"י הגר"א (נוהגין להפטיר בפ' וישלה וישלה חזון עובדי' (תכ"ה

We see two changes here.

That two verses from Yoel should be added in to the Haftara for Vayetze (which he already pointed out in the previous edition is Hoshea 12:14) which otherwise ends with the mention of sinners stumbling.[42] Evidently, earlier authorities did not think it necessary to avoid such an ending. This is cited by the Mishna Berura,[43] but is not written in any chumashim published before the Holocaust. He mentions that the Vilna Gaon ruled that we read Ovadia as the Haftara for Vayishlach, and those who follow him do so. The author of the *Chayei Adam* was related to the Vilna Gaon by marriage, and prayed with him in the Vilna Gaon's *Kloyz*.

These additions were printed in later editions of the book.[44]

During the same year, 1819, Rabbi Efraim Margolies published the *Sha'arei Efraim*,⁴⁵ which sounded similar to what was written in the *Chayei Adam* published in that same year:[46]

מה שגרשם במקצת חומשים הפטרת ויברח יעקב לפ' וישלה הוא ט"ס, כי הוא שייך לפ' ויצא, והפטרת וישלה בהושע ועמי תלואים למשובתי

It is unlikely that he saw the edition of the *Chayei Adam* that had been published just a few months beforehand. The fact that he writes that reading Hoshea 12:14 as the Haftara for Vayishlach is a mistake that appears in some chumashim indicates that he saw other chumashim with the Haftaros in what he considered the correct order, and is likely agreeing with them.

In the first edition of *Shulchan Hakriah* and *Misgeres Hachulchan* by R' Dov Reifman, published in 1864, the opinion of the *Sha'arei Efraim* is cited,[47] but in the second edition[48] it is not.

Later, the above-mentioned publisher of the *Chayei Adam*, Menachem Mann, changed his name to Romm and began publishing many books in Vilna, including the famous *Shas Bavli*. The chumashim published there had Hoshea 14:12 as the Haftara for Vayetze, and soon other publishing houses followed suit. Romm themselves continued to follow this approach,[49] even though

luchos for Vilna printed in 1826[50] and 1839[51] had Ovadia as the Haftara for Vayishlach. It seems likely that in Vilna itself the publication of the Vilna Gaon's practice in the Chayei Adam had an immediate effect.[52] Romm published the Toras Elokim chumash in 1874,[53] continuing to list Hoshea 11:7 as the Ashkenazi Haftara for Vayishlach, yet the following note was inserted before the Haftara:

הפטרה זו וגם הפטרת ויברח יעקב היא הפטרת ויצא לספרדים מפני שהם בנביא אחד אבל האשכנזים מפטירין בויצא רק ויברח יעקב ובוישלח חזון עובדיה כמבואר ברמב"ם ובלבוש

It is not clear what it means that both Haftaros are read by Sephardim for Vayetze, and it is rather strange that Hoshea 11:7 is listed for the Ashkenazi Haftara for Vayishlach with instructions that Ashkenazim actually read from Ovadia. Before the Haftara from Ovadia the following appears:

הגם שנמצא בחומשים כתוב שהיא הפטרה רק לספרדים אך מבואר ברמב"ם ובלבוש שהיא הפטרת וישלח בין לספרדים בין לאשכנזים These instructions appeared in the Mikraos Gedolos chumash they published in 1880, and others used these rather strange instructions as well.[54]

The Mikraos Gedolos chumash published by Kadishson in Piotrkow had the Haftara from Hoshea 11:7 without any instructions, but wrote the following before the Haftara from Ovadia:

כ"ה דעת הלבוש וראה עוד לזה ג"כ בסי' תרפ"ד ... הפטרת שבת א' ... של חנוכה

The Levush here explains that the reason why Zecharia is the Haftara on the first Sabbath of Chanuka while the fashioning of the menoras in Melachim is read on Chanuka only in the event that there is a second Sabbath is that that a Haftara discussing the future redemption is preferred, and the editor here felt the same applies to preferring Ovadia over Hoshea for parashas Vayishlach. The same instructions appear in the Romm Mikraos Gedolos printed in 1904.

Another Romm Chumash from 1898 had Ovadia as the Haftara for Sephardim only and Hoshea 11:7 for Ashkenazim. This chumash was reprinted in 1938, but that chumash was just a copy of one that was printed in Zhitomer in 1867, which is to this day viewed as the standard "shul chumash."

The Chayei Adam as printed in 1825 edition onward is cited by the Mishna Berura.[55] It seems that by then many communities were reading Ovadia for Vayishlach.

The practice of returning to the original Ashkenazi Haftara was not limited to Vilna and its environs. Shortly after the publication of Sha'arei Efraim, we find many communities in what became the Austro-Hungarian empire (where Rabbi Efraim was from) who read Ovadia for Vayishlach. This includes Vienna,[56] Tarnow,[57] Pressburg[58] Erlau,[59] and Eperjes.[60] But the practice in Gálszécs[61] was to read Hoshea 11:7 for Vayishlach. This was the practice in Warsaw in Russian Poland as well, according to the luach from there in 1889. By contrast, in Przeworsk[62] they still maintained the Haftaros, based on the Venice chumashim, Hoshea 11:7 for Vayetze and 12:13 for Vayishlach.

Cities that retained the original Ashkenazi practice throughout

It is impossible to know the effect of printed chumashim in various eras on every local practice, but it is clear that there were communities that simply ignored them and continued the old practice from before the era of printing. We have already seen that that was the case in Frankfurt. This was the practice in Worms as well, as seen in "Minhagei K"K Vermeiza" by Rabbi Yosefa Shamash, circa 1648.[63]

Concerning Mainz, in "Minhagei K"K BeSeder HaTefilla Unuschoseha" in the Sefas Emes siddur printed in 1862,[64] Hoshea 12:14 is the Haftara for Vayetze.

Although this is a late source, it seems to reflect a very early practice and only Haftaros that are not universal in Ashkenaz[65] are written there, which is why it does not mention the Haftara for Vayishlach, which by then was standard in Ashkenaz.

Concerning Prague (Bohemia), as mentioned earlier, chumashim there retained the original Haftaros of Hosea 13:12 for Vayetze and Ovadia for Vayishlach after they ceased to be printed as the Haftaros elsewhere. One chumash printed there 1697 does not, but it states explicitly that the Hafatros are as they are printed in Amsterdam. In Mendelsohn's Biur, printed in 1836, the following is written:

מנהג פראג ויברח יעקב – והיא הפטרת וישלח כמנהג האשכנזים, ויש מתחילים אותה בהושע י"א פסוק ז

The verses between Hoshea 11:7-12:13 are printed in small letters, indicating they are generally not meant to be read by the intended audience. In a chumash printed in 1893, Ovadia and Hoshea 11:7 appear as Haftaros for Vayishlach, with these instructions before the former:

כמנהג האשכנזים רק בפראג ובמדינת בעהמען מפטירין חזון עובדיה
Before the Haftara from Ovadia the following appears:

כמנהג הספרדים פראג ומדינת בעהמען

In a chumash printed in Budapest in 1898 it is mentioned as a practice of Prague; not as one of all of Bohemia.

Just like there are different sources whether the original Haftaros were maintained in Prague alone or in all of Bohemia, there is a similar matter with regard to Frankfurt. In the chumash printed in Roedelheim in 1818 the Haftara for Vayetze is Hoshea 11:7. The note there states:

בק"ק פפד"מ ורוב אשכנז מפטירין בפ' ויצא ויברח יעקב ואינם
אומרים כלל ועמי תלואים

And for Vayishlach, where the Ashkenazi Haftara is listed as Hoshea 12:14, it is written:

כאן מתחילין האשכנזים הפטרת וישלה אבל בק"ק פפד"מ ורוב אשכנז
מפטירין בפ' וישלה חזון עובדיה דלקמן

The same appears in the 1854 chumash published there, as well as all subsequent printings, including the edition this chumash published in Basel in 1964.[66] The same notes appear in a chumash printed in Konigsberg[67] in 1851 and Vienna in 1864. A chumash printed in Furth in 1901 had Hoshea 11:7 as the Ashkenazi Haftara for Vayishlach, but mentioned that the practice in Frankfurt was to read from Ovadia.

Here there is evidence that the retaining of the original Haftaros spread beyond Frankfurt, as it was the practice in the old communities of Mainz and Worms.

Another community that appeared to have retained the old practice throughout is Posen, from which there is a Pinkas[68] with unique practices and carefully retained customs.

The original practice returned, as it was mentioned in sources and chumashim in the 19th century. It was in the luchos in the Austro-Hungarian empire mentioned before and it was the practice in Chernowitz as of 1868. Later it was mentioned in the all of the luchos in Eretz Yisrael[69] and in that of Ezras Torah in the United States, causing (or reflecting) that the old/new Haftaros became the standard practice for Ashkenazim.

The reacceptance of the two original Haftaros was and is not universal. The Beis Medrash Hayashan in Berlin read Hoshea 11:7 for Vayishlach until its bitter end,[70] while the practice of Kehal Adas Yisrael there was to read Ovadia.[71] The United Synagogue communities in the United Kingdom[72] (and some synagogues in some

other Commonwealth countries) still read Hoshea, as it is listed as the Ashkenazi Haftara in the Hertz Chumash.[73] The Chabad[74] practice is similar to the Sephardi practice, and Amsterdam Ashkenazim read Hoshea 11:7 for Vayetze.

Adding verses from Yoel

The Chayei Adam cited this idea, which is then cited by the Mishna Berura. Two other options are mentioned in order to finish with a positive matter. One is to finish the Haftara earlier, at 14:7, and another is to add from Micha 7:18-20.[75]

Luach Eretz Yisrael of Rav Yechiel Michel Tucazinsky cites the practice of adding the two verses from Yoel. Lately, this practice has been cited by the Ezras Torah Luach in the United States.[76] Nonetheless, out of all of the chumashim that list the Haftara from Hoshea 12:13 for either Vayetze or Vayishlach, none mentioned this practice until the Koren Chumash of 1963, which cited that there are those who add the verses, and so is written in subsequent editions until today. By contrast, there are other Israeli chumashim that do not cite this practice. The first edition of the popular English Stone Chumash, published by ArtScroll in 1993, did not cite this practice, but from the second edition onward the verses from Yoel are there, along with instructions in English that there are those who add them.

Summary

In the pre-printing era most Ashkenazi communities read Hoshea 12:14 for Vayetze and everyone read Ovadia for Vayishlach. This changed due to a mistake in the Venice chumash of 1517, after which most chumashim listed Hoshea 12:14 as the Ashkenazi Haftara for Vayishlach and Hoshea 11:7 for Vayetze. Magen Avraham noted this error, but mentioned only the correct Haftara for Vayetze, leading Noheg Katzon Yosef, Amsterdam chumashim, and after them the Chayei Adam and Sha'arei Efraim, to claim that Hoshea 11:7 is the Ashkenazi Haftara for Vayishlach. As time passed, and possibly due to the influence of the Vilna Gaon, the practice reverted to what it originally had been, to read Ovadia for the Haftara of Vayishlach.

[1] The topic of this article is the development of the Ashkenazic practices regarding these Haftaros. Any mention of other practices is just an aside. I would like to thank R' Avraham Grossman for editing the original Hebrew and my brother R' Yehoshua Duker for editing the English translation. I would also like to thank Dr. Gabriel Wasserman, R' Dr. Eliezer Brodt, R' Elli Fischer, R' Mordechai Weintraub, my uncle Dr. Joel Fishman, and the staff of the National Library of Israel for their assistance and input. [2] Goldshmidt Ed. Vo. 2. Krios Vahaftaros, p. 589 [3] Hilchos Krias Hatorah Ch. 4. P. 53. [4] Keren Re'em edition, Vol. 3 29:23 (p. 29). [5] Albeck edition, Hilchos Krias

Hatorah p. 181. [6] The Yotserot of R. Samuel the Third, Vo. 1 227-229 [7] Piyutei R Yehuda BiRabbi Binyamin (Elitzur ed.) pp. 113-114. [8] See Fried, "Haftarot Alternatiot Befiyuttei Yanai Ush'ar Paytanim Kedumim" Sinai 2. He states one of my main claims there; i.e., that the change of the Haftara began at the onset of the printing era, but he does not mention specifics. [9] Cambridge T-S A-S10241, B14.22, B14.88, B14.95, B15.5, B16.21, B20.2 B20.4 20.14 Cambridge Lewis-Gibson MISC 25.53.16. [10] See list by Y. Ofer <https://faculty.biu.ac.il/~ofery/papers/haftarot3.pdf> [11] T-S AS19.241, B20.2, 4,14, B14.62c, 125, B15.5 [12] T-S B15.2, B20.2, 4. [13] T-S B16.21 [14] Pp. 107-108 [15] *ibid.* [16] *ibid.* [17] pp.214-215 [18] See Ofer [19] Ms. Par. 2168. [20] Ms. Lon BI Add. 9408, Kennecott 3 (the last 3 verses are not vowelized), [21] Hahogas Beis Haknesses DK"K Amsterdam, Proops ed. p. 519, and Machon Yerushalayim ed. p. 221. It is not clear whether or not the Ashkenazim, who established their community there in 1632, adopted the practice of the Sephardim who had arrived in the city a half century earlier, or whether they had another Ashkenazi source. Concerning Ashkenazi Amsterdam practices in general, see the introduction to the Machon Yerushalayim edition pp 41-42. [22] Concerning Pratisensis and the publication of the chumash in general, see, Penkower, J. "Mahadurat HaTanach Harishona Bomberg Laor V'Reishit Beit Defuso," Kiryat Sefer, 1983 pp. 586-604. [23] Meginei Eretz edition. Dyhernfurth (today Brzeg Dolny), Shabtai Meshorer pub. [24] This is the case in the chumashim published by Levy, H. in 1735, Atlas J. in 1700, and Antonis A. in 1719, all in Amsterdam, as well as the di Foc. Florence, 1755. [25] 179:2 pp. 239-240 Machon Shlomo Auman ed., [26] שמר in the original. [27] שמר in the original. [28] p. 240 [29] Concerning the errors in the book see the introduction to this edition pp. 17-19, as well as Shorshei Minhag Ashkenaz, Hamburger R.B. vol. 2, pp. 250-251. [30] Printed in same edition of Noheg Katzon Yosef, p. 441. Besides the chumashim (discussed later on) that discuss the Frankfurt practices, similar to what is cited in the Tzon Nachalos, this practice is also mentioned in Frankfurt by Divrei Kehillos, Geiger, R SZ, p. 369, but this source is later, as it is from 1864. [31] Halacha 16. [32] The book has Hoshea 12:13 as its Haftara for Vayetze. He lists Hoshea 11:7 as the Haftara for Vayishlach, followed by Ovadia under the headline "יש מפרטין הפטרה זו". In a Haftara book with Mendelssohn's *bi'ur* published by Shmidt A., in Vienna in 1818, all of the *halachos* mentioned in the Be'er Yitzhak were quoted, with the exception of the one with regard to Vayetze-Vayishlach. It is possible that the publisher was aware of the error here and did not want to insert it. Moreover, in the luach published by Shmidt for Vienna in 1805, he listed Hoshea 12:13 as the Haftara for Vayetze and Ovadia for the Haftara of Vayishlach, and it could be that he did not want to give the impression that the dominant practice is different from what he wrote there. The guidelines from Be'er Yitzchok, with the omission of this one, were also printed in chumashim published in Feurth by Tzendarf, D. in 1801, and another in Livorno by Prizek, A. in 1809. [33] Published in 1720. [34] Salzbach (1802, 1820), Livorno, 1795. Paris 1809. [35] Siman 6:6:1. [36] Magen Avraham was added as the source in the Krauss edition of 2013. [37] See introduction to Krauss edit. p. 6. [38] See "Hebrew Printing" by Fuks, L. Translated from Dutch in European Judaism" 5:2 (summer 1971). [39] See "Hebrew Book Trade in Amsterdam" Fuks-Mansfeld R. G. in Le Magasin de l'univers: the Dutch Republic as the centre of the European book trade: papers presented at the international colloquium, held at Wassenaar, 5-7 July 1990 / edited by C. Berkvens-Stevelinck [et al.]. [40] See Fuks *ibid.* [41] See Auman edition. Intro. p. 16. [42] This matter is discussed at length in Zera Yaakov, Zaleznik, R.S.Z. S. 138 [43] 28:22 [44] Menachem Mann and Ziml ed. Vilna, 1829, and 1839. Huffer ed. Zhovkva 1837, Wachs Jósefów, 1839. Menachem Mann and Ziml ed. Vilna, 1839. Shklover ed. Warsaw, 1840. [45] Published in Dubno. [46] 9:18. [47] S. 25 at the end [48] Berlin, 1882. [49] This is the case in the Mendelssohn Biur they published between 1848-1853, Tikkun Soferim in 1860, and again in 1864. [50] Publisher unknown. [51] Published by Menachem and Simcha Zisl, sons of R' Boruch. [52] Later luchos from Vilna listed Ovadia as the Haftara for Vayishlach. I was unable to read what it said for Vayetze on the 1880 copy I saw. No Haftara was listed in the 1890 edition, as only Haftaros that had alternative practices were mentioned, and Hoshea 12:13 for Vayetze had become quite widespread among Ashkenazim by them, leaving no need to mention it. [53] There was an earlier version in 1872 but I have not been able to locate it. [54] This includes chumashim published in Vilna by Rosenkrantz in 1893 and Metz in 1913, and a chumash published in New York by the Jewish Morning Journal (דער מארגען (זשורינגל) in 1914. [55] *Ibid.* [56] Luach in 1879 [57] Found in luchos printed there annually through 1887-1890, as well as in 1894 in Vienna by Sturm, D. Luchos are the source for the other practices listed here as well. [58] Now Bratislava from 1870, 1892, 1893, and 1894. Printed in Vienna by Elinger, M. [59] Eger in Hungarian 1889. Printed in Vienna by Engalder. [60] Today Presov 1887. Printed in Vienna by Ster, D. [61] Pronounced "Gossach", the ancestral home of my wife's family. Today it is called Sečovce. 1888. Printed in Vienna. [62] 1888. This appears to be the last time there is a record of the Haftaros being read that resulted from the misprinting in the Venice

chumashim. [63] Machon Yerushayaim ed. Vol II. p. 195. [64] p. 12 [65] Ashkenaz here refers to western Germany. [66] These instructions are found in Hapthoroth / translated & explained by Mendel Hirsch, rendered into English by Isaac Levy. London, 1966. I believe this is the last time they were given. [67] Now Kaliningrad [68] See Pinkas Beis Haknesses DK"K Posna, Mirsky S.K. in Brocho l'Menachem: essays contributed in honor of Menachem H. Eichenstein, rabbi of the Vaad Hoer, United Orthodox Jewish community, St. Louis, Missouri published by the Vaad Hoer, United Orthodox Jewish community, 1956. What is written there, that the Haftara for Vayetze is "VVayivrach Yaakov" from S. 11 is clearly a mistake in the numbering. [69] 1947 onward. [70] Minhagei Beis Medrash Hayashan DK"K Berlin, 1937. [71] Minhagei Beis Haknesses D'Khal Adas Yisrael, Berlin 1938. [72] Heard orally from Henry Ehreich of London, as well as on the website of the Muswill Hill Synagogue. <https://u.pcloud.link/publink/show?code=kZzoTE7ZiRKq7OeCnFVtgCP2qaUuqJtpwP27> A chumash was published by Valentine in the U.K. in 1868 with an English translation that had Ovadia as the main Haftara for Vayishlach, qualifying that some communities read Hoshea 11:7. [73] First Edition, published in 1929 in both London and New York. [74] p. XIII, Sefer Haftaros Lifi Minhag Chabad, Kehot, New York. [75] In "Luach Halalchos Vihamingim LChu" L Lishnas 5779 (Weingarten edition) these practices were cited from Luach Vilna. In R. Tucazinsky's luach he recommends that those communities that read the Haftara from a scroll that has the entire text of "Trei Asar" refrain from reading from Micha, as it is a violation of the principle not to skip to somewhere when it takes more time to roll the scroll than for a translator to complete translating the previous verse. [76] Nothing about this appears in the luach for 1995 and this does appear in 2000 onward. I was unable to obtain the luchos in the interim. In 2005 it is written "כתוב בחיי אדם" and nothing else, most likely a printer's error