

To: Parsha@YahooGroups.com
From: crshulman@aol.com

BS"D Mizerem Umimatar. And the Succah shell be a shade and a shelter, by day and by night, from heat and from storm.
<http://www.yimidwood.org/>

INTERNET PARSHA SHEET ON SUCCOS - 5763

To receive this parsha sheet in Word and/or Text format, send a blank e-mail to parsha-subscribe@yahoogroups.com or go to <http://groups.yahoo.com/group/parsha/join> Please also copy me at crshulman@aol.com For archives of old parsha sheets see <http://groups.yahoo.com/group/parsha/messages> For Torah links see <http://groups.yahoo.com/group/parsha/links>

Shabbos Chol Hamoed Succos 5762 [from last year]
RABBI ELI BARUCH SHULMAN
YOUNG ISRAEL OF MIDWOOD

1. Gemara in Avoda Zara: In the future nations will ask for another chance to keep the Torah. Hakadosh Baruch Hu shem will give them the mitzvah of Succah and will then unsheath the sun. The heat will be unbearable and the nations will leave their Succos and kick them. And even though Mitzta'er is exempt from the mitzvah, their failure will lie in their having kicked the Succah.
2. Question: Why specifically the mitzvah of Succah. And, more generally, what is meaning of this story.
3. On Shalosh Regalim we celebrate events out of our past: Ananei Hakavod, Matan Torah, Yetzias Mitzrayim. But not just past - these events define our present reality, which is why we celebrate them. Thus on Pesach we celebrate the Cheirus that is still ours - Ein Ben Chorin Elah Mi She'osek Batorah. On Shavuos we celebrate the Torah which still guides our lives. And on Succos we celebrate this invisible Ananei Hakavod that shelter us now - the ever-present, ever-watchful protection of Shomer Yisroel
4. Essential meaning of Succos: Tzeh Midiras Kva Vishav Bidiras Ara'i; leave the structure which we normally trust to protect us - our home, with its (hopefully) solid foundation, firm walls and strong roof - which represents all the structures that we - individually and collectively, as a society - trust to protect us - and remove ourselves to a flimsy, rickety structure in which all that protects us is - not, certainly, the plywood panels and bamboo sticks, but - the invisible Ananei Hakavod, the protection of the Ribono Shel Olam
5. The Zohar calls the Succah: Tzilah Dehimnusah, the canopy of faith. What a profound and beautiful description. Because in our Succah we live under the shelter of those Ananim that can only be seen with eyes of faith. And the stronger our faith, the more real the Ananim.
6. This has been the story of our history in Galus. We have been bereft of all those things that nations usually rely on for protection: armies, borders, etc. No other protection than that canopy of faith. Yiddish song: Ah Succaleh Ah Kleinalah, child thinks it will fall, but father reassures him it has stood for almost 2000 years.
8. At times we have been Mitzaer in that Succah; sometimes, our Tzar was so great that we could not feel the protection of that canopy of faith. But we never lost our faith in its existence; we continued to cherish it, and to strive to be worthy of it.
7. The Gemara in Avodah Zara, with which we began, tell us that in the days of Mashiach - and it seems that we are living in the days of Mashiach - Hakadosh Baruch Hu will test the nations with a situation in which all the defenses that they had built to protect themselves - wealth, technology, military might - will be of no use against an invisible enemy. A world in which there will be no safe haven, no home front. No shelter except for the invisible canopy of faith. And they will be able to pass that test - they will despise that Succah for its flimsiness.
8. But we continue to have faith in that Succah, that canopy of faith, and so we face the future with equanimity, sure that even were He to unsheath the sun He will continue to protect us beneath it, as the Navi foretold: Visucah Tihyeh Litzel Yomam Mechorev Ulimichseh Ulimistor

<http://www.koltorah.org/ravj/lulav-chatzitzot.htm>
From Sukkot Vol.10 No.6: 15 Tishrei 5761 -- October 14, 2000
CHATZITZOT WHEN TAKING THE LULAV

BY RABBI HOWARD JACHTER

Introduction We are familiar with the Halacha that when we immerse in a Mikva our bodies must be free of Chatzitzot (barriers between the water and our bodies, such as bandages), and our hands must be free of Chatzitzot during Netilat Yadayim. In this issue, we will examine the debate whether hands must be free of Chatzitzot during Netilat Lulav. General Background Regarding Chatzitzot The general rules regarding Chatzitzot are as follows: On a Torah level, something constitutes a Chatzitzot only if it covers the entire body (in the context of Tevila) or the entire hand (in the context of Netilat Yadayim) and is something that most people would not want to remain on their bodies for a long period of time.

Chazal greatly expanded the parameters of what constitutes a Chatzitzot. They decreed that even if the objectionable item is only on a minority of the hand it is considered a Chatzitzot. They also decreed that even if the item is not objectionable it is viewed as a Chatzitzot if it covers a majority of the hand. See the Rambam for a more detailed presentation of these rules (Hilchos Mikvaot 1:12).

It is often difficult to determine if something is objectionable (Makpid Alav). Moreover, it is sometimes surprising to discover which items the Shulchan Aruch views as objectionable. For example, the Shulchan Aruch (Yoreh Deah 198:10) states that a bandage on a wound constitutes a Chatzitzot. Even though the person wants the bandage to be on his hand now, he will eventually want it to be removed (see Badei Hashulchan 198:87 for further discussion of this issue). Similarly, rings on one's fingers are considered Chatzitzot because people remove their rings when working with messy things, such as dough (O.C. 161:3).

Chatzitzot and Netilat Lulav The Gemara (Sukkah 37a) presents two disputes between Rabba and Rava regarding Chatzitzot in the context of Netilat Lulav. The Gemara records that Rabba instructed the people who assembled the Arba Minim not to place any decorative items on the part of the Lulav where one takes the Lulav. Otherwise, he explained, there would be a Chatzitzot between one's hand and the Lulav. Rava challenged this ruling, arguing that nothing that comes to beautify an item can constitute a Chatzitzot.

The second dispute concerns placing a glove on one's hands when taking the Lulav. Rabba ruled that it is not a proper taking of the Lulav, while Rava believes that it is a proper taking of the Lulav. Tosafot (s.v. D'b'ina) notes that the Gemara (Sukkah 42a) states that even Rava agrees that if the intervening item does not contribute to the dignity of the Netilat Lulav, then it is not a proper taking of the Lulav. The Gemara's example of a barrier that detracts from the dignity of the Netilah is taking a Lulav that is encased in a container. The Halacha follows the opinion of Rava (Shulchan Aruch O.C. 551:7).

Rishonim - Tosafot vs. Ran Two distinct explanations of this passage of the Gemara appear in the Rishonim. Tosafot (Sukkah 37a, s.v. Ki and s.v. D'b'ina) explains that the concern for Chatzitzot in regard to Lulav is identical to the concern for Chatzitzot in the context of Tevila and Netilat Yadayim. The Ran (18a in the pages of the Rif, s.v. Lo), on the other hand, draws a very delicate distinction. He explains that fundamentally there is no concern for Chatzitzot regarding Netilat Lulav. Only when the Torah specifically indicates that there is concern for Chatzitzot (such as regarding Tevila) must we be concerned with Chatzitzot. The concern in the Gemara regarding Lulav is that the intervening items not impede the taking of the Lulav. Thus, if there is an intervening item that does not contribute to the dignity of the Netilat Lulav, then one is considered as if he did not properly take the Lulav. Small Chatzitzot - Rama vs. Gra The Gemara discusses large barriers that fully block the Netila, such as a Lulav encased in a container or a person wearing gloves while taking the Lulav. The Rama and the Vilna

Gaon debate the question of small barriers such as rings and Band-Aids. The Rama (O.C. 551:7) records that although the practice is to remove Tefillin and rings before taking the Lulav, this is not necessary because the Tefillin and rings cover only a small portion of the hand. The Vilna Gaon (Biur Hagra O.C. 551:7, s.v. V'nahagu) notes that the Rama is in accordance only with the Ran's explanation of Sukkah 37a. The Ran believes that since Chatzitza is fundamentally not a concern regarding Lulav, only large barriers impede the act of taking the Lulav. Smaller items, such as rings, are not significant and do not impede the taking of the Lulav. However, according to Tosafot's understanding of Sukkah 37a, the general rules of Chatzitza apply to the taking of a Lulav. The Vilna Gaon asserts that according to Tosafot, just as a ring constitutes a barrier regarding Tevila and Netilat Yadayim, so too it is considered a Chatzitza in regard to Netilat Lulav.

Accordingly, the Vilna Gaon rules that the removal of Tefillin and rings before Netilat Lulav is not merely a custom, but a required act. A ramification of this dispute is a case in which removing the Chatzitza creates difficulty (such as removing a Band-Aid that covers a recent wound). The Vilna Gaon would say that one must remove the Chatzitza as required by Halacha. The Rama might waive the practice to remove barriers in case of difficulty, as we sometimes say that a Minhag is not intended to apply in a case of difficulty.

Rav Soloveitchik's Defense of the Rama Rav Yosef Dov Soloveitchik (as recorded by Rav Hershel Reichman, Reshimot Shiurim Sukkah 37a p. 176) defends the Rama from the criticism of the Vilna Gaon. The Rav seeks to demonstrate that the Rama's ruling is in harmony with Tosafot's understanding of Sukkah 37a. The Rav explains that a ring or bandage constitutes a Chatzitza only in regard to Tevila or Netilat Yadayim because the entire body or hand must come in contact with the water. However, the Halacha does not require that the entire hand take the Lulav. Thus, the section of the hand covered by the bandage may be ignored (Dal Mehacha) and does not constitute a Chatzitza.

Conclusion - Aruch Hashulchan vs. Mishna Berura The dispute between the Rama and the Vilna Gaon has yet to be resolved. The Aruch Hashulchan (O.C. 551:20) rules in accordance with the Rama, while the Mishna Brura (551:36) rules in accordance with the Vilna Gaon. One should consult his Rav for a ruling on this matter.

Postscript Interestingly, the Rama indicates that it was common for men to wear rings. Indeed, Rav Chaim David Halevi, z"l, (the Chief Rabbi of Tel Aviv who recently passed away) cites other sources that demonstrate that it was common for men to wear rings. Rav Halevi thus concludes (Teshuvot Aseh Lecha Rav 5:94) that there is no Halachic objection to a man wearing a wedding band. However, Rav Moshe Feinstein (Teshuvot Igrot Moshe Even Haezer 4:32:2) writes that although it is not forbidden, it might be inappropriate for a G-d-fearing individual to wear a wedding ring. Presumably, this is because it mimics the practice of married women to wear a wedding ring.

From: Rabbi Riskin's Shabbat Shalom List [parsha@ohrtorahstone.org.il] To: Shabbat_Shalom@ohrtorahstone.org.il Subject: Shabbat Shalom:

SHABBAT SUKKOT BY RABBI SHLOMO RISKIN

Efrat, Israel - Since the first day of the Festival of Sukkot falls out on the Sabbath, we do not bring the four species (citron, palm branch, myrtle and willow), raise them and wave them in all six directions, in thanksgiving to the Almighty for the vegetation of the holy land of Israel on the celebration of the ingathering of the produce of our fields (Leviticus 23: 39,40). This is similar to the Festival of Rosh Hashana which also fell out on the Sabbath, and we did not sound the shofar despite the Biblical command, a day of the shaky, staccato sound (t ruah) shall (Rosh Hashana) be for you (Numbers 29:1). In both of these instances, we do not perform a positive commandment ordained by the Bible as a major expression of the Festival: the ram's horn reminds us - and G-d - of the binding of Isaac as well as of the manifold instances of Jewish sacrifice throughout the generations on the basis of which we plead for Divine Mercy on the Day of Judgements and the four species establish Sukkot as the Festival of

the nation of Israel in the Land of Israel, a foretaste of the redemption to come. Why should the Festival's confluence with the Sabbath prevent our performance of two central positive commandments? The usual explanation given is the one presented in the Talmud: It is as Rabbah decreed. Since everyone is obligated to hear the shofar, and not everyone is conversant with the proper manner of blowing the shofar, an individual may go to an expert to learn how to blow properly, and he will come to carry the shofar four cubits on the Sabbath day (when carrying is prohibited). And the same decree applies to the four species&. (B.T. Rosh Hashana 29b).

This explanation is difficult to understand. It is hardly logical to assume that merely because of the possibility that one may come to carry on the Sabbath, the Rabbis saw fit to nullify two Biblical commands and rather central commands at that, which fairly well define their respective holidays! And most Jewish communities have (and had) eiruvim, which render the prohibition against transporting objects from domain to domain or four cubits in the public domain inoperative in any case. So why suspend the shofar and the four species on a Festival which falls out on the Sabbath?

I believe that a question and answer of the early commentator on the Siddur, the Avudraham, as well as an insight of the Holy Zohar will provide an interesting illumination for our practice. The Avudraham queries as to why we make a blessing shehekhyanu (thanking the Almighty for allowing us to have lived and reached this occasion) on each of the Festivals, but not on the weekly Sabbath day. After all, the Sabbath is even more sacred than the Festivals, and the Sabbath too comes around cyclically, every seven days. Moreover, I would add, when a Festival falls out on the Sabbath day, our liturgy ordains that we add an additional word to the Amidah, be ahava, which means with love. Apparently, our Sages felt that the Sabbath expresses an even greater love than do the Festivals; does it not then follow that the Sabbath deserves a Shehekhyanu blessing no less than the Festivals. And what is the nature of the Sabbath's gift of a special love? Does not our law ordain that we chant the Song of Songs, consummate love song between the Almighty and Israel, specifically on the Festival of Passover? Apparently, the Festivals also express the love relationship!

The Avudraham answers the first question by enunciating the principle that although it is true that we recite the Shehekhyanu blessing at the advent of every Festival which returns cyclically, the cycle must be more than thirty days in duration. Hence, we neither recite

Shehekhyanu on the Festival of the New Moon (Rosh Hodesh, which comes every 29 or 30 days) nor - obviously - on the Sabbath, which comes every eighth day. The reason he gives is quite compelling: if a festival appears again within a 30 day period, its advent is not anxiously anticipated, it becomes part of the natural rhythm of life, and so it does not engender the excitement necessary for a shehekhyanu.

This insight opens the door for the magnificent interpretation of the Holy Zohar, which compares the feelings of the Jew for a Festival with the feelings of an engaged couple, and the feelings of the Jew for the Sabbath to the feelings of a married couple. On the one hand, an engaged couple can hardly wait to see each other, and - especially if they live somewhat of a distance away from each other - their dates are marked with tense excitement and high-rise anticipation. More often than not, the would-be groom will usually bring gifts for his bride as a visible sign of his affection. A married couple, on the other hand, will usually not get excited at each encounter, because they spend so much time together. They generally do not exchange gifts except on very rare and special occasions - because each constantly gives the other his/her most precious possession, him/herself. The married couple, although they do not always look that way, have a much deeper relationship and a much more profound love than the engaged pair. The married couple have indeed become as one being, as the Torah says, therefore shall all individuals leave his/her father and mother, cleave unto his/her spouse, and become one flesh. We don't get excited about seeing ourselves and we generally don't give ourselves gifts; but lack of excitement and gifts notwithstanding, a successfully married couple are so intertwined that it is inconceivable for the one to

live without the other. Hence, although the married couple may not recite the Shehechyanu of excited anticipation at their meeting, they do add the extra word *be'ahava*, with love, because their love is far deeper than the infatuation of engaged couples.

On this basis, the holy Zohar explains the lack of shofar and four species on a Festival which falls out on the Sabbath. The shofar and the four species are our gifts to G-d when we see Him as our Divine lover, as our supernal fiancée, on the Sabbath we give the Almighty the greatest gift imaginable, our very selves, in our commitment to the Creator of the world who has taken Israel as His spouse, as it were, with the marriage contract of Torah. Given this more profound love relationship, the gifts of shofar and four species become superfluous. Shabbat Shalom, Hag Sameach, and husbands, still give your wives gifts in honor of the Festival, The Zohar notwithstanding!

You can find Rabbi Riskin's parshiot on the web at:

<http://www.ohrtorahstone.org.il/parsha/index.htm>

Ohr Torah Stone Colleges and Graduate Programs Rabbi Shlomo Riskin, Chancellor Rabbi Chaim Brovender, Dean To subscribe, E-mail to: <Shabbat_Shalom-on@ohrtorahstone.org.il>

From: National Council of Young Israel [YI_Torah@lb.central.com]
Sukkot, first days 15-16 Tishrei 5763 September 21-22, 2002
Sanhedrin 10-11

Guest Rabbi: RABBI ARYEH Z. GINZBERG Associate member,
Young Israel Council of Rabbis

It is always inspiring to observe how our Gedolei Yisroel perform their mitzvot; usually done with meticulous concern and great simcha. Over the last thirty years of close observation of Gedolim, the mitzvah I observed as their greatest simcha and concern was the mitzvah of Sukkah.

I recall so vividly the scene where the Steipler Gaon ZT"L, even at an advanced age, would find in himself the inner strength to climb the flimsy ladder and knock in every single nail of the Sukkah himself; refusing all offers of assistance. To observe the joy, amidst the tears, of Maran Rav Shach, ZT"L and Maran Rav Yechezkal Abramsky, ZT"L as they entered their respective Sukkos and with great love kissed the walls of the Sukkah, is a sight I will never forget.

What is so special about the mitzvah of Sukkah that brought out such deep feelings of love and simcha in the performance of this particular mitzvah? If we focus on the origins of this mitzvah, we may find the answer to this question. Chazal tell us that there were three great miracles that took place daily for the forty years of Bnei Yisroel's journey in the desert. They were the manna, Miriam's well, and the heavenly clouds. All three were great miracles. However, there was one distinct difference between the miracles of the "heavenly clouds" and the other two miracles. The "manna" and "Miriam's well" were essential for survival. After all, without food or drink, they could not possibly survive in the brutal and oppressing Sinai Desert. The third miracle, the "heavenly clouds", was not essential for survival. After all, if they did not have the clouds showing them the direction, they may have wandered off a little, they may have taken a little longer, but they would have eventually arrived at their destination.

And so it begs the question, why is there no Yom Tov to remember the miracle of the "manna" or of "Miriam's well" (which they needed for survival), and yet there is a Yom Tov of Sukkos to remember the "heavenly clouds", which was not essential for survival? And not just a day of Yom Tov, but an entire week to commemorate this great miracle. The great Chasam Sofer ZT"L explains, that this very uniqueness of the miracle of the "heavenly clouds" is exactly why a Yom Tov is warranted. The other two miracles, because they were needed for survival, was in a manner of speaking HaShem's responsibility (as His promise was to bring them safely into Eretz Yisroel); but the very fact that the third miracle of the clouds was not essential, not needed for survival, it wasn't HaShem's responsibility to do it. And yet He did it anyway. Why? To demonstrate His great love for Bnei Yisroel. A miracle that was wrought on Klall Yisrael only as a manifestation to show His great love for Bnei Yisroel clearly warrants a Yom Tov. And not just a day of Yom Tov, but an entire week to remind

us each year of the level of HaShem's great love for Klall Yisrael. It is not often where we are able to get a glimpse of the depth of that great love HaShem has for us.

Another example of HaShem's love can be found by Avrohom Avinu. The Torah tells us that HaShem said to Avrohom that "Makom asher atah omed sham" "the place where you stand", I will show you Eretz Yisroel. Chazal tell us that Avrohom did not have to turn around. Instead, HaShem showed him all of Eretz Yisrael by turning Eretz Yisrael around for him to see.

This is difficult to understand. Why couldn't Avrohom just turn around; why the need for this great miracle that Hashem turned the entire Eretz Yisroel around? The Orach Chaim Hakodosh explains, that while it's true, HaShem didn't have to perform this miracle for Avrohom, but to show the depth of His great love for him, He performed it anyway. Whenever Hakadosh Boruch Hu performs a miracle for Klall Yisrael and it is not essential to do so; it is a clear manifestation of His great love for them. Sukkos, which remembers that very miracle, is therefore the Yom Tov that represents HaShem's great love for us.

The Sukkah, the mitzvah used to display that very love, has therefore been the very mitzvah used to return those deep sentiments of our love for Hakadosh Boruch Hu. It is therefore quite understandable why our Gedolei Hatorah felt the building of the Sukkah and the Sukkah itself so dear. A Kallah that receives her engagement ring from her chosson as a sign of his love, will cherish that ring as a symbol of his commitment and love for her. The beautiful and special mitzvah of Sukkah, commemorating the nonessential miracle for the "heavenly clouds", is the ring that shows HaShem's great love for Klall Yisrael. May we all be zoche this year, in the zechus of the great mitzvah of Sukkah, to witness the ultimate manifestation of HaShem's great love, with the bringing of Moshiach Tzidkeinu Bemhaira Biayamainu Amen.

From: ohr@ohr.edu To: os-special@ohr.edu Subject: S P E C I A L S -
The Curse of Happiness * S P E C I A L S * from Ohr Somayach
www.ohr.edu

THE CURSE OF HAPPINESS

BY RABBI YAAKOV ASHER SINCLAIR

Sponsored by the Kof-K Kosher Supervision www.kof-k.org |
info@kof-k.org ** Support Needy Families in Jerusalem **
<http://kerenyehoshuavyisroel.com/>

The Curse of Happiness by Rabbi Yaakov Asher Sinclair

On Succot you will hold the four species... "And you will rejoice before Hashem ."

Napoleon wasn't a great sleeper. He would make do on a couple of hours a day. Not that he was an insomniac, he just didn't like sleeping. Someone once asked him why it was that he slept so little. He replied "When I'm awake, I'm the king of the world. When I'm asleep, I'm no different from any other foot soldier."

One of the great tyrannies of the "me generation" is the curse of happiness. Don't get me wrong. I'm not against happiness. I like being happy as much as anyone. However, happiness, or the necessity to be happy, can be a tyranny of frightening proportions.

If we believe in an all-merciful G-d who is involved with the smallest detail of the creation, then our lack of happiness is not a world-shaking event. G-d knows why I'm feeling the way I'm feeling. He knows why I broke my leg. He knows why my stocks had to plummet. But if I'm all that that there is, if the knowledge of existence ends with the knowledge of only my existence, then this world is a very lonely place indeed.

There's an old joke that goes something like this: "Everyone in this world is crazy except you and me. And sometimes I'm not so sure about you." If the cognition of existence, "Cogito ergo sum" ("I think therefore I am"), as Descartes put it, leads me to exclude an existence higher than myself, then my happiness becomes an event on which the world turns or falls. In other words, if I am not happy and fulfilled right now, this world just became a pointless wasteland.

Of all the mitzvot which one would you think the most difficult?

Probably giving up your life to sanctify G-d's name. In fact, the Vilna Gaon said that the most difficult of the mitzvot is the mitzva of simchat Yom Tov, the Torah obligation to be happy on the festivals of Pesach,

Shavuot and Succot. With most mitzvot we fulfill our obligation by doing an action. We put on tefilin, we eat matza on the first night of Pesach, we refrain from eating of Yom Kippur. The mitzva of simchat Yom Tov, however, requires us to be constantly happy during Yom Tov. There should not be a single moment when we are not filled with the joy of the festival. Now, I ask you, was there ever a time when you were constantly happy for one whole week? How about a day? An hour? Maybe. And in that hour, wasn't there a single second that you couldn't find the correct change in your pocket, or you felt a little tired for a second or two? Or maybe for a split second you felt a little blue? Constant happiness? That's a very difficult thing to achieve. However, the Torah wasn't given to the angels. It was given to flesh and blood. If the Torah mandates this constant happiness from us, it must be achievable.

The mitzva of simchat Yom Tov is derived from Succot. "And you will rejoice on your festival and you will be only happy." Our sages describe Succot as "the time of our happiness." Succot is "the time of our happiness." What is the particular essence of Succot that makes it the time of happiness?

Most of our lives we think we're running the show. We may acknowledge there's a G-d in the world. But do we really live in accordance with that acknowledgment? Acknowledgment doesn't translate into knowledge. Once in a while something can happen to jolt our self-satisfaction. Someone is critically ill. We escape a car crash. A terrorist aims a gun at us and it doesn't fire. The word miracle leaps to our lips. We suddenly find ourselves very close to G-d. The little selfish universe that we have built for ourselves seems now somehow pathetic and childish. We know Who is running things. And how much we are beholden to Him.

This is the essence of Succa. Dwelling in the shade of faith. Realizing Who is protecting us. For seven days we emerge from our World Trade Towers of delusion and dwell in huts and booths and we realize how fragile we really are.

That feeling that only G-d is running the world is the only true and lasting happiness. When we realize that we are not the be-all and end-all of existence, that we are loved and highly-prized cogs in an infinite plan, we can relax and acknowledge Who is running things in this world. That's the true joy and happiness of the Jewish Festivals.

Have a good Yom Tov!

If you like this e-mail please share it with a friend. To subscribe to this list please send an e-mail to os-special-subscribe@ohr.edu. To unsubscribe, send an e-mail os-special-unsubscribe@ohr.edu. (C) 2002 Ohr Somayach International - All rights reserved. info@ohr.edu or visit www.ohr.edu

MessageFrom: Eretz Hemdah [eretzhem@netvision.net.il]

Subject: Hemdat Yamim Sukkot

Hemdat Yamim Sukkot 15 Tishrei 5763

Moreshet Shaul (from the works of

HAGAON HARAV SHAUL YISRAELI zt"l)

D'rasha for Sukkot 5708(?) ('47)

"All citizens in Israel shall sit in the sukkot in order that your generations shall know..." (Devarim 23: 42-43). Sitting in the sukka and understanding its significance serve as a certificate of citizenship in Israel. However, the lessons to apply from the sukka change according to the generation, and, therefore, Chazal stressed different aspects of the sukka. One opinion describes the historical sukkot as actual booths, while another refers to "clouds of glory." There are times when one needs to be stressed and times when the other is more relevant. When the Jewish people were sent into exile and their existence was one of a temporary, shaky dwelling, there was less need to stress that element of the sukka. Rather, the more powerful message was of Divine clouds that miraculously protected the Jewish people during its sojourns in the wilderness and the various exiles. Even during the time of the most horrible decrees, the Divine protection guarded at least "one from a city and two from a family" and returned them to Zion, as our own eyes have seen. [Let us examine parallels between our situation and that of the generation that left Egypt]. There are among

us those who ask if it wouldn't be better to sit on "the pot of meat" [Shemot 16:3- a reference to the plenty of Egypt]. This feeling exists despite the bitter experience of the true price of apparently free melons [see Bamidbar 11:6] that we did not need to plant in Egypt, the land of plenty [and other foreign lands, such as Germany]. Having finally made it to Eretz Yisrael and encountering, not respite, but encampments, temporary dwellings, unusual eating, and a new Jewish administration, we need to remember the sukka's second message. The sukka also recalls the physical sukkot of the time of Exodus. Bnei Yisrael of that generation did not leave Egypt and enter Eretz Yisrael without hardship or trials. Only after dwelling in booths, after entering Eretz Yisrael and working hard to conquer and split up the Land, did Bnei Yisrael merit to receive the good and broad Land. "And plant us in our borders." Eretz Yisrael cannot be like another land of immigration, where people decide to stay only if they find favorable living conditions. Here we have to plant our roots. Although it isn't easy, we will succeed with stubborn dedication. When we succeed to become acclimated in our land and build permanent houses, there is a need to stress the theme of the temporary dwelling. We must realize that however protective our homes are from the elements, physical housing is temporary and misleading. Hashem is our true protection. Even or especially in our own home of Eretz Yisrael, we flourish because of a constant Divine Providence which abounds here (see Devarim 11:12). We will build and plant and become implanted ourselves, but we will do so with an awareness and appreciation of Hashem's Providence and Hand.

Ask the Rabbi

Question: I am a resident of Israel and will be traveling abroad during Sukkot. On yom tov, I will be in a city with a Jewish community, but in a different neighborhood. Can I do Melacha (work) publicly outside the Jewish community on the second day (yom tov sheni)? (I assume that privately (b'tzina), there is no problem.)

Answer: A person who lives in Eretz Yisrael cannot do melacha in chutz la'aretz on the second day of yom tov because Chazal feared that such activity could cause machloket (Pesachim 51b). This is not a local halacha of yom tov alone, but a general rule when visitors have different practices than their host community (ibid.). We understand many people's impression that there is no problem to "violate" yom tov b'tzina. This is, in fact, the opinion and rationale of the Taz (Orach Chayim 496:2). However, the great majority of rishonim and acharonim forbid melacha even b'tzina (Tosafot, Pesachim 52a; Magen Avraham, ibid.:4; Mishna Berura, ibid.:9, to name a few). Sometimes we allow a person to privately follow his minhag against the local minhag, but not by melacha on yom tov sheni, for two possible reasons. 1) It is more difficult to do melacha unnoticed (Tosafot, ibid.). 2) The prohibition of melacha on yom tov sheni is a major institution, about which we are very strict (Ba'al Hamaor, Pesachim ibid.). We urge visitors to Jewish communities to follow the majority opinion and not do melacha even b'tzina. (We are aware of cases where bnei Eretz Yisrael did melacha "privately," and the matter became known and did cause a fight). In a few situations, one can be lenient. One is a situation where even one who sees what his friend is doing cannot tell that the action is forbidden for a local Jew. For example, one can cook without an eiruv tavshilin, because one who sees him cook does not see that he doesn't have an eiruv (Radvaz, cited by Mishna Berura 596:13). Also, if there is a machloket whether a given action is permitted on yom tov, then even a ben Eretz Yisrael who is strict on the matter can do it on the yom tov sheni. This shouldn't cause a dispute since even many locals are lenient. One example is smoking (which we feel is a melacha on yom tov and strictly forbidden all year, but, unfortunately, not all agree). Where does the prohibition of yom tov sheni apply? The Shulchan Aruch (OC 596:3) says that it applies everywhere within the techum Shabbat (the confines of the city, where one is permitted to walk on Shabbat) of the Jewish community. While it is difficult to rule on a city which we do not know firsthand (ask the local rabbi), in most major cities one can go from place to place within the city without leaving techum Shabbat. If in your case it is not so, how will you get to the beit k'nesset on the first day of yom tov?

Harav Shaul Israeli zt"l Founder and President
Deans: Harav Yosef Carmel Harav Moshe Ehrenreich
ERETZ HEMDAH 5 Ha-Mem Gimmel St. P.O.B 36236 Jerusalem
91360 Tel/Fax: 972-2-5371485 Email: eretzhem@netvision.net.il
web-site: www.erezhemdah.org

OU http://www.ou.org/torah/tt/5763/sukkot63/specialfeatures_mitzvot.htm
MEANING IN MITZVOT
by RABBI ASHER MEIR

Each week we discuss one familiar halachic practice and try to show its beauty and meaning. The columns are based on Rabbi Meir's Meaning in Mitzvot on Kitzur Shulchan Arukh.

A Stolen Sukkah

The Torah commands, "The festival of Sukkot shall you make yourself seven days" (Devarim 16:13). The additional expression "yourself" often comes to tell us that a mitzva object has to belong to us personally; for example, since the Torah tells us to take the four species "for yourselves" (Vayikra 23:40), we learn that on the first day the lulav and etrog must belong to the person doing the mitzva (SA OC 649:1).

However, the gemara concludes that this can't be the meaning of the word "yourself" regarding sukkah. The reason is that the Torah explicitly states, "Every freeman in Israel shall sit in sukkot" (Vayikra 23:42).

"This teaches that all Israel are fitting to sit in a single sukkah" (Sukkah 27b). Instead, the word "yourself" comes to disqualify a stolen sukkah (SA OC 637:3).

Since the gemara states that sitting together in one sukkah is "fitting" and not merely permissible, it seems that it is actually desirable for the sukkah to have a public character. This insight can help explain a famous puzzle from the book of Nechemia.

When Nechemia and his company returned to Yerushalaim from the Babylonian exile, "All of the congregation returning from exile made sukkot, and they sat in sukkot, for they had not done so from the time of Yehoshua bin Nun, all the children of Israel, until that day; and there was very great rejoicing" (Nechemia 8:17).

The commentators try and explain how the Scripture can seem to imply that the mitzva of sukkah had been neglected for so many generations. The Metzudat David, for example, explains that they had not in the past made such permanent and fine sukkot.

The Malbim gives a somewhat different explanation. He writes that what the people had not done since the time of Yehoshua was to sit in public sukkot, as the previous verse relates: "And they made sukkot, each one on his roof, and in their courtyards, in the courtyards of G-d's house, and in the street before the Water Gate, and in the street before the Gate of Ephraim". He goes on to suggest that at the time of the return from exile there was a special regulation permitting sukkot on public property.

These sources demonstrating the special advantage of a public sukkah may imply further that every sukkah has something of a public character. The house we live in all year symbolizes privacy and separateness, but at Sukkot we leave this edifice and dwell in a temporary booth which provides much less privacy and partition between us.

We are accustomed to say that on Sukkot each individual leaves his permanent dwelling and enters a temporary one; to a lesser extent, we may say that each person leaves his private dwelling and enters a communal one.

Rabbi Meir has completed writing a monumental companion to Kitzur Shulchan Aruch which beautifully presents the meanings in our mitzvot and halacha. It will hopefully be published in the near future.

Rabbi Meir authors a popular weekly on-line Q&A column, "The Jewish Ethicist", which gives Jewish guidance on everyday ethical dilemmas in the workplace. The column is a joint project of the JCT Center for Business Ethics, Jerusalem College of Technology - Machon Lev; and Aish HaTorah. You can see the Jewish Ethicist, and submit your own questions, at www.jewishethicist.com or at www.aish.com.

From: jgross [jgross@torah.org]
To: weekly-halacha@torah.org
Subject: Weekly Halacha - Succos
WEEKLY-HALACHA FOR 5763

By Rabbi Doniel Neustadt Rav of Young Israel in Cleveland Heights
A discussion of Halachic topics. For final rulings, consult your Rav
EATING IN THE SUCCAH ON THE FIRST NIGHT OF SUCCOS
Every adult male is Biblically obligated to eat a k'zayis of bread in a sukkah on the first night of Succos. The Talmud(1) derives this obligation from the similar obligation of eating a k'zayis of matzah on the first night of Pesach. Since these two obligations are closely related, their halachos are similar in many respects. Like all mitzvos, this mitzvah, too, can only be properly fulfilled if there is prior planning and clear knowledge of all the requirements. Let us review the pertinent halachos:

WHEN IS IT EATEN?

1. In the late afternoon of erev Succos, one should not eat so much food or wine that he will be unable to eat the k'zayis of bread with a good appetite(2). 2. One cannot eat the k'zayis of bread [nor make the Kiddush that precedes it(3)] until it is definitely night(4), preferably no earlier than 50 minutes after sundown(5). If one ate before that time, he must eat another k'zayis of bread in order to fulfill the mitzvah(6). 3. The k'zayis of bread may not be eaten after midnight(7). B'dieved, though, one who did not eat before midnight should do so after midnight and recite the proper blessing(8). 4. Preferably, one should sit down to eat the k'zayis of bread immediately after coming home from Ma'ariv. Unnecessary delays should be avoided(9).

IN FACT, HOW MUCH MUST BE EATEN? 1. There are various views among the poskim about the exact measurement of a k'zayis. Since this is a Biblical obligation, it is proper to be stringent and eat at least 1.75 fl. oz. of bread, although one who eats 1 oz. of bread fulfills his obligation. 2. There is a view among the Rishonim(10) that holds that the minimum amount of bread one is obligated to eat in the sukkah on the first night is slightly more than a k'beitzah, not merely a k'zayis. Although the basic halachah does not require the larger amount(11), still it is proper to satisfy that view as well(12). The amount to be eaten [to satisfy all views], therefore, is 3.5 oz. of bread(13). 3. The bread which is eaten [whether it is a k'zayis or slightly more than a k'beitzah(14)] must be eaten within a time-span of 3-4 minutes(15). One may not talk until he has chewed and swallowed the full amount(16). L'chatchilah, it is proper to chew and then swallow a k'zayis of bread in its entirety(17).

THE BASIC PROCEDURE 1. One is obligated to eat the minimum amount of bread even if he does not enjoy it and even if it causes him distress(18). Even a person who is classified as a choleh sh'ein bo sakanah is obligated to eat a k'zayis of bread(19). 2. Before eating the bread, one must have in mind that he is about to fulfill the Biblical mitzvah of eating bread on the first night of Succos(20). If one fails to have this intent and eats the piece of bread as he normally does every Shabbos or Yom Tov, it is questionable if he has fulfilled the mitzvah(21). In any case, he should eat another portion of bread with the proper intent(22). 3. One does not fulfill his obligation by eating cake, etc.(23) Only bread made out of one of the five species of grain is valid. 4. Women are exempt from this mitzvah, but if they do eat the required amount of bread in the sukkah, it is considered a mitzvah and they may recite the blessing over the sukkah(24). 5. There are some who maintain that the bread should be eaten without being dipped in honey(25), etc. (as is the custom between Rosh Hashanah and Shemini Atzeres). Most poskim are not particular about this stringency(26).

ARE WE REQUIRED TO FULFILL THIS MITZVAH WHEN IT IS RAINING? There are many discussions among the poskim concerning the obligation to eat in the sukkah on the first night of Succos if it is raining. The following points are raised: If rain is falling, is one obligated to eat in the sukkah or not? If it is raining, is one obligated to wait and see if the rain will stop so that he can eat in a rain-free sukkah? If one does eat in the sukkah while it is raining, can a

blessing be recited? If a person ate in the succah while it was raining and then the rain stopped, is he required to eat in the succah again? If a person ate in the succah while it was raining and then went to sleep, is he obligated to get out of bed to eat again once the rain has stopped? Since there are different rulings on all of these issues, the following is a summary of the majority opinion(27):

1. If it is raining steadily and there is a reliable weather forecast for rain all night, one should make Kiddush [with shehecheyanu] and eat a k'zayis [or slightly more than a k'beitzah(28)] in the succah. No blessing over the succah is recited. The rest of the meal is eaten in the house(29). 2. If there is no reliable weather forecast and there is a possibility that the rain will stop [e.g., it is drizzling or it is raining off and on], it is proper to wait an hour or two for the rain to subside(30). The poskim agree, however, that if the delay will disturb the dignity and pleasure of the Yom Tov, or if the family is hungry and/or tired, there is no obligation to wait. 3. If the rain stops while the meal is being eaten in the house or even after the meal is finished, one is obligated to go to the succah, recite leishev ba-succah, and eat at least slightly more than a beitzah(31) of bread. Even if the rain stops after midnight, that amount of bread must be eaten in the succah. If one has already gone to bed and then the rain stops, there is no obligation to get out of bed in order to eat in the succah(32).

FOOTNOTES: 1 Succos 27a. 2 Mishnah Berurah 639:27. 3 Beiu Halachah 639:3. 4 Rama O.C. 639:3. 5 This is the generally accepted time for "night", although there are opinions who maintain that "night" is 42 minutes after sundown. [Since this is a Biblical mitzvah, it is proper ??weather permitting ??to wait for 72 minutes after sundown, to satisfy the views of the Rishonim who hold that before that time, it is not definitely night.] 6 Mishnah Berurah 639:25. If, mistakenly, one ate the bread even earlier than sundown, not only must he eat another k'zayis but he must also repeat the blessing of leishev ba-succah. 7 Rama 639:3. 8 Mishnah Berurah 639:26. In that case, though, at least a k'beitzah of bread should be eaten. 9 Mateh Efrayim 625:42, 44. 10 Quoted by the Ritva and Ran in Succos 27b. 11 O.C. 639:3. 12 Mateh Efrayim 625:51; Mishnah Berurah 639:22. 13 The amount of a beitzah according to the Chazon Ish. 14 Mateh Efrayim 625:52 and Elef le-Mateh 87; Kaf ha-Chayim 629:51. Harav S.Z. Auerbach, however, maintains that for the amount of a k'beitzah, 6-8 minutes is allowed; see end notes to Succah ha-Shalem, # 27. 15 Mishnah Berurah 639:22. Children under bar mitzvah may take up to 9 minutes to consume the k'zayis or k'beitzah; Harav S.Z. Auerbach (Shemiras Shabbos K'hilchasah 54, note 130). 16 Kaf ha-Chayim 639:50. 17 Mateh Efrayim 625:52. Mishnah Berurah, though, does not mention this. 18 Beiu Halachah 639:3. 19 Bikurei Yaakov 639:6,24; Aruch ha-Shulchan 639:17. 20 Mateh Efrayim 625:51; Mishnah Berurah 625:1. In addition to this, one should bear in mind the reasons behind the mitzvah of succah. According to some poskim (Bikurei Yaakov 625:3 based on Bach), failure to have this intent invalidates the mitzvah. Mishnah Berurah, however, rules that b'dieved one fulfills his obligation even if he does not have in mind the reasons for the mitzvah. 21 See Chida (Simchas ha-Regel, quoted in Moadim u'Zemanim 6:69) who questions if one has fulfilled his obligation in this case. See, however, Mishnah Berurah 60:10, quoting the Chayei Adam. 22 Mateh Efrayim 625:53. 23 Mishnah Berurah 639:21. 24 Sephardic women, though, should not recite the blessing for the succah or for any mitzvah which they are not obligated to perform, such as lulav, shofar, etc. 25 See Yechaveh Da'as 4:37 for the various views. 26 Harav S.Z. Auerbach (quoted in Nishmas Avraham O.C. pg. 320 and Harav O. Yosef, ibid. pg. 337). Tzitz Eliezer (15:32-14) maintains that one should be stringent. See also Moadim u'Zemanim 1:86. 27 Based on rulings of Mateh Efrayim and Mishnah Berurah. 28 Mateh Efrayim 625:51,62 and Elef le-Mateh 84. See, however, Ketzei ha-Mateh, who maintains that in this case a k'zayis is sufficient according to all of the views quoted above. 29 When reciting ha-Motzi, one should have in mind that he will recite Birkas ha-Mazon in the house. 30 Some poskim are more stringent and recommend waiting until midnight. 31 In this case, because of the blessing which is to be recited, a k'zayis is not enough. 32 There is a

minority opinion (Moadim u'Zemanim 1:86, based on his understanding of the Gr"a; Harav M. Soloveitchik, quoted in Reshimos Shiurim, Succah, pg. 92, and in Mesorah, vol. 14, pg. 57) which maintains that even after going to sleep, one is obligated to wake up and get out of bed in order to eat in the succah.

Weekly-Halacha, Copyright © 2002 by Rabbi Neustadt, Dr. Jeffrey Gross and Torah.org. The author, Rabbi Neustadt, is the principal of Yavne Teachers' College in Cleveland, Ohio. He is also the Magid Shiur of a daily Mishna Berurah class at Congregation Shomre Shabbos.

The Weekly-Halacha Series is distributed L'zchus Doniel Meir ben Hinda. Weekly sponsorships are available - please mail to jgross+@torah.org . Torah.org: The Judaism Site <http://www.torah.org/>

http://www.torahweb.org/torah/2001/moadim/rhab_succos.html
TorahWeb [From last year]

RABBI YAAKOV HABER

SUKKOT - UNIVERSAL HOLIDAY?

The Haftorot for both the first day of Sukkot (from Zecharia 14) and Shabbos Sheb'toch Ha'moed (from Yechezkel 38-39) describe the wars of Gog and Magog, the battles preceding the advent of the Messianic Era. These battles revolve around Jerusalem with the chief combatants being Edom and Yishmael (see Malbim to Yechezkel 38:2). Certainly the recent tragic events, once again pitting Christian (the traditional inheritors of the Edom dynasty) countries against Moslem (descendants of Yishmael) countries, are frightening reminders of the eventual fulfillment of these prophecies. Zecharia prophesies that after the battle, all the nations of the world will be called upon to celebrate the festival of Sukkot with dire consequences for those refusing to do so. Presumably building on this concept, the Talmud in Masechet Avoda Zara (2a-3b) relates that in the future, Hashem will prepare the reward for those who were faithful to the Torah and its precepts throughout history. The nations of the world will advance various claims as to why they should receive reward even though they rejected the Torah and did not fulfill its commandments. Finally, Hashem grants them a last opportunity for merit by commanding them to build sukkot and dwell in them. After the nations build their sukkot, Hashem shines the sun in full force making the heat intolerable, after which the frustrated nations leave the sukka and kick the sukka during their hasty exit. G-d then laughs at the nations' insincerity. The Talmud questions why this should be held against the nations since, after all, even Jews are exempt from this mitzva when it is uncomfortable (mitz'ta'eir) to remain in the sukka. The answer given is that at least the Jews do not kick the sukka when leaving.

Perhaps we can offer a deeper explanation as to why the mitzva of sukka is singled out as the test for the nations of the world and why their refusal to fulfill it leads to such great punishment. Divine Commandments, the Mitzvot, can be fulfilled in one of two ways: 1) as necessary burdens, albeit beneficial, lofty ones; 2) as welcome opportunities to serve the Master of the World. The former is symptomatic of only a King-Servant relationship with Hashem; the latter adds to this the loving Father-Son relationship. Indeed, G-d is referred to as "Avinu Malkeinu" -- "Our Father; Our King." On the one hand, we have no choice but to fulfill the d'var Hashem -- the word of G-d -- as transgression will lead to severe punishment and fulfillment to immense reward. But on the other hand, we rejoice at the opportunity to please our Heavenly Father. (See Mishna Avot 1:3 and commentaries there.) How a person reacts when faced with difficulties while performing mitzvot, even those hardships exempting him from their fulfillment, demonstrates his underlying attitude toward the commandments. One who views mitzvot as burdens is pleased with the exemption and even resents the hardship leading to the exemption, it being indicative of an increased burden associated with the commandment. By contrast, the oheiv is saddened by the missed opportunity to please his Creator. Hence, the Umot HaOlam kick the sukka while leaving it due to uncomfortableness, indicative of a purely

pragmatic approach to commandments; the Jews leave as well, but reluctantly (see Ramo (639:7)), demonstrating their love of G-d and His commandments.

These are the contrasting attitudes between K'lal Yisrael and the Umot HaOlam (Nations of the World). K'lal Yisrael jubilantly declared "Na'ase V'Nishma" to accept the Torah at Har Sinai. The other nations, after discovering that its precepts would be difficult to keep, rejected it. K'lal Yisrael yearns for more opportunities for mitzvot; the Umot HaOlam rejoice when the burden is lifted. Specifically the mitzva of sukka readily emphasizes this point. Sukka is one of the few mitzvot that encompass the entire body and all life activities. Eating and sleeping as well as learning and prayer all are complementary aspects of this mitzva. Indeed, the poskim (decisors) rule that even regular conversation with acquaintances should take place in the sukka. Thus, all apparently mundane activities can become acts of Divine Service. One who views mitzvot as all-pervasive opportunities for elevating every aspect of life would also perform them with love and enthusiasm. The nations reject this sukka-concept of life revolving around the Divine Command. Hence, they reject the entire message of Torah and are not worthy of special Divine Reward in the End of Days. Indeed, unique korbanot are brought during the first seven days of Sukkot on behalf of the 70 nations of the world as our Torah concerns itself with the benefit of all of mankind and looks toward the day when all the nations of the world will recognize G-d's oneness (see second half of 'Aleinu prayer). However, the inner meaning of Sukkot ultimately remains the special treasure of the Jewish people. Hence, on the last day of the holiday, Sh'mini Atzeret, korbanot are offered on behalf of only K'lal Yisrael as Hashem, requesting that His beloved children who serve Him with love stay another day, states: "kashe alay preidaschem" -- "your leaving is difficult for Me."

This aspect of 'ahava in the performance of mitzvot is further highlighted by the intense, extra joy accompanying the celebration of Sukkot (see Rabbi Rosensweig, The Link Between Yom Kippur and Sukkot). In addition, the mitzva of Nisuch Hamayim (water pouring) on the mizbai'ach has been explained as an allusion to the verse in Shir HaShirim (8:7): "mayim rabim lo yuch'lu l'chabot et ha'ahava" -- "a multitude of water cannot extinguish the love (between K'lal Yisrael and their G-d)."

May the merit of our increased enthusiastic devotion to Hashem's commandments out of love allow us to be spared from the great wars of Gog and Magog and merit to dwell in the heavenly Sukkas 'Oro Shel Leviathan!

From: Kollel Iyun Hadaf [kornfeld@netvision.net.il]

To: daf-insights Subject: Insights to the Daf: Sanhedrin 6-10
INSIGHTS INTO THE DAILY DAF THE MORDECAI (MARCUS) BEN
ELIMELECH SHMUEL KORNFELD MASECHES SANHEDRIN
brought to you by Kollel Iyun Hadaf of Yerushalayim daf@dafyomi.co.il,
<http://www.dafyomi.co.il>

Online donations: <http://www.dafyomi.co.il/sponsors.htm> U.S.
contributions to: D.A.F., 140-32 69 Ave., Flushing NY 11367 ISRAEL
address: Kollel Iyun Hadaf, P.O.B. 43087, Jerusalem 91430
Sanhedrin 6b

AGADAH: PRAISING YEHUDAH'S SALE OF YOSEF QUESTION:
Rebbi Meir interprets the verse, "u'Votze'a Berech Ni'etz Hashem"
(Tehilim 10:3), as referring to someone who blesses Yehudah's act of
selling Yosef as a slave. Why is blessing Yehudah's act of selling
Yosef singled out for such censure? Moreover, why should the one
who blesses Yehudah be described as angering Hashem, while
Yehudah himself is not depicted as angering Hashem through his act?
(MAHARSHA)

ANSWERS: (a) The MAHARSHA answers that we might have thought
that since many good things developed from the sale of Yosef as a
slave (such as Yosef's ultimate rise to power in Egypt and his saving
the world from famine, including his family), it is appropriate to praise
Yehudah's act. Rebbi Meir therefore teaches that such a person
angers Hashem, as he implies that Hashem was behind the evil plan to
sell Yosef. Hashem never requires someone to do a misdeed (with evil

intent) in order to fulfill His divine plan, and thus someone who makes
such a suggestion angers Hashem.

(b) The EIN YAKOV says that one who praises Yehudah for selling
Yosef angers Hashem, because it would have been better had
Yehudah left Yosef in the pit to be killed.

What does the Ein Yakov mean? On the contrary, Yehudah saved
Yosef's life! The Maharsha explains that according to the Ein Yakov,
the one who blesses Yehudah for selling Yosef and saving his life is
saying that Yehudah did so only for monetary gain. Such a statement
angers Hashem, because, in truth, Yehudah did not do it for monetary
gain, but out of pure motives and fear of Hashem. Rebbi Meir is
interpreting the verse to be saying, "Botze'a Berech" -- one who praises
Yehudah for making money ("Botze'a") from the sale of Yosef, "Ni'etz
Hashem" -- angers Hashem, because he thereby belittles a Tzadik.

(c) The Maharsha offers a third explanation, which he admits is unlike
the explanations offered by the earlier commentaries. The phrase
"Mevarech Hashem" is sometimes used as a euphemism in the
Gemara to refer to someone who curses Hashem. The Maharsha
suggests that here, too, the "blessing" actually refers to a curse. Rebbi
Meir is saying that someone who *curses* Yehudah's initiative in the
sale of Yosef is not acknowledging Yehudah's good intention, which
was to save Yosef's life. His brothers would not allow Yehudah to
return Yosef to his home, so he did whatever he could to spare Yosef's
life. By cursing Yehudah a person angers Hashem, because
Yehudah's name contains the four letters of the Name of Hashem.

(d) The NETZIV (in HA'EMEK DAVAR, Parshas Vayeshev, ha'Rechev
Davar) quotes a different explanation in the name of RAV REFAEL
VOLOZHNER. The Gemara in Bava Basra (8b) states that captivity is
worse than death. However, it is apparent from the verses quoted there
that this applies only to a Jewish person taken captive by Nochrin.
This is because the Jew must struggle to maintain his observance of
Mitzvos among the Nochrin. In contrast, the captivity of a Nochri is
certainly better than his death, since he has no struggle but merely
assimilates into the culture of his captors.

When one blesses Yehudah for selling Yosef as a slave, he is
essentially praising Yehudah for saving Yosef from death, a fate worse
than captivity. However, death is only worse than captivity for someone
who does not struggle to observe the Mitzvos. Hence, one who praises
Yehudah is saying that it is not so important to observe the Mitzvos,
and thus captivity was better for Yosef than death. A person who says
such a thing certainly angers Hashem. (Y. Montrose)

The *D*AFYOMI! *A*DVANCEMENT *F*ORUM, brought to you by
Kollel Iyun Hadaf