

B'S'D'
INTERNET PARSHA SHEET
ON MIKETZ - 5761

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

From: RABBI YISSOCHER FRAND ryfrand@torah.org
"RavFrاند" List - Rabbi Frand on Parshas Miketz -
These divrei Torah were adapted from the hashkafa portion of Rabbi Yissocher Frand's Commuter Chavrusah Tapes on the weekly portion: Tape # 263, Women and Chanukah Licht. Good Shabbos!
Dedicated This Year Le'eluy Nishmas Chaya Bracha Bas R. Yissocher Dov - In memory of Mrs. Adele Frand

Chicken and Egg Situation: Cause and Effect Not All Its Cracked Up To Be

"And it was after two years, Pharaoh is dreaming that he was standing on the banks of the Nile" [Bereshis 41:1]. There is a grammatical problem in this pasuk [verse]. Had we been telling the story, the verb 'chalam' (dream) would have been written in the past tense (Pharaoh cholam - dreamt) rather than the way the Torah actually records it (Pharaoh choleim - is dreaming), in the present tense.

The Shemen haTov gives an insightful explanation for this grammatical problem, providing an important lesson in Torah philosophy. Many times it is important to ask the question "What came first - the chicken or the egg?". In other words, in any given set of circumstances one can analyze what is the cause and what is the effect. Which one is which may not always be obvious.

Without the benefit of the Mesorah -- the oral explanation of the Torah passed down by our Sages -- a person might understand the story of Yosef being released from prison as follows: Yosef was stuck in jail. All of a sudden the King of Egypt had a dream. He did not know what it meant. None of his wise men could explain it to him satisfactorily. Finally, one of the king's advisers remembered there was a prisoner in jail who was very good at interpreting dreams. They brought Yosef out of jail, he explained the dream, he was made the viceroy, etc., etc.

In this scenario, the cause of Yosef's release from prison was Pharaoh's dream. What would have happened if Pharaoh had not remembered his dream? For all we know, Yosef would still be stuck there in prison. This is the "secular" way of viewing this Biblical incident.

The way our Sages view this story, the sequence of events and the whole chain of cause and effect were totally different: Yosef was supposed to be in prison. He was supposed to go free 2 years earlier. But, because - as we learned in last week's Parsha - Yosef asked the butler to remember him to the King (an inappropriate act of putting his faith in man rather than in G-d, for someone on Yosef's spiritual level), two years were added to his sentence.

But when those two years were over, it was time for Yosef to go free. G-d wanted him released. The prison sentence was complete. Yosef had to be released from prison because, according to the Divine Master plan, he was the one who was eventually going to sustain Egypt and sustain the whole world, forcing his brothers to come down to Egypt. Therefore, the cause was the need to implement the Divine plan and the result was that Pharaoh had to start dreaming. Pharaoh's dream did not cause Yosef to be released from prison. On the contrary, G-d's plan to free

Yosef from prison caused Pharaoh to dream.

This is hinted at by the unique grammatical construction of the pasuk quoted above. Had the pasuk been written in the past tense -- "And Pharaoh had a dream" -- that would have left us with the impression that Pharaoh's dream triggered the sequence of events - as if the dream caused everything else to happen. The Torah is telling us that Pharaoh's dream was only the result. The time had come for Pharaoh to start dreaming (present tense) because of the need to implement G-d's Master plan.

Over the last few years we have witnessed earth-shattering events. It is very difficult to define history after the passage of only a few short years. But, nevertheless, I would just like to suggest an alternate interpretation.

The secular interpretation: The leader of the Soviet Union was a fellow named Mikhail Gorbachev. He saw that the Soviet economy was not working. It needed the infusion of Western capital and expertise. Therefore, he introduced this idea called Perestroika in order to get Western aid. But he knew that in order to 'play ball' with the West he had to relax emigration restrictions on the Jews. Therefore, along with Perestroika came a loosening of the chains that kept the Jews in Russia. However, Perestroika got out of hand and once the 'genie got out of the bottle' things began to unravel. Ultimately the whole country began to unravel. As a result, hundreds of thousands of Jews were able to go free. This is the secular view of history.

An alternative interpretation is as follows: G-d in his Wisdom, wanted Jews to be in Russia for X number of years. G-d promised us "If you are dispersed shall be in the uttermost parts of Heaven, from there the L-rd your G-d will gather you in and from there he will take you out." [Devorim 39:4] We were promised that in the End of the Days there would be an ingathering of the exiles. G-d knew that there were three million Jews in a prison called the Soviet Union. (We are not talking about an individual Yosef; we are talking about a nation in prison.) G-d said, "It is time for them to come out." And it came to pass at the end of -- not two years, but at the end of seventy years of Communism -- that G-d decided that Jews must go free. Therefore, G-d began the chain of events of history, starting with Gorbachev's calculations about the Soviet economy, etc., etc. The exodus of the Jews was not the result of the whole chain of events -- it was the cause of the whole chain of subsequent events.

This is the difference between the secular view of world history and the Jewish view of world history. Whether I am right or wrong, whether this is an accurate reading of the events of the early 1990s, I do not know. I am neither a historian nor a prophet and I do not want to take that responsibility.

I am merely offering an alternative explanation. I do not attest to the exact sequence of events. But I do attest to the idea that what we see as the Cause may be the Effect.

Transcribed by David Twersky; Seattle, Washington
twerskyd@aol.com Technical Assistance by Dovid Hoffman; Baltimore, MD dhoffman@torah.org Tapes or a complete catalogue can be ordered from the Yad Yechiel Institute, PO Box 511, Owings Mills MD 21117-0511. Call (410) 358-0416 or e-mail tapes@yadyechiel.org or visit <http://www.yadyechiel.org/> for further information. Project Genesis: Torah on the Information Superhighway learn@torah.org 17 Warren Road, Suite 2B <http://www.torah.org/> Baltimore, MD 21208

<http://www.artscroll.com/parashah.html>

Parshas Mikeitz

Excerpt from BRISK ON CHUMASH, by Rabbi Asher Bergman

And he gathered them together under guard for three days. Yosef said to them on the third day . . . "One of your brothers will be imprisoned under guard, and [the rest of] you go and bring provisions."

(Mikeitz 42:17-19).

Why did Yosef have to hold all the brothers under guard for three days before deciding to keep only one brother while allowing the rest to go? he could have offered this compromise immediately!

The brothers agreed to Yosef's plan to hold one of them under guard, because they knew that otherwise they would never be permitted to bring provisions back to their families. But there is a Mishnah (Terumos 8:12) that states, "If idolaters tell a group of women, 'Hand over one of your number for us to defile, and if you don't we will defile all of you,' better they should defile all the women than that one single Jewish woman should be given over willingly to them." The Talmud Yerushalmi (quoted by the Rash) extends this law to a case where idolaters ask a group of people to hand over one person to be executed, or else they will all be killed. No Jewish life may be willingly sacrificed, even if this ultimately costs the lives of many more people.

Thus, if Yosef had made his offer of keeping one of the brother's hostage at the outset, the offer would have had to be refused. The brothers would have been obligated to stay together rather than abandon one of their number to an uncertain fate at the hands of the Egyptian authorities. Therefore, Yosef incarcerated all the brother at first, and afterwards released all but one. This way the brothers were not required to hand over anyone, for Shimon was already imprisoned.

Brisker Rav

From: SHLOMO KATZ skatz@torah.org
Hamaayan / The Torah Spring Edited by Shlomo Katz
www.TheTorahSpring.org
Miketz

Today's Learning: Yevamot 14:1-2 Orach Chaim 358:3-5 Daf Yomi (Bavli): Sotah 9

We read in this week's parashah of Pharaoh's dream, in which Pharaoh was standing "over the river." The midrash comments: "The wicked stand over their gods, as it is written, 'He was standing over the river.' [The Egyptians worshipped the Nile.] In contrast, G-d stands above the righteous, as it is written (Bereishit 28:13), 'Behold! G-d was standing over him [Yaakov].'" R' Elya Meir Bloch z"l (1894-1955; rosh yeshiva of Telshe in Cleveland) explains:

The righteous constantly strive to improve themselves and raise themselves to greater heights. Thus they always see G-d as above them. Not so the wicked; they see themselves as above G-d and they constantly redefine Him and His commandments in a way that meets their perceived needs. (Peninei Da'at)

R' S.R. Hirsch z"l (Germany; 1808-1888) writes in a similar vein: One is accustomed to call the Torah "Religion" or Jewish Religion because the word religion usually describes the relationship of man to his G-d or gods. Yet, it is exactly this term "religion" that has made it so difficult to understand the essence of the Torah. The Torah is not the thought of man, but the thought of G-d, expressed in Divine laws. The Torah is not man's teachings about G-d, but G-d's teaching about what is and what man should be.

Given the common understanding of "religion," it is small wonder, writes R' Hirsch, that people ask questions which have no meaning so far as the Torah is concerned: "You want Judaism to remain the same forever?" "All religions rejuvenate themselves and advance with the progress of the nations, and only the Jewish 'Religion' wants to remain rigid, always the same, and refuses to yield to the views of an enlightened age?" These questions are meaningless and futile because the Torah is the unique eternal message of the Unique and Eternal G-d of heaven and earth. (Collected Writings: Sivan I and elsewhere)

"Now let Pharaoh seek out a discerning and wise man and set him over the land of Egypt." (41:37)

Why was a "discerning and wise man" needed to oversee the collection of provisions during the seven years of plenty? R' Shalom Schwadron z"l (1911-1997; the "Maggid" of the Maggid Speaks series) explains in the name of his teacher, R' Elya Lopian z"l (1872-1970):

Gathering provisions during a time of plenty for a famine that is seven years in the future requires real wisdom and understanding, for it is against human nature. The Sages say (Tamid 32a): "Who is wise? One who has foresight." Moreover, convincing the entire nation to share this foresight requires an additional measure of wisdom and understanding.

Our life times, continues R' Schwadron, are a time when mitzvot are plentiful, but they will be followed by years of famine when it is impossible to add to our stores of mitzvot. When those years come, we will regret every berachah we omitted and every prayer and benching that we recited with less than full attention. This is what King Shlomo alluded to in the verse (Kohelet 11:8), "Even if a man lives many years, let him rejoice in all of them, but let him remember that the days of darkness will be many." (Lev Shalom)

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

R' Yisrael Alter z"l (the "Gerrer Rebbe"; died 1977) used to say: Why did Yaakov reject Reuven's offer? Because it showed only a half-hearted commitment to Binyamin's safety. After all Reuven had four sons! (Quoted in Otzrot Tzaddikei Ve'geonei Ha'dorot)

In light of Yaakov's resistance to Binyamin's going to Egypt, why did the brothers have to bring the real Binyamin to Egypt? Since it was a matter of life and death, why didn't they pick any person from their household, or even from the street, and say he was Binyamin?

R' Chaim Soloveitchik z"l (1953-1918) answers: The Torah records that the Egyptian viceroy (Yosef) kept one of the brothers (Shimon) imprisoned when he sent the others home. Had the brothers returned with an imposter, Yosef could have forced Shimon to pick "Binyamin" out of a line-up and thus reveal their trick. (Quoted in Torat Chaim p. 44; Shai La'Torah p. 107)

Project Genesis: Torah on the Information Superhighway
learn@torah.org 17 Warren Road, Suite 2B <http://www.torah.org/>
Baltimore, MD 21208 (410) 602-1350 FAX: 510-1053

<http://www.ou.org/torah/ti/>

Torah Insights

By RABBI AVRAHAM FISCHER

Parshat Miketz

December 30, 2000

AT THE END OF HIS LIFE WHEN YOSEPH will lie on his deathbed, he will gather his brothers around him and predict that Hashem will some day redeem them from Egypt. Among his final words, he will adjure them: Land you will bring up my bones from here (Bereishit 50: 25)

ALWAYS SENSITIVE TO EVERY NUANCE, the Sages wondered why Yosef, though still alive, would refer to himself as bones. Why not say, as his father Yaakov had requested on his deathbed, Land you will carry me from Egypt (47:30)? Why speak of himself as though decomposition had already begun?

IN SOTAH (13 B) WE LEARN: Land Rav Yehudah said in the name of Rav: Why was Yosef called bones during his life? Because he did not protest his father's honor, for the [brothers] said to him Land your servant, our father and he did not say anything to them. E

THROUGHOUT THE NEGOTIATIONS FOR THE LIFE OF Binyamin (from the end of Miketz to the beginning of Vayigash), Yosef hears the brothers repeatedly refer to Yaakov as Land your servant. The Midrash Pirkei d'ERabbi Eliezer points out that Yosef hears this 10

times, and so he dies at the age of 110, losing one year from the ideal age of 120 for every mention of your servant. (Actually, the word AVEDECHA ϕ your servant ϕ appears five times, but was repeated each time by the interpreter, an essential part of the overall plan, so he heard it 10 times.) Since Yoseph heard his father described as your servant ten times, say the Rabbis, his own ears would hear his mouth say my bones.

BUT THIS MIDRASH IS VERY HARD to understand. firstly, what could Yoseph have said? If he would have corrected the brothers, would that not have blown his cover as vizier of Egypt? And, aside from the correspondence of 10 years for mentioning your servant, ten times, how does the punishment relate to the sin?

IN ORDER TO EXPLAIN THIS, we have to examine the totality of Yoseph's dreams and their actualization.

WHEN YOSEPH FIRST SEES HIS BROTHERS, he is finally in a position to see the fulfillment of his dreams. This is not an egocentric compulsion, says the Ramban. Yoseph is obliged to make his dreams come true, not only because he feels personally guided by them, but because he genuinely believes that he is an instrument in realizing Hashem's plans for the people of Israel: the prophecy told to Avraham at the Covenant Between the Pieces ϕ that this family would be strangers and slaves, and then redeemed and returned to the Land of Israel ϕ is about to begin.

IN ORDER TO ACCOMPLISH THIS MISSION, Yoseph must suppress his strongest familial emotions. He must maintain a facade appropriate for the vizier of Egypt ϕ harsh and imperious, speaking only in Egyptian ϕ while pretending not to know that the 11 men standing before him are his brothers. He must fight back the tears, revealing none of the many emotions ϕ neither the anger at being sold into slavery, nor the love for his family, and the yearning for his home ϕ that he must no doubt contend with.

AND AN INTEGRAL PART OF HIS DREAM was for his father to bow before him. That means that hearing, your servant, our father, was heart-wrenching as it must have been for Yoseph, was unavoidable. To carry this out, part of Yoseph had to die within him. The Torah promises that, for honoring one's parents, our lives will be lengthened. But Yoseph needed to force himself not to protest when his beloved father is called his servant, and this action took its toll. The Maharal of Prague notes that a bone does not feel. Yoseph, who loved and honored his father completely, had to become impervious to feeling, like bone. Yoseph took an enormous risk in making Hashem's prophecy happen. Consequently, becoming living bones was an act of self-sacrifice.

HOW DEEPLY INGRAINED ϕ how instinctive ϕ must Yoseph's honor of his father have been! the only way he could have tolerated hearing your servant, our father was by rendering part of himself dead inside!

IF WE ARE TRULY SENSITIVE to the values of torah, then we cannot witness them being trampled without feeling a twinge of pain and sorrow. Unfortunately, many have become all too indifferent. I should ask myself: how much does my Jewishness matter to me?

HAVE I EVER BEEN IN A GROUP OF PEOPLE who didn't know I was Jewish and someone told an anti-Semitic joke?

DID I SAY SOMETHING OR DID I SUPPRESS any reaction in order to be accepted by the group? Did I feel anything at all? THE GLORY OF TORAH STUDY, the pride of our people and the secret to our identity, is under-appreciated. In some instances, it is mocked as irrelevant. Do I go about my business, or do I weep for the honor of the Torah?

THERE ARE JEWS who do not observe kashrut properly, and in whose homes I will not be able to eat. How does that fact affect me? Do I care? Do I gloat at my Jewish superiority or am I sad? Do I accept that

the beauty and sanctity of Shabbat is not yet accepted by all Jews, or do I yearn for them to know about it?

DO I TAKE IT FOR GRANTED that some Jews care nothing about Israel, and have no interest in visiting it or learning about it? Or does such willful ignorance disturb me?

AND ϕ IF I DO CARE, if I do support the strengthening of Torah ϕ what am I willing to do about it? The first step is to make Torah truly alive within myself and an integral part of my life.

From: Yeshivat Har Etzion Office[SMTP:office@etzion.org.il]

Parsha61 -10: Parashat Miketz

Yeshivat Har Etzion Israel Koschitzky Virtual Beit Midrash (Vbm)

Parashat Hashavua

This Parasha series is being dedicated in memory of Michael Jotkowitz, Z"l.

Parashat Miketz Dedicated in commemoration of the yahrzeit of Chana Bas Menachem Mendel Yitzchak A"H - 4 Tevet 5756.

The Intractable Question: Why Did Yosef Not Send Word to his Father? By RAV YOEL BIN-NUN

Seven hundred years ago, Ramban (Bereishit 42:9) posed a difficult question, one which continues to puzzle whoever studies the book of Bereishit:

How is it that Yosef, after living many years in Egypt, having attained a high and influential position in the house of an important Egyptian official, did not send his father even one message to inform him (that he was alive) and comfort him? Egypt is only six days' travel from Chevron, and respect for his father would have justified even a year's journey! ... [It would] have been a grave sin to torment his father by leaving him in mourning and bereavement for himself and for Shimon; even if he wanted to hurt his brothers a little, how could he not feel pity for his aged father?

Ramban's own astonishing answer to his question is that Yosef's goal was to guarantee the fulfillment of his dreams. Even after the first dream had been realized, he intensified the deception in order to fulfill the second dream.

He did everything in its proper time in order to fulfill the dreams, for he knew they would be fulfilled perfectly.

Abarbanel (chap. 41, question 4) poses the same question, but more bluntly:

Why did Yosef hide his identity from his brothers and speak harshly to them? It is criminal to be as vengeful and recriminating as a serpent! ... How is it that as his brothers were starving and far from home, having left their families and small children and, above all, his aged, worried and suffering father waiting for them, did he not show compassion, but rather intensified the anguish by arresting Shimon?

Rabbi Yitzchak Arama (Akedat Yitzchak, 29, ques. 9; see also Abarbanel, chap. 41, ques. 6) finds Ramban's solution puzzling.

What did he stand to gain by having his dreams fulfilled? Even had there been some advantage, that would not have justified sinning toward his father! And as for the dreams, let the Giver of dreams provide their solutions. It seems very foolish to strive to fulfill dreams, as the fulfillment does not depend on the dreamer's will.

Professor Nechama Leibowitz, in her commentary to Bereishit (p. 327), believes that dreams can indeed be acted upon. She cites as proof Gideon, who hears a Midianite tell a dream, and acts upon it

(Judges 7:13,14), as well as the Babylonian exiles (Ezra 1), who did not wait for the seventy years of Jeremiah's prophecy to pass, but returned on their own, beforehand.

In my opinion, Prof. Leibowitz is mistaken. There are two differences between her examples and the case at hand, both of which are mentioned as well by R. Yitzchak Arama.

First, neither Gideon nor the Babylonian exiles committed a

grave offense in following their dreams. Their dreams did not contradict honoring parents, and certainly did not call on them to cause others grief. Secondly, Scripture itself clearly differentiates dreams from prophecy:

Let the prophet who has a dream tell his dream; And [let the prophet] who bears My word speak My word truthfully; What is straw to wheat? The Lord has spoken. (Yirmiyahu 23:38)

As the Talmud (Berakhot 55a) explains:

Rabbi Yochanan said in the name of Rabbi Shimon bar Yochai: Just as wheat cannot exist without chaff, there cannot be a dream without false elements. Rabbi Berekhia said: Although a dream may be partially fulfilled, it will not be fulfilled in its entirety. How do we know this? From Yosef, as it is written: "The sun (representing Yosef's father), the moon (his mother), and eleven stars [are bowing down to me]," and at the time, his mother was no longer alive.

The prophet Yirmiyahu teaches us that dreams are the outer shell of prophecy, just as chaff is the outer shell of wheat. The true prophet is able to separate grain from chaff in order to eventually produce clean flour for baking. It is dangerous to confuse the different levels, to the point where every inspired man is considered to be a prophet or seer; we could never clearly perceive the word of G-d. We need not deny the existence of great visionaries - or underrate their importance - even when we affirm that they are, after all, not prophets.

The Torah distinguishes Yosef's dreams from the prophetic dreams of Avraham, Yitzchak, and Ya'akov. The Patriarchs' dreams appear as pathways to divine revelation. In the Covenant between the Halves (berit bein ha-betarim), Avraham first sleeps and has a vision, and then receives G-d's word (Bereishit 16:12-13; 17-18). Ya'akov has a dream in which he sees a ladder and angels, and then G-d speaks to him. In Yosef's dreams, however, there is no outward prophecy or Divine revelation. Even in Yosef's solving of dreams, there is only a general feeling of prophecy:

Solutions come from G-d; please tell me [your dreams]. (40:8)

Not I [but] G-d will answer for Pharaoh's well-being. (41:16)

Only after completing his explanation does Yosef become more confident:

G-d is committed to doing this, and G-d will do it quickly. (41:39)

It is significant that Yosef uses G-d's universal name "E-lokim," and not the Tetragrammaton or Kel Shakkai, names G-d uses when He reveals Himself to Israel.

For all the parallels the Midrash draws between Ya'akov and Yosef (Bereishit Rabba 84:6), the Torah clearly differentiates the dreams of one from those of the other. This distinction draws a dividing line between the degree of revelation shown to the Patriarchs, on the one hand, and to Yosef and his brothers, on the other.

Clearly, Yosef's dreams are prophetic, and not mere nonsense. However, they are a form of ruach ha-kodesh (holy inspiration), rather than nevu'a (prophecy; see Maimonides' Guide to the Perplexed II:45, where he specifically mentions Yosef as being on the "second level" of prophecy; see also Akedat Yitzchak ad loc.). Ya'akov himself provides the appropriate response to Yosef's dreams:

His father was angry at him and said: "What is this dream you dream? Shall I and your mother and brothers come and bow down to you?" ... but his father awaited it. (Bereishit 37:11)

R. Levi adds:

He (Ya'akov) took pen in hand and wrote down on what date, at what time, and at what place. (Ber. Rabba, 84:11)

Dreams like this are precisely the kind of experience about which the Akedat Yitzchak writes, "Let the Giver of dreams provide their solution." These dreams are not granted in order to be put into action by the dreamer. Together with the sheer experience of prophecy, these dreams grant us the power to wait. A dream which comes true

without our active involvement is one that we can acknowledge, after the fact, as a prophetic dream. Only an outright prophecy, such as G-d's word to Gideon, should lead to action without first waiting. Certainly, only an outright prophecy can suspend a commandment, and only as a temporary measure (see Rambam, Yesodei HaTorah, ch. 9); it is unthinkable that a dream, the outcome of which is still uncertain, should suspend the fulfillment of a commandment even temporarily. Nevertheless, it is clear that Ramban considers these dreams to be full-fledged prophecies. This position is diametrically opposed to that of the Gemara (Berakhot 55a).

Even if we accept the Ramban's position on this point, his explanation of Yosef's behavior is untenable. The first dream was fulfilled when the brothers arrived in Egypt the first time.

Yosef was the ruler of the land; it was he who provided for all the inhabitants Yosef's brothers came and bowed to the ground before him. (4:26)

There were ten brothers then, excluding Binyamin, who was at home. They had come to obtain grain - the sheaves in the dream.

The second dream is fulfilled when they bring Binyamin and meet with Yosef at his palace for a meal, honoring him and offering him gifts:

Yosef came home, and they brought him the presents they had with them to his house, and bowed down to him. (43:26)

After all eleven stars had bowed down to Yosef in his own right, as second to the king of Egypt, without any direct connection to the grain, their father's turn comes:

He greeted them and said: "Is your old father, whom you mentioned, at peace? Is he still alive?" They said: "Your servant our father is at peace; he is still alive." They bent down and bowed. (43:27-28)

This painful scene, in which Yosef's brothers prostrate themselves before him in their father's name, and refer to him as "your servant our father," is the fulfillment of the second dream, in which the sun and the moon bow down to Yosef. The entire family (other than his mother, who was no longer alive) has bowed down to Yosef, albeit indirectly - in Ya'akov's case ϕ and without realizing the full significance of their actions.

This scene will repeat itself when Yehuda begs for Binyamin's safety and refers to Ya'akov four times as "your servant our father" (44:14,24,27,30-31). It must be noted at this point that Yosef arranged this episode in order to keep Binyamin in Egypt (since he could not foretell how Yehuda would react) AFTER the second dream had been completely fulfilled. The dreams had all come true before Ya'akov's arrival in Egypt, including the dream in which Ya'akov bows down to his son. In fact, he does not physically bow to Yosef when they are reunited in Egypt; none of the commentators suggest that he did.

The Torah does tell us that when Ya'akov was on his deathbed, Yosef came to see him, and "Yisrael bowed at the head of the bed" (47:31). But it is not clear whether his bowing is before Yosef or before G-d (Megilla 16b, Sifri Devarim 6) - the simple reading suggests the latter - and certainly, his bowing does not come about through Yosef's initiative. It is precisely the verse cited by Ramban in support of his contention which actually contradicts his theory:

Yosef recognized his brothers, but they did not recognize him. He remembered the dreams he dreamt and told them: "You are spies." (42:8-9)

It is clear that only at this point does Yosef remember his dreams, as he suddenly realizes that the first dream has been fulfilled (see Rashi to 42:9).

Since Yosef remembers his dreams only when his brothers arrive in Egypt, why did he not send word to Ya'akov before that? As ruler of Egypt, it was certainly within his capacity to do so.

Ramban answers that the ten brothers' bowing down at the first

meeting was not the realization of the first dream, as the eleventh brother had not yet bowed down to him. Yosef's first dream, however, does not specify the number of brothers making sheaves! Binyamin could not have been in the fields with them at the time, as he was eight years younger than Yosef and hence only nine years old.

Thus, even in a dream Yosef could not have seen Binyamin working in the fields. Even if we accept Ramban's assertion that these dreams are prophetic, we may not distort the content of the dreams. The second dream is never completely fulfilled, as Ya'akov himself did not bow down to Yosef, nor did Rachel, who had not been alive for many years. The family's economic dependence on Yosef cannot be considered a literal fulfillment of the sheaves' bowing down before him.

Ramban himself apparently realized the difficulties inherent in attempting to coordinate the story of the goblet with the dreams. He therefore proposes a second motive for Yosef's actions at this point:

The second affair, which he caused by means of the goblet, was not intended to trouble them. Yosef was afraid that they hated Binyamin, or were jealous of their father's love for him as they had been jealous of [Yosef] ... Perhaps Binyamin had realized that they had harmed Yosef and this had led to acrimony between them. Yosef did not want Binyamin to go with them lest they harm him, until he had verified their love for him. (Ramban, 42:9)

Abarbanel agrees:

Even after Yosef tested his brothers by accusing them of espionage, he was still not certain whether they loved Binyamin or whether they still hated Rachel's children, so he focused on Binyamin to see whether they would try to save him. (chap. 42, quests. 4,6)

In the words of Akedat Yitzchak:

Yosef's intentions were evidently to see whether they still hated him or whether they regretted their actions. (chap. 42, question 2)

This second solution is no less problematic than the first. First of all, we cannot avoid the feeling that the exegetes are attempting to explain away what seems to be an accidental outcome as a preconceived plan of events. The Torah itself indicates that Yosef simply had wanted to keep Binyamin behind, after their brothers had gone home. Possibly he feared that they would harm Binyamin at some point, as Ramban suggests, or he may have wished to reveal his identity to Binyamin alone and discuss with him plans for bringing Ya'akov to Egypt. He may even have intended to force Ya'akov to come to Egypt by holding Binyamin hostage. It might be that he simply wanted to hear from Binyamin all that had transpired since he was sold. He may have wanted Binyamin's cooperation in establishing the tribes of Rachel as a separate entity. But it seems utterly far-fetched that Yosef planned the affair of the goblet so that Yehuda would intervene and offer to be enslaved instead of Binyamin, forcing Yosef into an emotional situation in which, losing his self-control, he would finally reveal his identity.

All of this indeed came about, but none of it was premeditated. Yosef could not have intended to test his brothers' attitude toward Binyamin. What would he have done if, as was quite possible, they had accepted the situation as G-d's will, as punishment for their sin, and left Binyamin with him as they had left Shimon? Would this have proven either that they were not sorry for what they had done to Yosef or that they did not love Binyamin? Does submission to the power of a tyrant prove anything? When Avraham agreed that Sarah be taken by Avimelech, did that mean he did not love her? She herself did not object to this unpleasant means of survival in a strange land (Bereishit 12:10; see Ramban and Ha'amek Davar ad loc.).

At no point in Yehuda's long speech is there any mention of the brothers' feelings toward each other or toward Binyamin. Yehuda's expressed concern is with his "old father" whom they left behind, and who interested the ruler so much. Ya'akov is Yehuda's last resort, and

Yehuda plays it for all it is worth, hinting all the while at Yosef's responsibility for any outcome.

Can we be sure that, had Yehuda not committed himself to his father under penalty of "eternal guilt," that this outburst would have occurred? It can certainly be taken as a sign of repentance in general. But it was not evoked by any feeling of love or pity toward Binyamin or Yosef, but rather by a feeling of responsibility to his father.

There are two explicit references in our story to the brothers' attitude toward Yosef. The first is during their first visit to Egypt; the second is after Ya'akov's death.

Yosef hears his brothers express regret at their behavior towards him, when they had only just arrived in Egypt. This regret is coupled with the realization that all that is befalling them is a result of that behavior:

They said to each other: This is our fault, because of our brother; we saw his suffering when he cried out to us and we did not listen; That is why this misfortune came upon us. (42:21)

Yosef restrains himself at this point, apparently with some difficulty, and maintains his deception. At no later time does he acquire any new insights into their character. This confession was elicited freely without any pressure whatsoever; they never imagined he could understand them "because the interpreter was between them."

After Ya'akov's death, the brothers return to Yosef fearing retribution.

Yosef might wish to harm us. (50:15)

Most commentators believe that they then lie and invent the story of Ya'akov's deathbed charge, in order to save their lives (Rashi on 50:16; Ramban on 45:27). Their bowing to Yosef at this point, knowing who he is, may be considered the final fulfillment of the dreams.

His brothers also bowed down to him and said: "We are your slaves." (50:16-18)

In our attempt to understand Yosef's motivation for waiting so many years, and then deceiving his brothers, we have ruled out the desire for forcing the dreams to come true - as "dreams come to us without our consent" - and certainly do not justify torturing old and suffering parents. Furthermore, as we saw earlier, Yosef remembers his dreams only when his brothers appear before him in Egypt.

Testing their regret could also not have been the reason, as he had already heard them express repentance in his presence. He revealed himself later only because he heard of his father's suffering. True, the brothers, especially Yehuda, were found to be repentant. This was, indeed, part of a master plan. But the plan was devised not in Yosef's court, but in a higher domain:

The brothers were occupied with selling Yosef, Yosef was occupied with mourning and fasting, Reuven was occupied with mourning and fasting, Ya'akov was occupied with mourning and fasting, and G-d was occupied with creating the light of the Messiah. (Ber. Rabba 85:4)

When Yosef does follow his own initiative and asks the chief cupbearer to intercede before Pharaoh on his behalf, he spends two more years languishing in prison.

In summary, I believe that our question outweighs all its proposed solutions.

What, then, do I believe to be the correct understanding of Yosef's behavior? The answer will have to wait until next week's shiur. In the meantime, I invite readers to submit answers of their own to parsha@etzion.org.il.

From: Jeffrey Gross[SMTP:jgross@torah.org]
Weekly-halacha for 5761 Selected Halachos Relating to Parshas Miketz

By RABBI DONIEL NEUSTADT Rav of Young Israel of Cleveland Heights

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

MUKTZEH ITEM LEFT ON A BED

QUESTION: What can be done if a telephone or a camera is mistakenly left on a bed or chair before Shabbos, and one needs the bed or chair on Shabbos?

DISCUSSION: To answer this question, we must break it down into its components: 1) What type of muktzeh are such objects? 2) Are they the type that can be moved under certain circumstances? 3) If they are the type that cannot be moved, is there any other way to deal with them? 4) Does the issue of bosis apply here?

TYPES of MUKTZEH

There are basically two kinds of muktzeh. We will refer to them as severe muktzeh (chamur) and light muktzeh (kal):

Severe muktzeh includes items which are "set apart" before Shabbos because they will definitely not be used on Shabbos. Severe muktzeh includes items which are classified as "non-utensils", such as a rock, as well as items which are classified as "delicate" or "precision" utensils, such as a ritual slaughterer's knife, which will not, of course, be used for slaughtering on Shabbos, nor will it be used for any permitted activity because it is so easily damaged;

Light muktzeh includes items which are set apart because they are normally used for activities which are prohibited on Shabbos, but may, on occasion, be used for a permitted Shabbos activity, e.g., scissors.

WHAT PRACTICAL DIFFERENCES IS THERE BETWEEN THE TWO TYPES?

The main difference between the two types of muktzeh is that light muktzeh can be moved [in a normal manner] under certain circumstances while severe muktzeh cannot. The circumstances under which light muktzeh can be moved are a) if the muktzeh item is needed in order to perform a permissible activity, or b) if the place which the muktzeh item occupies is needed in order to perform a permissible activity. Let us explain:

In order to perform a permitted activity: A hammer, a typical light muktzeh, may be used in order to crack nuts. A sewing needle, another light muktzeh, may be used to remove a splinter from one's finger. Since nut-cracking and splinter removal are permitted activities, a light muktzeh item may be used. [The poskim(1) note, however, that light muktzeh should only be employed when no other suitable item is readily available. Therefore, if a nutcracker and a hammer are equally accessible, the nutcracker should be used. There is no need, however, to borrow a nutcracker if a hammer is available.]

If the place which the muktzeh item occupies is needed: If a tool was left on a bed and the bed is needed for sleeping, or if scissors were left on a chair and the chair is needed for sitting, the light muktzeh item may be picked up and removed, since the muktzeh article is in the way of a need which is permitted to be met on Shabbos. Also, if the light muktzeh is in the way of a permitted item, e.g., a hammer is on a bookshelf and it is blocking a book, it is permitted to move the hammer in order to reach the book. [It is highly questionable if one is allowed to move a light muktzeh item which is simply creating a clutter but not actually interfering with a permissible activity, e.g. a hammer left lying on a mantel. Most contemporary poskim do not allow moving a muktzeh item for this reason(2).]

SMALL APPLIANCES - WHAT TYPE of MUKTZEH ARE THEY?

There are two reasons as to why a telephone or a camera may be classified as severe muktzeh: Delicate or fragile items - While these small appliances are not as delicate as a slaughterer's knife, they are still fragile electronic devices which are handled carefully and not used for any purpose other than the one for which they are manufactured.

Possibly, they can be classified as a muktzeh machmas chisaron kis(3); No permissible use on Shabbos - Some poskim maintain that in order for a utensil to retain its status of light muktzeh, it must have some possible permissible use on Shabbos as do a hammer, a comb or a phone book, for example. These items are light muktzeh because they have various uses, some permitted on Shabbos and some not. But an object like a candlestick, which can be used only for a forbidden activity, can no longer be considered light muktzeh. Small appliances such as those in question have no permitted use on Shabbos. There is nothing that can be done with a telephone except making calls, an activity which is prohibited on Shabbos.

Not all poskim, however, agree that a light muktzeh object must have a possible use on Shabbos(4). Mishnah Berurah does not give a clear-cut ruling on this issue(5). Several contemporary poskim(6) rule that under extenuating circumstance one may be lenient and consider these items as light muktzeh.

Concerning our case, therefore, we have established two points: 1) The small appliances in question may be considered severe muktzeh; 2) Severe muktzeh may not be moved, even if the place which it occupies is needed for a permitted activity. It follows, therefore, that the telephone, etc., cannot just be picked up and removed from the bed or chair.

MOVING VIA "BODY" - IS IT AN OPTION?

In the opinion of the majority of the poskim(7), even severe muktzeh may be moved by means of one's body, which means moving the object by employing any part of the body except for the hand. When necessary(8), one can move all types of muktzeh using the foot, head, mouth(9), teeth, elbow(10), or any other part of the body(11).

Although theoretically this option can be exercised, it has virtually no practical application. There is no practical method for kicking or shoving a telephone without taking the receiver off the hook, in violation of a strict - possibly Biblical - prohibition. While this particular violation does not apply to a camera, it is still not practical to shove or kick a camera from the bed to the floor, since doing so would likely ruin the camera.

IS "INDIRECT MOVEMENT" AN OPTION?

Indirect movement means using a non-muktzeh item to move a muktzeh item. In our case, it would mean pulling at the blanket which automatically - but "indirectly" - moves the telephone. In the opinion of the Mishnah Berurah(12) and most poskim, indirect movement is permitted when it is being done for a permissible purpose but not when it is done for the sake of the muktzeh item. For instance, indirectly moving a camera off the bed or chair in order to protect it, i.e., for the sake of the camera, is prohibited. If, as in our case, the camera is moved [via the blanket] so that the bed or chair can be used, it is permitted.

This leniency, however, is not agreed upon by all poskim. Chazon Ish(13) rules clearly that indirect movement is prohibited in this case. In his opinion, indirect movement is permitted only when the permitted item is being moved for its own sake, and the muktzeh is inadvertently being carried along with it. But if the purpose is to move the muktzeh, even if ultimately one will use the bed on Shabbos - a permitted activity - it is prohibited to move the muktzeh.

It seems, though, that even the Chazon Ish would agree that the following case is permitted: If there is a bedspread on the bed which needs to be removed before one can sleep in the bed, then the camera is being indirectly moved in a permitted manner. Even when there is no bedspread, but the blanket is folded down [as is normally done] to get the bed ready for sleeping, and the camera is indirectly moved as the blanket is folded down, it may be permitted according to all views.

IS THE BOSIS ISSUE A PROBLEM?

Bosis, lit. a base, is any object which severe muktzeh was placed on before Shabbos. While the laws of bosis are complicated, the basic rule is that the bosis cannot be moved even if somehow the muktzeh item is no longer on it. Were a blanket or a bed a bosis, then even if somehow

the telephone or camera were removed from the bed [either by body movement or indirect movement, or by a non-Jew or a baby(14)] it would still be prohibited to use the bed, since it had served as a base for the muktzeh, which in turn, made the base itself muktzeh.

The blanket and bed in our case, however, do not become a basis. A base can only be a basis if the muktzeh was purposely placed on it before Shabbos, with the intention of leaving it there for Shabbos(15). In our case, though, the telephone, etc., was left there by mistake, so the chair or bed does not become a basis. If we can figure out a way to remove the muktzeh, the blankets and bed themselves will be permitted to be used.

WHAT TO DO?

In conclusion, there is no one solution for all cases. Sometimes "body movement" or "indirect movement" will solve the problem, but not always.

In a situation when no other bed is available or accessible, there is some room for leniency. An argument can be made that a telephone, etc., is not severe muktzeh at all, which will allow one to move it when the place it occupies is needed. We have previously stated that, under extenuating circumstances, contemporary poskim rely on the lenient view concerning items which have no permissible use. Having no other bed to sleep on is definitely an extenuating circumstance.

Concerning the halachic definition of a telephone, etc., as a delicate and fragile object, this definition is subject to the quick-changing pace of modern technology which can reformulate once delicate and fragile appliances into durable, unbreakable ones. Thus it is difficult to determine what is at the moment muktzeh machmas chisaron kis, severe muktzeh, and what is not. As is true here and in all similar cases, one should consult his rav for an actual ruling.

FOOTNOTES:

- 1 Mishnah Berurah 308:12, as explained by Igros Moshe O.C. 5:21 -12.
- 2 Igros Moshe O.C. 5:22 -31, Harav S. Y. Elyashiv (Shalmei Yehudah, pg. 11) and Az Nidberu 8:30 are stringent on this issue. See, however, Machazeh Eliyahu 46 who rules leniently.
- 3 Harav Y.S. Elyashiv (Shalmei Yehudah, pg. 41).
- 4 See Pri Megadim (Eishel Avraham 308:12), Aruch ha-Shulchan 279:1; 308:23 and Chazon Ish 44:13 who rule stringently, while Tosfos Shabbos 308:29 and Igros Moshe O.C. 5:22-28,32 do not.
- 5 See 308:34 quoting Mor u'Ketzia and Sha'ar ha-Tziyun 279:4 based on Magen Avraham.
- 6 Harav S.Z. Auerbach and Harav Y.S. Elyashiv (Shalmei Yehudah, pg. 19); Shevet ha-Levi 2:32; Az Nidberu 8:67; Zachor v'Shamor 41:4.
- 7 Mishnah Berurah 308:13; 309:14; 311:30; Beirur Halachah 266:13. See Minchas Shelomo 1:14-2.
- 8 Igros Moshe O.C. 5:22-6. Note that Chazon Ish O.C. 47:13 does not agree with this leniency; in his opinion there is no difference between moving muktzeh with the hand or any other part of the body.
- 9 Includes blowing; Rama 308:3.
- 10 Or back of the hand; Mishnah Berurah 276:31.
- 11 Note that the leniency of using the body applies only to objects which are normally moved by hand. If this object is normally moved by the body, the leniency does not apply; see Mishnah Berurah 308:62.
- 12 O.C. 311:8.
- 13 O.C. 47:14; see Minchas Shelomo 1:14-2. [This may be the view of Shulchan Aruch Harav 308:60 as well.]
- 14 Although a non-Jew or baby cannot be instructed to remove the muktzeh, they might do so on their own.
- 15 O. C. 309:4.

Weekly-Halacha, Copyright © 2000 by Rabbi Neustadt, Dr. Jeffrey Gross and Project Genesis, Inc. The author, Rabbi Neustadt, is the principal of Yavne Teachers' College in Cleveland, Ohio. He is also the Magid Shiur of a daily Mishna Berurah class at Congregation Shomre Shabbos.

The Weekly-Halacha Series is distributed L'zchus Daniel Meir ben Hinda. Weekly sponsorships are available - please mail to jgross@torah.org .

The series is distributed by the Harbotzas Torah Division of Congregation Shomre Shabbos, 1801 South Taylor Road, Cleveland Heights, Ohio 44118 HaRay Yisroel Grumer, Marah D'Asra. Project Genesis: Torah on the Information Superhighway learn@torah.org 17 Warren Road, Suite 2B <http://www.torah.org/> Baltimore, MD 21208

From: Kollel Iyun Hadaf[SMTP:kornfeld@netvision.net.il]
THE GISI TURKEL MASECHES NAZIR INSIGHTS INTO THE DAILY
DAF
brought to you by Kollel Iyun Hadaf of Yerushalayim daf@dafyomi.co.il,

<http://www.dafyomi.co.il>

Nazir 66b NAZIR, TALMIDEI CHACHAMIM, AND PEACE

QUESTION: The Gemara concludes the Masechta by saying that Talmidei Chachamim bring peace to the world. What does this statement have to do with this Masechta? ANSWERS: (a) The MAHARSHA says that this Gemara is related to the Mishnah. Shmuel and Shimshon were both Shoftim, judges, who brought peace during their reigns by judging the people righteously and causing peace to prevail among the people, and by protecting them from the foreign nations. (b) The LEKET HA'KOTZRIM says that this is related to the previous discussion in the Gemara. Even though a number of Amora'im say that it is better to rush and grab the Berachah before having to say "Amen" to someone else's Berachah, no one should get into any fights about it, because the way of Talmidei Chachamim is to bring peace to the world. (c) The EINEI SHMUEL suggests that this Gemara alludes to the connection between Maseches Nazir and Maseches Sotah. The reason Sotah follows Nazir is because when a person sees a Sotah being punished, he should become a Nazir and refrain from wine (Sotah 2a). Similarly, if a husband or wife suspects the other spouse of adultery, the suspected spouse should refrain from wine in order to show that he or she is completely innocent and is not interested in giving in to lusts. The Gemara is saying that if a couple has children who are Talmidei Chachamim ("v'Chol Banayich Limudei Hashem..."), they can be assured that neither of them have committed adultery, because the Gemara in Shabbos (55b) says that "one who has relations with a Zonah will not have children who are Talmidei Chachamim." Hence, by having children who are Talmidei Chachamim, peace will reign in the home!

SOTAH 2 - Today's Dafim are dedicated l'Ilyu Nishmas Malka bas Menashe Krause, mother of Gitle Bekelnitzky, Fred Krause and Fran Vogel. During very difficult times, under both material and spiritual duress, she and her husband raised their children in the spirit of our fathers, imbuing them with a love for Torah and Yiddishkeit. Her home was always open to the needy, even when her family did not have enough to feed themselves.

Sotah 2 "ZIVUG RISHON" AND "ZIVUG SHENI" QUESTION: Rav Shmuel bar Rav Yitzchak says in the name of Reish Lakish that a man's Zivug is made only according to his deeds ("l'Fi Ma'asav"). Rabah bar bar Chanah adds in the name of Rabbi Yochanan that making a Zivug is as difficult as Kerias Yam Suf. The Gemara challenges Reish Lakish's assertion that a Zivug is determined based on a person's deeds from the statement of Rav Yehudah in the name of Rav, who says that forty days before the creation of the embryo, a Bas Kol issues forth and pronounces who his Zivug will be ("Ploni l'Bas Ploni"). If the Zivug is already determined, based on Mazal, then how can it be determined based on one's deeds? The Gemara answers that only the "Zivug Sheni" is determined by one's deeds. The "Zivug Rishon" is based on Mazal. The reason why the Zivug is determined based according to one's deeds is because if a person's deeds are meritorious, he is given a better Zivug (see Rashi). Why, though, is the Zivug Rishon -- which is decreed before the person is born -- not dependent on the person's deeds? That Zivug should also depend on the person's deeds! Why should a person who is a Tzadik be stuck with a woman who is not a Tzadekes just because that is what was decreed for him at the time of his creation?

ANSWERS: (a) When Hashem first created man, He created Adam and Chavah together as one, and then He separated them. The RASHBA (TESHUVOS HA'RASHBA 1:60) explains that Hashem first created man and woman together and then separated them, so that they would later be able to come together and be joined and feel like a single unit. Perhaps it is for this reason that before the man is born a Bas Kol announces who his Zivug will be -- this shows that they both come from the same spiritual root, and that the woman that he eventually marries will be part of his own Neshamah. It would be impossible to bond their souls together in such a way *after* they are created, and therefore Hashem bonds them together before they are created in order for them to be able to bond together strongly. (If one of them is a Tzadik and the other is a Rasha, then one can influence the other to improve since they are bonded together so strongly.) It is only possible, of course, for one man to be bonded to one woman. A second Zivug cannot come from the same spiritual root, and therefore the Zivug Sheni must be "l'Fi Ma'asav," determined according to one's deeds.

(b) RABEINU TAM cited here by TOSFOS SHANTZ explains that "Zivug Sheni" refers to a widow or widower. The Zivug Sheni can only occur after the first Zivug occurred. In order for the Zivug Sheni to occur, Hashem must take the life of one of the spouses in the Zivug Rishon. Rabeinu Tam explains that this is the similarity between Zivug Sheni and Kerias Yam Suf. In both of them, Hashem must take the life of some in order to benefit others. According to Rabeinu Tam, it is possible that everything that occurs to a person is based normally on Mazal, unless he is an outstanding Tzadik (as Tosfos says in Shabbos 156a), and when it says that the Zivug Rishon is announced before the person is born, it means that his Mazal is determined already from the time that he is born. The Zivug Sheni

also should be determined by his Mazal just like the other major events in his life. However, there are times when a woman loses her husband not because it was the Mazal of her husband to die, but because of the great Zechuyos of another person who deserved her as his wife. This is the Zivug Sheni to which the Gemara is referring.

(c) The ME'IRI takes the opposite approach. He says that, normally, the Zivug should always be determined by the Zechus and actions of a person, like we asked in our question. When the Gemara says that the Zivug Rishon is determined by Mazal, it is referring to the Zivug that a person finds upon reaching the age of Mitzvos, which is the proper time for getting married (see ROSH, Kuntrus Pidyon ha'Ben, end of Bechoros). Since he did not yet have a chance to do many Mitzvos or Aveiros, his Zivug is still determined by his Mazal. However, any spouse that he finds after he has reached the age at which he is rewarded or punished for his deeds, then his Zivug is determined according to his deeds. The Gemara calls it "Zivug Sheni" since when a person gets married at this age it is normally the second marriage (since most people, at that time, became married at the age of Bar Mitzvah).

(d) The Mekubalim explain that "Zivug Sheni" does not refer to a second marriage. Rather, it means a second *matching*. Hashem determines -- before a person is born -- who will be the best match for the person. But he only gets that match if he is Zocheh to it through his Ma'asim Tovim. If he is not Zocheh, then he ends up with another woman, and that is what the Gemara calls "Zivug Sheni" (it is like a "secondary" match in place of the primary one). (HAGAHAH in BE'ER SHEVA; YA'AVETZ; see also TASHBETZ 2:1.)

4b EATING BREAD WITH WET HANDS OPINIONS: The Gemara says that if a person eats his bread without drying his hands after washing them, it is as if he eats bread that is Tamei. What is so bad about eating bread with wet hands that the bread should be considered Tamei?

(a) RASHI explains that "Tamei" here means that it is so repulsive to eat bread that is wet and soggy from the water on one's hands, that it is comparable to Tum'ah which is also repulsive.

(b) RABEINU CHANANEL cited by the BI'UR HALACHAH (OC 158:12) explains that when one touches the bread with wet hands, the bread because fit to become Tamei -- "Much'shar I'Kabel Tum'ah," and if a person who is Tamei then touches the bread without washing his hands, the bread will become Tamei. The Gemara means that since the person has enabled the bread to become Tamei by eating with wet hands, it is as if he is eating bread that is Tamei.

(c) The BACH (OC 165, DH v'af Al Gav) explains that the Gemara means that when a person does not dry his hands after washing them, his act of Netilas Yadayim is lacking and it is as if his hands are still Tamei. The Mishnah in Yadayim (2:1) says that if a person washes his hands for Netilas Yadayim with less than a Revi'is, the water that was used to be Metaher his hands becomes Tamei from his hands, and thus he must pour water over his hands a second time in order to be Metaher the water that is on his hands. In such a case, if he does not pour water a second time, then what he eats certainly becomes Tamei because of the water. That is not what the Gemara here is referring to, though, because the Gemara says that it is *as if* the bread is Tamei, and not that the bread actually is Tamei. The Gemara is referring to when a person washes his hands with a full Revi'is of water, in which case he does not have to wash off the water with a second pouring, because the water is Metaher itself when it is a Revi'is. Nevertheless, the Gemara says that it is recommended that he pour water over his hands a second time in order to remove the Revi'is of water, and if he does not pour water a second time, it is as if he is eating bread that is Tamei. The Bach explains that this is why we find that a person is supposed to recite a Berachah on Netilas Yadayim before drying his hands, since drying his hands is considered part of the Mitzvah (see OC 158:12). If he washed with less than a Revi'is, it is understandable that he must dry his hands in order to complete the Mitzvah of Netilas Yadayim, since the water that is Tamei must be removed. However, if he washed with a Revi'is, why is drying his hands part of the Mitzvah? It must be that the Rabanan considered there to be some degree of Tum'ah even when he washes with a Revi'is, and thus he has not finished the Mitzvah until he dries his hands.

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

Write to us at daf@dafyomi.co.il or visit us at <http://www.dafyomi.co.il>
Tel(IL):02-652-2633 -- Off(IL):02-651-5004 -- Fax(US):603-737-5728

Dear Chavrusas and friends, With the end of the fiscal year approaching, we ask you to please show your support for Kollel Iyun Hadaf. D.A.F.'s work is an important link in the perpetuation of the Torah -- a logical sequel to the "Es La'asos l'Hashem" that first prompted the sages of the ages to record Torah sh'Be'al Peh in

manuscript, then to print it and eventually to photo-offset the Talmud and its commentaries. Our email/Internet archives provide an invaluable Torah resource. An investment in Kollel Iyun Hadaf's project is an investment in the future of Klal Yisrael. We look forward to continue bringing you in-depth commentaries and analyses, but we need your support urgently. Please take a minute to send a donation to the Kollel (address below). Thank you for joining us. With best wishes for a Lichtiger and meaningful Chanukah,

Rabbi Mordecai Kornfeld Kollel Iyun Hadaf P.S. The Kollel is acknowledging donations of \$36 or more with a CASSETTE- RECORDING of a 20 minute shiur by Rabbi Kornfeld broadcast over international radio (on radio station "Kol Neshama"). This inspiring Shiur sheds new insights into the subject of Klal Yisrael and Eretz Yisrael, bringing with it a time-appropriate message for today's day and age.

ADDRESSES FOR DONATIONS: US office: "Dafyomi Advancement Forum"
140-32 69 Ave. Flushing N.Y. 11367 USA ... Write to us at daf@dafyomi.co.il or visit us at <http://www.dafyomi.co.il> Tel(IL):02-652-2633 -- Off(IL):02-651-5004 -- Fax(US):603-737-5728