

B'S'D' prison? 19. How did the baker know that Yosef had correctly interpreted the butler's dream? (40:16) 20. How was Yosef punished for asking the butler for help?

INTERNET PARSHA SHEET
ON PARSHAS VAYESHEV - CHANUKA - 5757

For e-mail of current or back issues contact cshulman@paulweiss.com

Some Internet Dvar Torah Lists

VIRTUAL JERUSALEM: E-mail to: listproc@virtual.co.il In msg type: subscribe <listname> Your_Name" Some of lists: Aviner-Eng: Ateret Cohanim; Ask: Ask-the-Rabbi; Bircas: Parsha by Rabbi Dov Rabinowitz; DafYomi: Ohr Somayach; Halacha: by Rabbi Doniel Neustadt; Parasha - Page: by Rabbi Kornfeld; Parasha-QA: Ohr Somayach; Torah-Talk: Parasha by Rabbi Steinberg; Weekly: Ohr Somayach on Parsha; Yhe-Halak by Rabbi Friedman; Yhe-MB by Rabbi Rimon; Yhe-UndHalakha by Rabbi Bick and Zvi Shimon; Yhe-IntParsha by Zvi Shimon; Yhe-Pesachim; Yhe-Metho by Rabbi Taragin; Yhe-Sichot - of Rav Lichtenstein and Rav Amital; Yhe-Jewhpi - on Jewish philosophy; Yhe-Parsha: by YHE rabbis (& yhe-par.d); YS-Parasha and YS-personalities - from Shaalvim; YITorah; Arutz-7; Shabbat-Zomet. Send command "lists" for complete lists.

SHAMASH: E-mail to listproc@shamash.org In message write " sub 'listname' <your name>" Bytetorah: Zev Itzkowitz; Enayim: YU parsha; Daf-hashavua: London; mj-RavTorah: Rav Soloveichik ZTL on Parsha. Send "lists" for complete list.

PROJECT GENESIS E-mail to majordomo@torah.org with "subscribe listname <your e-mail address>" in message. Lists include: Torah-Forum-digest / DvarTorah / Halacha-Yomi / Maharal / Ramban / Ramchal / RavFrاند / Tefila / YomTov / Drasha. Send "lists" for complete list.

SHEMA YISRAEL: E-mail to: listproc@jen.co.il In msg type: subscribe <listname> Your_Name" Some of lists: Peninim - on the Torah by Rabbi A. Leib Scheinbaum; Outlooks on Parsha by Rabbi Zev Leff; Hear - insights from Rabbi Weber; Companion - Shalom Bayis by Rabbi Feinhandler; Yitorah; Daf-insights, Daf-background, Daf-review, etc. by Rabbi Kornfeld. Send "lists" for complete lists.

CHABAD E-mail to listserv@chabad.org. In subject write: subscribe me. In text write: "Subscribe <code> (e.g.: code = W-2)" Some of Codes: D-3) Rambam Daily; W-2) Likutei Sichos On Parsha; W-3) Week in Review on Parsha; W-4) Once Upon A Chasid; W-7) Wellsprings - Chasidic Insight into Torah Portion. Send command "lists" for complete list of codes.

ISRAEL NEWS To: Listserv@pankow.inter.net.il Subject: Subscribe Listname <your name> Type "Subscribe <listname> <your name>". Lists include "Israline" and "Israel-mideast". Must confirm w/i 48 hours by sending to same address msg "OK xxxx" with xxxx the code receive in confirmation. Also Jer1 (listproc@virtual.co.il) has Arutz-7.

WWW - Shamash - <http://shamash.org> & <http://shamash.org/tanach/dvar.html>; Jerusalem 1 - <http://www.virtual.co.il>; Maven - <http://www.maven.co.il>; YU - <http://yu1.yu.edu>; YHE - <http://www.virtual.co.il/education/yhe>; OU - <http://www.ou.org>; Chabad - <http://www.chabad.org>; JCN <http://www.jcn18.com>; Project Genesis <http://www.torah.org>; ShamaYisrael - <http://www.shemayisrael.co.il>; Children - <http://www.pirchei.co.il>; Rav Soloveichik archives - gopher://shamash.org:70/11/judaica/tanach/commentary/mj-ravtorah; Rabbi Leibtag Tanach archives - <http://www.virtual.co.il/torah/tanach>; YOSS Drasha <http://www.yoss.org/whindex.htm>; List - http://www.yahoo.com/Society_and_Culture/Religion/Judaism; Israel - <http://www.ac.il>; Good link page - <http://www.ucalgary.ca/~akiva/HOJMI/links.html>; NCYI - <http://www.youngisrael.org>; My link page - <http://members.aol.com/CRShulman>; Congregation Bais Yitzchok - <http://members.aol.com/shtiebel/jamaicaestates.html>; Holliswood Jewish Center - <http://www.geocities.com/CollegePark/3648/>; Upcoming YIJE site - stay tuned!

"ohr@jer1.co.il" "parasha-qa@jer1.co.il" Vayeshev * PARSHA Q&A * In-Depth Questions on the Parsha and Rashi's commentary.

Parsha Questions

1. "These are the offspring of Yaakov: Yosef..." Give three reasons why Yosef is considered Yaakov's main offspring. 2. Yaakov rebuked Yosef for telling his brothers the dreams. Why? 3. How do we see from the dream about the sun, moon and stars that all dreams contain some untrue element? 4. How did Reuven plan to save Yosef? 5. What did Ishmaelites usually transport? 6. Who brought Yosef down to Egypt? 7. Where was Reuven when Yosef was sold? 8. In addition to the brothers, who else knew that Yosef was alive? 9. For how long did Yaakov mourn the loss of Yosef? 10. Verse 37:35 states "his father wept." To whom does this refer? 11. Who was Tamar's father? 12. Why did Tamar not tell Yehuda that she was pregnant with his child? 13. In what merit did Tamar deserve to have kings as her descendants? 14. Why is the word "hand" mentioned four times in connection to the birth of Zerach? 15. Why does the Torah relate the incident with Potiphar's wife immediately after the incident of Yehuda and Tamar? 16. In what way was Hashem "with" Yosef? 17. Why were the butler and the baker imprisoned? 18. For how long were the butler and the baker in

I Did Not Know That! "Yosef was seventeen years old... and Yisrael loved Yosef more than all his sons, for he was his `wisdom son....' (37:2-3) "Yaakov taught Yosef everything he had learned from Shem and Ever." Rashi. This hints to the custom to teach a child to read Hebrew when he is three years old. How so? Yaakov studied in the Academy of Shem and Ever for fourteen years. Yaakov taught this wisdom to Yosef by the time Yosef was seventeen. If it took Yaakov fourteen years to teach it, just as it had taken him to learn it, we see that Yaakov began teaching Yosef at age three! (See Rema, Orach Chaim Yoreh Deah 245:8)

Recommended Reading List

Ramban 37:2 The Evil Report 37:10 The Moon 38:24 Tamar's Punishment Sforno 37:2 The Evil Report 37:3 Yosef's Coat 37:18 The Brothers' Concern 38:1 Yehuda's Punishment 39:19 Why Yosef was Imprisoned

Answers to this Week's Questions All references are to the verses and Rashi's commentary, unless otherwise stated

1. 37:2 - (A) Yosef was the son of Rachel, Yaakov's primary wife. (B) Yosef looked like Yaakov. (C) All that befell Yaakov befell Yosef. 2. 37:10 - Because Yosef aroused the hatred of his brothers. 3. 37:10 - The moon represented Rachel. Since she had already died, it was impossible for that element of the dream to come true. 4. 37:22 - He intended to return to the pit and pull Yosef out of it. 5. 37:25 - Tar and Kerosene (Itran and Nepht). 6. 37:28 - A caravan of Midianites. 7. 37:29 - He was attending to Yaakov. 8. 37:33 - Yitzchak. 9. 37:34 - Twenty-two years. 10. 37:35 - Yitzchak, who wept because of Yaakov's suffering. 11. 38:24 - Shem. 12. 38:25 - She did not want to embarrass him in public. 13. 38:26 - In the merit of her modesty. 14. 38:30 - To allude to his descendent, Achan, who sinned with his hand by taking four things from the spoils of Jericho. 15. 39:1 - To teach us that just as Tamar acted with pure motives, so did Potiphar's wife. 16. 39:3 - Yosef mentioned Hashem's name frequently in his speech. 17. 40:1 - The butler was imprisoned because a fly was found in the king's goblet, and the baker was imprisoned because a pebble was found in the king's bread. 18. 40:4 - Twelve months. 19. 40:5 - The baker dreamed the interpretation of the butler's dream. 20. 40:23 - He remained in prison an additional two years. Written and Compiled by Rabbi Reuven Subar General Editor: Rabbi Moshe Newman Production Design: Lev Seltzer (C) 1996 Ohr Somayach International - All rights reserved.

"ravfrand@torah.org" Rabbi Frand on Parshas Vayeshev / Chanukah

"RavFrاند" List - Rabbi Frand on Parshas Vayeshev / Chanukah - This issue of "RavFrاند" is dedicated in memory of Arnold Ginsberg [Aharon Yehuda Ben Nassan] by his children.

Chanukah & 'Gelt' -- The Connection Between Fire & Money

In the beginning of Hilchos Chanukah [3:1], The Ramba"m says, "In the time of the Second Temple, the Greek Government made decrees against Israel and tried to abolish their religion. They did not permit them to learn Torah or perform the mitzvos, and they sent forth their hands against their property and their daughters."

Let us consider this list: They nullified our religion, they did not let us learn, they did not permit us do mitzvos, they took away our daughters, and they took away... our money. Money may be important, but should it be listed in the same breath with the others? Should the Ramba"m be equating taking our money with taking our daughters (and not only that, but the Ramba"m mentions money first!)?

How are we to understand this statement of the Ramba"m?

Many people have the custom, on Motzaei Shabbos [Saturday night], to say a Pizmon [poem] which begins with the words "HaMavdil bein Kodesh L'chol, chatoseinu Hu yimchol" -- He who distinguishes between that which is holy and that which is not holy, He will forgive our sins. These are beautiful words. The poem says that we sin because we do not appreciate the difference between that which is Sacred and that which is mundane. We spend our time and efforts on foolishness. We do not know what is Kodesh and what is Chol. We ask G-d, Who has the ability to distinguish between Kodesh and Chol, to please forgive our sins.

(The Lubliner Rav, Rav Meir Shapiro, once said about American Jews that they know how to make Kiddush, but they don't know how to make Havdalah. In other words, they put the wrong emphasis on things that which is holy, they treat lightly, and that which is really unessential, they make holy. They do not know how to differentiate.)

What is the next line of the Pizmon? "zareinu v'chaspeinu yarbeh k'chol," which means: "May our children and our money increase like the sand." This, in and of itself -- the lumping of children and money in the same breath -- would be difficult to comprehend. But, moreover, we just finished saying that we are inadequate for not being able to distinguish between Holy and mundane, and now we go ahead and make the same mistake all over again -- equating that which is Holy (children) with that which is mundane (money)! This would be like davening Ma'ariv [the evening service] immediately after Yom Kippur, without having the proper Kavanah [concentration]. We've just finished confessing our sins for improper thoughts during prayer, and then we turn around and do it all over again! Here too, we have just confessed our failure to properly set priorities, and then we lump children together with money.

Rav Shimon Schwab offers a beautiful insight, both in the Ramba"m and in the Pizmon. Rav Schwab says that what the Ramba"m means by saying the Greeks took away our money and our daughters, is that the Greeks knew how to destroy us. If we are to succeed with our children and with our religion, we need money. In order to have Yeshivos, shuls, a community, one needs money. Money is a wonderful thing. Let's not kid ourselves. We can do tremendous things with money. We cannot exist without money.

But money corrupts, sometimes... most of the time. However, money, in and of itself, can be the greatest tool that there is. The Midrash says that when G-d showed Moshe Rabbeinu [our Rabbi] a Half-Shekel coin, He showed Moshe a 'coin of fire.' The reason is because that is what money is. Money can be terribly destructive, like a fire. But where would we be without fire? No heat, no light, nothing.

Money is the same way. If one handles it right, it can save him. If one handles it wrong, it can destroy him.

This, the Ramba"m says, is what the Greeks understood. When they wanted to take out the foundations of the Jewish people, they sent forth their hands against their money and their daughters. Take away their money. Don't let them have Yeshivas, don't let them have Torah educators. That is how the Jewish People will be destroyed. The Ramba"m has his priorities very straight. The Greeks knew how to wage a war.

Rav Schwab says that this too, is what we say on Motzaei Shabbos: If we want to be successful with our children, then we also need 'our money (to) increase like sand.'

Imagine! Money like sand, unlimited funds! Consider what that would mean. We could pay educators, instead of their current low rate salary -- one-half, one-third, or one-quarter of what the lawyers and the doctors are earning -- an amount that they truly deserve.

Imagine if we could pay our teachers top dollar. What would the face of Torah education in America look like if we had unlimited resources and could pay top dollar? What would be if we could drop the class ratio from one teacher per 25 kids, to one teacher per 15 kids?

What about the children that need extra help? For those children, we could even have one teacher for every two children. It wouldn't matter if that would require an extra salary! We could do amazing things. The Jewish People would be a different Jewish People if our children and our money were

'increased like the sand.'

That is the prayer. We know what is holy and sacred and we know what is mundane and profane... and we know what money can do. We can do the right things with money. We can change the Jewish People with money. We pray that we have 'children and money like sand' to accomplish wonderful things for the Jewish people.

Personalities: -----

Ramba"m -- Acronym for R. Moshe ben Maimon (1135-1204), Spain, Egypt; author of "Mishneh Torah", Code of Jewish Law.
Rav Meir Shapiro -- (1887-1934) Polish Rav and Rosh Yeshiva; he visited America in the early 1920s as part of a fund-raising tour for his Yeshivat Chachmei Lublin; creator of the Daf-Yomi learning schedule.
Rav Shimon Schwab -- (1908-1995), Rav of the 'Breur Kehilla' in Washington Heights, New York, formerly a Rav in Baltimore, MD.
Rav Frand, Copyright (c) 1996 by Rabbi Y. Frand and Project Genesis, Inc.
This list is part of Project Genesis, the Jewish Learning Network. Project Genesis, the Jewish Learning Network learn@torah.org 3600 Crondall Lane, Ste. 106 http://www.torah.org/ Owings Mills, MD 21117

gopher://shamash.org:70/11/judaica/tanach/commentary/mj-ravtorah
Shiur HaRav on Parshas Vayeshev/Shabbos Channukah [From last year]
Shabbos Channukah traditionally falls out on Parshat Miketz. Sometimes there are 2 Shabbosos Channukah with Shabbos Vayeshev being the first and Miketz the second. On rare years Vayeshev alone is Shabbos Channukah. These Parshios have as their central theme the story of the sale of Joseph into slavery in Egypt. The Gemara (Megilla 32a) states that Moshe established that the selection of the Torah reading should be relevant to the particular festivals and occasions that occurred in that time frame. For instance we read about the laws of Pesach on Pesach, the laws of Sukkos on Sukkos etc. The Gemara applies this principle to Purim as well (Megilla 4a), when we read the story of the battle waged by Joshua against Amalek. It therefore follows that this principle should apply to Channukah as well, since like Purim it is also a Rabbinic ordained Festival. The Rav explored the connection between Channukah and the weekly Torah portions read during this time.
"And he sent him from the Valley of Chevron" (Breishis 37:14). Rashi asks that geographically Chevron in on a mountain and he that this alludes to the "profound counsel of that righteous one who was buried in Chevron", referring to Avraham Avinu and the Bris Bayn Habesarim. The whole purpose of the sale of Joseph was to pave the way for bringing Jacob to Egypt. The Medrash says that had Jacob not gone to Egypt in order to see Joseph he would have been brought down there regardless, in chains if necessary, to fulfill the promise of the Bris Bayn Habesarim. Jacob was well aware that the brothers hated Joseph, yet he sent him to them anyway. What was the purpose of sending Joseph to his brothers? If they were in need of help, how would Joseph, who was younger than the others, help his strong older brothers? Jacob was acting contrary to reason. This is what our Rabbis meant when they commented, as brought down by Rashi, from the profound counsel of Avraham Avinu. It was the divine will that guided Jacob to act in an irrational manner in order to facilitate the keeping of the promise "For your children shall be strangers in a land that is not their own". On the day that Jacob sent Joseph from his house to seek his brothers, the divine presence was working to unfold Jewish destiny. Our Rabbis said that on that very day Hashem was creating the light of the Melech HaMoshiach (Breishis Rabbah Vayeshev 5:1). On that fateful day that Joseph left his father's house to seek his brothers great drama of the Nation of Israel was initiated that continues to this day and will continue till "the saviors shall mount Mount Esav". On that day the prophecy given to Avraham expanded itself beyond the exile in Egypt, and set in motion the chain of events for all the history that that has befallen, and is yet to befall, the Jewish Nation till the arrival of the Moshiach. The preoccupation with the Melech

Hamoshiach is quite evident in Parshas Vayeshev which relates the story of Judah and Tamar and the birth of their twin sons, from whom the Melech Hamoshiach will descend.

In Tehillim (40:8) King David said "Then I said, Behold I have come, with a scroll of a book prescribed for me". Rava said on this verse (Yevamos 77a) that David thought that his was a new story, a new episode in Jewish History. He now realized that his story was begun many years prior, with the salvation of Lot from Sedom with his 2 daughters. The elder of the daughters had a child from Lot, Moav, who's descendant, Ruth, was David's great-grandmother. In other words, the story of Lot in Breishis is critical to the notion of Moshiach Ben David, for without Lot and his daughters King David would not have been born. David was pointing out that he thought that he only now was spoken about, in the book of Samuel. However the seeds were planted years before to assure his arrival, and consequently the arrival of the Moshiach Ben David. It was not only Lot that was saved years before in Sedom, but David as well. Likewise, it was not only Tamar who was spared by Yehuda's admission, but David and the Moshiach Ben David as well. The story of the sale of Joseph into slavery in Egypt marks the true beginning of the history of B'nei Yisrael. It also sets the stage for the arrival of the Melech Hamoshiach, through the act of Teshuva done by Yehuda in sparing the life of Tamar. This drama continues to this day and will be complete with the arrival of the Moshiach and the recognition of Hashem as the One Gd. We can go a step further with this idea. At the end of his life David referred to himself as the "Hukam A'v Moshiach Elokay Yisrael" (Smauel 2: 23v1) on which the Medrash comments that he was the one who established the yoke of repentance (Hukam A'v). David was the personification of Teshuva. He taught the concept of Teshuva to Klal Yisrael. When he admitted to Nathan the prophet that he had sinned and then remained speechless at that moment (according to the Vilna Gaon) he was repentant. He knew that he was wrong and he listened to the prophet even though as king he had the power to ignore him and move him aside. He obtained this repentant spirit from his ancestors. The Mechilta in B'Shalach says that the reason why Yehuda merited royalty was his admission of guilt to Tamar, and his inherent strength of repentance that allowed a man as great as he to openly repent. Jacob recognized this strength when he blessed Yehuda with "Gur Aryeh Yehuda", that even when you fall down and sin you have the strength to stand up, do Teshuva and rise again.

The entire story of the sale of Joseph can be viewed as a lesson in doing Teshuva. Teshuva is a prerequisite for the ultimate redemption. Yehuda set the example in Parshas Vayeshev when he sinned by saying "Of what benefit would it be for us to kill our brother" and when he finally repented in Parshas Vayigash when he laid down his life to protect Binyamin. Yehuda was not alone in doing Teshuva when the brothers confronted Joseph in Egypt they admitted their guilt, "Indeed are we guilty" (Breishis 42:21). The divine plan pre-ordained these events with Joseph and Tamar to allow Yehuda in particular and the brothers in general, to recognize the power of Teshuva. This ultimately ensured the Melech Hamoshiach by saving Tamar and his sons. Yehuda's willingness to sacrifice himself in Parshat Vayigash would not have been possible without the lesson of the importance of Teshuva that was driven home to him by the episode with Tamar in Parshat Vayeshev. One might ask, why didn't Joseph reveal himself to his brothers immediately after they admitted their guilt and expressed remorse about his forced slavery? The answer lies in the status of Yehuda and the need for him to act in an appropriately repentant manner. Yehuda was:

1) the leader of the brothers, and the leader is held to a higher standard than the others;

2) the one who suggested they sell Joseph into slavery.

Joseph waited for Yehuda to act out his willingness to offer his life for Binyamin and thus perform a higher level of Teshuva than the others. This was the Teshuva that Yehuda eventually performed in Parshas Vayigash. It is interesting to note that Joseph also did Teshuva: "And he entered his room and he wept there" (Breishis 43:30). He realized that he acted improperly towards his brothers, particularly in the way that he was constantly bringing bad reports (Dibasam raah el avihem) about them to

Jacob.

According to the Rav, Vayeshev, Miketz and Vayigash are the Parshios that begin the story of the Jewish People, the planting of the seeds that will eventually lead to the coming of Moshiach and the important role played by Teshuva in these events.

To return to our original question: How are these Parshios connected to Channukah? The Rav explained the linkage in the following way. The central theme of the 3 festivals is to remember our deliverance by the hand of Hashem from slavery in Egypt. Paroh sought the physical destruction of the Jewish nation, he did not persecute them for religious reasons. The same is true of Nebuchadnetzar who wanted to conquer the people and the land and to glorify himself. This can be seen from his treatment of Chananiah, Meshael and Azaryah (who requested and received kosher food from their captors). Purim also is a holiday whose theme is deliverance from imminent physical destruction at the hands of our enemies. Channukah had a new dimension; deliverance of the Jews from religious persecution, from without as well as within. This was the first major incident in Jewish history where the goal was spiritual assimilation of the Jew and not his physical annihilation. There were many hellenizers among the Jews who strongly advocated abandoning Jewish practice and engaging in the hellenistic practices of the Assyrians and Greeks.

Channukah was the first time that Jews died for Kiddush Hashem in response to religious persecution. This is reflected in the Al Hanisim prayer where we say that the goal of the Greeks was to dissuade the Jewish People from keeping their faith in Hashem.

An example of the lengths to which the Greeks went in attempting to dislodge the faith of the Jewish People in Hashem is the story of the nephew of Yossi Ben Yoezer who was cajoled by his Greek friends to steal the Menorah from the Beis Hamikdash. He refused and was murdered by his "friends". The Medrash refers to this story as a play on words in Parshat Toldos where Yitzchak smelled the fragrant odor of Jacob's clothing (Reach Begadav). The Medrash says that the word Begadav should be read Bogdav, those that are traitors to Him. However, even a hellenizer like the nephew of Yossi Be Yoezer had his limits and did Teshuva in his final moments.

The Gemara (Shabbos 22b) states that Channukah was established as a festival and joyous holiday the following year after the conquest over the Assyrians and the miracle of the oil. Why did they wait a year before establishing the holiday? The Rav explained that it was insufficient for the people to remove the physical Tumah from the Mikdash that was brought in by the hellenizers. Klal Yisrael also had to do a communal Teshuva for their actions during that period. This Teshuva was led by the Chashmonaim. Channukah was the culmination of their Teshuva efforts and hence a holiday of Teshuva. It shares a common theme, one of Teshuva, with the Parshios of Vayeshev, Miketz and Vayigash.

Dr. Israel Rivkin and Josh Rapps. Permission to reprint and distribute, with this notice, is hereby granted. These summaries are based on notes taken by Dr. Rivkin at the weekly Moriah Shiur given by Moraynu V'Rabbeinu Harav Yosef Dov Halevi Soloveichik ZT'L over many years. .

"Packouz@aol.com" "shabbatshalom@shamash.org" Shabbat Shalom!
Vayeshev AISH HATORAH'S Shabbat Shalom Weekly
Aish HaTorah -- Building the Jewish Future -- One Jew at a Time!
BS"D

Q & A: WHAT IS HANUKAH AND HOW DO WE CELEBRATE IT?

There are two ways which our enemies have historically sought to destroy us. The first is by physical annihilation; the most recent attempt being the Holocaust. The second is through cultural assimilation. Purim is the annual celebration of our physical survival. Hanukah is the annual celebration of our spiritual survival over the many who would have liked to destroy us through cultural assimilation.

In 167 BCE. the Syrian-Greek emperor, Antiochus, set out to destroy Judaism by imposing a ban on three mitzvot: The Shabbat, The Sanctifying

rest. The Midrash continues that the Almighty did not approve of Yaakov's retirement plans. Hashem asked, "are the righteous not satisfied with the World to Come? They would want to rest in this world too?" Immediately, says the Midrash, the incident with Yoseph occurred. Yoseph is kidnapped by his brothers and sold as a slave, thus throwing Yaakov's tumultuous existence into another 22 years of agony.

What exactly is the objection toward Yaakov's desire to rest? Why couldn't the father of the 12 tribes spend the final third of his life in tranquillity? On the fast day of the Tenth of Teves, during the height of World War II, Rabbi Ahron Kotler took the well known activist Irving Bunim on a train trip to Washington. The war in Europe was raging, Jews were being exterminated, and the two had to see a high-ranking Washington official to plead with him in every possible way -- "save our brothers." On the way down to Washington Rabbi Kotler tried to persuade Bunim to break his fast. "Bunim," he explained. "You cannot fast now. You need your strength for the meeting."

But Irving Bunim refused to eat. He was sure that he could hold out until the evening when the fast ended. The meeting was intense. Rabbi Kotler cried, cajoled, and begged the official to respond. Finally, the great rabbi felt that he impressed upon the man the severity of the situation. The man gave his commitment that he would talk to the President. When they left the meeting Bunim was exhausted. He mentioned to Rabbi Kotler that he thought the meeting went well and now he'd like to eat.

Rav Ahron was quick to reply. "With Hashem's help it will be good. And Bunim," he added, "now you can fast!" Yaakov wanted to rest. However, Hashem had a different view. There is no real rest in this world. As much as one has accomplished, there is always another battle -- another test. The moment one declares victory, another battle looms.

This week we celebrate Chanukah. The words Chanukah mean "they rested on the 25th (of Kislev)." It was not a total rest. Just one rest from one battle. The Hasmoneans had to rededicate the desecrated Temple, re-light the Menorah, and re-establish the supremacy of Torah over a Hellenist culture that had corrupted Jewish life. They rested from physical battle, but they knew that there would be a constant battle over spirituality for ages to come. They established the Menorah-lighting ceremony with flames that have glowed until today proclaiming with each flicker that the battle may be over but the war is endless -- until the final rest.

Good Shabbos and Ah Frailechen [a happy] Chanukah

"LeZecher nishmas R. Yonasson Aryeh z"l ben yibadel leChayim Tovim R. Moshe Aron, Reb Yonasson Aron, whose entire life was Chessed and Emes, and who was a driving force behind the spiritual and physical growth of the Torah community in Passaic, New Jersey, on the occasion of his first yahrtzeit. sponsored by the Sherer family of Yerushalayim Ir HaKodesh." Mordechai Kamenetzky - Yeshiva of South Shore rmk@torah.org

Drasha, Copyright (c) 1996 by Rabbi M. Kamenetzky and Project Genesis, Inc. Rabbi Mordechai Kamenetzky is the Rosh Mesivta at Mesivta Ateres Yaakov, the High School Division of Yeshiva of South Shore, <http://www.yoss.org/>

This list is part of Project Genesis, the Jewish Learning Network. Permission is granted to redistribute electronically or on paper, provided that this notice is included intact. For information on subscriptions, archives, and other Project Genesis classes, send mail to learn@torah.org for an automated reply. For subscription assistance, send mail to gabbai@torah.org Project Genesis, the Jewish Learning Network 3600 Crondall Lane, Ste. 106 <http://www.torah.org/> Owings Mills, MD 21117 (410) 654-1799

<http://www.virtual.co.il/torah/tanach/special/chanuka.56>
MACHON AVRAHAM PROJECT/ In Memory of Rabbi Abraham Leibtag
The Tanach Study Center [<http://www.virtual.co.il/torah/tanach/>]
Shiurim by Menachem Leibtag
THE BIBLICAL ROOTS OF CHANUKA Its relationship to the

prophecies of the Second Temple Period

Throughout the history of Am Yisrael, there were many military victories, yet Chazal never established a holiday commemorating those events. Many varieties of miracles have also occurred, yet no Rabbinnically-ordained holiday commemorates them [1]. Why are the military victory and miracle of Chanuka different? To answer this question it must be understood that the date of Chanuka possessed historic and prophetic significance several hundred years before the Hasmonean revolt! The following article will attempt to understand Chanuka based on its roots in the prophecies of Chagai and Zecharya [2]. Chagai and Zecharya were the two prominent prophets active during the beginning of the Second Temple period [3]. We shall begin with a selective quote from the Book of Chagai of a prophecy delivered, interestingly enough, on the 24th of Kislev.

"(10) On the 24th day of the ninth [month], in the second year of Daryavesh (Darius), the word of the Lord came to the prophet Chagai... (15) And now, take note from this day forward, as long as no stone has been laid on another in the House of the Lord, if one came... (18) Take note from this day forward, from the 24th day of the ninth month, from the day that the foundation was laid for the Lord's House - take note... for from this day on I will send blessings. (20) And the word of the Lord came to Chagai a second time on the 24th of the month: (21) Speak to Zerubavel, the governor of Judah: I am going to shake the heaven and the earth. (22) And I will overturn the thrones of kingdoms and destroy the might of the kingdoms of the nations. I will overturn chariots and their drivers; horses and their riders shall fall, each by the sword of his fellow."

It is clear from verses 15 and 18 above that the construction of the Temple was to begin on the next day, the 25th of Kislev. Several hundred years later, that very same Temple was rededicated on the 25th of Kislev, and the rabbinically ordained holiday of Chanuka was instituted to commemorate that event. As the date of Chagai's prophecy seems to be more than coincidental, we should expect a connection between this prophecy in Sefer Chagai and the celebration of Chanuka [4]. In order to locate this connection, Sefer Chagai must be understood in light of its historical setting. We shall begin with a brief overview of the major events leading to this time period. The destruction of the first Temple and the exile to Bavel left Am Yisrael in an unprecedented condition. Ever since the Exodus from Egypt, the mishkan (Tabernacle), and later the Bet Ha-mikdash (Temple), had served as Israel's spiritual and national center. In addition, Israel had always enjoyed sovereignty in its own land; although there were times of relative weakness, Israel was never under the official sovereignty of a foreign empire [5]. Suddenly, Israel was left without its land, its mikdash, and its sovereignty. Near the close of the First Temple period, Yirmiyahu had already foreseen the exile and destruction [6], proclaiming the sovereignty of Bavel over Israel for the next 70 years. As Israel had abused its sovereignty, its divine punishment was its subjection to the "yoke of the king of Bavel" (Yirmiyahu 27:12). At the conclusion of these seventy years Israel was to return to its land and sovereignty, ideally, in a fashion even grander than the original redemption from Egypt. "Assuredly, a time is coming, declares the Lord, when it shall no more be said, 'As the Lord lives, who brought the Israelites out of the land of Egypt', but rather, 'As the Lord lives, who brought out and led the offspring of the House of Israel from the northland and from all the lands to which I have banished them...' (23:7-8)."

This redemption, however, was not unconditional. It was to be preceded by Israel's seeking of God. "When seventy years of Bavel are over, I will take note of you, I will fulfill to you My promise to bring you back to this place... When you call Me, and come and pray to Me, I will give heed to you. You will search for Me and you will find Me... (29:10-14)."

It was the hope of the prophets that upon the return from exile, a new and better society would be established, correcting the ills of the First Temple period. At the end of these seventy years, Bavel's empire fell to the Persians and Koresh (Cyrus the Great) became king. In his famous edict,

issued during the first year of his reign, Koresh allowed the Jews to return to Jerusalem to rebuild their Temple (Ezra 1:1-6). They were even granted autonomy - but not sovereignty. Zerubavel, for example, the political leader of the returning Jews, is consistently referred to as "pechat Yehuda" - "the governor of Judah" (Chagai 1:1, 2:2). Only a small portion of the exiles returned and this small population succeeded only in building the mizbeyach [altar] (Ezra 3:2-6). Attempts to begin construction of the actual mikdash were thwarted by the local non-Jewish population (Ezra 4:4-5). It was only some 18 years later that the opportunity to begin construction of the Temple emerged. Clearly, Yirmiyahu's prophecies of redemption were only partially fulfilled. It was the challenge of the prophets of shivat Tzion (the Return to Zion), Chagai and Zecharya, to revive this redemption process.

It is in this setting, in the autumn of the second year of Darius, that Sefer Chagai opens:

"(1) In the second year of King Darius... the word of the Lord came through the prophet Chagai to Zerubavel ben She'altiel, the governor of Judah, and to Yehoshua ben Yehozadak, the high priest. (2) Thus said the Lord of Hosts: These people say, The time has not yet come for the rebuilding the House of the Lord. (3) And the word of the Lord continued: (4) Is it the time for you to dwell in your paneled houses, while this House is lying in ruins?"

Chagai's challenge is formidable, given the lack of enthusiasm surrounding the building of the mikdash. As the redemption process had not yet materialized, the people saw no point in building the mikdash. The first Bet Ha-mikdash had been built after a monarchy had been firmly established and Israel had reached economic prosperity (see Shmuel II 7:12-13, Melakhim I 5:5, 5:16-19). Due to the lack of sovereignty and prosperity during shivat Tzion, a general feeling of apathy prevailed (see Chagai 1:2, 2:3, and Zecharya 4:10). It is exactly this attitude which Chagai counters. In the following prophecies, Chagai calls for a national soul searching and a united effort to rebuild the mikdash. He foresees the return of economic prosperity and political sovereignty to Israel only after the mikdash is rebuilt (1:8-9, 2:7, 2:15-19). Building the mikdash, an act directing the nation's devotion to God, was a prerequisite to being worthy of attaining sovereignty and economic prosperity. The people accept Chagai's challenge, and prepare the materials for rebuilding the Temple. On the 24th of Kislev, the day before construction is to begin, Chagai delivers his concluding message. In the two prophecies given on this momentous day, Chagai emphasizes the same central points he had made earlier: as the mikdash is being rebuilt, economic prosperity and political sovereignty shall ensue (2:21-23).

"And the word came to Chagai a second time on the 24th day of the month. Speak to Zerubavel the governor of Judah: I am going to shake heaven and earth. And I will overturn the thrones of kingdoms and destroy the might of the kingdoms of the nations. I will overturn chariots and their drivers, horses and their riders shall fall..."

Although this vision was never fulfilled during that time period, there is no doubt that these closing words of Chagai were echoing in the ears of the Hasmoneans as they triumphed over the great Greek armies. We shall return to this point after completing the picture, by studying the prophecy of Chagai's sole prophetic contemporary, Zecharya. Sefer Zecharya also commences in the second year of Darius. Yet, while Chagai had emphasized primarily the nationalistic aspects of the redemption process, Zecharya delivers a more spiritual message. His opening prophecy implores the people to perform proper repentance; only then will God return to his people:

"Turn back to me, says the Lord... and I will turn back to you. (1:3)"

The next six chapters continue with the visions that Zecharya saw of the Divine Presence returning to Jerusalem [7]. Chagai and Zecharya strike a critical balance between conflicting ideals in the redemption process. Economic and political growth, although essential to national revival, are only vehicles to attain the higher goal of creating a nation devoted to God. Zecharya must balance the nationalistic aspirations of Chagai by emphasizing the need for repentance, necessary to be worthy of the Shekhina (Divine Presence). This balance is underscored in Zecharya's main

prophecy, 'coincidentally' the haftara of Shabbat Chanuka (2:14-4:7). "Shout for joy, fair Zion! For lo, I come; and I will dwell in your midst - declares the Lord... The Lord will take Judah to Himself as his portion...and he will choose Jerusalem once more. (2:14-16)"

Zecharya begins by telling the people to rejoice, as the Shekhina is returning. This is followed by a charge to Yehoshua, the High Priest, to be sure to follow the way of God and his commandments, and to work in harmony with Zerubavel. The prophecy climaxes with the vision of the menorah surrounded by two olives trees. The meaning of this image is explained as a charge to Zerubavel:

"This is the word of the Lord to Zerubavel: Not by might (chayil), nor by power (koach), but by my spirit (ruchi)... (4:6)"

This emphasis of ruach over chayil [8] and koach is the primary message to Zerubavel, the political leader to whom the sovereignty is destined to return. It is he who needs to be reminded of the importance of this balance. Despite the optimism of Zecharya's prophecies, their fulfillment was conditional. In his concluding prophecy [9] of the second year of Daryavesh, Zecharya states this condition clearly:

"Men from far away shall come and take part in the building of the Temple of the Lord, and you shall know that I have been sent to you by the Lord, if only you will obey the Lord your God! (6:15)"

Unfortunately, the prophecies of Chagai and Zecharya - of prosperity, sovereignty and the shekhina returning - were not fulfilled during that generation, nor in the following generations [10]. Israel remained under Persian rule, and later under Greek rule, for several hundred years. The condition set by Zecharya and earlier by Yirmiyahu, that Israel must repent to be worthy of a full redemption, seems not to have been met [11]. Although left unrealized, these vital prophecies most likely were remembered, as they reflected the most optimistic goals of the Second Temple period. One might conjecture that the anniversary of the original construction date, the 25th of Kislev, was also remembered. This may have also been viewed as an appropriate date to recall the optimistic prophecies of Chagai, pronounced on the preceding day, the 24th of Kislev. Later during the Second Temple period, when the Jews were subject to Greek rule, Hellenistic culture slowly became dominant. The rise of Hellenism climaxed with the famous decrees of Antiochus IV in 167 BCE, the details of which are recorded in Sefer Ha-makkabim I [12]. We are informed that after the decrees were enacted, the Hellenists erected an idol on the mizbeyach on the 15th of Kislev of that year. They waited, however, until the 25th of Kislev before sacrificing upon it. On that same day they began killing women who circumcised their children. Apparently, the Hellenists selected the 25th of Kislev intentionally. The choice of this day again may be just coincidental, or it might be that the Hellenists chose this date specifically le-hakh'is (to spite), being aware of its religious significance. The Hasmonean revolt began that same year, and three years later Judah was able to secure control of Jerusalem and purify and re-dedicate the mikdash [13]. It is commonly assumed that the battle to liberate the Temple Mount from the Greeks ended on the 25th of Kislev and on that same day they began the daily sacrifices (including the lighting of the menorah). According to this account there was no intentional selection of this historic date. However, according to other traditional Jewish sources a slightly different picture emerges. Megillat Ta'anit [14] records the 23rd of Cheshvan [15] of that year as well as the 3rd of Kislev as days of rejoicing, marking dates in which various idols erected by the Greeks on the Temple mount were dismantled. It appears from the account in Sefer Ha-makkabim that the dedication ceremony was set for the 25th of Kislev, in order to coincide with the very same day on which it was defiled, three years prior [16]. It also seems from Sefer Ha-makkabim that construction of the new vessels and mizbeyach took several weeks. Considering the fact that the Temple Mount was already under the control of the Hasmoneans in Cheshvan, and from the account in Sefer Ha-makkabim, it appears that the dedication of the mikdash on the 25th of Kislev was intentional. This day not only marked the date of its original construction, but also reflected the prophetic ideals and aspirations of Bayit Sheni. The reason they selected this date, as well as the

reason that the Hellenists had picked this date three years earlier, was due to its prophetic and historic significance since the time of Chagai. As mentioned earlier, the Hasmoneans most probably saw themselves as fulfilling the prophecies of Chagai. Evidently Rashi also accepted this view. Rashi explains in his commentary to Chagai 2:6, "I will shake the heavens and earth: in the miracles that occurred to the Hasmoneans". Choosing specifically the 25th of Kislev to dedicate the restored mizbeyach and vessels, demonstrated their belief that the military victory that they had achieved was a fulfillment of the prophecy of Chagai. Had the Shekhina also returned as foreseen by Zecharya? The miracle that took place with the cruse of oil and the menorah could have been perceived as a divine indication that the shekhina was also returning. Recall that the central vision of Zecharya is that of the menorah. In that prophecy, not only does he envision the return of the Shekhina, but also the return of sovereignty. The discovery of the cruse of oil with the seal of the kohen gadol, and the ensuing miracle which took place when lighting the menorah, although not the reason for establishing Chanuka, most likely was a strong enough sign to the Sages that the military victories of the Hasmoneans were divine, and worthy of commemoration. Our explanation so far has shown that the primary reasons for Chanuka were the military victories and the dedication of the Bet Ha-mikdash. Yet, why is it that we find that Chazal in later generations emphasize primarily the miracle of the oil? [17] As mentioned earlier, the central vision of Zecharya is that of the menorah surrounded by two olive branches. The main message of this prophecy was that Bayit Sheni should be characterized by the predominance of spirituality (ruach), over physical strength (chayil and koach). It is through this predominance of spirit that the pitfalls of the monarchy of the First Temple could be avoided. The miracle of the oil was reflective of this prophecy. It is understandable therefore, that the Sages placed such a heavy emphasis on the miracle of the oil. In the eyes of the Hasmoneans, and the people living at the time of the revolt, the primary reason for celebration was due to the military victories, the return of Jewish sovereignty, and the re-dedication of the mikdash - the fulfillment of the prophecies of Chagai. The Sages were aware of the dangers of the political power now achieved by the Hasmoneans. As time passed and there was a decline in the religiosity of the Hasmonean Dynasty, the Sages needed to emphasize specifically this message of Zecharya - "lo be-chayil ve-lo be-koach ki im be-ruchi." Even after the destruction of the Temple, we continue to celebrate Chanuka, since we are assured that another opportunity for the realization of these prophecies will arise. The message of Chanuka for our own generation, just as it was two thousand years ago, should be more than just 'coincidental'. To a certain extent, the prophecies of Chagai have been fulfilled. Sovereignty and economic prosperity have returned to Israel in its own land. Will the prophecies of Zecharya also be fulfilled? Just as before, it will depend on our ability to find the proper balance between ruach, chayil and koach.

Footnotes: ***** [1] The commemoration of Purim as a chag de-rabanan differs in many ways; this will be dealt with in a future article. [2] For the reader unfamiliar with sifrei Chagai and Zecharya, it is recommended to read Sefer Chagai, and the first six chapters of Sefer Zecharya. It is also recommended to read the first four chapters of Sefer Ezra, as well as chapters 25 and 29 of Sefer Yirmiyahu. [3] This time period is commonly known as shivat Tzion. It was during this time that Jews of the Persian empire returned to Jerusalem with the aspiration of rebuilding the mikdash and establishing a community. See Ezra 1:1-8 [4] In his article "Yom Yisud Heikhal Hashem", Megadim Vol. 12, Rav Yoel Bin-Nun addresses this question at length. His approach emphasizes the agricultural importance of this date, marking the end of the olive harvest, and the finale of the agricultural season of the previous year. He also deals with the historical importance of this date and its relationship to Chagai and Zecharya, as will be presented in this article in a more simplified manner. [5] This freedom from foreign dominion, celebrated yearly on Chag Ha-Pesach, is also of religious significance. Only a nation free from foreign dominion can become a nation totally dedicated to God. [6] Yirmiyahu

perek 25, in the fourth year of Yehoyakim (18 years prior to the destruction of the First Temple). These seventy years of Bavel's dominion are repeated again in perek 29. These 70 years should not be confused with the 70 years that transpired from churban ha-bayit until binyan bayit sheni mentioned by Zecharya (1:12 & 7:5). [7] The shekhina actually left Yerushalayim prior to the Temple's destruction - see Yechezkel 10. [8] Chayil can also imply economic prosperity; see Devarim 8:17 in its context. This understanding would relate nicely to the prophecy of Chagai. [9] Chapters 1-6 form a unit as they are all prophecies of the second year of Darius. [10] Although there is no account in Sefer Ezra as to what happened after the construction, their situation was close to pathetic. There is mass inter-marriage, chillul shabbat etc.; Nechemya several years later finds the city in ruins. They are obviously under Persian sovereignty as Ezra and Nechemya receive their authority from the Persian king. [11] Rav Yehuda Ha-Levi in Sefer Ha-Kuzari II.24 explains the unfulfillment of these prophecies in a similar fashion. He mentions inadequate teshuva as well as lack of enthusiasm of the exiled to return to Israel. See also Yoma 9b, where Reish Lakish and Rav Yochanan explain why the shekhina never returned during Bayit Sheni. [12] See chap 1:54-61, Sefer Ha-makkabim I, part of the Apocrypha. Although this book is not prophecy, from its style it is clear that the author was a god-fearing Jew. See introduction by Avraham Kahane "Ha-Sefarim Ha-Chitzonim" (Hebrew). [13] Macabees I chapter 4:36-60. From this account, it appears that more than one day was necessary to prepare the mikdash for the dedication ceremony on the 25th of Kislev. It was necessary to build a new mizbeyach, shulchan, menorah etc., and prepare the courtyards, as well as remove all the pagan idols. [14] A tannaitic source, listing various days of the year in which it is forbidden to fast or deliver a eulogy, due to a festive event which occurred on that day. [15] On 23 Cheshvan - the "soreeyga" (a cultic building of the Hellenists) was dismantled and removed from the azara. On 3 Kislev - the "simaot" (pagan idols) were removed from the Azara. [16] Maccabim I chapter 4:52-56. The reason for celebrating the dedication of the mizbeyach for eight days is not clear from this account. The miracle of the pach shemen is not mentioned. Most likely the original celebration of eight days was based on the original dedication of the mishkan. [17] See Shabbat 21b.

HALACHA FOR 5757 COPYRIGHT 1996-7
 SELECTED HALACHOS RELATING TO PARSHAS VAYESHEV

By Rabbi Doniel Neustadt

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

Baby-sitting: How to Avoid Yichud
 Yichud, the prohibition against a man being alone in a secluded place with a woman, is an Issur Min Hatorah(1). It is for this reason that Yosef Hatzadik,, who as a son of Yaakov Avinu kept the Mitzvos of the Torah, refused to be alone with his master's wife in their home(2). Indeed, on that fateful day when he unexpectedly found himself alone with her in the house, he was almost tempted to sin. What follows are some guidelines concerning Yichud in everyday situations.

QUESTION: Are relatives included in the prohibition of Yichud?
 DISCUSSION: Yichud is permitted with linear descendants, such as parents with their children(3) or grandchildren(4). Yichud is also permitted between a brother and a sister, but only on a temporary basis(5). They may not live together in the same house for a period of time which exceeds the normal stay of a house guest(6). Yichud with all other relatives, such as uncles, cousins, brothers-in-law, parents-in law, etc., is prohibited(7). At what age does the prohibition of Yichud begin? A boy over the the age of nine(8) may not be alone with a girl over the age of 12. A girl over three cannot be alone with a boy over 13(9). In other words, for the prohibition of Yichud to apply, one of the participants must be over the age of Bar/Bas Mitzvah. When both of them are minors(10), there is no prohibition of

Yichud(11).

QUESTION: Are there any permissible ways in which a girl over 12 may baby-sit for a boy over nine?

DISCUSSION: There are several permissible ways. The Halachic definition of Yichud is: Seclusion with little or no chance of intrusion from the outside. The Halacha states, therefore, that if there is a "Pesach Posuach" (open door) to a "Reshus Harabim" (public domain) then Yichud does not apply, since there is a constant possibility of public access. Thus, for Yichud to be permitted, both of the above factors - Pesach Posuach and Reshus Harabim - must be present.

What constitutes "Pesach Posuach" is a subject of debate among the Poskim. Nor is there an exact, undisputed definition of "Reshus Harabim". In the following situations, however, there is general agreement among the Poskim that Yichud is permitted: If the front door is left completely or partially open(12). After 10 p.m., the house must also be well lit(13); If the front door is closed, but unlocked, and people regularly walk into the house without knocking(14). After 10 p.m., one should not rely on this solution(15); If the door is locked, but the parents are in possession of a key and could come into the house at any time(16); If the door is locked, but

there is an unimpeded view from the street or from a facing window directly into the room where the Yichud is taking place(17). The home must be well lit. After 10 p.m. it is better not to rely on this solution(18); If another child, male(19) or female(20), is in the house. There are various opinions concerning the required age of the other child - ranging from a minimum of 5 to a maximum of 13 for a male and 12 for a female(21). This leniency is only applicable during normal waking hours(22). To extend the leniency to the nighttime sleeping hours, there have to be two children present plus the one who is being baby-sat(23).

Often, none of the above solutions are practical. A baby-sitter may not want to leave the door open or unlocked. Sometimes the parents may be out of town or unavailable to check on their children. Thus, the preferred method when hiring a baby-sitter is to give a set of keys to a married couple that lives nearby(24), with instructions that the husband and wife should come into the house several times throughout the day and the night. The baby-sitter must be told of these instructions. The neighbor must actually go into the house several times for this leniency to be valid(25).

FOOTNOTES: 1 View of the vast majority of the Rishonim. There are some instances when Yichud is permitted Min Hatorah but prohibited M'derabanan. 2 See Ibn Ezra, Rashbam and Seforno Bereishis 39:10. 3 EH 22:1. See Igros Moshe EH 2:15 and EH 4:65-8 who rules that it is permitted for a man to be alone with another woman in the presence of his daughter, mother or sister. 4 Pischei Teshuva EH 22:2 quoting the Bach. 5 Beis Shmuel and Chelkas Mechokek EH 22:1. 6 Igros Moshe EH 4:64, who adds that a sister who is visiting from a distant city may stay longer than a sister visiting from a nearby area, just as a guest from afar stays longer than a guest from nearby.

7 EH 22:1. 8 This is the ruling of the Shulchan Aruch EH 22:11 and all the Poskim. See, however Kuntres Toras Hayichud who quotes an oral ruling from Harav S.Y. Elyashiv that nowadays, we can be lenient and allow Yichud with a boy till age eleven. 9 EH 22:11. 10 Or one minor and one non-Jew - oral ruling from Harav S.Y. Elyashiv (Kuntres Toras Hayichud). 11 Bach and Yam Shel Shlomo in the name of the Smag, quoted in Dvar Halacha 2:8. They do not, however, explain why the process of Chinuch does not apply to this prohibition. See Igros Moshe YD 1:137. 12 EH 22:9. 13 Many Poskim hold that during the late night hours, when people are not on the streets, the leniency of an open door does not apply - see Be'er Haitev and Pischei Teshuva EH 22:9, and Igros Moshe EH 4:65-5. When the house is lit, however, there are Poskim who are lenient - see Dvar Halacha 3:15. The 10 p.m. deadline was given by the Chazon Ish (Dvar Halacha 3:14) as the time that is considered as "late night hours" in the city of Bnei Brak during the 1950s. Each location, depending on its population and lifestyle, must determine its own "late" hours. 14 Ruling of Harav S.Y. Elyashiv and Harav C.P. Scheinberg (Kuntres Yichud pg. 25). See Igros Moshe EH 4:65-4 who is lenient even when the door is locked, as long as there is a possibility that someone would come knocking on the door and he

would need to be let in. Most other Poskim do not agree with this leniency.

15 Since even a completely open door should not be relied upon late at night. Even lighting the house would possibly not be sufficient in this case - see Dvar Halacha 3:15 16 Dvar Halacha 3:3 quoting the Chazon Ish and Dovev Meishorim. 17 Noda B'yehuda EH 1:77; Igros Moshe EH 4:65-2; Dvar Halach 3:10. 18 See footnote 299. 19 Beis Shmuel EH 22:9; Chochmas Adam 126:5-9. 20 EH 22:10. 21 See Dvar Halacha 4:2-3 for all the various views. A sister of any age over five serves as a Shomeres - see footnote 287. 22 Rama EH 22:5; Shu"t Chasam Sofer EH 2:96. 23 Chazon Ish Kiddushin 45; Dvar Halacha 4:9. 24 A married couple is preferable since they can both come together to check on the house - thus avoiding a possible Yichud problem between the baby-sitter and the neighbor. Even in a situation where a Yichud problem does not exist, two neighbors should be asked to check on the house, since we are fearful that one can forget or fall asleep. 25 Dvar Halacha pg. 188-189. See further clarification in Shu"t Avnei Yashfei pg. 2:185.

HALACHA is published L'zchus Hayaed Doniel Meir ben Hinda.

<http://www.ucalgary.ca/~akiva/HOJMI/droshe.html>

Congregation House of Jacob-Mikveh Israel Calgary, AB

Dvar Torah: Vayeshev/Chanuka, 5757, Rabbi Moshe Shulman

UNITY & UNIFORMITY

The most hideous of crimes, monstrous of offences - when family fights with family, when brother lifts sword against brother, when the solution to internal strife is to sell one's own kin as a slave, as the brothers did to Joseph. We read the story so often that I'm afraid we often desensitize ourselves to what we are reading. They say about the great Chafetz Chaim that every time he came to Parshat Vayeshev he cried!

The Midrash draws a parallel between Moses, Isaiah, and Jeremiah - 3 who prophesied with the phrase "eichah" - "How!" Jeremiah - "eicha yashva badad" - "How could this city Jerusalem, once bursting with inhabitants, today lay widowed and alone." (Eichah 1) Isaiah: "Eichah haita lezonah..." - "How could this faithful city have turned astray, gone from a city full of justice to a city of murderers?" (Is. 2) Moses: "Eicha esa levadi..." - "How can I carry alone your troubles, your burdens, your strife?" (Num. 1)

The commentaries question this Midrash however, for the picture is not balanced. Isaiah and Jeremiah saw Israel in its downfall and destruction, Jerusalem in ruins, the Temple either closed or destroyed, while Moses saw Israel in its birth, at peace, and strong. Where's the parallel?

The answer is that from Moses we have a direct line to Isaiah and Jeremiah. For wherein lies the flaw in Israel, that ultimately caused the destruction? Is it not that first moment of strife, that first expression of "your troubles, your burdens, your strife" - your internal bickering and conflicts, the never-ending strife. In a foreshadowing moment Moses said that will ultimately tear you apart!

On the other hand, come together in unity, and love, and caring, stand united and you are invincible. That's the other side of the message. That's the other part of the Midrash, which explains Yaakov's blessings to his children, prefaced by the phrase: "he'asfu ve'agida lachem et asher yikreh lachem be'acharit hayamim" - "Gather together and I will tell you what will occur in the future time." Explains the Midrash: "When will you reach the 'future Redemption?' When you are gathered together. This can be compared to a stand of twigs. Each individual twig snaps in an instant. Put together they are unbreakable."

"Shir Hama'alot Ledavid: Behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity. It is like the precious ointment upon the head, that ran down upon the beard, even Aaron's beard: that went down over the hem of his garments. As the dew of Hermon, that descended upon the mountains of Zion, for there the Lord commanded the blessing, even life for evermore." (Psalm 133)

The Midrash relates these verse to a story of when Moses was anointing Aaron, two drops of sacred oil dripped down onto his beard. Each trembled in fear. Aaron trembled lest he had jolted and desecrated the oil. Moses trembled lest he had slipped and desecrated the oil. Came the decree of the Almighty: "al pi midotav"- "It is by my decree." You are not at fault - "ketal Hermon"- "just as the dew on the mountains is caused by G-d not man." Concludes the Midrash: "there G-d commanded the blessing," There G-d decreed that the greatest blessing is the blessing of peace: the peace of Moses and Aaron. For rather than blaming each other, accusing each other, each took responsibility out of care and love for each other. "hine ma tov uma na'im shevet achim gam yachad," "Behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity."

Which, to some extent, explains the surprise at Chanuka's popularity. Chanuka is not the story of peace! It's not the story of unity amongst our people, or love for our fellow man. That is perhaps the story of Purim, and hence Purim includes the the Mitzvah of sending gifts to each other. But it is not Chanuka!

Chanuka is the story of a war waged in the name of "religious freedom". It was a war fought against the Syrian Greeks against their religious persecution. But that's only half the story. It was also a war fought against our own brothers and sisters, the Jewish Hellenists, who had invited Syria into Jerusalem, and encouraged their Hellenization of the Temple service, and the community of Judea, who embraced the Hellenist culture and all it stood for. It was not a time of peace!

It was a time of struggle for the soul of our people, a struggle for the integrity of the Sanctity of Israel, the traditions of the Sanctuary, and the "Westernisation" and "Hellenization" of Judaism and the Jewish people. It was a war fought in defence of the ritual of Circumcision, in defence of the observance of Shabbat, the study of Torah, and the purity of Temple Service. It was a war which would determine whether, 200 years later, when Rome would arrive, they would find a Jewish state or a Greek state. It was a war fought over the authority of Torah in Jewish life!

It is true that we don't celebrate the military victory of Jew against our enemies and certainly not of Jew against Jew. We never have. But we must not distort the message of Chanuka - or of Jewish history.

We are a peace loving people - but we are not a people who will capitulate to the values of Western culture when they are antithetical to Jewish tradition, simply because it is vogue and more popular! In the story of Chanuka the Jewish "traditionalists" were the "few", the "weak", in contrast to the "strong and many" - and yet we prevailed!

Yes, we believe in unity, but unity does not mean uniformity. Unity does not mean we have to sacrifice our beliefs and ideals, and accept the lowest common denominator amongst our people, simply because those defending the lowest common denominator are doing so in the name of what they call unity!

No one yearned for peace and unity more than Moses himself. Yet when Korach rebelled against the authority of Torah, Moses called upon G-d Himself to defend the Torah. There is a time for peace and a time for struggle - "et milchama ve'et shalom" wrote King Solomon.

Yes, King David wrote: "How beautiful it is when brothers can sit together" - But remember it was King David who sang this prayer, David who united the people under one kingdom and one banner by declaring Jerusalem the capital of Israel and G-d the central focus of Jerusalem. David was willing and prepared to defend that unity based on the centrality of the Temple of G-d with his life and the life of his people!

There is an apocryphal story about Alexander the Great that probably never happened, but sums up the essence of what the Greeks wanted, and why this battle needed to be waged. It tells how Alexander the Great took 10,000 Macedonian soldiers and 10,000 Persian women, married them to each other. He himself marries the daughter of the Persian king. The message of this story was his dream: the SYNTHESIS of East and West. All of civilisation under one banner, all equal, all marrying each other, the symbol of unity! What a "wonderful" vision! "Simply accept our speech, our clothing, our culture, simply become one of us, and the whole world is unified." Bit how

antithetical it was to the very core of Judaism! Judaism believes in unity, but not uniformity! We are different from the nations of the world, and if asked in the name of peace and unity to give up the very essence of what defines who and what we are: that's where we draw the line. "Be one of us" to the Greeks means "marry amongst us". It means relinquish our religious beliefs to their in the name of unity!

No, said Matityahu: Torah is our life! It is our heart and our soul, our lifeblood! The Greeks were so open, so accepting, that they were smothering the Jewishness out of the Jewish people! That's where we had to draw the line.

How easy it is to come to us and say: "In the name of unity follow the majority." Matityahu could have also said: "The Hellenists and the Greeks are the majority - follow them!" Instead he chose to stand up in defence of Torah. That too is our challenge. We must be open, and accepting, and caring, and loving, and tolerant - for these are qualities so desperately needed today. But at the same time, we must defend Torah, and stand up for the truth of what Torah is and what it stands for. We must be open and caring, and loving, and accepting, and tolerant - but at the same time we dare not capitulate to the whims of the masses, and let Judaism be defined by all those who wish to redefine her in more convenient terms. To confuse unity with uniformity and to expect capitulation in the name of community is to be guilty of the religious intolerance that the Greeks perpetrated in the name of equality. Shabbat Shalom.

<http://yu1.yu.edu/riets/torah/halacha/chanuka1.html>

Mehadrin

by Rabbi Eliyahu Baruch Shulman

i. The Gemara in Shabbos, 21b, contains the following passage: "Our Rabbis taught [in a Baraisa]: The [basic] mitzvah of Chanuka is [that one should light] one candle for each household; those who [wish to] embellish (mehadrin) [the mitzvah light] one candle for each person; and those who [wish to] especially embellish (mehadrin min hamehadrin) [the mitzvah do as follows:] Beis Shammai say that the first day [i.e. night] he lights eight [candles], and from there on he decreases [the number of candles by one each night], but Beis Hillel say that the first day (i.e. night) he lights one [candle], and from there on he increases [the number of candles by one each night]."

ii. A homeless person is not obligated to light Chanuka candles. Someone who does not own his own home, but lodges at the home of another person, is obligated; he can, however, discharge his obligation by becoming a partner in his landlord's candles by paying him some token amount for a share in them. The same applies to a traveller who is away from his own home. The Gemara (ibid, 23a) records the following teaching: "Rav Zeira said: Originally, [before I was married], when I was a lodger [during the time that I studied] at the Academy I would participate with a perutah [a small coin] with my landlord. After I married I said: Now I am certainly not required to do so, since [my wife] lights for me at home.

iii. From Rav Zeira's teaching it emerges that someone who is away from home and whose wife lights on his behalf at home has fulfilled his obligation. Now, as we have already seen, those who wish to embellish the mitzvah (mehadrin) are enjoined to have a separate candle for each and every member of the household. The question arises: If someone is away from home and his wife lights for him at home, but he wishes to fulfil the embellishment of the mitzvah of mehadrin, should he light a candle for himself at his place of lodging?

[We assume, for simplicity's sake, that the traveller is only interested in fulfilling mehadrin, but not mehadrin min hamehadrin; thus, at most, he would light a single candle for himself. Obviously, if he wished to fulfil mehadrin min hamehadrin too he would also have to light additional candles for each of the nights of Chanuka that have gone by.]

This question is raised by Resp. Terumas HaDeshen (101, cited by Beis Yosef, Orach Chaim 677), who quotes an anonymous "great man" to the effect that the traveller need not light a candle for himself; indeed, if he does so the candle that he lights does not have the status of a Chanuka candle at all

(and he would not be allowed to recite the blessing on it). This authority, writes Terumas HaDeshen, reasoned that mehadrin must be governed by the guidelines set forth in the Gemara; since this form of mehadrin finds no precedent in the Gemara it is not considered a valid expression of mehadrin. Terumas HaDeshen himself disagrees with this ruling and holds that the husband ought to light his own candle in order to fulfil mehadrin. Beis Yosef sides with the anonymous "great man"; Rema (ibid:3) holds with Terumas HaDesehn.

iv. The view of this anonymous authority and of Beis Yosef seems difficult. Were the husband at home presumably he and his wife, if they wish to fulfil mehadrin, would each light their own candle. Why shouldn't they do the same when the husband is away from home? On the contrary, the fact that the husband is away should all the more mandate that he light for himself; in any event, there certainly doesn't seem to be any less reason for him to light.

Furthermore, the rationale offered by this authority, that this type of mehadrin finds no precedent in the Gemara, is difficult as well. Surely the Gemara need not enumerate every possible situation in which the members of the household may find themselves; it should suffice that the Gemara says that every member of the household lights.

v. Pri Megadim (Mishbetzos Zahav, ibid, 1) suggests that this authority exempted the husband from mehadrin not because he is away from home but because a husband and a wife are deemed a single entity (ishto ke'gufo) and are not reckoned as separate members of the household. According to this interpretation, the husband and wife would share a single candle even when they are both at home.

Although this is, indeed, the view of Mahrshal (Resp. 85), it does not seem to be a satisfactory explanation of the view of Terumas HaDeshen's "great man". This authority argued from the fact that this form of mehadrin is not mentioned in the Gemara; but a husband and wife are simply an instance of two members of the household and should not need a special mention in the Gemara.

vi. From the language of the Gemara ("one candle for each person") it is not clear whether mehadrin means that each member of the household should light a candle himself or, rather, that whoever is lighting (usually the head of the household) light as many candles as there are people in the house. For example: If there are five people in the household, does mehadrin require that each person light one candle or that the head of the household light five candles?

Rambam's position on this question is quite clear: "One who seeks to embellish the mitzvah lights as many candles as there people in the house" (Hil. Chanuka 4:1). This could not be more explicit; according to Rambam, one person lights all the candles of mehadrin.

However, Rema (Orach Chaim 671:2) writes that every member of the household should light on his/her own. The commentators discuss why Rema differs with Rambam on this point. (See Beis HaLevi, Kuntres Chanuka, 23a; Chidushei HaGriz, Hil. Chanuka; Aruch HaShulchan, ad loc.)

vii. Rambam's view seems somewhat difficult. If mehadrin means that every person lights his own candle, then one can easily understand why this is deemed an embellishment of the mitzvah; the very fact that the mitzvah is not delegated to one person but is performed by each and every person on his/her own is an embellishment of the fulfilment of the mitzvah. But if the head of the household lights all the candles anyway, as Rambam holds, then what embellishment is there in having the same number of candles as there are people in the house; why is this something desirable?

The obvious answer would seem to be that the element of embellishment here lies in the multitude of candles; there is a greater "pirumei nisa" (publication of the miracle) in having many candles than in having only one. But then why stop at the number of people in the house? Why not simply light as many candles as one can afford? What reason is there to peg the number of candles at the number of people in the house?

viii. Apparently Rambam holds that while it is desirable to have many candles, it is necessary that all the candles have standing as Chanuka candles; otherwise the additional candles are mere decoration and have no halachic significance. In order to have standing as a Chanuka candle, a candle must

serve to discharge a halachic obligation. The maximum number of candles that can be said to do this is the number of people in the household.

The logic of this limit is as follows: Each member of the household is by himself sufficient to obligate the house in one chanuka candle. Thus, if there are five persons living in the house, there are five obligations, each one for one chanuka candle. Of course, all these five obligations can be discharged with a single candle; indeed, that is the basic mitzvah: "One candle for each household". Still, the fact remains that the house carries five obligations. Therefore, up to five candles can have standing as chanuka candles; each candle then discharges one obligation. Any candles beyond that number are halachically meaningless.

The logic of Rambam's position is thus apparent. Mehadrin consists of having as many candles as possible. But the maximum possible number of candles is the number of people in the household, since that is the maximum number of candles that have can have standing as chanuka candles.

(The careful reader may object that the Gemara allows for more candles than there are people in the house, in the fulfilment of mehadrin min hamehadrin, in which one adds a candle for each night that has gone by. How do these additional candles have standing as Chanuka candles? The answer is that these candles publicize the fact that the miracle grew greater each night; thus, each additional candle serves as a "pirumei nisa" (a publication of the miracle) in its own right. Since "pirumei nisa" is the very essence of the obligation to light Chanuka candles these additional candles automatically have the status of Chanuka candles.)

ix. We are now in a position to understand the view of the "great man" of the Terumas HaDeshen. From our analysis of Rambam's view it emerges that the idea of mehadrin is not that each person should light on his own but, rather, that there should be as many candles as possible; a blaze of light, rather than a single gleam. Therefore, reasons this authority, mehadrin is only fulfilled when all of the candles are lit in a single home, forming one pageant. But if a traveller's wife lights for him at home and he lights again for himself at his place of lodging, each candle stands alone; this, in his view, is not mehadrin at all.

x. There remains one problem to be addressed. Granted that, according to the this view, the traveller cannot fulfil mehadrin by lighting a candle in his place of lodging; as we explained, since his candle and his wife's candle are in different houses they cannot form the single pageant that is mehadrin. But let the traveller fulfil mehadrin by having his wife light two candles: one for herself and one for him? After all, Rambam states clearly that all the candles of mehadrin are lit by one person; although this is usually the master of the house, there is no reason that it could not just as well be the mistress of the house or, for that matter, any member of the household.

Furthermore, from the fact that Terumas HaDeshen takes issue with this anonymous authority and rules that the traveller is obligated to light a candle of his own in order to fulfil mehadrin, it seems that he too accepts the premise that it is the traveller who must light the candle of mehadrin for himself; his wife cannot light an extra candle for him.

We must conclude that, in fact, both the Terumas HaDeshen and his "great man" do not follow Rambam; in their view, each of the candles of mehadrin should be lit by the member of the household whom it represents, not by the head of the household. Thus, this responsa of the Terumas HaDeshen is a source for Rema who, as we have seen, also differs with Rambam on this point and rules that, in order to fulfil mehadrin, each member of the household should light his own candle.

This does not contradict our premise that the Terumas HaDeshen's "great man" agrees with Rambam that the idea of mehadrin is to have as many candles as possible. This authority, however, holds that since, in the final analysis, each candle represents the obligation of a different member of the household, as we explained earlier, it is that person's obligation that is being discharged with that candle and he should light it himself, rather than delegate the lighting to the head of the household, under the general principle that a mitzvah should not be delegated, where possible (see Kidushin, 41a). Rambam apparently holds that the entire household's obligation is discharged collectively with all of the candles.

xi. Rema (671:7) rules that, for reasons unrelated to our discussion, it is preferable that each member of the household light in a different place in the house. In the light of the above, this ruling is consistent with the fact that Rema himself (677:3) holds with Terumas HaDeshen that a lodger should light a candle on his own in order to fulfil mehadrin; in this view, mehadrin can be fulfilled with candles that are distant from each other, or even in different houses. But, as we have seen, in the view of Beis Yosef and of Terumas HaDeshen's anonymous great man, all of the candles of mehadrin need to form a single spectacle and cannot be lit in separate houses; it seems logical that, in this view, the candles of mehadrin should lit together.

Subj: Shiur HaRav Soloveichik ZT"L on Inyani Chanukah
Date: 96-12-06 02:29:29 EST
From: jr@sco.COM (Josh Rapps)
Sender: owner-mj-ravtorah@shamash.org
To: mj-ravtorah@shamash.org

chanukah1.96

Shiur HaRav Soloveichik ZT"L on Inyanei Chanukah

The Rav noted that the Gemara (Shabbos 21b) asks "Mei Chanukah?". Rashi interprets the question as "for which miracle was it established". The Gemara continues to discuss the prohibition of fasts or eulogies during the 8 day period because after the Macabbees defeated the Greeks they found that they had defiled all the oil in the Mikdash except for one flask that was hidden and with the seal of the Kohen Gadol and that oil burned for 8 days till they were able to press new pure olive oil for the Menorah. The following year they established this 8 day period as one of Hallel Vhodaah. The Gemara in Shabbos mentions only the miracle of the Menorah as the basis for Chanukah.

The Rambam (Hilchos Chanukah 3:1-3) mentions that the Jews were successful in ousting the Greeks from the temple and restored the Jewish monarchy for an additional 200+ years. This victory took place on the 25th of Kislev. He then mentions the miracle of the oil, as mentioned in the Gemara. The Rambam then says that there are 2 manifestations to Chanukah:

1) Yemay Hallel Vsimcha - days of praise to Hashem and happiness. This is the reason that fasts and eulogies are not permitted on Chanukah, similar to Purim;

2) 8 days that we light candles to reveal and to demonstrate the miracle that Hashem did for us.

It is interesting to note that the Rambam mentions that these days are called Chanukah when he mentions that these are days of Simcha Vhallel in that they are forbidden to fasts and eulogies. For some reason he did not mention it in reference to the lighting of candles.

The Rama (Hilchos Chanukah 2) quotes Reb Avraham from Prague who held that there is a Ketzas Mitzvah to have a Seudah on Chanukah, however this would only be a Seudas Reshus. The reason for this is that the Chanukas Hamizbeach took place on those days. According to some opinions one would be required to eat Pas on Chanukah to fulfill the obligation of Seudah. (To say that there is a requirement to eat Pas on Chanukah, would be sensational, as it would make Chanukah stricter than Seudah Shlishis on Shabbos.) The Rambam says that these are days of Simcha, not Seudah. There is a negative manifestation (forbidden to fast and eulogize) and a positive side, to be happy.

The Rav explored the reason for requiring a Seudah on Chanukah. In the Midrash on Parshas Bhaaloscha, it says that the original date for the dedication of the Mishkan was supposed to be the 25th day of Kislev. However Hashem changed it to the first of Nissan, preceded by the 7 preparatory days beginning with the 23rd of Adar. Kislev had a complaint as to why it lost out on this great honor. The Midrash says that Hashem, Kivayachol, consoled Kislev saying that in years to come there will be another dedication held in Kislev during the time of the Chashmonaim. Therefore on Chanukah we celebrate both the dedication of the Mizbeach in the time of the Chashmonaim and the original intended day for the dedication

of the Mishkan.

The Gemara in Shabbos mentions only the aspect of Chanukah that relates to the lack of pure oil after the Greeks were ousted. However the Gemara elsewhere (Yoma 16a) talks about the fact that the stones of the Mizbeach were defiled by the Greeks. So there were other problems after the ouster of the Greeks, besides the lack of oil for the Menorah. The Mizbeach itself needed to be rebuilt in order that sacrifices could be brought.

The Rambam is of the opinion that the Halacha of Chanukas Hamizbeach is a Horaas Shaah, and the requirements stated in the Torah for the dedication of the Mishkan do not apply for all subsequent generations. However the Chanukas Hamishkan was a period of Yom Tov. The Rambam says that according to Rabbeinu Yonah there is a Mitzvah Ldoros to dedicate the vessels of the Mikdash through Avodah, There should be Meluim when a Mizbeach is dedicated and there is a Yom Tov associated with that period. This aspect of Yom Tov does not apply to the dedication of all vessels. But it does apply to the Mizbeach. The sacrifices that were brought in the Mishkan during its dedication were a Horaas Shaah. However the obligation to perform the dedication applies for all time. Hashem told Kislev that it will not lose the Yom Tov that was originally scheduled for its 25th day. The Chanukas Hamizbeach that will take place in the times of the Chashmonaim will be a Yom Tov as well, since it will be the day in which the Mizbeach will be dedicated and will make up for the moving of Chanukas Hamishkan from Kislev to Nissan.

On Chanukah, the Krias Hatorah that we read is from the dedication of the Mishkan by the Nessiim. If Chanukah was simply a commemoration of the miracle of the oil and Menorah, then we would be hard pressed to see the connection between the reading from the Torah and Chanukah. We should have read from Parshas Tsav or one of the Parshios that talk about the Menorah.

However if we view Chanukah from the perspective of the day on which the dedication of the Mizbeach took place, the intended day in the time of the Mishkan and the actual day of dedication in the times of the Chashmonaim, then the connection is obvious. Each day of Chanukah was part of the dedication process. Each day is connected to the other days of Chanukah in that it was one of the days that comprised the Chanukas Hamizbeach. The day(s) of Chanukas Hamizbeach (are) is indeed a Yom Tov. The Krias Hatorah is confined to the dedication of the Mizbeach only. However, on Shabbos, both aspects of Chanukah are mentioned: the Krias Hatorah mentions the dedication aspect and the Haftorah mentions the Menorah.

As the Rambam says, the reason these days are called Chanukah is because they were the days of Simcha Vhallel associated with the dedication of the Mizbeach. For this reason, fasting and eulogizing are forbidden. These days also commemorate the miracle of the oil that burned for 8 days. The term Chanukah has nothing to do with the candles. Rather it is associated with the Chanukas Hamizbeach.

This summary is Copyright 1996 by Dr. Israel Rivkin and Josh Rapps, Edison, N.J. Permission to reprint and distribute, with this notice, is hereby granted. This summary is based on the weekly Moriah Shiur given by Moraynu V'Rabbeinu Harav Yosef Dov Halevi Soloveichik ZT'L over many years. To subscribe to receive these summaries via email send mail to listproc@shamash.org with the following message: subscribe mj-ravtorah your_first_name your_last_name