



Divrei Torah

Parshat Vayeishev

23 Kislev 5780 / December 21, 2019

Shabbat Mevorchim Chodesh Tevet

Daf Yomi: Nudah 59; Nach Yomi: 2 Divrei Hayamim 18

Weekly Dvar Torah

A project of the

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF YOUNG ISRAEL

**SPONSORED BY THE HENRY, BERTHA AND EDWARD ROTHMAN FOUNDATION
ROCHESTER, NY, CLEVELAND, OHIO, CIRCLEVILLE, OHIO**

"Mie Chanukah"?

Rabbi Aharon Ziegler

Associate Member, Young Israel Council of Rabbis

This Parasha usually falls on the week of Chanukah, and this year is no exception. I would like show a connection that Rav Yosef Soloveitchik saw between the two.

The story and the laws of Chanukah are discussed in Gemara Shabbat (21b-22a). The Gemara asks "*Mie Chanukah*"? What is origin of Chanukah all about and particularly what prompted the rabbis to establish the Mitzvah of lighting candles? Was it because of the miraculous victory in battle that the Chash'mo'na'im succeeded over their Syrian-Greek oppressors, or because of the miracle that caused the small amount of oil to burn for eight days? The conclusion of the Gemara is that the Mitzvah was established because of the burning oil.

In the midst of this discussion the Gemara cites a pasuk from our parasha. They question, why in describing what the brothers did to Yosef by placing him in a *bor*, a pit, does the Torah state (37:24) *והבור ריק אין בו מים* That "the bor was empty, no water in it". Asks the Gemara, if the pit was empty, isn't it obvious that no water was in it? The redundancy implies that there was no water in it-but there were serpents and scorpions in it. However, the brothers could not have known that the pit contained lethal creatures, for Re'uven, who suggested the plan, intended to save Yosef, not throw him to his death. Furthermore, Yosef's survival in such a pit was an open miracle, and the brothers would not have sold him had they known that.

So far, a beautiful drasha. But Rav Soloveitchik asked, "What does this have to do with Chanukah?" Why is it inserted in the middle of a discussion about Chanukah? He said that the Rabbis of the Talmud often spoke in cryptic terms or in riddles to avoid censorship. What it means is that the Rabbis had a heated dispute concerning two points of view. One opinion was that we

should not rebel and fight the Greek army because even if we are victorious in every battle lives are lost on both sides, and this battle is not worth the loss of Jewish men. If the enemy had wanted to annihilate us, like Haman in days of Purim, then of course we have to fight to defend our lives, but here, they merely wanted to make us forget our Torah and stray from the performance of Mitzvot. That does not warrant losing Jewish lives.

The other Rabbis argued, using the pasuk from our parasha, that being devoid of Torah, or years of being "empty" of Torah, does not mean that our nation will remain status quo from what it was; if there is a void of Torah it will be filled with negative theories and Greek values. There is no vacuum in life, and no neutrality; its either Torah or anti-Torah. So our battle with the Greek culture was indeed a matter life or spiritual death. The latter won the debate, and thus, we have a happy holiday of Chanukah.

The issue is very relevant for us today. Children raised in homes without a Torah education and foundation, invariably will assimilate and eventually intermarry when they are exposed to the "free- society culture" on the college campuses. If their mind and thinking is not filled with Torah when they are young the void in their minds will be filled with negative thinking.

Shabbat Shalom and Chanukah Sa'mei'ach, from ELAZAR, ISRAEL

The Weekly Sidra **"A Missed Opportunity"**

Rabbi Moshe Greebel Z"L

There are times undoubtedly, when we cannot completely realize what major opportunities in our lives we have managed to miss. For, had we been more attentive, those now gone prospects may have yielded great results. Hence, it behooves every man to meticulously consider each and every aspect of his actions and his words throughout this exercise we refer to as life. A very good example of this principle is found in this week's Sidra.

The Torah reveals to us that Yosef was so despised by his brothers, they planned to execute him:

"And when they saw him from far away, even before he came near to them, they conspired against him to slay him." (B'raishis 37:18)

So great was this hatred for Yosef, that the brothers vehemently conspired against him:

"Come now therefore, and let us slay him, and throw him into some pit, and we will say, 'Some evil beast has devoured him,' and now we shall see what will become of his dreams." (ibid. 37:20)

But, through the will of HaKadosh Baruch Hu, Yosef was spared such an evil fate via the eldest of the brothers:

"And R'uvain heard it, and he saved him from their hands; and said, 'Let us not kill him!' And R'uvain said to them, 'Shed no blood, but throw him into this pit that is in the wilderness, and lay no hand upon him;' that he might rid him from their hands, to deliver him to his father again. (ibid. 37:21- 22)

Now, through the principle of 'Ayn HaMikra Yotzai Miday P'shuto,' or, the simple explanation of Mikra (Scripture) cannot be discounted, it would appear that what R'uvain heard were the actual brothers saying, "We shall see what will become of his dreams." That is, in a mocking manner the siblings reasoned that after slaying Yosef, what would indeed, become of his dreams to rule over them?

Now, while this Mikra L'fi P'shuto (simple Scriptural explanation) seems to clarify the above Passuk (verse), an alternate explanation to what R'uvain actually heard is discussed in the Midrash B'raishis 84-29:

"We shall see what will become of his dreams..... (This was) HaKadosh Baruch Hu Who said to them (brothers), 'You say "We shall see," and I say, "We shall see." Let us see whose words are fulfilled!'"

Basically then, as per this Midrash, the words 'We shall see what will become of his dreams' that R'uvain heard were stated by HaKadosh Baruch Hu as well in a sarcastic challenge metaphorically speaking, to the brothers. This explanation is Mikra L'fi Midrasho,' or, Scripture according to the Midrashic explanation.

Developing this theme, the *Likutei Basar Likutei* (B'raishis page #194) brings down the following Midrash from Rus Rabbah 5-6:

"Rabbi Yitzchak Bar Marion said, 'This verse can teach us that if a man is about to perform a good deed, he should do it with all his heart. For, had R'uvain known that Scripture would record of him, "And R'uvain heard it, and he saved him from their hands," he would have borne Yosef on his shoulders straight to his father.....'"

That is, had R'uvain known that the Torah would praise him thus, he would never have suggested that the brothers first 'Throw him into this pit that is in the wilderness,' but would have instead, placed the seventeen year old Yosef on his shoulders, and subsequently carried him directly to his father.

But, this of course, leaves us with the following difficulty. Did R'uvain, a Tzadik (righteous man) in his own right, actually require honor and platitudes to do something to its most correct extent? Being the eldest brother, shouldn't he have taken Yosef directly home to his father, whether the Torah would praise him or not? The above *Likutei Basar Likutei* supplies us with the following answer to this question.

As discussed prior, one version of Midrash has HaKadosh Baruch Hu Himself stating, "We shall see what will become of his dreams." Now then, expounds the *Likutei Basar Likutei*, R'uvain mistakenly was under the impression that all the brothers heard HaKadosh Baruch Hu challenge them by saying, "We shall see what will become of his dreams!" And, considered R'uvain, even though they all heard it, for some reason they are not paying any attention to it. Indeed, they must be very hard pressed to slay Yosef, and will not allow him to take the child home to his father, as he would rather do. Therefore, R'uvain decided to take very slow steps with the brothers, and instead, suggested that for the interim, they cast Yosef into the pit.

But, as per the above Midrash, explains the *Likutei Basar Likutei*, had R'uvain known that the Ruach HaKodesh (holy spirit) addressed only him, and not the other brothers, he would have understood that HaKadosh Baruch Hu meant for him specifically to save Yosef. And, without any further delay, he would have put himself on the line so to speak, and forcefully exercised his

rights as the eldest brother to take Yosef directly home to his father.

Hence, according to the *Likutei Basar Likutei*, had R'uvain realized the Ruach HaKodesh addressed him only as the only legitimate savior of Yosef, he would have acted immediately not for the sake of being honored, but rather, for the sake that HaKadosh Baruch Hu meant specifically for him to rescue Yosef.

And here then, is such a missed opportunity as concerns R'uvain. In conclusion, let us all make as certain as possible that each and every opportunity in life is given its due credit, and we carefully consider every aspect of our lives, for, what is missed, generally stays that way.

May we soon see the G'ulah Sh'laimah in its complete resplendence- speedily, and in our times. Good Shabbos.

Got The Message

Rabbi Dovid Sochet

Associate Member, Young Israel Council of Rabbis

When Yosef's brothers conspired to kill Him, the brothers said "ועתה לכו ונהרגהו ונשליכהו באחד" - Let us kill him and throw him into one of the pits and say, 'a wild animal killed him'. Then we shall see what will come of his dreams^[1]. Rashi on the Pasuk explains that the words "Then we will see what will come of his dreams" was not the brothers own words, but rather it was an interjection of a Bas-Kol (heavenly voice) implying, "You [the brothers] will see whose plans come true, yours or those of Hashem". The next pasuk ^[2] reads, "וישמע ראובן ויצלהו מידם" - "And Reuvein heard, and he rescued him [Yosef] from their hand." If both pesukim are read continuously this can be teaching us that what Reuvein heard was the bas-kol, and that only he and not his brothers was privy to it.

This can be better understood with a passage in Talmud ^[3] that recounts a chapter in the life of Ilfa and Reb Yochanan who were both Torah scholars who were extremely poor. Their financial situation became so difficult that they decided to leave the Beis Medrash and go earn a livelihood. On their way to find work Reb Yochanan overheard two heavenly angels conversing with each other. They said, "These two people deserve to be killed for leaving a life of eternal Torah study and pursuing a material livelihood". The angels continued saying that the only reason they did not kill them was because they overheard that the fate of one of them would soon take a favorable turn. Reb Yochanan overheard this discussion and Ilfa did not. Reb Yochanan said to himself, "Since I heard this discussion it is obvious that the angels meant that I would be the fortunate one." He therefore returned to the Beis Medrash and continued studying. Ilfa who did not hear the words of the angels continued on his way and went to work.

The Gemarah continues that by the time Ilfa returned from conducting his business Reb Yochanan was inaugurated as the Rosh Yeshiva, an extremely prestigious position. The Baal Shem Tov Hakadosh ^[4] instructed that whatever any person sees or hears is meant to tell him something meaningful in regards to the service of his Creator ^[5]. This lesson is true for every individual, not just the likes of Tzadikim. The problem is that most of the time the layman has not disciplined himself and his senses to attend only to which is pertinent to him and the Almighty's service. Because detrimental influences and distraction have a free pass into our field of awareness, the significance of those divine messages becomes obscured. Unless we sense that something is extraordinarily peculiar, it is difficult to discern that which is important from

the mundane cacophony of dissonance that suffuse our everyday life. The extent to which we commit ourselves and our "inbox" exclusively to our heavenly mission is the extent to which what we see or hear will contain a meaningful lesson for us.

The Master of the Universe converses with us on a regular basis, but one needs to be in sync with the Messenger in order to perceive His message. Ruach hakodesh (divine perception) was not only existent in Talmudic times; it is attainable even in our era, but it is reserved for those who believe in and are faithful to its Source.

Returning to our parsha, Reuvein likewise realized that since only he heard the bas kol and not his brothers he was the one who was destined to save Yosef. (Alternatively, we can understand it with an introduction from Tosafos. Tosafos [6] states that the reason the divine oracle is referred to as a "Bas-Kol", literally the daughter of a voice, rather than Kol, a simple voice, is because it is not a direct voice from heaven but rather the 'echo' of a celestial call. It is fraught with ambiguity and it can be interpreted correctly only by he for whom the message was intended. We might therefore understand that although all the brothers "heard" the Bas-kol, Reuvein was the only one who understood its message.)

This coming week will IY"H be the Yom Tov of Chanukah. We have already mentioned a couple of times a teaching from Reb Ahron of Karlin [7]. He frequently stated that, based on the words of the Zohar Hakadosh (2:88A), "All the blessings (of the week) present above (implying spirituality) and below (implying those blessings which relate to material needs) are resultant from the prior Shabbos". That this concept is the intent of the words we say during Kiddush every Friday night: וּשְׁבַת קֹדֶשׁ בְּאַהֲבָה וּבְרִצּוֹן הַנְּחִילֵנוּ, זְכוּרֹן לַמַּעֲשֶׂה בְּרֵאשִׁית, תַּחֲלִילָה לַמִּקְרָאִי – "His holy Shabbos, with love and favor he bequeathed us, as a remembrance of creation, the prologue to the holy convocations". The entire holiday that falls on a weekday gains its holiness from the previous Shabbos. The Shabbos is therefore the beginning of the holiday that falls during the succeeding week. Many years Chanukah actually falls on Parshas Vayeishev, although this year it does not. Therefore it is even more fitting to seek an indication of the Yom Tov Chanukah in this week's Torah reading.

There is an oft-quoted Medrash [8] that connects this week's parsha and Chanukah: הַדּוּדָאִים הָיוּ עֹלֵי רִיחַ, וְעַל פִּתְחֵינוּ כָּל מִגְדִּים, חֲדָשִׁים גַּם יְשָׁנִים, דּוּדִי, צִפְנִתִּי לְךָ – "The mandrakes have yielded fragrance, and upon our doorsteps are all precious fruits. Both new and old have I stored away for you, my Beloved." [9] The mandrakes have yielded fragrance— this refers to Reuvein, [reads the Medrash] as it is written [10], 'And Reuvein heard, and he rescued him [Yosef] from their hand.' And upon our doorsteps are all precious fruits—this refers to the Chanukah lights."

The Medrash contrasts Reuvein's saving Yosef and the Chanukah candles. What is the connection between these two seemingly unrelated themes?

I would like to propose the following explanation: The Chanuka celebration commemorates a series of miraculous events among which includes the discovery of an uncontaminated flask of pure olive oil which still bore the unbroken seal of the Kohen Gadol (High Priest). According to some interpretations [11] those who were preparing the Menorah knew that it would take eight days until new oil can be procured. They therefore divided that oil into eight parts so that they should be able to light the Menorah for each of those eight days. It seems that the Kohanim were confident that divine intervention would ensure that the meager quantity of oil would miraculously be sufficient for its sacred task.

Why were they so certain? It must be that they understood that finding that single pristine container of oil among the appalling defilement of the Temple was an event of extraordinary

import. The priests reasoned correctly that Hashem was instructing them to rely upon His Providence; that He would perform another miracle and have the oil last continuously for eight days of illumination. This is similar to Reuvein who concluded from the fact that he was the only one to hear the bas-kol, that he must act upon this and rescue his brother Yosef.

Good Shabbos, and a lichtiga Chanukah (a Chanuka full of light).

[1] Bereishes 37:20

[2] Bereishes 37:21

[3] Tractate Taanis 21

[4] Rabbi Yisrael the son of Eliezer the Baal Shem Tov ["master of the good Name"], 1698-1760. He is the founder of the Chassidic movement. He authored no books, although his disciples disseminated his teachings in lectures and in published form.

[5] see Keser Shem Tov, hosafos, 224

[6] Tractate Sanhedrin 11A

[7] 1802-1872, He is the author of the Sefer Beis Ahron

[8] see Yalkut Reuveni, Parshas Vayeitzei

[9] Shir Ha-shirim 7:14

[10] Bereishis 37:21

[11] see Beis Yosef Orach Chaim 670

Parshas Vayeishev: Coming To Terms With Our Past Мошиаха Vayeishev: примириться с нашим прошлым

Rabbi Yisroel Yitzchok Silberberg

Associate Member, Young Israel Council of Rabbis

Паршу начинается с "Vayeishev Яков в земельной Отца в Эрец-Исраэль». Яков после стольких лет лишений, наконец, достиг своей пенсионного этап. Он был готов, чтобы расслабиться и насладиться его семью в спокойствии. Мидраш говорит: Яков желал останавливаться мирно и трудности Иосифа перед ним. Всевышний сказал, что это достаточно того, что праведники будут вознаграждены удовлетворенности в мире грядущем, в этом мире, они должны переносить трудности. Что не так с Яков наслаждаясь GoldenYears? Не следует все заслуживают мирного выхода на пенсию? Мы ежедневно молиться, что мы не должны испытывать испытания и трудности, чтобы мы могли служить Всевышнему с радостью и хорошим состоянием ума.

Если мы посмотрим на точном языке Мидраш "кризис Иосифа прыгнул на Яков", кажется, предположить, что трудности Якова в связи с Иосифа был сам нанес. Как это было так ?? Стих гласит, что братья ненавидели Иосифа, потому что Яков показал фаворитизм по отношению к Иосифу. Было ли это неправильно для них ревновать и ненависть к Иосифу? Выросший в качестве ребенка ребенок, мои братья и сестры чувствовал, что я был по-разному. Но почему братья Иосифа ненавижу его так много, до такой степени, что в конце концов они проигнорировали его просьбы о пощаде и продал его в рабство? Даже Эйсава нечестивых помиловал Якова, когда они противостояли друг другу !!

Корень Якова, показывая фаворитизм с Иосифом было связано с его являясь старейшим из сыновей Рахили. Яков действительно намеревался жениться на Рахили и, как следствие, он не мог помочь, но относиться к Иосифа, как его верно первенца. Аль-могучий ожидается

Яков, чтобы понять, что, поскольку он был непреднамеренно дал Лии, как и его первой жены, он должен был принять постановление и просматривать Реувен (и более поздних Иегуда) как равный с Иосифом. Братья, следовательно, были чувствительны к этому, как они чувствовали, Иосиф был укрепления позиций Якова, что Иосиф был бы единственным наследником Царства Израиля. Они по праву считали, что Яков был игнорируя права Иегуда, царя из рода Лии и конечной Moshich Бен Давида. Таким образом, действия братьев не были жестоки акт мести, не хватало сострадания. Скорее всего, реакция на то, что они считаются попыткой Якова и Иосифа отрицать свои права. как сыны Лии, чтобы участвовать в руководстве Израиля.

Яков был наказан терпеть потери Иосифа, не потому, что Аль-могучий не хотел Яков, чтобы насладиться его выхода на пенсию лет, изучая Тору и цепляясь к Всевышнему. Скорее всего, он был наказан, потому что Яков didn't полностью прийти к соглашению, что это было для его лучшее, что Лия была его первая жена и равна Рэйчел. Человек должен смотреть все вхождения, которые не в его контролем, как в его пользу, хотя поначалу он не появляется, чтобы быть так. Если мы живем в отрицании и отмахнуться от события, которые не идут, как ожидалось простым совпадением, мы только усугубит наше трудности и продления трудности. Каждое действие мы принимаем, чтобы попытаться чрезмерному тяготы, только усиливает нашу первоначальную ошибку что мы не признаем, что Всевышний является контроль и это все к лучшему.

Иосиф тоже был вынужден быть выслан из отца и терпеть такие испытания и невзгоды, чтобы узнать, что большинство событий в нашей жизни не являются истинно под нашим контролем, и что по большому счету они находятся в нашу пользу. Как показывает опыт Джозеф период его в тюрьме, поначалу казалось несправедливым, что он был отправлен в тюрьму, так как он должен был вознагражден Всевышним для выдерживать искушения жены Potifar-x годов. Вместо этого он страдал в тюрьме, так как он был ошибочно обвинен в то, что он не совершал. Тем не менее, позднее он понял, что на самом деле это было благом, так как это в конечном итоге стало причиной его становится правителем над Египтом.

Иегуда также был наказан за продажу Иосифа, когда он был смущен и унижен, когда он смело признался, что он был отцом сына Тamar ". Он ошибся, думая, что Иосиф стремился контролировать братьев и быть единоличным правителем. Как он узнал от его отношений с Тamar, что кажется очевидным и проявляется в поверхностном понимании, часто просто упрощение более сложной и сложной ситуации. Иегуда чувствовал, что был уверен, что Тamar был виновен в прелюбодеянии, но, наоборот, оказалась здоровой акт с ее стороны, в котором она хотела объединиться с Yehudah и подготовить происхождение Мессии. Иегуда должны судить Иосифа более благоприятно, как понять, что Иосиф был просто выполняя волю отца и не пытается узурпировать полномочия, его брата. Мы тоже должны научиться давать другим презумпцию невиновности и Всевышний сделает то же самое с нами.

Тора этой главе показывает нам, что даже три великих людей, Яков, Иосифа и Иегуда, в то время как они были святые и праведные намерения, они не в состоянии признать очевидное. Они должны сделали шаг назад и взглянуть на ситуацию с более объективности и справедливости. Можем ли мы научиться из этих гигантов, чтобы быть более терпеливыми и понимающими, когда мы взаимодействуем с другими людьми.

Хорошие Шаббат.

למלאכים מגיע התורה ולא לנו

ל עוד תשובה שמשה ענה למלאכים. משה ענה שלא מגיע להם "על זה אמר הרבי מאוסטראווצא, מצינו בחז"ל, "כ דברי הרבי מאוסטראווצא. נמצא, לפי הריטב"ה התורה בגלל שאכלו בשר בחלב בבית אברהם אבינו, ע רב יסבור שבני ישראל קבלו את התורה, ולא המלאכים, מחמת שהמלאכים אכלו בשר בחלב אצל אברהם אבינו.

ה שלש), לכאורה המלאכים לא חטאו באיסור בשר בחלב אצל "אך הקשה החתם סופר (תורת משה, וירא ד בראשית יח, ח). ("ויקח תמאזה ונתלב וכן הבקר אשר עשה ויתן לפניהם... ויאכלו" אברהם אבינו, שהרי כתיב ולפי פשט הפסוק נראה שקודם המלאכים אכלו חמאה וחלב ואחר כך בשר, ובזה אין איסור

א עמ' שח), שהסיבה שאסור "אך לפי דברינו הדבר נפלא, שהרי כתב היהודי הקדוש (הובא בפרדס יוסף, ח פירוש: התחתון) "תתאה גבר" לאכול חלב אחר בשר, כי חלב הוא חסד, ובשר הוא דין, והרי אנו פוסקים גובר על העליון. וכאן מה שאכל ראשון הוא התחתון, ומה שאכל אחר כך הוא העליון). וממילא כשאוכל חלב אחר בשר, נמצא שמגביר את הדין על החסד, ואסור. אבל בשר אחר חלב, מותר, שאז מגביר את החסד על הדין.

רב אמר "אבל באמת, דבר זה הוא מחלוקת בגמרא (פסחים עו.). שמואל הוא זה שאמר תתאה גבר, אבל דהיינו העליון גובר). עתה סרה קושיאת החתם סופר, שהרי **רב** הוא זה שסבר שטענת משה ("**עילאה גבר** למלאכים היה שאכלו בשר בחלב בבית אברהם. והרי רב עצמו סובר עילאה גבר, וממילא יהיה אסור לאכול בשר אחר חלב, שאז הבשר, שהוא העליון, גובר על החלב, שהוא התחתון, שנמצא מגביר הדין על החסד, ושפיר המלאכים חטאו באכילת בשר אחר חלב

לשון הגמרא) [ריש בית, אלף מם ריש, עין יוד למד] ("**רב אמר עילאה גבר**" ורמז נפלא לדברינו: המילוי של ית ם לף א, ו ["**חמאה וחלב וכן הבקר ויאכלו**" אלף הי, גמל בית ריש] עולה לגימטריא של המילוי לבד של ית מד ית, ו ית ון, א ית וף יש, או וד לף ף מד או] (2968). ללמד, שלפי שיטת רב, הסובר עילאה גבר, המלאכים חטאו באכילת בשר אחר חלב

מאמר החכם

ה גוזר גזרה ונותן כח קיום למתנסים בה"הקב – "ברוך גוזר ומקיים"

רבי ברוך ממזבז

NCYI Divrei Torah Bulletin - a Project of the Young Israel Council of Rabbis