

INTERNET PARSHA SHEET ON KORACH - 5759

To receive this parsha sheet in WP 6.1 file (readable by Word), mailto:eshulman@cahill.com

SOME INTERNET DVAR TORAH LISTS Virtual Jerusalem: E-mail to: listproc@vjlists.com In msg type: subscribe -<listname> Your_Name" Some of lists: DafYomi (By Ohr Somayach); Parasha-9A (By Ohr Somayach); Weekly (Ohr Somayach on Parsha); YSParasha (from Shaalvim); YITorah (Young Israel); Camera; ShabbatZomet; ...

meet with Datan and Aviram. Though they have been provocateurs, and Moses risks humiliation by meeting with them, he still tries to make peace. Characteristically, Datan and Aviram rebuff Moses' offer and insult him. With this last ditch effort being met with failure, the die is cast and the unfortunate episode ends with the ground opening up and swallowing the rebels. We can derive a dramatic lesson from this story. Though he was totally in the right, and though he exposed himself to insult and humiliation, Moses did all he could to stop a tragedy. In acting this way, Moses provided subsequent generations with an exemplary model of what constitutes true humility, and showed how far one must go to put ego aside for the sake of peace.

May the merit of learning this Devar Torah aid in the complete and speedy recovery of Harav Shmuel Yaakov ben Ayala Hinda. Join the online learning revolution - sign up for free email lists now! http://www.aish.edu/learning/maillists/lists.htm The author, Rabbi Yehuda Appel, is an American who studied and taught Torah for many years in Jerusalem. In 1990, he and his family moved to Cleveland where he now serves as Executive Director of Aish HaTorah. (C) 1998 Aish HaTorah International - All rights reserved. Email: yappel@aish.edu Home Page: http://www.aish.edu

"RavFrاند" List - Rabbi Frand on Parshas Korach - These divrei Torah were adapted from the hashkafa portion of Rabbi Yissocher Frand's Commuter Chavrusah Tapes on the weekly portion: Tape # 198, Ethiopian Jewry Question. Good Shabbos!

Aish HaTorah: APPEL'S PARSHA PAGE PARSHAT KORACH Numbers 16 - 18 by Rabbi Yehuda Appel Aish HaTorah Cleveland

Rabbi Isser Zalman Meltzer was a great sage in Jerusalem 100 years ago. Once, during one of Rabbi Meltzer's Talmudic lectures, a young man who did not usually contribute to the discussions, spoke up - arguing that Rabbi Meltzer's interpretation contradicted the great Talmudic commentator, the Sfats Emes. Rabbi Meltzer, a noted Talmud scholar himself, apologized for his mistake, but asked permission to continue. After the class, one of Rabbi Meltzer's top students approached him and said: "Rabbi, I don't understand. First of all, your interpretation was not at odds with the Sfats Emes. And secondly, even if it was, there was nothing wrong in offering a differing interpretation." Rabbi Meltzer explained: "I noticed that there was an older man in attendance who does not usually come to my lectures. Also, the student who asked me the question usually does not participate in the discussions. I thought these two unusual circumstances may be related. Perhaps the older man was looking at the student as a prospective son-in-law. If that were the case, I did not want to put the young man in a negative light." One week later, Rabbi Meltzer's supposition was proved correct: The student who had posed the challenge in class became engaged to the older man's daughter.

The Negative Actions of The Fathers Also Foreshadow I would like to share an excerpt from the writings of the Chofetz Chaim. Part of the Chofetz Chaim's writings include a work called "Gate of Remembrance" (Sha'ar haZechira), in which he writes about the types of sins that a person should be very careful to avoid. The Chofetz Chaim devotes two or three chapters to what he calls "a very severe sin" -- the sin of divisiveness (machlokes). The Chofetz Chaim writes that divisiveness is one of the most destructive sins that a person can transgress, both literally and figuratively. The Chofetz Chaim quotes the Medrash from Korach, which states that normally the Heavenly Court only punishes sinners from age 20 and up, while the "Courts below" punish sinners from bar/bas mitzvah. But in the case of the machlokes of Korach even young infants were punished and swallowed up by the earth. Machlokes, which was Korach's sin, not only destroys a person and his family -- it even destroys his very small children. On numerous occasions, we have discussed the positive aspects of the concept that "the actions of the fathers foreshadow the actions of the children". For example, Avraham is the paradigm of Chessed. We have many positive paradigms among the Biblical personalities. However, there are also negative paradigms. This week, we will examine a negative aspect the concept "ma'aseh avos siman l'banim". The paradigms of divisiveness are Dassan and Aviram [two of the leading antagonists in Korach's group]. The heritage of machlokes -- and what it can do to a person -- stems from these two individuals. The Chofetz Chaim writes -- and this is so true -- that in addition to all the other sins associated with machlokes (slander, jealousy, hatred, embarrassing people publicly, etc.), machlokes always degenerates into "I am going to win this thing". And this evil inclination called "I've got to win" inevitably leads to the most destructive of outcomes. The Chofetz Chaim comments upon an amazing thing: if someone would try to cause the slightest harm to a person's child, the parent would stop at nothing to prevent the child from being harmed. So if a person becomes involved in a machlokes, and he is aware that we have a tradition that divisiveness will harm his or her children -- wouldn't any person with any common sense try to make peace, and stop the argument? But the evil inclination of machlokes causes people to feel that nothing else matters, other than "I've got to make my point."

True humility entails a willingness to put oneself in a bad light if it will help others. A prime example can be found in this week's Torah portion, Korach. Korach, a cousin of Moses and Aaron, launches a rebellion against them. He claims that they have unfairly seized leadership roles and have ignored the prophetic powers of the rest of the nation. Korach says that Moses and Aaron are no holier than anyone else - and he ridicules their teachings. Datan, Aviram, and 250 others join Korach's cause. Were the rebels' claims justified? No - they were patently absurd! Who would accuse Moses of snatching power, when in fact Moses had to be persuaded by G-d to take a leadership role in the first place! Moreover, the Torah describes Moses as "the most humble of all men." Wielding power was the last thing on his mind! Moses tells the rebels, though, that if they have any doubts about his designation of Aaron as High Priest, he is willing to conduct the following test: Each person who lays claim to Aaron's position should bring an incense offering to G-d, and whoever the Almighty chooses will become the High Priest. Moses is willing to put his position on the line in order to mollify the rebels. Then, in a stunning example of humility, Moses asks to

Rabbi Berel Wein once related a mind-boggling incident which involved the Chofetz Chaim himself: Two people became involved in an argument, and it grew and grew and grew. It became ugly and messy and consumed

their lives and affairs. And then, mysteriously, the children of the two antagonists started dying. It happened just like it is "supposed" to happen -- just like it happened with Dassan and Aviram. The Chofetz Chaim himself went to one of the parties involved and asked, "Don't you think it is time to stop? This is harming your children already!" Rabbi Wein said in the name of the Chofetz Chaim that the person answered as follows: "I will bury all of them, but I am going to win." That is the power of machlokes! A person becomes so obsessed that nothing else matters other than winning. "Winning IS everything."

This is the lesson of Parshas Korach. When we read that Dassan and Aviram were swallowed up WITH THEIR CHILDREN -- this is the 'actions of the fathers that foreshadow the actions of the sons'. All of us can claim that we are the descendants of Avraham, Yitzchak, and Yaakov. The question is, do we also want to be considered the descendants of Dassan and Aviram? Is that part of our ancestry? If it is, that type of heritage exacts, Heaven Forbid, a terrible cost -- it takes him down and it takes his children down as well.

Transcribed by David Twersky; Seattle, Washington twerskyd@aol.com
Technical Assistance by Dovid Hoffman; Yerushalayim dhoffman@torah.org
Tapes or a complete catalogue can be ordered from the Yad Yechiel Institute, PO Box 511, Owings Mills MD 21117-0511. Call (410) 358-0416 for further information. RavFrاند, Copyright (c) 1999 by Rabbi Y. Frand and Project Genesis, Inc. Project Genesis: Torah on the Information Superhighway learn@torah.org 17 Warren Road, Suite 2B http://www.torah.org/ Baltimore, MD 21208 (410) 602-1350 FAX: 602-1351

Rabbi Kamenetzky will be delivering a class on Tuesday afternoon, June 22nd in New York City. See below for details!

Drasha -- Parshas Korach -- Grinding the Point Rabbi Mordechai Kamenetzky Volume 5 Issue 41 6/18/99

The sojourn in the desert was no walk in the park. True, it was a period of time in which miracles were the norm and the level of spirituality soared, but life next to G-d required a perfect commitment. The actions of the Jewish nation were scrutinized, the eyes of Hashem peering as a strict teacher, correcting and adjusting every wrong move with immediate censure and swift action. We suffered for our mistakes. The Jews wandered for 40 years because of the erroneous reports of the spies. And the many rebellions and uprisings concerning the manna and other matters, including the ever-resounding desire to return to Egypt, were met with swift, decisive retribution. This week, however, the rebels are rebuked in three totally different ways, each a miracle onto itself. Korach organized a rebellion against Moshe and Ahron. Claiming nepotistic inconsistency, Korach said that Ahron did not deserve the position of Kohen Gadol. After all, he claimed "the entire congregation is holy, (they were all at Sinai). "Why, then," he argued with Moshe, "do you raise yourselves higher than the rest of the congregation of the Lord?" (Numbers 16:3) But this time the punishment is not the ordinary plague. First, in a display of absolute power and sovereignty, Hashem opens the earth and swallows Korach and the immediate family of rabble-rousers whole and alive! Then his 250 co-conspirators are consumed by fire as they attempt to offer a ktore (incense) sacrifice. And afterwards, to quell more grumbling, another miracle occurs. Each tribal leader is commanded to place a stick in the ground and miraculously only Ahron's stick begins to bud before their eyes. It grew leaves, flowers, and almonds -- a heavenly sign that only Ahron merits the exalted position of Kohen Gadol. It always bothered me. The opening of the earth is no little feat. Earthquakes of that magnitude did not occur at a moment's notice! Wasn't that event powerful enough to make the point? Why was there a need to quell the whining and punish the perpetrators with such powerful punishments and magnificent miracles? Shouldn't a heavenly warning have been enough?

Rabbi Meshulam Igra of Pressburg was one of Europe's leading scholars in the latter part of the 18th century. As a young man, he was engaged to the

daughter of a prominent community leader in the city of Butzatz. A few months before the wedding the young chosson ate a meal at the home of his future father-in-law. Dessert was served together with a hot treat a delicacy that the impoverished Reb Meshulam had never heard of -- coffee. The servant brought out a cup of brewed coffee together with sugar and milk. The prospective father-in-law directed his son in law to partake. The young scholar looked quizzically at each of the entities and began to ponder. There were two liquids and sugar. The Talmud teaches that eating precedes drinking. He took a spoon of sugar and ate it. Then he was unsure what to drink first the milk or the black brew. Noting that darkness in the Torah comes before day, he drank the black coffee. Noticing the grinds at the bottom of the cup, he took his spoon and began to eat them. Not wanting to embarrass his soon-to-be father-in-law who had served such a difficult-to-eat dessert, he slowly chewed and swallowed the grinds. His prospective bride stood in shock. "Father," she cried "I cannot marry a man who does not know how to drink a cup of coffee. He is a total klutz!" The engagement was broken. Years later this same community leader visited the home of Rav Yeshaya Pick the prominent Rav of Breslow. Upon entering the study he noticed the rav engrossed in a letter. He looked totally concerned and distraught. When the man asked what problem was, Rabbi Pick told him that he just received a letter that is filled with the deepest insights. "I have to be totally immersed in Torah thought to begin to comprehend the level of this man's brilliance. In fact," he continued, "I do not think a man of this caliber has emerged in the last fifty years! And," he added, "besides the brilliance, one can note his amazing humility and fine character throughout every word he writes." Then he looked up at the man.

"You come from Butzatz. Have you ever hear of a man called Meshulam Igra?" The man didn't emit a verbal response. He fainted. When he came to, he recounted the entire story of the engagement and its dissolution, how Rabbi Igra was meant to be his son-in-law but the match was broken over coffee grounds. Rabbi Pick looked up at him and shook his head sadly. "Is that so?" he exclaimed. "You gave up the opportunity for this great man because he did not know how to drink a cup of coffee?" Then he looked at the man and simply declared, "Faint again!"

Perhaps the greatest undoing of our nation throughout its history is the non-appreciation of its great leaders. Among our midst exists diamonds, but they are often treated like raw coal. There is a most popular song, sung in the Yeshiva world on all holidays, "Moshe emes v'Toraso emes. Moshe is true and his Torah is true." The inseparability of the Torah and its teachers, the appreciation of the two as inseparable in their validity is a fundamental in throughout the writings of Maimonides and all the philosophies of Torah Judaism. Without recognizing the greatness of our leaders, we would be lost. Hashem did not the rebellion against Moshe to subside with just one action. It took three very different miracles, the splitting of the earth, the fire that consumed, and the budding of the dry sticks, to reiterate the most important point that sustains us until today. Because if we do not realize from where our strength comes, Hashem will remind us. And He will tell us to faint again!

Good Shabbos Rabbi Mordechai Kamenetzky

Rabbi Mordechai Kamenetzky will be giving a shiur on Tuesday June 22 at 1:00 PM at 375 Park Avenue (corner 52nd) 37th floor -- the office of Martin Oliner. Topic: Tamuz -- A JEWISH MONTH, BUT A BABYLONIAN GOD! How did a nice Jewish month get a name like that? A discussion of the hows and whys of the effects and countereffects of gentile and pagan cultures on Judaism. Project Genesis: Torah on the Information Superhighway learn@torah.org 17 Warren Road, Suite 2B http://www.torah.org/ Baltimore, MD 21208 (410) 602-1350 FAX: 602-1351

From: Yated USA[SMTP:yated-usa@ttec.com]

Kortz Un Sharf-Short and Sweet Parsha Vertlach by Shaya Gottlieb
Vayikach Korach- and Korach took 17:1 Rashi: What caused Korach to take issue with Moshe Rabenu? He was jealous that Moshe chose

Elitzofon to be the Nosi of the Bnei Kehas instead of Korach. Elitzofon was chosen to be Nosi immediately after the Mishkon was erected. Why did Korach wait so long to quarrel? As long as Klal Yisroel was satisfied that their needs were being fulfilled, Korach was afraid to start up with Moshe Rabenu. However, after the story of the meraglim and the misonnenim, when there were 'mageifos' amongst Klal Yisroel, Korach dared to incite the nation against their leader, claiming it was all Moshe's fault. -Ramban

How can we be sure that Korach's argument was not l'shaim shomayim? Because Korach disagreed with his Rebbe, the Rebbe of the entire Klal Yisroel. Chazal: One who quarrels with his Rebbe is considered as if he quarreled with the Shechina. Such a machlokes cannot be l'shaim shomayim.

"Vayikach Korach." what did Korach take? Rashi: Lokach Es Atzmo- he took himself. Korach was multi-talented. He had yichus, was wealthy, talented and wise. Perhaps he was worthy of being a leader amongst Klal Yisroel. His problem? He took for himself. He didn't wait until he was given a position, but took action on his own. -Rebbe Bunim of P'shischa

"Vayikach Korach." Medrash-Lokach Mekach Ro-he took a bad deal. Korach had the right to err and feel that he deserves the nesius. However, he only gained everlasting shame from the 'deal'. In future generations, every good for nothing who will want to be great will think he is a privileged character like Korach, and the nickname 'a Korach' is used instead of 'troublemaker' or 'upstart'. -Rav Yonason Eybshutz

Ben Yitzhor Ben Kehos Ben Levi The possuk enumerates the yichus of Korach and his helpers. This shows that the yichus of these troublemakers was what gave them the courage to demand positions of leadership. -The Chozeh of Lublin

Yichus is a beautiful and useful adornment. However, according to logic it should make one humble-I have such an illustrious grandfather-am I worthy of bearing his name? Korach was the first one to take his yichus and use it to enhance his arrogance. -Rav Naftoli of Ropshitz

An arrogant person was once introduced to the Brisker Rav as one of the 'Anshei Shem'. The Brisker Rav replied, "We find the term 'anshei shem' written twice in the Torah, once by Dor Hamabul and once by the machlokes of Korach."

Many troublemakers and quarrelsome people like to boast that if the Rav of their city would be Rav in a different city, he would have been thrown out a long time ago. Because we are G-d fearing individuals, they say, we can tolerate our Rav's shortcomings. Korach's group said, "Rav Lochem. The fact that you remain a Rav amongst us is due to 'kol hoeidoh kulom k'doshim'-the entire congregation is holy. If we would not be so lofty, we would have deposed you a long time ago. -Ksav Sofer

Peninim Ahl HaTorah: Parshas Korach by Rabbi A. Leib Scheinbaum Hebrew Academy of Cleveland

And Korach ben Yitzhar ben Kehas ben Levi separated himself. (16:1) Korach was not simply another hatemonger who sought to usurp Moshe and Aharon as a result of intense feelings of envy. Korach was among those who "carried" the Aron Ha'kodesh. He was obviously sensitive to the fact that the Aron was in reality carrying those who attempted to carry it. It would be unrealistic to think that an individual who was so aware of Hashem should stoop to such machlokes, controversy, unless something "noble" motivated him. The Kotzker Rebbe, zl, explains that Korach sought Kehunah. He felt that he could serve Hashem better if he were a Kohen. His complete devotion to serve Hashem drove him to act the way that he did. Let us analyze this further. Korach knew that Moshe was chosen by Hashem to lead Klal Yisrael. He was also acutely aware that Hashem implemented the many miracles connected with Yetzias Mitzrayim, the exodus from Egypt, and the daily existence in the desert through Moshe's agency. The Agrah D'Kalah claims that while Korach was exempt from the service of offering korbanos because he was not a Kohen, he was nonetheless troubled about his lack of participation in this lofty service. Korach agonized over his lack of inclusion in the Kehunah to the point that he was driven to machlokes. What went wrong with Korach? His intentions were noble. How did he become the

paradigm of conflict? The answer, claims the Agra D'Kallah, lies in Korach's approach towards effecting his goal. The most noble mitzvah loses its sanctity if it is involved with strife. No position, regardless of its distinction, has value if it was stimulated by strife. If divisiveness is the means, if contention coupled with slander are the tools for erecting the edifice, then it has no meaning. It is not a mitzvah; it is transformed into a contemptible aveirah. Korach thought his yetzer tov, good inclination, had inspired him to challenge Moshe. He did not realize that his "frumer" yetzer hora, evil inclination, was spurring him on. The yetzer hora is very clever. Why should it attempt to convince us to sin if it can convince us that the aveirah we are about to perform is a mitzvah; the individual we are about to disparage is an obstacle in the way of our spiritual progress. A mitzvah that is created through an aveirah is not in fact a mitzvah. This represents the yetzer hora's ultimate triumph: distorting a person's mitzvos, for then he has nothing. While contentiousness and strife have been with us for a long time, nothing is as reprehensible as the self-righteous type of machlokes that some justify in the name of a mitzvah. Perhaps, people who behave in this manner should evaluate their idea of what constitutes a mitzvah.

And Korach gathered the entire assembly. (16:19) Korach is recorded in history as the archetype of the baal machlokes, one who generates strife and contention. We may wonder what distinguished Korach in this area. After all, he was not the first person in the Torah who was involved in strife. Did not Kayin fight with his brother? And the list goes on from there. We suggest that while Korach was not the first person to argue with others, he was the first to start a movement founded in contention, whose goal was to usurp the leadership of Klal Yisrael. It is one thing to disagree, even to argue publicly. To gather people, however, for the sake of convincing them to join him in a "holy war" against the Torah leadership of that generation is reprehensible. This type of deplorable behavior earned Korach his infamous reputation. Are things really that much different today? Frequently when people do not see eye to eye, rather than resorting to "healthy" disagreement, they resort to malicious slander, encouraging others to join them in their battle for "justice." No, we have not veered very far from the course that Korach charted. In fact, he would take pride in the character of machlokes that exists today. And the earth opened up its mouth and it swallowed them $\bar{\text{ר}}$ and all the men that belonged to Korach. (16:32) All those who joined Korach in his conflict met their end tragically. Korach's sons, however, did not die. As Sforno comments, "They were not drawn after him in the matter." It seems strange that such a charismatic demagogue as Korach had no permanent influence upon his children. Chazal assert that Korach was imbued with the ability to see the future. Therefore, he was secure in his success, since he foresaw his noble descendants. Ostensibly, Korach's ability was limited. He saw the tzaddikim that would be his progeny, but he did not see his own disaster. In any event, what happened to his children? Why did they not follow in their father's footsteps? Also, what merit did Korach have that his descendants achieved such spiritual prominence? We suggest a fundamental lesson to be derived from here. Korach made one enormous error that cost him everything. His theology was founded in "krumkeit," distortion, nurtured with arrogance and deceit. Yet, Korach was not a parent who imposed his faulty perspective upon his children. He was not one who feared that his children might sway to the "right" of his opinion. This trait is what saved him and them. He permitted his children to grow spiritually, unencumbered by his own misconceptions. Chazal tell us that Moshe Rabbeinu was rebbe to Korach's sons. During the height of the conflict they asked, "Who should we follow, our father or our rebbe?" This teaches us that Korach encouraged his children to study from their rebbe, and he did not pressure his children to challenge their rebbe because of his beliefs. Do we see this parental attitude today? How often do we find those whose insecurity about their own spiritual beliefs causes them to demand that their children adopt the same spiritual agenda. They demean anyone who might teach their children a way of life that is incongruous with theirs. After all, how would it look if their child were to be more observant than they? It would cramp their lifestyle if they were to feel uncomfortable to do whatever they please in the presence of their children. In this realm, Korach acted correctly. Regrettably, it was the

only such area.

Aish HaTorah: SHRAGA'S WEEKLY PARSHAT KORACH Numbers 16 - 18

"PURSUIT OF PEACE"

A Jewish man is shipwrecked on a desert island. After 10 years he's finally rescued by a passing ship. When the rescuers embark on the island, they are surprised to find the man has built himself an entire civilization: golf course, restaurant, and two synagogues. "But since you're here all alone on the island," they asked, "why do you have TWO synagogues?" "Because," replied the man, pointing to the buildings, "that's the one I go to, and that's the one I don't!"

KORACH - WHAT'S SO BAD? In this week's parsha, a terrible dispute erupts amongst the Jewish people. A man named Korach accuses Moses of corruption; Korach then recruits 250 men and stages a full-fledged rebellion. In the end, the earth opens up and swallows Korach and his cohorts alive. Why such a terrible punishment? Judaism regards quarrelling as one of the gravest sins. Why? Because divisiveness contradicts the essential unity of God. A flower has perfect form and symmetry, the ecosystem functions harmoniously, the colors of a sunset blend perfectly. Quarreling - with its tension, allegations and incriminations - undermines the harmony of creation. (Midrash BaMidbar Rabba 11:7) In Hebrew, the word for peace - "Shalom" - is derived from the root "Shalem," which means whole or complete. Peace is not merely the absence of war. Peace is a cooperative, symbiotic relationship, where both parties care for each other, assist each other, and ultimately complete each other. As King David says in Psalms 133:1, "How good and pleasant is it for brothers to sit peacefully together." These words - "Hinei mah tov u- mah-nayim, shevet achim gam yachad" - are perhaps the most popular Hebrew song.

HOW TO AVOID QUARREL We've all been faced with confrontation. It may be a business dispute, or simply jockeying for position at a red light. So what should we do? The surest way to immediately diffuse any conflict is to refuse to participate. Remember it takes two to argue. In our parsha, Moses asks to meet with the provocateurs Datan and Aviram. Moses eagerly pursues peace even though it means the risk of personal humiliation. (see Numbers 16:8,12) The Talmud (Avot 1:12) describes Aaron as famous for "pursuing peace." If Aaron saw two people arguing, he would tell each of them that the other admitted his mistake and wants to make up. That way, each party saves face, allowing the dispute to end. How much family dysfunction could be spared with this advice!

A WELL-INTENTIONED ARGUMENT The topic of "peace" is a popular one these days. We hear everyone talk about peace in the home, peace with the Arabs, peace in the inner city. Peace is perhaps the most central theme in Judaism. The Amidah prayer, said three times daily, ends with the word "Shalom." The Grace After Meals ends with the word "Shalom." The Birkat Kohaim (Priestly Blessing) ends with the word "Shalom." The entire Talmud ends with the word "Shalom." As well, the Talmud declares, "Shalom" is one of the Names of G-d! But if peace is such an essential Jewish value, then why are Jews always arguing?! Quarreling should not be confused with well-intentioned controversy. Any student of the Talmud knows that the schools of Hillel and Shammai were always arguing. Yet their respect for one another continually grew because they knew the disputes were for the sincere purpose of reaching a common understanding. In fact, the Talmud (Yevamot 14b) reports that the children of Hillel and Shammai intentionally married each other to show they were at peace. The Talmud states: "Just as no two faces are exactly alike, so too, no two opinions are exactly alike." Rabbi Shlomo Eiger explains: The fact that other people have different facial features does not bother me in the slightest. In fact, I am actually glad this is so, because it preserves my uniqueness! So too, I should appreciate the unique perspective that others bring to my life. The Talmud (Avot 5:20) describes a well-intentioned controversy as that between Hillel and Shammai. A poor-intentioned controversy is that of Korach and his followers, who tried to manipulate others for their own

selfish power struggle.

HAMMERING OUT THE TRUTH Judaism does not object to argument, if it is sincere and for the sake of truth. In fact, the Talmud (Kiddushin 30b) states that argument over Torah matter is proper, and participants will ultimately feel love for one another. If you've ever had the opportunity to visit a yeshiva, what's most striking is that the study partners are yelling at each other! Yet there's no love lost. The Talmud relates a story about the great scholar Rebbe Yochanan and his study partner Reish Lakish. The two learned together for many years, until one day Reish Lakish got sick and died. Rebbe Yochanan was totally distraught over the loss. His students tried to comfort him, saying, "Don't worry, Rebbe. We'll find you a new study partner - the most brilliant man in town." A few weeks later, Rebbe Yochanan was seen walking down the street, totally depressed. "Rebbe," his students asked. "What's the problem? We sent you a brilliant study partner. Why are you so sad?" Rebbe Yochanan told them: "This man is indeed a scholar. In fact, he's so brilliant that he can come up with 24 ways to prove that what I'm saying is correct. But when I studied with Reish Lakish, he brought me 24 proofs that what I was saying was wrong. And that's what I miss! The goal of study is not to just have someone agree with me. I want him to criticize, question, and prove to me that I'm wrong. That's what Torah study's about."

ISRAEL TODAY This week's parsha states clearly: "Don't be like Korach" (Numbers 17:5) - which the Talmud (Sanhedrin 110a) explains is the prohibition against quarreling. Hatred, jealousy and infighting are unfortunately not new terms to our people. The Talmud (Yoma 9b) says that it was baseless hatred amongst Jews which brought about the destruction of the Temple in Jerusalem. The Temple has lain in ruins for 2,000 years. Only through unconditional love will it be rebuilt. Much has been said recently about internal disputes between Jews in Israel. Can we stop these disputes? Perhaps not. But we can live with these disputes providing we remember one essential rule: "Every person is worthy of profound respect, regardless of their beliefs and level of observance." I may have differences and disagree with other Jews on various issues. I may have differences and disagree with my wife on various issues as well. But just as I would never consider distancing from my wife based on our disagreements, so too I would never consider distancing myself from other Jews based on our differences.

In Israel - where the issue of Jewish unity is most critical - much is being done to address the problem. Organizations like Geshet and Common Denominator run programs to bring together divergent groups - kibbutzniks with settlers, or secular with religious - to help them discover what unites us is greater than that which divides us.

How appropriate that the city of Jerusalem is actually a contraction of two words - Yeru-Shalem - "peace will be seen." May the Almighty bless all of us with the patience and sensitivity to respect all our fellow Jews.

SHABBAT SHALOM, RABBI SHRAGA SIMMONS

<http://www.aish.edu/learning/maillists/lists.htm>

(C) 1998 Aish HaTorah International - All rights reserved. Rabbi Shraga Simmons - ssimmons@aish.edu Home Page: <http://www.aish.edu>

From: Ohr Somayach[SMTP:ohr@virtual.co.il]

* TORAH WEEKLY * Highlights of the Weekly Torah Portion Parshas Korach ___Men At Work___ "Why do you exalt yourselves over the congregation of Hashem?" (16:3) You're driving home after a long week's absence. A week before, you had had a long delay on the highway due to construction, and you sigh as you wonder how long it will take to get back through it. You turn the bend, and to your delight, the traffic is flowing like money at a casino. The road repair crew has already finished their work. Sailing over the new tarmac, you notice that it has already lost its pristine blackness. In a few short days, it will be indistinguishable from the thousands of other dusty gray miles of pavement. Around the end of the 19th century, a saintly Jew in Russia authored a work which changed the course of Judaism. The book was called Chafetz Chaim -- "The Desirer of Life." Its subject matter, the laws of proper speech. In clear language,

the Chafetz Chaim led his readers through the sometimes tortuous laws of permitted and forbidden speech. The Chafetz Chaim's author was famous for guarding his tongue with such care that his name became synonymous with that of his creation. He became known as the Chafetz Chaim. One might have expected the Chafetz Chaim to be extremely taciturn, visibly guarding every syllable that left his lips. The opposite was, in fact, true.

In this week's Parsha it's difficult to understand how Korach could have hoodwinked so many of the Jewish People into suspecting Moshe of "lording it up" over the congregation. Just a few chapters previously, the Torah testifies that Moshe was the "humblest of all men." How could there have existed even a suspicion that Moshe was pumped up with his own self-image? When we master a certain character trait, it becomes an indivisible part of who we are. However, when we are still doing "road work" on part of our character, the signs of digging and construction are everywhere. It's clear to all that there are still "men at work." To the untrained eye, Moshe might have seen lofty and removed. He was, after all, the king of the Jewish People. And he behaved in a the manner of a king. But in his heart, Moshe understood, as no one before or since, exactly how small he was compared to G-d. Moshe didn't need to trumpet his humility. It was already integrated into his personality as seamlessly as the tarmac of last year's road repair.

___The Right Thing For The Wrong Reason___ "The man whom Hashem will choose -- he is the holy one." (16:7) It's not what you say, it's why you say it. The mishna in Pirkei Avot says, "Any dispute which is for the sake of Heaven will have a constructive outcome." However, says the mishna, any disagreement that is not for the sake of Heaven will not have a constructive outcome. It cites the argument of Korach and his cohorts with Moshe as an "argument not for the sake of Heaven." If you think about it, the mishna is problematic: The implication is that if Korach's intentions would have been correct, his dispute with Moshe would have had a positive outcome. In other words, what Korach said was, in essence, correct. It was why he said it, not what he said, that was at fault. How could it be that both Moshe and Korach were right? Korach claimed "all the people are holy;" whereas Moshe said: "He who Hashem chooses is holy." garment should be exempt?" Behind Moshe's monosyllabic reply lies a fascinating concept. An entire garment can be of techelet. Korach was right: The entire people can be holy. But just as a garment which is entirely techelet requires tzitzit, so a holy people need a source for their holiness. Holiness doesn't just exist by itself, it comes from the Holy One and is channeled through His tzaddikim. Just as tzitzit are a life-line joining a holy people to their Source, so it takes a Moshe to connect the Jewish People to its Source. It's not what you say, it's why you say it.

Sources: * Men at Work - Rabbi Mordechai Perlman * The Right Thing for the Wrong Reason - Sfat Emet as heard from Rabbi Mordechai Perlman

Written and Compiled by Rabbi Yaakov Asher Sinclair General Editor: Rabbi Moshe Newman Production Design: Eli Ballon

From: Jeffrey Gross[SMTP:jgross@torah.org]

WEEKLY-HALACHA FOR 5759

SELECTED HALACHOS RELATING TO PARSHAS KORACH

By Rabbi Doniel Neustadt

QUESTIONS and ANSWERS ON HILCHOS CHALLAH [Follow-up from Last Week]

QUESTION: Must challah be separated from all types of flour? ANSWER: Flour derived from the five species of grain - wheat, barley, spelt, rye and oats - requires the separation of challah. Rice, corn and soy flour are exempt.

QUESTION: Does the type of liquid used when making the dough have any affect on the obligation to separate challah? ANSWER: When flour is mixed with any amount of water, one is obligated to separate challah with a blessing according to all poskim(1). Flour mixed with fruit juice or with eggs only, requires hafroschas challah without a blessing(2). When flour is mixed with olive(3) oil, wine, milk or bee's honey there is a difference of opinion.

Most require separating challah with a blessing(4) while others recommend separating challah without a blessing(5).

QUESTION: Must challah be separated only when baking bread, or when baking other items as well? ANSWER: Thick dough from which cake or cookies will be baked requires challah separation if a minimum of 10 cups of flour is used. [Other ingredients do not count towards the minimum amount of flour.] Thick dough which will be fried or cooked requires hafroschas challah without a blessing(6). A liquid batter which will be fried or cooked is exempt from challah. If it will be baked, it requires hafroschas challah with a blessing(7).

QUESTION: May the designated piece of challah be removed with a fork or a knife? ANSWER: It is permitted to remove the designated piece of challah with any utensil but it is not recommended. As previously explained, the piece of challah is forbidden to be eaten. Since dough tends to stick, some crumbs may remain on the utensil and possibly render it [or other dishes washed along with it] non-kosher when washed with hot water later on. When the hot, burned piece of challah is removed from the oven, it should definitely not be removed with a utensil(8).

QUESTION: While sitting at the Shabbos table, a woman realizes that she forgot to separate challah from her challah loaves. What should she do? ANSWER: It is prohibited to separate challah on Shabbos or Yom Tov(9) unless the dough was made on Yom Tov(10). Accordingly, there is nothing that can be done(11) and the challah loaves may not be eaten(12). [If she realizes her oversight during bein hashmashos, and neither she nor the shul where her husband is davening has recited kabbolas Shabbos, she may still separate challah [even if she has already lit Shabbos candles], as long as the family has no other challah loaves for Shabbos(13).] If this oversight occurred outside of Eretz Yisrael, however, the challah loaves could be eaten so long as the lady intends to separate challah after Shabbos from whatever will remain of the challah loaves she had baked. She must follow this procedure(14): She must make sure that a small piece [e.g., one slice] remains from the loaves she had baked; Separate a designated piece from that designated piece and burn it. This is done by halachically annulling the piece of challah so that the dough no longer contains the forbidden challah piece. The woman [or her husband(18)] recites the following in the presence of a bais din of any three adult males(19): "I regret that I designated that piece of dough as challah, and had I known that I would regret it, I would not have designated it for challah." The bais din can then repeal her designation as they do with any other vow(20). Another piece of dough is then separated for challah. The same procedure would apply if the woman realized after baking her challah loaves that she mistakenly baked the designated piece of challah with them, or if somehow the designated piece got mixed up with any other food. When the challah loaves or other food are needed, this procedure may be followed on Shabbos or Yom Tov as well(21).

QUESTION: What can be done if the designated piece of challah, after being separated - regardless of whether a blessing was recited or not - gets mixed in with the rest of the dough? ANSWER: If the designated piece of challah is mixed in with dough which is 101 times greater in volume than the designated piece, then the entire dough may be baked and eaten(17). If the dough is not 101 times bigger than the designated piece, the dough may still be eaten - but only after the challah piece, which is forbidden to eat, is "removed" from the dough. This is done by halachically annulling the piece of challah so that the dough no longer contains the forbidden challah piece. The woman [or her husband(18)] recites the following in the presence of a bais din of any three adult males(19): "I regret that I designated that piece of dough as challah, and had I known that I would regret it, I would not have designated it for challah." The bais din can then repeal her designation as they do with any other vow(20). Another piece of dough is then separated for challah. The same procedure would apply if the woman realized after baking her challah loaves that she mistakenly baked the designated piece of challah with them, or if somehow the designated piece got mixed up with any other food. When the challah loaves or other food are needed, this procedure may be followed on Shabbos or Yom Tov as well(21).

QUESTION: Is flushing the designated piece of challah down the toilet the same as burning it? ANSWER: No(22). The proper method for disposing of the challah is to burn it. [We have previously explained that under extenuating circumstances only, some poskim permit wrapping it and throwing it in the garbage]. It is prohibited to feed it to one's pet or to derive any benefit from it(23).

QUESTION: Is it a mitzvah for ladies to bake challoos on erev Yom Tov as it is on erev Shabbos? ANSWER: Yes. It is considered a form of honoring the Yom Tov(24).

QUESTION: A woman prepares dough with the required amount of flour [16 cups] in order to recite the blessing, then divides the dough in two - half she bakes immediately while the other half is frozen to be baked at a later time. Does she separate challah? ANSWER: This issue is debated in the poskim(25). It is recommended, therefore, to separate challah but not to recite the blessing(26).

FOOTNOTES: 1 Y.D. 329:8. 2 Taz Y.D. 329:9. In practice, however, a dough [of 10 cups of flour or more] should not be prepared unless it contains either water, wine, olive oil, milk or bee's honey. 3 Mishnah Berurah 158:15. 4 Pischei Teshuvah 329:2; Kitzur Shulchan Aruch 35:7; Aruch ha-Shulchan 329:3. 5 Oral ruling heard from Harav M. Feinstein (quoted in Oholei Yeshurun, pg. 58) based on Bais Hillel Y.D. 329:9. 6 Shach Y.D. 329:4. 7 Y.D. 329:2. 8 Harav S. Shapiro. 9 Mishnah Berurah 339:26. B'dieved, if she mistakenly separated challah on Shabbos or Yom Tov, the food may be eaten. If, however, she was aware that it is forbidden to do so and she did so anyway, the food is forbidden to be eaten - Sha'ar ha-Tziyun 339:26. 10 If the dough was prepared on Yom Tov, challah is separated with a blessing but the dough is not burned until after Yom Tov is over. Once the piece is set aside, it may no longer be moved, since it is muktzeh - Mishnah Berurah 506:29. 11 If this occurred on the first night of Pesach or Sukkos when it is a Biblical obligation to eat a k'zayis of matzah or bread, a solution can be found. A rav must be consulted. 12 A possible solution is to prepare on Yom Tov another batch of dough and then separate challah from the new dough for both. See Rama O.C. 506:3 and Mishnah Berurah for the details. 13 Mishnah Berurah 261:4 and 28. Outside of Eretz Yisrael, though, this should not be done, since in the Diaspora it is permitted to separate challah after Shabbos, as detailed in the next paragraph. 14 Rama O.C. 506:3. 15 Rama Y.D. 323:1. If she forgot to separate challah from more than one dough, she must follow the same procedure with each dough. 16 Harav S.Z. Auerbach (Shemiras Shabbos K'hilchasa 42, note 57). 17 Rama Y.D. 323:1. 18 Aruch ha-Shulchan 323:14. 19 While her husband may not be one of the three, her children, her father and other relatives may - Y.D. 334:57. 20 Rama Y.D. 323:1. While some poskim do not agree with this procedure (see Taz 323:2), most poskim concur with the Rama's ruling, see Chochmas Adam - Sha'arei Tzedek 14:6; Pischei Teshuvah 3; Aruch ha-Shulchan 14. 21 Sha'arei Teshuvah O.C. 341:1. Since, however, a new piece cannot be separated on Shabbos or Yom Tov, this leniency would apply only outside of Eretz Yisrael, as explained earlier, see Shevus Ya'akov 3:27. 22 Chochmas Adam - Sha'arei Tzedek 14:34. 23 Rama Y.D. 322:5. A kohen, however, may derive benefit from it while burning it - Rama Y.D. 331:19. 24 Rama O.C. 242:1; 529:1. 25 See Y.D. 326:2, Beir ha-Gra 7 and Pischei Teshuvah 2; Chazon Ish Y.D. 198:3. 26 Leket ha-Omer 7:3; Harav S.Z. Auerbach (Shemiras Shabbos K'hilchasa 42, note 45).

<http://community.cleveland.com/cc/CAJS> Copyright (c) 1999 by Rabbi Neustadt, Dr. Jeffrey Gross and Project Genesis, Inc. The author, Rabbi Neustadt, is the principal of Yavne Teachers' College in Cleveland, Ohio. He is also the Magid Shiur of a daily Mishna Berurah class at Congregation Shomre Shabbos. The Weekly-Halacha Series is distributed L'zchus Doniel Meir ben Hinda. Project Genesis: Torah on the Information Superhighway learn@torah.org 17 Warren Road, Suite 2B <http://www.torah.org/> Baltimore, MD 21208 (410) 602-1350 FAX: 602-1351

From: Jonathan Schwartz[SMTP:jschwartz@ymail.yu.edu]
Subject: Internet Chaburah-- Parshas Korach (Chukas in Eretz Yisroel)

Prologue: So, is a tallis whose begged is made from techeles required to have techeles in the tzitzis? It seems that Moshe never answered Korach? Also, what was the connection of this famous midrash to Korach's core difficulty - namely that Moshe and Aharon were claiming "all the glory"? wouldn't need a rebbe. Therefore, the entire nation who had heard the Divrei Hashem at Har Sinai wouldn't need Moshe because they had heard Everything directly (Ki Kol HaEidah Kulam Kedoshim). Alas Korach was mistaken. Everyone needs a Rebbe to teach him that which is nistar from him and to show him a proper derech in halacha and hanhagas hachaim. Maran HaGadol Harav Hershel Schachter shlita, (Shiurei Chumash Korach, 5756) noted that the Rov's thought extends further than merely the kahal. Not only do lay people need Rabbonim, Rabbis need Rabbonim -- to show them the way to act, how to paskin and to fully grasp the ideas of Torah. (This thought is clearly indicated by Rashi (Sanhedrin 52b) who stresses that the members of Korach's crew, the ones who along with Korach missed the lesson of the tallis, were talmidei chachamim.

From: Aish Hatorah[SMTP:aishlist@mail.netvision.net.il]
From: "Rabbi Kalman Packouz" <packouz@aish.edu> AISH
HATORAH'S Shabbat Shalom Weekly 5 Tamuz, 5759
June 19, 1999 ...

DVAR TORAH: based on Growth Through Torah by Rabbi Zelig Pliskin When Moshe reprimands Korach for seeking the priesthood, he concludes, "Therefore, you and your congregation who gather together are against the Almighty; and Aharon, who is he that you complain against him?" (Numbers 16:11) What did Moshe mean when he said, "and Aharon, who is he"? Rabbi Shlomo Kluger comments that when someone verbally

abuses a very distinguished personage and then disparages a common person, the common person won't take great offense. This is what Moshe was saying to Korach. since you are really complaining against the Almighty, how can your words hurt Aharon? He will easily remain oblivious to what you say since he see that you also have complaints against the Almighty. Our lesson: When we come in contact with a very critical person, we need not take offense at what he says. This is the way he speaks to all people so there is no reason to take it personally. Realize that the problem is his, not yours, and you free yourself from any possible hurt feelings from what he says.

From: Mordecai Kornfeld[SMTP:kornfeld@netvision.net.il] Subject: Insights to the Daf: Beitzah INSIGHTS INTO THE DAILY DAF brought to you by Kollel Iyun Hadaf of Yerushalayim daf@dafyomi.co.il <http://www.dafyomi.co.il>

BEITZAH 16 - has been dedicated by Harav Avraham Feldman to the memory of Hagoan Rav Yisroel Zev [ben Avrohom Tzvi] Gustman ZTL, author of "Kuntresei Shi'urim", on the occasion of his Yahrzeit (28 Sivan). BEITZAH 17 (28 Sivan), has been dedicated to the memory of Harav Hagoan Rav Yisroel Zev Gustman ZTL by his Talmidim, on his Yahrzeit. The Dafyomi Advancement Forum needs your support. Send a contribution to D.A.F., 140-32 69 Avenue, Flushing NY 11367, USA

Beitzah 17 HALACHAH: WHAT TYPE OF FOOD MUST BE SET ASIDE FOR THE ERUV TAVSHILIN ... HALACHAH: Even the RI himself writes that he was afraid to rule counter to his uncle, Rabeinu Tam, and to permit using only a cooked item for an Eruv Tavshilin. The BEHAG also mentions the practice of preparing both a baked item and a cooked item. For this reason, a number of Rishonim write that one should be stringent l'Chatchilah and set aside both items. This is the Halachah as cited in the SHULCHAN ARUCH (OC 527:2), who writes that l'Chatchilah one should prepare both a baked item and a cooked item, but b'Dieved if one prepared only a cooked item, he may still bake on Yom Tov for Shabbos. (However, if he prepared only a baked item, it does not permit him to cook and it does not even permit him to bake, because the Takanah of Eruv Tavshilin was established to be made on a cooked item -- MISHNAH BERURAH 527:7).

21b HALACHAH: WASHING ONE'S ENTIRE BODY ON YOM TOV OPINIONS: Beis Hillel permits heating water on Yom Tov to wash one's feet. Why did they not permit heating water to wash one's entire body? (a) TOSFOS (DH Lo) says that the Heter of heating water to wash one's feet is because of "Mitoch" (Beis Hillel is consistent with his opinion, for he holds of Mitoch (12a)). It is Asur to heat water in order to wash one's entire body, because that is something which is not "Shaveh l'Chol Nefesh," -- not everyone considers it pleasurable to wash his entire body daily, and "Mitoch" does not permit Melachos which are not "Shaveh l'Chol Nefesh." (b) The RAMBAM (Hilchos Yom Tov 1:16) explains that the reason it is permitted to heat water to wash one's feet is because washing is a subcategory of eating and drinking (as is spreading oil on one's body), and therefore it is permitted on Yom Tov because of Ochel Nefesh. It is prohibited to heat water to wash the entire body because of the Gezeirah of Merchatz (Shabbos 40a; the Rabanan prohibited washing one's entire body on Shabbos, lest one heat up the water on Shabbos; they extended the Gezeirah to Yom Tov as well, so that one not think that it is permitted to heat water on Shabbos). The RAMBAM is following his opinion (1:4) that the only Melachos which are permitted by "Mitoch" are Hav'arah and Hotza'ah, but not Bishul. Bishul is permitted only for actual Ochel Nefesh, and therefore here it is permitted to cook the water because washing is considered Ochel Nefesh. HALACHAH: The Halachah follows Beis Hillel. It is Asur to heat water on Yom Tov in order to wash one's entire body, but it is permitted to heat water to wash one's feet, as well as one's hands. The ROVS (Beis Hillel, 5752) is quoted as having derived a key lesson from the ROVS (Beis Hillel, 5752) regarding washing one's entire body with water that was heated on Erev Yom Tov, see RAN here, and the SHULCHAN ARUCH (loc. cit.), and the REMA there.)

Beitzah 22 HALACHAH: EXTINGUISHING A FLAME ON YOM TOV OPINIONS: The Gemara discusses questions of extinguishing a flame for the sake of "Davar Acher," in order to prevent a financial loss, and in order to prevent one's house from filling up with smoke. What is the Halachah in these cases? (a) The Gemara says that it depends on the argument between Rabbi Yehudah and the Rabanan, who argue whether or not it is permitted to do Melachah for Machshirei Ochel Nefesh (and other non-food related, bodily pleasures) on Yom Tov. Since we rule like Rabbi Yehudah (Gemara, 28b), extinguishing a flame should be permitted where it increases one's pleasure on Yom Tov. Even though Abaye stated that it is Asur, he only stated so because "Halachah v'Ein Morin Ken." (TOSFOS, BA'AL HA'ME'OR, ROSH) (b) The RIF and RAMBAM (Hilchos Yom Tov 4:4) write that according to the Gemara's conclusion, extinguishing a flame in these cases is Asur. The RAMBAN (Milchamos) explains that they hold that even though we rule like Rabbi Yehudah concerning Machshirei Ochel Nefesh, that is because the Chachamim wanted to make sure that one would not refrain from Simchas Yom Tov. In these cases, though, extinguishing the flame is not necessary for a primary need of Ochel Nefesh, and one will not refrain from Simchas Yom Tov if he cannot do the Melachah. (The ROSH also offers this explanation, as a second answer.) It is not clear what the Ramban means. The CHASAM SOFER (cited in previous Insight) understands that the Ramban means these cases are uncommon and rare situations. The Chachamim did not permit doing Melachah for Hana'as ha'Guf in unusual cases. Alternatively, the Ramban means that in these cases it is still possible to eat, but it will just be uncomfortable to eat. Therefore, the Chachamim did not permit doing Melachah for Hana'as ha'Guf in these cases. (c) TOSFOS (DH Ha'Hi) explains that in practice, a compromise is made. Rabbi Yehudah actually permits two things: he permits doing Melachah for Machshirei Ochel Nefesh, and he permits doing Melachah for Machshirei Hana'as ha'Guf (as Rashi says in DH Rabbi Yehudah). The Gemara here is relying on the second Heter of Rabbi Yehudah, and that is why he permits extinguishing a flame for "Davar Acher" and in order not to have to eat outside (Rashi, DH Eisivei). We rule like Rabbi Yehudah only in his first Heter, and we permit doing Melachah for Machshirei Ochel Nefesh. We do not rule like Rabbi Yehudah in his second Heter, doing Melachah for Machshirei Hana'as ha'Guf. (This is similar to the Ramban's approach, according to the second understanding above, in answer (b), except that Tosfos

implies that the Isur to do Melachah for Machshirei Hana'as ha'Guf is an Isur d'Oraisa, while the Ramban seems to learn that it is only mid'Rabanan.) HALACHAH: The SHULCHAN ARUCH (OC 514:1) rules like the Rif (answer (b) above), that it is prohibited to extinguish a flame on Yom Tov. The REMA cites the Rishonim who permit it (answer (a) above), but he adds that if it is possible to go to another home to eat, then it is not permitted to extinguish the fire to prevent a financial loss (because then it is not being done for the sake of Machshirei Ochel Nefesh (pleasure on Yom Tov), but for the sake of preventing a financial loss).

Beitzah 23

EXTINGUISHING A FLAME ON YOM TOV QUESTION: The Gemara earlier (22a) discussed whether it is permitted, on Yom Tov, to extinguish a candle in a room where a man and his wife are residing, or to put out a fire in order to save one's home, both of which are considered necessary for Yom Tov (Rashi). We know that the principle of "Mitoch" teaches that any Melachah that is permitted for the sake of Ochel Nefesh is also permitted for other purposes (see Insights to 12a). The Melachah of Kibuy, extinguishing, is permitted for the sake of Ochel Nefesh, as we find in our Sugya, which says that it is permitted to grill meat on top of burning coals, even though the dripping fat from the meat causes the coals to become extinguished. If so, why is there any question whether it is permitted to extinguish a flame or put out a fire on Yom Tov, and why does the Gemara conclude that it indeed is not permitted? It should be permitted because of "Mitoch!" We find another situation in which it is permitted to do Kibuy for the sake of preparing food. When a flame is smoking and is going to ruin the food, it is permitted to extinguish the flame in order to protect the food. Once again, we may ask that since Kibuy is permitted in that case due to Ochel Nefesh, it should be permitted for other purposes as well because of "Mitoch!" In truth, though, the latter case, extinguishing a flame in order to save food, is not a case of Kibuy for the sake of Ochel Nefesh, but rather a case of Kibuy for the sake of *Machshirei* Ochel Nefesh. "Mitoch" does not apply to Melachos that are permitted for the sake of Machshirei Ochel Nefesh, but only to Melachos that are permitted for the sake of actual Ochel Nefesh. This seems to be the intention of the ROSH (2:19). (See also PNEI YEHOSHUA, KOVETZ SHI'URIM). However, "Mitoch" should work to permit Kibuy in all cases, since it is permitted to do Kibuy in the case of placing meat on coals, which is an actual case of Ochel Nefesh. ANSWERS: (a) The RE'AH here and in the CHINUCH (Mitzvah #298) explains that there are two types of Kibuy -- one that is done to effect a positive outcome (by accomplishing a desired result), and one that is done to effect a negative outcome (by removing an unwanted entity). In the case of roasting meat over the burning coals, one wants the juice of the meat to drip on the coals. In that case, the Kibuy is being done because one wants it to be accomplished and to achieve the desired consequence, and not because one is trying to remove something. The Kibuy discussed in our Gemara is when one wants to remove the flame. "Mitoch" will only permit an act of Kibuy that has a positive value, and therefore it cannot permit the Kibuy discussed in our Sugya. (b) The CHIDUSHEI ME'IRI explains that in truth, Kibuy is not permitted because of Ochel Nefesh. Placing meat over coals in such a way that the juice of the meat drips onto the coals is not considered Kibuy for Ochel Nefesh, since the dripping and extinguishing is not what one desires; it just happens incidentally while one is cooking the meat. Deliberately extinguishing a flame is never permitted for Ochel Nefesh, and thus "Mitoch" cannot permit it for other uses either. It is not clear what the Me'iri means by this. Perhaps he means that extinguishing the coals in such a manner is not an Isur d'Oraisa of Mechabeh at all (according to the conclusion of our Gemara), since it is done without intent. It is a Davar she'Eino Miskaven (since it is not certain that the dripping will extinguish the coals, i.e. it is not a Pesik Reisha). (c) According to the RAMBAM, our question is not a question. The Rambam (Hilchos Yom Tov 1:4) maintains that there are only two Melachos to which "Mitoch" applies: Hotza'ah and Hav'arah (carrying into Reshus ha'Rabim and kindling a flame). Only those two Melachos may be performed for purposes other than that of food preparation. All other Melachos are permitted only for the sake of food preparation and "Mitoch" does not apply to them. (See Insights to 12:1.d.) (d) The ROSH (2:19) seems to suggest that extinguishing a flame for Davar Acher is not considered a necessity for the Yom Tov, perhaps because it is not an act that is associated with Yom Tov. Likewise, extinguishing a flame in order to prevent monetary loss is not necessary to do on Yom Tov.

23b HALACHAH: CIGARETTES ON YOM TOV OPINIONS: The Gemara discusses placing incense on coals, which involves kindling and extinguishing on Yom Tov. These issues touch off a major debate among the Acharonim regarding the question of whether or not it is permitted to use cigarettes on Yom Tov. While many contemporary authorities have stated that there is no allowance to smoke at all (even on a normal weekday) due to the proven dangerous effects of cigarettes and second-hand smoke on the body, nevertheless according to those who do permit a Jew to smoke, may one smoke on Yom Tov? (Our intention here is not to issue a Halachic ruling, but to summarize the issues involved.) There are four points of discussion regarding smoking on Yom Tov. (a) The MAGEN AVRAHAM (OC 514:4) cites the K'NESES HA'GEDOLAH who prohibits smoking on Yom Tov because it involves Mechabeh, extinguishing. The DARCHEI NO'AM (#9), in a lengthy Teshuvah, asks that there does not seem to be any act of Mechabeh done when one smokes. If anything, it involves Hav'arah (burning), and not Mechabeh. Any conceivable form of Mechabeh involved (such as when one squeezes the cigarette, the fire is diminished) would seem to be a Davar she'Eino Miskaven and not a Pesik Reshei, and should thus be permitted. (b) The MAGEN AVRAHAM proposes a more basic reason to ban smoking on Yom Tov. Even if it does not involve extinguishing but only burning, and we know that Hav'arah is permitted because of the principle of "Mitoch," "Mitoch" only permits something which is "Shaveh I'Chol Nefesh," which everyone enjoys, and smoking is certainly not something that everyone enjoys. However, the PNEI YEHOSHUA (Shabbos 39b, DH v'Omer) and RAV YONASAN EIBESHITZ (Binah l'Imim, Hilchos Yom Tov 4:6) write that this is not enough to prohibit smoking. TOSFOS in Shabbos (39b, DH v'Veis Hillel) writes regarding going to a bathhouse to sweat on Yom Tov that even though washing the entire body is not "Shaveh I'Chol Nefesh" and is therefore prohibited (see Tosfos Beitzah 21b DH Lo), nevertheless sweating is permitted because it is for Refuah, and not for pleasure. Similarly, there might be grounds to permit smoking because of its medicinal properties, since people smoke to enhance their digestion or their appetite. RAV GUSTMAN, zt"l, was asked if we can permit smoking on Yom Tov with this argument in our day, now that the dangerous effects of smoking have been proven. Rav Gustman answered that anyone who smokes still convinces himself that it is beneficial for him. That is, the question is not whether or not smoking is objectively healthy, in the long run, but whether the person does it for the pleasure that it provides (in which case it is not

"Shaveh I'Chol Nefesh" and should not be permitted on Yom Tov), or for the chemical effects that it has on the body. Those who smoke do so for the artificial calming effect of the nicotine. Therefore, it could be considered "Shaveh I'Chol Nefesh," because when it comes to matters of Refuah, we look at the ultimate effect and not at what causes that effect, as the KESAV SOFER explains in a Teshuvah (OC #64). That is to say, since everyone would like to be relaxed, whatever has relaxing effects is considered to be "Shaveh I'Chol Nefesh." The KORBAN NESANEL (Beitzah 2:22:10), cited by the BI'UR HALACHAH (511:4), mentions another reason that could make smoking be considered "Shaveh I'Chol Nefesh." Since many people, and not just a few people, have the practice to smoke, it can be considered "Shaveh I'Chol Nefesh." The Bi'ur Halachah adds that this obviously applies only in places where it is still acceptable to smoke and most people do so. The KORBAN NESANEL himself, though, prohibits smoking on Yom Tov. Just because most people in a place smoke, that does not make it "Shaveh I'Chol Nefesh" since it is damaging to those who are not accustomed to it. Lighting the "Mugmar" and washing one's entire body are also things that many people do and are still considered things which are not "Shaveh I'Chol Nefesh" since some people do not appreciate such "pleasures." The PNEI YEHOSHUA (Shabbos 39b) also presents this argument. (c) The PRI MEGADIM (OC 511) points out that an additional problem is introduced when there is printing or letters on the outside of the cigarette wrapper, since by smoking one destroys those letters and transgresses the Melachah of Mocheh (erasing). Because of this, some people who smoke on Yom Tov do not inhale when the cigarette burns down to the letters, but they let it burn by itself, so that they should not transgress the Melachah of Mocheh. RAV HILLEL RUVEL, Shli'ta, pointed out that this practice will not avoid the problem of Mocheh according to the NIMUKEI YOSEF in Bava Kama (22a) who says that when one lights a fire, one is considered to have burned everything that will eventually be burned by the fire. When Rav Ruvel brought this up with Rav Gustman, zt"l, Rav Gustman said that those who act leniently can rely on the OR SAME'ACH (Hilchos Shabbos 23:2), who says that it is clear that if someone burns a book he is not Chayav for Mocheh, since Mocheh involves taking away the words, not the entire paper. (d) The KORBAN NESANEL (loc. cit.) writes that even if there is no Isur d'Oraisa to smoke on Yom Tov, it is still extremely common that one transgresses Isurei d'Oraisa while smoking, such as Hav'arah while attempting to light the pipe/cigar/cigarette, or while adding or removing tobacco from a pipe, or while tapping the ashes off of a cigarette. (This may have been the intention of the Kneses ha'Gedolah cited above, (a).) Other Acharonim (BIRKEI YOSEF OC 511) write that this reason cannot be used as grounds for prohibiting smoking on Yom Tov, because it is accepted that the sages today do not enact new Gezeiros. Since this reason entails making a Gezeirah (that one may not smoke, lest one transgress an Isur d'Oraisa while doing so), we cannot enact a rabbinical prohibition to prohibit smoking on Yom Tov in order to prevent one from transgressing Isurei d'Oraisa.

HALACHAH: The KORBAN NESANEL concludes in very strong terms that smoking on Yom Tov is reprehensible, and "if one wants to honor Hashem and his Torah he should hold himself back from smoking for one or two days (Yom Tov), even though his Yetzer Hara might suggest ways to permit it based on the Shas." However, most of the Acharonim, as cited by the BI'UR HALACHAH (loc. cit.), permit smoking on Yom Tov as long as one is in a place where most of the people smoke and it can be considered "Shaveh I'Chol Nefesh" there. RAV MOSHE STERNBUCH points out that nowadays, since even in places where people smoke they know that it is damaging to their health and it is becoming more and more accepted not to smoke, it is difficult to rely on these reasons to permit smoking on Yom Tov. When asked by Kollel Iyun Hadaf whether smoking is permitted on Yom Tov, RAV CHAIM PINCHAS SCHEINBERG said that it is certainly not considered something which is "Shaveh I'Chol Nefesh" and thus cannot be permitted on Yom Tov. Furthermore, Rav Scheinberg pointed out that it has been proven that smoking is dangerous to one's health, and therefore smoking cannot be permitted at any time. (Regarding those who already smoke and who suffer from nicotine addiction, see RAV MOSHE FEINSTEIN, Igros Moshe YD 2:49, and RAV MOSHE STERNBUCH, Teshuvos 1:316.)

Another interesting question raised by the Acharonim is, if one person maintains that it is not permitted to smoke on Yom Tov, may he light a cigarette for someone who is lenient? The KESAV SOFER (ibid.), based on the SHA'AR HA'MELECH (Hilchos Ishus 7:12), writes that if a person holds that a certain practice is prohibited and he helps someone who holds that it is permitted to do that practice, he transgresses the Isur of "Lifnei Iver." Therefore, one who holds that it is prohibited may not help another person smoke on Yom Tov, and he must treat cigarettes and other smoking implements as Muktzah. However, the Kesav Sofer adds, if he holds that Halachah permits smoking but he personally is stringent and does not smoke, then he may light a cigarette for someone else who smokes.

Beitzah 25b AGADAH: THE MOST BRAZEN OF NATIONS QUESTION: The Gemara tells us that the Jewish people are the most brazen of the nations. The attribute of brazenness is the opposite of that of Bushah, being chaste and unassuming. The Gemara in Yevamos (79a) teaches that David ha'Melech decided that the Nesinim were not fit to marry into the Jewish people because they did not demonstrate the three signs characteristic of the Jews, who are "Rachmanim, Baishanim, v'Gomlei Chasadim" (merciful, chaste, and doers of kindness). The MAHARAL (Nesiv ha'Bushah 1) explains that these are natural characteristics of the Jews which they inherited from the Avos (see also Beitzah 32b). They inherited mercifulness from Yakov Avinu (Bereishis 43:14) and Bushah from Yitzchak Avinu, whose unique trait was Yir'ah, fear (Bereishis 31:42), from which Bushah derives (Yevamos 79a). Their attribute of being Gomlei Chasadim comes from Avraham Avinu, who was exceptional in his Chesed (Bereishis 18:19). How, then, can our Gemara say that the natural tendency of the Jewish people is the attribute of brazenness, while the Gemara in Yevamos says that the natural tendency of the Jewish people is Bushah? (MAHARAL loc. cit.) ANSWER: The MAHARAL explains that there are two types of Bushah. One type comes from a person's lack of motivation. This type of Bushah manifests itself in one who is easily discouraged from taking any initiative because of his shame. There is another type of Bushah which one experiences when one realizes that someone else is greater than he, and therefore he submits himself to that person, making himself submissive to him out of his feeling of shame before one who is greater than he. The Jewish people are brazen with regard to the first type of Bushah, which they lack totally. They have a lot of initiative. They are always creative and moving. With regard to the other type of Bushah, the Jewish people excel, for they submit to those who are greater than they. It is in that sense that they are Baishanim (the positive type of Bushah). The Nesinim lacked this positive Bushah and therefore

David ha'Melech rejected them. (In NETZACH YISRAEL ch. 14, the Maharal seems to contradict this approach; his words there need further elucidation.)

From: Mordecai Kornfeld[SMTP:kornfeld@netvision.net.il] Subject: Hebrew: Yosef Da'as (entire Maseches); Reviews (until Daf 29b) *****HEBREW UPDATES***** "Yosef Da'as" notes until the END OF MASECHES BEITZAH may now be accessed from our site, <http://www.dafyomi.co.il/beitzah/yosefdas/betz-mnue.htm> The concise Hebrew Review notes for BEITZAH, PERAKIM 1,2,3 (until Daf 29b) are available from our Hebrew Review notes site, <http://www.dafyomi.co.il/beitzah/hebrew/betz-mnuegm.htm> (The files will be distributed through email upon request.)

The *D*AFYOMI *A*DVANCEMENT *F*ORUM, brought to you by Kollel Iyun Hadaf For information on joining the Kollel's free Dafyomi mailing lists, write to info@dafyomi.co.il, or visit us at <http://www.dafyomi.co.il> Tel(IL):02-652-2633 -- Off(IL):02-651-5004 -- Fax(US):603-7375728
