

”ולבני הפילגשים אשר לאברהם”

Avraham Avinu Married Keturah without a Kesubah so that Her Descendants Would not Have Any Claim to Kedushah

We read in this week’s parsha, Chayei Sarah (Bereishis 25, 5):
”יתן אברהם את כל אשר לו ליצחק, ולבני הפילגשים אשר לאברהם נתן אברהם
—Avraham gave all that he had to Yitzchak; but to the children of the
concubines who were Avraham’s, Avraham gave gifts; then
he sent them away from Yitzchak his son, while he was still
alive, eastward to the land of the east. Rashi provides the
following clarification based on the Midrash:

”הפילגשים חסר כתיב [כן הגירסה במדרש (שם) ”הפילגשים” חסר ב’ יודי”].
שלא היתה אלא פילגש אחת, היא הגר היא קטורה. נשים בכתובה, פילגשים בלא
כתובה, כדאמרינן בסנהדרין (דף כא.) בנשים ופילגשים דדוד. נתן אברהם מתנות.
פירשו רבותינו (שם צא.) שם טומאה מסר להם”

— the word פילגשים (concubines) is written in its incomplete form (missing two yuds), since there was only one concubine—Hagar, who is Keturah. Wives are married with a “Kesubah”; concubines (“pilagshim”) are without a “Kesubah” . . . Avraham gave gifts: Our Rabbis explained that he gave over to them a name of impurity.

The Chizkuni is perplexed by this, since, according to tradition, the word “הפילגשים” is written in the Torah in its complete form—with two yuds. Nevertheless, it is worthwhile to note the comment of the Ohr HaChaim hakadosh on the passuk in parshas Nasso (Bamidbar 7, 1):
”ויהי ביום כלות משה —it was on the day that Moshe finished erecting the Mishkan. Rashi comments in the name of the Midrash: “כלת כתיב, יום הקמת המשכן היו ישראל ככלה הנכנסת לחופה” —the word כלות is spelled defectively, without a vav, signifying that on the day the Mishkan was erected, Yisrael were like a bride (a “kallah”) entering beneath the wedding canopy. Concerning this comment, the Ohr HaChaim hakadosh writes (ibid.):

”ביום כלות משה. רבותינו ז”ל אמרו כלת כתיב, ורואני כי בספר תורה כתובה
בוא”ו. ואני אומר כי דברי תורה כאלו וכיוצא באלו, אינם נמסרים לכל מרים יד
בתופשי התורה, כי יסובב הדבר הכפירה והזלזול בכבוד מורים. ויש לך לדעת כי

סדר תורתנו הקדושה ותיבותיה ואותיותיה ספורות מזוקקות, הצובות ממצב
קדוש ונורא, נפלאים המה למכיר בהם, ויותר פליאות נעלמים מעין כל”.

Although Rashi and others state that the word is written as “כלת”, without a vav, I see that it appears in the sefer Torah with a vav. In truth, not everyone is privy to the secrets of the Torah; for it could lead to heresy and disrespect. Our holy Torah with its words and letters is pure and precise. Our blessed sages knew—based on a tradition handed down from generation to generation from the time of Moshe Rabeinu—that even though the word appears in the Torah as “כלות”, complete with a vav, HKB”H intended to convey the notion of “כלת”, with the vav missing; the letter vav was added for a different reason altogether.

We can apply this insight to help us understand Rashi’s comment here in our parsha. In fact, the accepted tradition is to write the word “הפילגשים” in our sifrei-Torah in its complete form, with the letter yud. Nevertheless, the scholars of Torah she’b’al peh were taught that the passuk actually conveys the meaning “הפילגשים”, without the yud (negating the word’s plurality)—alluding to Hagar. In truth, the letter yud was added for a different reason altogether (to be explained later).

In the Heavenly Academy “הפילגשים” Appears in Its Defective Form

As there are seventy different facets to the Torah, I would like to propose an explanation reconciling the discrepancy between Rashi and the “masores”—tradition. Rashi stated in the name of the Midrash that the word appears as “הפילגשים” in its incomplete form; whereas, according to our “masores,” it is written in its complete form, “הפילגשים”, with both yuds. Let us introduce a comment from the divine kabbalist Rabbi Shimshon of Ostropoli, ztz”l, hy”d, in Likutiei Shoshanim. He cites a Midrash Pliah regarding the passuk in parshas Shelach

apropos the mission of the meraglim (Bamidbar 13, 20): "והימים ימי ביכורי ענבים - מפני מה לא הצליחו מרגלים, מפני שהימים ימי ביכורי ענבים, ולכן כתיב (שמות ב-ב) ותצפנהו שלשה ירחים, ולכן כתיב ענבים—*the meraglim failed, because they went out on their mission during the days of the ripening of the grapes.* The word ענבים appears in its incomplete form, without the yud, alluding to the passuk (Shemos 2, 2): ותצפנהו שלשה ירחים—she hid him for three months.

Rabbi Shimshon explains the meaning of the Midrash based on a teaching from the Zohar hakadosh (Shemos 12a): ותצפנהו שלשה ירחים, אליו תלת ירחין דדינא קשיא שריא בעלמא, ומאן נינהו תמוז אב—*the passuk in Shemos alludes to the three months during which the strict form of "din" prevails in the world—Tamuz, Av and Tevet.* Hence, one must hide and safeguard oneself during these three months.

According to the Gemara (Taanis 29a), the meraglim left to spy on the land on the twenty-ninth of Sivan. The passuk attests to the fact that their mission lasted forty days (Bamidbar 13, 25): "וישובו מתור הארץ מקץ ארבעים יום". Thus, it turns out that they returned on the eve of Tishah B'Av. Yisrael cried without true cause, establishing that day as a day of crying for future generations—the day on which both Temples were destroyed. We see that most of their ill-fated mission took place during the month of Tamuz and it ended on Tishah B'Av. This period of time is the reign of the "samech-mem" in the world.

Accordingly, Rabbi Shimshon points out that this is alluded to by the letters preceding the letters of the word ענב—which are ל', מ', א', ל', which spell the name סמאל—the notorious "samech-mem." This then is the allusion inherent in the passuk. The reason for the meraglim's failure, despite the fact that they were all esteemed leaders of Yisrael was: "והימים ימי בכורי ענבים"—because they performed their mission during the reign of the "samech-mem." This is alluded to by the letters that come first, like "bikkurim," before the letters ענב.

We can now make sense of the Midrash Pliah's statement. The meraglim failed, because they went out during "the days of the ripening of the grapes (ענבים)"—during the reign of the "samech-mem." Therefore, the passuk states: "She hid him for three months"—referring to the months of Tamuz, Av and Tevet, during which the "samech-mem" reigns. This is why the word ענבים is spelled deficiently, without the yud—providing us with the allusion to סמאל.

In the Heavenly Academy "ענבים" Is Spelled without a Yud

Now, in Devash L'Fee, the great Gaon Chida, ztz"l, cites the aforementioned words of Rabbi Shimshon. He is perplexed by the fact that in our sifrei-Torah, the tradition is to write "ענבים" in its complete form, including the yud, and not the incomplete form, "ענב", lacking the yud. The Bnei Yissaschar reconciles the matter for us quite nicely (Tamuz-Av 2, 11):

"ונראה לפרש על פי מה שכתבו גורי האריז"ל בליקוטים כתב יד בשם האריז"ל [הובא ב"דבש לפי" מערכת ק אות י] הטעם של קרי וכתוב, כי התורה נדרשת בשתי ישיבות מתיבתא עילאה ותתאה, בישיבה העליונה אין שטן ואין פגע רע, ושם נקרא כמו שהוא נכתב... אמנם בישיבה של מטה צריך למסור רזי התורה בלחישא, ושיהא פשט הדברים קרובים למושכל לרבים עד כאן דבריו.

המשכיל יבין דהוא הדין כל שארי הענינים דדרשו חז"ל בקצת שינוי ממה שנמצא במסורת שלפנינו, כגון (במדבר ז-א) כלות משה שדרשו חז"ל (במדב"ר יב-ח) כלת כתיב ובמסורה שלפנינו מלא, אבל הם ידעו שבמתיבתא עילאה נכתב חסר... ויש לי לומר שבכאן גם כן הוא כך, במתיבתא עילאה שם אין פחד מהחיצונים נכתב בכורי ענבים חסר, הכוונה על פי הנ"ל [רמז על סמאל], מה שאין כן במתיבתא תתאה לא יתכן לרמזו בפירוש והבן.

We learn from the Arizal the reason for the phenomenon of "kri u'chshiv"—the discrepancy between how a word is written and how it is pronounced. For, the Torah is elucidated by two distinct Yeshivos—the heavenly academy and the academy down on earth. There is no Satan in the heavenly academy, causing harm and confusion; hence, a word is pronounced as it is written. . . However, in the academy down below, the Torah's secrets must not be presented openly, such that they can be grasped readily by the masses.

This applies to all matters expounded by Chazal in a somewhat indirect fashion and which differ slightly from the "masores." He cites as an example the discrepancy regarding the word כלות. Although, according to tradition, it is written with a vav; in the heavenly academy it is written without a vav. We can suggest that the same holds true regarding the spelling of the word ענבים. In the heavenly academy, there is no fear of corruption and harm from the external forces—the "chitzonim"—therefore, it is written incompletely, without a yud—alluding to the name סמאל. In the academy down below, however, care must be taken not to present this allusion so openly and explicitly.

Now, it would seem that this explanation presented by the Bnei Yissaschar applies to the passuk in this week's parsha, as well: "ולבני הפילגשים". We saw that Rashi stated in the name of the Midrash that the word "הפלגשם" is written incompletely. We can suggest that he is referring to the sefer Torah in the heavenly academy; there "הפלגשם" is spelled deficiently, without the yuds. Yet, the academy down below follows the "masores" to write "הפילגשים" in our sifrei-Torah—the complete form, including the yuds. Nevertheless, it is still incumbent upon us to explain why there is a fear and inherent danger in the academy down below to write "פלגשם" in its incomplete form.

The Word "פלגשם" Can Be Broken down to Spell פלג-שם

I would like to propose an explanation based on an illuminating teaching presented in Kol Eliyahu (Chayei Sarah) in the name of the Gaon from Vilna, zy" a. He addresses Rashi's statement: "הפלגשם חסר כתיב, שלא היתה אלא פילגש אחת, היא הגר היא" —that "הפלגשם" was spelled deficiently to teach us that Avraham had, in truth, only one concubine, Keturah—Hagar. If so, why didn't the passuk simply write the word "פילגש", in the singular? Why go to the trouble of adding the final mem--'ם' — forcing the deletion of the letter yud in order to arrive at the elucidation above—that Hagar was the only concubine?

The matter can be explained based on the following Gemara (Sotah 17a): "דריש רבי עקיבא איש ואשה זכו שכינה ביניהן"—**Rabbi Akiva expounded: If a husband and wife are meritorious, the Shechinah is present between them.** Rashi provides the following clarification: "שכינה ביניהן, שהרי חלק את שמו ושיכנו ביניהן, יו"ד באיש וה"י באשה"—the letters י"ה from G-d's name are split between the man and the woman; the letter yud appears in the word אי"ש, while the letter hei appears in the word אש"ה. This still requires further explanation. After all, the letters י"ה only represent the first half of the holy name; the letters ו"ה are still absent.

The Gra explains that the sages instituted that a man write a "Kesubah" for his wife in order to provide the missing letters necessary to complete the holy name. The word כתוב"ה is composed of the root "כתב"—indicating the act of writing—with the addition of the missing letters ו"ה, necessary to complete the holy name. Thus, it turns out that by means of "kiddushin," a man and a woman become an אי"ש ואש"ה, potentially supplying the letters י"ה; the writing of the "Kesubah" supplies the letters ה"ו, completing the four letters of the holy name ה"ו"ה.

Now, we can comprehend the significance and connection between the beginning and end of Rashi's comment. He begins by stating that "הפלגשם" is spelled without a yud, indicating that Hagar was Avraham's only concubine. Yet, this still doesn't explain why the word "הפלגשם" appears with a final mem rather than the singular "הפילגש". To answer this question, Rashi immediately adds: "נשים בכתובה, פילגשים בלא" —"נשים בכתובה"—the relationship with a concubine involves "kiddushin" without a "Kesubah." Therefore, the man and woman become an אי"ש ואש"ה, supplying the letters י"ה, but they lack the ו"ה. Consequently, the word "הפלגשם" is employed, which is formed by the letters "פלג-שם" (meaning split-name), indicating that this couple only possesses half of the holy name. This completes the Gra's explanation.

Why Do We Only Find This Allusion Regarding Avraham?

Let us build upon the Gra's explanation. We find that the term for a concubine, פילגש, already appears in the Torah at the end of parshas Vayeirah in connection with Avraham's brother Nachor (Bereishis 22, 24): "ופילגשו ושמה ראומה"—**and his concubine whose name was Reumah.** So, why does this allusion appear specifically here regarding Avraham Avinu in the passuk: "ולבני הפילגשים נתן אברהם מתנות"? Specifically here the word "פלגשם" is spelled incompletely, teaching us that since they were married without a "Kesubah," they only possessed half of the holy name--פלג-שם— the two letters י"ה. This allusion does not appear previously in connection with Nachor.

It appears that we can resolve this issue based on a query posed by the great author of the Shu"t Noda B'Yehudah in Doresh L'Tziyon. The Gemara teaches (Yoma 28b): "קיים אברהם אבינו כל" —**Avraham Avinu observed all the precepts of the Torah.** According to the Rambam (Melachim 4, 4) only the King of Yisrael is permitted to take concubines; it is prohibited for an ordinary citizen to take a concubine. This falls under the general prohibition (Devarim 23, 18): "לא תהיה קדשה מבנות" —**there shall not be a promiscuous woman among the daughters of Yisrael.** So, how did Avraham transgress this precept by taking Hagar as a concubine?

I found a very nice idea in the sefer Mayim Yechezkel, authored by the great Rabbi Yechezkel Katzenbogen, ztz"l, which provides us with a reasonable explanation, based on what the Rambam writes concerning the laws of a king (ibid.): "וכן לוקח מכל גבול ישראל נשים ופלגשים, נשים בכתובה וקידושין, ופלגשים בלא"

כתובה ובלא קידושין, אלא ביחוד בלבד קונה אותה ומותרת לו, אבל ההדיוט אסור בפילגש—a king can take a wife with a “Kesubah” and “kiddushin,” and a concubine without a “Kesubah” and without “kiddushin”; he can acquire her merely by consorting with her; however, it is forbidden for an ordinary citizen to take a concubine.

It is explicitly clear that the prohibition for an ordinary citizen is only: “בלא כתובה ובלא קידושין”—without a “Kesubah” and without “kiddushin”—under those circumstances she is considered a promiscuous woman and is prohibited to all of Yisrael. Avraham, however, took Hagar by means of “kiddushin,” alBeis without a “Kesubah.” According to Jewish law this makes her a married woman in all regards. Hence, there is no tinge of prohibition even for an ordinary citizen vis-a-vis the negative command: “לא תהיה קדשה”.

Based on this notion, he explains the juxtaposition of Rashi’s comments. First, he states that Avraham took Hagar as a concubine. Addressing the issue of how Avraham, who was not a king, could take a concubine, Rashi goes on to explain: “נשים בכתובה, פילגשים בלא כתובה.” In other words, there are two types of concubines. A concubine without “kiddushin” and without a “Kesubah” is prohibited to a non-king. A concubine with “kiddushin” but without a “Kesubah” is permitted to a non-king. Avraham married Hagar with “kiddushin” without a “Kesubah.” This concludes his explanation.

Now, we can suggest that all of the concubines prior to Avraham fell into the category of no “kiddushin” and certainly no “Kesubah.” For, at that time, prior to the giving of the Torah, taking a concubine in that manner was not prohibited. On the other hand, Avraham Avinu, who observed all the precepts of the Torah, was the first person in history to innovate the concept of a concubine with “kiddushin” but without a “Kesubah.” Hence, he was the only one where the taking of a concubine was associated with one half of the holy name. This explains why the Torah presents the allusion specifically in association with Avraham: “ולבני הפלגשם”—written in an incomplete form—indicating that they only possessed פלג-שם, since they wed without a “Kesubah.”

The Reason Avraham Wed Keturah without a Kesubah

Notwithstanding, we have yet to explain why Avraham married Hagar as a concubine with “kiddushin” but without a “Kesubah.” In truth, we have learned that this is entirely

permissible for an ordinary citizen. Still, the sages instituted that a man write a “Kesubah” for his wife. The Gemara states (Yevamos 89a): “מאי טעמא תקינו לה רבנן כתובה כדי שלא תהא קלה בעיניו” —the “Kesubah” was instituted to insure that a husband does not take his obligations to his wife lightly and will not divorce her without just cause. Additionally, the Gemara teaches us (Yoma 28b): “קיים אברהם אבינו אפילו עירובי תבשילין”—Avraham observed even mitzvos that were rabbinically-ordained, such as “eiruv tavshilin.” This being the case, what prompted Avraham Avinu to take Hagar as a concubine without a “Kesubah”?

In order to answer this question, let us first present a minor difficulty regarding the Gra’s incredible idea—that by writing a “Kesubah”—an anagram for הוי—a man and a woman complete the four letters of the name הוי. In Likutei Shas (Yevamos 61b), the Arizal provides us with a reason as to why the halachah accords with Beis Hillel—who state that a person fulfills the mitzvah of “pru u’rvu” only after fathering a son and a daughter:

“הנה האדם ואשתו הם רומזים לשם י”ה, וכשיש לו בן הוא ו’, וכשיש לו בת הוא ה’, והרי הוי”ה שלם, ועל כן חייב אדם להסתכל ולהשתדל שיהיה לו בן ובת כמו בית הלל, וסימנך (שמות ט-כז) הוי”ה הצדיק.”

A man and his wife represent the name י”ה; when they have a son, he represents the letter vav; and when they have a daughter, she represents the letter hei; then the name הוי”ה is complete. Therefore, a man must strive to have a son and a daughter as per the view of Beis Hillel.

Thus, we find explicit sources stating that the addition of the two letters הוי”ה to the letters י”ה, to complete the holy name, is accomplished by the birth of a son and daughter. So, how is it possible that the Gra from Vilna, zy”a, who was well-versed and proficient in all aspects of the Torah, nevertheless purports that the completion of the holy name with the letters הוי”ה is accomplished by means of the “Kesubah”?

The Kesubah Supplies the Missing הוי”ה until the Birth of a Son and Daughter

Let us defend the view of the honorable Gra, zy”a, for he was undoubtedly aware of the fact that the birth of a son and daughter serves to complete the holy name. Yet, he was probably bothered by the fact that until that feat was accomplished, it seems improbable that a husband and wife would dwell together with only half of the holy name—the הוי”ה. Certainly

they deserve to have the entire name among them from the onset of their married life; and in the merit of the complete name existing between them, they would eventually merit the birth of a son and daughter. Therefore, he explains that even before a son and daughter are born, the holy name is completed temporarily by means of the “Kesubah”—the anagram for **כתב ה'ו**. Nevertheless, the primary and main completion of the name occurs only after the couple have successfully fulfilled the mitzvah of “pru u’rvu”—after a son and a daughter are born to them.

Thus, the “Kesubah” only acts as a temporary measure to supply the absent ה'ו. As to why it is still necessary to maintain the “Kesubah” even after a son and daughter are born, and the name has already been completed, we have learned from the Gemara: “שלא תהא קלה בעיניו להוציאה”—that a husband should not view his wife lightly and dismiss her without cause.

This coincides very nicely with an idea found in the sefer Ktov L’Chaim. This work, which discusses matters related to the “Kesubah,” states that writing a “Kesubah” according to halachic guidelines acts as a segulah for the man and his sons after him. This is alluded to by the following passuk (Devarim 12, 28): “שמור ושמעת את כל הדברים האלה אשר אנכי מצוך, למען ייטב לך” —**safeguard and listen to all these matters that I command you, in order that it be well with you and your children after you forever, when you do what is good and what is right in the eyes of Hashem, your G-d.**

In other words: “למען ייטב לך ולבניך אחריו עד עולם”—if you want to insure that things will be well with you and your children after you forever, it is advisable: “כ'י ת'עשה ה'טוב ו'הישר ב'עיני ה' אלקיך”—to write a proper **כתוב ה'**—as alluded to by the first letters of this passuk—that is what is good and right in the eyes of Hashem. According to what we have learned, we can suggest a reason for this segulah. Seeing as the “Kesubah” temporarily completes the holy name—as alluded to by rearranging the letters to form **כתב ה'ו**—therefore it serves as a marvelous segulah to complete the name by giving birth to sons and daughters, representing the permanent ה'ו.

We can now appreciate why Avraham married Hagar—Keturah—as a concubine by means of “kiddushin” but without a “Kesubah.” On the one hand, he did not want to marry her without “kiddushin,” since he observed all of the Torah’s precepts, and it is prohibited to cohabit with

a woman without “kiddushin.” On the other hand, HKB”H told him (Bereishis 21, 12): “כי ביצחק יקרא לך זרע”—your offspring will come from Yitzchak. Thus, he understood that any children he fathered from Hagar would not share or be entitled to any portion of the realm of kedushah. Therefore, he married her without a “Kesubah,” indicating that he did not wish to supply the absent letters ה'ו with her. For, children they would have together, would not carry his name and would not be entitled to any portion of kedushah.

Avraham Wished to Prevent the Klipos from Gaining Access to the Letters ה'ו

Continuing onward and upward along this exalted path, let us endeavor to explain the matter in greater depth. Concerning the battle with Amalek, it is written (Shemos 17, 16): “ויאמר” —**and he said, “For there is a hand on the throne of ה'”; Hashem maintains a war against Amalek from generation to generation.** Rashi provides the following clarification: “נשבע הקב”ה שאין שמו שלם ואין” —**HKB”H swears that His name is not whole and His throne is not whole until the name of Amalek is completely eradicated.** So long as Amalek exists, the two letters ה'ו will remain absent from the name Havaya, leaving only the letters ה'י.

The deeper significance of this matter is provided by the Arizal in his discussion of the “kadish.” The “chitzonim”—the external negative forces—possess a hold on the last two letters of the holy name, the ה'ו. For this reason, the eleven spices of the ketores were burned every day in the Beis HaMikdash. They were meant to abolish the chitzonim’s ability to draw from the sanctity of the two letters ה'ו, which possess a numerical equivalent of eleven (6+5). As for the first two letters of the holy name, the ה'י, their light and kedushah is too great and powerful; thus, the “chitzonim” have no hold on them. Consequently, so long as the name of Amalek exists, the holy name remains incomplete, due to the absence of the letters ה'ו—which are within the grasp of the Klipos.

Based on this understanding, the Arizal explains the purpose of the “kadish.” It is designed to eliminate the ability of the Klipos to draw from the two letters ה'ו. This is implicit in the formula of the “kadish”: “יתגדל ויתקדש שמייה רבא”. The two words “יתגדל ויתקדש” contain eleven letters, equal to ה'ו; it is our intent and desire to expand them and return them entirely to the realm of kedushah. Thus, when we utter these

words, we should have in mind that we pray that the holy name be enhanced and sanctified. The word שמי"ה represents a contraction of שם-יה—the half-name possessing only the two letters יה"י, as long as we are in galut. We pray: "שמיה רבא"—that the holy name should once again be large and whole, possessing all four of its letters.

This enlightens us to some small degree as to Avraham Avinu's deeper intention and purpose in marrying Hagar merely with "kiddushin" but without a "Kesubah." He understood through "ruach hakodesh" that he needed to take her as a wife in order to produce all of the other nations, as indicated by HKB"H's statement to him (Bereishis 17, 5): "ולא יקרא עוד" את שמך אברם והיה שמך אברהם כי אב המון גוים נתתיך, והפרתי אותך במאד—**your name shall no longer be called Avram, but your name shall be Avraham, for I have made you the father of a multitude of nations; I will make you most exceedingly fruitful, and I will make nations of you; and kings shall descend from you.** Rashi explains that this statement refers to all the nations that would descend from him. Nevertheless, he understood full well that it was his obligation to distinguish between the holy and the mundane, between the light and the darkness, and between Yisrael and the other nations—as HKB"H indicated to him: "כי ביצחק יקרא לך" זרע—your lineage will come specifically from Yitzchak.

As a result, Avraham cleverly married Hagar—Keturah—by means of "kiddushin" without a "Kesubah." In this manner, the name יה"י alone would rest upon them as man and woman; for, there was no fear that her children, who did not originate from the realm of kedushah, would be able to derive any benefit from the letters יה"י, due to the immensity of their light. On the other hand, as we have learned, they were able to draw from the force of the letters יה"י. Hence, a concern existed that if he would write her a "Kesubah," any sons she would bear would have access to the letters יה"י supplied by the "Kesubah." This is why he married her merely with "kiddushin" and without a "Kesubah."

This then is the interpretation of the passuk: "ויתן אברהם" את כל אשר לו ליצחק, ולבני הפילגשים אשר לאברהם—and Avraham

gave all of his possessions to Yitzchak, but to the sons of the פילגשים—written in its incomplete form to convey the circumstance of פלג-שם, that only half of the holy name, the יה"י prevailed in their home, since they were conceived from a marriage with "kiddushin" but without a "Kesubah"; נתן אברהם—Avraham gave them gifts consisting of the name of tumah; "וישלחם מעל יצחק בנו בעודנו חי קדמה אל ארץ קדם"—**then he sent them away from Yitzchak his son, while he was still alive, eastward to the land of the east**—so that they would not have any claim or part of his kedushah.

At this point, we can shed some light on a point raised earlier. We learned that in the academy down below in this world, a world where the "chitzonim" reign, especially during times of galut, the "masores" dictates that we write in our sifrei-Torah: "ולבני הפילגשים"—in its complete form, with both yuds. For, in this world, there is some concern and fear to write: "ולבני הפלגשים"—lest it become public knowledge that they are the offspring of a relationship with פלג-שם, providing them with a grasp, chas v'shalom, on the half-name יה"י. We conceal this reality by writing "הפילגשים" complete with its yuds. This is similar to the "masores" handed down in the earthly academy to write: "והימים ימי בכורי ענבים"—including the yud in the word ענבים, in order to conceal the allusion to the "samech-mem."

Nevertheless, in the heavenly academy, where the "chitzonim" are powerless, there is no fear of writing in a sefer Torah: "ולבני הפלגשים נתן אברהם מתנות"—where the word "פלגשים" appears incomplete without the yuds, indicating that those children were the product of a relationship possessing פלג-שם. For, they were born to Avraham and Hagar, who married with "kiddushin" but without a "Kesubah." Avraham did so, to insure that only the letters יה"י would be present among them without the letters יה"י. He knew that the "chitzonim" have no grasp on that half of the holy name. For this reason: "וישלחם מעל יצחק" בנו בעודנו חי קדמה אל ארץ קדם—he sent them eastward, far away from Yitzchak, to insure that they had no entitlement or access to his kedushah.

Donated by Dr. Ralph and Limor Madeb
Lealui neshmat Refael Gavriel Simcha Chaim Ben shulamit

To receive the mamarim by email: mamarim@shvileipinchas.com