



	Candles	Mincha	DafYomi	Shiur	Shachris	פרשת: מקץ- חנוכה	סזק"ש
Friday	4:09	4:19	7:30				9:28
Shabbos		4:09	3:35	4:00	9:00		9:28
Sunday		4:20	5:30		8:00		9:29

IMPORTANCE OF

The Gemara (Shabbos 23a) quotes R' Yehoshua b. Levi who says that women are obligated in the mitzvah of Chanukah candles because: **אף הן היו באותו הנס**. Rashi explains that 1) women also suffered from harsh decrees and were saved; 2) women brought about the salvation. R' Yehoshua makes a similar statement in Pesachim (108a), requiring women to drink Arba Kosos on Pesach because **אף הן היו באותו הנס**. There, Rashi explains that the נשים צדקניות are credited with bringing about the Geulah, which is reason #2 above. R' Yehoshua also cites **אף הן היו באותו הנס** as the reason to obligate women in hearing Megilas Esther (Megilah 4a), where Rashi explains that the women were also under Haman's decree of annihilation, and were saved – reason #1 above. It would seem that in both Pesachim and Megilah, the other reason would also be applicable. Women certainly suffered from Egyptian slavery, and the miracle of Purim came about through the efforts of Esther. Why did Rashi not mention these? The Sefas Emes (Megilah 4a) suggests that there is a Halachic distinction between the two reasons. According to reason #1, since women were equally subjugated, their obligation is equal to that of the men, and as such, a woman could theoretically be מוציא men in the reading of the Megilah. But according to reason #2, women should really not be obligated in a time-dependent mitzvah. It is only because they were responsible for the salvation that they are given the mitzvah as a "gift". As such, they could not be מוציא a man. The Rivevos Ephraim (4:157) states that regarding Chanukah, both reasons are mentioned, since a) there were two women (אף הן) credited - Yehudis and Miriam (wife of Herod, see Rashi on Rif in Pesachim), plus, b) women are still able to be מוציא men because of their own suffering. On Pesach, it is understood that no one could be מוציא another with drinking the Arba Kosos. As such, only the נשים צדקניות reason is relevant and is sufficient as a basis. On Purim, since only one woman – Esther – was involved, the words אף הן (plural) would not support an explanation based on one woman's efforts to save Klal Yisroel. As such, only the reason of equal subjugation is mentioned.

QUESTION OF THE WEEK:

Why doesn't Al Hanisim for Purim also state that Chazal were קובע Purim for ... 'משתה ושמחה וכו' similar to Chanukah?

ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:

(How can we light a wick with a Shamash, if we can't combine 2 wicks?) The פסול of a Medurah (2 wicks) is that it looks like a non-mitzvah private flame. Such an appearance does not manifest until the Hadlakah act is finished, and they are burning together.

DIN'S CORNER:

If one forgot to say ותן טל ומטר in the brocho of בריך עלינו, it is best to add it in the brocho of שמע קולנו. Failing that, as long as he has not said: יהי לרצון אמרי פי or stepped back, he may return to בריך עלינו and continue on from there. One may say כל מיני תבראתה 90 times to establish a Chazakah. (MB 114:40)

DID YOU KNOW THAT

The Midrash (Shir HaShirim Rabah 1:21) expounds on the Posuk: **עליון על כל המשקין**, describing oil as: **לריח שמנך טובים** – rising to the top (i.e. floating) over all beverages. Mishneh Halachos (3:23) cites a Sefer (ידי משה) which states that the author conducted an experiment, combining oil with יין שרף - alcoholic spirits, and found that the oil did not rise to the top. As such, he concluded, based on this Midrash, that alcoholic spirits are not deemed a משקה, since the Midrash stated that oil rose above **all** משקין. If so, one should not be permitted to recite Kiddush over יין שרף. Apparently, the ידי משה held that the word **כל** meant **all**, without exception. However, this would seem to be a Machlokes HaPoskim. The Taz (או"ח 582:3) quotes the Levush, who considers the word "כולו" in **כל העולם כולו** redundant, since it already says **כל**. However, the Taz himself opines that **כל** could mean **רוב** (most), requiring כולו to establish that here, Hashem rules over the **entire** world. In fact, **כל** could very well be a Machlokes Rishonim, since the Ibn Ezra comments on the Posuk: **ויקבוצ את כל אוכל שבע שנים**, that Yosef did not collect **all** the food, since that would mean that everyone else would die of starvation. Rather, he collected **כל** - most of the food. The Ramban disagrees, understanding **כל** to mean **all** of the food, which Yosef held and then distributed as necessary. (But see Rashi on ותרעב) It may possibly be a Machlokes Tanaim as well, where the Gemara (Bechoros 3a) discusses the Halachos of a Bechor (first-born animal) owned jointly by a Jew and non-Jew. R' Yehudah applies the laws of a Bechor to it, and the Rabanan do not. The Gemara explains that they argue over the interpretation of the word **כל** in the Posuk: **הקדשתו לי כל בכור**. R' Yehudah holds that the word **בכור** implies a first-born belonging entirely to a Jew. The word **כל** comes to add where the Jew owns any part of the animal. The Rabanan, on the other hand, hold that **בכור** means a first-born that enjoys any Jewish ownership – even partial ownership. The word **כל** then comes to denote **all** – that its entire ownership must be Jewish, for the laws of Bechor to apply.

A Lesson Can Be Learned From:

When the Chofetz Chaim was a young man, he found himself on the road as Shabbos approached. He stopped at the nearest village and made arrangements to spend Shabbos there. As he had a sizable sum of money on him, he went to the Rav of the town and asked him to hold the money for him until Motzai Shabbos. When the Rav agreed, the Chofetz Chaim asked him for a receipt. The Rav said he could be trusted and refused to give him a receipt. After arguing a little, the Chofetz Chaim left the money without a receipt. As soon as Shabbos was over, the Chofetz Chaim said "A Guta Voch" to the Rav and walked out. The Rav called after him: "Come for your money. Did you forget it?" The Chofetz Chaim said: "No, but since you didn't give me a receipt, as the Halacha requires, I gave it to you as a gift, which does not need a receipt". Only when the Rav promised that he would give receipts in the future, did the Chofetz Chaim take the money back.

P.S. A Hartzlich Mazel Tov to the Kagan family upon the Bar Mitzvah of their son Avi. May they enjoy much Yiddishe Nachas from all their children. Sholosh Seudos sponsored this week by the Kagan family.

This issue is dedicated:

לז"נ פערל ב"ר יצחק הלוי ולז"נ אברהם ב"ר יעקב חיים

Dedications (\$18) and appreciations may be sent to: Kehilas Prozdor, 8 GreenHill Lane, Spring Valley, N.Y. 10977 (845) 354-7240
As this contains Divrei Torah and partial Pesukim, it should be treated with proper respect, both during and after use