



	Candles	Mincha	Daf Yomi	Shachris	סוק"ש
Friday	4:09	4:19			9:29
Shabbos		1:45/4:09	3:30	9:00	9:29
Sunday		4:19	4:45	8:00	9:30

**IMPORTANCE OF ....**

The Gemara (Gittin 21b) states that if a man hands his wife a *Get* on condition: שלא תשתי יין - that she not drink wine, or on condition: שלא תלכי לבית אביך that she not go to her father's house, if the condition's term is only for 30 days, the divorce is valid; if the term is forever, the divorce is invalid because the husband retains a non-expiring control over her, which is incompatible with the intended severance of a *Get*. *Tosafos* asks, surely if the father sells his house or dies, the condition will no longer hang over her, as the house will no longer be his. As such, since it can expire, why should it not be a valid *Get*? The *Rashba* suggests that the simple meaning of the condition was to forbid her to enter the house that was currently owned or occupied by her father, but that the איסור was to exist forever, regardless of any later developments, such as the father dying or selling it. The *MaHarsha* opines that the איסור will travel with the father, so that if he sells the first house and buys a second, the איסור then applies to the second. However, *Tosafos* is unwilling to concede that the words בית אביך in the context of a *Get* condition refer to a physical house or property. Instead, he suggests that the phrase "בית אבינו" is generally used to point to and include offspring, which means that as long as there is family, בית אבנו continues to exist. In fact, the father himself need not be alive, as the *Posuk*: שבי אלמה בית אביך (return as a widow to your father's house) indicates, since Tamar was the daughter of Shem, who was no longer alive when Yehudah told her to return to her father's house. This would apply to keep the condition active, even if the father sold the house, or never owned a house, since it refers to family, and not a physical structure.

**QUESTION OF THE WEEK:**

What may one not do on Chanukah that one may do on *Shabbos* and *Yom Tov*?

**ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:**

(Why are we not concerned with זוגות on *Shabbos* for *Lechem Mishneh*?) The *Meforshim* explain that זוגות are not a problem on *Shabbos* because *Mazikin* (demons) have no dominion on *Shabbos*, and that שלוחי מצוה are in any case, protected, especially if *Lechem Mishnah* is Scriptural. The *Sefer Mafsekin* איגרי (2) cites a suggestion that the problem of זוגות would only apply where one is under an obligation to consume a pair of *Challos*. However, the *mitzvah* of *Lechem Mishneh* may very well be fulfilled with the consumption of only one of the two *Challos*, and require merely that two *Challos* be present on the table when the *brocho* is said.

**DIN'S CORNER:**

Those who wait 72 minutes to end *Shabbos* all year, as is proper for *Bnei Torah* and *Yirei Shomayim*, should do so on *Motzaei Shabbos* Chanukah as well, before lighting Chanukah candles afterwards. (*Igros Moshe* אור"ח 4:62) But those who wait 72 minutes only on occasion, should not do so on *Motzaei Shabbos* Chanukah. (R' Shlomo Zalman Auerbach *ZTL*, quoted in *Shevus Yitzchak*, p. 75)

**DID YOU KNOW THAT ....**

The Gemara (*Kidushin* 39b) describes how a boy was sent up a tree by his father to perform the *mitzvah* of שילוח הקן. Despite having thus fulfilled two *mitzvos* whose reward is אריכת ימים, the boy fell during his descent and died. The Gemara suggests that perhaps the boy had a sinful thought at that moment, and died as a result. But the conclusion is that a sinful thought without a sinful deed is not held against a person. *Tosafos* adds that this is not the case with idolaters, where a sinful thought is held against the thinker as a deed, but a good thought is not given credit, as it is for a Jew. *Rashi* in *Chumash* explains that Yosef reported to Yaakov how the brothers degraded the sons of Bilhah and Zilpah, calling them slaves. *Binyan Ariel* explains the relative positions of Yosef and the brothers as dependent on whether they were still considered בני נח (non-Jews) or if they were already considered ישראלים. If they were Jews, as Yosef maintained, then Yaakov would certainly not have married a forbidden שפחה without first converting her. As such, her sons would be *bona fide* Jews, and not slaves. The brothers held that they were still בני נח and as Yaakov was thus permitted to marry a שפחה, her sons would remain slaves. The *Midrash* (בהר 34:9) says that if Reuven had known that the *Torah* would later describe and write about him: וישמע ראובן ויצילו מידם, he would have picked up Yosef on his shoulders and carried him back to Yaakov. Was Reuven so media-conscious? Should he not have saved Yosef regardless? However, Reuven did not know whose characterization of their status was correct - Yosef's (in which case he should be saved), or the brothers' (which made Yosef חייב מיתה), so he did nothing. If Reuven had known that the *Torah* would give him credit for having saved Yosef even though he had only intended to, he would have realized that this proves they were deemed ישראלים and that Yosef was right.

**A Lesson Can Be Learned From:**

R' Yerucham Yehudah Leib Pearlman, known throughout most of his life as the *Gadol* from Minsk, had established a reputation as an *Iluy* while still a young boy. When he was 11 years old, his father took him to see R' Yaakov Meir of Padua, who was interested in the boy's development. R' Yaakov asked Yerucham what was being studied currently in the *Beis HaMidrash*. Yerucham replied that the *Kollel* men and older *bachurim* were discussing the topic of ערי מקלט - where the Gemara says that in and near the city of Gilad, murderers were commonly found. They disagreed over the meaning of the *MaHarsha's* comment on this *Gemara*. R' Yaakov asked what each side held, and Yerucham told him. "And what do you think?" asked R' Yaakov. Yerucham replied that he didn't see the need to spend so much time arguing over the words of an *Acharon* (contemporary) that were written cryptically, especially when it concerned an *Aggadic* statement that had no Halachic significance. Imagine how much "real" learning could have been done during that time. R' Yaakov gently chastised the young boy, explaining to him that analyzing the words of the *MaHarsha* on such a topic has value in helping us to understand how the *MaHarsha's* mind works. We must know that because one of the rules we live by is אחרי רבים להטות - follow the majority. Without understanding their cryptic comments, we might never know what the majority says.

**P.S.** Sholosh Seudos sponsored this week by the Sternberg family.

This issue is dedicated:

לע"נ אברהם ב"ר יעקב חיים

ולע"נ אבי מורי הרב אהרן זאב ב"ר שמואל ולע"נ אמי מורתי מלכה ב"ר יהודה לייבוש הלוי

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

ולע"נ פערל ב"ר יצחק הלוי ולע"נ רבקה ב"ר מנחם מאיר