



	Candles	Mincha	DafYomi	Shiur	Shachris	פרשיות: בהר-בחקתי
Friday	7:37	6:50/7:47				9:23
Shabbos		7:30	6:15	7:15	9:00	9:22
Sunday		7:50	7:30		7:30	9:21

IMPORTANCE OF ...

The Gemara (Gittin 38b) states that one who frees his slave transgresses the mitzvah of: לעולם בהם תעבדו. The Arugas HaBosem (11) asks: the Gemara (Temurah 4b) records a Machlokes between Abaye and Rava regarding those things which the Torah forbids. Abaye holds that every time the Torah says something should not be done, if one transgresses and does it anyway, the results may still be effective. For example, if one slaughters an animal on Shabbos, was the Shechita valid? Abaye says yes; Rava says no. If this is the case, then according to Rava, each attempt to free a slave should be completely ineffective, as doing so would violate לעולם בהם תעבדו. If so, how could one ever "successfully" free his slave and transgress, as the attempt would always be ineffective? Furthermore, what would Rava do with the Gemara (Bava Basra 137a) which states that if one says "All my property is given to Reuven (for a life-estate) and after Reuven's death to Shimon", R' Shimon b. Gamliel says that even if Reuven sells or disposes of the property, Shimon may not claim anything more than what Reuven leaves to him. R' Zeira adds that this is true, even if Reuven freed all the slaves, despite the fact that he violates לעולם בהם תעבדו by doing so. Thus, we see that illegally freeing the slaves is effective. However, the Gemara (Gittin ibid) also notes that according to R' Yishmael, the Posuk: לעולם בהם תעבדו is not an obligation (חובה) but serves rather as permission (רשות) to enslave someone born of the seven nations of Canaan who had been really slated for annihilation. As such, freeing a slave does not necessarily fall into the category of something about which the Torah states לא תעביד (do not do) and therefore even Rava could allow it to be effective.

QUESTION OF THE WEEK:

Which son who is סומך על שלחן אביו (depends on the support of his father) is permitted to keep his own Metzias and earnings?

ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:

(If 1 of 2 sons died from having a Bris, what should be done with a 3rd?)

The Avnei Nezer (י"ד 2:325) states that if the two first sons were both endangered as a result of their Bris, even though one recovered, a 3rd son should not be given a Bris because a (partial) Chazakah exists that these boys will be endangered, but no Chazakah exists that they will recover from the danger.

DIN'S CORNER:

One may not cause a utensil to become muktze on Shabbos. Since the normal use of a utensil is established at the onset of Shabbos, if the utensil were suddenly used with muktze, or became otherwise unusable, this would constitute being Mevatel Kli MeHeichano – invalidating its use. Thus, one may not place clothing over a spill on the floor if the clothing would become unwearable as a result. However, one may place rags or napkins there, as this is their purpose. (Shemiras Shabbos K'Hilchaso 22:n47)

DID YOU KNOW THAT ...

The Gemara (Kidushin 53a) derives from the description of Maaser Sheni as לך הוא קודש לך that one may not use it to betroth a wife, even though one takes it to Yerushalayim and eats it there. The Gemara (Bava Metzia 88a) states that the stores in Beis Hino were destroyed three years before the Churban because its merchants and residents tried to get out of separating Maaser Sheni from produce that they bought and sold, claiming that the Torah restricts Maaser Sheni separation to that which one grows for himself to eat; not that which one buys or sells. However, since the Rabanan added the requirement that Maaser Sheni be separated before one sold or bought produce as well, Beis Hino was punished for trying to "hide" behind the Torah's Drasha. The Kehilas Yaakov (Bava Metzia 48) derives from the words of the Rashba that when the Torah exempted a buyer, it did not mean someone who was a guest at another's table. The food served to him would not be deemed "sold" to him and he was therefore obligated to separate Maaser before eating of it. Rabbeinu Yonah disagreed, and the Rema (אה"ע 28:17) concurred, ruling that a guest could use the portion served to him to betroth a wife. However, the Taz asks, does not the Shulchan Aruch (או"ח 170:19) rule that a guest may not take his portion and give it to the host's child or servant? Does this not indicate that a guest does not acquire his portion to do with as he pleases? The Be'er Heitev cites the MaHarshal who distinguishes as follows: food that is brought to the table for everyone, before each individual is served, remains the host's and no one has any ownership rights in it. A guest may therefore not take of this food and serve the host's family. However, once an individual is given his portion, he may betroth with it and may even give it to the host's family member or servant, without the host's permission.

A Lesson Can Be Learned From:

After the Malbim left the town of Mohilov, the community was not in a hurry to find a replacement. Several years went by until the leaders heard that R' Yoshe Ber was leaving Slutsk. When they approached him and offered him the post of Rav, he immediately turned them down. Feeling insulted, they asked why he was so quick to decide. R' Yoshe Ber replied that Mohilov was indeed a wonderful place and it would be an honor to hold the position once held by the Malbim. However, he recalled some advice he had once heard, where a person looking to marry a widow was advised to marry one that had been recently widowed. Such a woman feels lost, without a partner, a breadwinner, someone to make Kiddush and Havdalah for her etc... She will definitely appreciate being remarried. A woman who has been widowed a long time has already settled in and knows she can survive quite well without a husband. A community is the same. If their Rav has been gone only a short time, they would still feel the need for one. As Mohilov has been without a Rav for a while, it undoubtedly believes it can do without.

P.S. Sholosh Seudos sponsored this week by the Fuerst family.