



	Candles	Mincha	DafYomi	Shiur	Shacharis
Friday	4:11	4:23	7:30	8:10	
Shabbos		4:10	3:10	3:45	9:00
Sunday		4:25	5:00		7:30

IMPORTANCE OF

The *Gemara* (*Bava Basra* 16b) says that Yaakov was cooking red עדשים (lentils) because Avrohom had died, and it was the custom for an אבל (Yitzchok) to eat עדשים. *Rashi* adds that since Aisav began his life of sin that day, *Hashem* caused Avraham to die, rather than witness his grandson's behavior. R' Shlomo Kluger asks, the הגהות אשר"י in *Moed Katan* (פ"ג) states that Rabbeinu Gershon sat *Shiva* 14 days for his son who had been דעת ממיר (denied *Hashem*), immediately upon his becoming a מומר. If so, since Aisav had also become a מומר that day, denying עולם הבא and תחיית המתים, perhaps Yitzchok was sitting *Shiva* for that, and as such, we have no proof that Avrohom died that day. He answers that עדשים are a food specifically associated with death, and not simply with sitting *Shiva*. As such, the אבלות must have been for Avrohom's death. Besides, the *Rosh* says that when a רשע dies, the proper thing to do is celebrate, as the *Posuk* says: באבוד רשעים רנה, and not sit *Shiva*. (Dovid HaMelech sat *Shiva* for Avshalom, even though he was רשע because he had not sinned להכניס - for spite, but out of ambition.) Shouldn't the same be true regarding one who becomes a מומר? However, the *Bais Yosef* (י"ד 345) explains that when Rabbeinu Gershon sat *Shiva*, it was to soothe some of his own pain by mourning the fact that his son had not utilized the opportunity to do *Teshuvah*. Apparently, such an אבלות might be permitted. However at death, the *Rosh* maintains that if he died a רשע, he must suffer a little after burial before death provides him with enough כפרה to warrant אבלות. Since the opportunity for אבלות begins at burial time, the fact that a mourner could not begin it then, removes the possibility for it forever, under the rule of כיון שנדחה נדחה.

QUESTION OF THE WEEK:

What minimum שיעור, sufficient for one person, also acceptable for two, but only if they act consecutively, not together?

ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:

(Why do we say ישמע בערי יהודה and not all cities of *Eretz Yisroel*?)

The *Shitah Mekubetzes* (*Kesubos* 7b) quotes a *Yerushalmi* which says that when Aisav disputed Yaakov's right to MeOras HaMachpela, Yehudah killed him. As a result, when Aisav later achieved dominion over *Eretz Yisroel*, they decreed that all girls of Yehudah submit to the סרדיוט (governor) before marriage. To evade this decree, weddings in Yehudah were made quietly. The *Nusach* was therefore established to pray that the decree be abolished, and that once again the sounds of a *Chasunah* be heard in the cities of Yehudah. (R' Avrohom Gottesman)

DIN'S CORNER:

If a group is traveling in several vehicles, and one of them breaks down requiring a small delay, all must wait until it is fixed. If the wait will be unusually long, they need not wait. (*Kitzur* 189:6)

DID YOU KNOW THAT

The *Gemara* (*Gittin* 23a) explains that a blind man is ineligible to deliver a *Get* because he cannot testify with certainty as to the identities of the husband or wife involved. Rav Yosef asks, if so, how is a blind man permitted to live with his wife if he can't see her, and how may anyone know for certain that they are with their spouse where it is difficult to see, such as at night? We must conclude that one is normally able to identify their spouse through טביעות עינא דקלא - voice recognition, which applies equally to sighted and blind people alike. As such, why couldn't the blind *Get* agent ascertain the identities of the husband and wife this way as well? The *Gemara* therefore concludes that since the agent must say בפני נכתב ובפני נחתם - [the *Get*] was written and signed before me, a blind man is disqualified because he could not witness such an act. The *Shevus Yaakov* (1:100) was asked to rule in a situation where two men witnessed a beating and murder from a distance. They were unable to identify the victim by appearance but they heard his pleas for mercy and were certain that it was the husband of a woman who was now asking for a *P'sak* that her husband had died. Acknowledging that טביעות עינא דקלא is an acceptable premise dating back as far as Yitzchok's statement: הקול קול יעקב, the *Shevus Yaakov* distinguished between a situation where there was potentially conflicting evidence - such as where the witnesses testified that his appearance was not consistent with his voice, and where there was no such conflict, such as in his case. Nevertheless, the *Shevus Yaakov* was reluctant to rule alone in her favor, since this was a case of first impression for him. If she was able to secure similar rulings from 2 other *Poskim*, he would gladly join them.

A Lesson Can Be Learned From:

A man came to see R' Elimelech of Lizensk with a problem. He had a daughter of marriageable age but he had no money with which to provide a dowry. Fortunately, *Hashem* had been kind enough to send her a worthy *Chasan* from a fine family, who was satisfied to marry her without a dowry. However, the Austrian Kaiser had levied a marriage tax of 400 gold pieces on every girl who wished to marry. To pay such a large sum was impossible for most of the people, and many girls were growing older with little hope. He wished to call *Hashem* to a *Din Torah* over this. R' Elimelech told him to call two more *Dayanim* and they would hold the *Din Torah*. The petitioner stated his case, how the first *mitzvah* in the *Torah* was פרו ורבו, which they were effectively barred from fulfilling unless *Hashem* caused the decree to be voided. R' Elimelech asked that a *Gemara Gittin* be brought, where he showed the other two *Dayanim* how the *Gemara* deals with a half-slave's marriage prospects. He cannot marry a gentile maid because he is half Jewish; he cannot marry a Jewess because he is half-slave. "Therefore, the *Gemara* says: כופין את רבו - we force his master to free him entirely!" A few days later, the tax was abolished.

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