



	Candles	Mincha	DafYomi	Shiur	Shacharis
Friday	4:10	4:22	7:30	7:30	
Shabbos		4:10	3:25	3:50	9:00
Sunday		4:24			7:30

IMPORTANCE OF

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, all her sons would be *bona fide* Jews - 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 ויצילהו 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 saving Yosef even though he only thought to, he would have realized that they were deemed **ישראלים** and that Yosef was right.

QUESTION OF THE WEEK:

May one be a waiter in a non-kosher restaurant, serving Jews?

ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:

(May a teacher take off knowing that the substitute will be less effective?)

Rema (י"ד 246:6) rules that a woman is exempt from teaching *Torah*. As such, the absence of a female teacher cannot be held accountable for **ביטול תורה**. A male teacher would be held accountable, but if the substitute prevents **ביטול תורה**, even if he is not as effective, the teacher may take off. (*במראה הבזק* 2:181)

DIN'S CORNER:

One is not **ייצא** the *mitzvah* of lighting Chanukah candles with an electric Menorah. If he has nothing else, he should light it without a *brocho*, and hope that later he will find a proper wick and oil. The *Shul* Menorah may also not be electric. If one cannot light himself and must say the *brocho* of **הרואה**, he may not do so on an electric Menorah. (*Yechave Daas* 4:38).

DID YOU KNOW THAT

The *Rambam* (*גיולה* 13:3) rules that one may not return a lost item unless the claimant identifies it with a **סימן מובהק** - a clear and definitive mark, such as size, weight or quantity. R' Shlomo Kluger states in *האלף לך שלמה* (82) that 2 lesser **סימנים** are not conclusive, but if one has 3 lesser **סימנים**, since 3 represents a **סימן מובהק**, they are the cumulative equivalent of a **סימן מובהק**. For this reason, Tamar sent three **סימנים** to Yehudah - the seal, garment and staff, to identify her as his **קדשה**. The *Midrash* states that Yehudah initially rejected her claim, until she said **נא הכר נא**. The *Gemara* (*Yevamos* 120b) explains that with items that are lendable, even a **סימן מובהק** is not conclusive, because the claimant might be its borrower, not its owner. However, Tamar's response could have been based on the *Gemara* (*Bava Metzia* 29b), forbidding a borrower from lending the item in his/her care. Since the **קדשה** had received the 3 items from Yehudah as collateral, she was bound to guard them and not lend them out. Still, since one of the items was a garment, it could have been lent out in order to fulfill the *mitzvah* of *Tzitzis*, as *Chazal* say that one is pleased if his property is used for a *mitzvah* (see *MB* 14:13). The *Gemara* (*Menachos* 44a) describes how a man was dissuaded from doing an **עבירה** because his *Tzitzis* hit him in the face, showing how a *mitzvah* can save one from **עבירה**, but only at the time of the *mitzvah*. Yehudah believed he was not prevented by his *Tzitzis* from meeting with the **קדשה**, since their night-meeting was not a **זמן מצוה** of *Tzitzis*. However Tamar, as a woman, was not bound by the *mitzvah* of *Tzitzis*, if it was time-restricted to day. As such, she could argue that she had 3 non-lendable **סימנים**, which proved her identity. However, according to the opinion that *Tzitzis* may be fulfilled at night, women would be bound by it, rendering the garment **סימן** lendable. But if night is also a **זמן מצוה**, why didn't the *Tzitzis* prevent their liaison? It must be that the liaison with her was proper **יבום** and not **אנות**.

A Lesson Can Be Learned From:

A young man was being swayed by the winds of *Haskalah* and R' Shneur Zalman of Liadi (the *Baal HaTanya*) spoke to him at length, warning him how exposure to his "enlightened" friends would draw him after them and bring ruin to his soul. The young man replied with arrogance that he didn't believe himself to be so easily swayed. After all, he had been hanging around with the *Rebbe*'s Chasidim for some time and yet, he had resisted becoming a Chasid himself. The *Rebbe* replied that there was a significant difference. The *Gemara* (*Zevachim* 97a) states that if food comes into contact with a *Korban Chatas*, the food becomes sanctified from the association, if the *Chatas* connection is somehow absorbed into the food. On the other hand, if food touches something **טמא**, the mere touch is sufficient to render it **טמא** as well. Thus, we see that bad influences contaminate much more easily than positive influences. "Your resistance to Chasidus is therefore no guarantee that you will be safe from the sway of *Haskalah*!"

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