



	Candles	Mincha	DafYomi	Shiur	Shachris	ש"ס זק"ש
Friday	4:17	4:29	7:45			9:15
Shabbos		4:17	3:30	4:00	9:00	9:16
Sunday		4:20	5:00		7:30	9:16

IMPORTANCE OF

The *Gemara* (*Kesubos* 50a) states that in the city of Usha, a decree was enacted prohibiting one from being **מבזבז** - spending more than 20% of his assets, so that he doesn't end up being dependent on others for survival. This figure is derived from the *Posuk*: **עשר אעשרנו לך**, where 2 times **עשר** (a tenth) = 20%. *Rashi* explains that this restriction only applies to **עניים** - i.e. *Tzedaka*, based presumably on the words of *Chazal*: **חייך קודמין** - that one's own welfare take precedence over that of another. However, with regard to other *mitzvos*, the decree does not restrict one's expenditures. *Rambam* (*ערכין* 8:13) rules that one should not spend more than 20% on "*mitzvos*" - all *mitzvos*. The *Gemara* (*Beitzah* 21a) relates how Shimon of Taimon did not come to the *Beis HaMedrash* one *Yom Tov* evening, and the next morning, at *Shacharis*, R' Yehuda b. Bava asked him why. Shimon answered that soldiers had invaded his city and had threatened to ransack it, but they had slaughtered a calf for them, fed them, and sent them on their way. R' Yehuda replied: "I wonder if perhaps you have lost more than you have saved, since you were not permitted to prepare food on *Yom Tov* for non-Jews, as the *Torah* says: **יעשה לכם**, implying only for yourselves and not for non-Jews". It appears that according to R' Yehudah, the people in Shimon's city were obligated to give up all their assets to fulfill the *mitzvah* of **יעשה לכם** properly, and not just 20%. How would the *Rambam* explain this *Gemara*? The *MaHarsham* (5:54) suggests that the *mitzvah* under discussion here involves the possible *Chilul* of *Shabbos* and *Yom Tov*, which are compared by *Chazal* to *Avodah Zarah*. Everyone agrees that one must spend all he has rather than transgress *Avodah Zarah*.

DID YOU KNOW THAT

The *Gemara* (*Yevamos* 39b) states that originally, when men performed *Yibum* (levirate marriage) **לשמה** - for the sake of the *mitzvah*, *Yibum* took precedence over *Chalitzah* (the freeing ritual). Today however, when people marry for non-*mitzvah* reasons, *Chalitzah* takes precedence. As Abba Shaul said, when one marries a *Yevamah* because of her beauty, or because he wishes to be married, or for some other (non-*mitzvah* related) reason, it is almost a forbidden marriage and any child born is close to being a *Mamzer*. The *Shevus Yaakov* (3:135) states that Abba Shaul was only speaking of a situation where there was no respectable intention at all. However, if he wishes to perform the *mitzvah* and is also attracted by beauty or money, he does not fall into the category of: ... **הנושא אשה לשם ממון**. Where the offspring are destined to be **אינם מהוגנים** (unworthy). Otherwise, how are we to understand the *Pesukim* which indicate that Yaakov married Rochel because she was **ויפת מראה**? Would that not suggest that Yosef and Binyomin were **אינם מהוגנים**? Obviously, just as we see that today, when men marry based on personal interest, their children are considered **מהוגנים**, it must be that a combination of motives is acceptable. As such, even today, when a man comes prepared to perform *Chalitzah*, since we see that he does not have a personal interest in the *Yevamah*, *Beis Din* should be allowed to encourage him to perform *Yibum* instead. In particular, where an unmarried *Yavam* suffers from a disability in his right foot that precludes *Chalitzah*, he should be allowed to perform *Yibum*. Otherwise, the *Yevamah* would remain an *Agunah* forever.

QUESTION OF THE WEEK:

Which 2 things are generally done together; both require a *minyan*, but without a *minyan*, only one is done?

ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:

(Must a person eating alone say *Torah* at the meal?)

The *Mishna Berurah* (170:1) implies that one should, to remove the **זבחי מתים** characterization. However, the *Tiferes Yisroel* on the *Mishna* (*Avos* 3:3) presumes that one (or 2) eating alone is in a hurry and can't wait for a **מזומן**. As such, he need not say **תורה**.

DIN'S CORNER:

The right to choose who will be the *Mesader Kidushin* at a wedding depends on the custom in the area. Although the *Mesader* is being **מוציא** the *Chasan* with the **ברכות ארוסין**, some have the *minhag* that the right to choose is given to the side that is paying for the *Chasunah*. (*Teshuvos V'Hanhagos* 2:637)

A Lesson Can Be Learned From:

The *Rosh HaKolel* in Brisk was a big *Talmid Chochom* named R' Aryeh Leib. A wealthy man in Brisk wished to arrange a *Shidduch* between his son and R' Aryeh Leib's daughter. However, R' Aryeh Leib was looking for a potential *Talmid Chochom* for his daughter, and the rich man's son did not measure up. The wealthy man persisted, promising to pay off all of R' Aryeh Leib's and the *Kolel's* debts, to buy the couple a house and various other incentives. R' Aryeh Leib saw that it would not be easy to dissuade him so he sent a message with the *Shadchan* that since R' Yehuda HaChasid forbade a *Shidduch* where the *Chasan* and father-in-law have the same name, this *Shidduch* could not work. The wealthy man pointed out that their names were not the same. R' Aryeh Leib replied: "The *Gemara* (*Pesachim* 49a) states that if one marries his daughter off to an *Am HaAretz*, it is as if he ties her up and leaves her before a lion. If I married off my daughter to an *Am HaAretz*, her husband would be a '*Leib*' (lion in Yiddish), which is my name as well!"

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