



	Candles	Mincha	DafYomi	Shiur	Shachris	ש"ש
Friday	4:13	4:25	7:40			9:19
Shabbos		4:13	3:25	3:50	9:00	9:20
Sunday		4:20	5:00		7:30	9:20

IMPORTANCE OF

The Gemara (Berachos 34b) states the opinion of Rav Kahane that **הצפף עלי מאן דמצלי בבקתא** - it is arrogant for someone to daven in a valley. Rashi explains that it is only in a secluded place that one will feel **אימת המלך** - the fear of Hashem and thereby be able to daven with proper humility. Tosafos asks: the Posuk says **ויצא יצחק לשוח בשדה** - Yitzchok went out to the field to daven. Was this not an open space, like a valley? Tosafos answers that it was Har HaMoriah, which according to the Gemara (Pesachim 88a), was referred to as a **שדה** by Yitzchok. How does this help? Was not Har HaMoriah still an open, public space? The Mishna (Avodah Zara 45a) states that every peak in Eretz Yisroel was at one time, without a doubt the site of Avodah Zara. Tosafos quotes the Yerushalmi which notes that even though we have a Drasha that renders mountain peaks to be **מותר בהנאה** in spite of the Avodah Zara worshipped there, still, could the Beis HaMikdash be built on such a place? The Yerushalmi answers that the Beis HaMikdash was built by a **נביא**. R' Noson Adler (cited in Chasam Sofer - אור"ח 19:4) explains that the Midrash describes how when Avrohom & Yitzchok came near to Har HaMoriah, they saw it from afar, implying that it was a valley at that time. Avrohom felt it wasn't befitting a king to be honored in a valley so he davened for a **נס** and the valley changed into a mountain. Thus, as a valley, it hadn't been worshipped, and when it turned into a mountain, Avrohom had immediately acquired it. As such, any subsequent worship had no effect on it, since one cannot render another's property into forbidden Avodah Zara. So too, as a valley, it was improper for davening. But as a mountain, fit for a king's honor, it had the requisite **אימת המלך** and was therefore appropriate.

QUESTION OF THE WEEK:

When would someone, making Kiddush on Shabbos, be unable to be **מוציא** others because of what he is making Kiddush over?

ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:

(Whom should one save: a man about to be killed or a **נערה המאורסה**?)

The Sfas Emes (Yuma 82b) states that when faced with such a choice, he should save the man about to be killed. That way, only one life will be lost (the **רודף's**) and one **Aveirah** (ג"ע) committed. Otherwise, saving the **נערה המאורסה** will result in 2 lives lost (the **רודף's** and the **נרצח's**), plus an **Aveirah** of **דמים**.

DIN'S CORNER:

Although the Thanksgiving holiday appears to be a non-religious secular event, there is a possibility that its origins are idolatrous in nature. To utilize the day for a family get-together is certainly permitted. To serve turkey, if that is what they wish to eat is not strictly forbidden but falls under the category of those things which Chazal viewed with disfavor, as it appears to follow the customs of the Gentiles. It is also possible that celebrating such a private holiday is **אסור מן תורה**. (Mishneh Halachos 10:116)

DID YOU KNOW THAT

The Gemara (Kesubos 22a) states that a father is believed to say that he has accepted **Kiddushin** on behalf of his minor daughter, as derived from: **את בתי נתתי לאיש הזה**. The Gemara continues with a story of a beautiful woman whom many men wished to marry, and to whom she said that she was already betrothed. When she finally did accept **Kiddushin** from someone, she explained to the **Chachomim** that she had said that only to get inappropriate suitors "off her back". Although a rule exists which applies a self-imposed **איסור** on a person based solely on such a statement (she said she was betrothed; therefore she may not marry anyone else), still, if she can show an **אמתלא** - a reasonable explanation for her statement (as this woman did), she is not held to its consequences. This is distinct from testimony, where once witnesses make a statement, they will not be believed to "explain it away", regardless of how compelling their argument. The Shev Shmaatsa (6:8) states that the credibility of a father who claims to have accepted **Kiddushin** for his minor daughter is also subject to modification or nullification via **אמתלא**, as confirmed by the TaZ (אה"ע 37:22). Thus, where the father later explains that the betrothal was observed by invalid witnesses, his explanation is accepted and the original betrothal is voided. However, only the father may offer such an **אמתלא**. The Rebbe R' Hesh'l suggests that Lavan and his mother wanted to kill Besuel so that Rivka's marriage to Yitzchok would be subject to **מיאון**, allowing her to reject Yitzchok at any time while she was a minor. This right is only effective where she has no father. However, others hold that Besuel did in fact accept **Kiddushin** for Rivka. As such, to prevent him from coming up later with an **אמתלא** to get out of it, it was necessary for him to die.

A Lesson Can Be Learned From:

The Ponivezher Rav told the story of how when the Chofetz Chaim was a young newlywed, he sat and learned with great financial deprivation. His wife would obtain bread from a baker, on credit, which she would serve to her husband with a glass of tea as his daily meal. After a while, the baker refused to extend any more credit. When the young woman placed the lone cup of tea in front of the Chofetz Chaim, she burst into tears. The Chofetz Chaim stood up and exclaimed: "Satan! I know you will stop at nothing to prevent me from learning. It won't work!", and he continued to learn. The Ponivezher Rav added, "If the Chofetz Chaim had given in to despair, there would likely have been no Mishna Berurah, no Chofetz Chaim-Shemiras HaLashon, and the world would have missed out on perhaps the greatest Gadol of recent times. Who knows how many others could have been a Chofetz Chaim, but gave up, for various reasons? Who knows how many bakers have such a fate in their hands, everyday?"

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