



	Candles	Mincha	DafYomi	Shiur	Shachris	ש"ש
Friday	4:09	4:21	7:40			9:29
Shabbos		4:09	3:25	3:50	9:00	9:29
Sunday		4:20	5:00		7:30	9:30

IMPORTANCE OF

The *Gemara* (*Megilah* 14a) states that the removal of Achashverosh's ring in order to sign the decree authored by Haman accomplished more towards encouraging *Bnei Yisroel* to do *Teshuvah* than did the forty eight **נביאים** (prophets) and seven **נביאות** (prophetesses) who prophesied for *Bnei Yisroel*. The *Gemara* lists the seven **נביאות** as follows: Sarah, Miriam, Devorah, Chana, Avigail, Chuldah and Esther. The *Mizrachi* asks: it appears from this *Gemara* that the other **אמהות** (aside from Sarah) were not **נביאות**. What then is the meaning of *Rashi's* comment on **הפעם ילדה אישי אלי**, that Leah utilized *Ruach HaKodesh* to determine that 12 sons had to be born to form 12 *Shevatim*, and since she had now given birth to her share (3), Yaakov could have no complaints to her? How did Leah have *Ruach HaKodesh* if she was not a **נביאה**? The *Gemara* explains that there were much more than forty eight **נביאים** who prophesied throughout the history of *Bnei Yisroel*. However, only those whose prophecies were significant for future generations, beyond the one in which they prophesied, were included in the list of 48. So too, with regard to the 7 **נביאות**. Therefore, although Leah's vision certainly qualified her as a **נביאה**, the consequence of her prophecy was limited to her personal relationship with Yaakov and did not affect later generations. *Igros Moshe* (א"ח 4:49) notes that the many women who were **נביאות** were viewed as full-fledged prophets, equal to men, and were written of with the utmost respect, despite the fact that they were not obligated in *Talmud Torah*, nor in all time-bound *mitzvos*. R' Moshe therefore held that although a woman may voluntarily perform *mitzvos* she is exempt from, and even recite a *brocho*, she is to be discouraged where such a unilateral act would mark a serious departure from accepted Jewish custom, such as wearing a *Talis* to *daven*.

DID YOU KNOW THAT

The *Gemara* (*Sanhedrin* 73a) states that if one sees someone drowning in the river or someone being dragged away by a wild animal, one is obligated by **לא תעמד על דם רעיק** to save him. The *Rambam* (רוצח 1:14) and *Shulchan Aruch* (ח"מ 426:1) both bring this *Halacha* with one small change – instead of "**חיה גוררתו**" (a wild animal was dragging him away) they state: "**חיה באה עליו**" – a wild animal was advancing upon him. This change is based on and taken from the *Toras Cohanim* (*Kedoshim* 84). The *GRA* (ח"מ 426:1) notes that although the *Gemara* uses **גוררתו** it did not intend such to be the exclusive case, as we see from the *Gemara* (*Kidushin* 8b) where a man rescued a woman who was being chased by a dog. The *Gemara* wonders if the benefit to her of being saved was sufficient to be the equivalent of **כסף קידושין**, allowing the man to betroth her with that benefit, or perhaps, since he was obligated to save her under **לא תעמד על דם רעיק** anyway, it would not be sufficient. Although the *Gemara* concludes this question with a **תיקו**, it is clear that **לא תעמד** also applies to an approaching threat (a chasing dog), not only to an actual danger in progress (**גוררתו**). The *Minchas Yitzchok* (6:169) explains that the *GRA* needed to bring proof from this *Gemara* in *Kidushin* rather than simply point to the *Toras Cohanim's* use of **חיה באה עליו**. The reason is how *Rashi* explains the difference between the first occurrence of **באה עם הצאן** ... **ורחל**, and the second. The first time (29:6), the emphasis is on the *Aleph* of **באה**, giving it a meaning of coming in a present tense. The second time (29:9), the emphasis is on the *Beis* of **באה**, which denotes the past – she came. As such, one could not be certain that **חיה באה עליו** in the *Toras Cohanim* used **באה** in the present tense; it could have meant exclusively the past, to match the *Gemara*. Therefore, the *GRA* used the *Kidushin* case as a clear proof that even a threat is included in **לא תעמד**.

QUESTION OF THE WEEK:

If one hasn't washed his hands yet in the morning, and is prohibited from speaking *Divrei Torah*, may he answer *Amein*?

ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:

(When is the 2nd of two *Shemona Esreis* for *Chovah* – not the 1st?)

The *Mishna Berurah* (א"ח 208:9) cites the *Magen Gborim* who rules that if one *davened* 2 *Shemona Esreis* without intending either one specifically as *Tashlumin*, and he made a mistake in the first, such that he must repeat the *Shemona Esrei*, the second one may count for *Chovah* and he must now say a new *Tashlumin*.

DIN'S CORNER:

One must be very careful to eat *Sholosh Seudos* on *Shabbos*. Even if one is not hungry, one may be **יצא** with a small amount, preferably more than a **כביצה**. One should **לכתחילה** say *HaMotzi* over **לחם משנה** but one loaf is sufficient **בדיעבד**. If one cannot eat bread, any other food qualifies. Women are equally obligated to eat this *Seudah* and to eat **לחם משנה**. (א"ח 291 & MB)

A Lesson Can Be Learned From:

R' Chaim Soloveitchik was so in tune with the people of Brisk that when he would meet or see someone in a place that was unexpected, he would immediately figure out why this person was there. Once, he saw someone in such a circumstance, and assumed that the man was in the area to see his lawyer. Upon further consideration, R' Chaim came to the conclusion that this man was undoubtedly having trouble with his business partner and for that reason, was looking to speak with his lawyer. R' Chaim greeted the man and asked what brought him to that area. The man explained that he was having a problem with his partner and had to see his lawyer. Once, R' Chaim saw someone in a strange place and despite a concentrated effort to divine his purpose there, he could come up with nothing. R' Chaim's children ran out to ask the man what he was doing there. The man replied: "I don't really know. I was deep in thought and started to take a walk. Suddenly I was here!"

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