



Friday	4:10	4:20	7:30	3:50	9:00	9:32
Shabbos		4:10	3:20	3:50	9:00	9:33
Sunday		4:25	5:00	8:00		9:34

IMPORTANCE OF ...

The Gemara (Niddah 16b) states that the special angel appointed to oversee the conception of a child asks Hashem what the child's destiny will be: will it be strong or weak, wealthy or poor. The Gemara notes that the angel does not ask if the child will be wicked or righteous, because R' Chanina has said: הכל בידי שמים - all is in the hands of Heaven, חוץ מיראת שמים - except for fear of Heaven. Thus, although everything is known and orchestrated by Hashem, man still retains the choice to decide if he wishes to fear Hashem or not. Tosafos cites the Gemara (Berachos 10a) where Chizkiyahu explains to Yeshayahu that he never married because he saw with Ruach HaKodesh that his son (Menashe) would be wicked and therefore decided not to sire him at all. Tosafos asks, does this not show that even prior to his conception and birth, Menashe's (lack of) righteousness was already decreed? Tosafos answers: דהראו מה שעתיד להיות - that Chizkiyahu was shown what was destined to happen, meaning, although it was certainly Menashe's free choice that charted his path, it was still possible to be shown a vision of the future that would be a result of that path. The Gemara (Rosh HaShanah 10b) states that Yosef was released from prison on Rosh HaShanah to interpret Pharaoh's dreams from the night before. The Maaseh Rokeach says that since the whole world is judged on Rosh HaShanah (and the Yerushalmi adds that Jews are judged by day when they do mitzvos and gentiles at night when they stop sinning), Pharaoh was told that he and Egypt had just been judged and would enjoy 7 years of שובע (plenty). Therefore the Posuk (41:25) says regarding Hashem's decree - הגיד לפרעה - He told to Pharaoh. However, the 7 years of famine foretold for later were to punish them for their future wickedness, even though that wickedness was still their choice. As such the Posuk (41:28) says regarding the רעב that what Hashem will do then הראה את לפרעה - He showed to Pharaoh, which follows Tosafos' distinction.

QUESTION OF THE WEEK:

Under what identical circumstance would a man be permitted to light Chanukah Licht in the home, but not a woman?

ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:

(When could someone only visit one of several countries?) The Mishna Berurah (531:14) permits one who lives in Eretz Yisroel to leave temporarily for a Dvar Mitzvah. R' SZ Auerbach ZT"L added that after the mitzvah is done, he may remain to tour in that one country he was in, but not go on to other countries.

DIN'S CORNER:

If one cannot afford a candle for both Shabbos and Chanukah, Shabbos takes precedence; between a Chanukah candle and wine for Shabbos, the candle takes precedence. However, bread for all 3 Shabbos meals overrides everything. (Taz אר"ח 678)

DID YOU KNOW THAT ...

The Gemara (Nedarim 36b) asks: if one designates some of his grain to be Terumah for the produce of someone else's field, does it require the field owner's knowledge and approval, or not? The Rosh explains the two sides of the question. Do we say that the field owner is pleased with the fact that he need not separate some of his own grain to fulfill his Terumah obligation and thereby permit his produce for consumption, or do we say that he would rather perform the mitzvah of separating Terumah himself, even if it costs him? The Rambam and Shulchan Aruch both rule that the field owner's approval is not required; the act of separation is deemed a Zechus for the owner, characterizing the actor as the owner's Shliach. Would the same conclusion be reached if one affixed a Mezuzah in someone else's home, or if one brought in Chanukah candles and lit them in someone else's home? The Magen Avraham (אר"ח 437:6) notes an apparent inconsistency of the Rema who rules that if one rented a house Erev Pesach under the assumption that Bedikas Chometz had already been done, and it turns out that it wasn't and he must then do it himself, the rental is still valid but the renter can demand the cost of the Bedikah from the owner. However, the Rema also rules (יר"ד 291:2) that if one rented a house assuming there was a Mezuzah, and there wasn't, the rental is still effective but here the Rema does not say that the renter can demand the cost of a Mezuzah from the owner. The Magen Avraham explains that unlike the cost of a Bedikah, a Mezuzah's cost is not deemed a loss, since it retains its value. As such, one would prefer to do the mitzvah oneself, even with the expense. R' Zvi Pesach Frank (22 מקראי קודש) points out that regarding Chanukah candles also, a guest must contribute to the cost of the candles, to make them "his". Thus, if one lit one's own candles in the house of another, the homeowner would not be יוצא, as the candles were not his.

A Lesson Can Be Learned From:

A delegation from Germany once approached R' Chaim Soloveitchik and asked him to "contribute" a Takanah (edict) for them to undertake. R' Chaim told them to prohibit enrollment in a university. The delegates knew how difficult this would be to enforce so one stood up and slyly said to R' Chaim, "The Torah does not state a punishment for one who marries a non-Jew; it is only stated in Nach. Why? Because it would not be fitting to suspect Bnei Yisroel of doing such a thing. So too, how could R' Chaim suspect us of allowing enrollment in the university?" R' Chaim replied: "You have a point. But why was the punishment for intermarriage stated at all, even in Nach? Because eventually, the deplorable episode of Zimri and the Midianite princess took place. If Bnei Yisroel could thus show such little regard for their own honor, Hashem certainly need not be careful to spare it, and neither do I."

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