



	Candles	Mincha	DafYomi	Shiur	Shachris	ש"ס זק"ש	פרשת: מקץ-חנוכה
Friday	4:19	4:29	7:30				9:40
Shabbos		4:19	3:45	4:10	9:00		9:40
Sunday		4:29	8:30		7:45		9:41

## IMPORTANCE OF ....

The *Navi* (*Shmuel* 2:12) describes the reprimand of Nasan HaNavi to Dovid HaMelech by way of a parable concerning a rich man who owned many sheep, and a poor man who owned but one lamb. When the wealthy man was in need of a lamb to serve his guests, he took the poor man's lamb, rather than one of his own. Dovid's angry reaction was that the rich man was deserving of death. *Meforshim* ask, what could have been Dovid's basis for sentencing him to death for stealing a lamb. The *Sefer Eshera* *למאה* suggests that Dovid was referring to the *Gemara* (*Yevamos* 79a) which states that there are three *Midos* which characterize *Bnei Yisroel* – they are merciful (*רחמנים*), capable of embarrassment (*ביישנים*) and charitable (*גומלי חסדים*). One who does not have these three attributes is assumed not to descend from Avrohom Avinu. Dovid saw this personally when forced to hand over seven of Shaul's sons to the cruel Givonim, who refused to be appeased with anything less than their blood. As such, Dovid determined that the callousness of the wealthy man in Nasan's parable indicated that he could not be descended from Avrohom and as a Ben Noach, he was liable to be killed for theft. For this reason as well, the brothers of Yosef accepted guilt for ignoring Yosef's plea: *בהתחננו אלינו ולא שמענו*, while not expressing any remorse for the sentence that they passed on him, which they maintained was justified. It was only the apparent heartlessness and lack of mercy that they displayed towards Yosef, for which they felt liable, as unsuitable for descendants of Avrohom. However Reuven had told them that their original sentence was also not justified (*אל תשכרו דם*), and he pointed out to them now: *אל תחטאו בילד ולא שמעתם*, he had said that they should not sin against Yosef, even without (before) hearing (his pleas), and as such, their crime was not ignoring cries but rather *וגם דמו היה נדרש* – they are liable for his blood as well.

## QUESTION OF THE WEEK:

When would one not say *Kadish* at the end of *Krias HaTorah*, on a weekday ?

## ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:

(When may one choose from among different *berachos* ?)

The *Shulchan Aruch* (*אור"ח* 227:1) rules that when seeing a comet, lightning, an earthquake, or hearing thunder, one may recite the *brocho* of *עולם מלא עולם* and *עולם עולם* one may recite the *brocho* of *עושה מעשה בראשית*.

## DIN'S CORNER:

If one vows to fast on *Shabbos* or *Yom Tov*, or every Tuesday etc..., he must honor the fast, even if in so doing, he cancels the performance of *mitzvos*. This includes *Rosh Chodesh* and *Erev Yom Kippur* as well. However, he would not fast if the vowed day fell on *Chanukah* or *Purim*. (*Rambam* *נדרים* 3:9)

## DID YOU KNOW THAT ....

The *Gemara* (*Shabbos* 21a) discusses whether one must relight Chanukah candles if they go out accidentally during the half hour they are required to burn. The *Shiltei Giborim* cites the opinion of the *RiAz* who says that although we rule *אין זקוק לה* (if they go out, one need not relight), still one must light them in the first place with sufficient oil, and it would seem that if they were lit in a windy place and blew out, it is the same as having insufficient oil, and one must relight in a non-windy place. The *Taz* (*אור"ח* 673:9) and *Magen Avrohom* (*אור"ח* 673:12) rule accordingly. However, R' Shlomo Kluger (*האלף לך שלמה* - *אור"ח* 378) ruled that if one lit in a windy place he has been *יוצא* and he need not light again, because the candles themselves were capable of burning the requisite time. If it is only an outside factor (*i.e.* the wind) that may affect them, this does not detract from their suitability. The *Mishneh Shlomo* suggests that R' Shlomo Kluger does not disagree with the *Taz* and *Magen Avrohom*, and if the wind blows out the candles, R' Shlomo Kluger would agree that one must relight. However, R' Shlomo Kluger's *Chidush* is that if the candles do **not** blow out, because of his care, he would be *יוצא*, even in a windy place, because unsuitability must refer to the candles, wicks and/or oil, not to something separate from them, such as wind. R' Shlomo Kluger derives this distinction from the *Gemara* (*Succah* 23a) where R' Akiva built a *Succah* on a ship, which collapsed, apparently incapable of withstanding the wind at sea. Since R' Akiva agrees that a *Succah* must be capable of standing 7 days, he must hold that an outside force, such as wind, does not affect the suitability of the *Succah* per se, which could stand without wind. Similarly, if one covered the blood of *Shechitah*, and afterwards the wind blew the covering dust away, it should still qualify as a good covering.

## A Lesson Can Be Learned From:

In 1945, at a *Seudas Rosh Chodesh* in the Geneva home of R' Moshe Gross, the Satmar Rebbe ZT"L gave a *Drasha* about *Rosh Chodesh*. Later, before *bentsching*, the Rebbe added an unrelated *Vort*, regarding the *Gemara* (*Bava Basra* 23b) which says that a young bird does not hop more than 50 Amos away from its coop, so if found within 50 Amos, it belongs to the coop-owner. When R' Yirmiyah asked what the *Din* was if one foot was outside the 50 Amos line, he was removed from the *Beis HaMidrash*, and *Rabbeinu Tam* explains that it was because he cast doubt on the measures of *Chazal*, which are always exact. The Rebbe repeated this several times. A few months later, *Rav Botschko*, *Rosh Yeshiva* of the *Yeshiva* of *Montreux*, told R' Moshe Gross that one of his *Talmidim*, a worthy *Talmid Chochom*, was present at that *Seudah*. This *Talmid* had written a *Sefer* called "*Hashkafos*", which *Rav Botschko* had given a *Haskama* to, without reading it. The *Sefer's* main thrust was to state that many of the measures of *Chazal* were tied to nature, which makes them inexact. For example, a *Chanukah Menorah* above 20 Amos is *Posul* because the eye doesn't notice it. If people today notice things above 20 Amos, perhaps we need not be *Machmir* exactly on 20 Amos. After hearing the Rebbe's words, however, the *Talmid* took his *Sefer* and burned it, in his *Rosh Yeshiva's* presence.

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

This issue is dedicated:

לז"נ פערל ב"ר יצחק הלוי