



	Candles	Mincha	DafYomi	Shiur	Shachris	ש"ק
Friday	4:16	4:26	7:45			9:39
Shabbos		4:16	3:30	4:00	9:00	9:39
Sunday		4:30	5:05		7:45	9:40

IMPORTANCE OF

The *Gemara* (*Yevamos* 117a) states that a mother-in-law hates a daughter-in-law, whom she views as squandering her assets to be inherited by her son. According to the Rabanan, the fact that such hostility exists automatically creates mutual animosity between them. However, according to R' Yehudah, the "hated" one has a different reason: a daughter-in-law resents the mother-in-law's tendency to reveal to her son all that she (the daughter-in-law) does. Accordingly, these women are ineligible to testify in specific matters pertaining to the other. The *Ritva* points out that a sister-in-law might share her mother's resentment towards the wife of the son/brother. But what reason would the brother's wife have to hate her husband's sister? As no theory exists to suggest that a sister-in-law reports on her brother's wife to him, it may be that according to R' Yehudah, a brother's wife could testify regarding her sister-in-law, even though the sister-in-law would be ineligible. According to the Rabanan however, all animosity is mutual so both would be ineligible. The *Gemara* (*Sotah* 11b) says that Rav and Shmuel argue over **ויקם מלך חדש**: one holds that a new king arose and the other holds that it was the same king who had been deposed for his lenient view, and who was now reinstated to enforce harsher decrees. The *Gemara* also records a *Machlokes* between Rav & Shmuel over whether the two Jewish midwives were mother/daughter or mother-in-law/daughter-in-law. The **עיר בנימין** notes that the opinion which holds that Pharaoh was a new and cruel king, would also hold the midwives were mother-in-law/daughter-in-law, whose natural hostility to each other would provide Pharaoh with information that each would reveal about the other. The opinion that held it was the previously lenient Pharaoh, forced to issue harsh decrees, would hold the midwives were mother/daughter, whose love for each other would preclude the threat of betrayal.

QUESTION OF THE WEEK:

When is it permitted to look at one's reflection in a glass mirror, but not if the mirror is made of (polished) metal?

ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:

(Where would one have to only sometimes allow another to precede him?)

The *Rambam* (**ברכות** 7:12) rules that one must display *Kavod* and allow precedence for one who is greater than he, at a door that should have a *Mezuzah*, but only for entrance - not egress.

DIN'S CORNER:

If one deposits something in his garbage can and another comes by and takes it from there, the original owner may not "change his mind" and demand it back, even if the garbage can was on his property. However, if the owner claims he made a mistake, thinking the item was worthless but it wasn't, his *Hefker* is invalid and he may reclaim it. (*Mishna Halachos* 7:267)

DID YOU KNOW THAT

The *Gemara* (*Samhedrin* 89b) states that Ido was a *Navi* who transgressed his own prophecy. *Hashem* had told Ido to travel to Bais Kail where Yeravam was offering a sacrifice to his idolatrous calves, and warn him of *Hashem's* impending destruction. When Yeravam pointed at Ido and ordered him arrested, Yeravam's arm withered. Yeravam asked Ido to restore it, which he did, after which Yeravam invited Ido for a meal. Ido declined, as *Hashem* had told him not to eat or drink, but on his return from Bais Kail, a false *Navi* told him that *Hashem* had rescinded the command and wanted him to feed Ido. As Ido knew this prophet to have once been a true *Navi* (and believable), he obeyed him and ate. *Hashem* then said He would punish Ido for eating without *Hashem's* permission, and sent a lion to devour him. If so, why wasn't Yonah also punished with death for violating his own prophetic instructions to go warn Nineveh? The *Radvaz* (2:842) suggests that perhaps Yonah was not given the full *Nevuah* at first, although such is not apparent from the *Pesukim*. It appears therefore, that Yonah did not wish to accept the mission of prophecy upon himself, so as to protect the status of *Bnei Yisroel*. Had he stated as Moshe did: **שלח נא ביד תשלה** - requesting that *Hashem* choose another to send as His emissary to Egypt, Yonah would not have been punished at all. In fact, Yonah fled, mistakenly believing that *Hashem* would not send him *Nevuah* outside of *Eretz Yisroel*. In truth, once the *Nevuah* had begun in *Eretz Yisroel*, it could continue elsewhere, and therefore Yonah was punished only for attempting to flee.

A Lesson Can Be Learned From:

When R' Aharon Moshe Stern ZT"L, Mashgiach of the Kaminetzer Yeshiva in Yerushalayim, was a young man in his teens and living in New York, he decided he wanted to go to *Eretz Yisroel*. It was in the late 1940's and in order to be permitted entry into *Eretz Yisroel*, one needed a special certificate. When R' Aharon Moshe applied for one thru *Agudas Yisroel*, he was told that certificates were not available for single bochurim because a certificate could be used to admit an entire family. There were not enough available to "waste" on just one bochur. However, as he wanted one very much, the question was put to R' Shraga Feivel Mendelowitz. R' Shraga Feivel spoke to him and said that if he promised to stay in *Eretz Yisroel*, and not just visit for a while and then come back, then he would authorize a certificate for him. To R' Shraga Feivel's understanding, there was little difference between a family making *Aliyah* from New York to *Eretz Yisroel*, and a bochur moving to *Eretz Yisroel*, where he will eventually marry and raise a family as well. R' Aharon Moshe agreed and was permitted entry. The situation in *Eretz Yisroel* in 1947 was very difficult and there were many times when R' Aharon Moshe was prepared to get on the next boat and return, but his promise to R' Shraga Feivel kept him there.

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