



	Candles	Mincha	DafYomi	Shiur	פרשת: כי תצא שז"ק שחכר
Friday	7:17	6:45/7:27			9:38
Shabbos		1:45/7:12	6:30	7:05	9:00 9:38
Sunday		7:20			8:00 9:39

**IMPORTANCE OF ....**

The Gemara (Yevamos 55b) states that from the fact that the Torah refers to a dead wife as שארו (permitting a Kohen to make himself Tomay at her burial), we may derive that she is still "related" to him after death. In אתון דאורייתא (8) R' Yosef Engel suggests that a surviving spouse remains forbidden to relatives of the deceased because some remnant of the marital relationship continues to exist. It is this connection that binds a widow to the Yavam, and forbids her to everyone else. Where Yibum does not apply, a widow is permitted to remarry only by virtue of a Gezeiras HaKasuv (see Kidushin 13b). The Birkei Yosef (אבה"ע 17:1) speculates over people brought back to life miraculously, such as R' Zeira who was killed and "resurrected" by Rabba. Did R' Zeira have to marry his wife again, or does death end a marital relationship only when he stays dead? He cites the Yerushalmi (Gittin 7:3) which describes how a man gave his wife a Get, stating that it would be effective immediately, provided he doesn't return within 12 months. If he should die during that time, may she remarry, or must she wait until the 12 months are up? R' Yosi says that she must wait, because he could always be resurrected. Although most Meforshim do not share R' Yosi's concern, what everyone seems to accept is the fact that if the husband does return to life, the marriage merely continues, and does not have to be redone. This is presumably due to the fact that a marital connection survives death. The MaHarach Or Zarua (14) states that where a man dies thru Kidush HaShem, such as by refusing to transgress Avodah Zara, whether during a time of Shmad or not, all of Klal Yisroel must mourn him, and his widowed wife may not remarry ever, because of the great Kavod his death represents for Shomayim and for him. This too would seem to presume that it is her continued relationship with her martyred husband that puts her beyond remarriage. However, normative Halacha seems not to rule accordingly, as borne out by the unobstructed remarriages of Holocaust widows.

**QUESTION OF THE WEEK:**

If the instruments used for the ארבע מיתות ב"ד (the סייף sword, סקילה rock, חנק cloth, hanging tree) must be buried, should the same be done with a gun or a car that ח"ו kills a Jew?

**ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:**

(Which mitzvah can be done only שלא לשם מצוה?)

The Gemara (Bava Metzia 71a) states that given a choice, one must lend money to a Jew without interest, rather than to a non-Jew with interest. The Torah Temimah asks how a Jew can be forced to forgo investing his money for interest, in order to lend it to a Jew. He answers that the Gemara means to say that since lending to a non-Jew is also a mitzvah (לנכרי תשיך), when looking to do the mitzvah of lending, he should choose the Jew. However, if he is not looking to perform the mitzvah of lending, he may certainly invest his money by lending it to a gentile for interest.

**DID YOU KNOW THAT ....**

The Gemara (Sanhedrin 86a) states that if a kidnaper sells his victim back to the victim's own family, he is not punishable by death for having transgressed והתעמר בו ומכרו, because the Posuk specifically refers to a kidnapping that is: גונב נפש מאחיו – a person stolen from his brothers. If the selling places him back with his family, it was never מאחיו. The Gemara continues, deriving that if a man kidnaps his own son, he is Potur, because the Posuk begins with the words: כי ימצא (if it should happen), which excludes situations where the victim is easily within the kidnaper's grasp, such as the case would be with a father. Why was it necessary for the Gemara to introduce this exception? Would not a kidnapping by a father place him with his family, which was previously exempted from liability? LeHoros Nasan (4:125) cites a distinction made by the Minchas Chinuch (36) between a kidnaper who does not sell his victim or make him work, where he would not be punishable by death, but would nevertheless be liable for Malkus under לא תגנב. Here too, a kidnaper who sells his victim back to the family would still incur Malkus. A father who kidnaps his own son would not be punished at all. If the definition of kidnapping is taking someone against their will, how would this apply to a minor, who has no will? Do we say that although nothing can be done against a minor's will, still, if it is done without his will, as it must be, then it is also kidnapping? LeHoros Nasan says yes, dealing with a situation of parents whose constant bickering drove a daughter to depression. As a result, they sent her to live with an aunt, where she improved greatly. Now, the parents claim to have improved their home environment and want her back. If she remains with the aunt, against the parents' wishes, is there an element of kidnapping? Although other relevant issues exist, such as the parent's mitzvah of Chinuch, there is no question of kidnapping where the child arrived of her own (and her parents') accord, and may come and go as she pleases. Yet, she should be returned unless returning will endanger her mental health, which is paramount.

**A Lesson Can Be Learned From:**

A group of investigative reporters wished to do an expose on corrupt and unscrupulous businesses. They set up a woman's apartment with hidden cameras, crossed wires in an electrical socket (causing a short), and had her call 3 electricians. The first came in, saw that the electricity didn't work, and announced that the whole system would have to be replaced, for 3,000 Shekel. The woman "hondled" down to 2,800. The next electrician showed up, also did not check anything, and announced that his price was 2,000, with no discount. The third electrician, a Charedi, arrived, and asked her to describe the last thing she had done before bringing down the electricity. She showed him the outlet into which she had inserted a plug, and he quickly discovered and fixed the crossed wires. His price was normally 200, but he only took 120. The reporters confronted the first two electricians, who were very embarrassed, and then asked the Charedi why he had charged so little. He said that aside from their cameras, there were Heavenly cameras recording his every deed. How could he hope to escape their scrutiny?

**P.S.** Sholosh Seudos sponsored by the Sheli family.

This issue is dedicated:

לז"נ פערל ב"ר יצחק חלוי ולז"נ אברהם ב"ר יעקב חיים

Dedications (\$18) and appreciations may be sent to: Kehilas Prozdor, 8 GreenHill Lane, Spring Valley, N.Y. 10977 (845) 354-7240  
As this contains Divrei Torah and partial Pesukim, it should be treated with proper respect, both during and after use