



	Candles	Mincha	Daf Yomi	Shachris	פרשת: עקב	סזק"ש
Friday	7:47	7:00/7:57		7:00/8:00		9:30
Shabbos		1:45/7:00	6:00	9:00		9:30
Sunday		7:55	7:30	8:00		9:31

IMPORTANCE OF

The Gemara (Berachos 40a) states that if one says המוציא and before eating he instructs someone to prepare food for his ox, it is not a Hefsek, because one may not eat until his animal(s) have been fed, as derived from: ונתתי עשב בשדך לבהמתך. The Tosefta (Bava Metzia 11:14) states that villagers take precedence over all others with regard to their village spring (water), and R' Yosi says that even the village animals take prior to people who are not residents of the village. The Meshech Chochmah suggests that this is consistent with R' Yosi's opinion in the Gemara (Gittin 52a) which states that an administrator once sold off some real property of orphans in order to purchase oxen, and the transactions were not disapproved by R' Yehoshua b. Levi. The Gemara assumes that the "approval" was based on R' Yosi's statement that he always referred to his wife as his "house", and to his ox as his "field", because the field would be of no value to him without an ox to plow it. Thus, giving water to one's animals is as vital to one's own sustenance as drinking it oneself, which explains R' Yosi's opinion in the Tosefta. Dibros Moshe (Gittin 10:2) questions how the Gemara (Gittin 12a) considers the possibility of a master saying to his slave: עשה עמי ואניי זך – work for me but I will not feed you. If one must feed one's animals, how can he not feed his worker? R' Moshe asserts that the obligation to feed one's animals must be a real חיוב and not just a מדת חסידות because interrupting a brocho for "only" a מדת חסידות would constitute a Hefsek. He concludes that there is an equivalent חיוב to feed both one's animals and slaves, but suggests that there is an additional חיוב to support an עבד כנעני that is incumbent upon all Jews, not just the owner. As such, the slave can still survive.

QUESTION OF THE WEEK:

What should one do if all conditions to permit Lashon Hora are present, including Toeles, but he does not like the Medubar?

ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:

(When may one tell someone that Ploni cheated him or stole from him?) One may only disclose this if the 5 conditions have been met: 1) one is certain; 2) one is accurate; 3) there is impersonal Toeles; 4) there is no other way; and 5) the listener will only suspect. Additionally, the Toeles must be practical and definite. If the aggrieved party will be unable or unwilling to recoup his loss, it is Assur to tell him, as it will only cause him grief without purpose.

DIN'S CORNER:

One cannot be יוצא with the Tefilah of the Shliach Tzibur if one is capable of saying the Tefilah oneself. However, this only applies to a "Tefilah", not a brocho. Chazal's rule: ברוב עם הדרת מלך is not limited in application to discouraging splinter minyanim where there is room for all to assemble in one place together. It also applies where one person can say a brocho on behalf of several people, such as המוציא. Even regarding Tefilah, it might only apply to Shemona Esrei, and not to other Tefilos such as Tefilas HaDerech. (Kinyan Torah 5:119b)

DID YOU KNOW THAT

The Gemara (Yoma 87a) states how fortunate Tzadikim are that not only do they benefit from their own merits, but the benefit extends to their children and descendants as well. The Gemara cites Aharon Hakohen as an example, where Elazar and Isamar are described as בני הנותרים (remaining sons) after the deaths of Nadav and Avihu, implying that all four sons should have died, but Elazar and Isamar were spared in the Zechus of Aharon. The MaHarsha points out that this conflicts with the Midrash cited by Rashi on the Posuk: ובאהרן התאנף ד' מאד להשמידו which states that Hashem grew so angry at Aharon for enabling the Eigel that He wished להשמידו - to eradicate him, which means with the death of all his sons, and it was only through the Tefilah of Moshe Rabbeinu that half of Aharon's sons were spared. Chazal have listed other reasons for the deaths of Nadav and Avihu, but blaming their deaths on Aharon would seem to be punishing adult children for their father's sins. The Rambam (תשובה 6:1) only mentions that one's minor children may be punished for the father's sins, as stated in the Sifri on the Posuk: איש בחטאו יומתו – not the adult children. The MaHaral points out that this rule only applies when the children do not follow their father's example. When they do, even the adult children can be punished for the father's sin. How did Aharon's sons follow him regarding the sin of the Eigel? The TaZ (Divrei Dovid) asks what specifically was Aharon's sin in the Eigel incident, as Aharon's Kavanah was clearly לשם שמים. He suggests that Aharon was faulted for not having davened for Bnei Yisroel to do Teshuvah. Since Aharon's sons apparently did not daven either, they could be punished for Aharon's omission. R' Shlomo Kluger in חכמת שלמה on Shulchan Aruch (אור"ח 225) seeks to prove from here that the Magen Avraham's understanding of the brocho זה - הן שטרני מענשו של זה is the correct one, where the father says he is now relieved of the punishment for his child's misdeeds. The Levush held that the brocho refers to the child being punished for the father's misdeeds, which ends at the Bar Mitzvah. However, in light of the punishment visited on Nadav and Avihu, that may be incorrect.

A Lesson Can Be Learned From:

A Meshulach entered a wealthy London home seeking donations for his Mosad. The host was studying a certain Sugya of Gemara and asked the Meshulach to help him with some difficulties. It had been several years since the Meshulach had learned this Gemara so he wasn't much help. Still, he received a respectable check from the host. As the Meshulach left the house, he met another Meshulach who was about to enter. He advised Meshulach #2 that if he wanted a big donation, he should first go learn the Sugya well, and then approach the host. Meshulach #2 took his advice and, after preparing the Sugya thoroughly, he visited the wealthy man, who was overjoyed to have all his questions answered, and he received a very large check. Later, he wondered if he was guilty of Geneivas Daas, but was assured that it was really Siyata D'Shmaya.

P.S. Anyone interested in a Shabbos Netz minyan, see Jay Greenfield.

This issue is dedicated by the Chaimowitz family:

לע"נ יעקב מיכאל ב"ר מאיר

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

ולז"נ אמי מורתי מלכה ב"ר יהודה לייבוש הלוי

שמאל ב"ר גדליה יוסף רבקה ב"ר מנחם מאיר אברהם ב"ר יעקב חיים

לז"נ אבי מורי הרב אהרן זאב ב"ר שמואל

פערל ב"ר יצחק הלוי