

	Candles	Mincha	Daf Yomi	Shachris	סדק"ש
Friday	8:15	7:00			9:11
Shabbos		1:45/8:10	7:30	9:00	9:11
Sunday		8:25	7:45	8:00	9:12



IMPORTANCE OF

The *Gemara* (*Sanhedrin* 112a) states that if an animal is owned jointly by two partners, one of whom is a resident of an עיר הנדחת and the other who is not, the animal is forbidden and none of its meat may be eaten. *Rashi* explains that we do not view the animal as if it were divided into two parts because no part of the animal is permitted without a proper *Shechitah* on the whole animal. Since half of the animal is slated for execution under the laws of an עיר הנדחת, when the animal is subsequently slaughtered, it is deemed to be a partial execution, and therefore not a proper *Shechitah*. The *Ra'N* adds that although the *Shechitah* might be sufficient to remove the animal from the category of *Neveilah*, since it cannot be used to permit the *Ir HaNidachas* half of the animal, it cannot permit any of the animal. However, the *Gemara* continues, if a dough is owned jointly in the same manner, half of the dough is permitted, because theoretically at least, the dough is divisible between the two partners. The *Acharonim* discuss whether the division relies on the commonly used concept of *Bereirah*, which allocates retroactively to each partner the half that they subsequently receive as if it was always theirs. The *HaDrash V'HaYun* uses this distinction between an animal and dough to explain why Moshe said to Hashem: אל תפן אל מנחתם – do not pay attention to their (*Korban*) *Mincha*. The *Midrash* (18:10) asks why Moshe did not ask Hashem to ignore the portion of Korach and his followers in the actual *Korban Tomid* itself, instead of just the accompanying *Mincha*. The *Posuk* should have said: אל תפן אל עבודתם. However, since we see that an animal cannot be divided among joint participants, to invalidate a portion of the daily *Korban Tomid* because of Korach *et al*'s participation would render the entire *Korban* invalid. With regard to the *Mincha* however, which was a dough consisting of flour and oil, since the *Gemara* considers that to be divisible, it was appropriate for Moshe to request that Korach's portion be ignored.

DID YOU KNOW THAT

The *Mishna* (*Kesubos* 39a) states that the obligation placed by the *Torah* under the *Posuk*: ולו תהיה לאשה on certain men to marry a woman they have exploited is lifted when the woman is otherwise forbidden to him, such as a *mamzeres* or a first-generation Egyptian. The *Gemara* asks why the rule of עשה דוחה לא תעשה does not operate so that the obligation overrides the prohibition. The *Gemara* answers that עשה דוחה לא תעשה only operates where one has no choice but to fulfill the *mitzvah*. However, in the case of ולו תהיה לאשה, if the woman says she does not wish to marry him, the *mitzvah* disappears. Based on this, the *Rashba* (1:18) explains that any *mitzvah* that could potentially be “uprooted” by circumstances or by one party's unwillingness to participate, is deemed impermanent, and as such, one does not recite a *brocho* before performing it. For this reason no *brocho* is said on *Kibud Av* or *Kibud Rav*, as they can be מוחל on their *Kavod*, and no *brocho* is said over giving *Tzedaka* because the pauper may refuse to accept it. The *Ketzos* (243:4) brings a *Machlokes* regarding *Pidyan HaBen*, in a situation where the *Kohen* refuses to accept the *Pidyon* money. The *Pri Chadash* holds that one may still give the *Kohen* the money against his will, and effectuate a redemption. The *Atzmos Yosef* disagrees and states that only if the *Kohen* accepts the money will the *Pidyon* be valid. If so, according to the *Rashba*, how could there be a *brocho* for *Pidyan HaBen* – the *Kohen* might refuse the money ! The *Mishmeres Chaim* suggests that there is a further distinction to be made even among *mitzvos* whose fulfillment depends on another. Granted, if a pauper refuses to accept the *Tzedaka*, or if the woman to be married under ולו תהיה לאשה rejects the man, the *mitzvah* obligation no longer exists. However, if a *Kohen* refuses to accept the *Pidyon* money, the father is not thereby relieved of the obligation to redeem his son. As such, the *mitzvah* is very much still in force, and a *brocho* is therefore appropriate.

QUESTION OF THE WEEK:

What is preferable from the perspective of one who is giving *Tzedaka*: to give privately to an *Ani* or give to a *Kupah* fund ?

ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:

(When would one be required to wipe his hands three times ?)
The *Ba'er Hataiv* (אור"ח 4:28) quotes the *Bircas Avrohom*'s opinion that if one has no water to wash “*Negel Vasser*”, he must wipe his hands on wood or dirt, 3 times. Opponents argue that wiping does not remove the *Ruach Ra* anyway, and a simple cleaning wipe should be sufficient.

DIN'S CORNER:

One may not express thanks to one's lender for lending to him, because of *Ribis*. One may not express such thanks in writing either. However, one may express appreciation by publicizing a *Chesed* that a lender did, even if the lender has pleasure from it, for to do so is itself a *mitzvah*. (*Igros Moshe* יו"ד 1:80)

A Lesson Can Be Learned From:

A *Meshulach* from a *yeshiva* in London once visited the town of Meknes in Morocco where the *Gaon R' Refael Baruch Toledano* was the *Rav*. For some reason, the *Meshulach* was arrested and *R' Refael Baruch* had to work hard to have him released. He then prepared a *Seudas Hoda'ah* in celebration of the great *mitzvah* of *Pidyan Shevuyim* that he merited to perform. Towards the end of the *Seudah*, *R' Refael Baruch* took the *Meshulach* aside and tried to discover why he had been arrested in light of *Chazal*'s statement that אין ניוקין שלוחי מצוה אין ניוקין. The *Meshulach* defended himself and his behavior, and could not help *R' Refael Baruch* figure out a satisfactory explanation. *R' Refaul Baruch* then concluded: “If it is not something that you did, then the only explanation for why this *Shelichus* was not a complete *Shelichus Mitzvah* must be that there is a problem with the *yeshiva* that sent you”. The *Meshulach* looked up in surprise as *R' Refael Baruch* continued. “Possibly, the *yeshiva*'s policy when a *bochur* does not comply with the *yeshiva*'s *Sedarim* is to send him home. This can have a devastating effect on him and his descendants. Please accept on your *yeshiva*'s behalf to treat such cases seriously and use ejection only as a last resort”.

P.S. *Sholosh Seudos* is sponsored by the Sternberg family. Please visit perekmishna.com – 330 participants signed up already.

This issue is dedicated:

לז"נ אבי מורי הרב אהרן זאב ב"ר שמואל ולז"נ אמי מורתי מלכה ב"ר יהודה לייבוש הלוי

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 פערל ב"ר יצחק הלוי ולז"נ אברהם ב"ר יעקב חיים