



	Candles	Mincha	Daf Yomi	Shachris	סדק"ש
Friday	4:14	4:24			9:18
Shabbos		1:45/4:14	3:45	9:00	9:19
Sunday		4:24	4:50	8:00	9:19

IMPORTANCE OF ...

The Gemara (Shabbos 32a) states that a man is vulnerable to be punished for his misdeeds at those moments when he is in a potentially dangerous situation, such as when crossing a bridge, because he is being examined then. Would this include a modern, structurally sound bridge as well? The Gemara notes the customs of various Amora'im who were careful to avoid danger, for even if they would be saved from the danger, it might subtract from their merits, as derived from the Posuk: קטנתי מכל החסדים. Tosafos (Kesubos 30a) cites the Gemara: הכל בידי שמים חוץ מצנינים ופחים – all (misfortune) is the result of a decree from Shomayim, except for illness brought on from cold and heat. If so, what need is there to avoid danger – can one avoid a Heavenly decree!? Tosafos distinguishes between hardships that one must suffer unavoidably because of a Heavenly decree, and those he brings on himself through negligence. As such, when a man is vulnerable to punishment when crossing a bridge because his deeds are being examined, the punishment must be the result of a Heavenly decree which would apply equally to a weak bridge as well as a structurally sound bridge. For if it only applied to a weak bridge, that would fall into the category of negligence, which he brings upon himself. Tosafos (Berachos 54b) points out that Chazal list those who are obligated to say Birchas HaGomel as: sea travelers, wilderness travelers, one who recovered from an illness and one who was released from prison. Yet, in Tehilim (107) they are listed in a different order: wilderness travelers, released prisoners, recovery from an illness and a sea traveler. Tosafos explains that the Posuk lists them in order of the greater danger, whereas Chazal list them in order of the most common. Either way, they are all clearly deemed officially a Sakanah (even without any danger) which will bring about examination of one's deeds, and obligate a Birchas HaGomel. Apparently, according to Tosafos, danger brought about through negligence would not.

QUESTION OF THE WEEK:

How could one be a half-Gadol and half-Katan?

ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:

(When may one not say a brocho of הטוב והמטיב on Shabbos?)
 If one received good news on Shabbos which normally obligates one to recite a brocho of הטוב והמטיב, such as the birth of a child, but the way the news was received involved Chilul Shabbos, such as where a neighbor heard the news over the telephone, or drove to his house to tell him, he does not recite הטוב והמטיב as it looks like Chilul Shabbos doesn't bother him. (Toras HaYoledes 38:6)

DIN'S CORNER:

One should set the table on Motzai Shabbos with a tablecloth and other appropriate utensils in order to "escort" the Shabbos as it leaves. If one is not full, he should wash and eat a meal, singing Zemiros שבת לכבוד שבת. If he is full, he should at least eat fruit or cake. One should also light candles at this meal. (MB 300:1)

DID YOU KNOW THAT ...

The Mishna (Shabbos 24b) states that one may not light candles on Yom Tov using oil that was Terumah, and became Tomay. Tosafos points out that such oil must be burned anyway, and it is permitted to benefit from its burning. As such, since one may kindle fire on Yom Tov to cook, why may one not use this oil to light a flame and cook with it? Tosafos answers that since there are two competing purposes - one is a mitzvah obligation to dispose of Terumah oil that is Tomay, and the other is a personal desire to burn oil for cooking, the mitzvah purpose is overriding. Since the Torah permits fire on Yom Tov לכם ולא לגבוה – only for one's personal needs and not to fulfill communal Tum'ah disposal obligations, the Terumah oil may not be used, even though the end result (being burned up) would be the same. The Oneg Yom Tov (הקדמה) suggests that the same theory may explain why one cannot successfully Shecht an animal in an עיר הנדחת where every person and animal is to be put to death לפי חרב. Even if one technically performs a valid Shechitah on it, the fact remains that the Torah requires death לפי חרב, and therefore what must be done to the animal is deemed a מעשה הריגה (act of killing) and not a מעשה שחיטה (Shechting). By the same token, Shechem and Chamor were killed by Shimon and Levi "לפי חרב" because סייף was the punishment for what they did (Chamor as מסייע), whereas the rest of the men of Shechem were simply killed (ויהרגו כל זכר). As the אור החיים explains, Shimon and Levi were not able to kill Chamor and Shechem alone, because the residents were prepared to defend their royalty. As such, the residents had a status of רודף, forcing Shimon and Levi to kill them first, and a רודף may be killed in any manner. The perpetrators themselves (Shechem and Chamor) however, needed to be killed דוקא with סייף and so they were killed לפי חרב.

A Lesson Can Be Learned From:

When R' Zusia of Hanapoli was a young man, he spent countless hours engaged in תורה ותפילה, but he lived in abject poverty. The wife of a local businessman noticed the financial state of R' Zusia's family, and began to give R' Zusia's wife 20 rubles a week. Immediately, the businessman began to see blessings in his home and business, but did not understand why. His wife told him that it was undoubtedly her support of the poor scholar Zusia that was responsible. The businessman decided that if so, he would move Zusia and family onto his property and undertake to support them fully. He did so, and as his fortune improved even more, he engaged further in the mitzvah of Hachnosas Orchim. The שטן apparently did not like this arrangement, so he appeared to the businessman as a guest, and recommended that instead of supporting a poor unknown scholar, that he support elderly better-known scholars. The suggestion made sense, so the benefactor evicted R' Zusia to make way for another. When the businessman's fortunes turned around, he realized that this was the result of his stopping R' Zusia's support, so he searched for R' Zusia, who had since become well-known. R' Zusia told the man that what happened to him was typically מדה כנגד מדה. "When you supported a simple unknown scholar, you were also blessed unreservedly, without regard to whether you deserved it. However, when you started to discern, measuring one scholar against another, you too were examined, and found wanting".

P.S. Shalosh Seudos sponsored this week by the Sternberg family.

This issue is dedicated:

לד"ר אבי מורי הרב אהרן זאב ב"ר שמואל ולד"ר אמי מורתי מלכה ב"ר יהודה לייבוש הלוי ולרפואה שלמה בעד טובי זאב בן ח'י רבקה 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 ולע"נ יהודה לייבוש ב"ר אברהם יום טוב הלוי ולע"נ פערל ב"ר יצחק הלוי ולע"נ אברהם ב"ר יעקב חיים ולע"נ רבקה ב"ר מנחם מאיר