

	Candles	Mincha	Daf Yomi	Shachris	שק"ש
Friday	7:26	7:00			9:36
Shabbos		1:45/7:20	6:45	9:00	9:36
Sunday		7:35	8:00	8:00	9:37



IMPORTANCE OF

The *Yerushalmi* (*Shekalim* 6:1:25) asks what was written on the *Luchos* received by Moshe on Har Sinai. R' Chanina says that the first 5 of the עשרת הדברות were on the first tablet and the second 5 were on the second tablet. The Rabanan say that all ten were written on both *Luchos*. The Rabanan's position seems to be supported by *Rashi* on the *Posuk*: נתן ד' אלי את שני לוחת האבנים where the word לוחת is missing a *Vav*, and *Rashi* states that this is to indicate that the 2 לוחת were שוות - equivalent. If, as R' Chanina held, each of the לוחת had a different set of *Dibros*, how were they שוות? The *Gemara* (*Shabbos* 87a) states that Moshe did three things on his own volition, and Hashem agreed to them afterwards. They were: 1) Moshe added another day [before *Matan Torah*]; 2) Moshe separated from his wife; and 3) Moshe broke the לוחת. Why did he break the לוחת? The *Gemara* explains that Moshe constructed a *Kal V'Chomer* - if a non-Jew is prohibited from participating in *Korban Pesach*, which is only one *mitzvah* in the *Torah*, surely where *Bnei Yisroel* worshiped the *Eigel*, which renders them all *Mumarim* (apostates), they should certainly be prohibited from receiving the whole *Torah*. Thus, Moshe attempted to save *Bnei Yisroel* from punishment by preventing delivery of the עשרת הדברות (i.e. the *Torah*) to them, by smashing the לוחת. However, this presupposes that where a Jew worships *Avodah Zarah* he becomes a *Mumar* to the whole *Torah*. The *Gemara* (*Chulin* 4b) cites the opinion of R' Anan that this is not so, and that even if one is a *Mumar* to worship *Avodah Zarah*, it is still permitted to eat from his *Shechitah*. Still, if Moshe wished to save *Bnei Yisroel*, he should have at least smashed the tablet that contained the prohibition of לא יהיה לך - *Avodah Zarah*, so they would not be held liable for the *Eigel*. But then there would have been no need to smash the other one since, according to R' Chanina, it contained only the last 5 of the *Dibros*. However, since Moshe did smash both *Luchos*, it is apparent that the Rabanan were correct - both *Luchos* contained all the *Dibros*, which is why *Rashi* said that the לוחת were שוות.

QUESTION OF THE WEEK:

When would one say a *brocho* over someone else's misfortune?

ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:

(What garment may be worn only on *Shabbos*, but not a weekday?)
 The *Rema* (*אורח* 13:3) rules that if one of the *Tzitzis* on a man's *Talis* came off, and he will be embarrassed to sit without a *Talis*, and there is no other *Talis* available to him, he may put it on without a *brocho* and wear it - but only on *Shabbos*.

DIN'S CORNER:

Just as it is a *mitzvah*, when faced with a choice of stores - Jewish-owned versus gentile-owned - to patronize and give one's business to the Jew, so too, when a Jew is in need of employment, but a non-Jew will cost the employer less, it is incumbent upon the Jewish employer to hire the Jewish employee, albeit for the higher cost, and that additional cost may be treated as *Tzedakah*. (*Teshuvos V'Hanhagos* 2:477)

DID YOU KNOW THAT

The *Gemara* (*Chagigah* 3b) asks: איזהו שוטה - Who is a fool? One who walks alone at night; one who sleeps overnight in a cemetery; one who tears his clothing. Another *Beraisai* adds: one who destroys everything he is given. The *Rambam* (*עדות* 5:8) rules that if one clearly exhibits signs of dementia, even if he speaks lucidly, he is considered a שוטה. The *Beis Yosef* (אה"ע 121) understands the *Rambam* to use the four characteristics of the *Gemara* as just examples, but other *Acharonim* conclude that even if they are only examples, the signs of dementia must manifest themselves in actions similar to those examples. The *Noda B'Yehuda* (*אור הישר* 30) understands the *Rambam* to require a physical act of שטות - not simply foolish talk, in order to be characterized a שוטה. A man who had ל"ע lost his fortune, also lost his mind as a result, and was hospitalized because of his delusions, in which he believed himself still to be wealthy. He had lucid moments, was capable of conversing and recognized most people. After 13 years, he finally agreed to grant his wife a *Get*. The *Netivot* (דברי יוסף 15) held that his dementia was only verbal and did not manifest itself in ways similar to the *Gemara's* examples, nor did he commit any physical acts of שטות. As a result, he was prepared to allow the unfortunate man to give his wife a *Get*, provided three other גדולי הדור concurred. However, he received correspondence from the נזר הקודש who cited the *Yerushalmi* (*Shabbos* ch. 12): והסיר ד' ממך כל חולי... זה הרעיון, the illness which Hashem will remove is that of [delusionary] ideas and perception. If one were to contradict this man's idea of himself, might he not commit a physical act, based on his שטות? Is that not why he is hospitalized - to restrain him? As such, the *Noda BiYehuda's* criteria would seem to be present, and as a שוטה, he should not give her a *Get* as long as he is hospitalized.

A Lesson Can Be Learned From:

During World War II, Jewish children were smuggled out of Europe and taken through Teheran to Eretz Yisroel by the Jewish Agency. Unfortunately, they were then placed in secular kibbutzim which stripped them of all religion, forcing them *inter alia* to eat *Treifos*, on *Yom Kippur* and *chometz* on *Pesach*. At one of the meetings held by the *Rabbonim* to discuss how to stop it, someone mentioned that Chief Rabbi Herzog was shocked by this discovery and had openly criticized the Zionist leadership over it. He was ready to sign a public outcry, forbidding contributions to UJA until it was stopped, and many thought that the prestige of his office would be helpful. The *Brisker Rav* advised against it, explaining that after such a document would be published, a tremendous amount of pressure would be mounted against the Chief Rabbi by the secular organizations who would argue that the Chief Rabbi was undermining their efforts to settle the Land. They might even go so far as to express remorse over their activities, and promise to mend their ways, if only the Chief Rabbi would rescind his signature from the public petition. Rescinding his signature would cause much more damage because it would signal that the situation had been corrected when it had not. Although the *Brisker Rav's* position was conveyed to the Chief Rabbi, the latter went ahead with his plan, condemning all those involved and prohibiting donations to the UJA. Immediately, the Jewish Agency heads came to assure the Chief Rabbi that they had already begun to take corrective "steps" and that it would take time to implement all the changes they had in mind. They argued that he was harming the settlement of Eretz Yisroel and pressured him until he rescinded his signature, just as the *Brisker Rav* had foreseen.

P.S. *Shalosh Seudos* sponsored this week by the Grossman family.

This issue is dedicated:

ולד"נ אבי מורי הרב אהרן זאב ב"ר שמואל ולד"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

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