

תש"פ



A Kehilas Prozdor Publication

(c) 1990-2020 Rabbi Leibie Sternberg  
http://www.prozdor.com

(Monsey/Spring Valley Z'manim)

פרשת: כי תשא - פרה

	Candles	Mincha	Daf Yomi	Shachris	זק"ש
Friday	6:43	6:53			10:08
Shabbos		1:45/6:43	6:00	9:00	10:07
Sunday		6:53	7:15	8:00	10:06

משנכנס אדר מרבים בשמחה

**IMPORTANCE OF ....**

The Gemara (Shevuos 11b) states that after designating a red cow to become a Parah Adumah, if another "better" (נאה הימנה) cow is found, the first one is to be redeemed and the better one is to take its place. The Sefer Yehודה (25:9) says that although one should select the best animal available for all Korbanos, that is only לכתחילה, but once an animal is selected (and הוקדש) there is no obligation to replace it with a better one. The exception is the Parah Adumah which must be replaced even בדעיבד. Is this because of זה קלי ואנהו, where one need not spend more than an additional third of the original's value to beautify a mitzvah, or is it a special requirement for Parah Adumah, in which case the 1/3 limitation would not apply? R' Akiva Eiger in Gilyon HaShas points to a later Gemara and Tosafos (ibid 15a) which states that as the Torah describes each Korban Olah from the most expensive to the least expensive with the words: אשה ריה ניחח, we understand that the cost is not a factor – אחד המרבה ואחד הממעיט, as long as one's Kavanah is לשם שמים. Tosafos explains that the Gemara (Yoma 34b) requires the best animal in one's flock for the Korban Tomid, and the Gemara (Shevuos 11b) requires that one replace the Parah Adumah if a better one is found. Still, in both cases, "better" is not deserving of praise as the main requirement is that they be לשם שמים. Tosafos could have asked how one can reconcile זה קלי ואנהו with אחד המרבה ואחד הממעיט to question the whole concept of Hidur Mitzvah. However, Tosafos focused only on the Korban, where one is required to offer the best, but if he cannot afford the more expensive, then he can bring the less expensive, which is deemed just as good, as long as he does so with the proper Kavanah, and the better Parah Adumah. Just as the best animal (מיוחד בעדר) is a requirement based on הכבש אחד and not on זה קלי ואנהו as a Hidur Mitzvah, so too the requirement to replace the Parah Adumah with a better one is similarly not based on Hidur Mitzvah, and therefore the 1/3 limitation would not apply to the better Parah.

**QUESTION OF THE WEEK:**

May one speak about someone in front of one who hates him?

**ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:**

(May one say Lashon HoRa about oneself?)  
Yes. However, if a listener doesn't realize that the speaker is talking about himself, and he thinks it is about someone else, it may constitute Avak Lashon HoRa to cause such suspicion. Also, Chazal (Berachos 34b) disapprove of one who publicizes his sins.

**DIN'S CORNER:**

It is permitted to accept Tzedaka from a married woman today, even if she wishes to give a substantial amount, because women are more active and involved in the family's finances. However, if she says that her husband told her specifically not to give, but she wants to give anyway, it should not be accepted from her. (Teshuvos V'Hanhagos 4:219)

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

The Gemara (Sanhedrin 17a) states that judges selected for the Sanhedrin must be men of physical stature, men of wisdom, men of striking appearance, maturity and men of supernatural ability. Rashi explains that the supernatural ability was necessary where those convicted of sorcery were to be executed. Such people would attempt to use sorcery to save themselves, so the Sanhedrin would need to overcome their attempt and execute them using "counter-sorcery". Although the Torah mandates "מיתה" as punishment for those convicted of a capital crime, the Gemara acknowledges that executions may be administered using any form of מיתה available to the Beis Din. Apparently, an execution via sorcery would therefore also qualify as an acceptable form of מיתה. By the same token, if one were to commit a sin using sorcery (aside from the act of sorcery itself), that act would also qualify as a "מעשה עבירה" (sinful act), despite the fact that it is not an "act" in the conventional sense. The Targum Yonasan translates the words: סרו מהר מן הדרך ... עשו להם עגל מסכה as referring to the sin of Bnei Yisroel in creating the Eigel, which transgressed לא תעשה לך פסל וכל תמונה. Rashi comments on the words עגל מסכה that the sorcerers of the Eirev Rav created the Eigel with sorcery. Thus, an act of sorcery qualified as a sinful act, for which a sinner would be liable. The Rambam (Sanhedrin 14:8) applies this expanded definition to one who chases after an escaping murderer to kill him "בכל דבר" – by any means, including sorcery. This can be seen by the fact that Moshe killed the Egyptian who was beating Dasan, using Hashem's name, although it might have been possible to save Dasan using less extreme measures. Why then did Moshe kill him? It was because the Egyptian was already liable for execution earlier, for abusing Dasan's wife. As such, we see that a מיתה administered upon one who is slated for execution can be accomplished by sorcery.

**A Lesson Can Be Learned From:**

In 1928, the Polish government required by law that every congregation establish a representative administrative body. In the town of Brisk, the first election of representatives for an official Vaad HaKekillah was held. The less observant groups saw this as an opportunity to gain control of the town and launched a campaign. The Brisker Rav had a list of frum candidates drawn up, and in addition, a poster was prepared describing the failings of the other groups and the risks to the community if they should prevail. Unfortunately, the printing shop where the poster was prepared belonged to a sympathizer of the other groups, and he was quick to notify them of the Rav's poster. The opposition rushed to prepare their own poster, wherein they viciously attacked the Rav personally. The election was scheduled for Sunday, and both posters were completed on Friday, an hour before Shabbos. When the Rav heard that his posters were only just ready, he refused to allow them to be posted, for fear it may result in Chilul Shabbos. Despite his followers' assurances and their arguments that if they didn't post them now they would likely lose the election, the Rav remained firm, and no posters were placed. The opposition had no problem posting their own on Friday. On Motzai Shabbos the Rav's posters were placed, but now they appeared as a defense against the seemingly unprovoked attacks against the Rav in the opposition posters, and as such, were very successful. The chareidim won 8 seats while the opposition only won 3.

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

This issue is dedicated:

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