



	Candles	Mincha	DafYomi	Shiur	Shachris	זק"ש
Friday	4:10	4:20	7:30			9:32
Shabbos		4:10	3:35	4:00	9:00	9:33
Sunday		4:20	5:30		8:00	9:33

**IMPORTANCE OF ....**

The *Mishna* (*Avos* 5:20) quotes Yehudah b. Teima's maxim that the brazen (עז פנים) are bound for Gehinom while the shamefaced (בושת פנים) will go to Gan Eden. The *Mishna* concludes with a *Tefilah* (יה"ר .... שיבנה בית המקדש ב"ב ותן חלקנו בתורתך) and the *Meforshim* all seek to explain the connection. The *Gemara* (*Eruvin* 65b) quotes Rav Sheshes who states that he has an argument (based on a *Posuk*) which could absolve all Jews from being judged, from the time of the *Churban* until today – that the trials of being in *Galus* render all Jews as drunk, and therefore not responsible for their actions. However, the *Gemara* points out that a drunk is held to the transactions that he enters into, and is punished for his misdeeds. The *Gemara* concludes that Rav Sheshes was referring to the sin of *davening* without *Kavanah*. Apparently, using *Galus* as an excuse helps only for *Tefilah*, which is בין אדם למקום, but not for בין אדם לחברו. The *Toras Chaim* suggests that if the trials of *Galus* can be a *Kaparah* for sins, it will only help those who retain the attribute of בושה, who will thereby go to Gan Eden. However, those who remove the "protection" of this *Midah* of בושה and remain עזי פנים will have no excuse and will end up in Gehinom. The *Mishna's Tefilah* seeks to reawaken the *Midah* of בושה through the grandeur of a rebuilt *Beis HaMikdash*, or failing that, the study of *Torah*, as the *Mishna* (*Avos D'Rav Nasan* 21:2) states that while R' Akiva was teaching his students, he recalled with בושה, his youthful sins. He thereupon said: Thank you Hashem for having placed me among those who sit in the *Beis HaMidrah* and not those who sit on street corners. The *Gemara* (*Chagigah* 4a) states that if Yosef's brothers were so embarrassed in front of Yosef, how much more difficult it will be to face Hashem's rebuke. (*Tosafos* explains that although in some areas there are excuses, for some things there are just no excuses.) Hashem's rebuke will question why the *Midah* of בושה was abandoned. *Chazal* have stated (*Nedarim* 20b) that if one does not have this *Midah*, you may be sure that his forefathers did not stand at *Har Sinai*. They may have stood there physically, but they were obviously not part of ירחן שם ישראל.

**QUESTION OF THE WEEK:**

If one touched one's shoes or went to the bathroom in middle of a meal, must he wash and recite *Al Netilas Yadayim* again ?

**ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:**

(Why doesn't *Al HaNisim* on Purim also say וקבעום like on Chanukah ?) The *Tzitz Eliezer* (18:42) gives several reasons: 1) The *Megilah* already lists the *mitzvos*; 2) *Takanos* are made by *Chazal*, not *Neviim*; 3) There are too many *mitzvos* to list; ע"ש.

**DIN'S CORNER:**

One may not put oneself in danger, such as by walking past a crumbling wall or on a rickety bridge, or by walking alone at night. One may also not commit an illegal act or crime (where not against the *Torah*) even if the punishment is not "worse" than imprisonment. (*Chochmas Adam* 68:4)

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

On Yaakov's trip down to Egypt, he stopped in Beer Sheva and brought *Korbanos* לאלוקי אביו יצחק. *Rashi* notes (as stated in the *Midrash*) that the designation of Hashem as: אלוקי אביו יצחק, implies that one is more obligated to honor one's father than one's grandfather. The *Ramban* asks why this differs from *Parshas* וישלח, where Yaakov called Hashem אלוקי אביו אברהם ואלוקי אביו יצחק ? The *Loit* חן explains that in וישלח, Yitzchok was still alive, and therefore, Yaakov was מחויב to give כבוד to Avrohom as well, through his חייב to honor Yitzchok. The *Shulchan Aruch* (י"ד 240:14), based on the *Gemara* (*Kidushin* 31a) rules that if both one's father and mother request a cup of water, he must honor the father's request because the mother is also obligated to honor the father. (If they are divorced, the son can choose between conflicting demands.) So too, both a father and son are מחויב to honor the grandfather. It is only when the father dies (as Yitzchok did) that the חייב to honor the grandfather dissipates. For this reason, the *Gemara* (*Makos* 12a) suggests that a man can act as a גואל הדם (avenger) if his grandfather killed his father, and go after his grandfather for revenge. Since his father is no longer alive, there is no obligation of כיבוד אב on him vis-a-vis his grandfather. (This analogy seems to disagree with *Rashi's* conclusion.) Along similar lines, the *Noda BiYehuda* (אה"ע 2:45) ruled that where a father made a request from his son to be carried out after the father's death, if the mother objects, the son must honor the mother's objection, because the חייב to honor a live mother is greater than the dissipating חייב to honor a dead father. Based on this, R' Akiva Eiger (*Teshuvos* 68) concluded that where a son is faced with conflicting testamentary wills, he need not necessarily choose to do his father's bidding over his mother's, as he would have had to do if they were alive.

**A Lesson Can Be Learned From:**

Two *Rabonim*, one of Ashkenazic origin and the other of Sephardic extraction, were spending *Shabbos* in the home of a *Baal Teshuva* couple. The hostess was also of Sephardic extraction, and so the Sephardic *Rov* was familiar with the interesting array of delicacies being served. At one point, he stood up and entered the kitchen to ask how the hostess was planning to serve a certain dish, which required a special sauce. When the woman explained how she planned to do it, the *Rov* objected, explaining that her proposed method would not be allowed on *Shabbos* for sauces. Later that evening, the host confided to the Ashkenazic *Rov* that his wife was extremely upset, and was nearing the point where she was "fed up" with all the rules and איסורים and was prepared to throw it all away, over this incident with the sauce, whose recipe her mother and grandmother had passed down to her etc... The *Rov* advised him to tell her that the method she wished to use might be permitted according to the *Rema* under the right circumstances. However, to take advantage of this, she would have to follow the *Rema* in all things, from that day forward. This meant that she might have to give up certain of her customs which followed rulings of the *Beis Yosef*. However, the *Rov* cautioned him to merely state what he had told him, and to let her think it over herself. At a minimum, once she would hear that there was a possible *Heter*, she would calm down. The husband was astounded that the insight of the *Rov* turned out to be flawless.

**P.S.** Sholosh Seudos sponsored this week by the Tyberg family.

This issue is dedicated:

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

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