



	Candles	Mincha	Daf Yomi	Shachris	סוק"ש
Friday	5:40	5:50			10:01
Shabbos		1:45/5:40	5:15	9:00	10:01
Sunday		5:50	6:20	8:00	10:02

**IMPORTANCE OF ....**

The Gemara (Nazir 61a) states that the Torah acknowledges the concept of inheritance from a gentile to his son, as the Posuk states: **כי ירושה לעשוי נתתי את הר שעיר**. The Rambam (נחלות 6:9) states that the father-son legacy is the only form of inheritance that the Torah specifically recognizes, adding that any other rules of inheritance succession are to be governed by gentile custom. Koveitz Shiurim (Bava Basra 358) suggests that the Rambam's source for this addendum may be: **והנה בן ביתי יורש אותי**, where Avram laments the fact that he had no son, and as a result his servant Eliezer would inherit his assets. Did not Avram have a nephew – Lot ? Why would Eliezer preempt Lot ? It seems therefore, that in the absence of a son, rules of inheritance would depend on custom, and apparently the custom was that servants had priority. The MaHarSham (6:26) considered a case where a Jew sold his Chametz to a gentile who died in the middle of Pesach, without a son. Had there been a son, he would have inherited and continued the ownership. However, now the Chametz was in limbo, sitting physically in the Jew's house. Did the Jew reacquire it from Hefker ? A similar question was raised by the organizer of a Gemach who purchased many dishes in order to lend them out to people. The amount of dishes made it difficult to perform *Tevilas Keilim* on them, so he used a strategy supported by the Shulchan Aruch (יר"ד 120:16) and many Poskim, to give them all to a gentile as a gift, and then borrow them back, which made *Tevilah* unnecessary. He made an arrangement with the gentile to borrow them for 50 years, after which they would be returned. The problem arose when the gentile couldn't be found. Was he alive ? Did he have a son to inherit from him if he had died ? If not, would not the Keilim become Hefker and, as they were in the possession of the Gemach, would not the Gemach acquire them, and they would now require *Tevilah* ? The Ateres Paz (ח"מ 1:3:13) using several theories of רוב ruled that the Keilim were good as is until the expiration of the 50 year loan. Since most people who were known to be alive are deemed to still be alive, we can rely on this gentile being alive as well. Furthermore, most married women bear children, so the gentile probably has a child who will inherit from him if he should die.

**QUESTION OF THE WEEK:**

When might one not be permitted to say **ברוך שאמר** or **שתבח** during a regular, post-**נ** morning *Shacharis* ?

**ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:**

(When would one miss 2 *Tefilos* and say 3 *Shemona Esreis* at the next one ?) The *Pri Megadim* (משבצות 108:5) states that if one missed *Mincha* and *Neilah* on *Yom Kippur*, he says 3 *Shemona Esreis* for *Maariv*.

**DIN'S CORNER:**

If one forgets whether a certain **כלי** was used with meat or dairy, he must *kasher* it with **הגעלה** (purging) and then he may re-designate it as meat or dairy. If he does not purge it, he may only use it with *Pareve*. (*Shevet HaKehasi* 1:225)

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

The Gemara (*Chulin* 55b) states that a punctured spleen in a cow does not render the cow a *Treifah*. However, this is only if the puncture is in the thin part of the spleen. A hole in the thick part will render it *Treifah*, unless the puncture doesn't go all the way through, and at least an area equal to the thickness of a gold *dinar* is left intact beyond the puncture. The *Tur* (יר"ד 43) cites the *Rashba* who says that we are not told what the thickness of a gold *dinar* is, but we must conclude that it has to be less than half of the thickness of the spleen, since the Gemara's description uses the words: **אישתייר ביה כעובי דינר** (there remained [of the spleen] like the thickness of a *dinar*), and **אישתייר** (remained) can only refer to less than half of something. The *Taz* (יר"ד 43:7) says the same thing, as the *Shulchan Aruch* rules accordingly. The *Posuk* says that of the 5 kings who fled from the battle with the 4 kings, 2 of the kings - those of Sodom and Amora, fled from the battle and fell into a well, while **הנשארים הרה נסו** - the remaining [kings] fled to the mountains. If so, the "remaining" kings in the mountains were 3, which were more than the 2 kings who fell into the well and as such, the 3 kings should not have been labeled **הנשארים** as they were more than half ! The *Dvar Shaul* comments on the *Shulchan Aruch's* ruling that the *Midrash Rabbah* (*Rus* 2:7) states that when Elimelech died, **ותשארה היא ושני בניה** - Naomi and her two sons remained, and the *Midrash* adds the words: **ונעשית היא שירי מנחות** - she became the remains of [*Korbanos*] *Mincha*. The *Dvar Shaul* explains that just as a *Korban Mincha* has a *Kometz* (handful of flour) extracted from its ingredients, and yet the rest of the *Mincha* is referred to as **שירי המנחה** (the rest of the *Mincha*) despite being much greater in quantity than the *Kometz*, still, as compared to the *Kometz* in terms of importance, the "rest" of the ingredients are less **חשוב** than the *Kometz*. So too, although Naomi and her 2 sons were 3 people and Elimelech was only 1, Naomi and her sons are relegated to **ותשארה** status as compared to Elimelech who was more **חשוב**, which is why the *Midrash* makes the reference to **שירי מנחות**. The *Birchas Aharon* applies the same theory to explain why the 3 kings are called **הנשארים** as the *Torah* considered them less **חשוב** than the other 2.

**A Lesson Can Be Learned From:**

When R' Zvi Hirsch Levin was the Rav in Berlin, a number of young people developed an attitude of disrespect towards Rabonim whom they felt were not educated in science and the arts. Some community leaders proposed the opening of a Beis Midrash LeRabonim, where scholars would be trained in Torah and secular subjects. They were even able to secure government funding and assistance. When they asked R' Zvi Hirsch to support the project, he refused. He explained to them by reference to the Gemara (*Avodah Zara* 2b) which describes how Edom will come before Hashem and request reward for all the marketplaces and bathhouses they built, claiming that they were all built for the benefit of Klal Yisroel, so that they could study Torah. Hashem's response was that they did it all for themselves. Why wouldn't they claim that they built a Beis Midrash LeRabonim, which certainly was not for themselves ? Because even Edom would be embarrassed to present 'Rabonim' emerging from such a school before the Ribono Shel Olam.

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

This issue is dedicated:

ולז"נ אבי מורי הרב אהרן זאב ב"ר שמואל ולז"נ אמי מרת 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 ולע"נ רבקה ב"ר מנחם מאיר