



	Candles	Mincha	DafYomi	Shiur	Shachris	ש"ס
Friday	4:47	4:57	7:45			9:41
Shabbos		1:45/4:47	4:00		9:00	9:41
Sunday		4:57	5:10		8:00	9:40

IMPORTANCE OF

The *Gemara (Bava Kamma 9a)* states that one must spend up to a third on a *mitzvah*. The *Gemara* asks, a third of what? If it means a third of his assets, would not 3 *mitzvos* wipe him out? Rather, it means adding on a third extra for *Hidur Mitzvah* – beautifying the *mitzvah*. *Rashi* understands this to mean that when faced with two *mitzvah* objects to purchase, one should spend up to an additional half (or third) of the value of the less expensive object, and purchase the more expensive one with that additional money. *Tosafos* holds that the additional third referred to size, *i.e.* to purchase the *mitzvah* object that is up to a third larger than a smaller one. Though all agree that the concept of *Hidur Mitzvah* is derived from *זה קלי ואמורו*, where does the “third” come from? The *Bnei Yissachar (שבתות 2:4)* cites the *Targum Yonasan b. Uziel* on the *Posuk*: *ויקח שש מאות רכב בחור... ושלשם על כולו* where the *Targum* says: *ומוליתא תליתאה על כולהון*. The *Yerushalmi (8:2 כלאים)* and *Mechilta (1:7)* state that the custom was to ride in a wagon pulled by a single horse, until Pharaoh (in Yosef’s time) started using 2 horses. Finally, when chasing after *Bnei Yisroel*, Pharaoh used 3 horses, which is the meaning of *שלשם על כולו*. The same meaning is evident in *Targum Yonasan’s* words: *ומוליתא תליתאה – 3 horses*. Thus, Pharaoh added a “*Hidur*” of an additional third in his sinful activity, and Hashem paid him back in kind – *ומבחר שלשיו טבעו בים סוף*. Therefore, this is implied in the *Drasha* of *התנאה לפניו במצות*, to beautify *mitzvos* with the same calculation as was done at the *Yam Suf*. However, doesn’t the *Gemara (Kesubos 30a)* say that one should not spend more than a fifth on *mitzvos*? The *Biur Halachah (656)* suggests that the one fifth applies to all *mitzvos*, whereas the one third applies only to *mitzvos* that are active for a short time (*e.g.* esrog, matzoh etc..) where it is proper to be strict and apply a higher percent.

QUESTION OF THE WEEK:

If a married man had a name added to his original name (because of illness or as a *Segulah*) must his *Kesubah* be rewritten to reflect the new name?

ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:

(Who cannot be appointed as a *Shliach*, even for a *mitzvah*?)

The *Torah LiShmah (268)* rules that one may not appoint one’s father to be his *Shliach*, even for a *mitzvah*, as to do so reduces the respect a son must give to his father. The *Gemara (Kidushin 45a)* states that a son would not display such *Chutzpah* by asking his father to betroth a woman for him.

DIN'S CORNER:

One who recites *HaMotzi* over bread, and cuts the bread, should give a piece of the bread to all who are sitting there, but should not hand it to them, unless he hands it to a mourner. All others must take it from him, or from the table. No one may eat the piece of bread they received before the one who said the *brocho* eats his, unless he wishes to allow his *Rebbi* or other *Gedolim* to do so. He may also not eat his piece until most of those assembled finish saying *אמן* to his *brocho*. (*Rambam- Berachos 7:5*)

DID YOU KNOW THAT

The *Gemara (Bava Metzia 107a)* states that one may not stand near the field of another when its crops are fully grown as it is likely that he may cast an *Ayin Hora* on the crops out of envy, and the crops may suffer a loss. If a loss did occur, would the man who cast the evil eye be obligated to pay? Presumably, it would be very difficult to prove that he was actually responsible. But more than that, is one answerable for *Segulah*-type activities that are not natural? The *Halachos Ketanos (2:98)* stated that one who killed a man using Hashem’s name or sorcery would be liable, as the words that he spoke could be deemed an “act”, similar to shooting an arrow. But the *Chida (Devash Lefi מ:5)* notes that wherever *Chazal* say: *נתן עינו בו ונעשה לו עצמות* – a *Tzadik* looked at a *Rasha* who was then reduced to a pile of bones – it means that the *Tzadik* drew out the [small] spark of *Kedusha* from the *Rasha*, and all that was left of him was the pile of bones. The *Steipler (Bava Kamma 45 קהלות יעקב)* understands the *Chida* to be answering the question of how a *Tzadik* could allow his gaze, which presumably acts as a curse, to transgress the prohibitions against cursing. The *Chida* is explaining that it does not act as a curse at all, which may be why there is no question of liability to the *Tzadik*. The *Steipler* himself suggests that when the *Tzadik* gazes at the *Rasha* he is doing nothing more than finding the *Rasha* liable for his wickedness. The Heavenly *Beis Din* may then acquiesce to the *Tzadik’s* finding, and carry out a sentence. As such, the *Tzadik’s* gaze does not even rise to the activity level of an *Ayin Hora*. In the *Halachos Ketanos* case, *Shomayim* rules have established that death results “naturally” from uttering Hashem’s name or sorcery, and one may therefore be responsible for the act. The *Posuk* says: *וכאשר יניח ידו וגבר עמלק* – when Moshe’s hand lowered, Amalek would be superior over *Bnei Yisroel*. Knowing this (see *Ramban*), during those moments, could Moshe be held liable for any deaths or injuries *רח"ל*, for having lowered his hand? Perhaps, to exempt Moshe from liability, the *Mishna (Rosh HaShanah 3:8)* makes clear that it was not Moshe’s hands that affected the battle, but rather the hearts of *Bnei Yisroel*.

A Lesson Can Be Learned From:

A wealthy man who had just been blessed with a child after many years wished to donate 20% of his assets to medical research but could not decide between fertility research and eye disease research, since *Chazal* say about both the childless and the blind, that they are compared to the dead. His question (which was more appropriate) was sent to R' Chaim Kanievsky, who replied that eye care research should be favored. His reasoning was as follows: The *Shulchan Aruch (ח"א 473:5)* states that when choosing a vegetable for use as *Maror* at the Seder, one should select the first type mentioned in the list of the *Mishna (Pesachim 39a)*, and if that is not possible, he should choose the second one listed etc..., in the order stated. Thus, we see that *Chazal’s* order is significant. So too, when the *Gemara (Nedarim 64b)* lists the four men who are considered as if dead, the pauper, the leper, the blind and the childless, the blind comes before the childless, establishing its priority.

P.S. The Simchas Torah Chasanim Kiddush will be held this week after davening. Sholosh Seudos sponsored by the Zelcer 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