



	Candles	Mincha	DafYomi	Shiur	Shachris	ש"ש
Friday	5:20	5:30				9:26
Shabbos		1:45/5:20	4:45		9:00	9:26
Sunday		5:30	5:50		8:00	9:25

IMPORTANCE OF ...

The Gemara (Bava Basra 172a) states that if there are two men in one city with the same name and father's name (e.g. יוסף בן שמעון) they are not permitted to make a claim against the other based on a שטר (document), since it wouldn't be clear who owes whom. If they wish to do business, the Gemara says "שלוש", which means they must add a third generation (e.g. a grandfather's name) to identify them, such as יוסף בן שמעון בן יעקב. If even the grandfather's name is the same for both, they should add a סימן (sign) such as יוסף בן שמעון בן יעקב שהיה גוף (who is short) or לבן (who is fair-complexioned) etc.. If even this does not sufficiently distinguish them, they should write הכהן or ישראל. One might suggest that for this reason, the Torah describes the architect of the Mishkan as: בצלאל בן אורי בן חור למטה יהודה, since there may have been more than one אורי בן בצלאל among the Bnei Yisroel and perhaps they both had a grandfather named חור. However, even if this were so, why would the extended lineage be mentioned again in ויקהל where Moshe presents Betzalel to the Bnei Yisroel? It might have been necessary when Hashem told Moshe whom to choose, in כי תשא, to distinguish him from other Betzalels. However, Moshe had now identified him and didn't need the extra description. The גרש כרמל notes that Rashi comments in ויקהל how Chur was the son of Miriam (and therefore the nephew of Moshe). As such, Bnei Yisroel could have suspected that Moshe only heard בצלאל בן אורי from Hashem and that he unilaterally chose his nephew from the list of possible Betzalels. Therefore, the Posuk tells us explicitly that Moshe announced: ... ראו קרא ד' בשם בצלאל בן וכו'. - that Hashem told him specifically whom to choose, and that Hashem used Chur and the tribe of Yehudah to describe him.

QUESTION OF THE WEEK:

In a Pikuach Nefesh situation where money is needed, what is preferable: one active aveirah (steal) or several passive aveiros (not paying a worker - transgress an עשה and a לאו)?

ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:

(If a house's Mezuzah fell off on Shabbos, what should one do?) One can either make his house Hefker, which obviously makes him Potur from Mezuzah, or he can "claim" אונס, since he cannot do anything about it. The Gemara (Pesachim 70b) relates that a Tanna moved away from Yerushalayim, to become Potur from a Korban Chagigah on Pesach (which fell on Shabbos) rather than rely on the fact that the Gedolei HaDor did not instruct Bnei Yisroel to bring it. This implies that a Petur is preferable to the excuse of אונס, if possible. One should therefore choose Hefker.

DIN'S CORNER:

When faced with a choice of being מקרב a secular Jew, raised without Torah, versus a Jew from an observant home who has strayed, one should concentrate efforts where the chances of success are better, but lean towards rescuing the straying Jew if his/her parents are still living, as it would fulfill an additional מצוה to them. Teshuvos V'Hanhagos 3:480

DID YOU KNOW THAT

The Gemara (Pesachim 26a) states that קול ומראה וריח - [enjoying] sound, appearance and aroma [in the Beis HaMikdash] do not violate מעילה, the prohibition against deriving benefit from anything Hekdesh. As such, it was permitted to gaze at the Kiyor and benefit from the reflection of its mirrored walls. The Tur notes that this ability served a specific function. Since the Kohen who processed a Korban was required to do so לשמה - for the precise sake of the person offering it, when that person was a woman, the Kohen was able to see her briefly in the reflection of the mirrored Kiyor, and thereby know for whom the Korban was being offered. The Minchas Yitzchok (2:84) asks, if by not looking at her directly, the Kohen sought to avoid הרהור - the risk of unseemly thoughts, wouldn't that same risk exist in looking at the mirror's reflection? Furthermore, does not the Shulchan Aruch (75:5) clearly state that where a man may not say Shema in the presence of ערוה, he may also not say it where the ערוה is visible through a glass? The Minchas Elazar (3:25) states that in the midst of doing the Avodah in the Beis HaMikdash, the Kohen would not be susceptible to הרהור. If so, why couldn't he look at her directly? The Minchas Elazar suggests that a direct look was discouraged because of מראית העין - to avoid the appearance of impropriety. Another possible rationale could be as follows: Chazal established an obligation to avoid הרהור from such Pesukim as: ונשמרת מכל דבר רע ... ואחרי עיניכם. If generally, a direct look runs the risk of הרהור, would we also apply the same rule to a Tzadik whose elevated moral character is sure to resist it? Clearly, those Pesukim apply to everyone. However, their application might be limited to a direct look, where Chazal said לא פלוג - it applies to everyone. Where however, the "look" is only a reflection from a mirror, Chazal would not have been so rigid, and where circumstances suggest that the risk of הרהור is severely diminished, the restriction would have been somewhat lifted. Such would be the case with a Tzadik, and also for a Kohen in the middle of the Avodah.

A Lesson Can Be Learned From:

When R' Shimon Sofer was a young boy, he asked his father the Chasam Sofer an Apikores-like question. "A Maskil asked me this question and I couldn't think of an answer to give him", he explained apologetically. The Chasam Sofer said nothing until a few days later, when he called in his son and showed him how the question was easily answered. The boy asked him: "You obviously knew this when I originally asked you the question a few days ago. Why did you wait until now to explain it?" The Chasam Sofer replied: "I wanted to teach you that in matters of אמונה, one need not feel rushed or pressured to immediately resolve any questions or doubts. If you can't think of an answer today you will surely think of one tomorrow or the next day. Always rest assured that an answer exists. In the meantime, let nothing jeopardize your אמונה."

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

This issue is dedicated:

לע"נ אבי מורי הרב אהרן זאב ב"ר שמואל ז"ל

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