



Friday	7:36	6:45/7:46		9:23
Shabbos		1:45/7:31	6:30	9:00 9:23
Sunday		7:46	8:05	8:00 9:22

## IMPORTANCE OF ....

The *Mishna* (*Chulin* 74a) states that if one slaughters an animal and finds within it a fetus, the fetus does not require its own independent *Shechitah* to be eaten, as the *Shechitah* on the mother applies to it. Although it is likely in such a case that both the mother and child will end up being slaughtered on the same day, the *Issur* of: **אוֹתוֹ וְאַתָּ בָּנוּ לَا תִּשְׁחַתְּ בַּיּוֹם אֶחָד** would not apply, as the child is not considered to be “**בָּנוּ**” until it is born. The *Sefer HaEshkol* (182a) cites *Pesukim* such as: **הַנְּקֵה הַרְהָא וַיְלַدְתָּ בֵן** (he will be a **בָן** only after birth) and **שָׂוֹר אוֹ כָּשֵׁב כִּי יָלֵד** (it is only an ox or lamb if it is born) to prove that actual birth is required for a being to be considered an independent entity. The *Ibn Ezra* comments on the *Posuk*: **וַיִּתְרוֹצְצֻוּ הַבְּנִים בְּקֶרֶבָה** that the *Torah* calls them **בְּנִים** even while fetuses, only **בְּנִים סְוּסִים** – because they eventually became **בְּנִים**. However, the *Rambam* (*Shechita* 12:10) rules that the fetus is permitted because **עוֹבֵר יָרֵךְ אַמְוֹן** – a fetus is deemed one of the mother’s limbs. Would the *Rambam* agree that actual birth is necessary to convey the name **בָן**? The *Gemara* (*Megilah* 13a) asks why the *Megilah* had to say **וּבְמֹות אֲבֵיהָ וְאֶתְמָה** (about Esther) if it already said: **כִּי אֵין לְהָ אָב וְאֶם**, and answers that Esther’s father died when her mother conceived, and her mother died when giving birth to her. *Rashi* explains that her father died just before the moment when he could have been rightfully referred to as her father – at conception. Her mother died just before she would have been called her mother – at birth. Thus, **אֵין לְהָ אָב וְאֶם** meant to say that they never received those titles. Therefore, it is clear that the reciprocal relationship between **אָם** and **בָן** only starts after birth. What of the father? Shouldn’t the fetus be called **בָן** because the father is called **אָב** from the moment of conception? Perhaps this is why the *Rambam* focuses on **עוֹבֵר יָרֵךְ אַמְוֹן**, to establish that since the fetus is considered one of the mother’s limbs, it could never be called a **בָן** to the father until it achieves independence.

## QUESTION OF THE WEEK:

When would a *Tzibur* complete *Krias HaTorah* from a *Sefer Torah* that is *Posul*, even though there are others available?

## ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:

(When should one step back 3 paces **before** finishing *Shemona Esrei*?)

The *Mishna Berura* (124:13) says that if someone is still in the middle of *Shemona Esrei* when the *Chazan* is about to start *Chazoras HaShatz*, if he is afraid someone will make fun of him for davening so long, he should step back three paces, pretending to finish, go forward, and then complete *Shemona Esrei*.

## DIN'S CORNER:

If during a meal one drowses off, or goes to the bathroom, or realizes that he must interrupt the meal in order to *daven*, even if he goes to Shul to *daven*, these interruptions are not considered a *Hefsek*, and he need not say **הַמּוֹצִיא** again when he returns, but he should wash his hands again without a *brocho*. (MB 178:47)

## DID YOU KNOW THAT ....

The *Gemara* (*Rosh HaShanah* 25a) describes Rabbi Yehoshua’s distress at being forced to be **מַחְלֵל** the day he believed to be *Yom Kippur*, because Rabon Gamliel’s *Beis Din* ruled that *Yom Kippur* was on a different day. Rabbi Akiva comforted him with a *Drasha* using the *Posuk*: **תִּקְרֹאוּ אֶתְם בְּמוּעָדִים**, and two other places where the word **אתם** (“them”, referring to *Yomim Tovim*) is spelled without a “Vov”. Without a Vov, each **אתם** can be read to mean “you” instead of “them”, which, according to the *Drasha*, teaches us to follow *Beis Din*’s edicts, even if mistaken. The *Rema* (*Ao”H* 143:4) rules that although we take out another *Sefer Torah* if a mistake is found in the first one, the mistake must be a misspelled word, not simply the (non)existence of a “*Yud*” or “*Vov*” that would affect whether the word is a **מַלְאָה** (fully written) or a **חֲסָר** (missing a letter). This is because with our limited fluency and knowledge regarding when words are to be **מַלְאָה** and when in the writing of *Sifrei Torah*, we have no guarantee that the next *Sefer* will be any more Kosher than the first. If for example, a *Sefer Torah* contained the word: **תִּקְרֹאוּ אֶתְם בְּמוּעָדִים** (from the *Posuk*) with a “Vov”, which is clearly a mistake based on the *Drasha* of Rabbi Akiva, would the *Rema* agree that in this case, since we know positively that it is supposed to be a **חֲסָר**, we should remove this *Sefer Torah* and replace it with another? The *Noda BiYehuda* (*Ao”H* 2:12) ruled that according to the *Rema*, the *Sefer* should not be replaced, even in such a case. This is because the *Rema* was never concerned with a specific **מַלְאָה** or **חֲסָר**. The *Rema* believed that **נו** *Sefer Torah* today can be guaranteed entirely flawless in its representation of **מַלְאָה** and **חֲסָר**. As such, we have accepted not to invalidate *Sifrei Torah* based on possible **מַלְאָה** and **חֲסָר** errors. Therefore, there is no need, even here, to render the *Sefer* **פסול**.

## A Lesson Can Be Learned From:

A man moved to a new city and wanted to begin his residence there in the best way possible. He noticed that there was a group of idle people there whose attitude reflected frivolity and disinterest in those things that a Jew should be interested in. Wishing to avoid any negative influence from this group, he therefore made a vow not to join any gatherings where this group was in attendance. As it happened, he was invited to a festive meal, and shortly after he arrived, he saw members of that group arriving. He was unsure of what to do, so he made an excuse and left. But he wished to know for the possible next time what he should do. The MaHarsham informed him that there was no need for him to leave, and his vow would not be transgressed if he stayed. The MaHarsham cited the *Gemara* (*Sotah* 11a) which stated that the Egyptians decided they were safe to throw the Jewish male infants into the sea because Hashem, who always dealt **מִזְדָּחָה**, had sworn never to bring another flood on the world. However, Hashem was able to fulfill **מִזְדָּחָה** by causing the Egyptians to fall into the water themselves, and drown. “So it is with your vow as well. Although you swore never to join a gathering of that group, your vow does not include where they come to join with you”.

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

This issue is dedicated:

לע”נ אבִי מִרְיָה רַבִּי חַרְן אַבָּא בָּרְ שְׁמוּאֵל ז”ל

Dedications (\$18) and appreciations may be sent to: Kehillas 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

ולזין אברמת ב”ר יצחק הלי

ולזין פועל ב”ר יעקב חיימ