



	Candles	Mincha	DafYomi	Shiur	Shachris	פרשת: נשא	סזק"ש
Friday	8:13	6:50/7:45					9:10
Shabbos		8:00	6:30	7:30	9:00		9:10
Sunday		8:25	7:30	7:30	9:10		9:10

IMPORTANCE OF

The *Panim Yafos* cites the *Sifri* (8) in stating that the *Korban Mincha* which a husband provides for his wife when he suspects her of being a *Sotah* (adulterous) may be deducted from her *Kesubah*. However, the *Mishna* (*Negaim* 14:12) defines the standard of *Korbanos* which a husband is required to provide for his wife, and the *Rabanan* explains that this includes only such *Korbanos* as those a woman brings after childbirth, after *Zivah* impurity and when suspected of being a *Sotah* but not those which she becomes obligated in for *Chilul Shabbos* or for vows, since she could incur these repeatedly to annoy him. As such, just as all agree he must provide the post-childbirth *Korban* for her without deduction from her *Kesubah*, so too must he do regarding the *Korban Sotah*. The *Gemara* (*Sotah* 3a) records a *Machlokes* where the *Rabanan* define *רוח טומאה* as *רוח טהרה* (impure spirit) while Rav Ashi maintains that it is a *רוח טהרה* (spirit of purity). The *Panim Yafos* holds that they do not argue. The *Rabanan* refer to a situation where the wife is chaste and pure, characterizing the husband's suspicion as unwarranted, caused by a *רוח טומאה*; Rav Ashi was referring to a wife who behaves improperly, thus justifying the husband's suspicion as a *רוח טהרה*. The *Panim Masbiros* suggests that when the husband's suspicions were unfounded and unwarranted, the *Korban Sotah* should not be deducted from her *Kesubah*, as the *Mishna* implied. However, where the wife's behavior warranted suspicion, even if she did not actually sin, still, the husband would be justified in deducting the *Korban* from her *Kesubah*, as the *Panim Yafos* said.

QUESTION OF THE WEEK:

If only *Kohanim* may bless with *נשיאת כפים*, how are permitted to give a *brocho* to a *Chasan* or to one's children Friday night ?

ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:

(Why is *Shavuos* מתן תורה if we received the *Luchos* on *Yom Kippur* ?)

Rav Matisyahu Solomon (*מתנת חיים*) cites the reason for eating *Milchig* on *Shavuos* – that newly discovered meat preparation requirements needed more time, as proof that general rules in *Halacha* were somehow conveyed on *Shavuos* even if the details weren't given until *Yom Kippur*.

DIN'S CORNER:

One who invests in publishing new *Sefarim* may retain exclusive rights to the *Sefer* for a reasonable amount of time. However, whereas in the past, publishers were given up to 15 years, that was only because there were few buyers and 15 years were needed to recoup their expenses. Today, with many buyers, much less time is required. (*Teshuvos V'Hanhagos* 3:466)

DID YOU KNOW THAT

In *Moadim B'Halacha* (*Purim*), Rav Zevin cites the explanation of the Rogatchover Gaon, on the origin of a custom for the *Tzibur* to say the *Rogatchover Gaon*, on the origin of a custom for the *Tzibur* to say the *Rogatchover Gaon* together with the *Baal Koray* during the *Megilah* reading. Since the *Shulchan Aruch* (690:15) states that they should be said *בנשימה אחת* (in one breath), the *Tzibur* must fulfill that aspect individually, as the reader can only be *מוציא* them with the words – not the breath. Similarly, the *Beis HaLevi* (end of *בראשית*) holds that one *Kohen* cannot be *מוציא* other *Kohanim* with *ברכת כהנים* (*duchaning*). Since we derive from *אמור להם* that the *Kohen* must bless *בקול רם* (in a loud voice), no one *Kohen* is able to be *מוציא* the others with that feature. However, the *Chazon Ish* (29:3) argues that the concept of *שומע כעונה*, where one person can be *מוציא* another who listens, attributes to the listener all factors of the performance, including the loudness of voice. For if not, how could one be *מוציא* others by reading the *Megilah* without the act of "reading" (not merely the reciting) be attributed to them ? The *Chazon Ish* (5740:36) suggests that their *Machlokes* may depend on another facet of *ברכת כהנים*. The *Gemara* (*Sotah* 38a) derives from *אמור להם* that the *Tzibur* must be facing the *Kohanim* during *duchaning*, and not *פנים כנגד עורף* - the *Tzibur's* back facing the *Kohanim*. The *Sifri* (39) phrases it differently, excluding from *אמור להם* the case of *פנים כנגד פנים* – where the *Kohanim's* back faces the *Tzibur*. Thus, the *Gemara's* view of *אמור להם* focuses on the *Tzibur* who must face the *Kohanim* and hear the *קול רם*. The *Sifri* considers it to be the *Kohanim's* obligation to face the *Tzibur* and *duchan* *בקול רם*. The *Chazon Ish* holds as the *Sifri*, allowing one *Kohen* to be *מוציא* their collective *חיוב* of *קול רם*. The *Beis HaLevi* holds as the *Gemara*, that the obligation of hearing *קול רם* is on the *Tzibur*. As the *חיוב* is not on the *Kohanim*, one of them could not be *מוציא* the others.

A Lesson Can Be Learned From:

R' Tzvi Dovid of Cracow was the subject of a mud-slinging campaign and suffered much from ridicule and criticism. On Shabbos, he expounded on the Posuk in Tehilim: *ישירו בי יושבי שער* - the residents of the gates [lower class] will speak of me. "Why is this used to exemplify the sorry state of Jews in Golus ?" he asked. "Would it be better if important people spoke about him ? The answer is that when one speaks *Lashon HoRa* about someone, all of the speaker's Schar for his mitzvos is transferred to the victim of his *Lashon HoRa*, and all the victim's sins are transferred to the speaker. When great people heap abuse on someone, he may be comforted by the many mitzvos he will be receiving. But what can he hope for from the *יושבי שער* ?"

P.S. *Sholosh Seudos* sponsored this week by the Polin family to celebrate the *Sheva Berachos* of their daughter Leah & Joshua Commer.