



	Candles	Mincha	DafYomi	Shiur	Shachris	צ"ש
Friday	4:22	4:34	8:00			9:10
Shabbos		4:22	3:40	4:10	9:00	9:11
Sunday		4:30	5:15		7:30	9:11

IMPORTANCE OF

The Gemara (Nedarim 40a) states that those who visit a חולה cause him to live; those who do not visit cause him to die. How does a non-visitor cause him to die ? The Gemara answers that those who visit are מתפלל for him to live; those who do not visit do not benefit him that way. The Gemara (Berachos 34a) states that one who is מתפלל for a friend need not mention his name when doing so, as we find Moshe's תפילה: תפילה לא לה: did not mention Miriam's name. The Magen Avraham (א"ח 119:1) cites the MaHaril who says that this is only when the subject of one's תפילה is present. However, when not present, his name must be mentioned. Chasam Sofer (Nedarim 40a) says in the name of Mekubalim that mentioning the name of a חולה may sometimes work to his disadvantage, as it "awakens judgement" against him. As such, although one certainly performs a mitzvah when davening for a חולה, the benefit may be offset if his name is mentioned. When the Gemara says one who visits the חולה causes him to live, it is because one need not mention his name and the תפילה will certainly help. However, if one does not visit the חולה and yet, is מתפלל for him, by mentioning his name, he may bring harm. The Meforshim ask why Aisav was so upset upon discovering that Yaakov had received the berachos from Yitzchok. Wasn't Aisav on Yitzchok's mind when giving the berachos ? However, since Aisav was not physically present at the time, his name would have had to have been mentioned in the berachos for them to apply to him, and it was not. Although Yaakov's name was also not mentioned, Yaakov happened to have been standing there and didn't need his name mentioned.

QUESTION OF THE WEEK:

If a person eats alone, must he say Divrei Torah at the meal ?

ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:

(How could two groups who eat only their own שחיטה share the same meat ?)

The Shulchan Aruch (י"ד 13:2-3) rules that if a slaughtered cow has a calf inside it, the calf does not require its own שחיטה. However, if the mother cow's שחיטה was invalid, then the calf does need its own. As such, Group 1 can Shecht the mother and Group 2 will Shecht the calf. Group 1 will eat the calf, since it didn't need שחיטה; and Group 2 will eat it - it's their שחיטה.

DIN'S CORNER:

Those who are ineligible to write a Sefer Torah (e.g. women, minors, non-Jews, apostates etc..) are also ineligible to make corrections to it. However, if the correction involves separating two letters that have come together, they may do so, since they do not actually form the letters. (Biur Halacha 39)

DID YOU KNOW THAT

The Mishna (Yevamos 122a) states that all people are believed if they testify that a man has died, in order to permit his widow to remarry. This includes testimony from a single witness, a woman, a slave, a maid, a relative and even hearsay testimony. However, there are five exceptions, where traditionally, bad feelings may exist. Testimony from the (allegedly) deceased husband's mother, sister, other wife, brother's wife and daughter is not accepted as we suspect their motive. If the "widow" were to remarry based on their testimony and then her husband reappeared, she would then be prohibited to both husbands. The Rambam (גירושין 12:15) rules that the single witness, slave, maid, relative etc..., although normally Posul as a witness, may testify MiDeRabonon here because the subject matter is something that will eventually come to light (עבירה לגלוי) and they will be afraid to testify unless they are positive. However, a thief, who is Posul because of an Aveirah, may not testify. The Avnei Nezer (א"ח 65) asks why, citing a Tosafos (Kesubos 92b) which says that for any document which contains the signature of witnesses, the Torah does not require that the signatures be verified. Even if a thief produced the document, the signatures are to be trusted because a thief is afraid of getting caught in a forgery. If so, a thief should also be believed to testify for a widow since it is עבירה לגלוי and he would be fearful of getting caught in a lie ! He answers that the Ramban comments on: ויבז עשו את הבכורה that fools such as Aisav subscribe to the Epicurean theory of eat and drink today, without thinking of tomorrow. As such, although a thief might be afraid to forge a document's signature, it is because he fears exposure today as he presents it. However, in עדות אשה, even if the husband shows up alive someday, the fear is far away in the future and a thief would not be concerned.

A Lesson Can Be Learned From:

R' Chaim Palaggi, as Rav in Izmir, began a campaign to build a Jewish hospital. Needless to say, the project would require heavy financing and the Rav accepted that responsibility upon himself. He wrote to one of the city's most respected businessmen and asked him to contact Baron Rothschild, with whom the businessman had extensive dealings. The businessman replied that he believed nothing good would come from such a petition. The Baron would be upset that he was taking advantage of their business relationship, he would not contribute, and would likely sever their relationship. "והבאתי עלי קללה ולא ברכה" were his concluding remarks. R' Chaim wrote back: "Not every aspect of every mitzvah enjoys Hashem's help. That is why I wrote בעזרת השם on the letter. What the mitzvah doesn't protect, בעזרת השם certainly will."

P.S. Sholosh Seudos sponsored this week by the Kagan family.