



Friday	4:17	4:27	7:30	4:00	9:00	9:39
Shabbos		4:17	3:30	9:00	9:40	
Sunday		4:27	5:00	7:30	9:40	

IMPORTANCE OF ...

The *Mishna* (*Bava Kamma* 92a) states that if one says to another "Break my pitcher" or "Tear my garment", if he listens and does the damage he must pay, even though he was given "permission" to do so. The *Terumas HaDeshen* (317) cites a *Psak* in the name of Rabbeinu Ephraim that, based on this *Gemara*, if one invited another to eat a meal with him, the "guest" is liable to pay for the meal. However, the *Mishna* (*Kesubos* 107b) states that if a man traveled abroad and another man undertook to support the traveler's wife, he may not claim reimbursement. Based on this, the *Rif* (cited in the *Beis Yosef* ח"מ 128:1) ruled that if one raised an orphan he may **not** demand payment when the orphan is grown. The *Knesses HaGedolah* (128) seeks to distinguish between these apparently conflicting rulings as follows: The *Rif*'s orphan need not pay because the benefactor was supporting him in his own house, giving the orphan of his own food and drink; The *Terumas HaDeshen*'s guest on the other hand, received his food from the benefactor but the food was sent to the guest's house. The guest must therefore pay for it. *Rashi* explains the words: **ויראו אחי יוסף כי מת אביהם**, that Yosef's brothers noticed how after Yaakov's *Petirah* they were no longer invited to dine at Yosef's table. (The *Midrash* (100:8) says it was because Yaakov had always made Yosef sit at the head, above Yehudah and Reuven, and Yosef did not wish to do so anymore, nor did he wish to sit below them.) However, the brothers were alarmed by this change because, although Yosef had been consistently supporting them in Egypt, he was no longer doing so from his own table, but was rather sending their food to them, in their own homes. The *Sefer Yonah* suggests that as such, Yosef could potentially charge them for the food they were eating at home. Therefore, Yosef assured them: **ועתה אל תיראו אנכי אכלכל אתכם** - have no fear, I will support you [as before] (*i.e.* for free).

QUESTION OF THE WEEK:

Where would one's physical appearance (handsome or ugly) be Halachic grounds for granting or denying him a benefit ?

ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:

(Does "wasting" money on luxuries transgress **בל תשחית**?)

Rabbeinu Yonah (*Sefer Teshuva* 3:82) rules that one may not spend money **לריק** - on nothing. This establishes only that **בל תשחית** is not restricted to food. Still, as long as his money is spent on something he wants, there is no **בל תשחית**. (*2:159 ועלהו לא יבול*)

DIN'S CORNER:

The *Baal Kriah* and the one who received the *Aliyah* may not lean on the *Bimah* during the *Kriah* unless they are heavy and have difficulty standing without support. In any case, if they must lean on the *Bimah* in order to see the first few lines at the top of the *Torah* page) they may do so, provided they straighten up again as the *Kriah* proceeds further down. (*MB* 141:5)

DID YOU KNOW THAT ...

The *Gemara* (*Gittin* 20a) states the case of a *Sofer* (scribe), who while writing *Hashem's* name in a *Sefer Torah*, suddenly became confused and thought he was supposed to write the name **הודרה**, but then wrote the word mistakenly, leaving out the "ד", which resulted in his writing *Hashem's* name correctly, but without the proper intent. R' Yehudah says that he may trace his pen over the word again with proper **כוונה** but the *Chachomim* disagree (and such is the *Halacha*). Rav Chisda suggests that they would have the same *Machlokes* in the case of a *Get* written **שלא לשמה** - without specific intent to divorce the woman it is being given to. Here too, R' Yehudah should allow the *Get* to be retraced while the *Chachomim* would not. However, Rav Acha disagrees with Rav Chisda, believing that the reason retracing may be invalid in a *Sefer Torah* is because a *Sefer Torah* is an inherently sacred object, the creation of which is a *mitzvah*. As such, its writing falls under: **זה קלי ואמרה**, the requirement to beautify a *mitzvah* performance, and retracing is not a "beautiful" way to write a *Sefer Torah*. A *Get* on the other hand, is not sacred and would not require beautifying. Therefore, Rav Acha maintains that even the *Chachomim* might permit retracing in a *Get*. A *Sefer Torah* was once found to be missing two words in *Vayechi*, in the *Posuk*: **ויאמר יעקב א"ל שד"י**. Instead it said: **ויאמר יעקב אל יוסף א"ל שד"י**. At a suggestion that the words **ויאמר יעקב** be erased and rewritten as **ויאמר יעקב אל יוסף**, the question arose, had the *Sofer* forgotten to include the words: **אל יוסף**, where the word **אל** meant "to", or had he forgotten the words **יוסף א"ל**, where the word **א"ל** would have meant *Hashem* ? If so, the existing **אל** meant "to", and retracing it with **כוונה** could not infuse it with **קדושה**. R' Akiva Eiger (70) held that although it would appear to be a **ספק ספיקא** (double doubt) - 1) what did the *Sofer* forget; and 2) do we rule like R' Chisda or R' Acha, retracing was not an option according to either. He therefore recommended that the words **יוסף א"ל** be inserted between and **above** the words **אל שד"י**.

A Lesson Can Be Learned From:

The wife of R' Yitzchok Schwadron was very accommodating to her husband's Torah learning schedule. As a result, he asked her one day what he could do for her, as recognition for her self-sacrifice and devotion to his learning. She replied that she would very much like to learn a Blatt *Gemara* with him. R' Yitzchok sadly had to refuse, quoting her the *Gemara* which equates teaching a woman *Gemara* with teaching her 'Tiflus' (nonsense). "However", he added, "I will do the following for you. I will sit and learn in my study, explaining the *Gemara* to myself slowly and loudly. You may sit nearby and listen. Chazal say that one may not teach a woman *Gemara*. They did not forbid a woman from listening to her husband while he studies !"

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

This issue is dedicated:

לז"נ פערל ב"ר יצחק הלוי