



	Candles	Mincha	DafYomi	Shiur	פרשת: ויצא ש"ש Shachris	סוק"ש 9:15 9:16 9:17
Friday	4:16	4:26	7:34			
Shabbos		4:16	3:50		9:00	9:16
Sunday		4:25	5:00		7:45	9:17

IMPORTANCE OF

The *Gemara* (*Shabbos* 135b) discusses the requirement that all male gentile slaves owned by a Jew must be circumcised. Sometimes, such a slave is to be given a *Bris Milah* on its eighth day and sometimes as early as its first day. The *Gemara* explains that where a *Shifchah* (gentile maid) is purchased, if she brings along her male child with her, the child is to be circumcised immediately, even if it was just born. If she should give birth while she is a *Shifchah*, the child is given a *Bris* on the eighth day. The *MaHaril Diskin* questions why, when the *Posuk* describes Yaakov's wealth in Lavan's employ, it lists the maids before the servants – "ושפחות ועבדים" whereas when the *Torah* listed the wealth of Avrohom, it listed the servants first, followed by the maids. Also, the word - שפחות in Yaakov's case is a "full word" (מלא) with a *Vov*, whereas in Avrohom's case it is missing the *Vov*. The *MaHaril* suggests that when Avrohom purchased servants, he was not yet commanded in the *mitzvah* of *Milah*. As such, there was no obligation or requirement that purchased servants be circumcised. Presumably, it was therefore not difficult for Avrohom to acquire sufficient man-servants, after which he needed to purchase maids for his servants. Yaakov on the other hand, was already commanded in *Milah*, and was required to circumcise all servants that he acquired. As such, it is probable that Yaakov did not have an easy time finding gentiles who were willing to be circumcised in order to become his servant. It was therefore necessary for Yaakov to first purchase maids, in particular those who were pregnant, from whose children he would be able to build up a staff of servants. Therefore, regarding Yaakov, the *Posuk* says שפחות first, as a מלא (full), to reflect a "fullness" of the שפחות who were pregnant.

QUESTION OF THE WEEK:

How does one fulfill the *mitzvah* of ושמח את אשתו during the first year of marriage that is different from other years ?

ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:

(Must one say *Birchos HaTorah* before studying *Musar* ?)

Where the *Shulchan Aruch* (אור"ח 85:2) states that one may not have *Torah* thoughts in the bathroom, the *Mishna Berurah* adds that it is פשוט that one is permitted, while in the bathroom, to reflect on one's lowly *Madregah* and on how in the end, he will be returned to dust and decay, and how arrogance is certainly not befitting him. R' Chaim Kanievski derives from here that one may also think such thoughts before saying *Birchos HaTorah*.

DIN'S CORNER:

It is forbidden (even for a *Rebbi*) to strike someone with a *Sefer*, just as it is also prohibited to deflect a blow using a *Sefer*, unless the blow is life-threatening. One may also not bang on a *Sefer*, which includes a *Gabbai* who bangs on the *Bimah* for quiet, or to announce *Yaaleh V'Yavo* etc.. (*Beis Lechem Yehudah* (ד"ר 282)

DID YOU KNOW THAT

The *Gemara* (*Rosh HaShanah* 28a) states that one should not use an idolater's *Shofar* that was worshipped as *avodah zarah* or that was used as its ornament, or to serve an idol. However, if such a *Shofar* were used to blow *Tekios*, it is valid *B'Dieved*. The *Tur* (אר"ח 586) notes that this is only if the Jew did not intend to acquire the *Shofar*. If he intended to appropriate it, it would become the *avodah zarah* of a Jew, despite having been stolen, which was invalid for the *mitzvah* of *Shofar*. The *Bach* disagrees, doubting whether the Jew could acquire it simply by taking it from the idolater, choosing instead to understand that the *Tur* was referring to a Jew acquiring the *avodah zarah* from *Hefker*, which is ownerless. The *Magen Avraham* (*ibid*) joins in, arguing that having taken it, the Jew becomes liable if anything should happen to it. This אחריות makes it his, just as being liable for the *Chometz* of another makes the *Chometz* "his". However, the *Shvus Yaakov* (3:38) points out from the *Gemara* (*Sanhedrin* 72a) that although אחריות confers some sort of legal possession onto the thief, such possession does not ripen into ownership, since, as *Rashi* explains, if the object is still intact, he must return it to fulfill והשיב את הגזילה. Instead, the *Shvus Yaakov* suggests that there is no theft problem where a Jew appropriates the *avodah zarah Shofar*, because the *Torah* demands that one destroy all *avodah zarah*, as the *Posuk* states: ואשריהם תשרפון באש. This changes the legal identity of all *avodah zarah* into *Hefker*. This is evident in the actions of *Rochel* who took *Lavan's* idols, where *Rashi* explains that *Rochel's* intention was to separate *Lavan* from *avodah zarah*. How do her intentions change the fact that a theft took place ? It must be, as suggested, that intent to confiscate *avodah zarah* in order to destroy it makes it *Hefker*, and removes it from the category of theft..

A Lesson Can Be Learned From:

A man who had strayed a bit from *Shemiras HaTorah* eventually returned, and purchased for himself a beautiful pair of *Tefillin*. When he married and was *Zocheh* to a son, he took great care in raising him well, until the boy was accepted into a very prestigious "out-of-town" *Yeshiva*. On the day that the boy was preparing to leave, some *Lev L'Achim* volunteers happened to show up at the house and they noticed how the father could not stop crying. Assuming that he was sad to see his son leave home, they began to comfort him. He told them that he was crying because he could not afford *Tefillin* for his son, who had until now been sharing his *Tefillin* with him. What should he do now – keep them or give them to his son ? The *Lev L'Achim* men were very moved and quickly secured another pair for the boy. Although moot, a *Rav* was asked what the *Halacha* would be, and he said that if the son's learning would suffer from having to borrow *Tefillin* every day, then the son gets them. Otherwise, the father keeps them – חייך קודמן.

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