



	Candles	Mincha	DafYomi	Shiur	פרשת: תולדות ש"ש Shachris
Friday	4:13	4:23	7:30		9:19
Shabbos		4:13	3:50		9:19
Sunday		4:25	9:00		9:20

## IMPORTANCE OF ....

The *Gemara* (*Shabbos* 9b) asks what act defines the beginning of a meal. Rav says it is the washing of one's hands, while R' Chanina says it is the unfastening of one's belt. The *Gemara* goes on to clarify that R' Chanina (who lived in *Eretz Yisroel*) was referring to the custom of the Babylonians, and Rav (who lived in Bavel) was describing the custom in *Eretz Yisroel*. *Tosafos* explains that it was customary for students to leave home and study elsewhere, to eliminate distractions. Thus, R' Chanina had Babylonian students and Rav had students from *Eretz Yisroel*. The *Chasam Sofer* (9 ח"מ) comments that the "switch" was complete, i.e. there were no Babylonian students in front of Rav, and no *Eretz Yisroel* ones in front of R' Chanina. If there had been, it would have been appropriate for the *Amora* to teach the local custom, and not defer to the "foreign" students. The *Gemara* (*Megilah* 16b) states that the *mitzvah* of *Talmud Torah* is greater than honoring one's parents, since we see that Yaakov was not punished for neglecting his parents during the 14 years that he spent in the Yeshiva of Ever. The *Chasam Sofer* (*ibid*) asks, perhaps Yaakov was punished for those 14 years, but was not punished for the 14 years that he spent getting married and having children in Lavan's house. Perhaps it is the *mitzvah* of procreation (פרור) that is greater than honoring one's parents! The *Chasam Sofer* answers that Yaakov could have fulfilled the *mitzvah* of פרור without having to leave his parents. He left, only because of his problem with Eisav, for which it would be appropriate that he suffer some minimal punishment. However, to effectively fulfill the *mitzvah* of *Talmud Torah*, Yaakov had no choice but to leave his parents and study elsewhere. As such, even without the Eisav incident, Yaakov would have had to leave, and thus would not have been punished.

## QUESTION OF THE WEEK:

When would the *Halacha* regarding a *brocho* over a beverage be different if one drank the beverage cold versus hot, where both ways are common?

## ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:

(Which *brocho* is equal in *Gematriya* to what it is said over?)

The *Birkei Yosef* (203 א"ח) states that there are 55 types of vegetables over which the *brocho* of האדמה (55 in *Gematriya*) is recited.

## DIN'S CORNER:

After reciting the *brocho* of בשמים (or עצי) over spices, and smelling the spices, one does not recite a *Brocho Acharona* over the spices the way one does after eating food or drinking water because one only says a *Brocho Acharona* after having consumed a minimum fixed amount (*KeZayis* for food or *Revi'is* for beverages). Since the *brocho* over spices has no fixed amount, no *Brocho Acharona* can be said. (Or *Sameach* ברכות 1)

## DID YOU KNOW THAT ....

The *Gemara* (*Sotah* 10b) derives that it is better for one to throw oneself into a furnace rather than shame someone in public, from Tamar's refusal to identify Yehudah. *Tosafos* notes the fact that traditionally one must give up one's life only for the three cardinal sins. What gives a person, especially a gentile, the right to sacrifice his life in order to avoid embarrassing someone? The *Divrei Yatziv* (51 י"ד) cites the *Gemara* (*Sanhedrin* 57b) which derives from שופך דם האדם that committing any form of bloodshed makes a gentile liable. As such, הלבנת פנים – embarrassing someone which turns their face white, causes a loss of blood to the face, and should thus make one liable as a form of שופך דם. Perhaps for this reason, the *Gemara* (*ibid* 57a) makes a gentile liable for stealing even less than a *Perutah's* worth. The pain that he brings to the victim will cause הלבנת פנים, for which he is liable. However, the *Gemara* (*Sotah* 10a) suggests that Tamar claimed to have converted, and then the *Gemara* suggests that she may have been asked if her father had perhaps accepted *Kidushin* money from a man on her behalf. If she converted, then perhaps the *Posuk*: שופך דם האדם (which applies to *Bnei Noach*) would no longer apply to her. Yet, if she converted, she would not be her (former) father's daughter any longer, so how could he have accepted *Kidushin* for her? The *Divrei Yatziv* (*ibid*) suggests that a gentile father "owns" his daughter, as he would own a cow. As such, when Noach said about Cham & Canaan, שעבוד, it was not as a curse, but rather a שיעבוד, where Noach obligated Canaan to serve Shem and Yafes (and their descendants). By the same token, the *Posuk*: הן גביר שמתיו לך is also a שיעבוד, with which Yitzchok obligated Eisav. Such is also implied in the *Gemara* (*Eruvin* 43a) which states that when Moshiach arrives, all the nations of the world will be servants of the Jews.

## A Lesson Can Be Learned From:

One Rosh HaShanah afternoon, when the students of the Ponovezher Yeshiva had finished davening and were headed for the dining room to eat the Yom Tov Seudah, Rav Shach ZTL turned to one of his Talmidim and said: "Were you not accustomed in your father's home, to hear the Shevarim blown in the Chasidic way? In Yeshiva today the Shevarim were blown the Litvish way. You must find a Chasidic minyan and hear the Shofar blown the Chasidic way." The Talmid replied: "Where will I still find a minyan with which I can hear all the Shofar blasts? The only place might be in *Viszhnits*?" Rav Shach instructed him to go to *Viszhnits*. The Talmid objected: "But in *Viszhnits* they finish davening very late. By the time I return, I may end up missing my Yom Tov Seudah". Rav Shach persisted: Even so. The Talmid asked Rav Shach why he held it was so necessary to be strict here. Rav Shach answered: "The Chiyuv that I have in mind which applies to you comes from a different *Posuk*: אל תטוש תורת אמן, which obligates one to honor his minhagim, and those of his family. It may even be more important than the Yom Tov Seudah".

**P.S.** Sholosh Seudos sponsored this week by the Sheli family.