



	Candles	Mincha	DafYomi	Shiur	פרשת: לך לך שזק"ש Shachris
Friday	5:52	6:02			9:56
Shabbos		5:52	5:00	5:45	9:00 9:57
Sunday		5:57	5:30		7:45 9:57

IMPORTANCE OF

The *Gemara* (*Bava Metzia* 75b) states that there are 3 people who cry out in *Beis Din* but are not answered, because they brought their troubles upon themselves. They are: one who lends money without witnesses; one who accepts a master upon himself; and one whose wife rules over him. The *Gemara* defines one who acquires a master over himself as one who is unsuccessful in his town, but doesn't move to another town. Apparently, if things do not go well for someone, it isn't enough for him to simply move to another house or neighborhood, but he must move to another town. The *Rashba* (*Teshuvos HaMeyuchasos L'Ramban* 285) explains that moving is a form of *Galus* (exile) which will effect a *Kaparah* for him, and possible relief from his cloud of misfortune. However, does not the *Gemara* (*Makos* 12b) state that if a killer *B'Shogeg* residing in an *Ir Miklat* should kill again *B'Shogeg*, he is to be exiled from one neighborhood to another, within the *Ir Miklat*? Yes, but the *Gemara* (*Rosh HaShanah* 16b) states that in order for negative decrees to be annulled, one must move to another place, as derived from *לך לך מארצך*, where Avrohom was told to leave his land – not just his home - in order to build a great nation. On this basis, the *B'Tzeil HaChochmah* (3:42) assured an apartment dweller that frequent (fatal) accidents to other residents of the apartment house was not an indication of the building's bad "Mazel", since a building did not have its own *Mazel*. Yet, does not the *Sefer Chasidim* (475) state that if one built a new house or moved into a new house, and 3 consecutive deaths took place there, he is courting death to remain there? The *Divrei Chaim* (אהר"י 1:8) states that generally, the words of the *Sefer Chasidim* are not to be analyzed or used to create formulas, but rather to be taken exactly at face value. As such, the warning applies strictly to a situation where an individual took up residence in a new house, and 3 Jews died in it. It would not apply to a seasoned apartment house, where some of the dead were non-Jews, and had died in auto accidents etc... elsewhere.

QUESTION OF THE WEEK:

What is preferable (Halachically) – to live in a large city or in a smaller village?

ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:

(When would a *minyan* require 11 people instead of 10?)

The *Mishna Berurah* (219:6) states that when one *bentches Gomel*, he must do so in front of 10, himself included. However, the *Be'er Heitev* cites a *Machlokes HaPoskim* over that issue, and the *Kitzur* (61:2) rules that he needs 10 beside himself.

DIN'S CORNER:

If one wishes to say a "long" *Shemona Esrei* and he fears that others may mock him, he may step back when the *Shliach Tzibur* begins the repetition, and upon returning the three steps, he should complete the *Shemona Esrei*, as long as his intentions were purely *לשם שמאים*. (MB 124:13)

DID YOU KNOW THAT

The *Gemara* (*Kidushin* 12b) seeks a source to permit a woman to remarry after her husband's death. After rejecting several possible suggestions, the *Gemara* seems not to have an objection to using the *Posuk* dealing with a betrothed soldier who is exempt from service, out of fear that he may die *ואיש אחר יקחנה* - and another man will marry her. Some *Meforshim* ask why the *Gemara* did not use as a source, Avrohom's statement: *והרגו אותי ואותך יחי*, where *Rashi* explains that the Egyptians would kill Avrohom to remove the *Issur* of *אשת איש*, thus permitting them to take Sarah. The *VaYaged Moshe* suggests that there are more than a few categories of *Halacha* that can be derived from *Pesukim* prior to *Matan Torah*, such as *Aveilus*, which is derivable from Yaakov's death. However, *Tosafos* (*Moed Katan* 20a) quotes the *Yerushalmi* which states that we do not use pre-*Matan Torah* as a source. The *Beis Yitzchok* (י"ד 2:164) points out that in fact, we do derive certain things from pre-*Matan Torah*. However, the rule is that if a pre-*Matan Torah* derivation would result in the *Bitul* of some *mitzvah*, then it is not to be used. Only post-*Matan Torah* can do that. Therefore, since *Aveilus* causes a *Bitul* in the *mitzvos* of *Talmud Torah* and *Tefillin*, both of which are prohibited to an *Aveil*, a pre-*Matan Torah* source cannot be used for it. The same can be said for the concept of a widow remarrying. In pre-*Matan Torah* times, no concept of a *Get* existed; one merely separated from one's wife to effect a divorce (See *Rambam Melachim* 9:8). As such, a husband's death could easily qualify as an equivalent. However, after *Matan Torah*, when the requirement of a *Get* was introduced, it was no longer clear that a husband's death would be sufficient to permit remarrying, and a source was therefore required. Hence, to use Avrohom's pre-*Matan Torah* statement as a source would result immediately in *Bitul* of the concept of a *Get*, and as such, is not used.

A Lesson Can Be Learned From:

R' Avrohom Mordechai of Pintchov was a poor Chosid of the Chozeh of Lublin. When his daughters were unable to marry for lack of a dowry, his wife urged him to ask his Rebbe for a brocho. The Chozeh told him to go to a certain city. R' Avrohom immediately traveled there, and took a room in the local inn. With no other instruction, R' Avrohom sat in his room and studied. The innkeeper was curious and asked R' Avrohom why he came there to study. Could he not have done so at home? R' Avrohom told him that he himself did not know why he was there, only that his Rebbe had told him to come there. One night, the Melamed of the innkeeper's children came to R' Avrohom's room and tearfully related to him that several months before, he had become aware of a special hiding place that the wealthy innkeeper used to hide his money. Unable to control himself, he had taken the money and hidden it, but he now wanted to put it back. When the innkeeper discovered the loss, he and his family began to watch everyone like a hawk, but it did not dawn on them to suspect the Melamed. He wanted to avoid a *Chilul Hashem* so he was leaving the money with R' Avrohom who could return it. R' Avrohom made the innkeeper promise to ask no questions, and handed him the money. The stunned innkeeper said that he now saw why the Chozeh had sent him, and gave R' Avrohom a nice "finder's fee". Later, the Chozeh told R' Avrohom: "I could have helped you in several ways. But how else could I have helped that poor Melamed?"

P.S. Sholosh Seudos sponsored by the Weinstock family.

This issue is dedicated:

לז"נ פערל ב"ר יצחק הלוי ולז"נ אברהם ב"ר יעקב חיים

Dedications (\$18) and appreciations may be sent to: Kehilas Prozdor, 8 GreenHill Lane, Spring Valley, N.Y. 10977 (845) 354-7240
As this contains *Divrei Torah* and partial *Pesukim*, it should be treated with proper respect, both during and after use