



	Candles	Mincha	DafYomi	Shiur	Shachris	פרשת וירא זק"ש
Friday	4:28	4:38	7:30			9:07
Shabbos		4:28	4:00		9:00	9:07
Sunday		4:35	5:00		8:00	9:08

## IMPORTANCE OF ....

The *Gemara* (*Berachos* 5ba) relates that R' Chanina came to visit R' Yochanan who was suffering from an illness. R' Chanina took R' Yochanan's hand, which relieved him. The *Gemara* asks why R' Yochanan could not have relieved himself, and answers with the statement: **אין חבוש מתיר עצמו מבית האסורים** – a captive cannot release himself from prison. The *Mizrachi* asks, does not *Rashi* comment on the *Posuk*: **אל קול הנער** that the *Tefilah* of someone who is ill is answered before the *Tefilos* of others on his behalf? He answers that the *Gemara* assumed that one who is ill will be unable to concentrate. However, if he can, then his *Tefilah* is more effective. The *Gemara* (*Sanhedrin* 95a) relates that a Philistine named Yishbi attempted to kill Dovid HaMelech by throwing him up in the air and positioning a spear where he was expected to land. When Avishai saw this, he pronounced Hashem's Special Name, and Dovid froze in mid-air, remaining suspended above the spear. Why didn't Dovid himself work this miracle? The *Gemara* explains: **אין חבוש מתיר עצמו מבית האסורים** – he was unable to concentrate sufficiently to pronounce the Name (*Rashi*). The *Be'er Sheva* feels that *Rashi's* explanation would not work well in R' Yochanan's case, because what need was there for R' Yochanan to concentrate? He therefore suggests that the rationale of **אין חבוש מתיר עצמו** is that a person in dire straits is working with a flawed *Mazel*, and is thus under the dominion of *Midas HaDin*. The *Gerer Rebbe* asks, how can you say that [R' Yochanan's] *Tefilah* would not need *Kavanah*? The *Chasam Sofer* (198 א"ח) notes that the qualifications of one who may use Hashem's Special Name must be exemplary, excluding one even for having innocently benefited from another's largesse. As such, it is understandable how the inability to concentrate on the sanctity and divinity of the Name would disqualify one from using it. *Tefilah*, on the other hand, although certainly demanding *Kavanah*, is still available to those who may have difficulty concentrating, such as one who is ill. Therefore, the *Be'er Sheva* explains **אין חבוש מתיר עצמו** in terms of *Mazel*, not *Kavanah*.

## QUESTION OF THE WEEK:

If one missed *Shacharis*, and must now *daven* two *Shemona Esreis* for *Mincha*, may one eat before *davening Mincha*?

## ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:

(When may one make a *Siyum* only if he hadn't intended to?)

R' Shlomo Kluger (א"ח 386 האלף לך שלמה) states that if one was learning one of the *Neviim*, and realized he could finish it on *Erev Pesach* (or in the nine days), and make a *Siyum* to permit eating (meat), he may do so, only if when he started studying it, he did not do so with the intent to make a *Siyum* on it *Erev Pesach*.

## DIN'S CORNER:

One who desires something that belongs to another and is not for sale, even if it is a *mitzvah* item such as a *shofar*, and even if he only wants it to perform a *mitzvah* with it, he transgresses both **לא תחמוד** and **לא תתאוה**. (*B'Tzeil HaChochmah* 3:43)

## DID YOU KNOW THAT ....

The *Gemara* (*Kesubos* 49b) states that a decree was instituted in Usha to compel a father to support his children until they reached maturity. The *Gemara* concludes that only wealthy fathers may be compelled; those who are not wealthy may be encouraged and even shamed into complying, but not compelled. Several non-supporting fathers once appeared before Rav Chisda, who told them to go out and stand on an overturned mortar in the street, and to announce that even a raven wants its children, but that they (these fathers) don't. Presumably, forcing the father to acknowledge that his cruelty is greater than that of a raven would encourage him to change his mind and provide the support. This would also seem to imply that one is permitted to embarrass oneself in public. However, some *Meforshim* understand Rav Chisda's *Psak* as an announcement by the father that he is unable to support his children, and therefore, his children are in need of support from whomever is able to provide it. The *Mishna* (*Bava Kamma* 92a) states that if one injures someone, even if he pays all the damages he is still obligated to ask his victim for *Mechilah*. If the victim does not forgive him, he is deemed an **אכזר** (cruel person) for we see that: **ויתפלל אברהם ... וירפא אלוקים את אבימלך**, Avrohom davened that Avimelech be cured of the malady he was afflicted with, despite the suffering that he had brought upon Avrohom and Sarah. How do we see from Avrohom that not forgiving is deemed cruel? The *Gan HaMelech* (85) suggests that this is derived from **וד, פקד את שרה כאשר אמר**, where **כאשר אמר** refers to what Avrohom had said, *i.e.* asking for a cure for Avimelech. As a result of that request, Avrohom was also provided with a *ישועה* and Sarah gave birth to Yitzchok. Thus, we see that if an injured party forgives his assailant, the forgiver will also be rewarded for doing so. A refusal to forgive, knowing full well that he himself will be deprived of a reward because of his decision, can only be motivated by and referred to as cruel.

## A Lesson Can Be Learned From:

A Rav was collecting money for Maos Chitim before Pesach, with which to help the poor people of the city. He approached a wealthy man, hoping for a sizable donation, but the wealthy man told him that he was burdened enough supporting his own indigent brother. A few days later, the indigent brother came to the Rav, and asked that he be included in the community distributions, since his rich brother, who was supposed to be helping him, wasn't helping at all. When next the Rav met the wealthy man, the Rav mentioned that he now understood the *Mishna* in *Avos* (5:13) which says that there are 4 different human attitudes regarding one's possessions. He who says: **שלי שלי ושלך שלך** (what's mine is mine and what's yours is yours) has adopted a **מדה בינונית** – a centrist attitude that is neither generous nor tightfisted. Then the *Mishna* adds: **ויש אומרים זו מדת סדום** – and some say it is an attitude practiced in Sodom. How could there be such disparate views over this attitude, that one considers it average, and the other a **מדת סדום**!? But the explanation is simple. One who adopts this attitude is in essence saying **שלי שלי** – my obligations are mine and I will take care of them; **ושלך שלך** – and you take care of your obligations. This is a practical, if not generous outlook. However, **ויש אומרים** there are those who simply **say they will take care of their own, but don't. זו מדת סדום**.

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

This issue is dedicated by the Weissman family:

לע"נ ברוך ב"ר נחום משה

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

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