



	Candles	Mincha	DafYomi	Shiur	Shachris	זק"ש
Friday	4:17	4:27	7:30			9:39
Shabbos		4:17	3:45	4:10	9:00	9:40
Sunday		4:25	6:30		8:00	9:40

IMPORTANCE OF

The *Gemara* (*Megilah* 13a) expounds on a *Posuk* which describes how a woman named Yehudiyah gave birth to three sons, Yered, Chever and Yekusiel, explaining that Yehudiyah was Bisya, daughter of Pharaoh, and the three sons were three names for Moshe. From the fact that the *Posuk* uses the word "ילדה", the *Gemara* derives that whoever raises an orphaned boy or girl in his house is deemed as if he had given birth to him. A child raised by a non-parent is obligated to honor such a benefactor as an expression of *Hakoras HaTov*, as well as to honor the biological parent, because the *Torah* commands it. (See *Ksav Sofer* in *VaEschanan* on **כבוד את אבנך**) The *Mishna* (*Bava Metzia* 100b) states that if someone's olive trees were swept away by a river and deposited on the property of another, where they promptly took root and produced fruit, each of them can lay claim to the fruit. The tree owner says it was his trees that bore the fruit while the property owner says it was his land that produced the fruit. Therefore, they split the crop. The *Batei Kehunah* suggests that similar dynamics would seem to exist where one raises another's child, as the biological parent lays claim to original "ownership" while the adoptive parent's claim is based on support and nurturing. However, the *Gemara* explicitly gives credit to the adoptive parent - **כאילו ילדו** - as if he [also] gave birth to the child. But this depends on the adoptive parent providing support, filling the role of **כל המגדל**. The *Chida* says that for this reason, Bisya was careful to tell Yocheved: **ואני אתן את שכרך**, ensuring that she, Bisya, provided the support. Does **כאילו ילדו** mean that one can fulfill the *mitzvah* of **פרו ורבו** by adopting? *Chochmas Shlomo* (1:1 **אהע"י**) says it may depend on a *Machlokes* between the *Drisha* and the *Tur* (242 **י"ד**). The *Tur* says that every **כאילו** means to equate exactly, so it may fulfill **פרו ורבו**. The *Drisha* says it only means somewhat similar, so the equivalence falls short.

QUESTION OF THE WEEK:

Is it preferable, most things remaining equal, for one to go to Shul for *davening* by car, or by foot?

ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:

(Where would someone waiting to be stoned, be starved first?)

The *Daas Kohan* (68) derives (in the *Rambam*) that in light of the *mitzvah* of **לא תחיון**, once convicted, no one may keep the sorcerer alive with food. Even without a conviction, if one believes another to be a **מכשפה**, he may also not feed him/her.

DIN'S CORNER:

If someone is in need of medical treatment and his relatives or even strangers go out to bring in doctors etc... to treat him, the cost of the medical attention may be recouped from the sick person or his heirs. This is so whether or not the sick person requested medical attention, and is equally applicable to situations where the patient did not survive the treatment, or even died before the treatment could be administered. (85:2 **ש"ת הראש**)

DID YOU KNOW THAT

The *Gemara* (*Shabbos* 133b) states that as long as a *Mohel* is engaged in the performance of a *Bris Milah*, he may continue to remove any pieces of foreskin, even if leaving those pieces would not invalidate the *Bris*. Once he has stopped, however, he may not go back to remove those pieces. Although the general area of discussion in the *Gemara* pertains to *Shabbos*, and going back to cut off those pieces would constitute a second *Bris Milah* where the *Torah* only permitted one (on *Shabbos*), still, the *Gemara* does not mention *Shabbos* explicitly, and the *Rambam* (2:4 **מילה**) applies the *Gemara's* ruling even to weekdays. The *Chasam Sofer* suggests that the *Rambam's* basis may be the *Gemara* (*Sanhedrin* 84b) which states that Rav did not permit his son to remove a splinter from Rav's skin, for fear it would cause a wound. The *Gemara* goes on to distinguish between the inadvertent infliction of a wound upon a parent, with a potential punishment of **חנק** (choking) versus a wound on anyone else, which is "only" a **לאו**. As such, going back to remove the unessential pieces of foreskin after completion of the *Bris Milah* might be the infliction of an unnecessary wound, and transgression of a **לאו**. Certainly where one performs a *Bris Milah* on oneself, it should be permitted to go back and remove the unessential pieces, without it being deemed self-infliction of a wound (**חובל בעצמו**), if it is to fulfill the *Bris Milah* with a *Hidur*, based on **זה אלי ואנוהו**. Should **זה אלי ואנוהו** permit a father to do the same for his son? The *Nachalas Yaakov* notes that from the *Posuk*: **ויהי בדרך במלון** we see that even before *Matan Torah*, when there was no *Heter* of **וחי בהם** to exempt one from a *mitzvah* due to danger, still, Moshe did not perform a *Bris Milah* on his son Eliezer because of the hazards of the journey to Egypt, despite his personal obligation to circumcise him. The same rationale applies to the unessential pieces of skin. The father has no right to endanger or damage his infant son in order to fulfill his own private *mitzvah* of **זה אלי ואנוהו**.

A Lesson Can Be Learned From:

A Chasan was promised a certain amount of "Nadin" but it was now two days before the Chasunah and he had not received it. The Chasan discussed it with his Rosh Yeshiva, R' Boruch Shimon Schneerson, and the Rosh Yeshiva sent a stern message to the Kallah's father, threatening that if the Nadin wasn't delivered by the next morning, he would advise the Chasan not to go to the Chupah. The next morning, the Nadin was delivered, and the Chasunah went off without a problem. During the week of Sheva Berachos, the Chasan discovered that the Nadin money had been borrowed by his father-in-law, on the Kallah's name! He, the Chasan was now obligated to pay it back! Again, he asked the Rosh Yeshiva what to do. R' Boruch asked him if he thought strong tactics would work again with his father-in-law. The Chasan thought not. R' Boruch thereupon advised him to forget the injustice and go on as if it hadn't happened, relying on Hashem to help. The Chasan obeyed his Rosh Yeshiva, and immediately after Sheva Berachos, he was offered two very lucrative tutoring jobs which helped him pay off the loan very quickly, and which ended as soon as he had reached that goal.

P.S. Sholosh Seudos sponsored this week by the Gottheil family. Mazel Tov to the Ciner family upon the Chasunah of their son Tzvi to Nechama Weingarden.

This issue is dedicated by the Schulhof and Winter families:

לד"ר דוד ב"ר יעקב

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

לד"ר פערל ב"ר יצחק הלוי ולד"ר אברהם ב"ר יעקב חיים