



A Kehilas Prozdor Publication

(c) 1990-1998 Leibie Sternberg

<http://www.vuttrak.com/prozdor>

	Candles	Mincha	DafYomi	Shiur	Shacharis
Friday	7:42	7:00/7:52			
Shabbos		7:30	6:10	6:55	9:00
Sunday		7:58	8:30	6:50	7:30

IMPORTANCE OF

The *Gemara* (*Chulin* 87a) derives from **ושפך את דמו וכסהו בעפר** that he who slaughters beast or fowl is also bound by the *mitzvah* to cover its blood. Where one man slaughtered but another "stole" his opportunity to cover the blood, R' Gamliel required the thief to pay the slaughterer 10 gold pieces. The *Meforshim* understand this penalty as payment for the *brocho* that is said upon covering the blood, which the slaughterer was deprived of. The *Chasam Sofer* (*Chulin* 87a) asks why any payment must be made, since it is well established that if one attempted to do a *mitzvah* but was prevented from doing so, he is credited as if he did it. What then has he lost? The *Chasam Sofer* suggests that the 10 **זהובים** are compensation for his pain at not being able to actually complete the *mitzvah*, even though he gets **שכר** for it in either case. However, the *SHaCH* (ח"מ 382:4) states that the only time one must pay 10 **זהובים** for grabbing someone else's *brocho* is where the *brocho* is one that is said in front of others - where they will answer **אמן**, not where the thief says the *brocho* privately. What has been stolen is the **זכות** of benefiting others. *Seridei Aish* (2:102) states that although one may receive **שכר** for an unfulfilled desire to perform a *mitzvah*, it is still not the equivalent of an actual deed. As such, just as it is not enough for a person merely to plan to give **צדקה** (if the poor never actually receive anything), so too, it is insufficient for the slaughterer to be satisfied with the **שכר** of wanting to say the *brocho* if he was actually unable to be **מוכח** others with its recitation.

QUESTION OF THE WEEK:

Which *Sefer* (regardless of the subject matter) would only a *Talmid Chochom* be permitted to learn in?

ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:

(What happens if one swears he won't put on *Tefillin* or eat *matzoh*?)

Rambam (שבועות 5:15-18) rules that an oath not to wear *Tefillin* is a **שבועת שוא** (oath in vain) since he has no choice but to wear them, and he receives **מלקות** for the oath. However, if he swears he won't eat *matzoh*, since the oath is valid the rest of the year, he is bound by it on Pesach as well.

DIN'S CORNER:

If one is *davening* with a **ציבור** that uses a different *Nusach* than the one he is accustomed to, he may still say *Shemona Esrei* and other "quiet" parts of the *davening* quietly in his own *Nusach*. However, **קדושה** and other sections which may only be said **בצבור** must be said according to the *Nusach* of the **ציבור**, even if he says them quietly. Other parts such as *Pesukei D'Zimra* should be said in the *Nusach* of the **ציבור** if not too difficult for him, but if he cannot adjust, he may say them quietly in his own *Nusach*. (*Igros Moshe* אור"ח 2:23)

DID YOU KNOW THAT

The *Gemara* (*Bava Metzia* 32a) states that if one's father instructs him to do an **עבירה** he should not listen because we derive from **מחלל איש אמו ואביו תיראו ואת שבתותי תשמרו** that one may not be **מחלל** *Shabbos* at a parent's behest. The *Bnei Yissaschar* explains that the *mitzvah* of *Shabbos* specifically was used to teach this because of a *Machlokes Rishonim* over whether one is obligated to give **כבוד** to a father who is a **רשע**. The *Rambam* (ממרים 6:11) says one must still honor a father-**רשע** while the *Tur* (י"ד 240) holds one need not. The *Chida* (and others) asks why the *Torah* needed the *Drasha* from the above *Gemara* to teach a son not to listen to his father. Surely by instructing him to be **מחלל שבת** he is deemed a *Rasha* and according to the *Tur* one need not listen to him! The *Chida* answers that the *Drasha* is necessary where a son has accepted *Tosafos* (an earlier) *Shabbos* and the father has not. If the father tells the son to do an act of **חלול שבת** during this time, he does not become a *Rasha* thereby, but since we have the above *Drasha*, the son may still not obey him. As such, the *Bnei Yissaschar* concludes, *Shabbos* was the most appropriate conceptual circumstance that required the *Drasha*. However, this analysis only works according to the *Tur*. According to the *Rambam*, why is the above *Drasha* derived specifically from *Shabbos*? The *Ksav Sofer* (י"ד 107) held that where a son called his father to a *Din Torah*, since the process would clearly pose problems of **כיבוד אב**, the son was not obligated in **כיבוד אב** because his position was that the father was in the wrong, and deemed a *Rasha*. The *Ksav Sofer* held this to be the *Rambam's* opinion as well, that in that specific circumstance which renders the father a *Rasha*, a son need not honor him. As such, *Chida's* question-answer may apply even according to the *Rambam*.

A Lesson Can Be Learned From:

In the city of Izmir lived a wealthy miser. His butler had strict instructions to send away all people collecting **צדקה** with some sort of excuse, regardless of their story or need. However, he was still concerned with how to escape the collectors on his way to Shul. He hit upon the idea, not to take any money with him. He would therefore be able to say "I have no money with me. Come to my home later..." and depend on his butler to do the rest. Once, as he was walking in the street, his sandal tore. Without a single coin on him, he could not fix it, so he dragged it along. Suddenly he met the Rav, R' Chaim Pilaggi. R' Chaim understood at once what was happening and offered the miser a coin to fix his sandal. The miser was reluctant to take it, but R' Chaim said to him: "You deserve this coin, as I now understand the meaning of **מה יפו פעמך בנעלים בת נדיב**. What have shoes to do with **נדיבות**? Clearly, he who is not a **נדיב** (generous donor) will carry no money and will be forced to go shoeless because he can't pay to repair them!"

P.S. Sholosh Seudos sponsored by the Sheli family. There will be a *Siyum* on *Maseches Shabbos* at that time.

This issue is dedicated:
לז"נ פערל ב"ר יצחק הלוי

Dedications (\$18) and appreciations may be sent to: Kehilas Prozdor, 8 GreenHill Lane, Spring Valley, N.Y. 10977 (914) 354-7240
As this contains *Divrei Torah* and partial *Pesukim*, it should be treated with proper respect, both during and after use