



	Candles	Mincha	DafYomi	Shiur	Shachris	ש"ש
Friday	7:37	6:50/7:47				9:23
Shabbos		7:30	6:15	7:15	9:00	9:22
Sunday		7:50	7:30		7:30	9:21

IMPORTANCE OF ...

The *Gemara* (*Gittin* 38b) states that one who frees his slave transgresses the *mitzvah* of: לעולם בהם תעבדו. The *Arugas HaBosem* (11) asks: the *Gemara* (*Temurah* 4b) records a *Machlokes* between Abaye and Rava regarding those things which the *Torah* forbids. Abaye holds that every time the *Torah* says something should not be done, if one transgresses and does it anyway, the results may still be effective. For example, if one slaughters an animal on *Shabbos*, was the *Shechita* valid? Abaye says yes; Rava says no. If this is the case, then according to Rava, each attempt to free a slave should be completely ineffective, as doing so would violate לעולם בהם תעבדו. If so, how could one ever "successfully" free his slave and transgress, as the attempt would always be ineffective? Furthermore, what would Rava do with the *Gemara* (*Bava Basra* 137a) which states that if one says "All my property is given to Reuven (for a life-estate) and after Reuven's death to Shimon", R' Shimon b. Gamliel says that even if Reuven sells or disposes of the property, Shimon may not claim anything more than what Reuven leaves to him. R' Zeira adds that this is true, even if Reuven freed all the slaves, despite the fact that he violates לעולם בהם תעבדו by doing so. Thus, we see that illegally freeing the slaves is effective. However, the *Gemara* (*Gittin* *ibid*) also notes that according to R' Yishmael, the *Posuk*: לעולם בהם תעבדו is not an obligation (*חובה*) but serves rather as permission (*רשות*) to enslave someone born of the seven nations of Canaan who had been really slated for annihilation. As such, freeing a slave does not necessarily fall into the category of something about which the *Torah* states לא תעביד (do not do) and therefore even Rava could allow it to be effective.

QUESTION OF THE WEEK:

Which son who is *סומך על שלחן אביו* (depends on the support of his father) is permitted to keep his own *Metzias* and earnings?

ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:

(If 1 of 2 sons died from having a *Bris*, what should be done with a 3rd?)

The *Avnei Nezer* (*י"ד* 2:325) states that if the two first sons were both endangered as a result of their *Bris*, even though one recovered, a 3rd son should not be given a *Bris* because a (partial) *Chazakah* exists that these boys will be endangered, but no *Chazakah* exists that they will recover from the danger.

DIN'S CORNER:

One may not cause a utensil to become *muktze* on *Shabbos*. Since the normal use of a utensil is established at the onset of *Shabbos*, if the utensil were suddenly used with *muktze*, or became otherwise unusable, this would constitute being *Mevatel Kli MeHeichano* – invalidating its use. Thus, one may not place clothing over a spill on the floor if the clothing would become unwearable as a result. However, one may place rags or napkins there, as this is their purpose. (*Shemiras Shabbos K'Hilchaso* 22:n47)

DID YOU KNOW THAT ...

The *Gemara* (*Kidushin* 53a) derives from the description of *Maaser Sheni* as *לד' הוא קודש לד'* that one may not use it to betroth a wife, even though one takes it to Yerushalayim and eats it there. The *Gemara* (*Bava Metzia* 88a) states that the stores in Beis Hino were destroyed three years before the *Churban* because its merchants and residents tried to get out of separating *Maaser Sheni* from produce that they bought and sold, claiming that the *Torah* restricts *Maaser Sheni* separation to that which one grows for himself to eat; not that which one buys or sells. However, since the *Rabanan* added the requirement that *Maaser Sheni* be separated before one sold or bought produce as well, Beis Hino was punished for trying to "hide" behind the *Torah's* *Drasha*. The *Kehilas Yaakov* (*Bava Metzia* 48) derives from the words of the *Rashba* that when the *Torah* exempted a buyer, it did not mean someone who was a guest at another's table. The food served to him would not be deemed "sold" to him and he was therefore obligated to separate *Maaser* before eating of it. *Rabbeinu Yonah* disagreed, and the *Rema* (*אה"ע* 28:17) concurred, ruling that a guest could use the portion served to him to betroth a wife. However, the *Taz* asks, does not the *Shulchan Aruch* (*אורח* 170:19) rule that a guest may not take his portion and give it to the host's child or servant? Does this not indicate that a guest does not acquire his portion to do with as he pleases? The *Be'er Heitev* cites the *MaHarshal* who distinguishes as follows: food that is brought to the table for everyone, before each individual is served, remains the host's and no one has any ownership rights in it. A guest may therefore not take of this food and serve the host's family. However, once an individual is given his portion, he may betroth with it and may even give it to the host's family member or servant, without the host's permission.

A Lesson Can Be Learned From:

After the Malbim left the town of Mohilov, the community was not in a hurry to find a replacement. Several years went by until the leaders heard that R' Yoshe Ber was leaving Slutsk. When they approached him and offered him the post of Rav, he immediately turned them down. Feeling insulted, they asked why he was so quick to decide. R' Yoshe Ber replied that Mohilov was indeed a wonderful place and it would be an honor to hold the position once held by the Malbim. However, he recalled some advice he had once heard, where a person looking to marry a widow was advised to marry one that had been recently widowed. Such a woman feels lost, without a partner, a breadwinner, someone to make *Kiddush* and *Havdalah* for her etc... She will definitely appreciate being remarried. A woman who has been widowed a long time has already settled in and knows she can survive quite well without a husband. A community is the same. If their Rav has been gone only a short time, they would still feel the need for one. As Mohilov has been without a Rav for a while, it undoubtedly believes it can do without.

P.S. Sholosh Seudos sponsored this week by the Fuerst family.

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 (845) 354-7240
As this contains *Divrei Torah* and partial *Pesukim*, it should be treated with proper respect, both during and after use