



	Candles	Mincha	DafYomi	Shiur	Shachris	זק"ש
Friday	6:53	7:03				9:59
Shabbos		6:53	6:00	6:40	9:00	9:58
Sunday		7:05	9:00		8:00	9:57

IMPORTANCE OF

The Gemara (Horios 10b) gives an example to illustrate the *Posuk*: צדיקים ילכו בם ופושעים יכשלו בם, describing two men in the same situation, doing the same thing, yet one of them ended up sinning inadvertently while the other did not. The *MaHarsha* asks how we can call one a *Tzadik* and the other a *Rasha* if both did the same thing, and it just "happened" that one ended up sinning. He answers that what "happened" to each was based on who they were. The one who sinned had sinful desires, and *Hashem* merely gave him an opportunity. The *Panim Yafos* adds that the opportunity is intended to help him focus on how certain *aveiros* occur, as is *Merumaz* in: נפש כי תחטא בשגגה... ועשה מאמת מנהג – he sinned *B'Shogeg* (inadvertently) because he had previously transgressed in *אחת מנהג* – in an *aveirah* similar to this, which had become less offensive to him. A serious *Shogeg* will wake him up to be *מפושט במעשיו*. The *Gemara* (*Berachos* 5a) states that if a person sees that *Yisurin* are afflicting him, he should examine his deeds. The *Posuk* says: אשרי הגבר אשר תייסרנו קה – fortunate is he whom *Hashem* afflicts. The *SHuT Shtei HaLechem* (*Hakdamah*) notes that the "good fortune" is due to the word *תייסרנו*, which refers to him alone, a specific person, not a group. Since the *Yisurin* are specific to him and not to his group, community or country (like a famine), nor are they self-imposed (like causing oneself to catch a cold), it remains a message for him directly. As such, examining and rectifying his deeds will atone for him and hopefully bring relief.

QUESTION OF THE WEEK:

When would one not say עלינו at the conclusion of one of the 3 regular daily Tefilos ?

ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:

(Where may one only eat bread and beans ?)
The *Magen Avraham* (אור"ח 151:5) cites the *SMAK* who says that one may only eat a *Seudah* in a *Beis HaKnesses* if it is a *Seudas Mitzvah* such as one which will not generate קלות ראש, since only bread and beans are served.

DIN'S CORNER:

If someone is running for his life, such as a prisoner escaping from jail, and guards are chasing him, and he comes to a river that can only be crossed by ferry - he must pay full fare for the ferry ride, even if at that time the ferry would not be transporting anyone else. This is true even if the ride on the ferry is saving his life, because the ferry owner receives a fare for this type of work. The fugitive is not any different just because he needs the transportation to save his life. Thus, although it is a *mitzvah* to help our fellow man and not expect to get paid for it (e.g. saving a life or returning a lost item), this is only if the person doing the *mitzvah* does not usually make a livelihood doing it. Payment to someone who provides a service that he usually does for his livelihood, is not considered payment for a *mitzvah* - rather it must be considered payment for the service rendered. (SMA חו"מ 264:19)

DID YOU KNOW THAT

The *Mishna* (*Meilah* 21a) states that if one tells a *Shliach* to bring him something that is *Hekdesh*, and that he should take it from a window or from a bag, as long as the *Shliach* obtained it from either the window or the bag, the householder who sent him has committed *Meilah*. However if he instructed the *Shliach* to take it from the window, the sender will have committed *Meilah* only if he took it from the window, and not the bag. What if, after the *Shliach* took it from the window, the sender says to him – "No, I didn't mean from that window. I meant this other one" ? The *Mishna* states that the sender's inner thoughts have no standing, because we say: דברים שבלב אינן דברים, and the *Shliach's* act is still attributed to the sender, rather than himself. *Tosafos* (*Shevuos* 26b) says that דברים שבלב אינן דברים only if those thoughts contradict what was actually said. If so, the sender's later declaration that he meant a different window should be effective, since it doesn't contradict what he said. But how can a *Shliach* ever know what is on the sender's mind ? The *Gemara* (*Kidushin* 49b) states that if a man betroths a woman on condition שאני גבור (that he is brave/strong), he needn't be like Yoav or Avner, but rather it is sufficient if his friends fear him because of his *Gevurah*. But, what if he meant that he had to be like Yoav ? Such an intent does not contradict what he said ! The *Tiferes Yisroel* suggests that a non-contradictory interpretation of someone's words can be effective only when it does not affect someone else. Thus, if one makes a personal *Neder* and his intention is not what people generally have in mind, but rather something more exotic, then his דברים שבלב can be binding on him. However, when he betroths a woman and he needs her consent to the condition, he can only interpret it to mean that which people normally understand it to mean. So too, regarding *Meilah*, where the *Shliach* will be bound by his words, only the general understanding can be effective, not any דברים שבלב.

A Lesson Can Be Learned From:

R' Meshulam Igra as a young bochur, lived in a town where boys got engaged at age 12, and married at 13. R' Meshulam's genius was already acknowledged at a young age, and so a wealthy man promised to support him for his entire life if he married his daughter. It was customary that after agreeing to the betrothal, the Chasan ate a meal at the home of the Kallah. At that time, coffee had just been introduced, but only the wealthy drank it. When the mysterious black drink was served to Meshulam, with a bowl of sugar and a cup of milk on the side, he didn't know what he was expected to do with it. So he reasoned that אכילה is always mentioned before שתיה – so he ate all the sugar. Then, since our calendar is based on לילה first, and then יום, he drank the dark liquid first, and then the white milk. He then ate up the coffee grounds that were in his cup. The Kallah was aghast, so she and her mother insisted on breaking the *Shidduch*, over the father's objections. Years later, when the father discovered what R' Meshulam had become, he fainted. When he explained to his Rav why he had fainted, the Rav told him that he may as well faint a second time for such a loss.

P.S. Sholosh Seudos sponsored this week by the Sheli 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