



A Kehilas Prozdor Publication

(c) 1990-1998 Leibie Sternberg
http://www.vuttrak.com/prozdor

	Candles	Mincha	DafYomi	Shiur	Shacharis
Friday	8:07	6:50/7:30			
Shabbos		7:57	6:40	7:20	9:00
Sunday		8:22	7:45		7:30

פרשת: נשא

IMPORTANCE OF

The *Gemara* (*Sotah* 26a) states R' Akiva's opinion that we derive from: *ונקתה ונורעה זרע* that if a suspected but innocent wife drinks the bitter water intended for the *סוטה*, she will be blessed that if barren, she would now bear children. R' Yishmael disagrees, since this would encourage barren women to act suspiciously in order to be given the water, to obtain this blessing. Therefore, R' Yishmael limits the *brocho* to: lightening future childbirth pain for those with children, having sons instead of only daughters and having handsomer children than before. *Tosafos* asks, why doesn't R' Yishmael have the same problem? Wouldn't women act suspiciously simply to obtain his *berachos*? R' Heshel of Cracow suggests that one should really ask, why is R' Yishmael so concerned? Perhaps the *Torah* promises its *brocho* only to authentic possible *סוטה*, not *brocho*-seeking ones. It must be, since most people would not know who was authentic, if a drinker did not receive a *brocho*, it would lower the *Torah* in the public's eyes. Yet, the *Gemara* (28a) says that if the husband is not innocent, the water will not work on the wife, which could explain to most why a faker was not blessed. However, wouldn't the husband, who knows he is innocent, expect the *brocho*? The *Gemara* (47b) says that if her children are not innocent, the water will also not work. Thus, if she receives no *brocho*, everyone can assume it was the husband's guilt, and the husband can blame the children. Therefore, R' Yishmael was not bothered by fakers whom the *Torah* would not bless, but only because they had children (to blame). However, he questions R' Akiva quite correctly, since in R' Akiva's scenario, there were no children.

QUESTION OF THE WEEK:

If one has a just claim or defense, but no evidence to support his position, should he still initiate a *Din Torah* (as a plaintiff) or refuse to pay (as a defendant) causing a *Din Torah* against him?

ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:

(Why may we ask a Rav a *שאלה* if he is not currently studying the topic?)

The *Chasam Sofer* (*Shabbos* 3b) suggests that one may certainly ask a *גברא רבא* (great man) *שאלות* *Halacha* since he has set himself up to answer them. However, the questions should be specific - not so general that the Rav may "hang himself" by not taking into account every possible inconsistency. The *Boruch Tzuri* cites an opinion that one may not ask questions of the Rav publicly on a different *סוגיא*, but may do so privately.

DIN'S CORNER:

If one gave a utensil (that required *Tevilah* when purchased) to a non-Jew for repair, if the repairman added a part or piece of his own, the utensil must be "Toiveled" again, with a *brocho* (if it was said originally). If the utensil was recognizably improved, it requires *Tevilah* without a *brocho*. (*Teshuvos V'Hanhagos* 2:407)

DID YOU KNOW THAT

The *SHACh* (ח"מ 86:11) states that if a wife causes damage to a third party, her husband becomes obligated to make restitution to that third party from her *Kesubah* under the doctrine derived from: *ונתן לאשר אדם לו* - R' Nasan's rule that if A owes B and B owes C, A must pay directly to C. According to R' Yitzchok Elchonon Spektor in *עין יצחק* (אה"ע 1:78), this proves that a man's obligation to pay a *Kesubah* settles on him at the time of marriage, with the pay date scheduled for the time of divorce. Otherwise, if his obligation arose only upon divorce, he could not figure in the above equation since he owes her nothing while married. R' Yitzchok Elchonon held as a result, that even where a man obtained a *Heter Meah Rabonim* and deposited the *Get* with *Beis Din*, the payment obligation of the *Kesubah* also became active and took precedence over other debts of the husband, despite the fact that she did not actually receive the *Get*. A similar concept is provided by the *MaHarit* (1:131) where a *Tenaim* (marriage contract) failed to specify a date for the marriage. The bride's father kept pushing off the groom, who had now reached the age of 25. Since the *Tenaim* contained a penalty for non-performance, the *MaHarit* ruled that the father must pay it, because the groom is *מחויב* to marry and if he now marries another because of the father's obstruction, the *Tenaim* will not be fulfilled. Thus, the time to fulfill the *תנאי* arrives just before an act that will render it impossible to perform. So too, once the *Get* is deposited, the husband may marry another, which will end the first marriage, triggering the *Kesubah* obligation.

A Lesson Can Be Learned From:

R' Avrohom Abish, while Rav in Frankfurt, was a very good-natured and helpful person. A man came to see him, requesting a letter to the residents of Frankfurt, with which he hoped to collect sufficient funds to marry off his daughter. R' Avrohom wrote him a very warm letter with which the man was far more successful in his efforts than he had anticipated. In fact, he was so successful, that word soon spread around the city that he was sitting in the local tavern, "celebrating" away his good fortune. As his money dwindled away, the man suddenly noticed that his all-important letter from R' Avrohom was missing. He immediately returned to the Rav's home and requested a replacement. R' Avrohom Abish had by now also heard what this man had been up to. As gently as he could, R' Avrohom asked him if he knew why we generally refer to a drunk as one who is as *שיכור* as Lot. After all, wasn't Noach the first to drink and become inebriated? The answer is that Noach's three sons were already married when Noach planted the vine and drank. Lot on the other hand had 2 daughters to marry off. Such a person has no business wasting his time and money on drink.

P.S. Mazel Tov to the Coleman family upon the birth of a son. May they be *זוכה* to a timely *Bris* and much *Nachas*. Sholosh Seudos sponsored this week by the Grunwald family.