



	Candles	Mincha	DafYomi	Shiur	Shachris	ש"ק
Friday	8:13	6:50/7:45				9:10
Shabbos		8:08	7:00	7:45	9:00	9:10
Sunday		8:28	7:55		7:30	9:11

IMPORTANCE OF

The *Mishna* (*Sotah* 44a) states that when a *מלחמת מצוה* is being waged, even a *Kallah* must leave her *Chupah* to mobilize. The *Rashash* finds the idea of women at war unusual, based on several statements of *Chazal*, and concludes that their involvement was no doubt to provide support, food and shelter. The *Mishna* also states that soldiers who had sinned and found their courage waning as a result, could return home prior to engaging in battle. This included those who had committed such *עבירות* as the marriage of an *אלמנה לכהן גדול* or *גרושה לכהן הדיוט*. However, as these *עבירות* only pertain to *Kohanim* and they did not go to war, who could have returned pre-battle for such sins? The *Gemara* (*Kidushin* 21b) asks: May a *Kohen* take a *תואר*? If *Kohanim* did not go to war, how could they? The *Ramban* quotes *Sifri* on the *Posuk*: *בארצם לא תנחל וחלק לא יהי' לך בתוכם* (that the tribe of Levi would not share in the division of *Eretz Yisroel*) who notes that the double-*לשון* indicates that Levi would not share in the division of *Eretz Yisroel* and would not share in the spoils of war. As Levi did not usually go to war (see *Rambam שמיטה* 13:12) why would I imagine they should share in the spoils? The *Pardes Yosef* suggests that if Levi ended up doing what the women did – provide food and support etc..., then they would be deserving of the spoils. Therefore, the *Posuk* has to state that they did not share. So too, *Kohanim* were also permitted to assist in the war effort if they chose to. As such, if they had married illegally and feared the consequences of the *עבירה*, they were free to return home. And if a *תואר* opportunity presented itself, according to Rav, a *Kohen* could theoretically involve himself in it.

QUESTION OF THE WEEK:

When would a *Baal Tefilah* with all the *מעלות* that a *Baal Tefilah* requires not be permitted to *daven* before the *Amud*, even though it is appropriate for him and a majority of the *Tzibur* want him?

ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:

(Why does one say *HaMapil* even though one might not fall asleep?)
The *brocho* of *HaMapil* is not a *ברכת המצוה* or a *ברכת הנהנין* where an act must follow the *brocho*. It is a *ברכת תפילה* (like in *Maariv* - *השכיבנו*) established to be said before going to sleep. Thus it may be said regardless of one's actually falling asleep.

DIN'S CORNER:

One is permitted to walk about on *Shabbos* with "extra" clothing (e.g. to transport clothing elsewhere) provided they are worn normally - *דרך מלבוש*. Thus, one may drape a coat over one's shoulders, or wear a rain coat over another coat to protect it. However, one may not wear something specifically to protect a garment if not *דרך מלבוש*. (*Shemiras Shabbos K'Hilchaso* 1:18)

DID YOU KNOW THAT

The *Gemara* (*Yevamos* 43a) states that if a *Beraisa* existed that R' Yehudah HaNasi (Rebbi) did not learn, then R' Chiya, his disciple, could also not have known it. Yet, the *Gemara* (*Moed Katan* 16a) describes how Rebbi declared that no one should teach students *Torah* in the marketplace (as it was undignified), citing a *Posuk* as his source. R' Chiya disregarded the decree and taught his two nephews, Rav and Rabba b. Bar Chana in the marketplace, based on a different interpretation of the *Pesukim*. How could R' Chiya defy his teacher's edict? The *MaHarik* (12) explores the possibility that R' Chiya eventually became a disciple-colleague (*תלמיד-חבר*) to Rebbi, which might permit it. However, the *Gemara* (*Bava Basra* 158b) derives that Ben Azzai was a *תלמיד-חבר* to R' Akiva from Ben Azzai's use of the word "you" rather than "*Rebbi*", when addressing R' Akiva. Yet, the *Gemara* (*Kidushin* 49b) states that if a man betroths a woman on condition that he is a *Chochom*, he needn't be a *Chochom* like R' Akiva to fulfill the condition; if he betroths her on condition that he is a *Talmid Chochom*, then he needn't be like Ben Azzai to fulfill the condition. Thus, we see that Ben Azzai was still held to be a disciple of R' Akiva, despite being labeled as a *תלמיד-חבר*. Therefore, the *MaHarik* concludes that it is permitted for a student to disagree with his teacher in matters of *איסור* (as R' Chiya did). However, the *Gemara* (*Sanhedrin* 110a) which characterizes one who challenges, quarrels or complains about his *Rebbi* to be as one who had done so to the *Shechinah*, refers exclusively to one's *רבו מובהק* - primary teacher (who taught him most of his knowledge) and non-*איסור* matters. This is derived from the fact that Korach's group quarreled with Moshe, indisputably the *רבו מובהק* of *Bnei Yisroel*, but were characterized as *בהצותם על ד'* - contenders against *Hashem*.

A Lesson Can Be Learned From:

The *Baal Hafla'ah* - R' Pinchas HaLevi Horowitz was the Rav in Frankfurt for many years. He developed a reputation for being lenient in *Halachic* rulings, not fearing to disagree with the earlier *Poskim* such as the *ShaCh* and *TaZ*. He was once asked how he could rule leniently against the established opinions of such *Gedolim*. He replied "When I arrive in *Shomayim* after 120 years and stand before the *מעלה* of *בית דין של מעלה*, I have no doubt that the *ShaCh* and *TaZ* will come forward with claims against me for having disregarded their rulings. I will attempt to defend myself to the best of my ability but I feel confident that regardless of the outcome, I will have come away a winner. For after all, I will have gone to a *Din Torah* with such *Gedolei Yisroel*! On the other hand, if I ruled that a cow was *Traife* against my better judgement, then the cow will appear with a claim against me in the *בית דין של מעלה*. Even if I vanquish the cow, who wants to go to a *Din Torah* with an animal?"

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