



	Candles	Mincha	DafYomi	Shiur	Shachris	פ"ש	פרשיות: חקת-בלק
Friday	8:10	6:50/7:45					9:19
Shabbos		8:05	6:45		7:40	9:00	9:20
Sunday		8:20	8:00			8:00	9:20

IMPORTANCE OF ...

The Gemara (Kidushin 30b) states that regarding Torah study, even a father and son, or teacher and student, who study Torah together, will behave initially as enemies to one another, but in the end, will become devoted friends of one another. This is derived from: **את והו בסופה** - which is explained to mean there will be love (אהבה) in the end. The Shulchan Aruch (י"ד 242:2-3) rules that one who disputes his teacher is deemed to be arguing with the Shechinah, but the Rema permits one to dispute his teacher's ruling (פסק והוראה) if he has proof on his side. However, if a student were to dispute his teacher on a matter of Psak, would that not constitute **מורה הלכה בפני רבו** (ruling in front of one's teacher), which is definitely forbidden? The Gemara (Sanhedrin 6a) derives from: **מדבר שקר תרחק** that if a student sitting before his Rebbe during a Din Torah, sees a merit for a poor litigant and a fault against a wealthy one, he must speak up. The **שאלת יעבץ** (1:5) explains that when Rebbe said (Makos 10a) that he learned much from his teachers and friends but most from his students, he was referring to open Torah discussions whose purpose was to reach the truth. However, if a student sees that despite his attempts, the teacher is unwilling to accept his arguments, he is no longer permitted to continue his dispute, even in matters of Pilpul. Yet, if the matter is a practical one where an error in Psak may result, he must speak up. Thus, the Rema's ruling dealt only with this - permitting a student to speak up in matters of Psak to avoid error. But the Rema never permitted a student to act upon his Psak, even where he can prove his position. Thus, the result of such pointing out would not constitute **מורה הלכה בפני רבו**.

QUESTION OF THE WEEK:

When might someone who already said *Birchos HaTorah* in the morning with **כונה**, and did not subsequently nap, be required to say it again on the same day before sitting down to study?

ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:

(When might one not be permitted to study Musar?)

In *Teshuvos V'Hanhagos* (1:546), an opinion is quoted that forbids studying Musar on Shabbos as it will inevitably lead to sadness, and one must not be sad on Shabbos. However, it is qualified upon examination to only forbid Viduy as a result of Musar study.

DIN'S CORNER:

One who has already sired children is still encouraged to marry a woman who is able to bear children. However, if he is now unable to sire more children, he should marry a woman who cannot bear children. Even if he is able to sire more children but he cannot afford more children or he is afraid of potential rivalries etc..., he may marry a woman who cannot bear children. (Shulchan Aruch אה"ע 1:8)

DID YOU KNOW THAT ...

The Gemara (Bechoros 54b) states that in order for a man to be obligated in **מעשר בהמה** (separating a tenth of his animals), he must have a herd of at least ten animals together. The Gemara goes on to say that the shepherd's presence combines several groups of animals that may be as far away as 16 Mil (1 Mil = 2000 Amos) from each other, as the Rabanan have determined that a shepherd's eyesight covers up to 16 Mil. The Rema (ע"ע 17:34) rules that to free a woman to marry, witnesses testifying that her husband drowned in an (endless) ocean must have remained watching for a period long enough to ensure that the man actually drowned. R' Chaim Volozhin (**חוט המשולש** 1:6) asks, isn't our concern that he may have emerged somewhere else? How far can the witnesses see across the ocean anyway? We know that Hagar moved away from the dying Yishmael a distance of 2 bow shots - **הרחק כמטחוי קשת** (1 Mil according to the Midrash) in order not to see him die. Thus, witnesses should be capable of seeing no more than a Mil as well. He concludes that if the drowning man does not emerge within their eyesight in sufficient time, the **רוב** dictates that even if he were swept out beyond their eyesight, he would not survive. Yet, how are we to resolve the disparity between 1 Mil versus 16 Mil? The Gemara (Bechoros 55a) allows the **ציורף** of animals to be effected not only by the shepherd's presence and sight, but by his possessions as well. If his possessions are in one village and there are animals within 16 Mil of the village, they are counted, because his arrival is anticipated, rendering the animals already under his **שמירה**. Thus, his **שמירה** is deemed to stretch up to 16 Mil; not necessarily his physical eyesight, which we assume to extend only up to a Mil. This would also seem to be the **שיעור** one must distance oneself in order not to cause **היוק ראייה** (invading privacy by intrusive gazing), avoidance of which motivated Bilaam's praise in **מה טובו**.

A Lesson Can Be Learned From:

In the city of Brisk there lived two brothers who were renowned for their scholarship and piety. Their mother used to complain that one of them never said **ברכת המזון** (he never ate) and the other never said **ברכת התורה** (he never slept). Once, one of them took someone to a Din Torah for not repaying a loan. The defendant denied the whole thing, causing the brother to exclaim: "The Gemara says there is a **חזקה** that a man will not have the audacity to deny a **חוב** to his creditor's face. What has happened to this **חזקה**?" This same brother was once a single witness for another's claim, where, after the defendant did the same thing, the brother made the same observation and comment. Shortly thereafter, the brother visited his original debtor and asked him for **מחילה**. "I am certainly not forgiving the debt", he explained, "but I see now that the weakening of the **חזקה** seemed to bother me more where it was my money at stake, than where I was merely a witness. For the force of my comment to you, I must ask your forgiveness".

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

This issue is dedicated:

לד"ר פערל ב"ר יצחק הלוי