



|         | Candles | Mincha    | DafYomi | Shiur | פרשת: קרח<br>זק"ש Shachris |
|---------|---------|-----------|---------|-------|----------------------------|
| Friday  | 8:14    | 6:50/7:45 |         |       | 9:13                       |
| Shabbos |         | 8:10      | 7:15    | 8:00  | 9:14                       |
| Sunday  |         | 8:35      | 9:15    | 8:00  | 9:14                       |

## IMPORTANCE OF ....

The Gemara (*Sotah* 39a) states that a *Kohen* must wash his hands before *Nesias Kapayim* (*duchaning*), as derived from the Posuk: 'שאו ידיכם קודש וברכו את ד'. *Rashi* learns that he must wash specifically before going up to *duchan*, while the *Rambam* holds that the morning *Netilas Yadayim* was enough, if he was careful to keep his hands clean. The *Shulchan Aruch* (א"ח 128:6) rules like *Rashi*, and, based on a *Zohar*, states that water should be poured on the hands of the *Kohen* by a *Levi*. The *Be'er Heitev* (א"ח 128:8) cites several opinions regarding the issue of a *Levi* who is a *Talmid Chochom* pouring water over the hands of a *Kohen Am HaAretz*. Some say it is permitted, some say it is encouraged as a *Midas Chasidus*, and some say that such a *Levi* is encouraged as a *Midas Chasidus*, and some say that such a *Levi* is **חייב מיתה** for doing so. It would seem that this question is similar to that of *Hashovas Aveidah*, where the Gemara (*Bava Metzia* 30a) derives from **והתעלמת** that a *Talmid Chochom* is not obligated where it is not befitting his *Kavod*. The Gemara concludes that a *Talmid Chochom* may still return it, though not obligated, as an act of **משורת הדין**, and the *Rambam* and *Shulchan Aruch* rule accordingly. However, the *Rosh* forbids a *Talmid Chochom* from doing so, allowing him only, as a gesture of **לפנים משורת הדין**, to compensate the owner for not having returned it to him. As such, they should all agree that a *Talmid Chochom* should not degrade himself by pouring water on the *Kohen Am HaAretz's* hands. However, the *Mishnah* (א"ח 8) notes that the *Tannaim* and *Amoraim* used to dance in a seemingly undignified manner at a *Chasunah* or at a *Simchas Beis HaShoevah*, which shows that **במקום מצוה** it is permitted. Certainly here, where the Posuk says: **ונלו עלך וישרתוך** – the *Leviim* are bound to serve the *Kehunah* (not an individual *Kohen*) in its obligation of *Avodah*. As such, it may even fall first upon the *Talmidei Chachomim* to participate in every aspect of increasing the *Kedusha* of the *Kehunah*.

## QUESTION OF THE WEEK:

One is obligated to spend up to 1/5 of one's assets in order to fulfill a **מצות עשה**. Which *mitzvah* is an exception, requiring no outlay of assets ?

## ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:

(Where would *bentsching* with *Zimun* depend on the room's layout ?)

The *Biur Halacha* (195) cites the *GRA's* opinion that several groups of less than 3 people may not combine for a *Zimun*. Thus, in a room with many tables for two, no *Zimun* could be said.

## DIN'S CORNER:

Although one may not squeeze liquids from a fruit on *Shabbos*, one may suck the juice from the fruit. Because of this leniency, one may only do so by inserting the fruit into one's mouth and not when one is holding the fruit in one's hand, as this may lead to squeezing with one's fingers in a forbidden manner. (*Mishna Berurah* 320:12)

## DID YOU KNOW THAT ....

The Gemara (*Pesachim* 121b), in discussing the *berachos* made at a *Pidyon HaBen*, states that it is "**פשיטא**" that the father says the *brocho*: **על פדיון הבן** over the actual *Pidyon*. However, with regard to the **שההיינו**, does the father or the *Kohen* say that ? The *Tzlach* asks why the Gemara had to preface its question with a statement about how **פשיטא** it is that the father says the *Pidyon brocho*. The *Tzlach* answers as follows: According to the *Poskim* who allow one to redeem his son through a *Shliach*, if it is a *Shliach* doing the *Pidyon*, then it might not be proper for the *Shliach* to say **שההיינו**, since it's not his *mitzvah*. As such, it might make more sense for the *Kohen* to say the **שההיינו**, since he can say it regularly, at every *Pidyon*, whereas the father would only be able to say it if he himself does the *Pidyon*, and not a *Shliach*. What is the proof that *Pidyon HaBen* can be done through a *Shliach* ? It is the fact that the *Nusach* of the *brocho* on the *Pidyon* itself is: **על פדיון הבן**, and the *Rosh* on the Gemara (*ibid* 7b) states that for any *mitzvah* that can be done using a *Shliach*, the *brocho* for it is always "**על \_\_\_\_\_**" (on the *mitzvah*) rather than "**ל\_\_\_\_\_**" (to do the *mitzvah*). As such, it was necessary for the Gemara to first establish the "**פשיטא**" fact that the father's *Pidyon brocho* is **על פדיון הבן**, which is the form of *brocho* said when a *Shliach* may be used. However, if so, the *Rivash* (131) asks, why does the *Rambam* state that the *brocho* said over *Bris Milah* is in the form: "**למול את הבן**" ? The *Rivash* answers that *Milah* is the young boy's personal *mitzvah* (which another must perform), whereas *Pidyon HaBen* is not. The *Birchas Shemuel* (*Kidushin* #18) distinguishes between **ברכת המצוות** which are said over the *mitzvah*, versus the *brocho* of **שההיינו**, which is tied to the **קיום** of the *mitzvah*. With regard to **ברכת המצוות**, a *Shliach* may also say it, since he is also physically doing the *mitzvah*. However with regard to **שההיינו**, since it connects only to the **קיום** of the *mitzvah*, **קיום** applies only to he whom the *Torah* obligated in the *mitzvah* in the first place, and not to the *Shliach*.

## A Lesson Can Be Learned From:

A group of Chasidim were sitting at a *Simcha* when one of them made the philosophical observation that we all aspire to and pride ourselves on being **מאמינים בני מאמינים** (believers in *Hashem*). Yet, at the first sign of trouble, if someone should get sick **ר"ל**, we pick ourselves up and run to a doctor. Where is our **אמונה** then ? A second Chosid challenged this by pointing out that the *Torah* states: **ורפא ירפא** - that a doctor is permitted to heal. Why then shouldn't we go to a doctor ? A third Chosid decided to intervene. "The proper course of action is in our *Tefilos* each day. We say **אדון הנפלאות**. *נורא תהילות נורא רפואה* from one who is qualified to dispense it, because *Hashem*, the **נורא רפואה** has created *נורא רפואה* for this very purpose. If the *רפואה* is unsuccessful, we turn next to saying *Tehillim* to *Hashem*, the **נורא תהילות**. If that too proves insufficient, as a last resort, we implore *Hashem*, the **אדון הנפלאות**, to grant us a miracle where other solutions have eluded us."

**P.S.** Sholosh Seudos sponsored this week by the Miller 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