

תשנ"ח



A Kehilas Prozdor Publication

(c) 1990-1998 Leibie Sternberg

<http://www.vutrak.com/prozdor>

כתיבה וחתימה טובה Friday

Shabbos

Sunday

Candles Mincha

6:43 6:53

6:39

6:51

פרשת: נצבים

DafYomi Shiur Shacharis

5:30 6:10 9:00

7:00

IMPORTANCE OF

The *Gemara* (*Berachos* 55b) quotes R' Yehudah who says that one of three things which shorten one's days is when he is given a *Sefer Torah* to read and he refuses to read it. This is derived from: **כי הוא חייך ואורך ימך**. The *Meforshim* explain that this refers to one who lived during the time that everyone had to read his own *Aliyah*. However, the *Tur* (א"ח 139) states that before one rises to read from the *Torah*, he must prepare his portion 2-3 times, and R' Akiva is cited as an example, where he was not prepared and so when he was called up, he refused to go. Should not R' Akiva have been subject to R' Yehudah's statement, as he refused the *Sefer Torah* that was offered to him? The *Torah Temimah* suggests that although certainly one must comply with the *Tur* (and *Shulchan Aruch* which rules accordingly), the fact that one did not prepare is itself grounds for the punishment R' Yehudah speaks of. However, an occasional lapse would not be cause for concern. Only one who was never prepared, and so continually refused to go up, would be subject to shortened days. We see this from the fact that R' Akiva refused the *Aliyah* and was still **זוכה** to long life. Based on R' Yehudah's statement, the *GRA* explains the ruling of the *Shulchan Aruch* (א"ח 135:6) where a *Yisroel* is called up to the first *Aliyah* in the absence of a *Kohen* and after he says **ברוך** a *Kohen* walks in. The *Halacha* is that the *Kohen* takes over the *Aliyah* but the *Yisroel* must remain at the *Bimah* until the third *Aliyah*, which he then receives. The *GRA* (*ibid*) states that this is based on R' Yehudah's statement, since if the *Yisroel* were to leave the *Bimah* before receiving an *Aliyah*, he would be deemed to have rejected the *Torah*.

QUESTION OF THE WEEK:

If one makes inquiries about someone for **שידוך** purposes, must one state that the inquiries are for that reason?

ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:

(Why may one travel if a subsequent **ברכת הגומל** implies that it's dangerous?) The *Avnei Nezer* (א"ח 39) derives from the words: **חייבים טובות** in **ברכת הגומל**, which is said after each sea or desert trip, even if one experienced no danger, that an unnecessary trip itself is a **חטא**, for which he should have been punished, but was saved. Yet, *Binyan Tzion* (137) holds that **שומר פתאים ד'** permits one to undertake activities unlikely to be harmful, if not yet in danger.

DIN'S CORNER:

It is customary to say **התרת נדרים** on *Erev Rosh HaShanah* before at least 3-10 people. In order for the **התרה** to be effective, one must understand what he is saying - *i.e.* that he regrets having made vows, and say it sincerely. Although this custom has for some reason been adopted only by men, it is commendable if a woman makes her husband (or father?) a *Shliach* for her to request **התרה** and the man should add the words: **וכן לאשתי** at the conclusion of his **התרה**. (*Teshuvos V'Hanhagos* 1:338)

DID YOU KNOW THAT

The *Mishna* (*Kesubos* 63a) states that a husband who refuses to supply his wife with those things the *Torah* obligates him in (*i.e.* **שאר כסות ועונה**) must pay her a penalty of three *Dinarim* per week - 1/2 *Dinar* per day, until he complies. The *Gemara* (64b) explains that *Shabbos* is not included in the fine because to do so, would constitute *S'char Shabbos* - [the wife] earning money from her husband on *Shabbos*. *Rashi* notes that the prohibition against *S'char Shabbos* is based on a *Gezerah* (Rabbinic ordinance) enacted because of its similarity to *Mekach U'Memkar* - the conducting of business, which is forbidden on *Shabbos*. The *Beis Yosef* (א"ח 585) asks, isn't *Mekach U'Memkar* itself a *Gezerah* enacted to prevent the violation of *Torah* laws such as writing and erasing, which commonly accompany business transactions? If so, do we not have a rule that prevents enacting one *Gezerah* on top of another? The *Beis Yosef* answers that the prohibition against *S'char Shabbos* is not a true *Gezerah* but is characterized as a **חשש** - a concern that *Chazal* had, based on their previous *Gezerah* against conducting business. As such, its application is not subject to the restriction of **אין גוזרין גזירה לגזירה**. Furthermore, as it is only a concern but not an **איסור**, it would also not apply in the case of a *mitzvah*, such as where one takes money to blow *Shofar* or serve as *Chazan*. Still, in the *Shulchan Aruch* (א"ח 306:5), while allowing that some permit it, the *Mechaber* himself forbids the hiring of a *Chazan* for *Shabbos* while later permitting it (without approval) regarding *Rosh HaShanah* and *Shofar* (*ibid* 585:5). The prevalent custom, in light of this contradiction is to employ **הבלעה** and pay the *Chazan* for his travel or a weekday service.

A Lesson Can Be Learned From:

A *Talmid Chochom* was offered a position as a *Rav* and he came to the *Chofetz Chaim* for advice. The *Chofetz Chaim* discussed all the general obligations of a *Rav*, and then added, "Let me tell you one more **אחריות** (responsibility) that a *Rav* has. For a brief time, I served as *Rav* here in *Radin*. During that time, the local *Shochet* was caught selling non-kosher meat and was removed from his position. He later came to me, destitute and apologetic, promising never to do it again if I would only help him to regain his position. I agreed on condition that he undertake to donate candles to the *Shul*. Everything went well from that point on, until the butcher died. Shortly after his funeral, I had a dream in which 3 *Rabonim* came to me and asked if my directive to the *Shochet* (that he donate candles to the *Shul*) had been a **קנס** (penalty) for his egregious sin, or a form of **כפרה** (atonement) for it. I replied that I had intended it as a **קנס**. The next night, the butcher himself came to me in a dream, crying how he had been arguing in **מעלה** **בית דין של מעלה** that the candles had already provided him with a **כפרה** for his **עבירה** but because of what I said, the *Beis Din* had decided that he still required a **כפרה**. Imagine! The **בית דין של מעלה** would have absolved him if only I had said the candles were a **כפרה**! Such is the **אחריות** of a *Rav*."

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

This issue is dedicated:
ל'ז'נ' פעלר ב"ר יצחק הלוי

Dedications (\$18) and appreciations may be sent to: Kehilas Prozdor, 8 GreenHill Lane, Spring Valley, N.Y. 10977 (914) 354-7240
As this contains *Divrei Torah* and partial *Pesukim*, it should be treated with proper respect, both during and after use