



	Candles	Mincha	DafYomi	Shiur	Shachris	ש"ש	פרשת: כי תבוא
Friday	7:07	7:17					9:40
Shabbos		7:02	6:00	6:50	9:00		9:40
Sunday		7:15	6:50		8:00		9:41

## IMPORTANCE OF ....

The Gemara (*Berachos* 59b) distinguishes between the *brocho* one must recite upon having built a new house, and the *brocho* said on (having one's field irrigated by) rain. Since one has no partner in the new house, the *Mishna* (*ibid* 54a) requires that he recite a *SheHechianu*. With regard to rain, the *Mishna* requires that he say the *brocho* of *HaTov V'Hamaitiv* since he presumably has "partners" (e.g. other landowners) who will also profit from the rain. The *Elya Rabba* (223:9) raises the question of why the *Gemara* makes such assumptions regarding partners. The *Gemara* (*Sotah* 54a) states that the proper order of a man's activities should be: 1) build a house; 2) plant a vineyard; and then 3) marry. As such, the presumption is that where one built a house, he was not yet married and thus, had no partner. Therefore, he should say *SheHechianu*. However, after planting a vineyard and waiting for rain, he could have married. He would therefore say *HaTov V'Hamaitiv* when it started to rain. The *Chasam Sofer* (א"ח 156) adds that in the *Tochacha*, parts of the threatened doom are described as: ... **אשה תארש** (you will betroth a woman but another will take her) followed by **בית תבנה** (you will build a house but not live in it) and then **כרם תטע** (you will plant a vineyard but another will harvest it). This jumbled order (i.e. marriage first) is described by the *Rambam* (דעות 5:11) as foolish and destined for failure, and its depiction in the *Tochachah* indicates the upheaval of propriety that will mark such a time. As such, the *Mishna* assigns a *SheHechianu* to building a house which is assumed to be in a time of prosperity, where the proper order recommends that it take place prior to marriage. However a lack of rain indicates a time of punishment and *Tochachah*. As such, the proper order would be reversed, and the vineyard would have been planted after marriage. For this reason, *HaTov V'Hamaitiv* would be the proper *brocho* to say when it rains.

## QUESTION OF THE WEEK:

If one did not *daven Shacharis* and must now *daven Mincha* twice, may he eat before *Mincha*? Before the *Tashlumin*?

## ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:

(What place is appropriate for some to *daven*, but not others?)

The *Shulchan Aruch* (א"ח 90:5) rules that one should not *daven* in an open area, like a field, as one only experiences **אימת המלך** in an enclosed area. The *Kaf HaChaim* (*ibid* 28) states that if one had been miraculously saved from danger in that open area, one may *daven* there, despite its being a **מקום פרוץ**.

## DIN'S CORNER:

One does not recite a *brocho* before eating something that is *Assur* to eat, including such things as food that was stolen. If one has liquor that was paid for, but smuggled in so as to avoid the tax, he may say a *brocho* over it. (ת"ש R' Yonasan Steif 120).

## DID YOU KNOW THAT ....

The Gemara (*Beitzah* 25b) states that a blind man may not walk in the *Reshus HaRabim* on *Yom Tov* carrying his cane. *Rashi* explains that to do so is mundane and demeaning to *Yom Tov*. The *Rosh* adds that a blind man doesn't need the cane to walk, only to feel his way. As such, he is different from a lame man who is unable to walk at all without a cane, and who may thus carry one, since for him a cane is the equivalent of shoes. However, if a cane can be equated to shoes, what difference is there between one who cannot walk at all without it, and one whose walking will be enhanced by it? Even shoes themselves are not indispensable to walking, although they enhance it and make it more comfortable. *Igros Moshe* (א"ח 5:19) suggests that perhaps shoes themselves are part of one's attire and as such may be worn in any case, unlike a cane which is only granted shoe-like status where indispensable. However, since a cane is undeniably **not** worn, its status as attire seems not to require actual wearing but is granted rather on the basis of its helpful purpose. If so, it should be given such status wherever helpful, including for a blind man. Therefore, *Igros Moshe* concludes that a cane is not similar to shoes as much as it is similar to the foot itself. The *Aruch HaShulchan* (א"ח 301:70) states that one who is lame may walk out with a cane as it is **כרגלו** – like his foot. Although there are those who cannot walk at all without shoes, as indicated by the *Posuk*: **והעגנה אשר לא נסתה כף רגלה הצג על הארץ** (the very delicate woman who never tried to set her foot onto the ground), the fact remains that as a rule, shoes are still not indispensable to walking. As such, a lame person's cane must be seen as **replacing** his foot for walking, which cannot be said regarding the cane of a blind man. Therefore, despite the fact that people seem to be lenient in this matter, the proper path would seem to warrant being strict, prohibiting a cane to a blind man on *Shabbos* & *Yom Tov*.

## A Lesson Can Be Learned From:

Rav Galinsky was once sitting on a bus next to a man who was not a Shomer Mitzvos. He saw that the man was interested in talking with him so preemptively, Rav Galinsky said to him that every Jew must have a "red line" in his Judaism, a line which he would never cross. Did he have such a line? The man thought for a moment and then said that his line was that he would never give up being a Jew. He had no desire to be a gentile. Rav Galinsky said to him that when he was young, he was passing through a town near the Black Sea and saw the mayor of the town giving a speech. The mayor was urging the people to make a stand against Hitler, who, if not stopped in their town, would have a clear path into the countries beyond. The message was clear: To stop Hitler from reaching and overrunning there, he had to be stopped here. It is the same with a person's red line, Rav Galinsky concluded. If one wants to be assured that he will never cross over his line, he shouldn't set up his defenses at that point but rather much further away, to protect his line.

**P.S.** Sholosh Seudos sponsored this week by the Sheli family.

This issue is dedicated by R' Dov Rabinowitz and family:

לע"נ לאה ב"ר שבתאי

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

ל"נ פערל ב"ר יצחק הלוי