



Friday	6:33	6:43						9:47
Shabbos		6:30	5:30	6:20	9:00			9:47
Selichos: 12:45 AM	Sunday	6:35	8:15		8:00			9:47

IMPORTANCE OF

The *Gemara* (*Bava Metzia* 62a) states that if one obtained a cow or a *Talis* or any other defined item illegally, and then died, his children are obligated to return it, as an act of *Kavod*. The *Gemara* asks: doesn't the father's possession of this item indicate that he was a sinner? If so, does not **וְנִשְׂאָ בְעַמְדָּ לֹא תֵאָר** teach us that he need not be honored? The *Gemara* answers that the father had done *Teshuvah* but had died before returning it. *Tosafos* (*Kesubos* 86a) asks how *Beis Din* can force the children to return the item to preserve the father's *Kavod*, since *Kibud Av* is a *mitzvah* with a stated reward (long life), and all such *mitzvos* whose rewards are clearly stated cannot be forced upon anyone. *Tosafos* answers that for *Kavod* alone, they could not be forced. However, there is an additional requirement (**אָרוּר מְקַלָּה אָבִיו**) to avoid *Kalon* (humiliation) of their father, which is not subject to the *mitzvah*-reward rule, that they remain obligated in. The *Mishna LaMelech* asks if so, why did the *Gemara* focus on the fact that the father was a sinner, as if that would have relieved the children of any obligation? A child is always obligated to avoid anything that could humiliate a parent, even if the parent is a sinner! He answers that perhaps a child is only obligated to avoid acts that could cause *Kalon*. But he might not be obligated to take action to remove *Kalon*. If the father was a sinner, the son might be able to leave the existing *Kalon* undisturbed. However, since the *Gemara* establishes that the father had done *Teshuvah*, the *mitzvah* of *Kavod* applies. Although it has **מִתְּוֵן שְׂכָרָה בְּצִדָּה**, it is obligatory in order to avoid *Kalon*. The *mitzvah* to avoid *Kalon* normally might not require an act. However the *mitzvah* of *Kavod* does. Therefore, the combination will obligate the son to act.

QUESTION OF THE WEEK:

Where a group of people are about to perform a *mitzvah*, when would the order in which they do so (*i.e.* who goes first) depend upon whether there are at least 5 in the group, or less than 5?

ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:

(When would *Aliyos* be *Kohen-Levi-Yisroel-Kohen-Levi-Yisroel*?)

The *Mishna Berurah* (135:44) rules that when there are only 2 *Leviim* and 2 *Yisroelim* (and the rest are *Kohanim*), the order should be *Kohen-Levi-Yisroel-Kohen-Levi-Yisroel-Kohen*.

DIN'S CORNER:

It is customary to fast during *Aseres Yemay Teshuvah*. Since there are (at least) 4 of those days on which one may not fast (*i.e.* 2 days of *Rosh HaShanah*, *Shabbos Shuva* and *Erev Yom Kippur*), one should complete those 4 days during the days of *Selichos*, selecting the first day of *Selichos*, *Erev Rosh HaShanah* and two other days of choice, preferably Monday and Thursday. If one attended a *Seudas Mitzvah* or plans to attend one, he should eat at the *Seudah*, and fast on a different day. (*Kitzur* 128:12)

DID YOU KNOW THAT

The *Mishna* (*Sanhedrin* 60b) lists the various acts, such as bowing and sacrificing, which constitute worship of *avodah zara* to the extent that one would be executed for such worship. However, one who embraces, kisses, washes, clothes, puts shoes on etc.. an *avodah zara* is only liable to *Malkus*. On the basis of this list, the *Shaar Ephraim* (124) determined that if one accepted upon himself to "clothe" someone (**לְהַלְבִּישׁ**) his obligation did not necessarily include providing shoes (**לְהַנְעִיל**), since clothing and "shoeing" are different activities. However, the *Shvus Yaakov* (1:24) disagreed, presuming that the *Mishna*, by stating both **מְלִבִּישׁ** and **מְנַעִיל** was simply listing the various ways in which one could incur *Malkus*, without necessarily making a statement about the meaning, definition and/or limitations of **מְלִבִּישׁ**, which could still easily include shoes. The several separate references to both clothing and shoes, most prominently the *Remez* in the *Torah* from: **לֹא בָלוּ שְׁלֹמֹתֵיכֶם וְנַעֲלַךְ לֹא בִלְתָּהּ**, do not change the fact that the category name for both is still **מְלִבִּישׁ**. Yet, the *Gemara* (*Shabbos* 113a) states that one's *Shabbos מְלִבוּשׁ* should not be the same as one's weekday clothing, without making reference to shoes, and in fact, the *Kaf HaChaim* (א"ח 262:25) quotes the *Rav Poalim* (4:13) who says one need not change one's shoes for *Shabbos* (although it is still recommended). The *Magen Avraham* (א"ח 2:3) states that one should not put on two **מְלִבוּשִׁים** together, as it causes forgetfulness. Would this apply to shoes as well, in particular, during the winter when some put boots or galoshes on their shoes, and then slip their feet into the combination? Would this be deemed putting on two **מְלִבוּשִׁים** at the same time? The *Tzitz Eliezer* (7:2) says no. The rationale of the *Shvus Yaakov* is based on people's language and custom. An obligation to clothe someone (such as a parent) would normally include shoes. However, since the *Posuk* distinguishes between them, an *Issur* concerning **מְלִבוּשׁ** would not apply to **מְנַעִיל**.

A Lesson Can Be Learned From:

A troubled couple that had originally lived in Bialystok was now living in Yaffo. For a long time, the husband had refused to give his wife a *Get*, but one day he allowed himself to be convinced. The Rav in Yaffo arranged a *Sofer* and witnesses, but it was late by the time the *Get* was ready. The Rav said they would have to daven *Mincha* first. The Rav davened a very long *Shemona Esrei* and after *Mincha*, he said that since it was after *Shkiyah*, they would conclude the *Gittin* on the next day. The wife was afraid the husband might back out, but the Rav insisted. That night, the Rav received a visitor from Bialystok who said he knew the woman receiving the *Get* by a different first name. In the morning, the woman acknowledged the other name, not realizing that she had to give all names she was known by. The Rav explained that his delay was not a **מִוִּפְתָּ**. He had seen one of the witnesses write something on a piece of paper that belonged to someone else. As this rendered him *Pasul*, the Rav postponed the *Get* and replaced him with another **עַד**.

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

This issue is dedicated by the Rabinowitz and Ritholtz families:

לְעִנְיַן לֵאמֹר בֵּית שְׁבִיתָאִי

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

לִזְמַן פְּעֻלַּת בֵּית יִצְחָק הַלְוִי