

Kehillah #35



THE PERTINENT PARASHA

Gratitude: Where Our Connection to Hashem Begins

Rabbi Yehoshua Pfeffer | Rav of Kehillat Ohr Chadash, Ramot, Jerusalem

The Torah explains why the nations of Ammon and Moav are banned, for eternity, from entering the Jewish fold: "For they did not come to meet you with bread and water on your way when you came out of Egypt, and they hired Bilam son of Beor from Pethor in Aram Naharaim to curse you" (*Devarim* 23:4).

is so bad about not offering us bread and water?

The Ramban provides an answer to this question that reveals a central principle of what it means to be Jewish. He explains that Ammon and Moav, as descendants of Lot, owed their very existence to the kindness of Avraham Avinu, who risked his life to save Lot from captivity. It was in Avraham's merit that Lot and his daughters were saved from Sedom. The refusal of Ammon and Moav to offer us bread and water (at a minimum) was thus a glaring lack of *hakaras ha-tov* - a demonstration of gross ingratitude in rendering rendering evil for good.

Is being ungrateful worse than murder?

Although the refusal to give us bread and water was a moral wrong and the hiring of Bilam a nefarious act of antagonism, even the combination of both leaves us wondering: why should these nations be banned while nations ostensibly far more evil, such as the murderous Amalek or the enslaving Egypt, are allowed in? What

But how should we understand the Ramban? Is being ungrateful worse than murder? Certainly, the answer is negative. In terms of severity of sin, no crime is worse than murder. Nonetheless, the Ramban teaches us that in terms of character traits, there is none more central to being Jewish than *hakaras ha-tov*: gratitude.





THE PERTINENT PARASHA



Gratitude defines the difference between an act of receiving and one of taking. A person who takes focuses on himself alone: he is seeking to gain something, to complete a lack. The act of taking else achieves the mission. He is self-centered. In contrast, the act of receiving focuses on the giver. Taking is blind to the identity of the

relationship begins by receiving, with gratitude. As the Pasuk says, it is exactly for this reason – for receiving from Hashem – that we left Mitzrayim: “I am Hashem, your God, who brought you forth from the Land of Egypt; open your mouth and I will fill it” (*Tehillim* 81).

We came out of Egypt to receive Hashem’s goodness. A precondition for this is gratitude. Those who do not possess this basic character trait are thus excluded from the nation.

As we approach the day of Rosh Hashanah, this is a basic lesson that we should study and internalize. Rosh Hashanah is the day on which we begin to recalibrate our connection with Hashem. And doing so starts with gratitude.

The Shofar symbolizes our enthroning of Hashem upon us. First and foremost, Hashem’s Kingship represents our dependence on Hashem and trust in His benevolence. Avinu, our Father, and Malkenu, our King, go hand in hand. Both are matters of relationship, and both begin with our readiness to receive, with gratitude, from Hashem.

As Ammon and Moav demonstrate, the same principle applies to human relationships. During Elul, our focus is on the primary root: our connection with Hashem.

Avinu, our Father, and Malkenu, our King, go hand in hand and both begin with our readiness to receive, with gratitude, from Hashem.

person we take from. There is no giver. In receiving, I receive something from somebody.

In other words, gratitude is the key to relationship. When we receive something, with due appreciation to the giver, the bond between giver and receiver is strengthened and the relationship flourishes. In contrast, when there is no gratitude, when we take rather than receive, the element of relationship is absent. Only one person matters.

The Jewish people exist to be in relationship with Hashem. And this



Bringing the Beauty Home

Rabbi Yaacov Haber | Rav of Kehillas Shivtei Yeshurun, Ramat Beit Shemesh

A Jewish man goes to war and encounters among the enemy a beautiful woman. The Torah says that he can take her home, but he must cut off her hair and 'do' her nails. It's interesting that the two ectodermic appendages – hair and nails – are singled out for adjustment on this hostage woman.

Kabbalistically, this portion of the Torah refers to the battle one fights daily within oneself. So often, we are torn between that which seems externally beautiful and that which is wholesome and real. Our thoughts and actions are the two major arenas for personal growth. A person's hair represents the *klipa* or the extraneous aspect of one's thoughts. And a person's nails represent the *klipa* or the extraneous aspect of one's actions.

What exactly does 'do' her nails mean in our parasha? There is actually a Talmudic argument on this topic. Rabbi Eliezer interprets 'do' to mean that she should cut her nails very short. However, Rabbi Akiva disagrees and interprets 'do' to mean that she should let the nails grow long. (Yevamos 48) On the surface, this dispute seems a cosmetic issue, but it is really a

very deep concept.

In our battle for personal growth, we strive to conquer our nature and our emotions. We search for new beginnings and a fresh start. However, every one of us comes with a bag full of the past. What should we do with our past?

This is the argument. Rabbi Eliezer taught that the growth that comes from negativity is negative – cut it off; get rid of it.

Rabbi Akiva took a different approach. The beauty of Judaism is its ability to take even the most mundane and even negative aspects of life and sanctify them. Teshuvah, in its ideal form, turns one's sins into good deeds. If you have arrived to Judaism with a past, don't cut it off. Make it holy!

The period we are in now before the fresh New Year begins is a special time for introspection and growth. There are two ways to begin fresh. We can become brand new and leave the past behind. This is perhaps the easier path to follow. Or we can take the advice of Rabbi Akiva. Don't throw the past away. Bring it forward, bring it home, and make it holy.



MEKOM AVODA Workplace Ethics & Halacha

Returning an Object of Minimal Value

Rabbi Asher Meir | Torah and Policy Researcher

Our parasha includes the commandment to return lost property: “Do not see your brother’s ox or sheep straying and ignore it; surely take it back to its owner.”

The Jewish people have historically been scrupulous in fulfilling this mitzvah. The book of Shmuel (I 9-10) describes Shaul’s trek throughout a vast area searching for lost donkeys. The search must have taken several

him. It seems it never occurred to him that he would not eventually find his donkeys at the home of some fellow Jew who agreed to watch over it. Shaul was certain that there was not a single settlement in the entire region where a Jew might neglect his obligation to do so.

Shaul’s donkeys were evidently of great value – enough to justify his absence for a prolonged period. Would his neighbors have shown the same dedication if they noticed some object of lesser value, such as an identifiable shoelace or a button? Is this included in the obligation?

There is a certain logic to ruling stringently on this matter. The passage continues, “Do the same for any lost object which is lost, and you find it.” It would suffice to say “for any lost object,” and the Gemara (BM 27a) derives from the seemingly extraneous expressions that the mitzvah applies only when the object is worth a peruta (a few agorot today). As soon as this criterion is fulfilled, all the relevant aspects of the mitzva seem to automatically apply: the finder is required to pick up the object, store

The finder is required to pick up the object, store it safely, make an effective public declaration of his find, and interview any prospective owner to verify that the object belongs to him.

weeks and crossed scores of settlements. Finally, Shaul decides to call off the search, because he thinks his father Kish will start to worry about





MEKOM AVODA

Workplace Ethics & Halacha



it safely, make an effective public declaration of his find, and interview any prospective owner to verify that the object belongs to him. No other value or effort criterion is mentioned in the Talmud or the Shulchan Aruch (other than the matter of expenses incurred).

However, a number of reasons are mentioned by contemporary authorities to exempt finders from undertaking to return an object that the owner is unlikely to seek.

1. The Shulchan Aruch HaRav (36) is insistent that even if the finder is a wealthy person who would not take the trouble to seek an object of minimal value for himself, he is still required to return it, because he is allowed to waive his own rights but not those of his fellow man. From this we can infer that if even the original owner would not bother to invest the effort, the Alter Rebbe would agree that the finder is exempt (cited from Rav Zalman Nechemiah Goldberg).

2. The following verse commands to watch over the object “until your fellow comes to seek it.” Some reasonable expectation of being able to return the object is a core part of the mitzvah. Hence, if

there is little reason to think that the owner will seek the object, there is no mitzva to undertake to return it (R. Zvi Shpitz, *Mishpetei HaTorah, Aveida* 8:9).

3. *Derech hinoach*: The Gemara (BM 21a) excludes from the mitzvah taking care of a lost object which was intentionally left there by the owner. One consideration involved is that the owner is more likely to find it by looking where he left it than by trying to stay alert to figure out who is watching it for him. Likewise, someone who lost something of little value will likely find it easy to retrace his steps to

The Torah asks the finder to put himself in the shoes of the owner, and consider his distress and desire to restore his lost object.

find his lost button or shoelace, but burdensome to try and seek out the finder (R. Yair Vasserteil).



MEKOM AVODA

Workplace Ethics & Halacha



4. The gemara (27b) wonders how it is possible to return an object based merely on the owner's description, rather than requiring a higher level of proof such as testimony. The answer is that the general policy of requiring a low burden of proof is preferable to the average person. Occasionally, his rights are infringed because someone else succeeds in claiming his lost object, but more often he benefits by not having to go to the trouble of bringing stronger proof of his ownership. Likewise, the average person prefers not having to take the trouble to take care of many small objects, even at the cost of occasionally missing out on the chance to retrieve his own lost object (R. Yair Vasserteil).

It seems to me we can bring another consideration from the mitzvah immediately following – helping raise a fallen pack animal. This mitzvah has much in common with returning lost property, and could be viewed as an application of it. The verse says that you must raise the animal “with him” – with the owner. Rashi, based on the *Sifri*, elaborates: “but if he sits idly and expects you to carry out the mitzvah yourself, you are exempt.” The obligation is to share the burden of

effort with the owner, and not to take on the entire burden while the owner refuses to raise a finger. In our case, where the owner would not invest any effort in seeking an object of such minimal value, similar logic can be applied.

Furthermore, the main message of the commandment to return lost objects is one of *arvus*, mutual responsibility. The Torah asks the finder to put himself in the shoes of the owner, and consider his distress and desire to restore his lost object. This is one reason that the mitzvah does not apply at the Torah level to non-Jews, to whom *arvus* does not automatically apply. But mutual responsibility is, after all, mutual, and perhaps it is also fair for the owner to put himself in the shoes of the finder and ask if it is really fair to expect that he invest great effort in taking care of an object of little value, which in addition has little chance of finding its owner.

A good solution in these cases is to try to put the lost object in a nearby place where the owner is more likely to find it if he does retrace his steps – for example, to pick it up from the ground and put it on a ledge or tie it to a post.



Taking Interest

The Loan as Investment Rationale

Rabbi Shloimy Muller

Talmid of Rav Pinchas Vind shlita, founder of the Beis Horaah L'inyanei Ribbis

Last week we explained that any dealing with an Israeli bank that involves interest, whether as the borrower or the lender (i.e., depositor) requires a heter iska.

As mentioned, the *heter iska* stipulates that the lender is considered an investor, and the money which the borrower returns to the lender, in excess of the principle, is really the profit of the investment and not interest on the loan. This raises some questions, though.

If the transaction is really an investment, the borrower's monthly payments should be linked to the success of the investment. However, we know that practically, the borrower's monthly payments to the bank don't fluctuate, but that rather he pays a set amount every month, (i.e., the interest rate). How does that work? What if the investment didn't garner a profit?

The rationale is as follows. Rather than the borrower needing to report his profits each month, the two parties mutually agree that the borrower retains the right to pay a monthly settlement. As long as the borrower returns the pre-agreed settlement amount, the lender has no right to demand more. Therefore, in a loan covered by a *heter iska*, the interest rate is actually the predetermined amount which the borrower can return in lieu of the actual profits.

If the investment did not profit, the borrower may refuse to pay the monthly fee. This is a crucial point; because

forcing the borrower to pay a return on the investment, even if it didn't profit, is a form of *ribbis*.

However, the *heter iska* stipulates that the lender must prove the lack of profit by making a shevua, an oath. As long as the borrower does not take an oath affirming the lack of profit, it is assumed that the investment profited. Since most people are very reluctant to make a *shevua*, the lender's investment is relatively safe.

In summary:

1. The money given to the borrower is an investment, *not* a loan.
2. The lender is therefore entitled to the returns.
3. The interest rate is the settlement that the borrower returns in lieu of fluctuating profits.
4. If the investment did not yield profit, the borrower may swear to absolve themselves from returning the monthly settlement. .

Consequently, the *heter iska* does not solve every potential *ribbis* and has limited application, as we will learn in the coming weeks.



PARASHA AND PARNASSAH

Winning the War

Rabbi Tzvi Broker | Career Coach and Director of Pilzno Work Inspired

This week's parasha begins: "As you go out to war against your enemies..." For many of us who haven't – and probably will never experience – going out to the front lines of battle, how can we find relevance of this eternal teaching of the Torah? One explanation could be found through a teaching of the Chida (Rabbi Chaim Yosef David Azulai) and others who highlight the connection between the word for bread, lechem, and war, milchama.

As physical beings, we need to eat and involve ourselves with the physical world in order to survive. At the same time, the connection between lechem and milchama gives us a hint that we must engage in physicality with caution. Without proper consciousness of this idea, we can easily slip into the spiritual dangers of materialism, especially in today's times. The Sefas Emes points out in this week's parasha the role that the commandments play in helping us be victorious in this war.

"It's a principle that positive and negative commandments were given to the Jewish people to enable a Jew to live as a free person. Therefore, as a nation we first experienced leaving the slavery of Mitzrayim and then received the Torah, which teaches

us how we can spiritually remain free from being ruled by physicality through the 613 commandments."

"Each commandment that's called a remembrance of leaving Mitzrayim is letting us know that through this commandment one can experience being free, as is found by the commandment of leket, shichicha and peah [gleanings, forgotten produce and the corners of the field the farmer leaves for the poor]. This is teaching us that through fulfilling this commandments, one's food is purified. As a result one won't become too attached to one's wealth."

"Therefore, the Torah gives us the commandments of maaser and tzedakah so that they will be protections for one's wealth since a Jew must be a free person in the realm of one's soul, body, and everything one owns. Therefore, within one's dwelling place we were given the commandment of mezuzah. And within one's clothes we were given the commandment of tzitzis so that all of these should help us to remain free, and it's a remembrance of the leaving of Mitzrayim..."

Hashem envisioned that we live in and are positively engaged with the





PARASHA AND PARNASSAH

physical world. As we see from our own lives, so much time is spent tending to our bodily needs and earning a parnassah. The Sefas Emes is telling us that the Torah's commandments are designed to enable us to engage positively in the physical world and fulfill our purpose in this world without being spiritually damaged along the way.

Elul is an opportune time to ask whether our involvement in physicality and work is making us closer to G-d or drawing us further away. One

exercise we can implement for Elul is to consider how we can upgrade the kavanah of a mitzvah that we do while we're at work. It could simply be making a more focused bracha over food, grabbing a few lines of Torah learning at during our lunch break, or even stopping to kiss the mezuzah on the way to our desks.

The Torah and mitzvos are essential vitamins we need in order to thrive and stay strong while fulfilling our purpose of uplifting the physical world.



BIOGRAPHY & LEGACY

Sarah Schenirer – The Founder of Bais Yaakov

Rabbi Dov Loketch | Rabbi of Agudas Yisrael Mogen Avraham, Detroit

Two weeks ago we read about the success of the Bais Yaakov movement and the foundation of the Teachers' Seminary in Krakow. This week we will discover what life in the seminary was like for teachers and students.

Brilliant and talented educators were hired to teach at the Teachers' Seminary in Krakow. Among the most notable was Dr. Judith Rosenbaum, a graduate of the *Realschule* in Frankfurt and Frankfurt University, who later married the renowned *Dayan* Yeshayah Grunfeld.

The standards of admission to the Seminary were strict, as students

were required to be familiar with Rav Hirsch's classic work *The Nineteen Letters* in German, and to have graduated from a "Gymnasium" (accredited high school). The curriculum included advanced-level secular studies and several languages. All students at the Teachers' Seminary were required to pay tuition. Girls were applying for admission from throughout Europe.



BIOGRAPHY & LEGACY



In 1933, a prominent Gerrer Chasid named Rabbi Yehudah Leib Orlean was appointed director of the Teachers' Seminary. He further expanded and upgraded curriculum, introduced textbooks to supplement Frau Schenirer's handwritten lesson plans, and arranged for the Seminary to be duly accredited by the Polish State. Gutta Sternbuch, who studied in the Krakow seminary in the mid-1930s, describes Rabbi Orlean this way: "A young man, still in his thirties, with a pale face and a long black beard [. . .], a philosopher, a visionary, an innovator, a speaker, and a true friend. He developed a personal relationship with each one of us. He was compassionate and caring, and he understood our young restless hearts. All the girls brought their personal struggles to him, and he helped each one individually."

Despite the intellectual rigor of the curriculum, the atmosphere in the Seminary was warm and spirited. The girls saw each other as sisters, as members of the same family, guided in their Yiddishkeit by Mama Sarah. The Seminary was always abuzz, ringing with song and laughter. Girls would dance down the stairs and sing together in between classes. Frau Schenirer succeeded in restoring not only Jewish girls' faith in, and commitment to, HaShem, but also the joy and exuberance of living as

His servants.

She had a special love for nature, and during the summers, the learning was moved out to the countryside. Frau Schenirer would often take her girls on trips and hikes to appreciate the beauty and majesty of HaKadosh Baruch Hu's world. Her student, Pearl Benisch, presents the following description of one such outing: "Frau Schenirer enjoyed hiking with the girls up the mountains, especially the Tatras. She would express her thoughts: "Girls, you know it is easy to go downhill. Climbing up and ascending the heights is harder. Every obstacle you overcome brings you closer to your goal. You just have to carry the proper climbing equipment and take the right steps to avoid falling." She found crucial life lessons in the activity of mountain climbing.

She would also teach her students, "We must always remember that if today does not go well, it can help us prepare for tomorrow." Pearl Benisch further recalls: "They always tried to reach the summit in time to see the sunrise, to observe the sun struggle to conquer the darkness and bring light to the world. She was overwhelmed by the breathtaking view. The girls sang together with her, in awe and passion, '*HaShamayim Mesaprim Kevodo, VeGam HaAretz Malah Chasdo!*' The Heavens proclaim His



BIOGRAPHY & LEGACY

Glory and the whole world is full of His loving-kindness.”

They would then all daven Shacharis together. Indeed, one of the most famous, iconic Bais Yaakov photographs from prewar Europe, which graces the cover of Naomi Seidman’s biography, Sarah Schenirer and the Bais Yaakov Movement, is one of a group of girls and teachers listening attentively to a model lecture delivered by Tzilah Orlean, sister-in-law of Rav Yehudah Leib, while sitting together on the ground in the resort town of Ravkha in 1928. These summertime programs were a crucial component of the Bais Yaakov experience.

Merging Sophistication with Passion

One particularly enlightening example of Frau Schenirer’s extraordinary ability to convey the depth and profundity of Jewish tradition was her unique perspective on the holiday of Tu B’Av. As the Mishnah (Ta’anis 4:8) describes, on this day, the unmarried women of Yerushalayim would go out into the vineyards dressed in “borrowed white clothing so as not to embarrass those who did not have,” and then the bachelors would come and matches were made. Frau Schenirer saw this occasion of Tu B’Av as an opportunity to emphasize the importance of modesty and class equality. She writes: “Borrowed white dresses for each Jewish woman without distinction between rich and

poor . . . how beautiful that sounds! Today when the young Jewish woman is drowning in a flood of different fashions, and often forgets the fashion of modesty, this factor must teach us a great deal. Jewish women assembled for their holiday not only in plain white but even in borrowed dresses. No trace of luxury sparkles in their dress, there is nothing of the foolish pride that the rich feel toward the poor, and which draws the poor to imitate the desires and pleasures of the rich. Everyone must wear a borrowed dress, which demonstrates clearly that nothing we possess is ours, but rather comes from G-d and we need learn only what to do with what we have been given as a gift.”

Reflecting on the success of Bais Yaakov, Naomi Seidman observes that Frau Schenirer and the Seminary succeeded in merging the discipline and intellectualism of German Orthodoxy with the passion and fervor of the world of Polish Chassidus. This perfect blend of sophistication and passion became one of the hallmarks of Bais Yaakov and defining features of its resounding success. It is no exaggeration to say that the girls viewed Frau Schenirer with the same awe and reverence that a Chassid shows to his esteemed Rebbe. She was their guide, their leader, their source of inspiration, their role model, and their figurehead.



*A celebration
in the kitchen*

מתחדשים לשנה טובה

With Luxury Kitchens by ReNew

ReNew Kitchens - Making Dreams Come True
Creating The Perfect Kitchen for You
High Quality, Festive and Inviting All Year Round

**Feel free to make an appointment
and create the kitchen of your dreams
With a professional and expeditious team
that understands your needs.**

רמיהו 27 י'דוטלים | 029661144 | RENEW-KITCHENS.CO.IL



מטבחי יוקרה מועצבים



What's In a No?

Rebbetzin Ilana Cowland

Relationships Coach and author of *The Moderately Anxious Everybody*

No. Such a loaded word for one so short. I guess you could also say that about Napoleon. What is it about this

ourselves danger.

And then it comes. That first harsh word. We may be too young to understand its meaning, but we are alerted to something being wrong, to our carer's change in tone, to a severity we have not yet seen. We don't yet have words to express our fears. We can't say, "What happened? What changed? Am I bad? Do you still love me? Will you still protect me?"

So we do what we know. We cry. Now that our carer has seen us stop at the edge of the road we were about to cross, or drop the bleach we were about to drink, or whatever the case may have been, the tone of the no is dropped. Our carer resumes a stance of love and comes to comfort us.

That is, until the next misdemeanor, of which there will be plenty.

How many times a day does a parent say *no* to their toddler? If the toddler is healthy and well, then the answer is many! With plenty of curiosity but no barometer for what is dangerous, *no* is the most likely word to keep the child alive.

It's natural to fear saying no to our teens. Our childhood subconscious fears playing the bad guy.

word that triggers so many people, and how can we learn more about this word so we can use it to our advantage?

Firstly, the word *no* was probably the first negative human communication we ever experienced. Human beings, unlike animals, are remarkably helpless for a relatively long time in our early childhood. We are cooed to, smiled at, snuggled, swaddled, and fed for months and months before we are able-bodied enough to cause





ERP EDUCATION, RELATIONSHIPS, PARENTING

And there we have it—the no paradox. The very word that made you feel threatened is the same word that's keeping you safe. And this paradox will continue throughout life.

How many people suffer because they can't say *no*? They dread delivering the negative answer. Yet, it's the *no* boundary, should they master it, that will protect the matters in their vicinity that require the yes. *No* to the fifth event of the week, because of the yes to the needs of my family. *No*. The word with two faces.

And then we really grow up. And so do our children. And here's when *no* really kicks in. It's natural to fear saying *no* to our teens. Our childhood subconscious fears playing the bad guy. Our early teen memory remembers the venom we may have felt towards the adults who got in our way. We don't want to be on the receiving end of that venom. It's a crazy time! Who can afford to lose the closeness they have with their teenager? We need to be there for them. How can you be there for a child who is angry?

Or are we just terrified of their outburst? Have we become intimidated by their fury? And have we increased their fury by disclosing our fear of stoking it?

So, by all means, stay on the good side of your volatile teenager. But remember that *no* is a paradox.

The same *no* that will set them off, will keep them safe.

The same *no* that will make you unpopular, will establish you as the reliable adult.

The same *no* that will deprive your child of their desire, will demonstrate your standards and expectations.

No becomes a problem not when we apply it, but rather when we fear it.

The same *no* that will leave them without, will teach them that they can cope and manage.

The same *no* that doesn't let them have whatever their friends have will teach them that they can afford to be an individual.

No becomes a problem not when we apply it, but rather when we fear it.



Aveida Mida'as and the Flying Rubik's Cube

Josh and Tammy Kruger

The Story

Two brothers, Avishai and Eliyah, were walking home from school together when they heard someone screaming from an apartment in the building to their left.

"That's it! I've had it with this thing!"

With that, an object was thrown from the window. It flew down from the 4-story apartment, crossed the street, and landed in a grassy area.

The boys noticed that the object was small and multicolored.

"Is that what I think it is?" asked Avishai. "Yes, it's a Rubik's Cube!"

"It's an unsolved Rubik's Cube" corrected Eliyah. "He's probably the millionth person to give up."

Eliyah picked up the cube "I was thinking about buying one of these, but I guess that fellow just saved me the money."

"What do you mean?" asked Avishai. "You're not going to take it are you? We need to do *hashavas aveidah!*"

Eliyah stared at Avishai. "Are you kidding me? He obviously doesn't want this Rubik's Cube anymore! Isn't this a case of *aveidah mida'as*?"

Avishai took out his phone. Let's just call home and see what Mom or Dad have to say about this.

Discussion

Q: What connection does this story have with Parashat Ki Tetzei?

A: The second aliyah of this week's parasha tells us about *hashavas aveidah*, the mitzvah of returning a lost object to our fellow Jew.

Q: What is *aveida mida'as*?

A: The *Gemara (Bava Metziah 25b)* mentions a case of a person who left a valuable object in a garbage can that was regularly cleared. It rules that if the owner placed the object in the garbage can, then he is considered to have intentionally given it up. The object is not "lost." Such situations are called "*aveida mida'as*" - losing something intentionally. The Rabbi's ruled that the mitzvah of *hashavas aveida* does not apply in such





PARASHA HALACHA FOR THE SHABBOS TABLE



situations.

Q: What should the boys do?

A: They should return the Rubik's Cube to its owner. This case is an exception. When someone throws an object in anger, we must presume that the main reason for the action is the desire to appease anger through violence. It is very likely that that the person did not actually make a real decision to give up the object (*Machaneh Efraim* on *Rashi's* opinion of the *Rosh, Bava Kama 26a*).

Back to Our Story

After discussing the situation with their parents, the boys entered the building and knocked on

the door of the apartment. A boy answered the door.

"Hi. I'm Avishai, and this is my brother Eliyah. Did anything by any chance fall out of your apartment window?"

The boy blushed. "Well, it didn't exactly fall. I'd been trying to solve the Rubik's Cube for hours. It was so frustrating that I overreacted. I suppose it's completely broken, and I feel bad because it was a gift from my grandparents."

"I have two pieces of good news for you," said Avishai "Number one: Your Rubik's Cube is still in good shape. Number two: I know how to solve it, and I'd be happy to teach you!"

The next day, the brothers stopped by their new friend's house to begin the lessons.



Written in collaboration with Rabbi Yehoshua Pfeffer and based on an article in Hemdat Yamim by Rabbi Daniel Mann (<http://www.erezhemdah.org>). Le'ilui neshama of Frumit Bat Yosef, Edith Nusbaum a"h.



www.kehillah.org.il

Kehillah is an organization dedicated to serving the Anglo-Torah community living in Israel. It is active in areas of community, education, and leadership.

We welcome your feedback! Please send comments, insights, and suggestions to: info@kehillah.org.il

For advertising please email: kehillahorg@gmail.com or call: 02-5473074

For dedications email info@kehillah.org.il or call: 0542406476

