

Toronto Torah

Beit Midrash Zichron Dov

Parshat Mishpatim

24 Shevat 5771/January 29, 2011

Vol.2 Num. 22

Shiur in Review: Yonah's Change in Heart

R' Mordechai Torczyner

This comes from a shiur delivered in a weekly Trei Asar series, co-sponsored with Mekorot. The full shiur is available at <http://bit.ly/elykZ5>. The class meets at 1:30 PM, Tuesdays at Shaarei Shomayim (but not February 1).

Yonah flees from before G-d, seeking to evade his prophetic mission, and ultimately attempts to surrender his life rather than fulfill the responsibility assigned to him. This wayward prophet is swallowed by a fish, and - during the course of a three-day stay in the depths - experiences a change of heart. He composes a poetic prayer, and pleads for another opportunity to serve. Before this man had sought escape, but now he expressed a longing to draw close to his Creator. What inspired Yonah to alter his path?

One might suggest that Yonah was motivated by fear of impending death, or by the pain of life in the Piscine Hotel. However, this would ignore the passion of his prayer, in which Yonah spoke of remembering G-d and gazing upon His sacred sanctuary. Also, this explanation would call into question Yonah's sincerity, and so raise doubts as to why G-d granted the former prophet his wish. Why, then, did Yonah decide to serve G-d after all?

One possibility emerges from a dialogue between Moshe and HaShem on Har Sinai. As described in the gemara (Sanhedrin 111a), Moshe ascended to Heaven and found HaShem describing His patience in the Torah. Moshe contended that HaShem should be patient only with the righteous - to which HaShem replied that he would eventually come to see the worth of patience for the wicked. That day came with the sin of the Meraglim, when Moshe found himself pleading for Divine mercy for the rebellious Jewish nation.

As Yonah personally declared (Yonah 4:1-3), he had fled from before G-d because of a Moshe-like objection to Divine mercy. Commentators differ in their explanations for that objection, but all agree that Yonah contended that G-d should not apply mercy to the wicked of Nineveh. Perhaps this explains Yonah's metamorphosis in the fish; like Moshe after the sin of the Meraglim, Yonah came to see the value of Divine mercy when he needed to plead for it himself.

Alternatively, Yonah's own choice of words offers us another explanation. Yonah waxed rhapsodic (2:5), "I was exiled (נִגְרַשְׁתִּי) from before Your eyes." This calls to mind two other exile experiences: "And He exiled (וַיִּגְרַשׁ) the

man [Adam and Chavah, from Eden]," and Kayin's charge to G-d, "You have exiled me [גִּרְשַׁתָּ]". Adam and Chavah sinned, and then they hid and dissembled when G-d called for them and questioned them. Kayin sinned, and he attempted to hide the truth when G-d questioned him. Both were punished with exile, giving them the distance they had actually sought by hiding, and at that point they repented.

Perhaps the same is true for Yonah. Yonah sought to escape HaShem's presence, and with his entry into the sea he was granted success. At this point, he was distant, and the flow of prophecy was cut off; Yonah 1, G-d 0. But at this moment the former prophet understood what his success truly meant - that he had erased his connection to the Divine. Like Adam and Chavah, like Kayin, he was now exiled. This frightened him, and he instantly repented his hard-won distance and sought his own return.

As the Vilna Gaon wrote (Aderet Eliyahu to Yonah 1:1), the story of Yonah is the story of every soul. We come to this world with a mission, and, at times, we wander from that mission and stray from the presence of the G-d who directs us. Yonah's renewed appreciation of Divine mercy through his own experience of forgiveness can teach us to recognize and appreciate Divine kindness in our own lives. Yonah's appreciation for the value of proximity to G-d can remind us to be similarly motivated to draw closer to our Creator. May we learn the lessons of the man who was swallowed by a fish, and so draw closer to the G-d who has charged us with missions of our own.

torczyner@torontotorah.com

Parshah Questions

Dovid Zirkind

Answers are provided on the back page.

- What can be learned from the expression "Asher Tasim Lifneihem - which you shall place before them"?
(Rashi, Seforno to Shemot 21:1, Kedushin 35a)
- Did Hashem give Moshe more than ten commandments at Har Sinai?
(Rashi, Seforno to Shemot 24:12, Yerushalmi Berachot 6:1)
- Why is "Lo Tivasheil Gedi Bachaleiv Immo - you shall not boil a kid in its mother's milk" repeated three times in the Torah?
(Rashi to Shemot 23:19, Talmud Chulin 113b)
- For Children: Why is the penalty for stealing an ox different from the penalty for stealing a sheep?
(Rashi to Shemot 21:37)

zirkind@torontotorah.com

To sponsor a Toronto Torah in memory or in honour of a loved one for \$180, please email sponsorship@torontotorah.com or call 416-781-1777.

וישנם עוד דינים הנלמדים מעבד לקידושי אישה ודברים רבים נוספים.

הטבע האנושי

במבט של אדם מודרני, אנו מאמינים בתפיסת עולם השואפת ליצור שיוויון. אנו מתערבים בתרבויות שונות שאינן דוגלות בערכים אלו ומנסים לתקן אותם. יש בזה דבר נפלא אך בו בזמן יש בכך משהו מתנשא, אנחנו יודעים מהו הטוב ומהו הרע ומחליטים עבור אחרים בעניינים אלו. הרב קוק באיגרת פ"ט (חלק א עמ' צו) ששלח לתלמידו ד"ר משה זיידל, כותב על מצוות העבדים.

ודע עוד, שהעבדות, כמו כל דרכי ד' הישרים, שצדיקים ילכו בהם ופושעים יכשלו בהם, לא הביאה מצד עצמה לעולם שום תקלה, כי עצם חוק העבדות הוא חק טבעי בבני אדם, ואין שום הבדל בין העבדות החוקית להעבדות הטבעית, ואדרבא העבדות החוקית שהיא על פי רשותה של תורה באה לתקן כמה תקלות, שהעבדות הטבעית היא צפויה אליהם.

הרב קוק ממשיך עוד ומפרט על אנשים שהולכים לעבודה באין ברירה, והמעסיקים אינם נותנים להם תנאים ראויים. אותם אנשים מתמסרים לעבודה כיוון שיש בהם את תכונת העבדות. אנו רואים בימינו כי ישנם להתפרנס. ישנם לעצרו אנשים שמנצלים את התופעה הזו על מנת להתעשר ומנצלים את העובדים הללו. אותם עובדים מוחזקים בתנאים קשים וחירותם נשללת מהם. אומר הרב קוק שטוב היה אם היינו לוקחים מוסר מדיני תורה של עבד עברי כדי ללמוד איך לנהוג בעובדים שלנו ולא לפסול את המושג רק בשם ערכים מודרניים.

izolberg@torontotorah.com

תשלום לגנבתו (כפי שכתוב בשמות כב). אנו מדברים על שני מצבים שבהם אין לאדם כסף, בשני המצבים הוא פונה למעשה שמוציא אותו מהחברה. התוצאה בשני המקרים היא עבדות בסגנון התורה; הוא גר אצל אדם בעל אמצעים (הרי הוא רכש אותו) שדואג לצרכיו, נוהג בו בכבוד ומקבל יחס טוב יותר משכיר (בלשון הרמב"ם סוף הל' ז: בד"א בעבד עברי מפני שנפשו שפלה במכירה, אבל ישראל שלא נמכר מותר להשתמש בו כעבד). בעבדות משהו אחר, מן מערכת שיקומית לאנשים שנסיונות החיים גרמו להם להרגיש כי אינם חלק מהחברה. אנו מנסים להחזירם לתוכינו. אותו עשיר שעד כה נראה כל כך מרוחק משווה את העני השפל הזה אליו, עד כדי כך שהעני לא רוצה לעזוב. הריטב"א על קידושין מביא את התוספות על מהות רצונו של העבד:

רבו אוהבו והוא אינו אוהב את רבו, אינו נרצע שנאמר כי אהבך. הקשו בתוספות הא למה לי קרא דהא פשיטא שאינו נרצע אלא מדעתו ומרצונו, תירצו דהכי קאמר שאע"פ שהעבד רוצה להיות נרצע מפני עניות וכיוצא בו ולא מפני שאוהב את רבו ושיהא לו חבה עמו, אינו נרצע.

אנו רוצים להימנע ממצב שבו העבד רוצה להשאיר עבד רק בגלל שהוא פוחד לחזור לחברה. צריך להיות מניעה חזקה של אהבה בכדי שנאפשר לו להשאיר, וגם זה במחיר רציעת אוזנו.

דיני עבד בימינו

ישנם דינים נוספים שאותם אנו לומדים מעבד עברי. דין אחד כפי שמביא המהר"ם מרוטנבורג (חלק ד ס"י עב) הוא היכולת לאדם לפרוש באמצע חוזה מעבודתו כיוון שאם לא כן, אדם נחשב כעבד שאין לו אפשרות לעזוב את עבודתו בכל זמן שירצה. הציץ אליעזר (חלק ז ס"י מח) לומד מעבד עברי שכשם שצריך לשלוח עבד, בצאתו לחופשי, עם מתנות כך צריך לשלוח עובד שמסיים את עבודתו עם מתנות (דמי פיצויים).

בפרשת השבוע שלנו אנו נפגשים עם מצוות העוסקות בעבדים.

(א) וְאֵלֶּה הַמִּשְׁפָּטִים אֲשֶׁר תִּשִׂים לַפְּנֵיהֶם (ב) כִּי תִקְנֶה עֶבֶד עִבְרִי שֵׁשׁ שָׁנִים יַעֲבֹד וּבִשְׁבַעַת יֵצֵא לְחֻפְשֵׁי חָנָם... (ז) וְכִי יִמְכַר אִישׁ אֶת בְּתוּלָתוֹ לְאִמָּה לֹא תִצָּא קְצָאתָ הָעֲבָדִים: (שמות פרק כא)

איך אנו, כאנשים שחיים בתקופה שבה עבדות היא ממש מילה גסה מצד הערכים שעליהם אנו מתחנכים, יכולים לקבל את דברי התורה כמוסר עליון?

עבדות על פי התורה

בראש וראשונה אנו צריכים לבחון את התפיסה שעליה מבססת התורה את גישתה לעבדות.

בפרשת בהר (ויקרא פרק כה) התורה מתארת לנו את הדרך שבה צריך לנהוג עם עבדים.

תורה אומרת לנו שאל לנו לנהוג בעבד כעבד אלא כשכיר, יש לו "חוזה" הוא חוזר לחייו הקודמים בתום הזמן. הקב"ה מציין את הסיבה; "כי עבדי הם" אף אחד מישראל לא יכול לטעון בעלות על רעהו כיוון שכולנו בסופו של דבר "עבדי ה'" שנקנינו לו בעת שהוציאנו ממצרים.

הרמב"ם לומד מספר דינים מפסוקים אלו

כל עבד עברי אסור לישראל שקנהו להעבידו בדברים בוזים שהם מיוחדים לעשות העבדים כגון שיוליך אחריו כליו לבית המרחץ או יחלוץ לו מנעליו שנאמר לא תעבוד בו עבודת עבד אינו נוהג בו אלא כשכיר שנאמר כשכיר כתושב יהיה עמך, ומותר לספר לו שערך ולכבס לו כסותו ולאפות לו עיסתו אבל לא יעשה אותו בלן לרבים או ספר לרבים או נחתום לרבים... (הל' עבדים א, ז)

אנו רואים מהרמב"ם כי דינים אלו של עבודה מבזה ושיש לנהוג בו כשכיר ולא להשתמש בו ככל שיחפץ. עוד למד הרמב"ם מפרשה זו

אחד המוכר את עצמו או שמכרוהו ב"ד אינו נמכר בפרהסיא על אבן המקח ולא בסימטא כדרך שהעבדים נמכרין שנאמר לא ימכרו ממכרת עבד אינו נמכר אלא בצנעה ודרך כבוד. (שם א,ה)

יש לנהוג בו בכבוד, בכל שלב ובכל מצב, ולא זו בלבד אלא

כל עבד עברי או אמה העבריה חייב האדון להשוותן לו במאכל ובמשקה בכסות ובמדור שנאמר כי טוב לו עמך... מכאן אמרו כל הקונה עבד עברי כקונה אדון לעצמו (שם א, ט)

בסופו של דבר, עבד עברי הוא לא השקעה משתלמת. אם כך מדוע לו לאדם לרכוש עבד עברי?

ראינו ברמב"ם קודם לכן שישנם שתי אפשרויות שבהם אדם נמכר לעבד; או שהוא מוכר את עצמו משום עניות (כפי שכתוב בויקרא כה) או משום שבית דין מכרוהו בעבור

**613 Mitzvot: Mitzvah 79
Mixing Mercy with Judgement**

As the gemara (Sanhedrin 6b) records, "Moshe used to say: Let the law pierce the mountain! But Aharon would love peace and pursue peace, and create peace between people." While we certainly believe in Aharon's embrace of peace, judges are required to apply the principles of law to litigants who choose to go to trial. Just as law overrides considerations of peace, so law overrides considerations of mercy; Mitzvah

#79 demands that a judge set aside his personal feelings when issuing a verdict. Every fair judicial system depends upon the fair application of law to all members of a society. A judge's intentions may be the best, but once he bends the rules – even for a good cause – justice is no longer served. Therefore, we are taught that a judge may not slant his verdict to favor a needy party.

torczyner@torontotorah.com

Ha'Am V'Ha'Aretz

Rav Yisrael Bruna

Russell Levy

Ashdod

Torah in Translation

Yarmulka

Responsa Mahari Bruna 34

Note: *There are a wide variety of views among the poskim on this issue. For example, see Igrot Moshe 1:1.*

Case: Reuven walked in front of ten people [meaning, in a public place RL] with his head uncovered; one of the students saw and reprimanded him. Reuven did not listen, and the student excommunicated Reuven.

I responded that his excommunication is valid.

It is stated (Kiddushin 8a) that Rav Kahana [covered his head RL] because he was a great man, and Rashi explained that this would not apply for others; this should imply that there is no requirement to be careful to do this. Further, [Rav Huna, the son of Rav Yehoshua] stated (Shabbat 118b): "May a reward come to me, as I have never gone four cubits without an uncovered head" [implying that covering one's head is a pious act, above the letter of the law RL].

Nevertheless, this [view of covering one's head as merely a pious act, and not a requirement RL] only applies to them, who lived in the Land of Israel* among people who walked about with their heads thus covered. However, we, who live among the nations, live among the nations, who go without a head covering. Therefore, for us to do so would be as if we were following their customs (chukat hagoyim); one could not distinguish between Jew and non-Jew. Therefore, going without a head covering would be violating the accepted Jewish custom (dat yehudit). It is stated in Ketuvot (72a) that a woman who goes without a head covering is as one who transgresses the faith. Jewish attire is described as distinctive clothing, and even shoes and sandals (Bava Kama 59b), and in a time of persecution, even the method of tying one's shoelaces is important (Sanhedrin 74b).

Therefore, since the student reprimanded and he did not listen, he is considered like a heretic (apikores). Given that he was excommunicated for the sake of Heaven, even the Rabbi must ostracize him.

Signed, Mahari Bruna

[Mahari Bruna then continues:] I will add that this only applies to walking, though. There is no need to be careful when one is sitting, as it is normal when one is sitting to lighten one's burden. This is also implied from the statement, "Rav Kahana did not go with an uncovered head"; it did not say, "Rav Kahana

Born in 1400 in Brno, Moravia (Bruna, now part of the Czech Republic), R' Yisrael ben Chaim miBrna was described by his teachers R' Yaakov Weil and R' Yisrael Isserlein (author of Terumat haDeshen) as "a brilliant student, who devoted himself, body, and soul, to the study of the Talmud." He was, at a young age, appointed the Rabbi of his home town.

In the early 1450s, Franciscan monk Johannes Capistrano incited people against the Jews in the southern German states. Capistrano claimed that the losses to the Ottomans were caused by the Jews in their midst. This contributed to the expulsion and massacres of Jews from numerous cities; for example, in Breslau, many Jews were burned at the stake due to his agitation.

In 1454, upon his arrival in Moravia, Capistrano convinced King Ladislaus, ruler of Hungary and Bohemia, to exile all Jews from many cities, including Brna. He gave the butchers of Brna, who had given away their abattoir to build a Franciscan convent, the Jewish synagogue in which to build a marketplace.

Upon his expulsion, R' Yisrael moved to Regensburg, where he opened a yeshiva and answered halachic questions. This troubled R' Anshel Segal of Regensburg, who viewed himself as the Rabbi of the city. R' Yisrael's teachers, the leaders of German Jewry, weighed in on the issue and ruled in R' Yisrael's favour, that he may teach and issue rulings in Regensburg (Terumat haDeshen 128).

Though many of R' Anshel's supporters held R' Yisrael in contempt for many years, that feeling dissipated when R' Yisrael was recognized as the first rabbinical authority in Germany upon the deaths of R' Weil and R' Isserlein.

In 1474, R' Yisrael was thrown in prison for

did not sit with an uncovered head". Further, Rav Huna requested a reward for not going four cubits without a head covering; however, he may have travelled a shorter distance without one, and all the more so that he may have sat without one. In truth, though, it all depends on how one is sitting.

* It is unusual that Rav Huna, the son of Rav Yehoshua, would be described as one who lived in the Land of Israel. There are numerous gemarot that testify of both his Babylonian origin and place of settlement: he was a student of Abaye (Pesachim

Ashdod, a southern coastal city, is located between Ashkelon and Tel Aviv and is the fifth largest city in Israel. In Tanach, the city is described as one of the centres of the Plishtim, with them building a temple there for one of their gods. In Shemuel I (5:1-7) we are told that Ashdod was the location which the Plishtim used to house the aron, while it was captured and in their hands. Archaeological evidence suggests that the ancient city of Ashdod was a few miles inland, while the modern city is directly on the coast.

The modern city of Ashdod was founded in 1956, with the first 22 families, immigrants from Morocco, settling immediately. With the building of the port of Ashdod in 1961 - today Israel's largest port, handling over 60 percent of all port cargo - the city's population exploded, boasting 30,000 residents by 1969. In the '90's many immigrants from the Former Soviet Union chose to settle in this city, where immigrants make up a significant minority of the population. The city grew by over 100,000 people.

thirteen days due to his opposition to a tax placed upon the Jewish community by Emperor Frederick III. Around the same time, a Jewish apostate by the name of Bayol accused R' Yisrael of infanticide, of killing a seven year old Christian child. After thorough interrogation, Bayol admitted that R' Yisrael was innocent. Nevertheless, he removed himself to the house of his son, R' Menasha, in Prague, and ended his days there in 1480.

R' Yisrael was the leader of German Jewry during his life, and he responded to questions about all aspects of life. His son, R' Menashe, collected and published 284 of these responsa posthumously. rlevy@torontotorah.com

111b) and Rava (Bava Batra 22a); after their deaths, he, along with Rav Papa, was among the administration of the yeshiva in Naresh (Berachot 57a); among his colleagues were Rav Mari and Rav Pinchas (Ketuvot 85a) and Rav Nachman bar Yehuda (Sanhedrin 30b). All of the Amoraim mentioned resided in Bavel. However, the Maharshah had a different text in the gemara; his text referred to Rabbi Chanina, an Israeli amora, in place of Rav Huna. It is possible that Mahari Bruna had the same text, in which case the gemara is referring to two Israeli amoraim. rlevy@torontotorah.com

What can be learned from the expression “*Asher Tasim Lifneihem – which you shall place before them*”?

- Rashi suggests that this phrase was a commandment to Moshe in how he should teach the mitzvot of our parshah. He was told not to simply teach the laws two or three times, and have that suffice. Rather, Moshe was to expound upon the mitzvot with reasons and explanations, so that they should be placed completely, like a ‘set table’, before his students.
- Seforno suggests that the Torah’s laws fall into two distinct categories. There are some mitzvot which have an absolute applicability; if you are commanded to perform that mitzvah then you must carry it out to the best of your ability. However, our Parshah contains many mitzvot which are merely instructions on how to act in specific situations. If one does not own animals, or if one’s animals never cause damage, these mitzvot are not relevant. As such, these mitzvot that are not expected of us are rather placed before us, in the event that they should become necessary.
- Although in some areas of halachah men and women are treated differently, the gemara in Kedushin 35a sets down the rule that regarding monetary law, men and women are subject to the same rules and

regulations. This halacha is derived from our verse, that the laws should be “placed before them,” meaning both men and women.

Did Hashem give Moshe more than ten commandments at Har Sinai?

- When telling Moshe that he would receive the luchot on Har Sinai, Hashem added that that he would also receive “HaTorah ViHamitzvah”. Rashi suggests that Hashem did give Moshe everything. The Aseret Hadibrot, although they are only ten commandments at face value, contain within them references to all six hundred and thirteen mitzvot.
- Seforno, based on the same verse, explains that initially Hashem indeed intended to present Moshe with the entire Torah when he ascended Har Sinai. However, when the people sinned in Moshe’s absence he was only given the luchot to break, and then he would be required to write the Torah himself.
- In addition, the Yerushalmi learns a fundamental halachah from this verse. The juxtaposition of Torah and Mitzvah teaches us that just as we are to recite a berachah before we study Torah, so we should recite a berachah before we perform each mitzvah.

Why does the Torah repeat the verse “*Lo tivasheil gedi bachaleiv immo – you shall not boil a kid in its mother’s milk*” three times?

- Rashi cites one opinion of the Gemara in Chullin (113a) which explains that we are thus prohibited from eating, deriving benefit from, or cooking a combination of milk and meat.
- Also in Chullin, Rabbi Akiva suggests that with each prohibitive iteration the Torah added an exception: The laws of milk and meat do NOT apply biblically to wild animals, birds and non-kosher animals.

For children: Why is the penalty for stealing an ox different from the penalty for stealing a sheep?

- Rashi quotes two explanations: Rabban Yochanan Zakkai suggests that one who steals a sheep has to carry it out on his shoulders. Although it was his choice to steal the animal, the Torah is lenient for him because of the disgrace he went through. Therefore he only pays four times the value, not five. Rabbi Meir sees this halachah from the owner’s perspective. When one’s ox is stolen he doesn’t only lose the ox; he loses the profits of working the animal as well. A sheep does not work for its owner, and so no labour is lost. Therefore, the thief pays more for stealing the ox.

dzirkind@torontotorah.com

Schedule for the Week of January 29, 24 Shevat

Shabbat, January 29

7:45AM R' Azarya Berzon, Ramban: Parshat Yitro, Or Chaim

10:15AM R' Azarya Berzon, The Month of Shvat in Halacha and Hashkafa, Clanton Park

One Hour Before Mincha: R' Azarya Berzon, Kiddushin 9b, Mizrachi Bayit

7:00PM Parent/Child Learning, Shaarei Shomayim

Sunday, January 30

9:15AM Itamar Zolberg: Parshah & Issues b' Ivrit, Zichron Yisrael

7:30PM R' Azarya Berzon, Masechet Megila 3b: Which Comes First, Megilla or Burying the Dead?, Shaarei Shomayim

8:30PM R' Azarya Berzon, Masechet Kiddushin: The Third Method of Marrying a Woman, Shaarei Shomayim

Monday, January 31

12:10PM Russell Levy, Masechet Pesachim (advanced), Wolfond Center *Lunch served*

7:30 PM R' Meir Lipschitz: The Thought of R' Shlomo Aviner, 37 Fraserwood, Apt 4, *Women*

8:30PM R' Azarya Berzon, Rambam: Lo Tachmod, Clanton Park

8:45PM R' Meir Lipschitz: Gemara Beitzah Chaburah, Shaarei Shomayim

9:20PM R' Azarya Berzon, Ramban: Insights into Parshat Yitro, G-d's and the People of Israel, 12 Midvale Road

Tuesday, February 1

1:30PM R' Mordechai Torczyner: Yonah, at Shaarei Shomayim, with Mekorot *does not meet this week*

7:30PM R' Azarya Berzon: Tools for Brisk: Din Klali or Din Misuyam, BAYT Thornhill

8:00PM Dovid Zirkind: Interactive Parshah Discussion, Westmount Learning Centre

8:30PM R' Mordechai Torczyner: Minchat Chinuch at Clanton Park *does not meet this week*

8:30PM R' Azarya Berzon: Moral Dilemmas in Monetary Issues, BAYT Thornhill

Wednesday, February 2

9:15AM R' Mordechai Torczyner: Hosheia, 239 Franklin *Women Babysitting provided - does not meet this week*

7:15PM R' Azarya Berzon, Week's Shiur Highlights, Clanton Park

7:30PM Russell Levy: Napoleon's Sanhedrin, Shaarei Shomayim

8:30PM R' Azarya Berzon: Masechet Kiddushin 42b “Ein Shliach LeDvar Aveira”, Shomrei Shabbos Chevra Mishnayos

Thursday, February 3

8:00PM R' Netanel Javasky: Landmark Halachic Responsa, Bnai Torah

8:30PM R' Azarya Berzon: The Asseret HaDibrot in Halacha & Hashkafa, Clanton Park

10:00PM R' Azarya Berzon: Rambam Hilchot Talmud Torah, Clanton Park

Friday 6 AM R' Mordechai Torczyner: Daf Yomi, BAYT