

THE BAIS HAVAAD

HALACHA JOURNAL

Family, Business, and Jewish Life through the Prism of Halacha



A PUBLICATION OF THE
BAIS HAVAAD HALACHA CENTER
105 River Ave. #301, Lakewood NJ 08701
1.888.485.VAAD (8223)
www.baishavaad.org
info@baishavaad.org
Lakewood • Midwest • Brooklyn • South Florida

לע"נ הרב יוסף ישראל
ב"ר משה גרוסמן זצ"ל

Dedicated in loving memory of
HaRav Yosef Grossman zt"l

VOLUME 5783 • ISSUE XLV • PARSHAS HA'AZINU-SHABBOS SHUVAH



OF RATS AND FLATS: WHO PAYS FOR DAMAGE TO A BORROWED CAR?

Adapted from the writings of Dayan Yitzhak Grossman

Two very different cities, Bnei Brak and New York, are currently experiencing a rat crisis:

The city of Bnei Brak is facing a distressing predicament as rats infest its overcrowded neighborhoods, causing fear and concern among residents...The situation has escalated to the point where residents describe the presence of rats as a more significant concern than potential terrorist attacks...The light rail works in Bnei Brak are being linked to the rat infestation, as they may have displaced the rats from their underground habitats. Additionally, the city's lack of cleanliness, sewage overflow, and garbage accumulation have contributed to the situation...¹

Recorded rat sightings in New York are at an all-time high. In December, Mayor Eric Adams posted, with great fanfare, a job announcement: The city was looking for a "highly motivated and somewhat bloodthirsty" candidate to take on the newly restored position of rat czar...Yet three months later, the position still hasn't been filled. A few weeks ago, the mayor himself had to pay a \$300 fine for failing to control rats at a rowhouse

he rents out to tenants...²

One ancient solution to rat problems still utilized today is cats:

After rats were reported at Adams's rental property, Curtis Sliwa, the public provocateur and Adams's Republican rival in the last election, showed up outside the rowhouse, offering the services of two of his many cats. "It's time that we revert to the best measure that's ever worked. And that's cats," he told reporters.

Sheila Massey, a retiree in Washington Heights, started Hard Hat Cats several years ago with this same idea in mind. The program places spayed and neutered "cat colonies" with large businesses prone to rats. Although my colleague Sarah Zhang convincingly disputed the effectiveness of cats as a form of rodent control in this magazine, Massey begs to differ. While they may not be effective rodent murderers, they are, she says, very good deterrents.³

The eternal war between cats and rats (and their

(continued on page 2)

The Bais Hava'ad
on the
Parsha
Bring the Parsha to Life!

PARSHAS HA'AZINU

DOC FEE

Excerpted and adapted from a shiur by
Dayan Yehoshua Grunwald

"He found him in a desert land, and in the wastes of a howling wilderness; He encircled him, He made him comprehending..."

Dvarim 32:10

The Zohar here says that a doctor may heal the sick and will receive a special bracha from Hashem for doing so. The Gemara (Bava Kama 85a) also infers from the repetitive phrase "verapo yerape" (Shmos 21:19) that a doctor is permitted to heal. Many *Rishonim* explain that it is an obligation.¹

The Gemara says one may not charge money for a mitzvah, other than *sechar batalah* (payment for being idle from one's regular work during the time he performed the mitzvah) and *sechar tircha* (payment for the trouble involved). If it is a mitzvah for doctors to heal, how may they charge for their services? The Ramban writes (Toras Ha'adam) that if the doctor stipulated in advance that the patient must pay more than a de minimis fee, and other doctors in the area could have done the job, he may charge more.

The Ritva (Yevamos 106a) maintains that a doctor may never charge more than a minimal fee, while the Ri Mei'Orleans (cited in Tosfos Ha'Rosh Brachos 60a) says that because the Torah permits him to heal, he may be compensated for his services. The Tur and Shulchan Aruch (Y.D. 336:3-4)

¹ See Ramban in Toras Ha'adam, Sha'ar Sakanah, and Torah Temimah to Shmos 21.

(continued on page 2)

¹ Bnei Brak Overrun By Rats, Possibly "Hundreds of Thousands". Matzav.com. <https://matzav.com/bnei-brak-overrun-by-rats-possibly-hundreds-of-thousands/>

² Xochitl Gonzalez, New York's Rats Have Already Won. The Atlantic. <https://www.theatlantic.com/ideas/archive/2023/03/new-york-city-rat-infestation-politics/673250/>

³ The Atlantic. *ibid.*

On Bended Knee

Q When we fall to the floor on Yom Kippur during the Avodah and Aleinu, why is something first placed on the floor?

A The Torah (Vayikra 26:1) forbids *hishtachava'ah* (prostration) anywhere other than the Bais Hamikdash. Chazal (Brachos 22b) define *hishtachava'ah* as complete prostration—*pishut yadayim veraglayim* (arms and legs extended), face down on the ground. Prostration with bent arms and legs (as we do on Yom Kippur) is not *hishtachava'ah*, but is forbidden *vide Rababan* (Rambam Hil. Avodah Zarah 6:8).

Chazal teach that the *de'Oreisa* prohibition only applies on a stone floor like that of the Bais Hamikdash (Brachos *ibid.*). *Mide Rababan*, it is forbidden on any surface (Rama O.C. 131:8).

(continued on page 2)

O&A from the
BAIS HAVAAD
HALACHA HOTLINE
1.888.485.VAAD(8223)
ask@baishavaad.org

(continued from page 1)

smaller cousins, mice) is the subject of an anecdote in the Gemara:

There was a certain man that borrowed a cat from his friend to chase away mice. The mice united against the cat and killed it. Rav Ashi sat and inquired: In such a case, what is the halacha? (Is it like the case of an animal that died as a result of its work, or not?) Rav Mordechai said to Rav Ashi: Thus said Avimi from Hagronia in the name of Rava: Regarding a man whom women overcome and kill, there is no judgment and no judge (i.e., no redress). (Just as a woman wouldn't be expected to prevail over a man, the borrower need not have anticipated that mice would overcome a cat, so he wasn't negligent, and this is a case of an animal dying on account of its work—*meisah machamas melacha*—in which a borrower is exempt.)

There are some who had a different account of this incident, that the cat ate many mice and became overheated and died. Rav Ashi sat and pondered the incident: In such a case, what is the halacha? (Is it considered a death resulting from work?) Rav Mordechai said to Rav Ashi: Thus said Avimi from Hagronia in the name of Rava: Regarding a man whom women overcome and kill (i.e., one who died of sexual overindulgence—Rashi), there is no judgment and no judge. (Just as that death is uncommon and unexpected, the borrower need not have anticipated that the cat would overindulge in mice and die, so this is a case of an animal dying on account of its work, and the borrower is exempt.)⁴

Both versions of the story are for some reason omitted by the Ramban and the Shulchan Aruch. But the second version is invoked in a dispute that is both theoretically important and of great practical significance, between R' Meir Halevi Abulafia (the Remah) and the Rosh, about the scope of a borrower's exemption from liability for a borrowed animal that died due to work. The classic case of *meisah machamas melacha* is an animal that dies as a consequence of its labor, but the Remah and the Rosh disagree about an animal that was borrowed for travel on a certain route,⁵ and during that travel was lost to bandits or wild animals. The Remah rules that this is considered *meisah machamas melacha* by analogy to the cat that died due to its overindulgence in mice: The borrower of the cat was not liable for its death, even though it was not caused by the labor for which the cat was borrowed and was only a consequence of that labor. Here, too, the animal is considered *meisah machamas melacha* because it was lost due to the route on which it was borrowed to travel. The Rosh rejects the analogy, because the cat died in the course of the labor itself, similar to a

borrowed animal that died as a consequence of the travel itself, whereas a loss to bandits or wild animals could occur even in the absence of the labor and so cannot be considered a consequence of it.⁶

R' Yosef Karo defends the Remah from the Rosh's challenge by pointing out that bandits and wild animals are not commonly found in cities, while intercity roads are presumptively dangerous, so the animal's loss while traveling is indeed a consequence of its labor;⁷ he accordingly codifies the Remah's position in his Shulchan Aruch.⁸ The Rama (R' Moshe Isserles, not the Remah) in his glosses notes that the Rosh disagrees with the Remah,⁹ but he does not explicitly decide between them. The Shach sides with the Rosh, based on the Ramban's rationale for the exemption of *meisah machamas melacha*: A borrower is generally liable even for losses that are not his fault (*oness*), but if the lender has been negligent, the borrower is exempt, and one who lends an item that is not fit for purpose is negligent.¹⁰ But in the Remah's case, observes the Shach, the borrowed animal was entirely fit for purpose, and there was no negligence on the part of the lender, so the borrower remains liable.¹¹

The Machanei Efraim, however, points out that other *Rishonim* explain the rationale for the exemption of *meisah machamas melacha* differently: By lending his animal despite knowing that it could be damaged by labor, the lender implicitly waives such damage.¹² He argues that this approach supports the Remah's extension of *meisah machamas melacha* to his case. Additionally, the language of the Rosh indicates that his disagreement with the Remah is not a fundamental one, based on the rationale of the Ramban, only a technical objection, that a loss to bandits or wild animals isn't a result of the animal's labor.¹³

This dispute has significant ramifications for the case of a borrowed car that is damaged in an accident or has a flat tire, if that is not attributable to a defect in the car or tire. According to the Remah and the Shulchan Aruch, if the borrower wasn't negligent, this may be considered *meisah machamas melacha*, but according to the Ramban and the Shach, he would be liable, because the exemption of *meisah machamas melacha* hinges on a presumption of negligence by the lender.

There are, however, several considerations that may cause even the Remah and the Shulchan Aruch to agree that the borrower is liable in this case, or even the Rosh to agree that he is *not* liable:

6 Both views are cited in Tur C.M. *siman* 340.

7 Baie Yosef *ibid.* (Bedek Habayis).

8 Shulchan Aruch *ibid.* se'if 3.

9 Hagahos HaRemah *ibid.*

10 Chidushei HaRamban *ibid.* 96b.

11 Shach *ibid.* s.k. 5. Cf. Ketzos Hachoshen *ibid.* s.k. 3; Nesivos Hamishpat *ibid.* *Blurim* s.k. 5; Kava Dekashyasa, *kushya* 39, and the many comments of contemporary authorities on our topic cited in the 5752 edition of that work (volume 2 pp. 48-54).

12 Nimukei Yosef *ibid.* p. 55b in Rif pagination.

13 Machanei Efraim, Hilchos She'eilah *Ufikadan siman* 4. Cf. Sha'ar Hamelech, Hilchos Chovel Umazik at the end of 7:3; R' Naftali Nussbaum, cited in Kava Dekashyasa *ibid.* p. 52 sv. *Amnam yesh leho'ir*.

(continued from page 1)

When the two lenient elements are combined—incomplete prostration on a non-stone floor—there is no prohibition, so we do this on Yom Kippur (Mishnah Brurah *ibid.* note 40). In stone-floored shuls, the Rama (*ibid.*) says the minhag was to spread grass on the floor before Yom Tov.



RAV ARYEH FINKEL

Today, most shuls distribute paper or cloth sheets regardless of the flooring material, to ensure that the prohibition is never violated (Matei Efrayim 621:14).

A shul with a small area rug needs no further separator, but a large rug that remains in place for the long term looks like a floor (see Piskei Teshuvos *ibid.* footnote 165).

If paper or cloth aren't available, one may use a tallis, because it is worn loosely (Sha'ar Hatziyun *ibid.* 44), but a fitted garment cannot serve as a separation while it is worn (Piskei Teshuvos *ibid.*).

It is primarily the face that requires separation (Ramban *ibid.* 6:7), but the minhag is to use something large enough to go beneath all or most of the body. If the available separator is not large enough, place it under the face.

- Some contemporary authors declare that the exemption of *meisah machamas melacha* does not apply to damage inflicted by the borrower himself (*adam hamazik*).¹⁴ According to this view, even if he was not at fault (e.g., he drove over a nail), he would be liable even according to the Remah.
- R' Naftali Nussbaum suggests that the exemption of *meisah machamas melacha* only applies where the item is destroyed and cannot be repaired.¹⁵ According to this approach, even the Remah would agree that the borrower is liable for repairable damage to the car.
- According to the Machanei Efraim's understanding of the dispute between the Remah and the Rosh, insofar as the damage could not have occurred without the car being driven, even the Rosh would agree that this is considered *meisah machamas melacha*. (This is the position of Rav Nussbaum as well.)

14 Kuntres Kava Denichusa, cited in Kava Dekashyasa *ibid.* p. 49; R' David Yitzchok Man, cited in *ibid.* p. 51.

15 Kava Dekashyasa *ibid.* pp. 52-53.

4 Bava Metzia 97a.

5 The language of the Remah is "leleich bederech yadua." This article assumes that the Remah's position is not limited to this case and extends to where the animal was borrowed to travel anywhere the borrower wishes, but I have been unable to find explicit discussion of this point in the position.

(continued from page 1)



follow the Ramban.

Today, the conditions of the Ramban are usually fulfilled, because patients are informed at the outset that they

must pay, and there are usually other doctors in the area. If there is only one person nearby capable of treating a particular condition, R' Chaim Pinchas Scheinberg says he may not charge. But R' Moshe Feinstein allows it, because the doctor studied medicine for many years with the intent to charge for his

services, and this is also in the best interest of the community.² R' Shlomo Zalman Auerbach (cited in Nishmas Avraham) also permits it, but only if the doctor could have been seeing non-

Jewish patients during that time.

2 R' Yitzchak Zilberstein also writes (Shiurei Torah Lerof'im) that the Jewish community needs observant doctors and readily agrees to pay.

To become a corporate sponsor of the BHHJ or disseminate in memory/zechus of a loved one, email info@baishavaad.org



BHHJ SPONSORS

Mr. Aryeh Pomerantz

Elevate your Inbox.

Scan here to receive the weekly email version of the Halacha Journal or sign up at www.baishavaad.org/subscribe

