



	Candles	Mincha	DafYomi	Shiur	Shacharis
Friday	7:56	7:00/8:06			
Shabbos		7:44	6:30	7:10	9:00
Sunday		8:12	7:40		7:30

## IMPORTANCE OF ....

The *Gemara* (*Bava Metzia* 71a) quotes R' Shimon ben Elazar as saying that he who lends his money interest-free is praised in the *Posuk*: עושה אלה לא ימוט לעולם... (he lent his money without interest ... he who does so will never be displaced, i.e. lose it), which implies that he who lends with interest will lose his money. The *Gemara* asks: Do we not find that people lose their money even without having lent with interest? R' Eliezer answers (as *Rashi* explains) that when people lose their money without having lent it with interest, it isn't completely lost – they will get it back. However, if they lend with interest they will lose it and never recover it. The *Shev Shmaatasa* asks, may we not continue the *Gemara's* question by noting that many people unfortunately suffer a financial loss, losing their money and not recovering it, even if they had not lent with interest? He answers, citing a *Midrash* (*Bamidbar* 22:8) which says: משפיל אף מרומם ד' (Hashem humbles and even elevates). Why are possessions called נכסים? Because they are hidden (נכסה) from one and made available to another. Why is money called זוזים? Because they move (זז) from one person to another. A noblewoman asked R' Shimon ben Chalafta what Hashem has been doing since Creation and he answered that Hashem has been making ladders, lowering some people while elevating others. ע"כ Thus, the money lost by those who do not lend with רבית is not lost permanently – it will turn up somewhere, albeit in another person's possession. However the money lost by those who violated the laws of רבית will remain lost forever, to everyone - מוטט עולם.

## QUESTION OF THE WEEK:

When would we tell a thief not to return the גניבה to an honest owner because of a suspicion the owner may commit a fraud?

## ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:

(Should 2-9 men daven עשרה עשרה together, even without a Minyan?)

The *Chayei Adam* (68:11) states that 3 people fulfill the minimum for ברוב עם הזרת מלך, which requires that 3 do a *mitzvah* together. The *Teshuvos V'Hanhagos* (1:23) quotes R' Mordechai Benet's חידוש on *Berachos* 18a, which states that if 2 men are שומרי מות (guarding a dead body), each one must watch the deceased while the other says שמע. However Ben Azzai states that for שמונה עשרה, they may secure the body in safety so as to daven together, proving that even 2 must do so.

## DIN'S CORNER:

One is permitted to walk (but not hurriedly) over grass on *Shabbos* despite the possibility that some blades may be uprooted thereby. However, one who is eating over grass must be careful not to drip any enriching liquid onto the grass as this would constitute both זורע and possibly חורש. (MB 336:25-26)

## DID YOU KNOW THAT ....

The *Rema* (ח"מ 246:17) rules that if one invites another to eat with him, the guest is expected to pay for his food. Even where a man agrees to support his son-in-law for a specific period, the son-in-law must reimburse him for everything eaten beyond the agreed time, if the father-in-law claims it. The *Chavos Yair* (134) ruled accordingly in a case involving a widow who moved in with one of her sons for 15 years. The son discovered that she had a lot of money, which she planned to divide among all her children. The host son then laid claim to 15 years of room and board. The *Chavos Yair* distinguished between a situation where she might have moved in for 2 years, and then gone on her own. In such a case, the son's support would be deemed a gift. However, here he had every right to reimbursement, even though he never said anything to her about it all along. The other brothers claimed that she earned her keep as a maid, helping to cook, clean, sew and watch the children. The *Chavos Yair* cited *Erachin* (19a) where the *Gemara* explains why the (ערך) value of a man decreases 70% as he reaches age 60, whereas a woman's value only decreases 67%. It is because an older woman is a סימא - a treasure in the house, as she continues to function in her natural capacity. Therefore, whatever tasks she performed here were done lovingly for her grandchildren, and not as a maid.

## A Lesson Can Be Learned From:

When R' Eizel Charif was the Rav in Slonim, he was told that a certain wealthy member of the Kehilla was accustomed to pledging impressive sums of money for the institutions and poor of the community, but when he was approached to pay up, he always replied that he had been מתיר (released himself from) the vow with the justification that he never would have made the vow if he had known that he would actually have to pay. R' Eizel gave him a short *Drasha* on the subject and severity of not keeping one's promise, concluding with the words of *Chazal* in *Shabbos* (32b) that a man's wife will die as a result of his not fulfilling his vows. After the man left, someone commented to R' Eizel that the rich man's wife was well-known in the community as a shrew who made her husband's life miserable. Was it possible that the *Torah* provided this alternative method to a husband who wished to "separate" from an evil wife who refused to accept a *Get*? R' Eizel smiled as he explained: "In *Eretz Yisroel*, when someone married, his friends would ask 'מוצא' or מוצא אשה מוצא טוב (good) or מוצא אשה מוצא רע (bad)? The word מוצא, which represents a bad wife, is also used in 'מוצא שפתיך תשמור ועשית' – where the *Torah* requires one to fulfill his promises, even in a case where his wife's status is one of מוצא".

**P.S.** Sholosh Seudos sponsored by the Soofian and Fuerst families. Mazel Tov to Miriam Jacob and Mark Cohen on their recent engagement.