



	Candles	Mincha	DafYomi	Shiur	Shachris	ש"ש
Friday	7:06	7:16				9:47
Shabbos		1:45/7:06	6:30		9:00	9:46
Sunday		7:16	7:30		8:00	9:45

IMPORTANCE OF ...

The Gemara (*Eruvin* 4a) states that if one enters a house that is afflicted by a נגע and he is carrying (not wearing) garments, shoes and ornaments, he and the items he is carrying become *Tomay* immediately as the *Posuk* says: והבא אל הבית .. יטמא, and the garments, shoes etc.. are seen as entering the house themselves. If he is wearing them, then he becomes *Tomay* immediately, but his garments, shoes and ornaments do not become *Tomay* until he remains in the house for a certain minimum amount of time. This is because by wearing them, they become בטל to him, and as such they are not deemed to have entered the house independently. The *Piskei Teshuvah* (2:157) cites the opinion of the Brisker Rav where two men approached the entrance to a *Beis HaMidrash* – one wearing his *Talis* and *Tefillin*, and the other carrying them – and a question arose regarding who was to be given precedence to enter first. The Brisker Rav said that based on the above distinction, it seems clear that when one is wearing something, it is בטל to him and it doesn't enter the building independently, so precedence should be given to the one who is carrying the *Talis* and *Tefillin*, where they retain their own identity and *Chashivus*. The *Be'er Moshe* (8:222) sees this distinction as leading to an opposite conclusion. The one who is wearing the *Talis* and *Tefillin* brings them into the *Beis HaMidrash* while they [and he] are engaged in the *mitzvah* for which they are designated. This should surely be given precedence. It is only regarding טומאה that the *Torah* established a *Chidush*, limiting application of והבא אל הבית to items being carried in, rather than worn. But no one can deny that the items entered the house, either way. As such, since there is no imperative for independent entry regarding *Talis* and *Tefillin*, precedence should be given to the one who wears them.

QUESTION OF THE WEEK:

In the section of *Shacharis* known as *Korbanos*, we recite descriptions of the daily *Korbanos*, as well as the *Shabbos* ones. Why do we not recite descriptions of the *Yom Tov Korbanos* ?

ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:

(A creditor was מחול but the debtor thinks he didn't mean it)
The *Rema* (אה"ע 76:5) states that even where a wife agrees to forgo her right to certain of her husband's obligations towards her, the husband is not released, because she doesn't mean it with a full heart. Still, in financial matters, we say דברים שבלב אינם דברים and despite his belief, the debtor may accept the מחילה as sincere.

DIN'S CORNER:

One may place letters or numbers side by side on *Shabbos* even if they form a word, as long as the letters etc.. are not connected to each other or fixed in place. Thus, the page number in *Shul* may be assembled and displayed, and then disassembled and replaced without fear of writing or erasing. (Igro Moshe אור"ח 135) However, Scrabble may not be played on *Shabbos* because it is still a game that normally involves keeping score, which is אסור.

DID YOU KNOW THAT

The *Mishna* (*Negaim* 12:5) states that the *Torah* requires all things to be removed from a house that could be infected by a נגע to prevent them from becoming טמא, if the *Kohen* subsequently declares the house to be טמא. This is representative of the *Torah's* interest in safeguarding Jewish money, particularly where there is a risk of a הפסד מרובה - a great loss. The *Pischei Teshuvah* (י"ד 32:2) quotes an opinion that measures הפסד מרובה as a loss of at least 1/6 of the object's value. However, the point is raised by the *Har HaCarmel* (י"ד 15) that if we consider the decrease in value of one *zuz* in an object worth six *zuz* to be הפסד מרובה, could we reasonably agree that the diminution in value of 99 *zuz* in an object worth six hundred *zuz* does not qualify as הפסד מרובה, since it isn't at least 1/6 ?! He therefore concludes that conceptually, הפסד מרובה is to be determined on a subjective basis, depending on the time, place and the parties involved. Rabbi Akiva Eiger (*Teshuvos* 43) raises the question of one ספק affecting the *Kashrus* of three different animals. The loss of each individual animal would not constitute a הפסד מרובה while the loss of all three would. He juxtaposes this question against one concerning the difference between a *Chometzdike* pot and a *Chometzdike* oven on Pesach. According to Rav (see the *Ran*), both should be destroyed, but בדיעבד we may spare the oven, as הפסד מרובה. Could we not add the values of all his *Chometzdike* pots to also create a הפסד מרובה? Without resolving the question, R' Akiva Eiger suggests that where the *Halachic* status of each animal depends on the one ספק, we might be able to combine all animals similarly affected by that ספק and rule leniently based on the risk of הפסד מרובה. However, where the *Halachah* clearly states that each pot must be destroyed, each pot is to be judged on its own value and cannot combine to create a קולא of הפסד מרובה.

A Lesson Can Be Learned From:

The Dubner Magid once stopped off for the night at the home of a man who was very stingy. The host "apologized" for having no food in the house but graciously offered a place to sleep. The Magid had difficulty falling asleep on an empty stomach, and thus was able to overhear how the host and his family secretly enjoyed a late supper when they thought their guest was asleep. In the morning, the host, who fancied himself a learned man, asked the Magid to tell him a "Vort" before leaving, to fulfill *Chazal's*: לא יפטר אדם מחברו ... אלא מתוך דבר הלכה. The Magid cited a *Chazal* which says אל ישנה אדם מן המנהג - a person must act as those around him act, which we learn from the fact that Moshe Rabbeinu did not eat while in שמים, to be like the מלאכים. Why didn't *Chazal* also mention the fact that Moshe did not sleep while in שמים ? Going without sleep is much harder than going without food ! Doesn't the *Gemara* say that if one swears he won't sleep for 3 days, we whip him immediately and put him to sleep ?! The answer is that in order for Moshe to know that he should not eat because the מלאכים did not eat, it was understood that he would not sleep, because he had to make sure that the מלאכים weren't eating after he had gone to sleep, the way some do. As such, there was no need for *Chazal* to mention it at all.

P.S. Mazel Tov to the Miller family upon the marriage of their daughter Batsheva to Yosef Krohn. Sholosh Seudos sponsored by the Millers to celebrate Sheva Berachos.

This issue is dedicated:

לע"נ אבי מורי הרב אהרן זאב ב"ר שמואל ז"ל

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

ולז"נ פערל ב"ר יצחק הלוי ולז"נ אברהם ב"ר יעקב חיים