



	Candles	Mincha	DafYomi	Shiur	Shachris	ש"ש
Friday	6:01	6:13	8:45			8:52
Shabbos		6:01	5:00	5:40	9:00	8:51
Sunday		7:15	7:45		8:00	9:50

IMPORTANCE OF

The *Mishna* (*Menachos* 110a) states that the *Torah* uses the phrase "ריח ניחוח" (a pleasant fragrance) when describing expensive *Korbanos* (עולת בהמה), less expensive ones (עולת עוף) and those brought by the poor (מנחה), to teach us the rule that: אחד המרבה ואחד הממעיט ובלבד שיכוין לבו לשמים - one who gives more and/or one who gives little, as long as he does so for the sake of *Shomayim*. The *Tur* (א"ח 1:1) also states regarding *davening* that one who says alot is equal to one who says a little as long as he has כוונה, because a little with כוונה is better than alot without. The *Taz* (א"ח 1:3) asks why alot with כוונה isn't better than less. The *Gemara* (*Shabbos* 10a) states that Rava saw Rav Hamnuna *davening* a lengthy *Tefilah* and commented that in so doing, he was neglecting eternal life (*Torah*) by spending too much time on חיי שעה - temporary life (obtained by *davening*). Rav Hamnuna's position was that there was a time for *Torah* and a time for *davening*. Therefore, when the *Tur* stated אחד המרבה he was referring to those like Rav Hamnuna for whom *davening* time was well spent, and אחד הממעיט referred to those like Rava, who believed more time should be spent on *Torah*. The conclusion: אחד המרבה ובלבד שיכוין לבו לשמים referred to that which motivated both of their positions – *Torah* & *Tefilah*. In the same vein, the *Tur* also stated that a little *davening* with כוונה is better than alot without, because sometimes, it is the length of the *Tefilah* that puts the ability to have כוונה at risk. Therefore, it is better to say a little with כוונה and not say alot, but only if the motivation is לשמים, to ensure that at least that much will be with כוונה.

DID YOU KNOW THAT

The *Gemara* (*Makos* 8a) derives from ואשר יבא את רעהו ביער that one who goes to *Galus* for killing unintentionally in a forest had to be in the forest by choice. The word ואשר excludes the case where he was there for a *mitzvah*, such as to cut wood for a *Sukkah* or for the *Korbanos*. The *Gemara* asks, does אשר always mean choice? What about ואיש אשר יטמא - a man who will become טמא. Aren't there instances when he has no choice, such as where he stumbles upon a מת מצוה? Perhaps he should not become טמא in such a case, or at least not be punished if he enters the *Beis HaMikdash* in such a טמא state. The *Gemara* answers that אשר can still mean choice, since with regard to טומאה, the *Torah* states: טמא יהי - he is טמא regardless of the circumstances. The *Gemara* (*Horios* 10a) expounds: אשר נשיא יחטא (when a prince will sin) יכול גזירה (I might have thought that the *Torah* was decreeing that this will take place) ת"ל אם הכהן המשיח יחטא (the *Posuk* states earlier - if the anointed *Kohen* will sin). Just as the *Kohen's* sin was "if", so too is the נשיא's. The *Gemara* explains that the suggested decree might have been similar to that which caused houses in *Eretz Yisroel* to develop צרעת, thus causing them to be torn down and the treasure hidden within their walls to be found. However, why would I think אשר נשיא יחטא was a decree? Shouldn't אשר imply choice? The *MaHarsham* (3:272) answers that here too, we have an exception. Truly, אשר can continue to mean choice. However, as *Rashi* points out, the fact that אשר נשיא was used instead of אם נשיא suggested that אשר had a different meaning, which could have implied an imperative.

QUESTION OF THE WEEK:

In what circumstance would there be an immediate Halachic distinction based on a child having been born before versus after חצות הלילה?

ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:

(Where could one only sue if partial payment has been made?)
The *Mishna Berurah* (488:13) rules that if after Pesach, the non-Jew refuses to return the Chometz that was sold to him, one may not force him or sue him to do so. However, if the non-Jew had previously made partial payment for the Chometz but now refuses to pay the rest, one may sue him in court for the rest or to get back the Chometz.

DIN'S CORNER:

If one eats Matzoh without having said a *brocho* of *HaMotzi*, he has not fulfilled the *mitzvah* because *Chazal* (*Berachos* 35b) state that if one eats something without saying a *brocho* it is as if he has stolen from *Hashem*. As such, the Matzoh would be like מצה גזולה and eating it would be מצוה הבאה בעבירה. (R' Shlomo Kluger - 321 א"ח - האלף לך שלמה)

A Lesson Can Be Learned From:

At one time, the schedule of R' Aharon Kotler ZT"L was such that two days out of the week he gave a regular Shiur and on those days, he would be sitting in his office preparing. A certain bochur was assigned to bring R' Aharon a cup of coffee at certain times. One such day, shortly after the bochur had delivered the coffee, he noticed that R' Aharon had not touched it. The bochur thought to himself that in all likelihood, R' Aharon had been so engrossed in his preparation that he hadn't noticed the coffee and had now let it cool off. The bochur removed the untouched cup and brought R' Aharon a new one. When he saw later how the second one also lay untouched, the bochur realized something unusual was happening and gathered the courage to ask R' Aharon why he had not drunk the coffee. R' Aharon proceeded to explain that he had heard of a certain Shidduch that had been suggested between two families which he knew well. He was expecting the girl's family to call him for information about the bochur, who had once learned in the Lakewood Yeshiva. He didn't want to lie or exaggerate about this bochur, yet to tell the truth as he saw it might be harmful to him at the present time, and the חסרון (failing) would likely improve after the bochur married and settled. Therefore, R' Aharon decided to fast that day in the hope that he would not be asked for information.

P.S. Sholosh Seudos sponsored this week anonymously.