



	Candles	Mincha	DafYomi	Shiur	Shachris	ש"ש
Friday	6:00	6:10				9:54
Shabbos	7:29	6:10	5:30	6:30	9:00	9:54
Sunday		6:10	5:30	6:30	9:00	9:55

והיית אך שמח

### IMPORTANCE OF ...

The Gemara (*Nedarim* 10a) states that one should not designate a *Korban* with the words: לה קרבן, but should rather say it the opposite: קרבן לה. This is because of the possibility that he may say the first word - לה - and be unable to continue for some reason, thus leaving the mention of Hashem's name hanging לבטלה. The Magen Avrohom, in his Sefer Zitz Re'ei (VaYikra) asks why so many Tefilos begin with Hashem's name, including the מדות שלש עשרה מדות, in light of this restriction. The same question can be asked regarding Moshe's opening statement: ה' מסיני בא. The Ner L'Meah suggests that since the Torah was written by Moshe at Hashem's behest, obviously, the Gemara's problem would not have been a concern. Furthermore, the Gemara (*Sotah* 13b) states an opinion that משה לא מת. The MaHarsha explains that Moshe was already "angel-like" while still alive, citing his ability to exist on Har Sinai without food or drink for 40 days, and his permanent separation from his wife. As the problem envisaged by the Gemara in *Nedarim* would not apply to angels, there would remain no reason why the Posuk could not begin with ה' מסיני בא. Moshe's status may also be derived from his description in the Posuk: משה איש האלוקים, suggesting משה מלאך-like qualities and implying their applicability to Moshe while still alive.

### QUESTION OF THE WEEK:

What unique Halacha do the following mitzvos share: Sefiras HaOmer, Kiddush Levanah, Tzitzis, Shofar, Lulav and Milah ?

### ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:

(When would Melacha be permitted on Yom Kippur, but not eating ?)

The Sefer Toraik Yisrael (20:10) quotes R' Chaim Kanievsky as saying that if one lived near the International Date Line and in the middle of Yom Kippur he crossed over it, since it would then be Erev Yom Kippur where he now was, he could do מלאכה. However, since he had already begun to fast, it is as if he had been תענית separately, and so he must complete the fast.

### DIN'S CORNER:

If one must choose between spending Yom Tov where there is only a Succah, or where there is only a Lulav, he is to determine which of those places has the best chance of acquiring both. Thus, if the place which has a Succah is expecting to receive an Esrog/Lulav before the end of the day of Yom Tov, he should go there, since the mitzvah of Esrog/Lulav may be performed all day. Even if the only Esrog/Lulav possible is one that is currently beyond the Techum and must be transported from there, since it is possible to do so through a non-Jew, he should choose the Succah place and transport the Esrog. If he cannot accomplish both mitzvos, he may choose whichever he wishes. The Pri Megadim recommends Succah over Lulav. (Mateh Ephraim 625:22)

### DID YOU KNOW THAT ...

The Gemara (*Bava Metzia* 70b) states that if a non-Jew supplied animals in a money-back guaranteed joint business venture with a Jew, the first of any offspring born to those animals are exempt from the laws of a first-born. Rava explains that this is because if the Jew does not return the non-Jew's investment to him, the non-Jew will seize the animal and/or its offspring, indicating that he has a beneficial interest in these animals, thus exempting them from the laws of Bechor. The עין יצחק (40 אה"ע) concludes from this that where the money for a deal was not paid, the deal becomes retroactively בטל. We do not view the deal as done, leaving only a question of owing and paying money. The same is apparent in the Rema (120:2 אה"ע) which states that if a man hired a scribe to prepare a Get for him, and then steals the Get (i.e. without paying for it) and gives it to his wife, the Get is ineffective. Why isn't the Get valid and the money owed deemed simply a חוב (IOU) which must be paid ? The Chelkas M'Chokek explains that if the scribe had given the Get to the man and expected payment later, it would have been valid. However, since the man had seized it without the scribe's consent, it remains stolen until he pays for it. A man once purchased Schach from a non-Jew at a certain price, but when making payment, he caused the seller to make an error and paid less money than he should have. In מקראי קודש (2:18) R' Zvi Pesach Frank held this to be a case where payment was expected immediately and was not forthcoming, thus constituting theft, and invalidating the Schach.

### A Lesson Can Be Learned From:

A man had an elderly mother who lived alone in a distant city and she refused to move. He was unable to visit her often and was depressed that he could not properly fulfill Kibud Aim. He asked the Brisker Rav to help convince her to move in with his family. When she visited Brisk next, the Rav broached the subject, but she said that she could never leave her city. She explained that her grandfather had been very poor and all he had ever dreamed of was someday being able to buy his own Esrog instead of using the community one, shared by all. He carefully put away penny after penny for decades, until he thought he had enough. He and his wife went to an Esrog dealer in Vilna and explained how they had put away this money and wished to order an Esrog. The merchant counted the pennies but there weren't enough. When the old couple left depressed, the wife turned to her husband and suggested that as they were very old anyway, they should sell their house and rent a room. The money from the sale could buy an Esrog. They did that and purchased an Esrog that was the talk of the region. Everyone wanted to see it and use it, until finally, someone dropped it, breaking the Pitum. The grandfather reacted with equanimity, refusing to become angry. "This is why I can never leave my city. I cannot forgo the pleasure I feel whenever I pass the house my grandfather sold to fulfill his dream".

**P.S.** All are invited to the Sternberg Succah on Motzai Shabbos for a Simchas Bais HaShoevah.