



	Candles	Mincha	DafYomi	Shiur	Shacharis
Friday	4:20	4:32	7:30	7:30	7:30
Shabbos		4:20	3:30	4:00	9:00
Sunday		4:36			7:30

IMPORTANCE OF

The *Rashba* (תשובות 4:187) writes that a priest once argued to him that לא יסור שבט מיהודה ... עד כי יבא שילה implies that Yehudah's descendants will rule until Shiloh (viz. Moshiach) arrives, after which they will not rule. Since we see that Yehudah no longer rules, it must be that [their] "Messiah" has come ! The *Rashba* answered that such an interpretation would mark Yaakov's words as a curse, not a *brocho*, which cannot be. Therefore, the word עד must mean לעד - forever, that Yehudah will continue to rule even after Moshiach arrives, making this a *brocho* to Yehudah specifically, that any king who will rule must be from Yehudah. The priest maintained however, that based on Yaakov's words, if Yehudah had stopped ruling, Moshiach must have arrived. The *Rashba* replied that even so, Yehudah's rule ended with the *Galus of Bavel*, which took place many centuries before the events the priest wished to legitimize. The priest attempted to argue that *Galus Bavel* didn't qualify because the *Sanhedrin* was still empowered, but the *Rashba* again showed him that he was mistaken. The גר"ח asks, if any ruling king must be from Yehudah, how may we explain the fact that מלכי ישראל, not of Yehudah, ruled concurrently with Rechavam and his successors in מלכות יהודה ? He answers that the *Rambam* states (1:8 מלכים) that although the מלוכה really belongs to Dovid, still, a נביא may anoint a king from another שבט who will be bound by all the rules and *mitzvos* of a king, including the ability to pass his royalty on to his descendants. The *Posuk* שבט מיהודה לא יסור only requires that at a minimum, if any Jewish king rules over *Yisroel*, at least one שבט must be ruled by someone from Yehudah. As such, the *Posuk* is parsed as: מיהודה - לא יסור שבט, to teach that at least one tribe will not depart from Yehudah.

QUESTION OF THE WEEK:

Why do we say הטוב והמטיב over a better wine, but not over a better food ?

ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:

(Why does the first *Parsha* of שמע mention ובכל מאדך but not the second ?)
The first *Parsha* discusses קבלת עול שמים, for which one is obligated to sacrifice all his assets. However, the second *Parsha* discusses קבלת עול המצוות for which one is only obligated to spend up to 20% of his assets.

DIN'S CORNER:

If one finds someone's אבידה (lost object) he must return it and not accept a reward for doing so. However, a reward may be accepted if it is appreciation for something ancillary to the actual אבידה. For example, the *Chazon Ish* held that notifying the owner that you found it and have it, is sufficient. One could accept a reward for then delivering it. (תשובות והנהגות) 3:463

DID YOU KNOW THAT

The *Gemara* (*Kesubos* 91b) states that it is a *mitzvah* for orphans to pay off the obligations of their father. *Rashi* explains that it is an act of respect [to clear the father's name] but that unlike a *mitzvah* such as *Lulav* or *Sukkah* (which *Beis Din* can force one to fulfill), *Beis Din* cannot force the orphans to pay, as it is only a Rabbinic *mitzvah*. *Tosafos* (*ibid* 86a) disagrees, noting that *Beis Din* can force the fulfillment of a Rabbinic *mitzvah*, such as the *mitzvah* to fulfill the testamentary instructions of one who died. The *Shoel U'Maishiv* (2:1:1) cites the *MaHari Ibn Shoeb* who quotes the *Ramban* in saying that we learn 10 things from Yaakov's instructions to his sons, one of which is derived from: ויעשו לו בניו כן כאשר ציום - that Yaakov's sons did as Yaakov had commanded them, thus establishing the *mitzvah* to fulfill testamentary instructions as מן התורה. *Tosafos* however would argue that Yaakov's sons acted out of אב כיבוד for their father rather than to fulfill the instructions of a מת. In fact, the *Ramban* implies as much, explaining why Yaakov made Yosef swear that he would fulfill the instructions to transport his body to כנען - not that he ח"ו suspected Yosef of not obeying his father, but rather to make it more compelling to Pharaoh. However, the *Shevus Yaakov* (1:168) interprets Yosef's oath differently, deriving that Yosef had no אב כיבוד obligation to obey Yaakov after his death in matters not pertaining to Yaakov's money (משל אב). This is why Yaakov asked Yosef: אל נא תקברני במצרים - please do not bury me in Mitzrayim. This סברה is derived from the *MaHarik* (166) where a son promised his father that he wouldn't marry without his father's permission. When he asked if he was bound by this oath, the *MaHarik* concluded that choosing a spouse was deemed a matter משל בן and not משל אב, as long as she was הוגנת, and the אב כיבוד obligation only applied to assets/concerns משל אב.

A Lesson Can Be Learned From:

A large European town was in need of a Rav. However, they were having a difficult time securing one because there were very few scholars or learned men in the town. No qualified *Talmid Chochom* could be enticed to move there. Finally, they successfully lured a prominent Rabbi to accept the post by telling him that the *TaZ*, the *Magen Avraham* and R' Akiva Eiger were buried there. However, it didn't take too long for the Rabbi to discover the deception. When he complained to the communal leaders, one of them said to him: "We did not lie to you. The *TaZ*, *Magen Avraham* and R' Akiva Eiger are not really buried in those cities that claim their gravesites. As long as the works of those great Rabbis are studied in those towns, their lips are moving, and one can truly say that they are alive in those towns. Here however, nobody studies the teachings of those great men. If they can be said to be dead and buried anywhere, it is here !"

P.S. Sholosh Seudos sponsored this week by the Rubin family.