



	Candles	Mincha	DafYomi	Shiur	Shachris	ש"ש	בראשית
Friday	6:02	6:12					9:54
Shabbos		6:02	5:00	5:45	9:00		9:54
Sunday		6:12	6:45		7:30		9:54

**IMPORTANCE OF ...**

The Gemara (Yuma 86b) states that when one commits a sin for the first time, he is forgiven for it. Why then was Adam HaRishon ejected from Gan Eden and punished, having sinned only once ? The Eyn Yaakov suggests that a sin is forgiven after only the first time if the law was stated through a Shliach (agent). However, where a צווי (command) was given directly by Hashem, such as in the case of Adam HaRishon, forgiveness is not automatically forthcoming for the first Aveirah. The Minchas Yitzchok adds: the Posuk precedes the צווי against eating from the עץ הדעת with a statement: מכל עץ הגן אכול תאכל - you may eat from all the trees in the garden. Since it would seem to have been sufficient to state only that the עץ הדעת could not be eaten from, the Posuk permitting all the other trees seems to be extra and is stated only as a condition; that is, you may eat all the other fruits as long as and on condition that you don't eat from the עץ הדעת. However, the Gemara (Bava Metzia 94a) states that in every condition, the תנאי (condition) must come before the מעשה (act). Thus, the Posuk should have warned against eating of the עץ הדעת first, following it with permission for other fruits. Not to do so, invalidates the תנאי. If so, Adam HaRishon should not have been punished ! It must be that the תנאי קודם למעשה requirement, as it is derived from the conditions imposed on the tribes of Gad & Reuven, would seem only to apply when a צווי comes through a person. However, where Hashem conveys the צווי directly, the condition should remain effective even if it follows the act.

**QUESTION OF THE WEEK:**

Where would a group of people be מחויב to perform a certain mitzvah, yet be permitted לכתחילה to forgo the חיוב and perform the mitzvah as a רשות ?

**ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:**

(When might one have to say SheHechianu over the Esrog on the 2<sup>nd</sup> day ?) The Teshuvos V'Hanhagos (2:306) quotes the Bikurei Yaakov who suggests that if one uses different Esrogim on the first and second days of Succos, he may have to say the SheHechianu both times. Although there are many factors involved and distinctions can be made in this situation, a more compelling case can be made where one "borrowed" an Esrog & Lulav on the first day of Yom Tov (on condition to return it), said the SheHechianu, and then took his own set on the 2<sup>nd</sup> day.

**DIN'S CORNER:**

Since the first 3 berachos of Shemona Esrei are considered as one brocho, a mistake requires that one start over from the beginning. However, this only applies to mistakes at the conclusion of the berachos, such as saying הקל הקדוש instead of המלך הקדוש during עשרת ימי תשובה. A mistake in the middle, does not require repetition but does require correction. Therefore, if one forgot to say המוריד הגשם in its proper place, he may add it in anywhere before completing מחיי המטים. (Biur Halacha 114:מקום)

**DID YOU KNOW THAT ...**

The Gemara (Sanhedrin 46b) considers the question: for whose honor is a Hespel (eulogy) delivered - for the honor of the deceased, or that of the surviving relatives ? A resolution is attempted from the fact that Sarah's burial was delayed until Avrohom returned from the Akeidah. If the Hespel was intended to honor Avrohom, should that have been cause to deprive Sarah of a timely burial ? A Hespel must therefore be for the benefit of the deceased and as such, Sarah's burial was delayed for her honor until Avrohom could arrive to eulogize her. The Gemara rebuts this argument by pointing out that even if a Hespel is for the survivor's (i.e. Avrohom's) honor, since Sarah would have wanted Avrohom to be honored, she would have "agreed" to delay her burial for that purpose. The Shvus Yaakov (2:94) derives from this that we may make assessments about what a deceased person would "want". Thus, there is an opinion (Kesubos 97b) which holds that a man does not wish his wife to have to appear in court, as it would be degrading to her. This אומדנא (assessment) should therefore apply after his death as well. A man once died, leaving behind a widow and small son. The deceased's parents paid for the grandson's schooling, took care of his needs and named him their heir, asking only that he say Kadish for them, after their death. The boy's mother objected. Should her wishes be complied with, as we can assume her deceased husband would not have wanted her to have to appear in Beis Din to litigate this issue ? Should a husband be deemed more favorable towards a wife than to his parents, as the Posuk says: על כן יעזב איש את אביו ואת אמו ? The Shvus Yaakov ruled that the boy should say Kadish, as requested. The concept of ודבק באשתו only applies while a husband is alive, and wishes to maintain her good will. After his death, since she can potentially remarry, a husband would rather honor his father's wishes.

**A Lesson Can Be Learned From:**

On one very dry Simchas Torah in Eretz Yisroel, shortly before the prayer of "Geshem" was about to begin, some members of the Shul approached the Rav and asked that he give a short speech concerning what their obligations were at such a time, to improve the success of their Tefilah. The Rav complied and included in his remarks the fact that neglecting to wish someone a hearty "Shalom Aleichem" can have a detrimental effect on the water situation in Eretz Yisroel. He cited the Gemara (Yevamos 78b) which describes how after each of 3 years of famine, Dovid HaMelech listed the factors causing drought. After reviewing Avodah Zara and lack of Tzenius (both of which were not problems at that time), he suggested that it was a deficiency in Chesed (donating and not paying up) that was responsible. The Rav stressed that if one paid attention to the "little" things in human relations, being warm to people, not ignoring them etc., the rain would come.

**P.S.** Sholosh Seudos sponsored this week by the Meckler family.