



| | Candles | Mincha | DafYomi | Shiur | Shachris | ש"ס זק"ש |
|---------|---------|--------|---------|-------|----------|----------|
| Friday | 5:15 | 5:27 | | | | 9:29 |
| Shabbos | | 5:15 | 4:15 | 4:55 | 9:00 | 9:28 |
| Sunday | | 5:25 | 5:50 | | 7:30 | 9:28 |

IMPORTANCE OF ...

The Gemara (Gittin 45b) states that if a *Sefer Torah* or *Tefillin* were written by a *Mumar* (apostate Jew) they are *Posul*, as derived from the words: **וקשרתם וכתבתם**, teaching us that only one who is bound by and believes in **קשירה** (binding the *Tefillin* on one's arm) is eligible to write *Tefillin*. The *Beis Yosef* (39 א"ח) limits this *Halacha* to a *Mumar* who has rejected the entire *Torah* or one who is a *Mumar להכניס* - rejecting with insolence only to anger *Hashem*, even if in one specific **איסור**. The *Magen Avraham* (*ibid*) adds a third category - one who is a *Mumar* in that very thing, *i.e.* he does not don *Tefillin*. Thus, a *Sofer* who does not himself wear *Tefillin*, becomes ineligible to write *Tefillin* for sale to others. However, although one can become a *Mumar* simply by transgressing an **איסור** a few times, to become a *Mumar* *L'Tefillin* one must have never put them on. If he wore them once, he would not qualify as a *Mumar*. The *Netziv* (1:8 משיב דבר) thus ruled that a *Sofer* who had reputedly erased *Hashem's* name from *Tefillin* where it was expedient, hardly wore them himself, and was generally lax in *davening* and *Birchas HaMazon* was nevertheless an eligible *Sofer*. Yet, it would be wise to check all *Tefillin* and *Sifrei Torah* that he had written previously, and he must be monitored for proper **כוונה** in the future. **העמק דבר** says on the *Posuk*: **תדבר אל כל חכמי לב אשר מלאתי רוח חכמה** - that both **לב** and **חכמה** were necessary to make the *Bigdei Kehuna*, which, like all items of **קדושה** required **לשמה** when made and also required proper **כוונה** when their materials were being prepared.

QUESTION OF THE WEEK:

If 2 partners own a *Talis* jointly, *Tzitzis* must be put on it, even though each partner only "owns" 2 corners (half) of it. Yet, if one of them objects, the other may not put on *Tzitzis* because he only owns half. What's the difference ?

ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:

(What *brocho* may be said after **המוציא** but before eating bread ?)
The (46 שו"ת הלכות קטנות) states that if one made **המוציא** and then realized that he hadn't said **על נטילת ידים** after washing, he should either say the *brocho* then, or he should eat a little bread (less than a **כזית**) and then say it.

DIN'S CORNER:

If a person's parent died during the month of Adar in a non-leap year, the son should fast to honor the *Yahrtzeit* in future leap years during the first Adar. If he had adopted the *minhag* by oath to fast on the *Yahrtzeit*, then he must fast on that day in both Adars. Otherwise, if he was simply aware that such a *minhag* existed, he need not fast, and should do whatever his *minhag* is. Either way, the other mourners need not give him a *Kadish* to say, in more than one of the two months (*Mishna Berurah* 568:42)

DID YOU KNOW THAT ...

The Gemara (*Zevachim* 18b) explains how according to Rav, the long **כתונת** (shirt) worn by the *Kohen* must fit him perfectly, with its hem reaching the ground exactly. If it is too long, causing it to drag on the ground, or too short, the **כתונת** is invalid. When the Gemara cites a *Beraisa* that permits a shirt that is too long, R' Zeira says that this refers to a too-long shirt, which is pulled up until its hem reaches the ground, and where the extra material is contained under and above the **אבנט** (belt) which keeps it from falling down and dragging. The belt allows us to consider the extra material as if it had been **מגוי אגוי** - cut off. A wife once tailored a garment for her husband but it came out too long. He criticized her sharply and demanded that she adjust it to his size. Upset by his criticism, she replied with an oath that she would not do so. Having no choice, the husband was forced to hitch up the garment and hold it in place with his belt. However, he was unable to wrap the belt around himself adequately so his wife assisted him in doing so. The question of whether what she did violated her oath was raised. The (232 תורה לשמה) held that it had violated the oath, since the belt was not simply a temporary cosmetic measure designed to make it look like it wasn't too long, but was rather considered *Halachically* to have cut the extra material off. Such an act would definitely be considered a **תיקון**.

A Lesson Can Be Learned From:

A Chosid of the Satmar Rebbe ZT"L had a son of marriageable age but for some reason, he was unable to finalize a Shidduch for the boy. Some relatives wrote to him, suggesting that he bring his son to Eretz Yisroel where they could arrange several appropriate meetings. The Chosid asked the Rebbe if he should do so and the Rebbe replied that he didn't think it was necessary to go to Eretz Yisroel. The Chosid obeyed the Rebbe, but after several more months went by without success, he could no longer resist the pleas of his relatives and so he, his wife and son flew to Eretz Yisroel. Within a few weeks, they met all the suggested candidates arranged by their relatives, but nothing was accomplished. Dejectedly, they returned to the United States. A month later, the Satmar Rebbe called the Chosid and suggested to him that perhaps now would be a good time for him to take his son to Eretz Yisroel. The Chosid told the Rebbe with great embarrassment that he had just come back from Eretz Yisroel, despite the Rebbe's advice, and that there was nothing there for him to look into. The Rebbe urged him, saying that he believed if he went back now to Eretz Yisroel, he would be Matzliach. The Chosid took his son and flew back to Eretz Yisroel. A week later, a Shidduch was finalized between them and a family that had just moved to Eretz Yisroel from Hungary, only three weeks before.

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