



	Candles	Mincha	DafYomi	Shiur	Shachris	ש"ש
Friday	4:39	4:51	7:45			9:42
Shabbos		4:39	3:45	4:15	9:00	9:42
Sunday	4:50	5:20			7:30	9:42

## IMPORTANCE OF ....

The Gemara (Bava Metzia 87a) derives a rule of etiquette from the Posuk: **ויאמר אליו איה שרה אשתך**, where Avraham was asked by the 3 Malochim "Where is Sarah your wife". R' Yosi says that since the letters **י**, **ו** and **א** (of the word **אליו**) have dots above them in the Sefer Torah, and the word **איו** means "where is he", we see that it is proper to inquire as to the welfare of one's hostess. Tosafos points out that the Malochim had clearly said "**איה שרה**" to Avraham, and that any derivation from "**איו**" would seem to refer to a man. If the lesson to be determined was limited to asking about the hostess, then shouldn't the word **איה** have been dotted? Tosafos then cites the Midrash (48:15) which states that just as it was proper to ask Avraham regarding Sarah, **איו** teaches us that it was also appropriate to ask Sarah regarding Avraham. The Mizrachi argues that this is undoubtedly an error as it would not be proper for a man to speak to a woman. However, the MaHarsha notes that it is certainly permitted to speak with a woman for a productive purpose, as we find Eli HaKohen speaking to Chanah and Elisha HaNavi speaking to the woman from Shunam. It is only deriving improper pleasure from the sound of a woman's voice that is forbidden. Certainly, **דרך ארץ** matters are permitted. R' Nachman Engel suggests that when the daughters of Yisro returned home after being saved by Moshe and told Yisro what had happened, Yisro believed that they had not invited Moshe to a meal as they felt it may have been improper to do so. Yisro's response was "**ואיו**" - where is he? Since we derive from **איו** that particularly in matters of **דרך ארץ**, it is not improper for a man and woman to speak, they should certainly have expressed **הכרת הטוב** for his help and should invite him for a meal.

## QUESTION OF THE WEEK:

For which prestigious scholarly post, would a Yisroel, in full control of his faculties, become too old to qualify?

## ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:

(Where would a firstborn be entitled to receive more than **פי שנים** - double?)

The Gemara (Bava Basra 127a) states that a **טומטום** (person of unknown gender) is not counted when the extra share of the firstborn is calculated. Thus, if 3 brothers inherit \$900 and one of the youngest is a **טומטום**, the Bechorah share is \$300, based on 2 sons. If the **טומטום** is then determined to be a male, the \$600 is divided evenly among all 3. The Bechor receives a total of \$500.

## DIN'S CORNER:

At a "Kiddush" on Shabbos after davening, where one person says Kiddush on wine out loud and everyone has **כרונה** to be **יוצא**, those who also take some of his Kiddush wine to drink (any amount) need not say a **brocho** over other beverages (whiskey, soda etc..). However, those who do not drink some of the wine must say a **brocho** on other beverages. (Yechave Daas 5:20)

## DID YOU KNOW THAT ....

The Gemara (Zevachim 24a) states that just as a Kohen must perform all tasks of the Avodah with his body, allowing nothing to interpose between his skin and the **כלי שרת** (utensils), so too there may be nothing between the skin of his feet and the floor (רצפה) of the Beis HaMikdash. The Gemara (Berachos 62b) derives that one may not enter the Har HaBayis wearing shoes from the Posuk: **של נעליך מעל רגליך**. The Ramban comments on this Posuk, noting that the Shechinah was in the **סנה** (bush) and although Moshe was not near the **סנה**, the entire area became sacred and he could not wear shoes there, just as the Kohanim served in the Mikdash barefoot. Should not the Ramban have rather mentioned the Gemara in Berachos which is more on point, rather than the Halacha regarding **חציצה**, which would seem to be unrelated? The Midrash (Bereshis Rabba 67:7) relates that after Geviha b. Kosem defeated the Egyptians' claim against the Jews before Alexander the Great for all the spoils that the Bnei Yisroel took with them from Egypt, Alexander wished to visit Yerushalayim. A Kusi warned him that he wouldn't be allowed into the Kodesh Kodashim so Geviha adorned a pair of socks with jewels and suggested that the king put them on as they reached the Har HaBayis, which Geviha said was slippery. Why should socks have been allowed? The Minchas Yitzchok (3:19) cites the Gemara (Shabbos 66b) which implies that if footwear is ineligible for Chalitzah, one may wear it on the Har HaBayis, thus permitting socks. Therefore, the Gemara which derives from **של נעליך** that one must remove one's shoes does not present an absolute barefoot requirement, since socks and other footwear ineligible for Chalitzah may still be permitted. However, the barefoot requirement for a Kohen's Avodah is because of **חציצה**, which is unrelated to Chalitzah eligibility and yet based on **קדושה**, making it an absolute example for the Ramban to compare with Moshe.

## A Lesson Can Be Learned From:

R' Moshe Aharon Stern, Mashgiach of the Kaminetz Yeshiva in Yerushalayim always visited his granddaughters in the hospital when they gave birth, bringing them sweets and a set of clothing for the newborn, much to the amazement of the hospital staff. To one such young mother, who had finally given birth after a number of years, R' Moshe Aharon presented outfit after outfit, enough to fill a suitcase. The 'Kimpetur' exclaimed: "I only had one baby, not 6 at a time like in Mitzrayim!" R' Moshe Aharon explained to her how every time he visited America on Yeshiva business, he would buy all his grandchildren such gifts. Although she had not yet given birth, he had always bought for her as well. B"H he now had the opportunity to give them to her.

**P.S.** Mazel Tov to the Gottheil family upon the birth and Bris of a son. May they enjoy much Nachas from him and his siblings. Sholosh Seudos sponsored this week by the Chaimowitz family.