



	Candles	Mincha	DafYomi	Shiur	Shachris	ש"ש
Friday	5:05	5:12	8:00			9:34
Shabbos		5:05	4:15	4:45	9:00	9:34
Sunday		5:20	5:30		7:30	9:33

### IMPORTANCE OF ....

The *Mishna* (*Kesubos* 72b) states that if a man betroths a woman on condition that she have no blemishes (**מומין**) and then it turns out that she has, the betrothal is void. The *Gemara* (*ibid* 74b) elaborates, adding that even if she went to a doctor and had the blemishes cured, the betrothal is still not valid. The *Shulchan Aruch* (*אה"ע* 39:7) rules that where the doctor cures (/removes) the blemishes, the betrothal is retroactively valid. This is true however, only where the man never despaired of their being cured. The *Beis Shmuel* says that if he saw her blemishes and believed them to be incurable, even if they were subsequently removed, the betrothal remains void. On the other hand, the *Birkei Yosef* (*אה"ע* 39) notes that if the betrother is a doctor, the betrothal remains valid, as we presume that he would plan to remove them. Since the purpose of the condition against blemishes was to avoid an end result of blemishes being left on her, their removal satisfies the condition. The *Gra* suggests that this could explain why the *Posuk* says **כי אני ד' רופאך** (I am Hashem - your healer), even though Hashem just promised that He would not inflict the Egyptian illnesses upon the Jews, implying that they would not need a healer. However, since the standard metaphor places Hashem as the groom and the *Bnei Yisroel* as the bride, our betrothal seems to have been executed successfully despite our blemishes (*i.e.* sins). This is precisely because **אני ד' רופאך** - Hashem is the **doctor** who, as stated above, sees the sins/blemishes and plans for their removal.

### QUESTION OF THE WEEK:

If one used an Esrog to make a jelly or other food, must one recite a **שהחינו** before eating it, bearing in mind that a **שהחינו** was already said over the Esrog on Succos, together with the other three *Minim* ?

### ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:

(Which serious *עבירה* is permitted to honor the *Shabbos* ?)

The *Magen Avraham* (*או"ח* 242) cites a *Yerushalmi* (*Moed Katan* 2:3) which says that one may borrow money at interest to provide food for a *Seudas Shabbos*. There is a *Machlokes* among the *Poskim* if this permits **רבית דרבנן** only, or even **דאורייתא**.

### DIN'S CORNER:

A lender may not demand repayment of a loan if he knows that the borrower does not have the money. The lender may not even appear within the borrower's line of vision during such a time. The borrower is also obligated to pay on request if he has the funds, and may not push the lender off. The borrower may also not put the loan at risk by frivolous spending, jeopardizing his ability to repay. If a borrower is known to do this, a lender may refuse to lend him, and thus avoid the prohibition against demanding. (*Kitzur* 179).

### DID YOU KNOW THAT ....

The *Gemara* (*Shabbos* 142a) discusses the issue of **מדומע** (a mixture) with regard to *Shabbos*. If one part of *Terumah* was mixed with 100 parts of *Chulin*, the *Terumah* becomes **בטל** and anyone may eat the mixture. However, so as not to deprive the *Kohen*, one part must be separated and given to him. R' Yehudah says that this separation (which then permits the mixture to be eaten) may be done on *Shabbos*. When the question is asked: Isn't this a **תיקון** (repair) ? the *Gemara* suggests that R' Yehudah holds it is sufficient to plan such a separation without actually doing it physically, and the intention alone will permit the mixture to be eaten without it being an act of **תיקון**. This method is referred to as: **נותן עיניו בצד זה ואוכל מצד אחר**. *Tosafos* (*Gittin* 31a) asks, if so, why is it not permitted to separate *Terumah* in the first place on *Shabbos*, using such a method ? *Tosafos* answers that an intent to separate would be sufficient in the case of **מדומע** because all the grain in question has already been tithed - none of it is **טבל**. However, to remove the status of **טבל** by separating *Terumah* is a major **תיקון** and may not be done on *Shabbos* even by **מחשבה** alone, just as **דמאי** (doubtful grain) may also not have its doubt resolved using the **מחשבה** method on *Shabbos*. The **מהר"ש פרימו** derives from here that since the *Mon* took on whatever taste one wished, it was only permitted to **think** of what one desired before *Shabbos*; on *Shabbos* itself such a thought would be forbidden as effecting a **תיקון** through **מחשבה**. The *Har Tzvi* asks why it was necessary to prove this from *Tosafos*. Doesn't the *Posuk* say clearly: **את אשר תאפו אפו** regarding the *Mon*, where the *Mechilta* explains that one "baked" it by imagining it baked, and that this had to take place on Friday ? He answers that the *Posuk* might simply have been informing them that imagining a taste for *Mon* would not work on *Shabbos*; but not that having such a **מחשבה** was **אסור**. Therefore, proof from *Tosafos* was needed.

### A Lesson Can Be Learned From:

R' Avrohom Abba Leifer, after many years as the Rav in Pittsburg, retired and lived out his remaining days in Ashdod. A wealthy man approached him and offered to build a magnificent building for R' Avrohom, to serve as a *Beis HaMidrash* and as a *yeshiva*, but on one condition: he wished to receive half of R' Avrohom's share in Gan Eden and to reside with R' Avrohom in his section there. R' Avrohom thought for a few moments and then replied: "I am perfectly willing to give you half of my Torah learning and sign a contract to that effect, as such *Yissachar-Zevulun* arrangements are commonplace. However, I cannot guarantee that you will reside with me in my section, because the *Gemara* (*Pesachim* 50a) states with regard to **מלכות** (those executed by the king): **אין אדם יכול לעמוד במחיצתו** - no one else can stand in their section, but *Nazi* victims such as I am will be allowed" .

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