



	Candles	Mincha	DafYomi	Shiur	Shachris	ש"ס
Friday	5:12	5:22	8:30			9:31
Shabbos		5:12	4:15	4:50	9:00	9:30
Sun/Mon		5:25	6:00		7:30	9:29

IMPORTANCE OF

The Gemara (Succah 28a) states that R' Eliezer was asked 30 questions regarding the laws of a Succah. On 12 he said he had heard a ruling but on the other 18 he had not. When it was suggested that he think, and come up with a ruling on his own, he replied that this would force him to say something which he had not heard from his *Rebbi*. Since he was always first to the *Beis HaMidrash* and last to leave, had never slept in the *Beis HaMidrash*, had never spoken idle talk there and had never said something which he had not heard from his teachers, he did not wish to suggest an opinion of his own on those 18 questions. Why did R' Eliezer mention all his other attributes if the only relevant one was the last one? The Gemara (Sotah 40a) quotes R' Avahu as saying that he used to think he was humble, until he once saw R' Abba of Acco say a *Pshat*, and then not object as his *מתורגמן* (translator) said a different one. The *MaHarsha* explains that had the translator given an inferior explanation, R' Abba would have been forced to object. However, by giving a different but equivalent, and perhaps better explanation, the translator was implying that R' Abba was redundant. Still, he did not object, despite the affront. Apparently, the translator should have kept his *Pshat* to himself, rather than shame R' Abba. So too, R' Eliezer's point was that he was clearly very diligent in his studies. Still, he would not say more than what his *Rebbi* had said. The *Daas Zekainim* comments on the words: *פורשי כנפים למעלה* that the *Keruvim's* wings spread up "דרך ענה ויראה" - with humility and fear. The *Or HaNefesh* comments that the true scholar seeking to grow should still be able to control himself and keep his *Chidushim* to himself if to do otherwise would hurt someone's feelings. Even the *Keruvim*, reaching upward, maintained *ענה*.

DID YOU KNOW THAT

The Gemara (*Sanhedrin* 46b) inquires whether a *Hesped* (eulogy) is offered to honor the deceased or to honor the surviving relatives. A practical difference would emerge where the deceased left instructions that he not be eulogized. He certainly can forgo his own honor, but he would not be able to be *מוחל* the honor of his relatives. *Tosafos* asks why the Gemara (*Yevamos* 78a) indicates that *Hashem* was upset over the lack of a proper *Hesped* for Shaul. If it is to honor the living, then the *Bnei Yisroel*, who failed to eulogize him adequately, were clearly *מוחל*. *Tosafos* answers that 1) *Bnei Yisroel* were afraid to let Dovid see them mourn Shaul, and 2) Even if a *Hesped* is to honor the living, a king, inadequately eulogized, reaches an additional level of disgrace, and warrants more. The *Teshuvos Beis Yaakov* (83) derives from here that in the case of a king, just as there is an element of *יקרא דשכבי* (honor to the deceased) even if we say that a *Hesped* is for *יקרא דחיי*, so too is there an element of *יקרא דחיי* according to the opinion that a *Hesped* is for *יקרא דשכבי*. As such, if a king or *Talmid Chochom* left instructions that he not be eulogized, the element of *יקרא דחיי* should allow his wishes to be overridden. However, the *Shulchan Aruch* (י"ד 344:10) rules that a deceased's wish not to be eulogized must be honored, and does not distinguish between a *Talmid Chochom* or others. The *Midrash* (*Shemos* 35) derives from *ועשית את הקרשים למשכן* that *Hashem* promised Moshe, if there would ever be no *Mishkan* or *Mikdash*, the death of a *Tzadik* would provide *Kaparah*. As such, the *Minchas Yitzchok* (9:135) suggests that praising a *Tzadik's* deeds is always permitted so as to comfort us with the knowledge of his *Tzidkus*, and the *Kaparah* provided by his death. Thus, one may state such praises, even where a *Hesped* is precluded.

QUESTION OF THE WEEK:

When would someone be *יציא Kiddush* Friday night by saying only the middle of the *brocho* (starting with *אשר קדשנו במצותי*) and leaving out the *ברוך אתה ד'* at the beginning and end?

ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:

(Which is preferable: to learn a little well, or a lot superficially?)

The *Posuk* (*Mishlei* 13:25) *צדיק אוכל לשובע נפש ובטן רשעים תחסר* is explained by the *GRA* as referring to a *Tzadik* who studies to understand, regardless of how much, as opposed to the "Rasha" who tries to collect a lot (to appear learned) but retains nothing.

DIN'S CORNER:

One must gird oneself during *Shemona Esrei* with a belt (i.e. *Gartel*) even though he is already wearing a belt around his pants to separate his lower body from his heart, to fulfill *הכין* (prepare to greet *Hashem*). Although some hold that this only applies to one who wears such a *Gartel* all day, it is still a *Midas Chasidus* for everyone to wear it during *Tefilah*. (MB 91:4)

A Lesson Can Be Learned From:

R' Shlomo Zalman Auerbach ZT"L was invited to the Simcha of a certain philanthropist. Unfortunately, R' Shlomo Zalman took ill shortly before the Simcha and was unable to leave the house for the entire week. He drafted a letter to the Baal Simcha in which he apologized that "because of my health and other reasons I was unable to participate in the Simcha", and in which he extended a *brocho* to the Baal Simcha's family. Before the messenger left to deliver the letter, he asked R' Shlomo Zalman why he had to write "and other reasons". Was not R' Shlomo Zalman's health situation a sufficient reason? R' Shlomo Zalman explained to him that even if he had been healthy, he could not have guaranteed that he would have been able to attend, because of his many duties and the claims on his time. "As such, it might not have been entirely truthful to say that my non-attendance was because of my health. One must be careful to only write the truth!"

P.S. A *Hartzlich* Mazel Tov to the Tyberg family upon the engagement of their son Reuven to Jaqui Rubinstein. **ברוכים הבאים** to the Grossman family. Sholosh Seudos sponsored by the Schmerhold family.