



	Candles	Mincha	DafYomi	Shiur	Shachris	ש"ס
Friday	5:55	6:05	8:30			8:58
Shabbos	5:55	5:20	5:20	5:45	9:00	8:57
Sunday	6:10	8:30			7:45	8:56

IMPORTANCE OF

Rashi states that *Shabbos* was mentioned before the *Mishkan* in the beginning of *VaYakhel*, to teach us that building the *Mishkan* does not override *Shabbos*. The *Alshich* asks: why would I think that it does? After all, *Shabbos* has an עשה and a לא תעשה while the *Mishkan* only has an עשה! The *Gemara* (*Kesubos* 62b) states that when *Rebbi's* son was betrothed to the daughter of *R' Yosi b. Zimra*, it was arranged that he would go away and study for 12 years before the marriage. However when *Rebbi's* son saw her, he said that 6 years was enough. When he saw her a second time, he said he would prefer to marry first, and then go away for 12 years. He was a little embarrassed by his reaction, but *Rebbi* assured him that *Hashem* had done the same thing, first planning to wait 40 years until *Bnei Yisroel* entered *Eretz Yisroel* to have a *Beis HaMikdash* built (as is derived from תבאמו ותטעמו) but then arranging for the *Mishkan* to be built right away. The *MaHarsha* questions this analogy, in light of the accepted premise that the instructions to build the *Mishkan* came about because *Bnei Yisroel* sinned with the *Eigel* - the *Mishkan* to provide a *Kaparah*. The *Yismach Moshe* quotes the *Ir Binyomin* who explains the analogy as follows: *Hashem's* plan to wait 40 years for the *Beis HaMikdash* was to give *Bnei Yisroel* time in the *Midbar* to study undisturbed, before having to work the land and build a *Beis HaMikdash*. Yet, the *Eigel* and the subsequent need for a *Mishkan*, brought about *Bitul Torah* due to the constant assembly and disassembly of the *Mishkan*. A similar *Bitul Torah* consequence resulted from the reaction of *Rebbi's* son, as well. The *Gemara* (*Shabbos* 118b) states that if one keeps *Shabbos* properly, he will be forgiven for everything, even for *Avodah Zara*. If *Shabbos* is so powerful, why does it not wipe away the sin of the *Eigel*? Yet, the *Mishkan's* function was to do exactly that. As such, one might imagine that *Mishkan* is more important and overrides *Shabbos*. Therefore *Rashi* says, *Shabbos* was stated first, to teach us that *Mishkan* does not override it.

QUESTION OF THE WEEK:

When would the *Kohen* who received the first *Aliyah* in the *Kriah*, say the *Haftorah* instead of the one who received *Maftir*?

ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:

(Is there עבירה where the שליח is known to do עבירה?)

The *Rema* (388:15) rules that if one sends a *Shliach* to be מוסר (betray) Jewish money or lives, the sender is חייב if the *Shliach* is known as a מוסר. However, the *SHaCH* and *Ketzos* disagree, arguing that אין שליח לדבר עבירה is a גזירת הכתוב.

DIN'S CORNER:

If one scares someone, by suddenly yelling at him or by suddenly appearing out of the dark or in some other similar way, he is not liable financially, but is חייב בדיני שמים. (*Kitzur* 184:6)

DID YOU KNOW THAT

The *Gemara* (*Sanedrin* 73a) states that if one sees another person drowning or being attacked by animals or bandits, he must save him, because of the *Posuk*: לא תעמוד על דם רעך. The *Gemara* asks: do we not derive this from והשבותו לו – that one must [save and] return one's body to him? The *Gemara* answers that indeed, from והשבותו לו I would learn only that one must personally attempt to save him. From לא תעמוד על דם רעך I derive that one must also hire others to rescue him. *Rashi* adds that one must try כל צדדין – all avenues to effect the rescue. The *Rema* (656:1) rules that to fulfill a *mitzvah* one should not spend more than 1/5 of one's assets, but to avoid transgressing a לא תעשה one must spend all his money. Is this what *Rashi* means by כל צדדין? The *Chavas Yair* (165) derives from the statement of the *Gemara* - מטרה ומיגר – the bother that one must undergo even when he himself cannot effect the rescue. However, if he hires people, he will certainly be reimbursed from the man being rescued, so money is not what *Rashi* meant. What about the *Rema*? The *Chasam Sofer*, in his annotations on the *Rema* states that in his opinion, the difference between when one spends 20% or 100% of one's money does not depend on whether it is a מצות עשה or a מצות עשה, but rather on whether an action is involved. Thus, if a מצות עשה would be transgressed by an act, such as the מצות עשה of observing the laws of *Shemittah*, one would be obligated to spend all one's money rather than violate the עשה by taking *Shemittah* fruit. By the same token, when the *Torah* states a לאו which involves no action, such as: לא תתירו ממו עד בקר, one need not spend all one's money to avoid leaving remnants. As such, לא תעמוד על דם רעך, which also would be violated by inaction, does not obligate one to spend all his money, to avoid transgressing it, by acting. It may be due only to the fact that לא תעמוד על דם רעך has community ramifications, and as such, requires additional exertion, but not all one's money.

A Lesson Can Be Learned From:

R' Moshe Bassan had a deep love for *Eretz Yisroel* and although he didn't live there, he had a *Pushka* for the poor of *Eretz Yisroel* on his desk, and he was always collecting on their behalf. One day, a distinguished member of the community came to invite *R' Moshe* to his son's *Bris*, and requested that *R' Moshe* serve as the *Sandek*. *R' Moshe* wished him a hearty *Mazel Tov* and thanked him for the honor. Unfortunately, *R' Moshe* informed him that had a prior engagement on that day, and could not attend. The man's disappointment was evident, and he exclaimed: "I promise 200 dinars to the *Eretz Yisroel* fund if the *Rav* will attend". Reaching into his pocket, *R' Moshe* replied "I am sorry, I already promised to be elsewhere. But, so the poor of *Eretz Yisroel* shouldn't suffer ..." and *R' Moshe* put 200 dinars into the *Pushka*.

P.S. Sholosh Seudos is sponsored this week by the Sheli family.