



	Candles	Mincha	DafYomi	Shiur	Shachris	ש"ס
Friday	8:06	6:50/7:45				9:10
Shabbos		8:01	7:00	7:40	9:00	9:10
Sunday		8:22	7:50		7:30	9:10

IMPORTANCE OF

The *Gemara* (*Chulin* 88b) states the opinion of R' Nachman b. R' Chisda that one may cover the blood of *Shechitah* only with the kind of dirt in which something can grow. *Tosafos* lists desert dirt as the kind that normally may not be used. However, *Tosafos* then suggests that when the *Bnei Yisroel* were traveling through the *Midbar*, the desert was capable of growth. The *Gemara* (*Shabbos* 6b) cites conflicting *Beraisos*, where one characterizes a desert as a *Reshus HaRabim*, while the other does not. *Abaye* resolves this by stating that one refers to the time when the *Bnei Yisroel* were in the *Midbar*, while the other refers to today. *Rashi* understands this to mean that the *Midbar* was a significant place when the *Bnei Yisroel* were in it, giving it the status of a *Reshus HaRabim*. Today, however, no one goes there, so it isn't even a *Reshus HaRabim*. If so, why does the *Rambam* (*שבת* 14:1) list a *Midbar* as a *Reshus HaRabim* ? The *Kesef Mishna* cites the *Rambam's* son who also holds that when the *Bnei Yisroel* were in the *Midbar* for 40 years, the desert bloomed like a valley. As such, it was not a *Reshus HaRabim* but rather a *Reshus HaYachid* then, since no one would walk freely through it. Only later, when it reverted to being barren, did it become, as the *Rambam* says, a *Reshus HaRabim*. The *Or Chadash* (*Pesachim* 3b) asks in the name of the *Shaagas Aryeh* how the *Bnei Yisroel* were able to bring a *Korban Pesach* in the *Midbar* since we know that only those who owned property were obligated. What property did the *Bnei Yisroel* own there ? The *Panim Masbiros* suggests that since wherever the *Bnei Yisroel* were in the *Midbar*, they could grow things, it was as if each Jew owned that spot.

QUESTION OF THE WEEK:

For which *mitzvah* is one obligated to imagine circumstances that may be different from what everyone else thinks ?

ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:

(Why is there no custom of **בה"ב** following *Shevuos* ?)
The *Mishna Berurah* (492:1) explains how the fasts of **בה"ב** were to effect a *כפרה* for presumed *Aveiros* caused by the celebration and rejoicing on *Yom Tov*. Since *Shevuos* was only one day, there was an insufficient presumption. The *Be'er Hetev* also notes that during a 7-8 day *Yom Tov*, which includes *Chol HaMoed*, there would be a much greater chance he did *מלאכה*.

DIN'S CORNER:

The custom in many Shuls is for the *Gabbai* to add in the words: **בלי נדר** when announcing the donations of those who received an *Aliyah*, in case they don't pay. However, although these words remove the pledge from the strictness of a *נדר*, they do not cancel the pledge. One is still bound by a *התחייבות* to *Tzedaka* under the rule of: *מוצא שפתיך תשמור ועשית*. (*Teshuvos V'Hanhagos* 2:476).

DID YOU KNOW THAT

The *Shulchan Aruch* (*י"ד* 208:4) rules that one who was placed in *נידוי* (excommunication) for a while but did not comply with its conditions, need not "make up" for it later after being released from *נידוי*, by observing its restrictions for a length of time equal to the time he had ignored them. This is because *נידוי* is Rabbinic. However, the *Sifri Zuta* (*Piska* 12) derives from: **תסגר שבעת ימים** regarding *Miriam's Tzaraas* that *נידוי* is Scriptural. The *Shach* (*ibid*) questions what appears to be a contradictory *Halacha* (*י"ד* 334:28) where the *Shulchan Aruch* rules that one who is *מזולז* (degrades) a *נידוי* **must** make up for it by adopting its conditions for a time equal to his *זלזול*. The *Shach* resolves this by distinguishing between one who simply doesn't comply with standard *נידוי* conditions (e.g. he may not join a *minyán* or *mezuman*) which are Rabbinic, as opposed to one who obligated himself or was obligated in something under the threat of *נידוי*, where the *Torah* requires him to satisfy any violation by agreeing **לנהוג איסור כימים שנהג בהן היתר**, which is presumably what the *Sifri* also had in mind. The *Netziv* (*דבר* 4:6) was asked regarding a man whose wife had become *ל"ע* insane, and he had then married another woman without benefit of a **ק' רבנים**. The *Netziv* stated that one may not have two wives today, not because of the *Cherem* of *Rabbeinu Gershom*, but because it has become an established *מנהג* not to allow it. Violating this *מנהג* is punishable by *נידוי* and he must therefore separate from his second wife until a *Get* and *Kesubah* can be deposited for the benefit of his first wife, through the *Rabbonim*. However, there would be no need for them to separate additionally for the period of time he lived with her illegally (w/o the *היתר*) because although he had committed a *נידוי* offense, he had not been *בנידוי* *מזולז*.

A Lesson Can Be Learned From:

A Rabbi from Rumania visited with the *Apter Rov* and related to him some of the difficulties that he tolerated from his congregation. As an example, he described how a wealthy but sinful member of the community wished to be designated as the lay leader, and tried to bribe the *Rabbi* into supporting him. The *Rabbi* very proudly assured the *Apter Rov* that he had rejected the bribe. When the *Rabbi's* visit ended and he took his leave, the *Apter Rov* blessed him that he always remain honest and full of *Yiras Shomayim*. The *Rabbi* found such a *brocho* strange and asked the *Apter Rov* why he had said this to him. The *Apter Rov* replied: "The *Posuk* says: **לך ה' חסד כי אתה תשלם לאיש כמעשהו** (*Tehillim* 62), where we acknowledge *Hashem's* *חסד* in compensating each man for his deeds. What is the great kindness in that ? Didn't the man earn his reward ? The answer is that *Hashem's* *חסד* leads man into a *נסיון* that is custom-made for him, so as to improve him while not overburdening him beyond his ability. If you were exposed to a *נסיון* that tested your integrity, you obviously need work in that area !"

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