



	Candles	Mincha	DafYomi	Shiur	Shachris	ש"ס זק"ש
Friday	6:33	6:45				9:47
Shabbos	8:01	6:40	5:30	6:10	9:00	9:47
Sunday		6:40	5:30	6:10	9:00	9:47

IMPORTANCE OF

The Gemara (Megilah 16b) states that studying Torah is greater than honoring one's parents. Proof is derived from the calculation of Yaakov's punishment for not having served his father Yitzchok, in which the 14 years that Yaakov spent studying in the Yeshiva of Ever were not counted. The Chasam Sofer (9 חו"מ) asks: perhaps it is not the mitzvah of Talmud Torah that outweighs honoring one's parents, but rather the mitzvah of ורבו פרו, and the 14 years excluded from the calculation represent the 14 years that Yaakov worked to marry Leah and Rachel ! Does not the Torah clearly say: **כן יעזב איש את אביו ואת אמו ודבק באשתו**, על, implying that marriage preempts Kibud Av ? The Chasam Sofer answers that Yaakov could have married and still lived in Yitzchok's vicinity, able to perform both mitzvos. He ran away of his "own" volition, to escape Eisav, for which he would later be deserving of punishment. However, studying Torah properly would not have been possible in Yitzchok's vicinity, because success in Talmud Torah requires that one travel away from one's home, away from the doting of one's parents and the pressures of family. The Gemara (Kesubos 62b) says that it was common for students to leave home and study elsewhere for 2 or 3 years. Thus, Yaakov would have been correct for leaving Yitzchok and travelling to the Yeshiva of Ever even if the trouble with Eisav had not taken place. Yet, the Gemara (Gittin 6b) has R' Evyasar condemning those who leave their wives in Bavel and go off to study in Eretz Yisroel, citing a Posuk. However, the Chasam Sofer interprets that Posuk as lamenting the Galus, which forces such a serious separation, rather than blaming the Talmidim who are only doing what is best. As the Posuk says: **ישא מדברותיך**, והם תכו לרגליך, on which the Gemara (Bava Basra 88a) comments: these are the Talmidei Chachomim who travel from town to town and country to country in order to "give and take" in Torah.

QUESTION OF THE WEEK:

If an Esrog that is part lemon is Posul, why isn't the minor lemon part בטל ברוב, leaving it totally Esrog ?

ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:

(May someone who eats on Yom Kippur be the Shliach Tzibur ?) Teshuvos V'Hanhagos (3:176) rules that if he is ill and yet eats less than the שיעור each time, then he is fasting as best he can, and may be the Shliach Tzibur. But not if he eats the שיעור.

DIN'S CORNER:

As long as the S'chach was initially placed on the Succah under valid conditions, i.e. the roof or Shlock was not over it at the time, then the roof may be removed and replaced as often as needed on Yom Tov. (MB 626:19)

DID YOU KNOW THAT

The Gemara (Yuma 69a) states that Kohanim were not permitted to walk outside of the Beis HaMikdash wearing their בגדי כהונה, but they were permitted to wear them inside the Beis HaMikdash even when not doing the Avodah. This is because the Torah was given not to angels, but rather to humans, who could not be expected to remove the garments immediately upon completing the Avodah without an extra moment's delay. However, taking them out of the Beis HaMikdash is deemed חול - profane. The Mishna (Succah 28b) describes how one is permitted to leave the Succah and enter the house when his food begins to spoil from the rain. The Rema (או"ח 639:7) states that if one is פטור from the mitzvah of Succah (such as when it rains) and nevertheless remains in the Succah, he receives no reward and the act is deemed foolish. The עונג יום טוב (או"ח 49) asks: it should be forbidden to sit in the Succah during the rain, since one may not derive personal pleasure from the walls and S'chach of the Succah, where no mitzvah is taking place. If there is a roof (or "Shlock") covering the Succah, this would seem not to be a problem, as the Succah would then be Posul, and the Torah would allow הנאה in such a case. However, why isn't sitting in an open Succah in the rain prohibited ? He answers that as was the case with בגדי כהונה, the mitzvah of Succah was also not given to angels, but rather to humans who couldn't be expected to leave the Succah at the exact moment that it was no longer a mitzvah to sit in it. Yet, Tosafos (Yuma 69a) notes that a Kohen would not be permitted to put on בגדי כהונה in the first place, even in the Beis HaMikdash, if not planning to perform the Avodah. The analogy to angels would only apply where he was previously permitted to wear them. As such, one should also not be allowed to enter an open Succah during the rain, for the same reason.

A Lesson Can Be Learned From:

A man came to R' Chaim Soloveitchik in Brisk, complaining that his relative had died that morning, and yet the Gabbai of the Chevra Kadisha had give first burial rights to a rich man that had died later in the day. R' Chaim opened the Rambam to Hilchos Avel, looked through it and then announced: "I will reprimand the Gabbai but it is no concern of yours". The Rabbonim who were present were mystified. They had themselves looked through the Rambam and found nothing on this subject. And why was it no concern of the relative ? R' Chaim explained to them that precedence of one מת over another could be dictated either by the rule of: **אין מעבירין על המצוות**, or by some specific rule of **כבוד המת**. In looking through the Rambam, R' Chaim found no Halacha dealing with this, thereby eliminating the reason of **כבוד המת**. "As such, if it is only a matter of **אין מעבירין על המצוות**, the Gabbai did nothing to disgrace the relative's מת, and therefore owes him no apology. However, I, as the Rav must instruct the Gabbai in the proper **דין**".

P.S. All are invited to the Sternbergs on **חוצא"ה** for Simchas Bais