

KOVETZ

HEOROS
HATMIMIM
V'ANASH

ספרי

MELBOURNE

ISSUE 20



ROSH CHODESH KISLEV

5774

KOVETZ

HEOROS

HATMIMIM

V'ANASH

~ Melbourne ~

•

20

ROSH CHODESH KISLEV, 5774



PUBLISHED BY THE STUDENTS OF THE RABBINICAL COLLEGE
OF
AUSTRALIA & NEW ZEALAND

•

A project of
The Talmidim Hashluchim

Hatomim Mordechai Rubin
Hatomim Menachem Mendel Shpitzer

67 Alexandra st. East St. Kilda
Victoria 3183 Australia
YGHeoros@gmail.com

CONTENT

D'VAR MALCHUS

Yud Tes Kislev9

Gemarah

Tosfos: התם דלאו עיקר שבת הוא חיובי תני פטורי לא פטורי13

Hatomim Moshe Tuvya Amzalak

Talmid in Yeshiva Gedolah

Chumash

Efron's Understanding of the Maaras HaMachpeila16

Hatomim Shlomo Stark

Talmid in Yeshiva Gedolah

Halacha

Canvas Sukkah18

Rabbi Daniel Gould

Kollel Menachem, Brisbane

D'VAR MALCHUS

Yud Tes Kislev

The Parallel Between Yud-Tes Kislev and Circumcision

Among the concepts which my revered father-in-law, the Rebbe, shared with regard to Yud-Tes Kislev is the following: "Yud Kislev marks the birth of a chassid, and Yud-Tes Kislev is the bris (circumcision)."

The connection between Yud-Tes Kislev and a bris can be understood based on the concept that the mitzvah of circumcision contains three dimensions:

1) the actual act of circumcision -- cutting the foreskin; 2) the fact that as a result, a person remains circumcised; 3) that he is no longer uncircumcised.

As explained, the realization of only two of these dimensions is not enough; the halachah requires that all three be completed. These three dimensions have parallels in our Divine service. "Being circumcised" refers to our efforts to "do good," revealing and expressing the good which every Jew possesses. "Not being uncircumcised" refers to "turning away from evil,"³ not being under the authority of "the uncircumcised one," i.e., the yetzer hora. And both these dimensions must come through effort -- as alluded to by the act of circumcision itself.

These concepts enable us to appreciate the statement of my revered father-in-law, the Rebbe, that "Yud-Tes Kislev is the bris." Yud-Tes Kislev is the time when the teachings of Chassidus emerged victorious and were "redeemed in peace." It is the Rosh HaShanah of Chassidus. And thus, each of the three dimensions of the mitzvah of circumcision reflects a fundamental thrust in the teachings of Chabad Chassidus.

Chabad Chassidus mandates that all the good which a Jew achieves be accomplished through toil. No one should be satisfied with good that comes effortlessly. To cite a well-known story: A chassid once came to the Tzemach Tzedek and asked him to bless his grandson with a good memory. He asked that the child "remember everything he sees and hears from the Rebbe and the chassidim, so that without effort he will be G-d-fearing."

The Tzemach Tzedek answered him: "For 50 years, my grandfather (the Alter Rebbe) and my father-in-law (the Mittlerer Rebbe) have worked so that Chassidim will come to the fear of G-d through painstaking toil, and not merely achieve fear of G-d effortlessly."

This is the fundamental difference between Chabad Chassidus and the Chassidic approaches prevalent in Poland. Chabad holds that it is not enough to rely on the Divine service of the tzaddik, expecting his service to elevate his followers. Instead, everyone should -- and must -- toil in his Divine service with strenuous physical and spiritual effort, as it is written: "Man is born to toil." This parallels the act of circumcision.

Chassidus requires that Yiddishkeit and Torah be spread everywhere, and that efforts be made on behalf of our fellow Jews. As the Rebbe Rashab stated: "A chassid is one who commits himself to seek out his colleague's welfare." This is the parallel to being circumcised in our Divine service.

Frequently, circumcision is associated with the heart, the seat of our emotions. Our hearts should be circumcised, i.e., they should be permeated by good. The good each of us possess will then be revealed, and we will show concern for the welfare of all Jews.

One of the objectives of Chassidus is the altering of the natural thrust of our emotions. As the Alter Rebbe stated "The entire motive of Chassidus is to change the nature of one's emotional qualities." This rising above one's natural, inborn tendencies is the parallel to not being uncircumcised.

An Inner Bond

Another fundamental concept associated with circumcision² is that the holiness of the soul -- the connection a Jew shares with G-d -- enters the body and is internalized through this mitzvah. Therefore the Alter Rebbe rules that the mitzvah of circumcision marks "the entry [i.e., an internalized connection] of the holy soul" into the body of a Jewish child. For this reason, from circumcision onward, a child is assured a portion in the World to Come.

This is also one of the fundamental dimensions of the Chabad approach; Chabad requires an inner bond. The three dimensions of Divine service alluded to by the mitzvah of circumcision must not be observed in a merely superficial manner, empowered by our potential of faith, but instead must be internalized. First, they must permeate the intellectual powers -- chochmah, binah, and daas -- of the G-dly soul and ultimately, they must permeate the intellectual powers of the animal soul, and even our brains, the physical organ associated with thought. This reflects the entry of the soul of holiness into the physical body, and the subsequent inner bond.

First Stages

The bris is only the beginning of the connection between the G-dly soul and material existence. Nevertheless, based on our Sages' statement, "All beginnings are difficult," it is possible to explain that the soul's first entry into the body confers additional power, and affords an advantage[338] not present in the more developed stages of the soul's entry that accompany a child's education in Torah and mitzvos. Indeed, it surpasses even the complete entry of the soul that takes place at the time of a child's Bar Mitzvah.

May it be G-d's will that the days preceding Yud-Tes Kislev, which represent birth and the preparation for the bris, serve to prepare us to study Chassidus and follow the paths of Chassidus, and to do this with happiness and gladness of heart.

(Adapted from a letter from Yud-Beis Kislev and Sichos Yud-Tes Kislev, 5722)

GEMARAH

***Tosfos:* התם דלאו עיקר שבת הוא חיובי תני פטורי לא פטורי**

Hatomim Moshe Tuvya Amzalak
Talmid in Yeshiva Gedolah

Rav Pappa explained why here the mishna states '2 that they are 4 (for the one standing inside) and 2 that they are 4 (for the one standing outside)', whilst the mishna in shavous merely states 'two that they are four). The reason for this discrepancy as explained in the gemoro, is that since here it is ikur shabbos so the mishna included cases of chiyuvei and ufturei, however in shavous where there isnt any particular focus on shabbos, the tana only taught cases of chiyuvei, and not the pturei. Our Tosfos has some difficulty with the latter part of this distinction (regarding hasom dlav ikur shabbos) and qualifies the gemoro's answer.

Tosfos explains: It was not necessary for Rav Pappa to state that the reason he does not mention pturei in shavous is only because there it is not עיקר שבת; but rather Rav Pappa could have said that the Mishna in shevuos does not include Pturei because the Tana states the cases in a manner that they are all similar to Marois Ngoim where we taught לחיובא כולהו. However the reason פפא states that התם דלאו עיקר שבת כו' is because it was necessary to answer that since here (our mishna in shabbos) is

עיקר שבת, therefore the Tanna concluded that there in shavous, since it is not עיקר שבת he mentions only חיובי.

Tosfos takes his assertion one step further: Even the מקשה did not ask that the Mishna in shavous like in shabbos, should also teach 'ב שיהן ד בפנים וב שיהן ד בחוץ' since he knew דומיא דמראות נגעים קתני. But rather the gemoras intital question was that in our mishna it should only state 'ב שיהן ד' & no more- thus no addition of 'ובחוץ ובפנים' which would accumulate to 8 cases.

Upon learning Tosfos, it is evident that the Maharshal does not maintain, that there is a connection between these 2 significant points of Tosfos, and thus it is a printing error. Yet as chassidus explains "everything occurs for a reason (hashgocho protis)", and therefore there must indeed be a reason for why the printer formatted tosfos with these ideas under the same ד"ה.

Through analysing tosfos there are perhaps a few ways to explain this connection.

One possible way of looking at this connection: In the first section of tosfos, the baal tosfos is conveying how the gemoro is focused on our mishna/ gemoro in shabbos, and not that in shavous. Despite the possibility of saying 'דומיא דמראות נגעים' in which there are 4 חיובים and thus we didnt teach 'דיני פטור', the gemoro insisted to say that the reason we didnt teach to say that the reason we didnt teach 'דיני פטור' by shavous is beacsue 'לא עיקר שבת הוא', showing a major and primary focus on the ideas and notions in specific regards to shabbos (our masechta). The baal tosfos in accordance to his shita, further consolidates his belief that the gemoro at this point is focusing on our mishna, as the מקשה's initial question, 'teach only 4 cases of חיובים and no more', is only

applicable to our mishna, as by shavous we indeed do teach 4 cases of ח'יובי and no more.

Perhaps another connection is:

Tosfos's words קמסיים נמי דלאו עיקר שבת הוא suggest that the gemoro could've indeed said דומיא דמראות נגעים but didnt due to the fact that we said in regards to our mishna, that we are dealing with עיקר שבת, and therefore to attain parallelism in the sentence we say that shavous is לאו עיקר שבת הוא. Yet this arouses: if the whole reason we said that shavous is לאו עיקר שבת הוא was because we had taught that our mishna is עיקר שבת הוא, then seemingly we can ask, from where and how does Tosfos know that our mishna in shabbos is any more of a focus than the quoted mishna from shavous? Perhaps shavous is indeed the focus, and the gemoro here is not asking on our mishna but rather the mishna in shavous; therefore we should actually say in regards to shavous that התם דומיא דמראות נגעים, and it is because of this that we taught only four cases of ח'יובים in shavous?

Therefore, tosfos in his further assertion comes to prove that our mishna is indeed the focus. Tosfos proves this by explaining that the gemoro at this stage is undoubtedly highlighting questions in regard to our mishna, as the question 'teach only 4 cases and no more' is not applicable to the mishna in shavous (where we do only indeed teach four) but only applicable to our mishna!

Perhaps these two answers present a possible explanation for the connection between the two seemingly unrelated ideas of tosfos.



CHUMASH

Efron's Understanding of the Maaras HaMachpeila

Hatomim Shlomo Stark

Talmid in Yeshiva Gedolah

In פ' ח"י שרה it relates the story of Avraham asking the people of חת to purchase the cave of Machpeliah from a man named Efron for 400 shekel, in order to bury his wife Sarah who had passed away just before. In Perek 27 (Pasuk 9) it says: "To give me (avraham) his (efron) cave of machpelia which is at the end of the field, let him (efron) give it to me (avraham) for its full price as a burial plot in your land". Pasuk 16 reads: "Avraham listened to efron avraham weighed to efron the silver that he had mentioned in the presence of the people of חת: 044 shekel of silver in standard currency".

Why did Efron sell the cave and the surrounding field for the base price of 400 shekel if it was worth so much more to Avraham? As we see from Pasuk 9 that he chose Efrons field in specific and even more so Adam and Chava (created by Hashem Himself) were buried there. Yet at the start he wanted to give to avraham for free?!

Based on a Sicha we can answer the above. In Likutie Sichos (Chalek 5 page 106) the Rebbe says that we must say that Efron did not know the preciousness of the cave and the field (Adam and Chava were buried there) especially to Avraham. For if Efron had

known the significance that the field and all that was on it to Avraham he would never sold it for 400 shekel. How much more so for free! This can explain why Efron sold the field for 400 shekel. The Rebbe notes (note 8) that this that he did not know is from Zohar page 227 side 2, but not only is it ע"פ קבלה but also implied from the simple Peshat of the Pasuk.

It is interesting to note that the Torah never explicitly tells us of the burying of Adam & Chava. Perhaps according to the opinion earlier in the Parsha that Rashi brings that the meaning of Maaras HaMachpeilah is Pairs that were buried there, it may be understood that they were buried there. However, according to the opinion that it was a *Bais V'Aliya* – 2 levelled cave, it isn't so clear that people would know of Adam & Chava's burial spot.

Although it would seem that all people would know of this famous place, yet we find in the Midrash, that angels told Avraham of the speciality of the place and that Adam & Chava & the other future Tzadikim that would be buried there. This Midrash seems to imply that the uniqueness of the place wasn't common knowledge, even to Avraham.



HALACHA

Canvas Sukkas

Rabbi Daniel Gould

Kollel Menachem, Brisbane

The beginning of the discussion of the validity of sukkah walls made from canvas or any other light weight material begins in the Mishnah : סוכה כד :

“If one makes his sukkah among the trees with the trees as walls for it, it is kosher”.

The Gemora there begins its discussion by quoting a ruling from Rav Acha bar Yaakov: *“any wall that cannot withstand a common wind is not a wall...”*¹

As this Gemorah is brought down in Halacha we find both in *the Tur*² and *Shulchan Aruch* תרל-י.

¹ : סוכה כד The Gemora then asks what about our Mishnah that states: if one made a sukkah among the trees with the trees as walls it is kosher. Won't the trees sway backwards and forwards? And the Gemora answers, we are dealing with the strong stumps of the trees. Which leads us to the next question but what about the branches? and the Gemora goes on to answer that it is talking about when it was made weaving with palm and bay tree branches, as Rashi explains, in order to make it into a wall that won't move in the wind.

² תרל-י “if one made a sukkah among the trees, with the trees as walls, it is kosher. And this is when the branches are tied so that they should not shake in the wind, as any wall that isn't able to stand in the face of a common wind is not a wall. And Rebbenu Peretz rights there for it isn't right to make all

“If one makes a sukkah amongst the trees with the trees as walls, if they are strong or tied and reinforced so that a common wind would not be able to shake them constantly, and you fill the spaces between them with hay and straw in order that the wind shouldn’t shake the – it is kosher. Therefore it is not correct to make all the walls with sheets of linen, without poles³, even if tied down well, as sometimes they will untie without notice, and you will be left without walls that are able to stand in a common wind. And if one wants to make walls with sheets, it would be good to erect walls of poles less than three tefachim between each”

The Magen Avraham⁴ brought in the Mishnah Brurah⁵ adds that even if the sukkah is in a place where there is no such wind, or even in the middle of one’s house, where there is no such worry, a wall made in such a way, that a common wind would cause it to shake is nonetheless invalid.

From all the above we find two issues that need to be defined in order that a sukkah without a solid wall would be valid. 1) Is the moving of the walls, what is implicit in Shulchan Aruch, the Magen Avram and Mishnah Brurah that any movement of the wall would invalidate its kashrus. 2) Even if the wall were secured in such a way where it wouldn’t move, Shulchan Aruch nonetheless says not to use such walls as they may come untied.

the walls from sheets of linen without poles even if tied well. As sometimes they will snap without notice and you will no longer have walls able to stand a common wind. So if one wants to make walls from sheets it is good to erect a wall of poles less than 3 tefachim between each”

3 The concept of erecting poles less than three tefachim between each pole, will create a valid wall according to all opinions as any gap less than 3 tefachim is considered as part of the wall and one will have a full wall as a result - שריע חרלט -

⁴ ס'ק טז

⁵ ס'ק מז

How much is the wall allowed to move?

Piski Teshuvos⁶ quotes the Chozzen Ish's novel opinion that wall is kosher so long as it moves only less than three tefachim which is based on the following reasoning:

The wording of '*invalid*' used in *Shulchan Aruch* implies that the wall would have to move in a way that it would be considered *invalid* according to Halacha, for example if the wall would be distanced from the schach vertically more than three tefachim or elevated above the ground more than three tefachim⁷ then the sukkah is *invalid* even at the time when the wall is not moving⁸. However if it moves a bit, (less than three tefachim 29-30cm⁹) this is not considered *invalid* at all. So based on the opinion of the Chozon Ish which the Piskei Teshuvos seems to hold like, is that any wall that moves less than three tefachim is a valid wall.

Rav Ovadya Yosef¹⁰ however holds that one should not make a sukkah out of sheets and one who does is sitting in an invalid sukkah, is missing out of the mitzvah of sitting in a Sukkah and is making a brocho in vain. He goes on to argue the validity of the

⁶ פסקי תשובות תרל – ט

⁷ Similar to the law regarding the poles mentioned above that any gap less than three tefachim is not considered as a gap so as long as the schach is within three tefachim from the edge of the schach or the ground it is kosher.

⁸ The Chazon Ish as quoted in the footnote in Pskei Teshuvos, that if the sukkah is found in a place where it is surrounded by walls where the wind can't shake it, it would be kosher regardless, but as mentioned above the Mishnah Brurah holds a surrounding wall would not help.

⁹ שייעורין של תורה עמ' סד

¹⁰ יחזה דעת ח'ג סי'מו

Chozon Ish's statement regarding that the Achronim left the shiur undefined, as you see in Rashi, The Ritv'a, Rambam, Shulchan Aruch it is implicit that any wall that moves even slightly is invalid... and even if you want to say we don't have a clear proof to negate the words of the Chozon Ish, if the measurement for these walls was three tefachim it would not have been refrained from being defined, and that itself is why the great Achronim didn't define it (see Shdi Chemed Kllali Poskim 27:29 how this kllal is defined). And further it is still a safek, and safek torah we are stringent with.

Moadim vZmanim¹¹ suggests that even if they move a bit they are kosher since we find mention of these walls being used¹² implies that they do have a kosher status, and since these walls by nature, even if tied down well, move, it must be that, their movement is considered kosher. So as long as the walls don't move more than is usual for them when tied down, they would be kosher. And the worry of Shulchan Aruch for when they become untied is when moving more than this amount.

How can one secure these walls?

The Moadim vZmanim¹³ concludes that perhaps those who want to use these sheets today understood the Shulchan Aruch statement as referring to a case that was only tied above, in which case you will find they can come undone, but if tied down well above, below and on the sides you don't need to worry, therefore

¹¹ מועדים וזמנים ח' א סוף פד

¹² פסיקתא פ' אמור

¹³ מועדים וזמנים ח' א סוף פד

one need not protest. Nonetheless one should be stringent not to use them since it is explicit in Shulchan Aruch not to use sheets at all lest they come untied, and there is no room to be lenient.

Mishnah Halochos¹⁴ suggest that the case of Rebbenu Pertez¹⁵ brought in Shulchan Aruch, that one shouldn't tie these walls lest they come undone and move, was talking about a case where they were not tied with a full frame like our sukkah's nowadays further when they are secured by pegs there is no worry of them becoming untied and Rebbenu Peretz only refers to a case where they were tied with a knot. Therefore if the sheets of the sukkah are secured with pegs and a full frame they are kosher.

Rav Moishe Feinstein writes¹⁶ that the din that if a wall will be moved by a wind at all is unique to the laws of sukkah, and while a wall that would move in the wind might be kosher for shabbos if tied down to the ground properly, for a Sukkah it would be problematic, just like other difference you find by the walls of a sukkah that don't exist by the laws of Shabbos. And this difference stems from the unique principle you find by Sukkah, 'Yeshiva b'Sukkah' dwelling in the Sukkah, which requires that the dwelling be like a person's residence which would consist of complete and full (and therefore unwavering) walls. He does finish though that this is not completely clear by him, and it could be that if the walls move a little bit in the middle it would be kosher and therefore needs further investigation, so as result one should be stringent. He

¹⁴ משנה הלכות ח"ה סיף עז

¹⁵ See footnote 2 in the words of the Tur

¹⁶ אגרות משה סימן מ אות ב

then goes on to quote the opinion of the Chozon Ish and note that he didn't make this distinction between Sukkos and Shabbos and when concluding, he states according to this if it sways a little it is not a problem, and even if it move's less than three tefachim, when not tied it would be kosher from the outset. However it would still have to be tied below regardless because a wall that is constantly swaying (less than three tefachim) is something that you will not find in any home, and since, like mentioned above, that the sukkah has to be like a person's residence. However in his concluding paragraph he says that one should still not tie these canvases and use them as walls, and those who want to claim that the Shulchan Aruch's worry of these canvas untying and moving is only thin sheets but today's thick canvas's would not pose such a worry. This does not seem reliable, especially since even the latest of the Achronim didn't mention such a distinction, and the custom here in America (where this is being written from) to buy canvas sukkas is not according to the instruction I have written.

In summary

A person wanting to use a sukkah made with canvas or other similar materials should follow the advice given in Shulchan Aruch, and make a 10 tefachim wall from poles or ropes within 3 tefachim of each other, and this will make such a sukkah kosher according to all opinions.

One should also note that even in a closed off area or where there is no wind. It is problematic according to most Poskim including the Magen Avraham brought in the Mishnah Brurah, though the Chozen Ish and others hold that it would be ok.

In between all this discussion we find an interesting paradox in Halacha. A sukkah needs to be a **עראי** temporary dwelling, and not a **קבע** permanent dwelling. However this temporary dwelling

needs to be made קבע permanent which is through us performing the mitzvah of dwelling in the Sukkah. We find the same paradox in the world. The existence of the world is something that is temporary. On one hand it has no real existence of itself, just the word of Hashem invested in it. But on the other hand it is specifically here that Hashem wants a dwelling place, and just like a person in his own home, there you find him comfortable enough to reveal his true self completely. So too, we are we required to make this world, a dwelling place for Hashem, where his true existence is felt and nothing is more permanent and fixed than that.

And this is achieved specifically through recognizing the physicality of the world as a temporal being and not something fixed and in that corporeality you have to make that temporal object, lifestyle, desire, something permanent through using it in ones service of Hashem. In other words in addition to ones spiritual services of Hashem, torah and tefilah, one must also bring his avoida in the physical dealings of one's life themselves, eating drinking with a blessing before and after and with the intention of serving Hashem, and likewise throughout the rest of a person's day, kol masicha yeu leshm shamaim, and bchol darcheicha deyhu through this we will reach the ultimate goal of making a dir bitchatonim for Hashem and all the yidden with tishvu bsukkah achas, tekif umyad mamish¹⁷.



¹⁷ Based on a farbrengen of The Lubavitcher Rebbe 18th of Tishrei Chol haMoed Sukkos 5713

מוקדש

לכ"ק אדמו"ר נשיא דורנו

יה"ר שיראה הרבה נחת מבניו – התמימים בפרט
משלוחיו, חסידיו, וכלל ישראל בכלל
ומזכה להגאולה האמיתית והשלימה
תיכף ומיד ממש

מוקדש ע"י ולזכות

התלמידים השלוחים

מנחם מענדל שי' גורארי'
מנחם מענדל שי' שפיצר
מנחם מענדל שי' שוחאט
מנחם מענדל שי' ראסקין
מרדכי שי' רובין
ניסן אייזק שי' הלל
משה שי' לרמן
ישראל לייב שי' לעסטר
יוסף יצחק שי' קאסל
מנחם מענדל שי' הרץ
יוסף חיים ברוך הכהן שי' טייטלבוים

לזכות התלמידים השלוחים שיחיו

**ALSTON
& BIRD** LLP

Attorneys at Law

Atlanta • Brussels • Charlotte • Dallas

Los Angeles • New York • Research Triangle

Silicon Valley • Ventura County

Washington, D.C.

www.alston.com

LEIB M. LERNER

Partner

333 South Hope Street
Sixteenth Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071

213-576-1000

Direct: 213-576-1193

Fax: 213-576-1100

Email: leib.lerner@alston.com

נדפס ע"י ולזכות
הרה"ח הרה"ת
ליב מרדכי לערנער
וזוגתו אסתר עליזה שיחיו

ובניהם

**מנחם מענדל, חי' מושקא,
אפרים פנחס והינדא שיחיו**

ויה"ר שימלא השי"ת כל משאלות לבם בכל המצטרך,
בגשמיות וברוחניות,
כרצו"ק ולנח"ר כ"ק אדמו"ר נשיא דורנו

לע"נ

מרת נעכא רייצא

בת חיים זרח ע"ה

פרנקל

נפטרה ג' כסלו ה'תשס"ט

ת.נ.צ.ב.ה.

ע"י ולזכות

כל יוצאי חלציה ממשפחת פרנקל יבלחט"א

להצלחה רבה ומופלגה בכל עניניהם בגו"ר



לזכות

הילדה **שיינא שרה** שתחי

לרגל הולדתה בשעתומ"צ

מוצש"ק חיי שרה, כ"ג מרחשון ה'תשע"ד

ולזכות אחיה אהרן בצלאל שיחי

*

נדפס ע"י הורי'

הרה"ת שמואל אשר וזוגתו מרת חנה שיחיו

וויסמאן



לזכות ולרפו"ש קרובה בב"א

למרת **בינה** בת **שרה רבקה** שתחי

לע"נ

מרת בילה

בת ירוחם משה ע"ה שפיצער

נפטרה כ' תשרי ה'תשע"ד

ת.ג.צ.ב.ה.

ע"י ולזכות

כל יוצאי חלציה ממשפחת שפיצער יבלחט"א
להצלחה רבה ומופלגה בכל עניניהם בגו"ר



לזכות

הבחור הת' נחמן יהושע שי'

קסטל

לרגל יום ההולדת י"ט מר - חשון

ויה"ר שימלא השי"ת כל משאלות לבו בכל המצטרך,

בגשמיות וברוחניות,

כרצו"ק ולנח"ר כ"ק אדמו"ר נשיא דורנו

*

נדפס ע"י אחיו

הת' אהרן מנחם מענדל שי' קסטל