



Friday	5:31	5:43	8:15	5:10	9:00	9:19
Shabbos	5:31	5:45	4:45	9:00	9:18	
Sunday	5:45	6:10		7:30	9:17	

IMPORTANCE OF ...

The Gemara (Sanhedrin 20b) states that the Bnei Yisroel were commanded to perform three mitzvos upon entering Eretz Yisroel: 1) Appointing a king; 2) Eradicating Amalek; and 3) Building the Beis Hamikdash. R' Yosi concluded that appointing a king took precedence to destroying Amalek, as indicated in the Posuk which places **כי יד על כס קה** (referring to Hashem's throne - kingship) before **מלחמה לד' בעמלק**. The Rambam brings an additional proof from the sequence of Shmuel's instructions to Shaul, where Shmuel says: "Hashem sent me to anoint you - go smite Amalek". When Shaul returned, having spared Agag and the animals (against Hashem's will), Shaul replied to Shmuel's chastisement: "כי יראתי את העם" – for I feared the nation. The Gemara (Yuma 22b) elaborates on Shaul's humanitarian arguments against destroying Amalek, and the Oneg Yom Tov (הקדמה) explains that Shaul intended to relinquish his kingship. The Gemara (Horios 10b) derives from **מצוות ד' אלוקוי ... אשר נשיא** that a king may fear no human - only **ד' אלוקוי**. The Yerushalmi notes that while Dovid Hamelech was fleeing from Avshalom, he would bring a regular *Korban* - not a king's one, since his fear rendered him un-kingly during that time. As such, Shaul's reply to Shmuel - I feared the nation, was an attempt to relinquish his royal status, admitting to fear of humans. That being the case, Amalek could not be totally destroyed, since only when Bnei Yisroel had a king could that be accomplished. A Bas Kol rang out in response to Shaul's humanitarian arguments: "אל תצדק הרבה" - do not be overly righteous.

DID YOU KNOW THAT ...

The Gemara (Sotah 33b) describes how until the Bnei Yisroel crossed the Yarden river, the Aron HaKodesh had been carried on the shoulders of the family members of Kehas. Upon reaching the Yarden, Yehoshua told the Kohanim to take over. The Rambam (Sefer HaMitzvos 34) explains that although the original command (בכתף ישאר) had been given to the Leviim, it was really intended for the Kohanim who then became the exclusive bearers of the Aron, always upon their shoulders. However, the Posuk (שמואל 1:6:15) states that when the Aron returned after being captured by the Pelishtim, it was the Leviim who took it off the wagon and carried it. According to the Rambam, shouldn't it have been the Kohanim? The Daas Zekainim (Tosafos) comments that the carrying poles (בדים) were not to be removed from the Aron because the purpose and sanctity of the Aron was specifically to house the Luchos, as is derived from **ואל הארון תתן את העדות**, and no other utilization was to be made of it. Rashi (שמואל 1:4:12) explains that when the Aron was captured by the Pelishtim, Shaul, a young man from Binyomin, grabbed the Luchos from Golias and ran away with them. As such, the Aron, upon its return, did not have the Luchos in it. Since the sanctity of the Aron depended on the Luchos, without them, even the Rambam would allow Leviim to carry it. However, at the same time, the Gemara (Sotah 35a) says that the people of Beit Shemesh were punished for continuing to work and ignoring the Aron upon its return. Why did they do so? It may have been a mistaken belief that without the Luchos, there was no requirement of **כבוד** towards the Aron.

QUESTION OF THE WEEK:

If one discovers on or after Purim that the regular Sefer Torah in use has been Posul, must he immediately read Parshas Zachor from another Sefer Torah?

ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:

(May/must one fulfill Bikur Cholim for someone with a contagious illness?) The Teshuvos HaRema (20) states that one need not fear injury from performing the mitzvah of Bikur Cholim where the illness is contagious, except for Baalei Raasan – a particularly dangerous brain disease described in Kesubos 77b.

DIN'S CORNER:

When one hears the שהחיינו over the Megilah, one is to have in mind that the brocho should also apply to the other mitzvos of the day - Mishloach Manos and the Seudah. The Baal Koray should have that in mind when saying the brocho as well (MB 692:1). Similarly, if one intends to be יוצא the mitzvah of זכור with the Kriah of **כי תצא**, not only must he have כונה at the time, he must inform the Baal Koray that this is his intention, so the Baal Koray can have him in mind when reading it. (6 מקראי קודש)

A Lesson Can Be Learned From:

R' Rafael HaKohen Kook, Rav of the city of Tiberias, came to visit the Brisker Rav after a long absence, and he asked if he could say the brocho of SheHechianu, as the Halacha states one should do when one hasn't seen his friend in 30 days. The Brisker Rav replied in the negative. R' Rafael asked: "Does not the Shulchan Aruch (אורח 225:3) state that if one sees a new fruit each year he recites SheHechianu, even if he sees it on a tree or in his friend's hand? And doesn't the Mishna Berurah add that the brocho was established to mark the joy in one's heart upon seeing a new fruit? If so, when one sees a friend and rejoices at the sight, why should he not say SheHechianu?" The Brisker Rav replied: "The difference is as follows: With regard to seeing a new fruit, Chazal established that one experiences joy, and as such, the brocho must be said. However, regarding one who sees his friend after a 30 day absence, the Shulchan Aruch (ibid 225:1) states that one says SheHechianu only if the friend is dear to him and he rejoices to see him. Who among us is capable of measuring whether the standard of 'rejoices to see him' is ever truly fulfilled? Until then, it is better not to say the brocho".

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