



	Candles	Mincha	DafYomi	Shiur	Shachris	סזק"ש
Friday	7:41	6:50/7:51				9:20
Shabbos		7:36	6:30	7:15	9:00	9:20
Sunday		8:03	7:30		7:30	9:19

### IMPORTANCE OF ....

The Gemara (Yuma 9b) quotes R' Yochanan who said that the fingernail (an insignificant body part) of those who lived during the first *Beis HaMikdash* was superior to the entire abdomen of the generation of those who lived during the second *Beis HaMikdash*. Resh Lakish objected, citing the fact that the later generation was able to occupy itself with *Torah* study despite the fact that it was under the dominion of foreign rulers, whereas those who lived during the first *Beis HaMikdash* had it "easier". R' Yochanan replied that the presence of the *Beis HaMikdash* itself resolves the question. Those who lived during the first *Beis HaMikdash* merited that after 70 years, a second one was built for them. Those living towards the end of the second *Beis HaMikdash* did not, and we too have not yet reached such a level. The *Meromei Sadeh* asks why R' Yochanan could not prove it from the fact that the גאולה came to the survivors of the first *Churban*, but not the second. He answers that one cannot bring proof from גאולה because Hashem constantly watches to make sure that if *Bnei Yisroel* begin to sink, He would redeem them immediately. However, since after the *Churban* of the 2<sup>nd</sup> *Beis HaMikdash* they continued to engage in *Torah*, there was no immediate rush to the גאולה. Therefore, the proof must come from rebuilding the second *Beis HaMikdash*, for which there was no reason other than Hashem's finding those *Bnei Yisroel* worthy. Based on this, the *Tzitz Eliezer* (10:12) states: At the beginning of בחקתי, after all the initial *berachos* of rain, threshing, peace, military power, abundance of food etc.. are promised, the *Torah* adds: ונתתי משכני בתוכם ולא תגל נפשי אתכם, implying that the only clear proof that Hashem will not hate us (ולא תגל) comes from His placement of the *Beis HaMikdash* (ונתתי משכני), and cannot be proved from the other *berachos*.

### QUESTION OF THE WEEK:

When would the order of the first 6 *Aliyos* be as follows: *Kohen, Levi, Yisroel, Kohen, Levi, Yisroel* ?

### ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:

(Could an accidental eating of *Basar B'Chalav* be used to determine טעם ?) The *Bais Yitzchok* (129) holds that if one ate something unaware that it was *Basar B'Cholov*, he can't be asked afterwards if he tasted them both because לא רמיא - it hadn't occurred to him to concentrate while eating. R' Akiva Eiger (*YD* 98:1) says only a *Goy's* טעם can't be relied on, but concludes צ"ע לדינא.

### DIN'S CORNER:

If one is sick on *Shabbos* (but not life-threatening) he should go to a doctor who is *Shomer Shabbos*, to minimize *Chilul Shabbos*. If one cannot, or a non-*Shomer Shabbos* is the expert, he should visit the non-*Shomer Shabbos* doctor, knowing full well that it will probably cause *Chilul Shabbos*. (שמירת שבת כהלכתו 1:40:8)

### DID YOU KNOW THAT ....

The *Chinuch* (344) states that the לא תעבוד עבד לאו forbids one to work an *Eved Ivri* in the humbling way that an *Eved Canaani* may be worked. However, the *Rambam* (עבדים 7:1) describes the sort of tasks one may not impose upon an *Eved Ivri*, concluding that you may not burden the *Eved Ivri* with them only because he already feels subservient (שפל). You may however, impose such tasks upon a free Jew, who decides to work for you by his own choice. As such, the לאו of לא תעבוד בו is not directed exclusively at an *Eved Ivri*, but at any Jew who is compelled to work. It is only because an *Eved* is usually so compelled that the לאו is stated regarding him. The *Ohel Yehoshua* finds this distinction significant in the *Mishna* (*Gittin* 41a) which states that if a gentile *Eved* is half-freed (by one of two owners), *Beis Hillel* says he works עבודת עבד one day for his remaining owner and one day for himself, alternately. However, on the day that he works for the owner, would not his freed half (the Jewish half) be compelled to do *Eved-work*, which under this לאו is not permitted? If the לאו only applies to an *Eved Ivri*, it would not apply here because the remaining servant half in this case is an *Eved Canaani*, not an *Eved Ivri*. But if the לאו applies to all Jews compelled to work, this *Eved's* Jewish half should exempt him from עבודת עבד. Although eventually the *Mishna* concludes that the only practical solution is to force the remaining owner to free his half, this was only because the *Eved* could not marry in his situation. However, לעתיד לבא where this should not be an issue, עבודת עבד might not be permitted here.

### A Lesson Can Be Learned From:

Two years after the *Netziv* invited his son, R' Chaim Berlin to move from Moscow to Volozhin and teach in the Volozhin Yeshiva, the *Netziv* was forced to close the Yeshiva in order to avoid the secular demands of the Russian government. R' Chaim assumed the position of Rav in the city of Kobrin for the next three years, and from there he accepted the same post in a small Russian city called Yelizavetgrad. His friends and colleagues could not understand why R' Chaim was prepared to move to such a city, which had very few Jews who could appreciate the greatness of R' Chaim's *Torah* knowledge. In fact, the whole picture of *Yiddishkeit* in Yelizavetgrad was very bleak. Why 'waste' himself there? R' Chaim overheard these comments and remarked that they were correct. "If you view *Rabonus* as a vehicle for the עולם הזה reward, then I should definitely stay in a city such as Volozhin or Brisk, give a *Shiur* and generally associate with *Talmidei Chachomim* and *Shomrei Mitzvos*. However, if *Rabonus* is a vehicle for reward in the עולם הבא, then it would be more worthwhile to bring about the closing of one store on *Shabbos*, influencing one butcher to stop selling *Traife* meat or guiding a child towards a life of *Torah*. Such activities will generate much more *S'char* than one could achieve in a city of *Torah* and *mitzvos*."

**P.S.** המקום ירחם Aryeh Schmerhold upon the *Petirah* of his father ע"ה. Sholosh Seudos sponsored this week by the Fuerst family.