



	Candles	Mincha	DafYomi	Shiur	Shachris	ש"ס זק"ש
Friday	8:15	6:50/7:45				9:12
Shabbos		8:10	7:15	7:50	9:00	9:12
Sunday		8:29	8:00		7:30	9:12

**IMPORTANCE OF ....**

The *Yerushalmi* (*Bava Metzia* 8) describes how Alexander the Great managed to visit a far-off land, beyond the hills of darkness. While there, the local king sent him a loaf of bread, made entirely of gold. Acting insulted, Alexander sent a message: "Do I need your money ?", to which the king replied: "You must. Is there no food where you come from, that you need to come here !" Alexander then insisted that he had come to see how the king ruled in judicial cases. One day, an argument came before the king, in which a buyer of property discovered a treasure buried in the ground. Since he had not paid for such a treasure when buying the property, he wanted to give the treasure to the seller. The seller maintained that he had sold the property together with whatever was in it, and that the treasure should go to the buyer. The king ruled that since one of them had a son and the other a daughter, the two should marry and the treasure be given to them. Alexander could not hide his surprise. The king asked what he would have done, and Alexander replied: I would have killed both sides and kept the treasure for myself. The king asked: Does the sun shine where you live ? Does it rain ? When Alexander answered yes, the king concluded that such gifts from *Hashem* could not be coming in the *Zechus* of people who act as Alexander says he would act. "Therefore, it must be in the merit of your animals that you have the sun and rain." *Binyan Ariel* derives from here that *Hashem* is willing to spare sinful mankind in the merit of animals, but not if to do so would require a miracle. Miracles can only come in the merit of man. Therefore, *Bnei Yisroel* complained to *Hashem* for His having brought them to the *Midbar*: למות שם אנו ובעירנו. With their own lives in danger, why worry over animals ? However, since in the *Midbar* a miracle was required to keep them alive, why, they asked, did *Hashem* bring us here, where the merit of animals can't help us ?!

**QUESTION OF THE WEEK:**

Is one *Krias HaTorah* if he misses a *Posuk* or *Pesukim* ?

**ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:**

(Where would an approved, appropriate *Baal Tefilah* be denied the *Amud* ?)

The *Mishna Berurah* (53:62) states that an appropriate *Baal Tefilah*, approved by the majority of the *Tzibur* may not be sent if an idolater attempts to influence his selection, because we should not accept appointment of a *Baal Tefilah* through an idolater.

**DIN'S CORNER:**

If a *Minyan* has exactly 10 men, and one wishes to leave because he feels he can't keep up with them and he wants to *daven* with another *Minyan* that goes slower, he may not leave but must continue to *daven* with the faster *Minyan*, at his own pace, even if it means he may *daven* **ביחידות**. (*Teshuvos V'Hanhagos* 2:62)

**DID YOU KNOW THAT ....**

The *Shulchan Aruch* (יר"ד 123:1) rules that one may not have **הנאה** from non-Jewish wine, in order to prevent the use of wine that was designated for idolatry. The *Rema* comments that today, it is very uncommon for wine to be consecrated to idolatry, and as such, one may have **הנאה** from non-Jewish wine, but may not drink it. Thus it is permitted to receive such wine in the collection of a debt, and although one should not deal with such wine commercially, if one purchased such wine he may sell it. The same conditions apply to Jewish wine that was touched by a non-Jew. The *Beis Yosef* asks, was there not a Rabbinic decree forbidding non-Jewish wine to prevent intermarriage, based on the unfortunate events at the end of *Parshas Balak* where Jewish men were corrupted with wine ? What need was there for this decree if it was already forbidden ? The *Plotzker Rav* in **יין ישמה** suggests that without the intermarriage decree, non-idolatrous gentile wine might have been permitted, even for drinking. The reason is the low risk of confusion between idolatrous (**יין נסך**) and non-idolatrous (**יין סתם**) wines. Since everyone knows the seriousness of idolatry, there would have been no need to enact a preventive measure against **יין סתם**. However, do we not have a general rule with regard to decrees that even if the original reason is no longer applicable, the decree itself remains ? How could the *Rema* allow leniency today just because idolatry has become uncommon ? It is possible that the *Rema* is referring to the wine of **ישמעאלים** (Moslems) who were never idolatrous. Since they were never included in the decree against **יין נסך**, their wine was only forbidden as **יין סתם** in the first place. As long as **יין נסך** was a real fear, their wine remained **אסור** like everyone else's. However, when **יין נסך** became uncommon, other nations retained their **איסור** but **ישמעאל**'s was downgraded to drinking.

**A Lesson Can Be Learned From:**

Rabbi Chaim of Sanz once asked one of his Chasidim who was himself the Rav of a city, why he hadn't been getting involved in the financial affairs of a certain resident in his city, who had fallen on hard times. The Rav/Chasid answered that truthfully, he had no idea that the man was in such financial difficulty. R' Chaim replied: We know from Bilaam's words to the angel: **חטאתי כי לא ידעתי**, where he tried to explain that he didn't know that the angel was standing there. If ignorance was an acceptable excuse, why wasn't it accepted from Bilaam ? It must be that ignorance, especially where one should have known better, is itself an **עבירה**. As such, since a Rav has a responsibility to know what is going on in his Kehilla and since he has such a unique position, he must make it his business to seek out those in trouble or need, and help alleviate their suffering.

**P.S.** Sholosh Seudos is sponsored this week by the Schmerhold family. Mazel Tov to all graduating High School seniors and honorees, including Rivkie Sternberg, Valedictorian at Machon Yaakov L'Banos.