



	Candles	Mincha	DafYomi	Shiur	Shachris	פרשת קרח: סזק"ש
Friday	8:13	6:50/7:45				9:16
Shabbos		8:10	6:45	7:40	9:00	9:17
Sunday		8:25	8:00		8:00	9:17

IMPORTANCE OF ...

The *Gemara* (*Eruvin* 64a) states in Shmuel's name that if a non-Jew is unwilling to rent out his rights in an area to permit an *Eruv*, nevertheless, a valid *Eruv* is possible if a Jew who works for him contributes to the *Eruv* in his stead. When Rav Nachman heard this ruling, he declared: "How excellent is this statement !" When Rav Nachman heard another ruling of Shmuel, that one should not decide *Halacha* after drinking a *רביעית* (3.5 oz.) of wine, he stated: "This statement is not excellent", as Rav Nachman found that a *רביעית* of wine helped to clear his head. Rava questioned Rav Nachman's comments in light of Rav Acha's remark that saying one Rabbinic statement is pleasant while another is not, diminishes the honor of the *Torah*. Rav Nachman then expressed regret for his comments. The *MaHarsha* notes that Rav Acha's remark applies even where one only praised a statement of *Chazal*, without criticizing another one. Saying that one is excellent implies that others are not. The *ShaLoH* seems to concur, warning those who sell *Aliyos* not to say things like: "*Aseres HaDibros* is a *פרשה נאה* (beautiful section)", as this implies that others are not. However, the *RaShaSh* points out many instances where statements of *Chazal* are criticized, and even *Chazal* themselves are criticized for saying them. He concludes therefore that Rav Acha's remark does not apply where a critic disagrees with the statement *להלכה*, as is his right. It does however apply, where, as here, Rav Nachman agreed that the *Halacha* was as Shmuel said, yet he still expressed displeasure with it. *Yabia Omer* (י"ד 2:16) adds that even the *MaHarsha* would permit an occasional statement of appreciation where it does not refer to *Halacha* but rather to *Drush*. This may answer (the *Taz's* question of) how *Rashi* could say about *Parshas Korach*: *פרשה זו יפה נדרשת*.

DID YOU KNOW THAT

The *Radvaz* (3:627) states that one may not place himself in life-threatening danger, even to save another. One who does so is deemed a *חסיד שוטה* (fool). The *Sefer Chasidim* (674) notes that if a very heavy person is drowning, one should not simply jump in to save him if the chances are good that they will both perish. How then may a doctor treat patients whose illnesses are contagious ? A landlord once wished to back out of a lease upon discovering that the prospective tenant's wife was ill with a contagious disease. The *Rema* (*Teshuva* 19) ruled that he could not, noting that in the *mitzvah* of *Bikur Cholim*, we find no distinction between diseases that are and aren't allegedly contagious, with the exception of *Baalei Raasan* (see *Kesubos* 77b), where flies and the wind spread the affliction. Yet, the *Rema* himself rules (י"ד 116:5) that one should flee a city hit by an epidemic. The *Tzitz Eliezer* (9:17) resolves this, distinguishing between one person's disease, where the surrounding atmosphere has not been befouled, and an epidemic where it has. He brings proof from R' Akiva Eiger (י"ד 116:5) who cites *Rabbeinu Bachya* on the words: *הבדלו מתוך העדה*. Why was it necessary to separate from Korach and his company ? Cannot *Hashem* cause a group to die, yet save one from among them ? He answers that separation is necessary for 2 reasons: 1) To escape an epidemic's foul atmosphere; and 2) As a caution against the *מדת הדני* which when set loose, may have difficulty distinguishing between *Tzadik* and *Rasha*. Thus, where the air is heavy with disease, the *Rema* would agree that one must stay away and not endanger oneself, as the *Radvaz* had ruled (unless of strong character and motivation, who will be protected by the *mitzvah*). Where, however, one is dealing with a single patient, if one is careful to avoid obvious contamination, he need not fear the alleged contagion.

QUESTION OF THE WEEK:

When might one not be permitted to study *Musar Sefarim* ?

ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:

(Where may one profit from a *Chilul Shabbos* but his animal may not ?)
The *Rema* (א"ח 325:10) rules that if a non-Jew brought water from a well through the *Reshus HaRabim* on *Shabbos* for a Jew, the Jew may drink it since he could have gone himself to the well. However, animals would not have been able to get water from the well themselves. They may therefore not drink it.

DIN'S CORNER:

It is forbidden (even for a *Rebbi*) to strike someone with a *Sefer* just as it is certainly forbidden to deflect a blow using a *Sefer* (unless the blows are life-threatening). One may not bang on a *Sefer*, and this includes even the *Shamash* banging for quiet or for *ביאה ויבא* etc... (י"ד - בית לחם יהודה) :282

A Lesson Can Be Learned From:

The wife of R' Yisroel Salanter once bought a lottery ticket. When R' Yisroel found out about it, he was very upset at the prospect of winning such a great deal of money. He summoned two men to his house and in his wife's presence he announced that he would have nothing to do with his wife's possessions or what they might produce, forever. Later, his wife asked him what would be so terrible if they had some money. He replied that when *Hashem* gives someone wealth, it is not for him alone. He is being given the responsibility to distribute it to the needy. "Who can bear such a responsibility ? Can I seek out and identify every person who needs help ? What if I miss one poor person or overlook someone who is sick ? Would I want to be responsible for having failed to provide even one child with a *Melamed* ?! I do not wish to be put to the test." His wife merely observed: "If you are not fit for such a purpose, then no one is."

P.S. *Sholosh Seudos* sponsored this week by the Tyberg family.

This issue is dedicated:

לד"ר פערל ב"ר יצחק הלוי