



	Candles	Mincha	DafYomi	Shiur	Shachris	ש"ס	מטות-מסעי
Friday	8:11	6:45/7:45					9:18
Shabbos		8:06	7:15	8:00	9:00		9:19
Sunday		8:25	9:00		8:00		9:19

IMPORTANCE OF

The Gemara (Sanhedrin 17a) states that if *Beis Din* unanimously finds someone guilty of murder, he is not to be executed, but rather set free, because under the doctrine of **הוצילו העדה**, every accused must always have someone looking for a **זכות** on his behalf. What if someone killed **בשוגג** ? If the entire *Beis Din* found him guilty **בשוגג** and wanted to send him to *Galus* would the requirement of **הוצילו העדה** demand that he be set free ? The *Torah* states that someone in *Galus* can only go free when the *Kohen Gadol* dies. As such, we may assume that all the murderers in *Galus* will be praying for the *Kohen Gadol*'s death. The *Gemara* (Makos 11b) says that the *Kohen Gadol* must accept this personal "responsibility", because he didn't pray (enough) to *Hashem* to prevent the murder(s), albeit unintentional, from occurring in the first place. If one was sentenced to *Galus* at a time when there was no *Kohen Gadol*, he could never go free. However, if the *Kohen Gadol* died before **גמר דיין** (the verdict), but a new *Kohen Gadol* was appointed immediately and was in place when *Beis Din* stated their verdict, then the **רוצח** would go free at the death of this new *Kohen Gadol*. The *Gemara* asks, how is this new *Kohen Gadol* in any way responsible for the murder, which occurred long before he took office ?! The *Gemara* answers that he should have prayed that the verdict be for acquittal. The *Aruch LaNer* asks, if the murderer is guilty, how could the *Kohen Gadol* be expected to pray that the *Beis Din* violate **לא תטה משפט** by making a mistake ? We must therefore conclude that the *Kohen Gadol* was expected to pray that the guilty decision of the *Beis Din* be **unanimous**, which, as shown earlier, would provide the murderer (**רוצח**) with an acquittal, without requiring *Beis Din* to make a mistake.

QUESTION OF THE WEEK:

When would one be obligated to eat something, but only if there was an amount of forbidden food in it ?

ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:

(When should one split *davening* between 2 places, *LeChatchila* ?)
The *Be'er Heiteiv* (אר"ח 90:11) cites the *Yad Eliyahu* (42) who says that if a group of people form a *Minyan* on *Shabbos* morning to daven **כותיקין**, they should go to *Shul* later for *Musaf* (if it's not too much later) to fulfill **ברוב עם הדרת מלך**.

DIN'S CORNER:

Those who listen to the *Kiddush* of another on *Shabbos* day and intend to be **יוצא** with it should not speak until after the *Kiddush*-sayer finishes the *brocho* and tastes even a small amount of the wine (**בדיעבד**). The same rule would apply to *Havdalah*. However, with regard to *Kiddush* on Friday night, one must wait additional time until the *Kiddush*-sayer has swallowed **מלוא לוגממו** (**cheekful**), which is the obligatory amount **לכתחילה** in every case, but is **מעכב** only Friday night. (*Teshuvos V'Hanhagos* 4:70)

DID YOU KNOW THAT

The *Gemara* (*Sotah* 43a) seeks to prove that the *Bnei Yisroel* carried the *Aron HaKodesh* into war with them, from the *Posuk*: **וכלי הקודש** ... **וישלח אותם משה** ... **ואת פינחס** ... **וכלי הקודש** means the *Aron*. However, the *Midrash Yalkut* (785) quotes R' *Yochanan* who defines **וכלי הקודש** as the *Urim V'Tumim*. The *Maaseh Rokeach* explains that the *Nachalas Binyomin* (*mitzvah* 111) writes that on *Shabbos* it was not permitted to utilize the *Urim V'Tumim*, since, as the *Gemara* (*Yuma* 73b) states (in *Reish Lakish's* name), the letters of the *Urim V'Tumim* - **מצטרפות** - would join together to form the response, which could constitute writing. However, R' *Yochanan* held that the letters were **בולטות** - protruded, and the *Kohen* would then jumble the letters in his own mind to form the words. As such, its use should be permitted on *Shabbos*, and therefore the *Bnei Yisroel* took it into battle instead of the *Aron*. The *Gemara* (*Shabbos* 104b) states that if on *Shabbos*, one wrote a single letter in *Tiveria* and another in *Tzipori*, he has transgressed the *Issur* against writing (a minimum of 2 letters), even though the letters are not together, and would have to be joined. The *Har Tzvi* (*Tal Harim - Koseiv* 4) derives from here that just as the lack of joining does not detract from the completed act of writing, so too, if one were to only join together two previously completed letters (such as in *Scrabble*), that would not be an act of writing and he should not transgress. If however, one joined together two previously written half-letters, such an act would very well be considered writing. Similarly, separating letters in a word from each other would also not constitute erasing, though breaking up a letter would. A *Shul* acquired a *Paroches* which consisted of two curtains hanging side by side, with the *Posuk* of **לנגדי תמיד** 'ד **שויתי** printed across them. The name of *Hashem* was written out and placed as four letters in the middle, 2 on each curtain. As the *Paroches* would be opened, the 2 curtains would be pulled to opposite sides, thus "destroying" the formation of *Hashem's* name. Upon closing, the name would form once again. Was it permitted to do so, even on a weekday ? The *Ateres Paz* (י"ד 13) sees no problem, opining that if opening such a *Paroches* does not constitute erasing on *Shabbos*, it would also not constitute erasing of *Hashem's* name. Still, having such a *Paroches* would seem to be at odds with *Minhag Yisroel*.

A Lesson Can Be Learned From:

R' *Moshe Mordechai Shulsinger* shlit'a once informed R' *Yechezkel Abramsky* zt"l that the *Amshinover Rebbe* had fallen so ill that he had been sent to the hospital and was receiving blood transfusions. *Rav Abramsky* commented, "Every time that I recite *Bircas HaMazon*, when I ask *Hashem* not to make me need **בשר ודם**, I have in mind the medical "donations" of organs and blood transfusions, praying that I never need them." R' *Shulsinger* pointed out that this did not seem to be the simple meaning of the words. R' *Abramsky* replied that when one davens, he is free to develop any *Kavanah* that he wishes to apply to the words, in addition to their simple meaning. "This is what I have added".

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