



	Candles	Mincha	DafYomi	Shiur	פרשת: פנחס	סזק"ש Shachris
Friday	8:07	6:45/7:45				9:21
Shabbos		8:02	7:00	7:55	9:00	9:21
Sunday		8:15	8:45		8:00	9:22

## IMPORTANCE OF ....

The *Gemara* (*Bava Basra* 122a) establishes from the *Posuk*: **בין רב למעט** that *Eretz Yisroel* was divided equally among the tribes, but that individuals within the tribes received portions of differing sizes. Those who received portions of lesser value would be compensated financially. What does "lesser value" mean? The *Gemara* concludes that property "closer" was worth more than property farther away. The *Rashbam* explains that this refers to Yerushalayim, and that those who accepted property further away from Yerushalayim were compensated for that. The *Chasam Sofer* (א"ח 29) asks the obvious question – at the time *Eretz Yisroel* was divided up, Yerushalayim belonged to Yevusi. Its designation would not come until mandated by prophecy in the days of Dovid. The *Mishkan* was then in Shiloh, where it would remain 330 years. The *Rashbam* should have explained that "close" and "far" referred to Shiloh. The *Shulchan Aruch* (א"ח 150:5) rules that the entrance to a Shul must be such that the *Tzibur's* backs are towards it when they *daven*. The *Magen Avrohom* (5) notes that if a Shul with the entrance on the wrong side is destroyed, it should be rebuilt correctly, even if the majority object, and if the seating will be disrupted, they should settle up among them. The *Chasam Sofer* explains that a person who owns a seat in Shul, has ownership rights even in the ground upon which his chair sits. However, where his seat had been in the area that should have been the entrance, he owns nothing. Those who must "settle up" refers to the fortunate few who are no longer sitting near the door, and whose seats have increased in value, for which they must now pay. The *Chasam Sofer* therefore concludes that the *Gemara* meant to require compensation based on proximity to Shiloh. However, even though Yerushalayim was not contemplated at that time, when it eventually did become the center, those who owned property in it and near it saw its value increase. As such, they now had to pay for this newly-established privilege.

## QUESTION OF THE WEEK:

May one study *Torah* to the tune of a non-Jewish song?

## ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:

(Why does a Chasan walk out before **רצה** so as not to prevent *Tachanun*?)

The *Terumas HaDeshen* (*Psakim* 80) rules that a *Chasan* walks out before **רצה**. R' Chaim Kanievski (דולה ומשקה p. 90) explains that this is so that the *Chasan* won't appear as if he is walking out for this reason, and the 3 final *berachos* are deemed as one.

## DIN'S CORNER:

One must try always to *daven* in a *Beis HaKnesses*, and a *Beis HaMidrash* where *Torah* is studied is recommended even more. The *Beis HaMidrash* where he himself has learned *Torah* takes on an additional precedence. A *Beis HaMidrash* includes the hallways and other chambers, even though they may not have the same *Kedushah*. (*Piskei Teshuvos* p. 688)

## DID YOU KNOW THAT ....

The *Mishna* (*Sanhedrin* 2a) states that *Bnei Yisroel* may not go out to fight a voluntary war unless confirmed by the *Sanhedrin* of 71. The *Mishna* (*ibid* 20b) states that a king may not go to a voluntary war without *Sanhedrin's* approval. The *Rambam* understands this to mean that a voluntary war can only be fought where both conditions – a king and *Sanhedrin* approval – are present. This raises the question of how many wars were fought when the reigning king over *Bnei Yisroel* was a *Rasha*, such as those listed in the *Mishna* (*Sanhedrin* 90a) who had lost their portion of *Olam HaBa*. Presumably, *Sanhedrin* did not confirm the anointing of such kings, did not acknowledge them, and would therefore not have authorized war. The *Gemara* (*Bava Kamma* 91b) forbids one to cause himself injury, and a clear directive from **מאד לנפשותיכם** obligates one to keep himself safe. How then were *Bnei Yisroel* permitted to go to unauthorized wars? The same question could be asked regarding anyone who places himself in danger without obligation, such as *Pinchas*, who endangered himself to fulfill **קנאים פוגעין בו**, which is voluntary. The *Divrei Yatziv* (ח"מ 81) suggests that although the rules do not permit one to endanger himself, even where he attempts to save someone else, a different rule applies where one is trying to save *Klal Yisroel*. For this reason, Esther was permitted to approach *Achashveirosh*, transgressing **גלוי עריות**, because she was saving *Klal Yisroel*. The *Noda BiYehuda* (י"ד 2:161) condoned a similar sacrifice by a married woman whose traveling group was threatened by a killer, where the *Heter* came from saving a group. The same rule should apply to idolatry, killing, and risking one's life, where saving the *Klal* would permit it. Therefore the *Posuk* praises *Pinchas* for having averted Hashem's vengeance – **ולא כליתי את ב"י בקנאתי** – *Pinchas* saved *Klal Yisroel*, and was thus permitted the risk, as were the armies of idolatrous kings. This may be why *Chazal* said: **פינחס זה אליהו** instead of: **אלהו זה פינחס** (*Pinchas* lived first). Since *Eliyahu* is the Halachic decisor of all outstanding (**תיקו**) questions, *Chazal* wished to establish that everything *Pinchas* did was Halachically correct, by linking him with *Eliyahu*.

## A Lesson Can Be Learned From:

A wealthy secular Jew died, but he left behind two sons who were *Talmidei Chachomim*. These sons approached the widow of a certain *Tzadik* who had died recently, and offered to pay off her many bills and loans if she would agree to allow their father to be buried next to her husband, the *Tzadik*. From the weight of her **חובות**, the widow and her family agreed to the deal. However, the *Rav* of the city was adamantly against it, arguing that *Chazal* clearly forbid a *Rasha* to be buried next to a *Tzadik*. The sons brought the question before the [author of the] *Machaneh Chaim*, who ruled to permit their father to be buried next to the *Tzadik*. The *Machaneh Chaim* explained that the *Mishna* (*Avos* 2:9) calls one who does not pay back his loans a *Rasha* - **למה רשע ולא ישלם**. One's death does not relieve him of his obligations. A man would prefer to be buried next to a *Rasha* rather than to be called a *Rasha* himself.

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

This issue is dedicated:

לז"נ פערל ב"ר יצחק הלוי ולז"נ אברהם ב"ר יעקב חיים

Dedications (\$18) and appreciations may be sent to: Kehilas Prozdor, 8 GreenHill Lane, Spring Valley, N.Y. 10977 (845) 354-7240  
As this contains *Divrei Torah* and partial *Pesukim*, it should be treated with proper respect, both during and after use