



	Candles	Mincha	DafYomi	Shiur	פרשת: שופטים סזק"ש Shachris
Friday	7:29	7:00/7:45			9:35
Shabbos		7:30	6:30	7:20	9:00 9:36
Sunday		7:40	7:15		8:00 9:36

IMPORTANCE OF

The *Gemara* (*Sanhedrin* 21b) states that a Jewish king must write two *Sifrei Torah*; one to be placed among his valuables and the other to be with him at all times. The latter, according to the *Gemara*, is to be written in the form of an amulet and hung on his arm to be worn at all times. The *Rambam* (3:1 מלכים) rules that two *Sifrei Torah* are required but does not mention the *Din* of one being an amulet or hung around the king's arm. The *Gemara* (*Shabbos* 30b) describes the events surrounding the *Shabbos* death of Dovid HaMelech, and how Shlomo HaMelech was instructed by the *Chachomim* to place a *Kikar* (loaf of bread) or child (*i.e.* items that were not *Muktzeh*) on Dovid's body, which permitted his transport on *Shabbos*. The *Shulchan Aruch* (אר"ח 311:4) cites an opinion (from the *Mordechai* 3:43) that only requires such a strategy when the dead body is unclothed, since its clothes, also not being *Muktzeh*, could permit a transfer as well. As such, the *TaZ* raises the obvious question of why Dovid could not have been transported on the basis of his clothing. Even if a king's clothing cannot be worn by a non-king, they would still not be *Muktzeh*, because Shlomo could wear them. The *Tosafos Shabbos* answers this, based on the ruling of the *Shulchan Aruch* (אר"ח 364) that one who falls from a roof and dies should be buried in his clothing, which definitely absorbed some of his blood. As such, one may assume that Dovid, who tripped and fell, bled into his clothing, making them unusable and thus, *Muktzeh*. However, wasn't Dovid wearing the amulet-*Sefer Torah*? That should have been sufficient to transport his body on *Shabbos*! From here we see, the Rogatchover Gaon (צפת פנה) derives, that the story of the *Gemara* in *Shabbos* disagrees with the amulet theory of the *Gemara* in *Sanhedrin*, and the *Rambam* rules according to the *Gemara* in *Shabbos*.

QUESTION OF THE WEEK:

When there is *Krias HaTorah* on a Sunday, and upon returning the *Sefer Torah* to the *Aron* one says לדוד מומר, can he be יוצא the *Shir Shel Yom* (for Sundays) with that as well?

ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:

(When would one recite a *brocho* before saying *Tehilim*?)

The *Mishna* in *Maseches Sofrim* (14:4) states that one who reads from *Kesuvim* (except for the 5 *Megilos*) should recite a *brocho* אקב"ו לקרות בכתבי הקודש. This would only apply where one reads from a *Klaf* (parchment) written *k'Halacha* (see *Nachalas Yaakov*).

DIN'S CORNER:

One is permitted to walk (but not quickly) over grass on *Shabbos*, despite the possibility that he might uproot blades of the grass by doing so. However, one who is eating over grass must be careful not to drip any enriching liquid onto the grass as this would constitute זורע and possibly חורש. (MB 336:25-26)

DID YOU KNOW THAT

The *Rema* (י"ד 291:2) states (quoting the *MaHaril*) that if a non-Jewish tenant asks his Jewish landlord for a *Mezuzah* to affix on his doorpost, it is forbidden to give it to him. However, if to refuse him would cause *Eivah* (ill will) or be harmful to the Jew, he may give it to him. The *Rema* (ibid 148:12) states that although the *Mishna* (*Avodah Zara* 2a) forbids commerce with idolaters on and near their festivals, today, where necessary to avoid *Eivah*, the restriction is lifted. But here, the *Rema* did not explain *Eivah* with the words: "harmful to the Jew". *Igros Moshe* (י"ד 1:184) suggests that *Eivah* can mean two things: 1) Such ill will that the non-Jew will want to take revenge against the Jew; or 2) where the Jew did not do anything that warrants revenge, but the non-Jew develops feelings of hatred. *Rashi* comments on the *Posuk*: וְכִי יִהְיֶה אִישׁ שֶׁנֶּאֱמַר לְרַעוּהוּ .. וְאָרַב .. וְהִכְהוּ .. וּמָת that as a result of hatred (and transgressing לֹא תִשְׂנֵא) one ends up committing murder. How much more so is this true with regard to idolaters, who are suspected of murder even without any specific, associated hatred. As such, both forms of *Eivah* end up with the same result. The difference would be that only the first form justifies transgressing a *Torah Issur*. The second form of *Eivah*, although potentially threatening, does nothing more than add another danger to an already dangerous world. As the *Gemara* (*Shabbos* 121b) states, Rav Huna saw a man killing a bee one *Shabbos*, and remarked to him "Have you killed all the bees?", meaning, although they're dangerous, killing only one does very little and should be avoided, unless it is chasing you. This form of *Eivah* only permits a *Rabbinic Issur*. The *Issur* against giving a non-Jew a *Mezuzah* must be *D'Rabanan*, since his interest in its *Shemirah* implies that he will treat it with proper respect. As such, if the non-Jew threatens to move out, leaving the apartment vacant unless given a *Mezuzah*, one must gauge the *Eivah*. If he intends to rent instead from a non-Jew, where he will certainly have no *Mezuzah*, his leaving indicates the second form of *Eivah*, permitting the Jew to grant his request. However, if he plans to rent from another Jew who will give him a *Mezuzah*, his leaving is not due to *Eivah*, and granting his request to keep him is *Assur*.

A Lesson Can Be Learned From:

A woman in Bnei Brak suffered from certain complications following the birth of her eleventh child, and as her condition was serious, many of her family's neighbors and relatives were busy saying *Tehilim* for her recovery. A 12-year old boy told the Rav that he was positive she would recover. When asked why he said that, the boy related that he had just taken his *Bechinah* (test) in applying for *Yeshiva* and had done very well. Beforehand, he had made a "deal" with Hashem, asking that the decision on his application, expected to be immediate, should nevertheless be delayed, and the *Yisurim* (pains) that he would suffer as a result should be for the woman's benefit. As "requested", his acceptance was inexplicably delayed 3 days, during which time the woman recovered.

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