Vol 22 # 13

PLEASANT RIDGE NEWSLETTER

בס"ד

9:20

תשע"ב



A Kehilas Prozdor Publication

(c) 1990-2012 Rabbi Leibie Sternberg

 Candles
 Mincha
 DafYomi

 Friday
 8:10
 6:45/8:20
 7:15

 Shabbos
 1:45/8:05
 7:15

 Sunday
 8:20
 8:45

פרשת: פינחס סזק"ש Shiur Shachris 9:19 7:55 9:00 9:19

8:00

IMPORTANCE OF

The Gemara (Sanhedrin 29a) states that we do not offer arguments or excuses on behalf of a מסית (one who incites others to idolatry) to save him from a death sentence. This is derived from the serpent in Gan Eden, for whom no excuse was offered, though it could have argued: דברי הרב ודברי התלמיד דברי מי שומעין - essentially an excuse by the inciter that the one incited should not have listened to the incitement. Tosafos asks: if so, can't every *Maisis* use that excuse ? *Tosafos* answers that the serpent was never commanded not to incite, as Jews have been. Since he was not under an obligation to refrain, he would have been able to discharge himself by arguing דברי הרב. Similarly, the Minchas Chinuch (462) opines that if a non-Jew incites one to idolatry, he is not liable, because the Torah only obligated Jews in this prohibition. However, The Yad Chanoch (61) points out that the Bnei Yisroel were told to attack and destroy Midyan because of what they did to Bnei Yisroel – בנכליהם אשר נכלו לכם על דבר פעור which clearly defines their liability for having incited Bnei Yisroel to idolatry. This must be because, as Tosafos said, Midyan never presented the דברי הרב excuse. Had they done so, it is possible that Bnei Yisroel would not have been commanded to destroy them. However, does not the act of inciting to idolatry fall under the rubric of Avodah Zarah, which is obviously one of the 7 Noachide mitzvos? The RaN (Avodah Zarah 59a) holds that Yayin Nesech that has been pledged to Avodah Zarah is forbidden to gentiles as well, since they are also obligated in the prohibition against Avodah Zarah. If that is part of the Avodah Zarah prohibition, shouldn't incitement to idol worship also be included in Avodah Zarah? The Turei Even (Chagigah 13a) states that although there may be many facets to the Avodah Zarah prohibition, there is no death sentence except for actual worship. Thus, for incitement alone, a gentile would not be liable for death, as a Jew would, but Midyan was slated for destruction because of the damage they perpetrated on *Bnei Yisroel*, as the *Posuk* continues:...יעל דבר כזבי...

QUESTION OF THE WEEK:

What brocho may be said after המוציא but before eating bread ?

ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:

(When does one sit Shiva for a non-relative, non-נשיא, non-ת"ח?)

DIN'S CORNER:

If a non-observant Jew is driving on *Shabbos* and stops to ask directions, one may not assist him with information even though to do so may shorten his trip and will certainly preclude his need to stop again and ask for more directions. One should not even bother to admonish him that he should not be driving on *Shabbos*. Instead, one should remain silent and ignore him. (ציץ אלעאר) 15:18)

DID YOU KNOW THAT

(Monsey/Spring Valley Z'manim)

Targum Yonasan comments on the words: קרבני לחמי that Kohanim may eat Lechem HaPanim, but not the Korban Tomid. The Korban Shmuel (או"ח) notes that it is clear from elsewhere that a Korban Olah may not be eaten at all, and wonders why it was necessary to say so, and introduce Lechem HaPanim into a Posuk that is not relevant. The Gemara (Bava Kamma 60b) states that Dovid HaMelech wished to ask the Sanhedrin if it was permitted to save oneself using someone else's money. [Dovid wanted to burn down Jewish haystacks in which the Pelishti soldiers were hiding] The Sanhedrin replied - no. Tosafos and the Rosh hold that Pikuach Nefesh certainly permits one to save oneself using another's money. They understand Dovid's question to be whether a saved person in such a case is exempt from having to pay for the damage, to which the Sanhedrin replied no. However, *Rashi* understands that Dovid's question was more basic - may one save oneself, even in a situation of Pikuach *Nefesh*, with another's money, to which the *Sanhedrin* said – no. Yet, the Gemara (Menachos 95b) describes how a starving Dovid held he was permitted to eat the Lechem HaPanim in Nov, after it was removed from the Shulchan. If, according to Rashi, one may not use another's money, even for Pikuach Nefesh, may one use money of Hekdesh!? The Mishna (Avos 5:5) states that one of the continuous miracles occurring in the Beis HaMikdash was that a woman never miscarried from the smell of the [roasting] Hekdesh meat. Rashi explains that this refers to a pregnant woman's yearning for the Korban meat that she had smelled, but we do not permit her to eat it. Is this not a matter of Pikuach Nefesh? Does not the Gemara (Yoma 82a) in fact specifically permit Hekdesh meat to a pregnant woman? The Binyan Tzion (1:167) suggests that according to Rashi, the Hekdesh permitted to a pregnant woman is limited to that which a Kohen receives from the Korban. As it belongs to a Kohen, in Pikuach Nefesh situations, the Kohen would be sure to give her some to eat. The miracle was that even where the Kohen was unaware of her yearning and did not give her any, she would still not miscarry. The Hekdesh not permitted to her would be that which "belongs" to the Mizbeyach, which Rashi holds one may not use to save oneself. This may be behind the words of the Targum Yonasan, permitting [a Kohen's] Lechem HaPanim but not Hekdesh, in Pikuach Nefesh situations.

A Lesson Can Be Learned From:

The author of Mekor Chaim would say that earlier generations had an abundance of Talmidei Chachomim, but not so many published Seforim. Today, it is the opposite. The reason is that printers used to be only in the big cities. An author would travel thru many towns and villages to get there, showing his Chidushim to the Rav of each town on the way, making corrections and printing it only if the Sefer were still publishable. Today, there are printers everywhere, and an author can publish a Sefer in his hometown without showing it to anyone to test its quality.

P.S. Sholosh Seudos sponsored by the Sternberg family.