Vol 29 # 37

PLEASANT RIDGE NEWSLETTER

בס"ז

תשע"ט



A Kehilas Prozdor Publication

c) 1990-2018 Rabbi Leibie Sternberg	(Monsey/Spring Valley Z'manim)			פרשת: שמות	
http://www.prozdor.com	Candles	Mincha	Daf Yomi	Shachris	סזק"ש
Friday	4:17	4:27			9:39
Shabbo	os 1	:45/4:17	3:30	9:00	9:40
Sunday	,	4:27	4:50	8:00	9:40

IMPORTANCE OF

The Gemara (Bava Kamma 113b) seeks to prove the law of Dina DiMalchusa Dina from the fact that the government cuts down private trees (without compensation) and builds bridges with them. Rava says that since Jews are permitted to use those bridges in spite of the fact that they were built with "stolen" trees, this proves that the confiscation was legal, because of Dina D'Malchusa. If so, would all the "confiscations" of Jewish wealth committed by Nazi Germany ימש"ר be similarly legalized by the fact that it was a government that enacted the laws permitting it? The Beis Yosef (מר"מ) 369) cites the opinion of Rabbeinu Tam who states that Dina DiMalchusa only applies when the government evenly applies its laws to everyone, and not just a select group or community. As such, the theft of millions of Jewish assets by the Nazis could not be legalized by Dina DiMalchusa. If so, how may Jews benefit today from the fruits of those stolen assets, in the form of reparations, or even by buying German goods? Does not the German money come from those stolen assets? The Poskim concur that even the Jews who survived had relinquished hope of retrieving any of their confiscated wealth, and performed יאוש. If anything, the survivors have a claim against Germany, but no claim to any specific money that it has. The *Peninim Yekarim* cites the Shev Shmaatsa's insight on: כי לא כנשים המצריות, where Pharaoh had complained to Shifra and Puah that Dina DiMalchusa demands that they obey his order. They replied that his Gezerah was not evenly applied, since it did not affect Egyptian women - only the Jewish women. At which point, Pharaoh modified it, announcing לכל עמו – to his whole nation, כל הבן הילוד היאורה תשליכהו, applying it to everyone – both Jew and Egyptian.

QUESTION OF THE WEEK:

Which *Shabbos* preparatory activity should a man give priority to on *Erev Shabbos*?

ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:

(When is there an imperative to visit a non-Jewish cemetery ?)

The *Rema* (559:10) states that one should go directly from the *Beis HaKnesses* to the cemetery on *Tisha B'Av*, and (*MB*) if there is no Jewish cemetery, he should go to a non-Jewish one, to indicate how we consider ourselves to be like the "dead".

DIN'S CORNER:

If three people have completed a meal and have begun to bentsch with Zimun, if another person who did not eat or drink with them suddenly shows up, he must also join in with their Zimun as it would not be proper to remain silent while others are praising Hashem in his presence. However, since he did not eat with them, he cannot say the words: ברוך שאכלנו משלו ברוך שאכלנו משלו ברוך שאכלנו משלו ברוך שאכלנו משלו ברוך שובורך שמו תמיד לעולם ועד. Instead, when the leader says: ברוך ומבורך שמו תמיד לעולם ועד. If there were ten men present already responding to the Zimun, then the newcomer must say: ברוך אלוקנו ומבורך שמו תמיד לעולם ועד. (MB 195)

DID YOU KNOW THAT

The Gemara (Kesubos 15a) derives from the Posuk: וארב לו וקם the rule that כל קבוע כמחצה על anything in its established fixed position does not become בטל ברוב (nullified by the majority), but is deemed equivalent to the majority. For example, if a wall collapses on someone from a group of 9 gentiles and 1 Jew, we do not say that it was probably a gentile, but rather, since the group has assembled in a fixed place, we consider it to be 50-50 gentiles and Jews, and as such, we may be Mechalel Shabbos to dig him out. The Gemara (Berachos 28a) describes how an Ammonite Ger asked if he could marry a Jewess. R' Gamliel said No, based on the Posuk: לא יבוא עמוני; R' Yehoshua said Yes, since Sancheriv had mixed up all the nations and Ammon was no longer (קבוע) in its own land. As such, this Ger's lineage is Botel B'Rov and he is no longer deemed an Ammonite. Had Ammon remained in their land, he/they would have been קבוע (fixed) and not subject to Bitul. The Midrash (VaYikra 4:6) states that a gentile argued with R' Yehoshua b. Karcha that Jews and their religion should be Botel B'Rov vis-a-vis the rest of the world. R' Yehoshua asked him if he had children, and he replied that he did, and they caused him much difficulty at every meal, when each son would thank his own god, and they would end up fighting with each other over their different deities. R' Yehoshua told him that before attempting to dictate religion to the Jews using a ,rtc. the world population would have to create uniformity among themselves. As a Remez, we find Eisav with only six family members, referred to in the Posuk as: נפשות, כל נפשות ביתו = plural) whereas Yaakov's 70 family members are called by the Posuk: נפש) יוצאי ירך יעקב שבעים נפש = singular, one soul). The Bris Shalom says that Yaakov and his sons could have remained had they stayed put in Eretz Yisroel (i.e. Canaan) and thus been immune to the world's רוב. Still, even in Egypt, without being קבוע, their Achdus and loyalty to Hashem would always keep them from being Botel to the rest of the world who could not establish such uniformity.

A Lesson Can Be Learned From:

A Rabbi once visited the home of a recent newcomer to his community and noticed a knicknack in the form of a glass square with a voice-ear piece imbedded inside it. The Rabbi asked his host if he was in the communications business, and the young man replied that he wasn't, but that there was a story behind that piece. "I was raised observant, but I slowly convinced myself that many things were 'not necessary', I was also not content to keep my opinions to myself, but got into discussions with anyone I could find, arguing with much conviction. Very often, someone would say to me - What if you're wrong? I paid no attention, believing firmly that I was right. One day I got sick, and no doctor could diagnose my illness. As I weakened, one doctor proposed a radical and dangerous treatment, trying to convince me that I should agree to it. Almost by itself, the words: 'What if you're wrong?' spilled out of my mouth. When I realized what I had just said, my life was jolted, and I quickly came back to observance. I made this piece as a reminder that sometimes, one does well to listen to one's own true, inner voice.

P.S. Shalosh Seudos sponsored this week by the Sternberg family.

This issue is dedicated: