



	Candles	Mincha	DafYomi	Shiur	Shachris	פרשיות: פקודי-שקלים	זק"ש
Friday	5:32	5:42	8:45				9:17
Shabbos		5:32	5:00		9:00		9:16
Sunday		5:42	6:00		8:00		9:16

IMPORTANCE OF

The Gemara (Makos 11a) states that because killers in Galus go free when the Kohen Gadol dies, it is expected that those killers will pray for his death. Why is the Kohen Gadol subjected to such curses ? The Gemara answers, it is because they should have prayed (harder) that (accidental) killings not take place. The Gemara (Pesachim 59b) derives from: **ואכלו אותם אשר כפר בהם** that [when] the Kohanim eat [the Korban], the owners achieve *Kaparah*. The *Alshich* notes that this is because the Kohen [Gadol] is partially responsible for the sin which required that a *Korban Chatas* be brought, i.e., he should have davened better that the sin not occur. Therefore, the Kohen must participate in the *Korban*, which is implied by: **בעלים מתכפרים** – the *Korban* has 2 “owners” – the sinner and the Kohen. *Rashi* comments on the words: **ויביאו את המשכן אל משה** that the *Mishkan* was too heavy for *Bnei Yisroel* to assemble so they brought it to Moshe, who hadn’t participated in its construction. Moshe said he could not assemble it himself so Hashem told him to pretend to assemble it, and it would build itself. Why hadn’t Moshe participated ? The *Magid Mishna* suggests it was because the *Mishkan* was intended to atone for something *Bnei Yisroel* had done, that Moshe was not involved in. However, when it came to assembling it, *Bnei Yisroel* were incapable, because of the rule: **אין קטיגור נעשה טיגור** – the accuser cannot become the defender, i.e., the act of assembly would be a reminder of their having “assembled” the *Eigel* as well. Therefore, it was brought to Moshe for assembly. However, Moshe believed that he was partially responsible for the *Eigel* by not coming down earlier or notifying *Bnei Yisroel* of his imminent arrival, thus allowing the mistake which resulted in the *Eigel*. As such, Moshe too felt that he could not assemble the *Mishkan* so Hashem told him to merely pretend to assemble it, and in reality it would assemble itself.

QUESTION OF THE WEEK:

Which three *mitzvos* require that one sit when performing them ?

ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:

(Where should a Kohen interact with a non-Jew even to become **טמא** ?)
The *Rambam* (הל' אבל 3:14) states that among the *mitzvah* activities that a Kohen is encouraged to participate in, even if it makes him **טמא מדרבנן** as a result are: jumping over (occupied) funeral caskets in order to see a gentile king, and disputing a non-Jew’s claim to ownership, because it is deemed **מציל מידם**.

DIN'S CORNER:

A lender may not demand repayment of a loan if he knows that the borrower does not have the money. The lender may not even appear within the borrower’s line of vision at such a time. The borrower is also obligated to pay on demand if he has the funds, and may not push the lender off. The borrower may also not put the loan at risk by frivolous spending, jeopardizing his ability to repay. If a borrower is known to do this, a lender may refuse to lend him, and avoid the prohibition on demanding. (*Kitzur* 179).

DID YOU KNOW THAT

The *Rambam* (*Shekalim* 1:1) writes that everyone must donate a half-Shekel each year, even a pauper who lives on *Tzedaka* must beg, borrow or sell his clothes to fulfill this *mitzvah*. The *Biur Halachah* (657: **אפילו**) points out from the *Gemara* (*Kidushin* 29a) that *Pidyan HaBen* requires 5 *Selaim*, even if one has no money. Is there not a rule which says that one should/need not spend more than 20% of his assets on any *mitzvah* ? What should one do if he only has 5 *Selaim* ? The *Chazon Ish* (י"ד 187) answers that the case of *Pidyan HaBen* is rightly characterized as a debt owed to the Kohen. The 20% rule does not apply to a debt. However, he asks the same question regarding the *Machatzis HaShekel*. Why must a pauper with no money borrow or sell garments to pay for this donation ? The nature of the *Machatzis HaShekel* obligation is considered in the *Minchas Chinuch* (105). Is it also a debt, which would avoid the 20% limitation, or is the *mitzvah* the act of giving ? It seems from the *Rambam* that the *mitzvah* is to give rather than to owe, since the *Rambam* rules (*ibid*) that one must donate the *Machatzis HaShekel* all at once, rather than paying it off slowly (the *Ramban* disagrees). If so, should not the 20% limitation apply ? The *Biur Halacha* raises the argument that *Chanukah* candles and *Arba Kosos* on *Pesach* also require one to borrow or sell one’s garments, but only because they involve *Pirsumei Nisa*. However he rejects this, pointing out that *Shabbos* candles also have the same requirement, without *Pirsumei Nisa*. The *Yekar Tiferes* suggests that the 20% limitation only applies to *mitzvos* that originated as obligations on the individual (e.g. *Tefillin*, *Lulav*). Those *mitzvos* which were initiated as *Tzibur* responsibilities would not be so limited, as they are not tied in origin to any individual’s financial ability but rather represent the *Tzibur*’s collective duty. Thus, *Chanukah* and *Pesach* are based on a communal celebration of *Geulah*, and the *Machatzis HaShekel* obligation is certainly communal as it supports the *Tzibur*’s daily *Korbanos*. As such, there is no monetary restriction limiting the expense to 20%.

A Lesson Can Be Learned From:

R' Meir of Lublin was collecting money to support his Yeshiva and visited a wealthy man one afternoon. Nothing R' Meir said was having any effect on the would-be donor. In fact, the man seemed to be complaining to R' Meir that he was having a restful nap when he heard the knock on his door, and he immediately arose so that R' Meir would not have to waste time waiting for him. "If that is so", pointed out R' Meir, "you should give me double the amount I am asking for. You certainly know that after the *brocho* **מענעפי** **המעביר שנה מעיני ותנומה** we do not answer **אמן**. It is only after the *brocho* is completed with the words: **הגומל חסדים טובים לעמו ישראל** that we answer **אמן**. Why is that ? Because we are not overly concerned with the fact that someone had been sleeping. However, once that person shows us that he is also a **גומל חסדים טובים** - one who does acts of kindness for **ישראל** - we gladly say **אמן** to that, and at the same time, we will also have in mind for the **אמן** to cover the fact that he had been sleeping as well, since he has now properly awakened to a *D'var Mitzvah*."

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