



	Candles	Mincha	DafYomi	Shiur	פרשת: ויקרא שזק"ש Shachris
Friday	6:45	6:55			10:06
Shabbos		1:45/6:45	5:45		9:00 10:06
Sunday		6:55	7:15		8:00 10:05

IMPORTANCE OF

The *Gemara* (*Kidushin* 49b) relates that a man in Bavel sold all his property, intending to move to *Eretz Yisroel*, but he didn't mention his plan at the sale. When circumstances prevented him from moving, he tried to get his possessions back, but Rava ruled that unexpressed intentions are **דברים שבלב** and have no impact. The *Gemara* suggests that the source of this rule is derived from the *Posuk*: **יקריב אותו לרצונו** – a man will [be forced to] offer it (his *Korban*) willingly. The *Gemara* explains that this means if a man vows to offer a *Korban*, he will be forced to fulfill his vow until he says **רוצה אני** – “I am willing”. The *Gemara* asks: of what use is his statement that he is willing when he is being forced, and he obviously doesn't mean it? It must be that his inner feelings (**דברים שבלב**) are of no consequence. However, the *Gemara* (*Bava Basra* 47b) states that if a man is forced to sell something, the sale is nevertheless valid, because every sale is somewhat forced upon the seller, who wouldn't be selling unless he needed the money. Since the seller is receiving money for his possessions, we may presume that he grudgingly consents to the sale, and it is done with his **רצון**. If so, the *Pnei Yehoshua* asks, what proof have we that **דברים שבלב** are inconsequential when a man is forced to say **רוצה אני**? Perhaps, when he realizes that he is morally obligated to fulfill his vow, and he is being coerced anyway, he will grudgingly consent to offer the *Korban*, with his **רצון**, and there are no conflicting inner thoughts to be disregarded. The *Pnei Yehoshua* answers that the presumption of grudging consent only applies to validate the *Korban* for others, *i.e.* the *Kohanim*, who would not be permitted to process his *Korban* unless he offered it “willingly”. However, if after saying **רוצה אני** he still secretly resented the coercion and was unable to reach the level of true consent, the *Korban* would not satisfy his own personal obligation, and he would have to offer another. Since the *Gemara* takes no cognizance of the possibility of such thoughts, it must be because **דברים שבלב אינם דברים**, and therein lies the proof.

DID YOU KNOW THAT

The *Gemara* (*Shabbos* 3a) derives from the word: **בעשותה** that one is held liable for a sin when he performed the whole sin, not just part of it, and the *Gemara* (*ibid* 92b) elaborates, explaining that if 2 people write on *Shabbos* together with one pen, or do various other *Melachos* together, where each of them could have done it all himself, then they will not be liable. If they could not have done it all themselves, but needed each other, then they will both be held liable (R' Shimon would still exempt them). Though the *Posuk* is dealing with *Shabbos* and sins that obligate a *Korban Chatas*, there is much discussion over whether the **שנים שעשאוהו** exemption applies to other sins, or those obligating *Malkus*, rather than just a *Korban Chatas*. R' Shlomo Kluger (**האלף לך שלמה** – 372 אר"ח) went so far as to use it when ruling in a case of one who gave a Lulav to another, but still held onto it (near the top) when it was shaken. If the grasp of each was sufficient to keep it from falling, then just as in the case of **שנים שעשאוהו** no one has performed the whole act, so too, no transfer has taken place, and the recipient has not fulfilled the *mitzvah*. In (480) **נשמת שבת** the question of holding an infant next to a light switch on *Shabbos* (in the hope that he will turn it on or off) is also tied to **שנים שעשאוהו**, where although the adult does not assist in the actual *Melachah* itself, his support and involvement rise above the level of **מסייע** (mere assistance), and the fact that he would not turn the switch on himself makes both he and the infant **אינו יכול** – unable to complete the act alone, which renders them both liable for the joint act. The (1) **חורש** **אגלי טל** notes that in the course of plowing a field on *Shabbos*, neither the farmer nor the ox can be seen as capable of doing the plowing alone, rendering them both **אינו יכול**. Would R' Shimon exempt the man who is plowing because he is not doing the whole *Melachah* himself? The **אגלי טל** concludes that R' Shimon would only exempt 2 people doing a forbidden act together when both are people. When one is an animal, R' Shimon would agree that the man involved is liable.

QUESTION OF THE WEEK:

When would one have to do *Bedikas Chometz* on a lower floor but not an upper one?

ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:

(What mistake must be fixed in *Shacharis* but not *Mincha*?)

Biur Halacha (127) says that if one mistakenly said **שלום רב** during *Shacharis*, if he realizes it before saying **ברוך אתה ד'**, he should say **שים שלום**; if he said **שים שלום** during *Mincha*, he need not go back and say **שלום רב**, as **שים שלום** has more **בקשות**.

DIN'S CORNER:

Although *Chazal* originally established that *Derashos* be held publicly for 30 days during which the *Halachos* of each upcoming *Yom Tov* would be taught, today, since all *Halachos* are written in *Seforim*, every individual has his own personal *mitzvah* to study those *Halachos* until he is fluent with them and knows what he must do. (*Shulchan Aruch HaRav* 429:3)

A Lesson Can Be Learned From:

A man was being **מבטל** his *Chometz*, slowly reading the Nusach from a Hagadah, concluding with the words: **לבטל ולהוי הפקר כעפרא דארעא** (it should be annulled and ownerless like the dust of the earth). A wise man standing nearby said to him: **לאור דוקא כעפרא דארעא** (not necessarily like dust of the earth). When asked what he meant by those words, the wise man explained that we say something similar to that three times a day at the end of *Shemona Esrei*: **ונפשי כעפר לכל תהי** – let my soul be as dust to everyone, a plea for Hashem's assistance in being humble and accommodating. One who understands what these words mean, says them with the proper *Kavanah* and behaves accordingly, may certainly annul his *Chometz* and treat it like dust. “However,” the wise man concluded, “one who is slighted by small things, and takes offense easily, such as you did yesterday when someone accidentally bumped into you as he stepped back from *Shemona Esrei*, might not effect a sufficient *Bitul* simply by calling his *Chometz* dust of the earth”.

P.S. Sholosh Seudos sponsored by the Sternberg 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