



	Candles	Mincha	DafYomi	Shiur	פרשת: ויקרא זק"ש Shachris
Friday	6:02	6:12	8:40		8:51
Shabbos		6:02	5:15	5:50	9:00
Sunday		7:15	8:30		8:00
					9:49

IMPORTANCE OF

The Gemara (*Bava Kamma* 66a) states that when a thief effects a change in the item he stole, he acquires it thereby. This is derived from *והשיב את הגוילה אשר גזל* – which teaches us that he must return it, if it is as it was when he stole it (*אשר גזל*). If it was changed, he must pay money, since the change means he acquired it. The Gemara (*ibid* 65b) describes a *Machlokes* between Beis Shammai and Beis Hillel regarding a change made to *אתנן זונה* (a harlot's payment) or *מחיר כלב* (something switched for a dog) which is normally forbidden to be offered as a *Korban*. According to Beis Shammai, if she received wheat and she turned it into flour, it is still forbidden to be offered. However, Beis Hillel derives from the words *גם שניהם* that only the original payment is *Assur*, *ולא שינויהם* – but not any changes to them. *Tosafos* asks why we need both *Derashos* to teach that a *שינוי* acquires, and answers that the *Chidush* of the *Posuk* *אשר גזל* is to establish that even a temporary, reversible *שינוי* also acquires. However, the *Rambam* (*גזילה ואבדה* 2:10) rules that a reversible change does not acquire. Why then do we need 2 *Pesukim*? The *Gemara* also states that if one stole a lamb and while in the thief's possession, it aged and became a ram "on its own", that change also acquires it into the thief's ownership, known as a *שינוי דממילא*. The *Rambam* (*ibid* 1:13) rules accordingly. The *Minchas Chinuch* (571:5) asks, if so, why does the *Rambam* (*איסורי מזבח* 4:15) state that a change from wheat grain to flour permits the *אתנן* to be offered, if a case of *שינוי דממילא* would be a greater *Chidush*? The *Minchas Mordechai* suggests that the *Rambam* in fact does not hold that *שינוי דממילא* is a valid *שינוי* with regard to *אתנן*. He only considers it a *שינוי* in the case of a stolen item, as derived from *אשר גזל*. Therefore, we need 2 *Pesukim*; the 2nd to teach *שינוי דממילא* in the case of *גזילה*.

QUESTION OF THE WEEK:

Why should someone saying *Shemona Esrei* stop and listen to *Kedushah* – do we not say *העוסק במצוה פטור מן המצוה*?

ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:

(When would a former *עולה* say *Haftorah* instead of the *Maftir*?)

The *Shaarei Teshuvah* (*אור"ח* 566:1) cites the *Noda BiYehuda* (2:110) which states that on a *Taanis*, if the one called up for the *Maftir Aliyah* is unable to say the *Haftorah*, it is preferable to ask the *Kohen* or *Levi* who had the first 2 *Aliyos* to say it for him. If they are also unable, then someone else should be asked.

DIN'S CORNER:

Shirts that have been laundered using starch that is *Chometz* may be kept and used on Pesach because the form of the *Chometz* is not identifiable. *Chometzdike* paste may not be used to hang papers on windows 30 days prior to Pesach if the paste will show. If the papers were hung before then, they need not be removed, even if the paste is visible. (*Mishna Berurah* 442:14-17)

DID YOU KNOW THAT

The Gemara (*Bava Kamma* 91b) states that one may not cause oneself an injury. However, the Gemara (*Shevuos* 27a) states that if one swears an oath to harm himself, the oath is effective, and he is liable if he does not fulfill it. This is derived from the *Posuk*: *להרע או להטיב* from which we learn that just as one may do good to oneself (*להטיב*), so too may one do bad to oneself (*להרע*). Does one have the right to harm oneself? The Gemara answers that by harm, we mean that he may swear an oath to fast. The Gemara (*Pesachim* 76b) states that a fish was once roasted together with meat, and Mar b. Rav Ashi forbade the fish to be eaten, as fish with meat cause bad breath and *Tzaraas*. The *Yabia Omer* (י"ד 1:8) notes the *Halacha* that one may not be *Mevatel* an *Issur LeChatchila*. This means that for example, if some milk fell into a pot with a little meat, one may **not** add meat to it until there is 60 times as much meat as milk, which could theoretically then be *mevattel* the milk. What if a fish fell into a pot of meat? Could one add meat in order to be *mevattel* the fish in 60? Since eating fish with meat is not an *Issur*, but rather a *Sakanah* (danger), perhaps the rule of *לכתחילה איסור מבטלין* would not apply. On the other hand, if one may not harm oneself, and eating a harmful thing (like fish with meat) violates that rule, do we say: *אין מבטלין* on it? The *Yabia Omer* concludes that one may be *mevattel* that *Issur* in such a case, by adding enough meat to be *mevattel* the fish. This is because the potential *Issur* of harming oneself only applies where one intends to harm oneself. However, where one is hungry and wants to eat, even though there may be a problem later, we do not consider the act of eating to be Halachically harmful. As such, eliminating the taste in 60 is permitted.

A Lesson Can Be Learned From:

A wealthy man had four sons learning in Yeshiva, for whom he was paying full tuition, and 3 sons-in-law learning in Kollel, who were being fully supported by him. He asked the Satmar Rebbe ZT"L if, in light of this, would he still be obligated to give *Tzedaka* to Yeshivos and to the poor. The Rebbe replied that the *Posuk* *ושמחת בחנך אתה* is followed by *ובנך ובתך ועבדך ואמתך והלוי והגר והיתום והאלמנה אשר בשעריך* which lists the 8 people under the mitzvah of rejoicing on Yom Tov. It would seem that if one causes these eight to rejoice on Yom Tov, he has fulfilled the mitzvah of *ושמחת*. However, Rashi says: My (Hashem's) 4 opposite your 4. If you are *משמח* mine (the Levi, Ger, orphan and widow) then I will be *משמח* yours (son, daughter, slave and maid). Rashi's point is that when one supports one's own family, there is suspicion that he does it out of his feelings for them, rather than for the mitzvah. Rashi explains the "crime" of returning a lost item to a non-Jew the same way – that it shows how he returns lost items for personal, ethical reasons, and not for the mitzvah. So too with regard to support. Hashem says that without you taking care of mine, the *Mekatreg* argues that your support of yours is not *מצוה*. *לשם מצוה*. If you take care of mine, then they are all deemed *מצוה*.

P.S. Sholosh Seudos is sponsored this week by the Sheli family.