



Parshiot Matos-Massei

2 Av 5779 / August 3, 2019

Daf Yomi: Temurah 15; Nach Yomi: Iyov 23

Weekly Dvar Torah

A project of the

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF YOUNG ISRAEL

**SPONSORED BY THE HENRY, BERTHA AND EDWARD ROTHMAN FOUNDATION
ROCHESTER, NY, CLEVELAND, OHIO, CIRCLEVILLE, OHIO**

Flavor with Substance

Rabbi Yitzchak Gettinger

Mara D'atra, Young Israel of the West Side

The first half of the Parsha discusses the battle between the Jews and Midyan, a fight initiated by the Jews to purge themselves of any spiritual contaminations they had absorbed from Midyan's influence. In the aftermath of the war, Moshe discovers that the Jews failed to kill the female Midyanites and is incensed at this decision, and when the Jews offer some of the spoils as a Korban to God, Moshe even suspects them of offering this Korban as atonement for further promiscuous activity with the Midyanite girls. In truth, they respond to Moshe, not even one person sinned with the girls, and the Korban was offered not as atonement for sinful acts, but rather as atonement for lustful thoughts they had for the girls. (Shabbos 64a) Many commentators are bothered why these thoughts warranted atonement, as given the principle that "God does not consider bad thoughts like actions," (Kidushin 39) one does not need atonement for sinful thoughts that are not acted upon.

In analyzing the context of this Korban, it is important to note that they did not offer this Korban immediately after the war, but rather after another key theme that transpired in the aftermath of the war with Midyan. With all the spoils of Midyan available for taking, the Jews are taught the Halachos of how to "kasher keilim"- to purge the cooking Midyanite utensils of all non-kosher residual flavors in their walls, and this Kashering process permitted the Jews to use the pots for their own purposes. Why were these Halachos first taught in the aftermath of the war with Midyan, almost 40 years after the rest of the Torah was taught? Surely the laws of kashering could have been pertinent to the mitzvah of cooking meat and milk together, to dictate how to kasher a pot that cooked meat and milk together, and yet God waited to teach these laws until the war with Midyan.

The novelty of the laws of kashering are two-fold, because besides for the explicit point that there is a way to purge a pot from non-kosher flavors, the implicit message is that there is a need to kasher keilim and that the flavors in the pot's walls that would subsequently be imparted to another dish are forbidden. As rudimentary as that is to our knowledge, the truth is that the prevailing opinion in the Tana'im is that this principle of "ta'am k'ikar"- flavors are treated like substance itself- is only known because God said the Jews had to kasher the Midyanite pots. Without this, logic would have dictated that forbidden foods are only relevant in substance form and their flavors would not have posed a problem whatsoever. After this implicit message is understood, the explicit message of kashering keilim is that there is a way to remove those forbidden flavors by using mediums of heat and the like to extract the flavors that are stuck in the pot. Succinctly put, the novelty was both that there is a problem and that there is a way to fix the problem, but without the laws of kashering keilim, one would remain oblivious to the existence of a problem and to its possible solution.

There is a tremendous mussar in the Torah equating forbidden flavor with substance, because it reflects on the severity of even

residual or minimal effects of contamination. Conceptually, "flavor" is the effects and influences of a matter felt long beyond the existence of the substance itself, and despite being invisible and ostensibly imperceptible, they are still Halachically existent and treated like substance itself. There are many times when we assume ourselves to be "clean" from a given spiritual contamination because we don't perceive its substance as a part of our soul, but in truth, we are soiled from its flavors that are still imparting their harmful effects and tainting our souls. On the other hand, the dichotomy of kashering pots is uplifting and comforting in the sense that we have the ability to purge ourselves from the effects of contamination, and by using the medium of fire and applying the principle that "the way flavor comes in, it will come out," (Pesachim 74) one can stoke the fiery passions of teshuva and rid the soul of these flavors. These points were embodied in the battle the Jews initiated with Midyan, as given their past sins with Midyan, God was telling the Jews that it was not enough to simply "move on" from Midyan and continue forward, but it was rather crucial that they understand the detrimental effects of Midyan's influences and abolish them completely with a war of vengeance. Midyan taught us how strong flavor is, and also that we can purge ourselves of it, and it is therefore fitting that kashering pots is taught specifically in the aftermath of the war on Midyan.

It is from this perspective that we should approach the timing of the Korban brought for the lustful thoughts of the Midyanite girls, because although lustful thoughts are generally treated less severely and do not mandate atonement, the Jews were so uplifted by the message of kashering pots that they brought a Korban nonetheless. Once they learned of the Torah equating flavor with substance, they were horrified by their thoughts, because thoughts are quite like flavor in the sense that the girls may be long gone, but the residual effects lingered on by means of thought. When they applied the dualism of kashering pots to this idea and realized they had the power to "kasher", they were motivated to completely purge their souls of any effects from Midyan and they therefore came forward specifically after these laws had been taught with their special Korban.

(There are opinions in the Talmud that "ta'am k'ikkur" is not a Biblical idea and is forbidden only by the Rabbis. If flavor is not forbidden by the Torah, why did the Jews have to kasher the Midyanite pots? The Gemara in various places, (Avoda Zara 67, Pesachim 44) says that according to this opinion, the need to kasher Midyan's pots was a unique law that was an exception to the usual rule and was not meant to serve as an example. Proving this point, the Gemara notes that even if we adopt that Ta'am is like Ikkur, we know that "Ta'am Lifgam"- tastes that linger in a pot after a significant time has passed from its usage, are not forbidden. Midyan's pots should surely have been at last been in the category of "taam lifgam" which is definitely permitted, and we must rather conclude that the need to kasher the pots was a unique one time exception.

Based on the idea mentioned above, the idea of the war with Midyan being an exception means that regarding Midyan, God decreed that any residue whatsoever was forbidden, and even the flavors that are generally permitted were forbidden here. The entire war with Midyan meant to abolish any lingering flavors with Midyan, and given that the pots reflected this point, the Jews brought a Korban for their thoughts that echoed this theme.) Good Shabbos.

Trust in HaShem

Rabbi Azriel Blumberg

Associate Member, Young Israel Council of Rabbis

It is difficult to imagine that, given the choice, any Jew would opt not to live in Israel. Yet, as the Jews prepared to enter the land of Canaan, the tribes of Reuven, Gad, and half of Menashe approached Moshe with such a request (Bamidbar 32:1-5). They said: "We are willing to give up our share in the land of Canaan; we would prefer to settle on this side of the Jordan where there is plentiful pasture for our cattle."

How could they have had the audacity to make this request? Leaving aside their reluctance to live in the land that G-d had promised their forefathers, how could they abandon their brothers in their war against the Seven Nations in Canaan? Knowing that this would be said, the leaders of these tribes prefaced their words by referring to the land across the Jordan as "the land that G-d has smitten before the Congregation of Israel" (32:4). With this, says Ohr Hachaim, they hoped to deflect any aspersions.

The rulers of many of these cities were far superior to the Jews in military prowess and might. This land was not conquered by natural means; it was clearly the Hand of G-d that gave the land to the Jews. So, they reasoned, this land was surely just as sacred as the land of Canaan, since both were granted to the Jews by the Hand of G-d alone. They saw no need to join their brothers in their

capture of the Land of Canaan, saying, "Just as G-d miraculously fought Sichon and Og on this side of the Jordan, He will certainly do the same to the inhabitants of Canaan. It does not matter how many or how few Jews go to fight – it is not they who will really be fighting, but G-d who will fight for them."

Moshe responded, "Although you may espouse trust in G-d, it is not proper for you to act in this fashion. First of all, when your brothers go to war, will you just sit there?" (32:6). "You may be correct that the war will be won only through Divine intervention, but G-d does not want the Jews to sit back and wait for a miracle." Though in reality they will not be fighting the war, they still must go to war. For G-d's intervention to be less obvious, they must do whatever they can through natural means to make their effort a success. The tribes must join their brothers in this effort.

An additional aspect of Moshe's reproof: If a parent found it necessary to send his child off to a distant land, would he not accompany him as far as possible? Even if your accompaniment of your fellow Jews has no tangible purpose, how can you "sit here" while your brothers are facing danger? Do you not feel for them?

Moshe also said: "Why do you disparage the hearts of the Bnei Yisrael? (32:7). While you claim you are staying here because you are concerned about your possessions, it will appear to everyone else that you stayed because you feared for your safety. While you claim to have chosen this land out of belief in G-d's Divine providence, it will appear that you have settled here because you lacked trust in G-d's protection."

In practical terms, you are no better than the Spies who verbally disparaged the Jews from entering the Land of Canaan. (32:8-15) While your words speak of faith, your actions demonstrate quite the opposite.

The tribesmen responded: "We will go and fight for our brothers in the land of Canaan. Meanwhile, we will build corrals for our cattle and cities for our children." (32:16,17) Moshe replied: Why do you mention your cattle first? It seems that you plan to construct the corrals on the perimeter of your camp and place your children on the inside where they will be insulated from an enemy attack.

Just the opposite: "Build yourselves cities for your children" – on the perimeter where they will be vulnerable, and on the inside build "corrals for your sheep"! In this way, "what comes out of your mouth you shall do" (32:24) – the trust in G-d that you are preaching to your brethren should certainly be apparent in your own actions. If they are not to be afraid of the Seven Nations in Canaan, you certainly should not be afraid of isolated attackers here (Kli Yakar). While it is certainly praiseworthy and important to speak of one's trust in G-d, for "the mouth is the gateway to the intellect," there are a few considerations we must keep in mind.

First – although G-d truly does provide for all our needs, we cannot merely sit back and wait for an open miracle. It is possible that we only deserve G-d's help in a hidden way. Indeed, we must "go to war" and try everything we can to bring about the desired result through natural means. In this way, we can understand why Noach, who was saved from the Flood in a clearly miraculous fashion, had to build an Ark. Even though G-d was willing to perform a miracle for Noach, He wanted the miracle to remain more subtle. To the casual observer, it appears that Noach was saved by means of the Ark. But only through a more careful look does one realize that the Ark could never have naturally withstood the conditions it underwent (Rav Dovid Feinstein, shlita).

Second – when other people are in need, we can never merely "sit there." While we can trust in G-d to help us and others, we may not allow this belief to stop us from trying to provide for others the same assistance and compassion that we would want from them.

A woman once saw Rabbi Sholom Schwadron zt"l running toward the doctor while holding a child in his arms. The woman began to shout words of encouragement and comfort, saying that G-d would surely help. As he got closer, she started to scream, for she realized that Rabbi Schwadron was holding her own grandchild (The Maggid Speaks).

As important as it is to proclaim one's trust in G-d, the real test lies in one's actions. When your business is going well, it is easy to say, "All my success comes from G-d." When a competitor opens a business across the street, however, it becomes more of a challenge to accept this as G-d's will and continue to act appropriately (Chazon Ish – Emunah U'Bitachon).

Let us endeavor to show our trust in G-d in both our words and our actions... and may we soon merit G-d's ultimate salvation.

Shabbat Shalom.

The Weekly Sidra

"The Permissible Equivalent"

Rabbi Moshe Greebel Z"L

One of the truly fascinating aspects of Torah is that every prohibition given to us has a permissible counterpart. This can clearly be seen from the Gemarah in *Chulin* 109b, wherein Yalta, the wife of Rav Nachman, offers the following discourse:

"Yalta once said to Rav Nachman, 'Observe, for everything that the Divine Law has forbidden us, it has permitted us an equivalent. It has forbidden us blood but it has permitted us liver....'"

Momentarily interrupting the Gemarah, the Torah has prohibited us from consuming blood:

"Moreover you shall eat no kind of blood, whether it is of bird or of beast, in any of your dwellings." (Vayikra 7:26)

Yet, the liver of cattle, undomesticated beasts, and poultry, which receives blood that the heart pumps with each beat, is permissible to be eaten. We return to the Gemarah:

"..... It has forbidden us intercourse during menstruation but it has permitted us the blood of purification....."

Interrupting again, relations with one's wife who at the time is menstruating are forbidden:

"And if a man shall lie with a woman having her menstrual sickness, and shall uncover her nakedness; he has made naked her fountain, and she has uncovered the fountain of her blood; and both of them shall be cut off from among their people." (Vayikra 20:18)

Yet, from the Gemarah in *Sanhedrin* 87b, we see that the blood discharged after childbirth does not prohibit relations between man and wife:

"..... The blood of childbirth..... It has been stated that Rav said, 'It (blood discharged for eighty days after childbirth) issues from one and the same source. The Torah declares it unclean (during the first fourteen days after childbirth), and clean (the following sixty six days).....'"

We return to Yalta in the Gemarah *Chulin* 109b:

"..... It has forbidden us the fat of cattle, but it has permitted us the fat of wild beasts....."

Interrupting again, we see that the Chailev (forbidden fat as opposed to the permissible kind we refer to as Shuman) of livestock is forbidden for consumption:

"It shall be an everlasting statute for your generations throughout all your dwellings, that you eat neither fat nor blood." (Vayikra 3:17)

Yet, the Torah does not forbid the Chailev of undomesticated beasts for consumption. We return to Yalta:

"..... It has forbidden us swine's flesh, but it has permitted us the brain of the Shibbuta (fish which has the same taste). It has forbidden us the Girusa (bird), but it has permitted us the tongue of fish (which has the same taste). It has forbidden us the married woman, but it has permitted us the divorcee during the lifetime of her former husband. It has forbidden us the brother's wife, but it has permitted us the levirate marriage....."

Interrupting again, the Torah forbids taking one's sister-in-law while his brother is alive:

"You shall not uncover the nakedness of your brother's wife; it is your brother's nakedness." (Vayikra 18:16)

Yet, when the brother-in-law dies without leaving issue, the Mitzvah of Yivum (levirate marriage) is to take the widow in marriage:

"If brothers live together, and one of them dies, and has no child, the wife of the dead shall not marry outside to a stranger; her husband's brother shall go in to her, and take her to him for a wife, and perform the duty of a husband's brother to her." (D'varim 25:5)

Back to the Gemarah:

"..... It has forbidden us the non Jewess, but it has permitted us the beautiful woman (taken in war)....."

Interrupting again, we see this principle:

"And see among the captives a beautiful woman, and desire her, that you would have her as your wife." (D'varim 21:11)

Returning to Gemarah, we see that the equivalent of one prohibition eluded Yalta:

"..... I wish to eat flesh in milk, (where is its equivalent?)" Thereupon, Rav Nachman said to the butchers, 'Give her roasted udders.'"

That is, the udder is an organ formed of the mammary glands of female quadruped mammals which carries milk.

The renown Admur (Chassidic master) Rav Yisroel Friedman of Rizhin (1796– 1850) of blessed memory, posed the following question. If all prohibitions of the Torah have a permissible equivalent, where is the equivalent of informing against another by speaking behind his back? The answer to this query can be found in this week's Sidra wherein we see the commandment given to Moshe and the B'nai Yisroel to go to war against Midyan:

"And HaShem spoke to Moshe, saying. 'Avenge the B'nai Yisroel of the Midianites; afterwards shall you (Moshe) be gathered to your people.'" (Bamidbar 31:1-2)

Moshe then issued the following order:

"And Moshe spoke to the people, saying, 'Separate from yourselves men for the war, and let them go against the Midianites, and do the vengeance of HaShem against Midyan.'" (ibid. 31:3)

Concerning the underlined expression above, Rashi explains to us that the term 'men' refers to Tzadikim (the righteous). Now, taught the Rizhiner, a major prerequisite for being a Tzadik is that out of humility, one makes his best attempt to hide this fact. Yet, when it came to this war against Midyan, in order to select the type of army commanded by HaKadosh Baruch Hu, it was a Mitzvah for his neighbors to inform on who was truly a Tzadik 'behind his back.'

Hence, we see that for every prohibition in the Torah, there is a permissible equivalent.

May we soon see the G'ulah Sh'laimah in its complete resplendence- speedily, and in our times. Good Shabbos.

Am Echad

Rabbi Aharon Ziegler

Associate Member, Young Israel Council of Rabbis

From beginning of perek (Ch.) 32 (shishi) until the end of the sidra, Moshe Rabbeinu is confronted with a very disturbing situation. Two tribes, Gad and Reuven, approach Moshe with the request of remaining and settling on the east side of Jordan, and not to settle in the Promised Land. Moshe is deeply disturbed and hurt at the mere mention of such a thought, having come so far and

being so close to Eretz Yisrael Moshe himself would have given every thing in this world for the privilege of crossing the Yardein (Jordan) and entering Eretz Yisrael. Alas, that was not meant to be. So Moshe, as hurt as he is, resigns himself to his fate and destiny. However, Moshe is a genuine leader and not a dictator, so he agrees to honor their request, but with a stipulation. He insists that their men, of army age, must cross the Yardein together with the other tribes and help in the fight for conquering the Land.

The two tribes agree to this commitment and the deal is about to be ratified. But, at the last moment, as he is about to allocate the land to them, he injects another stipulation (32:33). He insists that half of the tribe of Menashe also stays on the east of Jordan while the other half of Menashe will cross over the Jordan with the rest of Bnei Yisrael into the Promised Land. A very strange request indeed it was. What is most puzzling and striking is that none of the traditional commentators address the question of what this was all about. Up to this point nowhere is Shevet Menashe mentioned in the negotiations, so what was this point of Moshe all about?

Rav Yosef Dov Soloveitchik, ZT'L, suggested that Moshe, being the leader and Rebbe par excellence, who loved every Jew as a parent loves a child, was very concerned about the unity and future of Bnei Yisrael. Moshe is about to die and he is concerned about a possible split in Klall Yisrael; between the ten tribes who are crossing and the two tribes who are remaining. This disturbing thought brought him much anguish and so he was determined not to let it happen. He devised a plan of splitting half the tribe of Menashe to live on one side of the Yardein the second half on the other side. He reasoned that this would solidify their bonds of unity. If parents will be on one side while the children on the other, or if one sibling on this side and one on the other side there will be a constant flow of visitors and travelers between the two sides. This, Moshe Rabbeinu hoped will guarantee the Achdut (unity) of Bnei Yisrael, and Moshe will be able to leave this world with a peaceful mind and an optimistic view for the future of our people.

It is indeed most appropriate to read this message as we are approaching Tisha B'av. We must realize that we all share the responsibility of concerning ourselves for the unity of our holy nation and respect for one another. Shabbat Shalom.

Eternal Life Vs. Everlasting Shame

Rabbi Dovid Sochet

Associate Member, Young Israel Council of Rabbis

"Vies malchei Midyan haragu al chalileihem es Evi vi'es Rekem vi'es Tzur vi'es Chur vi'es Reva chameishes malchei Midyan vi'es Billam ben Beor haragu bechorev- They killed the kings of Midian along with their [other] slain ones: Evi, Rekem, Tzur, Chur, and Reva, the five kings of Midian; also Bilaam-the son of Be'or - they slew with the sword." (Bamidbar 31:8)

In this, the Torah's narrative of Klal Yisroel's defeat of the Midianite armies, we read a name with which we may be familiar: Tzur. Tzur appeared in the Torah first at the end of Parashas Chukas as the father of Kozbi, the woman with whom Zimri sinned publicly.

The Medrash Tanchuma (Pinchas 2) tells us that Tzur was the greatest of the five Midianite kings, but he was demoted and appears third in the Torah's listing of the Midianite kings because he ungrudgingly sent his daughter to publicly commit a vile, immoral act.

When we study this medrash we have to wonder: For whom does the Torah advance this diminishing of Tzur's character? Those who esteem the words of the Torah, namely the Jewish people, are already acquainted with Tzur's dastardly nature and placing him third in the series of Midianite nobles could hardly impact our already deleterious opinion of his ignoble personality. Further, in regard to the evil Tzur himself, would he even care about this debasement of his honor? Would it bother Tzur in the least that the Torah lists the Midianite kings and places him third instead of first?

Similarly this question strikes us when we study the medrash in Parashas Chayei Sarah. In one of the pesukim describing Avroham's purchase of Me'aras HaMachpelah, the name of Ephron the Hittite's name is omitted alluding to his shady handling of the sale of Me'aras HaMachpelah.

Again we have to wonder: Would Ephron care? When we read the parsha, it is quite apparent that Ephron is a particularly greedy person who was far more concerned about the amount of money he could derive.

These questions stem from a misconception that we, as humans, might be under. Man's quest for his individual immortality is innate, whether it be manifested in a physical sense or in the legacy he leaves behind, but this sentiment is not supported by the values

endorsed and promoted by the Torah.

The Torah is more than a book of beautiful words and lofty sentiments; it is more than the highest code of behavior demanded of a human being. It is the ultimate manifestation of eternal existence.

After the public reading of the Torah we make a blessing, "*Asher Nassan lanu Toras ve'chaiyei olam nata bishochenu* - Who has given us a Torah of truth and planted within us eternal life." A casual examination of those words impress upon us that the Torah is the eternal life planted within us. Our holy Torah, that seed of eternity, makes our bodies holy so that they become fit partners for the soul's journey into infinity.

The only true eternalness is Hashem, but the Zohar teaches us "Orayssa v'Yisroel v'Kudsha Brich Hu Chad Hu" - "The Torah and Yisrael and Hashem are all one" (Zohar, Acharei Mos) The Torah and Bnei Yisroel as being one with Hashem are thus also eternal. However, it is not the individual Jew that is eternal; it is only the body of the Jewish nation as a whole that is eternal.

The Maharal (Rabbi Yehuda Lowey (1512- 1609) goes to great lengths to show that although Avrohom was himself worthy of receiving the Torah, the Torah could only be given to the entire nation (Maharal, Tiferes Yisrael, Perek 17). The Torah is not given to individuals; it must be given to a people. Therefore, The primary justification for the existence of Torah-true Jews is as a nation.

As such, it is incumbent upon each Jew to be aware that he, the individual, cannot reach his ultimate fulfillment as an individual but only as a cell in the body of the entire Jewish nation. If one has the mistaken impression that he relates to Hashem merely as an individual in his own merit and that the Torah was given to him as an individual, he is not serving Hashem, rather he is merely serving his own ego! Only as part of the entire Nation can Jews relate to the Torah and to our Creator.

This concept cannot be stressed or reiterated enough. One cannot be a Jew on his own. One can only learn Torah, pray, and perform Hashem's many other commandments as part of the Nation of Israel, a nation which consists of people who together form one unit. The individuals within this nation are like the cells of one organism.

Only with this awareness can we justly value our connection to Torah. For after all, all generations that came after Sinai never said, "*Kol asher dibur Hashem naaseh vi'nishma*- We will do and we will understand" (Shemos 19:8) Chazal do say that the souls of all Jews were present at Sinai, however, the soul not the individual. Rather, the individual is body and soul together); they never accepted the Torah personally. So what obligates them to fulfill it? What connects them to the experience at Sinai? Since none of them ever entered into a verbal or written covenant of accepting the Torah with the Almighty, as individuals there would seem to be nothing to bind them. They are bound and committed to the Covenant only because they are part of a nation. It was necessary for the entire national commitment, and the unity of the people was critical, as it is written: "*Vayichan sham Yisroel neged hahar*- Israel camped at the foot of the mountain (preparing to receive the Torah)' - like one man with one heart" (Rashi on Shemos 19:2, noting that the Hebrew verb used in the verse is singular in order to stress the unity of the people). This is the nation that said at Mount Sinai, "*We will do and we will understand.*"

On the flip side wicked, haughty people seek to be immortalized in the sense that they wish to live forever, or at least have their ideas perpetuated forever. Balak/Tzohar and Ephron desired as all potentates do, to be eternalized as themselves, not as a part of something greater than their individuality.

This did not happen. On the contrary, Hashem the Torah and the Jewish people, which are eternal, regard them in their well-deserved negative light. By the Torah's dropping the vav from Ephron's name and counting Balak in a lower status they are now eternally remembered by the eternal people to their everlasting disgrace.

We are now in the period of the year that is referred to as *bein hamtzorim* "the three weeks", a time of national mourning for the Jewish people. Chazal (Tractate Yuma 9B) tell us that the second Bais Hamikdash was destroyed because of Sinaas Chinam, hatred among Jews to one another. If we could have only perceived ourselves correctly, as only a piece in the greater picture which is Klal Yisroel, there could not have been hatred amongst ourselves. Only our egos and our being self-absorbed allowed us to hate one another and thereby cause the destruction of our Holy Temple. Let us be cognitive of our true goal and of our true value as a whole and thus merit with the help of Hashem Yisborach to the rebuilding of our Holy Beis Hamikdash with the coming of Moshiach Tzidkeinu speedily in our day. Good Shabbos.

Meafar Kumi

Rabbi Ronen Shaharabany

Graduate, NCYI Rabbinic Training Program

(במדבר לג, א). מה הקשר? "אלה מסעי בני ישראל" שמות לב, ד (חטא העגל) גרם ל) "אלה אלקיך ישראל", איתא בילקוט ראובני

ץ (פרשת מסעי) כשישראל קבלו את התורה בסיני, נעקר יצר הרע מלבם, וכשחטאו בעגל, חזר להם יצר הרע. "פירש הרבי יוסף צבי דושינסקיא בספרו תורת מהרי ולכאורה קשה, אם נעקר מלבם יצר הרע, איך חטאו בעגל? אלא ודאי שיצר הרע לא נעקר לגמרי מהם, אלא שהיצר הרע לא בא בגלוי להסית את ישראל לעבירות, אלא מלבם, כלומר "יצר הרע" ל כשקבלו ישראל את התורה נעקר "בא בלבוש של יצר טוב. שמתלבש יצר הרע באיצטלא דרבנן לעשות מעבירה מצוה, ומרע טוב. וזו כוונת חז "יצר טוב" הגיעו למדרגה שלא העיז עוד יצר הרע לבוא אליהם בגילוי לב כתמול שלשום, אלא בהסתר פנים בא, בתורת

עתה נבין איך חטאו ישראל בעגל. יצר הרע לא באה לישראל בגלוי, בטענה שישראל יעבדו עבודה זרה כפשוטו להאמין שהעגל הוא אלוה, שהרי יצר רע זה נעקר מלבם. בטענה שצריך להעמיד ממוצע בין ישראל לאביהם שבשמים כדי לקרב לבם לעבודתו יתברך. יצר הרע בא בטענה שכל כוונתו אך, "יצר טוב" אלא בא להם בלבוש של ורק לטובת ישראל, לקרבם לה' יתברך. וכך נתפתו ישראל ועשו את העגל, שהרי יצר זה לא נעקר מלבם

להתגולל במדבר לא מקום זרע וישוב בני אדם. כי הנה ידוע שלכל אומות העולם יש שר ומזל – "אלה מסעי בני ישראל" גרם ל "אלה אלקיך ישראל" עתה נבין מדוע ן כתב (פרשת "למעלה. אבל לישראל, אין מזל ומקשר המפסיק בינם לאביהם שבשמים. אלא תמיד עומדים הם תחת השגחתו ועינו הפקוחה של ה' בכבודו ובעצמו. והרמב ש. והנה אף על פי כן, דווקא במדבר אשר מזל רע שולט בו, נתגדלו ישראל ושם ניזונו במאכל "מ מלאך המקטרג על ישראל, ע"אחרי מות) שמדבר הוא מקום שליטת הס רחוני שלא כדרך הטבע, וראו התגלות אלקית בכל צעד ושעל. וכך הכירו וידעו כי הם עומדים אך ורק תחת השגחתו יתברך, ואין להם שום מקשר ומזל. ומכיון שטעותם של ישראל בחטא העגל הייתה שחשבו שצריכים הם למקשר בינם לבין ה' יתברך, וכי חס ושלום ככל הגוים בית ישראל. לכן נזקקו להשתהות במדבר ציה ולהתגולל בכל ן"כ דברי המהרי"ה המסעות הללו כדי שיתברר אצלם השגחת ה' עליהם, שאף במקום אשר המזל הרע שולט שם, ייטב אתם ה' יתברך ויתן להם חנינה, ע

ב מסעות "איתא במגן אברהם (אור החיים, סימן תכח), בשם הצרור המור: מ. "אלה מסעי בני ישראל" גרם ל "אלה אלקיך ישראל" ונראה להוסיף עוד בביאור מדוע כ. וכתב הפרדס יוסף, שהרמז בזה הוא, שה' לא עזב את ישראל בכל מקום "ב (אחד משמות ה'), ע"אין להפסיק בהם (בקריאתם), שהוא נגד שם מ "אלה מסעי" שבפרשת ש"שנסעו במדבר. בכל מקום שהלכו, ה' היה עמם, ע

ישראל שחטאו בעגל. "אלה אלקיך ישראל" מסעות, הרומז שה' לא עזב את ישראל בכל מסעיהם, גופא היה "דהיינו מ, "אלה מסעי בני ישראל" ואפשר לומר, שהגורם ל לא עזבו את ה', אלא אדרבה, חיפשו להתקרב אליו. ומחמת שישראל לא עזבו את ה' בעגל, גם ה' לא עזבם במסעיהם

אדם מדי בבל יון. והרי איתא בגמרא (מגילה כט). רבי שמעון בן יוחי אומר, בוא, הוא ראשי תיבות ה'ד' גלויות "אלה מסעי בני ישראל" (א נחל קדומים ועוד, כתב החיד ל (עירובין" ש. מדוע בכל מקום שגלו ישראל שכינה עמהם? ונראה לפרש: איתא בחז"ל וראה כמה חביבין ישראל לפני הקדוש ברוך הוא, שבכל מקום שגלו שכינה עמהם, ע אל תקרא חרות אלא חירות, אלמלי לא נשתברו לוחות הראשונות אין כל אומה ולשון שולטת בישראל, ולא היו "חרות על הלוחות" נד., שמות רבה מא, ז) על הפסוק כ. ועתה מובן, שהרי כל סיבת הגלויות הייתה חטא העגל, וישראל שלא עזבו את ה' בחטא העגל, אלא אדרבה, חיפשו להתקרב אליו, זכו שבכל מקום שגלו "גולים, ע (מחמת חטא העגל), שכינה עמהם

נרמזו הגלויות, שהרי פסוק זה מרמז לנו שה' היה עם בני ישראל בכל מסעיהם במדבר מחמת שהם היו עמו יתברך בחטא "אלה מסעי בני ישראל" ונפלא שדווקא בפסוק העגל – הדבר שגרם למסעות. והרי זו גופא גם הסיבה שה' היה עם ישראל בד' גלויות, שישראל היו עמו יתברך בחטא העגל – הדבר שגרם לגלויות. לכן שני דברים אלו נרמזו באותו פסוק

שזה רומז לכוונה הפנימית של – "הא עין גמל, חית טית אלף" – ורמז למה שאמרנו, שכוונתם הפנימית של ישראל בעגל הייתה להתקרב לה': המילוי הפנימי של חטא העגל (עם הכולל) (1105) "את ה' אלקיך תירא" חטא העגל, עולה בגימטריא

מאמר החכם

אילו נטלה מהיצר הרע כל אפשרות לעשות מעשים בשמו של היצר הטוב, אז כמה מעשים מגונים לא היו אפשריים כלל

רבי צבי אלימלך מדינוב

NCYI Divrei Torah Bulletin - a Project of the Young Israel Council of Rabbis