



Diurei Torah

Parshat Pinchas

24 Tammuz 5779 / July 27, 2019

Daf Yomi: Temurah 8; Nach Yomi: Iyov 16

Shabbat Mevorchim Chodeh Av

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

Leadership

Rabbi Aharon Ziegler

Associate Member, Young Israel Council of Rabbis

In Israel we are preparing for new elections. We have to select a new leader, to guide us and to unite us.

In the Parasha. Moshe is told that he will soon die and a new leader must be chosen. The difference is that in the Parasha it will be HaShem who will choose a successor to Moshe and not by popular vote of the people. Moshe says to G-D, (27:16) "Let the G-D of spirits of all flesh, appoint a man over the congregation..who will lead them out and bring them in, so that the congregation of G-d will not be like the sheep without a shepherd". Moshe is told, "Take Yehoshua, the son of Nun, a man of spirit, and place your hand upon him". Meaning, he will be your successor, the leader of Am Yisrael.

Midrash Tanchuma (Pinchas 11) asks why the leadership was given to Yehoshua when others, such as Pinchas and Eliezer, had greater intellectual talents. In reply, the Midrash quotes a pasuk from Mishlei (27:18), *The one who guards the fig tree will eat its fruits*. Yehoshua was chosen as Moshe's successor because he arranged the chairs and spread the mats on the floor before the shiur began. Because of his devoted service, he was the appropriate candidate to replace Moshe.

When the Baal Shem Tov passed away, the mantle of leadership was not given to Rav Yaakov Yosef, a Torah giant and the author of the "Toldos Avraham Yosef". Rather, it passed to the Maggid of Mezeritch, who had served the Baal Shem Tov with great devotion and loyalty. Similarly, Rav Chaim Volozhin became the successor to his teacher, the Vilna Gaon, partly because he was not only his student but his attendant and confidant.

Yehoshua was not a greater scholar than Pinchas or Eliezer, but "the service (Shimush) of Torah scholars is greater than its study" (Berachot 7b). Service does not merely signify physical toil, it also represents a special closeness and friendship between the rebbe and talmid. The chosen talmid not only receives information from his rebbe, but absorbs his way of life, until they are practically identical in their essence. Moshe knew that through his trusted Mesharet (servant) and confidant, the Torah would be properly transmitted to future generations.

is a way of life. It does not only consist of rules and laws but a totality of a 24/7 life conduct. The way a rebbe eats dresses and walks. The way he relates to his wife and children, to his guests and strangers-all that is Torah.

student in Yeshiva Tifereth Yerushalayim was constantly disruptive and had no interest in learning. The Menahel of the Yeshiva wanted to expel him but needed the consent of the Rosh Yeshiva-Rav Moshe Feinstein. Rav Moshe consented to having the boy expelled-from classes, but not from the Yeshiva. The boy was assigned to the office of R' Moshe as his personal attendant; to carry his seforim, to keep the office tidy and clean and to bring R' Moshe to his home after Yeshiva was over. The boy began to love R' Moshe, he became interested in learning and wound up becoming a "rebbe" in the Yeshiva for difficult students.

Shalom from Yerushalayim.

Difficult Mitzvos

Reb Yitzchak Rabinowitz

Associate Member, Young Israel Council of Rabbis

Pinchas, the son of Elazar, the son of Aaron the Kohen, turned back My anger from upon the Children of Israel when he zealously avenged Me against them. So I did not consume the Children of Israel in My vengeance. Therefore say: Behold! I give him my covenant of peace" [Bamidbar 10:1-12].

When we fully appreciate what Pinchas did, we must consider the circumstance that surrounded him. In last week's parsha [Balak 25:4], HaShem says to Moshe, "Take all the leaders of the people and hang them (the people that worshipped the idol Ba'al Peor) before HaShem against the sun." Rashi explains that Moshe was to convene courts with these leaders and pass judgment and punish the sinners. Rabbi Samson Raphael Hirsch comments that HaShem commanded the convening of these special courts because, according to conventional Jewish law, a court may only become involved after the witnesses first warn a person against sinning and, if their warning is ignored, the witnesses themselves are to bring the sinner to the Beit Din. In this case, however, no one was getting involved! No one was trying to stop the idol worship from being performed. Therefore, HaShem instructed Moshe to have the leaders convene a special Beit Din/Court and to punish the sinners without the standard halachic procedures. As we know from last week's parsha, the idol worship was accompanied and inspired by immoral behavior with the Moabite women.

In the midst of all this, Zimri, the prince of the tribe of Shimon, takes a Midianite woman and outdoes the rest of the sinners by sinning with her. This was a direct challenge to the authority of Moshe and the leaders. At this point, when Pinchas considered punishing Zimri, he must have looked all around him and realized that so many people would not support his actions. But Pinchas took a lesson from a halacha in Shulchan Aruch. In Hilchot Treifot, the Shulchan Aruch deals with the laws of shechita and the rules that render an animal unfit to eat (see Yoreh De'ah 58). To check a bird for a broken limb, it must either walk or swim. But swimming can be a deceptive test to determine that a bird is fit only if the bird is able to swim against the current. A lame animal can be carried along with the flow. Pinchas understood that to be spiritually sound, one must be ready to swim against the current of society. Pinchas wouldn't allow the corruption, or the apathy, of the surrounding society to stop him.

There is another point to consider. At this point, Pinchas held no special status within his people. On the other hand, Zimri was a *nasi*, the prince of the tribe of Shimon, which dictates that he had to have been a great person. Furthermore, many commentaries state that Zimri had sincere and noble intentions in what he did. How then did Pinchas justify to himself the decision to kill a leader of the Jewish people? The answer is that he consulted with his rebbe. The Gemarah in Sanhedrin 82a states that, when Pinchas saw what Zimri was doing, he remembered a halacha, he went to Moshe, and said: "Did you not teach me that if one commits such an act with a gentile, a zealous one may slay him?" Even those who are called upon to stand up for the honor of HaShem cannot take things into their own hands. They first must seek guidance from their rebbe.

The Yalkut Me'am Loez asks an interesting question. How did Pinchas know how to use a spear? After all, he didn't come from a family of warriors. Where did he gain the ability to use a spear so well that in one act he speared two people at the same time? The Yalkut answers that, once he saw the mitzvah and was willing to sacrifice himself by performing it, Pinchas received *Siyata Dishmaya*, Divine assistance, to complete his task successfully. Pinchas had no experience using a spear, but he knew that he had to do this mitzvah, as difficult as it may have been. So he took the spear in hand trusting that HaShem would grant him the ability to accomplish the task. The Yalkut Me'am Loez concludes that this holds true for every mitzvah. Once a person begins a mitzvah, although it may be difficult, HaShem sends *Siyata Dishmaya* to bring it to success. Shabbat Sha

The Weekly Sidra

The Honor of One Talmid Chacham to Another"

Rabbi Moshe Greebel Z"L

This week's Sidra, we are introduced to five very extraordinary sisters who appeal to Moshe for judgment:

And these came the daughters of Z'lafchad, the son of Chaifer, the son of Gilad, the son of Machir, the son of M'nashe, of the families of M'nashe the Gileadite; and these are the names of his daughters; Machlah, Noah, and Chagla, and Milkah, and Tirtzah. And they stood before Moshe and before Elazar the Kohain, and before the princes and all the congregation, by the door of the Tent of Meeting, saying." (Bamidbar 27:1-2)

When the sisters appearing 'Before Moshe and before Elazar,' Rashi poses the following:

... afterwards 'before Elazar'? Is it possible that if Moshe did not know (the law) and Elazar did know? But transpose the Passuk (verse) and read it (as if it were written, 'Before Elazar and before Moshe') These are the words of Rabbi Yoshiya....."

By interrupting Rashi, we are being told that the order of standing before Moshe and Elazar suggests that if Moshe could not answer, they would go on to Elazar. But, is it plausible that Elazar could answer something that Moshe could not? That is why Rabbi Yoshiya has us transpose the order to Elazar and Moshe. That is, they would begin with Elazar, and continue on to Moshe for a final ruling. We return to the Rashi:

Abba Chanan said in the name of Rabbi Elazar, 'They (Moshe, Elazar, and the princes) were sitting in the study hall, and they (five sisters) came and stood before all of them.' (Sifri Pinchas 12, Bava Basra 119b)

Essentially, according to Abba Chanan, when two or more Talmidei Chachamim (Torah scholars) sit together, regardless of which is greater, they would both be consulted. That is why the order of Moshe, Elazar, etc. in the Torah is not necessarily referring to any hierarchy of greatness.

Next *Binyan Ariel* (Rav Shaul Lowenstam 1717- 1790 of blessed memory) cites yet another situation in the Torah of individuals coming before Moshe for judgment:

... there were certain men, who were defiled by the dead body of a man, so that they could not keep the Pesach on that day; and they came and stood before Moshe and before Aharon on that day. And those men said to him, 'We are defiled by the dead body of a man; Why are we kept back, so that we may not offer an offering to HaShem in His appointed season among the B'nai Yisroel?'" (Bamidbar 9:6-7)

Rashi here has this to say:

... before Moshe and before Aharon.... When both of them (Talmidei Chachamim) are sitting together in the Bais HaMidrash (study hall), come and stand before them both (regardless of which is greater). Neither is it proper to go from one to the other, for, if Moshe did not know, from where would Aharon have known?"

Continuing the *Binyan Ariel*, in this situation of these defiled men coming 'Before Moshe and before Aharon,' Rashi only makes use of the interpretation of Abba Chanan concerning two (or more) Talmidei Chachamim sitting together in the Bais HaMidrash. Yet, here, Rashi does not use the opinion of Rabbi Yoshiyo of transposing the Passuk ('Before Aharon and before Moshe') as he did when speaking of the five sisters. And we know that this debate between Rabbi Yoshiyo and Abba Chanan applies in both cases. Why should this be so?

In the Gemarah of *Bava Basra* 119b, the dispute between Rabbi Yoshiyo and Abba Chanan is described in the following manner:

... they stood before Moshes and before Elazar the Kohain and before the princes and all the congregation.' Is it possible that they stood before Moshe etc. and they (meaning Moshe) did not say anything to them (five sisters so that) they (had) to stand before the princes and all the congregation? But, the verse is to be transposed and expounded. These are the words of Rabbi Yoshiyo. Abba Chanan said in the name of Rabbi Elazar, 'They (Moshe and company) were sitting in the Bais HaMidrash, and these came and stood before all of them.....'"

Gemarah elaborates:

Wherein lies their dispute? (One) master (Abba Chanan) is of the opinion (that) honor may be shown to a disciple in the presence of the master, and the other (Rabbi Yoshiyo) is of the opinion that it is not to be shown (and only the master may be consulted). And the law is (that honor is) shown (to the disciple). And the law is (that honor is) not to be shown. Surely this is a contradiction between one law and the other! There is no contradiction. The one (refers to the case) where his master shows him (disciple) respect; the other, where his master does not."

Then, poses the *Binyan Ariel*, since Rabbi Yoshiyo is of the opinion that where the master and disciple sit together, only the master may be consulted, why in this particular Gemarah did he not give his opinion of transposing the Passuk (which Rashi as well did not make mention of)?

In order to answer this question, instructs the *Binyan Ariel*, we must realize that the final Halacha (law) in this Gemarah is where the master shows honor to the disciple, the disciple may be consulted even though he sits with the master. Where the master does not honor the disciple, only the master may be consulted.

Now, concludes the *Binyan Ariel*, our question is resolved. For, in the situation of the five sisters, we do not know whether Moshe honored them, the princes, etc., or not. Therefore, we cannot issue a full rendering of the Halacha. For, from one side it is altogether possible that Moshe honored them, and that is why the sisters addressed them all. Or, it is possible that Moshe did not honor them, and in such a situation it would be forbidden to consult anyone other than the master. Hence, since we do not know the exact circumstances of what took place, Rabbi Yoshiyo says that the Passuk had to be transposed with Moshe not being the first mentioned.

However, when it comes to the defiled men who 'Came before Moshe and before Aharon,' it is a well-known fact that Moshe made it his business to honor his brother Aharon without fail. We can see this from the words of the *Ohr HaChayim* (Rav Don Yosef Ibn Chiya 14th century of blessed memory) in *Bamidbar* chapter 9:

How righteous are the words 'And the man Moshe was very humble, more than any other men which were upon the face of the earth.' (Bamidbar 12:3) For, Moshe Rabbeinu peace be upon him, was very modest, and would always give honor to Aharon his brother...."

as well in the *Ohr HaChayim* in *Bamidbar* chapter 9:

It was stated (by our Rabbanim) that whenever they (Moshe and Aharon) stood before the Pharaoh, Moshe always gave honor to Aharon...

Therefore, since the defiled men approached the Bais Din in which sat Moshe and Aharon, it goes without saying that since Moshe honored Aharon, it is permissible for these men to consult Aharon, and there is no need whatsoever to have to transpose the Passuk. It is for this reason that the Gemarah in *Bava Basra* 119b) does not offer Rabbi Yoshiyo's opinion to the case of the defiled men.

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

Loyalty and Dedication

by Rabbi Yitzchak Gettinger

from the D'atra, Young Israel of the West Side

One of the key points of the Parsha is the transition in leadership from Moshe Rabeinu to Yehoshua. In the aftermath of the "Bnos Tzafchad's" requests to inherit their father's portion in Israel, Moshe was inspired by their ancestral claims, and it was a catalyst for his own personal request that his children inherit his position. However, God denies Moshe's requests, and responds that Yehoshua was the better choice instead of Moshe's children. In the full version of the Midrash, strong criticism is placed on Moshe's children, as the Midrash goes so far as to write that Moshe's children did not learn Torah." While this is one angle on the issue, Rashi in his commentary to Chumash leaves out any sense of criticism of Moshe's children, and instead quotes the parts of Midrash that praise Yehoshua for his loyalty and dedication to studying Torah with Moshe, and these characteristics as reasons why Yehoshua merited to be the next leader.

In the Midrash, Rashi cites the Pasuk from Mishlei: "He who guards the fig tree shall eat its fruit," and explains that this is a reference to Yehoshua who was constantly by Moshe's side, guarding each and every piece of Torah that "fell from the tree." In the parable of the one guard

fruit tree, the implication is that the watchman is not necessarily the most worthy for the fruit, but instead is simply "in the right place at the right time" to be the first to snatch the freshly ripened fruit. By positioning himself as Moshe's attendant and ever "watching the tree," Yehoshua had endless opportunities to grow in ways that others did not.

This idea can be furthered based on a Gemara in Eruvin 54, where the Gemara quotes this same Pasuk-"*He who guards the fig tree shall eat its fruit*" and explains that the Pasuk is a parable for the study of Torah. Unlike the fruit of other trees, which ripen simultaneously, the fruit of a fig tree ripen at staggered intervals. Thus, at any point in the season one is able to find newly ripened fruits that are ready for eating. In the process of studying Torah, there is always new flavor and insight that emerges from each study session, and from that perspective, Torah is more like figs than other fruits. Other fruit trees do not warrant the constant watching like a fig tree, as one can simply come at the single time of ripening and harvest all the fruits together. Torah is based on the cumulative effects of constant study, and unlike the "one-time harvest" of most trees, Torah continuously ripens, little by little.

The inextricable connection between Torah and *Hasmadah*, persistent study of Torah, is the reality of the way the fruit ripens on the tree of Torah. The greatest of minds can walk into the study hall periodically to study Torah and expect the words to produce a "one-time harvest" with a large yield and abundance, but in reality, the *Masmid* who constantly guards the tree will walk away with all the smaller increments of ripened fruit. The greater mind may be left unhappy and frustrated. In Yiddish, there is an expression that emphasizes the importance of "creating one's own *mazal*," positioning oneself correctly so the *mazal* can just fall into one's lap. By way of implication, it seems that Yehoshua was not the greatest mind for Torah, but in guarding the fig tree, he "made his own *mazal*" and collected all the freshly ripened fruits from Moshe's tree.

From different sources in Chazal, there is a sense of criticism for Yehoshua's Torah after Moshe passed away. In Baba Basra, the Gemara notes that members of the generation complained that "*Moshe's face was like the sun, while Yehoshua's was only like the moon.*" Moreover, the Gemara in Baba Basra 16 discusses that Yehoshua forgot much of Moshe's Torah and that the people actually wanted to murder him! Why was Yehoshua punished so harshly? The Gemara says that before Moshe passed away, he asked Yehoshua if he had forgotten anything or if he wished to clarify anything. In sharp response, Yehoshua said-"*It is written about me that I never left the tent of Torah. Could it be that I forgot anything?*"

Perhaps the depth of Yehoshua's mistake was not just that he arrogantly assumed himself to be Moshe's equal, but rather that he misrepresented his value really was. He did not possess the greatest mind, and he did not have the great memories to automatically remember all he had learned. His very "right" to succession was his diligence and persistence in guarding of the tree, and the moment he veered from those values and did not stand on a chance to review his studies one last time with Moshe, he was no longer the guarder of the fig tree. God precisely chose the man who understands the danger of forgetting their Torah and cleaves to the tent like the guarder of the fig tree, and Yehoshua was punished for not staying faithful with that value when he rejected Moshe's offer to review their Torah one last time. Good Shabbos.

Pinchas Pinchas: Is Zealotry and Revenge a Prelude to Peace?

Пинхас Пинхас: Есть Фанатизм и Мечь Прелюдия к миру?

Reb Yisroel Yitzchok Silberberg

Associate Member, Young Israel Council of Rabbis

В русском языке термин "фанатик" стало синонимом с человеком, который действует в экстремальной манере и часто из чувства ревности. В энциклопедическом словаре определяется как фанатик "человека, который фанатично и бескомпромиссно достижения своих религиозных, политических и других идеалов." Кроме того термин "мечь" имеет столь же негативную коннотацию в обществе. Светская определение термина мечь "быть взыскать наказание или искупление за плохого от имени, особенно в обиженный или мстительный дух." Тем не менее, на этой странице в главе, мы находим, что характерно быть фанатиком и мстят не абсолютно отрицательным, а это похвально.

Пинхас награжден Аль-могучий своими героическими действиями убийства Зимри, президент племени Шимона, и Kasbi, дочь царя Midya, фанатизма, чтобы освятить имя Всевышнего. Действительно Пинхас хвалили по Аль-могучий для остановки аморальный акт Зимри, быстро и решительно действовать за честь Naheem. Кроме того, мы узнаем, что Аль-могучий команды еврейский народ, чтобы убить Midyans как акт мести за их причинение еврейский народ ко греху. Поэтому мы заметим, что существуют случаи, были фанатизм и мечь, которые являются приемлемым и похвально.

Вопросная линия, которая определяет ли мы достичь мира через акты страсти и фанатизм или, показывая сдержанность? Очевидно, ответ заключается в том, что при достижении мира через сдержанности и диалога неудачным и нереальным, то человек может действовать и

ести мир в результате актов фанатизма. Пинхас погладил и убил Зимри ради чести Всевышнего и, следовательно, его поступок был похвален. Так же, евреи велено взять реванш и уничтожить все Midyanites, потому что они вызваны евреями грешить с женщинами Моавитянами.

не менее, это руководство трудно следовать, и может быть размыта в разы. Когда Дина нарушаются Ефрона, Яков Авину имел право действовать ее обратно силой, как она была проходит против ее воли, которая является грехом. Тем не менее, Яков не действовать фанатизмом, чтобы освободить и он не планирую взять реванш у народа Хаит. С другой стороны, Шимон и Леви сделал акт с фанатизмом и мести, как он озорил своему отцу "должны они сделать нашу сестру в шлюху"?

и фанатизм допускается только в крайнем случае и только ради славы Всевышнего? Если так будет выполняется в отношении людей, которые не связаны честь Всевышнего, мы должны проявлять сдержанность?

т Аль-могучий предоставит нам мудрость, чтобы отличить, когда мы должны действовать с чистой фанатизма и мести, и когда мы должны действовать сдержанно. Хорошие Шаббат! Good Shabbos.

What Can We Learn from the Survival of Korach's Sons?

by Dovid Sochet

Associate Member, Young Israel Council of Rabbis

Parshas Korach, the Torah recounts the great rebellion against Moshe, fueled by his envious relative Korach, which ended in disastrous consequences for Korach, his family, and his co-horts. The earth opened under their feet and their dwelling places and swallowed them - man, woman and child. The fires caused by "machlokes", or contentious dissension, are so great that even those who are otherwise blameless are nonetheless consumed along with others who may actually be more culpable than they are. Because of his venomous acrimony, Korach and his cohorts were condemned to obliteration and oblivion. But did they all suffer the same fate? In our Parsha (26:11) the Torah tells that the Bnei Korach did not die. What are we to make of their survival? How did they extricate themselves from their doomed position?

In the context of this conflict Moshe Rabeinu said (Bamidbar 16:29-30) "If these men (Korach and his cohorts) die the common death of all men, and the earth will be visited upon them, then Hashem has not sent me. But if Hashem will make a new creation, and the ground opens its mouth and swallows them and all that is theirs, and they descend alive into the grave, you will know that these men have provoked Hashem." Why did Moshe, who was countlessly ready to sacrifice more than just his physical life for the Jewish people; he was also prepared to relinquish his neshama his spiritual life, for them, ask Hashem to kill Korach in such an extraordinary way? It seems as if, Heaven forbid, Moshe is asking Hashem to take revenge on his, Moshe's, behalf in a most bizarre fashion. This would be contrary to our understanding of Moshe as the most humble of all being against our understanding of the Torah's admonition against seeking vengeance.

The Jewish belief that this world is only an entranceway for the World to Come (See Pirkei Avos 4:16). As such, true compassion is to facilitate for people to repent, gain forgiveness, and merit everlasting life in the next World. Shlomo Hamelech writes in Koheles (7:2) "It is better to go to a house of mourning than to go to a house of feasting, for that is the end of every man, and the living shall lay it to his heart." This teaches us that being confronted with death is something that can and should initiate one to a course of repentance.

The Rambam (Moreh Nevuchim 2:29) writes "permanent changes in nature do not happen spontaneously". This Universe remains perpetually with the same properties with which the Creator has endowed it... none of these will ever be changed permanently, only periodically by way of some miraculous intervention, but eventually nature will revert to the course originally ordained by the Creator. Likewise, mankind will continue or revert to nature unless people are interdicted in a most unusual fashion. Further, writes the Rambam, (see Moreh Nevuchim 3:32,) Hashem purposefully sends out reward and punishment in order to encourage people to observe the commandments.

If Korach and his allies would have died a natural death then no one else who was involved in the dispute would have done teshuva, and they would not merit a portion in the World to Come (according to R' Akivah's opinion see Sanhedrin 109B) which is the main world. Moshe, by asking Hashem to give them an unnatural death, was actually trying to save whoever he could from Korach's camp, not *chaliilah* (heaven forbid) taking revenge. The sons of Korach were only awakened to do Teshuva after they saw the catastrophic event that brought about their father's doom.

Ultimately, we can understand that Moshe intended to provide a means by which many lives would be spared in this world. Indeed, we learn that Korach's sons survived the calamity because they did do teshuva, as Chazal say (Sanhedrin 110A) that as Korach's sons were falling into Gehennom for their father, they repented. And miraculously, a place was fortified for them above Gehennom and thus Korach's sons were saved. And in that moment, at the last possible moment, they rethought their father's erroneous and unjustified rebellion against their selfless leader Moshe and his T

mitted the truth to themselves and to others.

Taz, Dovid Halevy Segal (born about 1586–1667), in his sefer Divrei David, brings a contradiction whether the sons of Korach actually survived. He cites Rashi who quotes the above mentioned gemarah in Sanhedrin. He then goes and brings the Re'em, Rabbi Eliyahu Mizrach (born 1455, and he passed away in 1525 or 1526). He is best known for his Sefer ha-Mizrachi, a super commentary on Rashi's commentary on the Torah. He is also known as *Re'em*, the Hebrew acronym for "Rabbi Eliyahu Mizrach" who quoted a Medrash (See Medrash Shocher Tov 1) that the sons of Korach came up to the surface of the land, and they entered into Eretz Yisroel and were *Nevi'im* - prophets. A very compelling proof to this is that Shmuel was a decedent of Korach's sons, and even Rashi himself writes this in Tehillim (42:1). The Taz therefore suggests that it is possible that they were in Gehenom for some length of time, and afterwards they ascended back onto the face of the Earth.")

He had realized that the Decree of Hashem to kill them all had already been sealed but he wished to save those who would repent. The Gemara in Sanhedrin (Eruvin 19A) that *Resha'im* do not repent even at the entrance of Gehenom. Moshe wanted them all to fall into Gehenom hoping that those who were not that deeply entrenched in wickedness would repent at the doorpost of Gehenom and thus be spared. Unfortunately, only Korach's sons were not fully evil and were salvageable. Had they been completely wicked, then even while falling into the abyss they would not have repented. All the others, however, had already gone too far and as such were considered completely evil and they did not repent even at the entrance of Gehenom.

The tzadikim pondered this entire episode which could not have lasted more than a few seconds, and they made the observation that even a small amount of sincere thought of repentance can save a person. As the Gemarah (Kedushin 49B) teaches us that when a known rasha betrothed a woman on the condition that he is a complete tzadik, we must consider that the betrothal might be valid because of the possibility that he might have temporarily reflected on repentance. So great is the power of teshuva that it can transform a great rasha into a perfect Tzaddik in one instant!

We see that Moshe was not trying to hurt Korach and his henchmen out of spite. On the contrary, he was trying to save them either from eternal damnation in the world to come, or literally saving their lives in this world by praying to Hashem to provide a supernatural intervention.

Maafar Kumi

Rabbi Ronen Shaharabany

Graduate, NCYI Rabbinic Training Program

כפרשתנו: "פינחס בן אלעזר בן אהרן הכהן השיב את חמתי מעל בני ישראל בקנאו את קנאתי בתוכם ולא כליתי את בני ישראל בקנאתי" (במדבר כה, יא). איך על ידי שש זה זכה פנחס לכפר על כל ישראל ולהצילם מקליה? ועוד, מהי ההדגשה שפנחס לקח "רומח" בידו, כדכתיב (שם, ז) "וירא פנחס... ויקם מתוך העדה ויקח רומח ב

גאון רבי מאיר יחיאל הלוי מאוסטראווצא (ספר "מאיר עיני חכמים" מהדורא תליתאי, עמ' פג), ישנן שתי דרכים בעבודת ה', על פי הגמרא במסכת עבודה זרה (ז.ז): ה' ר' יונתן הלכו בדרך והיו לפנייהם שתי דרכים, אחת פתוחה לפתח עבודה זרה, ואחת פתוחה לפתח בית פריצות. אמר האחד לחבירו, נלך בדרך הפתוחה לעבודה זרה רש"י, כיון שאין לנו תאוה לעבודה זרה לא ישלוט בנו היצר. אמר לו חבירו, נלך בדרך הפתוחה לבית פריצות, נכופ את יצרנו ונקבל שכר, ע"כ. דרך אחת – להתרחק מכל האפשר, "ללחום בו מרחוק" ולהמנע מנסיונות. דרך שניה – להתקרב אל יצר הרע ולכבוש אותו.

באר הרב מאוסטראווצא את דברי החז"ל (חולין ס:), מה נשתנה קרבן שער של ראש חודש שנאמר בו "לה" ("ושעיר עזים אחד לחטאת לה" - במדבר כה, טו), אמר ה' שער זה יהיה כפרה עלי שמיעטתי את הירח, ע"ש. מדוע נתמעט הירח? אומות העולם מונים לחמה, וישראל מונים לירח. ה' מיעט את הירח, לרמוז לישראל להתרחק מן הרע, ולמעט מחמימות ומותרות המביאות לידי נסיונות ועבירות. לא להיות כחמה שהיא בתוקף החום. על האדם להשמר ולהתרחק מן היצר הרע כי קשה מאוד לעמוז בר עליו. ובכל זאת אמר הקב"ה, "הביאו כפרה עלי שמיעטתי את הירח", שיכול להיות שישנם אנשים שלא ישמרו מלהתקרב אל הרע, ובכל זאת ימשלו ברוחם ויתגברו ויכריעו יתלו שכר מרובה. נמצא שעבורם הקב"ה לא היה צריך למעט את הירח, ובשבילם הקב"ה צריך כפרה, ע"ש.

ס' אחר כתב הרב מאוסטראווצא (שם, עמ' קיד), על הפסוק "ויקח רומח בידו" (במדבר כה, ז), במלחמה ישנם שני מיני אדם. יש העומד מרחוק ויורה על שונאו בקשת ס, אבל שומר נפשו מלהתקרב אל קשרי המלחמה, כהסברא של "נלך בדרך הפתוחה לבית עבודה זרה". ויש המתקרב לשונאו ונלחם בו בחרב ובחניט, כהסברא של הפתוחה לבית פריצות ונכופ את יצרנו". וזה היה פנחס, שהיה כה קדוש עד שהיה יכול להתקרב אל הרע ולא להינזק. וזה שכתוב "וירא פנחס", שראה מעשה הרע ולמזה, "ויקח רומח בידו" וקירב את עצמו למלחמה, ע"ש.

פנחס, שאחז בשיטת "נלך בדרך הפתוחה לבית פריצות ונכופ את יצרנו", לא היה צריך למיעוט הירח, ועורר את זה שהקב"ה צריך כפרה על שמיעט את הירח.

ס' אחר כתב הרב מאוסטראווצא (ח"א סוף הספר עמ' כא, אות ח), הדרך שהקב"ה ממליץ טובה על ישראל ומסיר מהם קטרוג עוונות, היא על ידי שתולה את החטא ידו בעצמו, כביכול. ואומר הרב, שזוהי גופא על ידי בחינת "הביאו עלי כפרה שמיעטתי את הירח", דהיינו הקב"ה "מאשים את עצמו" בחטאי ישראל.

בין בס"ד איך פנחס השיב את חמתו של ה' וביטל את החרון אף והקטרוג מעל בני ישראל. מבואר בספורנו (במדבר כה, פסוק ד ופסוק יא) שהחרון אף של ה' על ישראל חמת שלא מיחו בפושעים. והרי זה שישראל לא מיחו, הוא משום שאחזו במידה של "ירח" במיעוט, ושמרו נפשם מלהתקרב אל קשרי המלחמה. אבל פנחס אחז במימש", "ויקח רומח בידו", וקירב את עצמו למלחמה. ובזה פנחס עורר בחינת "הביאו עלי כפרה שמיעטתי את הירח", שהרי הוא לא נזקק למיעוט הירח. ובחינה זו של ו עליו כפרה שמיעטתי את הירח" גופא גרמה שהקב"ה יתלה את החטא – זה שישראל אחזו במידת הירח ולא מיחו – בעצמו, וממילא נתבטל הקטרוג מעל ישראל

"פינחס בן אלעזר בן אהרן הכהן השיב את חמתי מעל בני ישראל... לכן אמור הנני נותן לו את בריתי שלום". ונראה לי לרמז: "שמש" עולה בגימטריא 640. "לבנה" ע 552. ההבדל הוא 552. נמצא שמיעוט הלבנה מרומז במספר 552. ופנחס, על ידי שעורר בחינת "הביאו עלי כפרה שמיעטתי את הירח", זכה למידת השלום, ולפ"ם" במילוי (הי שין למד ויו מם - עם הכולל) עולה בגימטריא 552

אחר יש לרמז, "שמש" עולה בגימטריא 640, "ירח" במספר קטן (עם הכולל) – בבחינת ירח במיעוטו – עולה 12. ההבדל הוא 628. נמצא שמיעוט הירח מרומז במ פנחס, על ידי שעורר בחינת "הביאו עלי כפרה שמיעטתי את הירח", זכה ל"כהונת עולם", כדכתיב "והייתה לו ולזרעו אחריו ברית כהונת עולם". ולכן "כהונת עולם" (ע) עולה בגימטריא 628

מאמר החכם

אין כללים בעבודת הבורא – וגם כלל זה אינו כלל

היהודי הקדוש

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