

לעילוי נשמת
מרת עקא עדנה
צפורה ע"ה וסרטל
בת משה מנחם הלוי ז"ל



על דשא

AL EY DESHE

Weekly Torah Insights and inspiration on the Parsha from the Rosh Yeshiva Shlit"a of Gur

Servitude of Hashem

וַעֲבָדִי כָלֵב עֲקֵב הִיָּתָה רוּחַ אַחֶרֶת עִמּוֹ וַיִּמְלֵא
אַחֲרָי וַהֲבִיאתִיו אֶל הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר בָּא שָׁמָּה וְזָרְעוּ
יִירָשָׁנָה.

But My servant Kalev, because a different spirit was with him and he followed Me wholeheartedly, I shall bring him to the land to which he came, and his descendants shall possess it (Bamidbar 14:24).

The *Or Hachaim* wonders why only Kalev is called "My servant." Why not

It is the toil, the effort, the resistance that earns the name "My servant."

Yehoshua as well? Should the *pasuk* not have said, "My servants, Yehoshua and Kalev"?

He explains that Yehoshua was never truly tested. Moshe Rabbeinu had *davened* for him: *יְהִי יוֹשִׁיעֶךָ מִכָּצֶדֶת מְרַגְלִים* — and through that *tefillah*, the *yetzer hara* was removed from him. He was shielded from the influence of the *meraglim*; he was never in danger of joining them. Thus, his steadfastness, while admirable, was not unexpected.

Kalev, however, "had a different spirit with him." He felt the pull of the *yetzer hara* urging him to follow the *meraglim*, who were great men, leaders of the nation. He sensed the danger and fled to Chevron to *daven* at the graves of the *Avos*. Kalev faced a real *nisayon* and overcame it; therefore, he alone is called "My servant."

These words of the *Or Hachaim* strengthen every Yid who faces inner battles. One who serves Hashem without struggle, whose path is smooth and pleasant, is fortunate and will surely merit a bright *Gan Eden*. However, the title "*eved Hashem*" is reserved for those who fight — those who feel the "foreign spirit" within them, the pull of nature and desire, yet rise above it. It is the toil, the effort, the resistance that earns the name "My servant."

Therefore, a person should not fall into despair when he sees the challenges the *yetzer hara* places before him. These very struggles are what allow him to become an *eved Hashem*. Why envy another who seems to have fewer battles? His *avodah* is not yours. Your struggles are your path to becoming Hashem's servant.

This idea is echoed in the *Kedushas Levi* on the *pesukim* (Bamidbar 14:21-22): *וְאֹלָם חַי אֲנִי וַיִּמְלֵא כְבוֹד ה' אֶת כָּל הָאָרֶץ, כִּי כָל הָאֲנָשִׁים הָרָאִים אֶת כְּבֹדִי וְגו'*

The Mekoshesh's Punishment

וַיִּמְצְאוּ אִישׁ מִקֵּשֶׁשׁ עֲצִים בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיט. וַיִּנְיְחוּ
אֹתוֹ בַּמִּשְׁמֶר כִּי לֹא פָרַשׁ מִהַ עֲשֵׂה לוֹ.

And they found a man gathering wood on Shabbos... They placed him in custody, for it had not been clarified what should be done to him (Bamidbar 15:32, 34).

Rashi, citing the Gemara (*Bava Basra* 119b; *Sanhedrin* 78b), explains that Moshe Rabbeinu already knew that the *mekoshesh* was liable for death, as the Torah states (*Shemos* 31:14): *מְחַלְלֵיהָ מוֹת — יוֹמָת* — *Those who desecrate it shall surely die*. What Moshe did not know was which form of death applied.

*Tosafos*⁵ ask: Why was Moshe uncertain? The Gemara (*Sanhedrin* 52b) teaches that whenever the Torah prescribes death without specifying the method, the punishment is strangulation (*chenek*). Why did Moshe not simply apply this rule?

Tosafos answer that Moshe had a compelling reason to hesitate. He reasoned that the *mekoshesh* might be comparable to an idol worshipper, whose punishment is stoning (*sekilah*). Public desecration of Shabbos is akin to denying *Maaseh Bereishis*, and in that sense resembles *avodah zarah*. Moshe therefore wondered whether the general rule of *chenek* should apply, or whether the severity of the act demanded *sekilah*. Rav Akiva Eiger⁶ challenges this explanation. If Moshe's comparison to

⁵ *Bava Basra* 119a, s.v. "*shene'emar*"; *Sanhedrin* 78b, s.v. "*lo*."

⁶ *Gilyonei HaShas*, *Sanhedrin* 78b.

¹ See *Sotah* 34b.

Servitude of Hashem

Cont. from page 1

live, the glory of Hashem shall fill the entire earth, for all the men who saw My glory... The word *כי* — *for*, seems out of place. How does the death of the generation of the *meraglim* cause Hashem's glory to fill the world? Moreover, why mention the filling of Hashem's glory here at all?

The *Kedushas Levi* explains that the generation of the *midbar*, who received the Torah, had no *yetzer hara*; as Chazal² say, they were “free from the *yetzer hara*.” Their children, however — the next generation — did not have this advantage. They had a full *yetzer hara*, real *bechirah*, and genuine inner conflict. When they

Their victories would reveal Hashem's presence far more than the effortless purity of the earlier generation.

would fight, strive, and overcome, then the glory of Hashem would fill the world. Their victories would reveal Hashem's presence far more than the effortless purity of the earlier generation.

Thus, *כי כל האנשים הראים את כבודי* — those who lived in the *midbar* and experienced open *nissim* — they would not bring about the fullness of Hashem's glory. Rather, it would be their descendants, who would face a “different spirit” — the spirit of the *yetzer hara* — and nevertheless triumph over it. Through them, Hashem's glory would spread throughout the world.

The *Kedushas Levi* further explains the phrase: *אֶת כָּל הָאָרֶץ יִמְלֵא כְבוֹד ה'*. The Mishnah in *Avos* (6:12) teaches: “Everything Hashem created in His world, He created for His glory.” The

Rambam³ explains the *pasuk* (*Yeshayah* 45:7): *יוֹצֵר אוֹר וּבוֹרֵא חֹשֶׁךְ עֹשֶׂה שָׁלוֹם וּבוֹרֵא רָע* — *Who forms light and creates darkness, who makes peace and creates evil*, noting that the word *בוֹרֵא* — *creates*, implies absence. Thus, the creation of darkness and evil are described as *בוֹרֵא*, since they are forms of absence — places where Hashem's light is hidden.

This is what the Mishnah (*Avos* 6:12) means: *כל מה שברא הקדוש ברוך הוא בעולמו, לא בראו אלא לכבודו*. Hashem created a world with darkness and evil because only in such a world can there be *avodah*. When a Yid overcomes a struggle, choosing to fulfill Hashem's will, that is the greatest revelation of His glory. Hashem created a world where His presence is hidden so that human beings could uncover it.

The *Sfas Emes*⁴ adds that the *meraglim* did not doubt Hashem's ability to conquer the land. They doubted their own ability to withstand the spiritual challenges of Eretz Yisrael. For the greater the holiness, the greater the concealment surrounding it. Eretz Yisrael is the palace of the King; therefore, the *yetzer hara* is strongest there. The *meraglim* feared that the intensity of the spiritual tests would overwhelm them.

But Yehoshua and Kalev answered (*Bamidbar* 14:9): *וְאַתֶּם אַל תִּירָאוּ וְגו' כִּי לַחֲמֹנוּ הֵם* — *You should not fear... for they are our bread*. Just as bread sustains the body, so too *nisyonos* sustain the soul. *Bnei Yisrael* do not belong to this world; their true place is above. Their existence in this world is sustained only through the work of confronting concealment. The *nisyonos* themselves give the soul life. Therefore, one should not despise the difficulties of this world. They are the very means through which a Yid becomes who he is meant to be.

At the end of the *parashah*, the Torah commands us in the mitzvah of *tzitzis*. The Gemara (*Menachos* 43b) teaches that the punishment for neglecting the white strings is greater than for neglecting the *techeiles*, because *techeiles* is expensive and difficult to obtain, whereas white strings are affordable and easily accessible. The Gemara compares this to a king who asks one servant for a seal of gold and another for a seal of clay. When both fail, the one who failed to bring the clay seal is more culpable.

Tosafos explain the comparison of a clay seal to *tzitzis*: Just as a clay seal symbolizes servitude, so too *tzitzis* testify that we are servants of Hashem.

It may be understood further that clay represents the mud of this world — the lowliness, the struggle, the confusion. Hashem placed us in the “mud” and asks us to rise from it. *Tzitzis* represent standing firm in *nisyonos* from within the “mud.”

Perhaps this is why *techeiles* has remained hidden for generations. Hashem is telling us: “Your *avodah* is not in lofty spiritual visions. Your *avodah* is in the ‘clay’; serve Me there.”

We live in a generation filled with unprecedented *nisyonos*. The *yetzer hara* is powerful, aggressive, and relentless. But precisely for this reason, our generation has the greatest opportunity to bring glory to Hashem. Every time a Yid resists temptation, every time he pushes away the “different spirit” within him, he becomes an *eved Hashem*. This is why we are here; this is our life force and our mission.

May Hashem help us serve Him faithfully, elevate every struggle, and fill the world with His glory.

סעודה שלישית פרשת שלח תשפ”ה מאמר ב

2 *Shemos Rabbah* 32:1.

3 *Moreh Nevuchim* 3:10.

4 *Shelach* 5638.

Cont. from page 1

avodah zarah was based on the fact that the *mekoshesh* acted publicly, then we cannot derive from this case that a person who desecrates Shabbos privately is also liable for *sekilah*. Although Hashem confirmed Moshe's reasoning in this case, perhaps only public desecration is comparable to *avodah zarah*, while private desecration should revert to the default punishment of *chenek*.

Several *Acharonim*⁷ explain that *Tosafos* never meant that Moshe distinguished between public and private desecration. Rather, Moshe reasoned that since public desecration resembles *avodah zarah*, the *pasuk* מות יומת must refer to *sekilah* — and once the *pasuk* defines the punishment as *sekilah*, that applies universally, even in private.

Rav Akiva Eiger, however, understood *Tosafos* more literally: Moshe compared the *mekoshesh* to *avodah zarah* only because it was public. Therefore, he asks: How do we know that private desecration is also punishable with *sekilah*?

One may suggest an answer: If the reason for *sekilah* truly depended on the act being public, the Torah would have indicated — even subtly — that the *mekoshesh* acted publicly. Since the Torah is completely silent about this, Chazal understood that the punishment of *sekilah* does not depend on publicity. The Torah's omission teaches that the punishment applies equally in private. *Tosafos* were only explaining Moshe's initial uncertainty; the final halachah is learned from the Torah's silence.

Some answer Rav Akiva Eiger's question by noting that an idol worshipper is stoned at the gate where he served the idol or at the entrance of *beis din*,⁸ whereas the *mekoshesh* was stoned מחוץ למחנה —

outside the camp (*Bamidbar* 15:36). This proves that his punishment was not derived from *avodah zarah*.

However, this does not fully resolve the issue, because *Tosafos* never meant that Moshe equated the *mekoshesh* to *avodah zarah* in every detail — only that the severity of public desecration suggested *sekilah*.

The *sefer Sanhedrei Ketanah* offers a different approach: Every act of Shabbos desecration is considered public, as the Shach⁹ defines "public" as anything known to ten Yidden, even if not performed in front of them. The *Pri Megadim*,¹⁰ citing the *Tevuos Shor*,¹¹ adds that even if the act is not yet known, if the sinner is certain that it will become known to ten people, it is considered public. Since any capital case requires warning by two witnesses, and those witnesses will testify before a court of twenty-three, the act will inevitably become known. Thus, there is no such thing as a capital case of Shabbos desecration in true privacy; therefore, the punishment is always *sekilah*.

However, this approach is difficult. First, according to Rabi Yosi ben Rabi Yehudah cited in *Sanhedrin* (8b), a *talmid chacham* does not require warning. In such a case, the sinner may not realize that witnesses are present, and thus will not know that his sin will become public. Would we then say that his punishment is *chenek*? This is unheard of.

Moreover, the *Toras Chaim*¹² writes that if a person desecrates Shabbos in front of many people but is embarrassed to do so in front of a great Torah scholar, it is considered a private desecration. Thus, a case of private desecration is certainly possible if the sinner assumes he will be

judged in his hometown *beis din*, not in front of great Torah scholars.

Thirdly, according to Rabi Yehudah cited in *Sanhedrin* 80b, one is not liable for death unless he is informed of the specific punishment. Would we then require witnesses to inform the sinner that they intend to testify before *beis din*, so that the act becomes "public," warranting *sekilah* instead of *chenek*? This is not found anywhere.

Finally, the assumption that every warned sinner knows with certainty that witnesses will testify is not compelling. Many factors may prevent testimony — fear, illness, travel, or other circumstances. Therefore, one cannot assume that every case will become public.

Thus, Rav Akiva Eiger's question remains in any situation where the sinner is not certain that his act will become public: How do we know that his punishment is *sekilah*, not *chenek*?

A more satisfying resolution emerges from the *Peleisi*,¹³ *Yavin Daas*,¹⁴ and other *Acharonim* who write that when a person sins after receiving a proper warning, and knowingly exposes himself to the death penalty, this very brazenness is considered equivalent to public desecration. Even if only two witnesses are present, his willingness to violate Shabbos despite the warning demonstrates a level of rebellion that halachically classifies the act as "public." This is not because the act will become known, but because the sinner has shown open defiance.

According to this, Rav Akiva Eiger's question is resolved: Any act of Shabbos desecration that is punishable by death is, by definition, considered "public," and therefore liable for *sekilah*.

נמלכין בסנהדרין דף עח עמוד ב

7 Gilyonei HaShas, *Sanhedrin* 78b; Kli Chemdah, *Parashas Pinchas*, note 2; Kovetz Shiurim, *Bava Basra*, note 356.

8 See Rambam, *Hilchos Sanhedrin* 15:2.

9 *Yoreh De'ah* 157:4.

10 *Yoreh De'ah* 384:17.

11 *Simlah Chadashah* 384:16.

12 *Eruvin* 69b, s.v. "hahu." See also *Mishnah Berurah* 385:6.

13 11:2.

14 *Peirush Ha'aruch* 2:4.



Shelach	Candle Lighting	Motzei Shabbos
Brooklyn	8:09	9:18
Lakewood	8:09	9:17
Baltimore	8:15	9:23
Chicago	8:06	9:19
North Miami	7:54	8:53
Los Angeles	7:46	8:50

Parshah Medley

מֵרָאשִׁית עֲרִשְׁתֶּיכֶם תִּתְּנוּ לַיהוָה תְּרוּמָה לְדֹרֹתֵיכֶם.

From the first of your kneading, you shall give a portion to Hashem, for your generations (Bamidbar 15:21).

The *Baal Haturim* notes that the *pasuk* begins and ends with the letter *mem*, hinting that a generous *terumah* — an *ayin yafeh* — is one-fortieth, as the Mishnah (*Terumos* 4:3) teaches regarding *terumah*.

The *Aderes*, in *Ataros Adar*, raises a strong question. This *pasuk* is speaking about *challah*, not *terumah*. Regarding *challah*, we do not find any concept of “*ayin yafeh*” or “*ayin ra’ah*.” The Mishnah (*Challah* 2:7) establishes fixed amounts: A homeowner gives 1/24, and a baker gives 1/48. There is no mitzvah to add beyond this as an act of generosity. Why, then, would the *Baal Haturim* hint to the measure of *terumah* here, when *challah* has no such category?

The explanation is that when a person trains himself to give generously in *terumah* — one-fortieth, the measure of an *ayin yafeh* — this shapes his entire approach to giving. Then, when he later fulfills the mitzvah of separating *challah*, even though the amount is fixed and may not be increased, he performs it with a good eye, with warmth and generosity. Because he trained himself to give with a full heart, even a fixed obligation is performed with love. Therefore, the Torah hints here to the measure of an *ayin yafeh*, teaching that generosity in *terumah* cultivates generosity in *challah* as well.

Another explanation may be offered. A person might reason: Why should I give a generous *terumah* of one-fortieth, when I will soon be giving *challah* to the *kohen* as well — perhaps even to the same *kohen*? Since he will receive 1/24 from my *challah*, I may as well reduce my *terumah*. But this is the thinking of someone with an *ayin ra’ah*, someone calculating what he gains and loses.

Thus, the Torah hints — through the *mem-to-mem* structure — that this is not the proper approach. One who has an *ayin tovah* does not make such calculations. He gives freely, without weighing what he will later give or receive. Therefore, the Torah alludes to the measure of an *ayin yafeh* to teach that *terumah* should be given generously, without diminishing it because of the future obligation of *challah*.

קידושא רבא פרשת שלח תשפ"ה

וַיִּהְיֶה כָּלֵב אֶת הָעָם אֶל מֹשֶׁה.

Kalev silenced the people toward Moshe (Bamidbar 13:30).

The Gemara (*Sotah* 35a) asks: Where was Yehoshua at that moment? The Gemara explains that Yehoshua also attempted to speak, but the people silenced him harshly, saying: “Shall this one, whose head is cut off, speak?”

The *Sefer Hama’arich* on the *Aruch* explains this puzzling expression. Since Moshe had to change his name from Hoshea to Yehoshua, it implies that originally his “head” — the beginning of his name — was lacking. His name became complete only after Moshe added the letter *yud*.

But this seems difficult. Once Moshe added the *yud*, Yehoshua’s name was complete; why would they still call him “headless”?

The explanation is that anything a person receives as a gift, without personal effort, is not truly considered his. Only what a person acquires through his own toil is regarded as genuinely belonging to him.

In truth, Yehoshua certainly possessed the spiritual power of the letter *yud*. As the *Targum Yonasan* writes, Moshe added the *yud* because he saw Yehoshua’s profound humility and worthiness. Moshe merely brought out what was already within him.

However, from the perspective of the people, the *yud* was something Yehoshua had *received*, not something he had *earned* through struggle. Therefore, they dismissed it and said he had “no head” — meaning, the *yud* did not “count” in their eyes, because it came to him as a gift.

קידושא רבא פרשת שלח תשפ"ה

From the Desk of the Rosh Yeshivah

Accepting a Teaching Position

A correspondent wrote:

I have been asked to speak to younger *bachurim* and try to inspire them with *divrei Torah* and *yiras Shamayim*. But I know myself — I recognize my own shortcomings and struggles with the *yetzer hara* — and I don’t feel worthy of being a role model. The only difference between me and the *bachurim* is our age difference. Should I accept this responsibility?

The Rosh Yeshivah answered:

I wish the answer to every question was this clear. I have absolutely no doubt that you must accept this position.

-Do not spend time thinking about your own deficiencies; that is not the point here.

-When there is a fire burning, no one stops to analyze whether the bucket of water is perfect. There is a raging fire of the *yetzer hara* in the streets today; anyone who can help put out even a small part of it is obligated to do so, without personal calculations.

-A single sincere word that reaches the heart of a *bachur* can protect him in a moment of *nisayon*.

-You certainly have what to offer — more than enough to share — from what you have learned over the years.

Do not withhold good from those who seek it; do not hold back Torah from those who want to hear it.

May Hashem be with you, guiding you to say what is right.

Shaul