Torah Chesed

TOG

## OVERVIEW of the Daf

### 1) Who was allotted portions in Eretz Yisroel?

It is noted that the Mishnah follows the opinion that portions in Eretz Yisroel were allotted to those who left Mitzrayim which is not a universally-held opinion.

A Baraisa presents a dispute whether portions were given to those who left Mitzrayim or those who entered Eretz Yisroel.

The Gemara notes that all opinions agree that the phrase לשמות מטות refers to those who left Mitzrayim and explains how we know that this is the correct interpretation.

#### 2) R' Pappa's inquiries

R' Pappa cites a verse that seems to support the position that Eretz Yisroel was given to those who left Mitzrayim.

# **REVIEW** and Remember

- 1. Who was assigned portions in Eretz Yisroel?
- 2. Explains מתין יורשין חיין.
- 3. Which people were denied portions in Eretz Yisroel?
- 4. Why does the verse of 'לרב תרבה נחלתו וכו' support the opinion which says the land was given to those who left Mitzrayim?

# **HALACHAH Highlight**

The dispute regarding who merited portions of land in Eretz Yisroel

ר' יאשיה אומר ליוצאי מצרים וכוי ר' יונתן אומר לבאי הארץ וכוי R' Yoshiya says that it was given to those who left Mitzrayim etc. R' Yonason holds that it was given to those who entered the land

B en Yehoyada¹ offers an interesting explanation of the dispute between R' Yoshiya and R' Yonason in our Gemara related to whether portions of land in Eretz Yisroel were given to those who left Mitzrayim or to those who entered

(Continued on page 2)

## Distinctive INSIGHT

The "complainers" and the group of Korach do not have a portion in the World-to-Come

מתלוננים ועדת קרח לא היה להם חלק לעולם הבא

ater (118b), the Gemara explains that the "complainers and the gang of Korach" who did not receive a portion in the land does not actually refer to two separate groups, but it refers to "the complainers of the gang of Korach." Rashbam identifies these complainers as the two hundred and fifty men who, as a part of Korach's rebellion, gathered to offer the incense to challenge Aharon. They are the ones who confronted Moshe, and they died a fiery death as they brought the incense and a fire came and burned them. In the Baraisa, the daughters of Tzelafchad assured Moshe (Bamidbar 27:7) that their father was not a member of these men who met to stand against Hashem. Ritva notes, however, that we do not find that the two hundred and fifty men who joined the revolt of Korach are ever referred to with the title "מתלוננים – complainers". Rashba and Shitta Mikubetzes explain that this additional reference is regarding the family members of Korach. Netzi"v (in עמק הנצי"ב) also questions referring to this group as the "complainers" of the group of Korach, when they are one and the same as the group of Korach itself.

explains that when the daughters of Tzelafchad declared that their father was not part of the עדת קרח, they were referring to the two hundred and fifty men who were burned as they challenged Moshe with the bringing of unauthorized incense. In our Gemara, the group which did not receive a portion in the World-to-Come—the "complainers"—refers to the people who spoke against Moshe in the aftermath of the debacle of Korach. In Bamidbar (17:6) a group confronted Moshe and Aharon saying that they had been instrumental in killing the nation of God. Ritva questions this approach, as well, noting that this particular group seems to have been a large gathering (וילנו כל עדת בני ישראל). Later (118b), the Gemara informs us that the portion in Eretz Yisroel which the "complainers" forfeited was given to Yehoshua and Kalev. If the ones who rose up against Moshe and Aharon were these same "complainers", it would mean that Yehoshua and Kalev received the portions in Eretz Yisroel of not only the spies, but the portions of this large group of complainers, as well. This would mean that Yehoshua and Kalev received exceptionally large portions in Eretz Yisroel, (Highlight...Continued from page 1)

Eretz Yisroel. In Sanhedrin (66a) R' Yoshiya and R' Yonason disagree about the parameters of the prohibition of cursing a parent. R' Yoshiya holds that the "1" of the phrase אביו ואמו connects the two words so that one does not violate the prohibition against cursing one's parents unless one curses them both. R' Yonason disagrees and asserts that the "1" divides so that one is liable for cursing a father or a mother.

Earlier in the Gemara (100a) R' Eliezer taught that Avrohom Avinu acquired Eretz Yisroel when he traversed acquired the land when he walked its length.

land that was not their own. How do account for the fact into the wilderness. that the Jews were enslaved in Mitzrayim for only 210 years? If we follow R' Yoshiya who maintains that a "1" connects,

(Insight...continued from page 1)

and Ritva asserts that this is unreasonable to say. Furthermore, to refer to these people who came later as "the complainers of Korach" is not appropriate.

Ritva therefore explains that this group were the select few who had originally confronted Moshe to send spies to scout the land (see Devarim 1:22). Now, they again joined forces with Korach. When they appeared as repeat offenders, they lost their right to their portion to the World-to-Come.

the land following Hashem's instruction התהלך בארץ לארכה Avrohom Avinu never successfully acquired Eretz Yisroel. - walk the land its length and width. The difficulty Accordingly, the 400 year count could begin with the birth is that we only find that Avrohom walked the length of the of Yitzchok and there were four hundred years between the land so how did he acquire the land? Mahari Algazi answers birth of Yitzchok and the exodus from Mitzrayim. Consethat R' Elazar must be following R' Yonason who says that a quently, he holds that the land was given to those who left "1" is meant to divide and Hashem told Avrohom to acquire Mitzrayim. According to R' Yonason who maintains that Eretz Yisroel by walking the length or the width, thus he the "1" divides, Avrohom Avinu acquired the land so we cannot include Yitzchok's lifetime as part of the four hun-Based on this we could present the following explana- dred years. As such, the land was given to those who ention. Avrohom was told that his descendants would be giv-tered Eretz Yisroel for although the four hundred years did en Eretz Yisroel after four hundred years of suffering in a not transpire they earned special merit by following Hashem

1. בן יהוידע לסוגיין.

For Heaven's sake! מתלוננים ועדת קרח לא היה להם חלק

e find on today's daf that those involved in Korach's controversy lost their right to bequeath their portion of Eretz Yisrael to their heirs. We see from here the terrible consequences of machlokes, especially if the fight wears the garb of being l'shem shomayim.

Rav Yisrael Salanter, zt"l, would warn his beloved students, "At the very least, don't make yourselves out to be acting l'shem shomayim!"

He would explain, "A person who turns a blind spot to his natural ulterior motives and thinks he acts only for the sake of heaven is a terrible hazard

to himself and others. If things do not keepers are in a fight. Each one blames go according to his plan, he naturally the other for stealing his customers. feels angry. After all, he is certain that Even if they fight the whole year his every movement is one hundred round, when erev Yom Kippur comes, percent for the sake of heaven, so why they will surely regret their petty squabisn't Hashem allowing his altruistic ble and wish to make up. It is more plans to come to fruition? It is equally than likely that one merchant will enobvious to this person that anyone ter his friend's shop and say something who is an impediment to his plans for like, 'Listen, Reb Chaim. Today is erev whatever reason is in the wrong and Yom Kippur. Let's drink a l'chaim and may be crushed or pushed aside in any forgive each other!' form he can get away with!"

He explained this with a very direct than a mitzvah!" <sup>1</sup> parable. "Let's say two competing shop-

"But if they fight 'l'shem Rav Yisrael would use this princi- shomayim,' will they make up erev ple to explain the Mishnah in Avos in Yom Kippur? Absolutely not! On the his uniquely pithy manner. "The sages contrary, on erev Yom Kippur each taught, 'Any conflict that is I'shem will feel that he has the license to purshomayim – סופה להתקיים – it is sue his friend mercilessly. After all, destined to exist in perpetuity.'-Talk each one already knows that he is comabout a thing that is sure to last forey-pletely l'shem shomayim. Keeping up the fight with his friend is nothing less

■מובא באבני שלמה, חייג, עי צייב

