

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



עַיֵי דֵשֶׁה

AL EY DESHE

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

Strength of Humility

שמע ישראל אתה עבר היום את הירדן לבא לרשת
גוים גדלים ועצמים ממך

Hear, Yisrael, today you cross the Yarden, to come and drive out nations that are greater and mightier than you. (Devarim 9:1)

Rashi comments: "You are mighty, but they are mightier than you."¹ The *mefarshim* wonder about this: Klal Yisrael's battles were won by Hashem, so what difference did it make

Chizkiyahu — each made a different request of Hashem. David said (Tehillim 18:38), אַרְדּוּף, אוֹיְבֵי וְאֲשִׁיגֶם וְלֹא אָשׁוּב עַד כְּלוֹתֶם – *I shall pursue my foes and overtake them, and not return until they are destroyed.* Hashem agreed to fulfill that prayer. Asa said, "I don't have strength to kill my enemies; I will chase them, and You, Hashem, kill them." Hashem agreed to do so, as the pasuk says (Divrei Hayamim II 14:12), וַיִּרְדְּכֶם אֱסָא וְגו' כִּי נִשְׁבְּרוּ, וַיִּרְדְּכֶם אֱסָא וְגו' – *Asa pursued them... for they were crushed before Hashem.* Yehoshafat said, "I have no strength either to kill or to chase my enemies; I will sing *shirah*, and You, Hashem, take action." Hashem agreed to do so, as the pasuk says (Divrei Hayamim II 20:22), וּבָעַתָּה הִחֲלוּ בְרִנָּה וּתְהִלָּה נָתַן ה' מֵאֲרָבִים עַל בְּנֵי עַמּוֹן וְגו' – *As soon as they began their exuberant song and praise, Hashem set up ambushers against the Children of Ammon... and they were struck down.* Chizkiyahu said, "I have no strength to chase my enemies, to kill them, or even to sing *shirah*. I will lie on my bed, and You, Hashem, take action." Hashem agreed to do so, as the pasuk says (Melachim II 19:35), וַיְהִי בַלַּיְלָה הַהוּא וַיֵּצֵא מַלְאָךְ ה' וַיִּךְ בְּמַחְבֵּה אֲשׁוּר – *And it was on that night: an angel of Hashem went out and struck the Assyrian camp...*

cont. on page 2

Land of Plenty

אֶרֶץ אֲשֶׁר לֹא בְמִסְכָּנֶת תֹּאכַל בָּהּ לֶחֶם לֹא תִחָסֵר כָּל בָּהּ

A land where you will eat bread without poverty – you will lack nothing there. (Devarim 8:9)

Baal Haturim notes that the word וְצִפְחָת appears two other places: וְצִפְחָת הַשֶּׁמֶן לֹא תִחָסֵר – *and the flask of oil shall not lack* (Melachim I 17:14) and וְצִדִיק אֹכֵל לֶשְׂבַע נַפְשׁוֹ וְרָשָׁע יִשְׁעוֹ תִחָסֵר – *A righteous person eats to satisfy his soul, but the stomach of the wicked will lack* (Mishlei 13:25). What is the common thread between these three pesukim?

David Hamelech said (Tehillim 23:1), ה' רֹעִי לֹא אֶחָסֵר – *Hashem is my shepherd, I shall not lack.* *Sefarim hakedoshim* explain that David wasn't simply asking for his physical needs to be taken care of. He was praying never to lack the feeling that Hashem is his shepherd and takes care of him fully.⁷

When Eliyahu Hanavi assured the woman during a time of famine that *the flask of oil shall not lack*, that it would continue to provide oil until the famine ended, it was clear to all that this was not a natural phenomenon. It was obvious that the oil was not the

cont. on page 3

⁷ See *Sfas Emes*, Terumah 5631

The true nisayon is not whether one will sacrifice his material wealth for Hashem, but whether he can maintain real ahavas Hashem while still retaining possession of his money.

whether they themselves were strong? Several approaches are offered. Let us suggest another approach.

The Midrash² states that four kings of Yehudah — David, Asa, Yehoshafat and

¹ See also Rashi to 11:23

² Eichah Rabbah 4:15

Strength of Humility

cont. from page 1

We can understand that chasing and killing one's enemies takes strength, but what is so difficult about singing *shirah* that Chizkiyahu couldn't do it? Furthermore, Asa and Yehoshafat surely understood that it wasn't their strength that could enable them to pursue and kill their enemies, but Hashem's – so why did they feel too fatigued to do so?

Sefarim hakedoshim speak of a great danger that increases in proportion with one's own abilities and efforts in defeating his enemies: it might cross his mind to think he accomplished this on his own. David Hamelech understood that with his level of *emunah*, even if he pursued, overtook and killed his enemies with his own might, he would never consider that it was he who had done this; of course it was Hashem. Thus, David had the “strength” to pursue, overtake and kill them.

Asa felt that pursuing his enemies wouldn't harm his *emunah*, but killing them would; so he left that to Hashem. Yehoshafat recognized that any action at all on his part could lead him to take the credit in his mind, so the only thing he could do was sing *shirah*. Chizkiyahu realized that even if he would sing *shirah*, he might feel that it was his *shirah* and *tefillah* that accomplished the victory, so instead he would lie in his bed, his *emunah* intact.³

This, then, is what Rashi means, “You are mighty, but they are mightier than you.” As they entered Eretz Yisrael and prepared to do battle with its inhabitants, Bnei Yisrael needed to be aware of the *nisayon* that faced them. True, *you are mighty* – you are capable of waging war, and you will win your battles. But *they are mightier than you*

– don't begin to ascribe your successes to yourselves but believe wholeheartedly that your victories are from Hashem. אל תאמר, בלבבך, בהדרך ה' אלקיך אתם מלכניו, לאמר, – *Do not say in your heart, when Hashem pushes them away from before you, saying, “Because of my righteousness did Hashem bring me to possess this land.”* (9:4)

This concept is not only true of battles waged against enemies. It is true of all of man's activities and accomplishments. One must never entertain the thought that his achievements are a result of his own wisdom and capabilities.

The pasuk says (6:5), וְאָהַבְתָּ אֶת ה' – *You shall love Hashem, your G-d, with all your heart, with all your soul, and with all your resources.* Chazal (Berachos 54a) explain: וְאָהַבְתָּ אֶת ה' – *even as He takes your soul.* וְאָהַבְתָּ אֶת ה' – *with all of your money.* *Panim Yafos* wonders why וְאָהַבְתָּ אֶת ה' is not interpreted as “even as He takes your money,” like the interpretation of וְאָהַבְתָּ אֶת ה'. He explains that with one's life, the test of *ahavas Hashem* is when one must sacrifice it, but with money, it is the other way around. The true *nisayon* is not whether one will sacrifice his material wealth for Hashem, but whether he can maintain real *ahavas Hashem* while still retaining possession of his money. When a person has wealth and abundance, he must take care not to become conceited over it, as the pasuk says (8:14), וְרִם לְבַבְךָ וְשָׁכַחְתָּ אֶת ה' אֱלֹהֶיךָ, – *and your heart will become haughty and you will forget Hashem, your G-d.* Rather, אֶת ה' וְזָכַרְתָּ אֶת ה'

ה' אֱלֹהֶיךָ כִּי הוּא הִנְתֵּן לְךָ כֹּחַ לַעֲשׂוֹת הַיָּד – *You shall remember Hashem, your G-d: that it is He Who gives you strength to make wealth* (8:18).

Panim Yafos elsewhere⁴ explains a statement of Chazal⁵ that money “stands one on his feet.” Material possessions and financial successes weigh one down in his place, making it difficult for him to advance in *emunah* in Hashem. This is what the pasuk means (Bereishis 13:2), וְאַבְרָם כָּבֵד מְאֹד, – *Avram was very heavy with livestock, silver and gold.* Because of his many possessions, it became difficult for Avram to grow and achieve higher levels of *kedushah*. Only because of his great *madreigah* was Avraham Avinu able to bear this heavy load and believe with pure *emunah* that all his material gains were exclusively from Hashem.

This lesson is applicable equally to a wealthy person dealing with riches and to a pauper managing his chicken and eggs. Whatever a person does, he must remember that his achievements are not his own, but a gift from Hashem. A Yid's *avodas Hashem*, too, is not his own doing. The Sfas Emes says repeatedly⁶ that any action or thought of Torah and mitzvos is granted to a person by Hashem. We must strengthen ourselves and instill into our consciousness that every step we take, be it in *avodas Hashem* or in worldly matters, is gifted to us by the Ribbono Shel Olam.

(עקב תשפ”ב – ס”ג - שבע ברכות, מאמר ג)

3 Obviously, these high levels of the *malchei Yehudah* are far above our understanding. See *Sifsei Tzaddik*, Chanukah 22 and *Likutim* 3.

4 11:6

5 Pesachim 119a and Sanhedrin 110a

6 See *Likutim*, Elul

Land of Plenty

cont. from page 1

source of sustenance, but ה' רעי, Hashem Himself would provide.

This, too, is the message of לא תחסר כל בָּהּ. The inhabitants of Eretz Yisrael would sense that Hashem Himself tends to their needs. As the pasuk says (11:12), אָרְץ אֲשֶׁר וּגוֹ, תָּמִיד עֵינֵי ה' אֵלֶיךָ בָּהּ – *A Land that... the eyes of Hashem, your G-d, are always upon it.* Actually, this is not only true of those who live in Eretz Yisrael; as the Gemara (Kesubos 75a) says, “Both one who was born there, and one who yearns to see it.” A person can live across the world and yet be defined as

says (Tehillim 34:11), 'כְּפִירִים רָשׁוּ וְרָעִבוּ וְדָרְשׁוּ ה', 'לא יחסרו כל טוב – *Young lions may want and hunger, but those who seek Hashem will not lack any good.* This could mean that when even fearsome lions lie hungry, those who seek Hashem will be sustained and will not starve. As the pasuk says further on (Tehillim 37:25), וְלֹא רָאִיתִי צָדִיק נֶעְזָב וְזָרַעוּ, וְלֹא רָאִיתִי צָדִיק נֶעְזָב וְזָרַעוּ – *I have not seen a righteous man forsaken, nor his children begging for bread.* If we understand Targum Yerushalmi this way, the pasuk is assuring us that our basic needs will be met in Eretz Yisrael.

But Rashi explains the pasuk of ה' וְדָרְשׁוּ differently. When the Torah says (Shemos 20:10), לֹא תַעֲשֶׂה כָּל מְלָאכָה, it doesn't mean that we may not do *all* the melachos on Shabbos, but that we may not do *any* of them. In the same way, those who seek Hashem not only will be spared living in want, but they will not lack *any* good. They will not be deprived of a single item of goodness.

But do the facts reflect this? There are plenty of *tzaddikim*, plenty of seekers of Hashem, who are not given every material goodness the world has to offer.

The answer is that it is not the goods that determine whether a person is blessed with plenty, but his own frame of mind. *Tzaddikim* may sometimes lack for basics, but they are overjoyed by what they have, since they feel that ה' רעי, Hashem takes care of them personally. Whatever they need, they have, and whatever they don't have, they don't need. Whatever Hashem allots them is perfect. ה' וְדָרְשׁוּ truly feel that they lack for nothing.¹¹

This is the meaning of לא תחסר כל בָּהּ. The Jewish people would live in Eretz Yisrael with the feeling and understanding that *Hashem is my shepherd.* Hashem gives us the need to eat and drink, and Hashem supplies us with food and drink. Our very existence and vitality are only from Hashem. Thus, the Jewish people would not feel any lack whatsoever.

We may now understand the connection to the third pasuk cited by *Baal Haturim*: וְצִדִּיק אֵכֵל לְשֹׂבַע נִכְשׁוּ וְבָטָן רָשָׁעִים תִּתְחַרֵּץ. The pasuk says in Tehillim (107:5), וְצִדִּיק אֵכֵל לְשֹׂבַע נִכְשׁוּ וְבָטָן רָשָׁעִים תִּתְחַרֵּץ – *Hungry as well as thirsty, their soul grew faint within them.* The Baal Shem Tov explains that hunger and thirst were created so that through eating, a person would rectify his soul. Thus, וְצִדִּיק אֵכֵל לְשֹׂבַע נִכְשׁוּ – a *tzaddik* understands that his eating is for the sake of his soul. But וְבָטָן רָשָׁעִים תִּתְחַרֵּץ – a wicked person's eating falls short, because it is for the sake of his stomach.

A land where you will eat bread without poverty. A person may be a millionaire and eat the finest delicacies on gold dishes, and yet eat with poverty — poverty of mind, because he does not understand that eating is meant to benefit the soul. But in Eretz Yisrael, even when food is scarce, the Jewish people will lack for nothing, since they will eat with the proper frame of mind and with the awareness that ה' רעי – that Hashem, Who creates all food, supplies us with all our needs at all times.

(עקב תשפ"א – ס"ג מאמר א)

It is not the goods that determine whether a person is blessed with plenty, but his own frame of mind

a *ben Eretz Yisrael*. Such a person will have the feeling of לא תחסר כל בָּהּ.

There are two opinions in Chazal on what the word תִּתְחַרֵּץ (in the pasuk לא תחסר כל בָּהּ) refers to. The Gemara⁸ reads it as referring to Eretz Yisrael – “Eretz Yisrael lacks nothing.”⁹ Targum Yerushalmi, however, implies that it is addressing the people – “לא תחסרון – *you will not lack.*” How can the Torah say that no Jew will ever lack anything in Eretz Yisrael? Factually, there would be periods of scarcity when food would be hard to come by.¹⁰

There are two ways we can understand Targum Yerushalmi's approach. The pasuk

8 Berachos 36b, Yoma 81b, Sukkah 35a

9 See *Chefetz Hashem*, Berachos ibid

10 See Rashbam

11 See *Shelah*, Pesachim, *Matzah Ashirah*, *Derush* 5

A Tale of Two Obligations

וְאָכַלְתָּ וְשָׂבַעְתָּ וּבְרַכְתָּ אֶת ה' אֱלֹהֶיךָ

You will eat and you will be satisfied, and bless

Hashem, your G-d. (Devarim 8:10)

The halachah is that if one is unsure whether he recited *Birkas Hamazon*, he must do so again, since this is a *safek d'Oraisa*, an uncertainty that concerns the fulfillment of a *mitzvah d'Oraisa*. *Magen Avraham*¹² suggests that one who *bentches* out of doubt must recite the fourth *berachah* as well – even though reciting the fourth *berachah* is only a *mitzvah d'Rabbanan*. He gives two rationales: first, that people should not take the fourth *berachah* lightly, and second, that *Birkas Hamazon* must always (by Rabbinic ordinance) include all four *berachos*.¹³

What about where one is only unsure whether he recited the fourth *berachah*? Must he *bentch* again? The above reasons of *Magen Avraham* wouldn't seem to apply to this scenario. However, *Tosafos*¹⁴ maintains that if one does not fulfill a Rabbinic component of a *mitzvah d'Oraisa*, the *Chachamim* eliminate his fulfillment on the *d'Oraisa* level as well. If so, one who is unsure whether he recited the fourth *berachah* of *bentching* should be seen as in doubt whether he *bentched* at all – and accordingly, should need to *bentch* again, as a *safek d'Oraisa*. It is notable that although the *poskim*, particularly *Pri Megadim*, cite this opinion of *Tosafos* in numerous places, they do not invoke it here. Why not?

There is a *mitzvah d'Oraisa* to recite *Kiddush* on Shabbos, and a Rabbinic obligation that it be done over a cup of wine. *Pri Megadim*¹⁵ discusses whether a minor (*kattan*), whose overall obligation of *Kiddush* is only *mid'Rabbanan*, may recite *Kiddush* for an adult who has already said *Kiddush* in davening, and is thus only obligated *mid'Rabbanan* as well. *Pri Megadim* invokes the above *Tosafos*: since with the *gadol's* davening he has not fulfilled *Kiddush mid'Rabbanan*, he

has therefore not fulfilled it *mid'Oraisa* either, and thus he may not be *yotzei* from a *kattan*.¹⁶

Similarly, the *Acharonim* challenge the opinion of *Dagul MeRevavah*¹⁷ that one who davened on Friday night cannot recite *Kiddush* for a woman who did not daven, since she is obligated *mid'Oraisa* while his obligation is only Rabbinic. The *Acharonim* cite the opinion of *Tosafos*, by which the man has not fulfilled his obligation *mid'Oraisa* either – thus, he could be *motzi* a woman who did not daven.

It would seem, however, that *Tosafos'* position does not pertain to these cases. *Tosafos* is discussing a case where one sits in a *sukkah* without adhering to relevant Rabbinic requirements. Since his fulfillment of the *mitzvah* did not include the Rabbinic components of the *mitzvah*, he has not fulfilled it at all. But where the procedure is to first fulfill a *mitzvah mid'Oraisa*, and then add its Rabbinic element, one who follows the prescribed formula would surely not lose his fulfillment *mid'Oraisa*. Thus, one's fulfillment *d'Oraisa* of *Kiddush* by davening should not be cancelled because of his lingering requirement *mid'Rabbanan* to recite it over wine.

If so, the same should be true of the fourth *berachah* of *Birkas Hamazon*. Since the *Chachamim* instituted that it be recited after the *d'Oraisa* portion of *bentching*, one's obligation *mid'Oraisa* is fulfilled upon reciting the first three *berachos* – and is not revoked if he fails to recite the fourth *berachah*.

One might counter that the *Acharonim*¹⁸ suggest that according to *Tosafos*, one who sets aside *terumah* or *pe'ah* at less than the Rabbinically required amount has not satisfied his obligation *mid'Oraisa* either. Seemingly, *Tosafos'* opinion does apply even where the obligation *mid'Rabbanan* is simply adding on

to the obligation *mid'Oraisa*. So why would the fourth *berachah* of *Birkas Hamazon* be different?

This is no comparison, however. By *terumah* and *pe'ah*, the *Chachamim* obligate that one set aside a *quantity* that equals a sixtieth of his produce. There are not two amounts one must give – one *mid'Oraisa* and one *mid'Rabbanan*; the *Chachamim* require one specific amount. Thus, one who fails to fulfill the *chiyuv d'Rabbanan* loses his fulfillment *d'Oraisa* too. But in *Birkas Hamazon*, the Rabbinic obligation is that one recite the fourth *berachah* after completing the *mitzvah d'Oraisa* of the first three *berachos*. Thus, if one does not do so, he does not lose his fulfillment *d'Oraisa*.

So why don't the *poskim* cite the opinion of *Tosafos* regarding one who is unsure whether he recited the fourth *berachah* of *Birkas Hamazon*? Perhaps it is in accordance with a statement of *Pri Megadim*¹⁹ that although one who neglects a *d'Rabbanan* aspect of a *mitzvah* loses his fulfillment *mid'Oraisa*, this does not apply to a case of doubt. If one is unsure whether he fulfilled the *d'Rabbanan* component, it is judged as a *safek d'Rabbanan*, and one need not do it again. If so, it is clear that one who is unsure whether he recited the fourth *berachah* of *bentching* need not *bentch* again.

But it seems that *Pri Megadim* himself does not follow this assertion. To start with, he cites an opinion of *Taz*²⁰ as proof that *Taz* does not follow the opinion of *Tosafos* – but *Taz* is discussing a case of *safek*, where, per *Pri Megadim's* own statement, *Tosafos'* stance does not apply. In fact, *Pri Megadim* invokes *Tosafos'* opinion in numerous places when dealing with cases of *safek*. If so, our original question returns: Why isn't *Tosafos* cited regarding one who is unsure whether he recited the fourth *berachah* of *Birkas Hamazon*?

(בנאות דשא – עקב תשפ"ב)

12 184:7

13 See *Machatzis Hashekel*, ad loc.

14 *Sukkah* 3a s.v. *D'amar*

15 *Pesichah Kolleles*, vol. 3 se'if *kattan* 7 and 8

16 See *Michtav L'Chizkiyah* by the author of *Sedei Chemed* (*Sukkah* 23)

17 *Siman* 271

18 About *terumah*: *Imrei Binah*, *Dinei Terumos u'Maasros* 1; about *pe'ah*: *Minchas Chinuch*, 217:2

19 *Pesichah Kolleles*, vol. 4 *siman* 11

20 *Siman* 184