



לעילוי נשמת  
 הרה"ח הרה"ת ר' משה בהרה"ח דוד העניך ע"ה  
 זאקליקובסקי  
 נפטר בשם טוב ליל ש"ק פ' תז"מ  
 בדר"ח אייר, גבורה שבתפארת, ה'תש"פ  
 תנ"צ'ב'ה'

# דעם רבינ'ס אַ וואָרט

A Word  
 on the  
 Parsha

Compiled By:  
 Rabbi Mendel Vogel

## קדושים

לֹא תִעַמְדוּ עַל-דַּם רֵעֵךְ (יט, טז)

You shall not stand by [the shedding of] your fellow's blood.

There is a well-known teaching of the Baal Shem Tov: everything a person hears or sees should be taken as a lesson in *avodas Hashem*.

With this in mind, we gain a new understanding in Rashi's explanation on this *possuk*: “[Do not stand by,] watching your fellow’s death, when you are able to save him; for example, if he is drowning in the river...”

The very fact that you were present to “watch your fellow’s death” is proof that “you are able to save him,” and it is solely for this reason that Hashem put you there.

From here we can learn a lesson uniquely applicable to us: In our generation, there are many *Yidden* who are in danger of spiritually “drowning” in the stormy waters of materialism. We need to know that each and every one of us has the duty to try and rescue these *Yidden*, since the very fact that you happen to see or know of these *Yidden* in danger means that you were given the ability to save them.

**Takeaway:** The *yetzer hara* might protest, “Who do you think you are to be involved in being *mekarev* another *Yid* when you yourself have much to work on?” The response to this is that the very fact that you were made aware of the situation is proof that you are able to save him, and that you have the necessary *kochos*. It depends on *you* to revive his *neshama* by showing him the light of Torah and mitzvos.

(Likkutei Sichos vol. 32, p. 125)

## אמור

וּסְפַרְתֶּם לָכֶם מִמָּחָרֵת הַשַּׁבָּת (כג, טז)

And you shall count for yourselves, from the morrow of the rest day...

“The Baitusim would say [that] *Shavuos* [always occurs] after *Shabbos* [i.e. on a Sunday].

**Rabban Yochanan ben Zakkai joined** [the discussion with the Baitusim] **and said to them:** ‘Fools! From where [have] you [derived this]?’ **And there was no man who answered him, except for one elderly man...** and he said: ‘*Moshe Rabbeinu* was an *ohav yisroel* and he knew that *Shavuos* is [only]



one day. Therefore, he arose and established it after Shabbos, in order that the Jewish people would enjoy themselves for two days.' [Rabban Yochanan ben Zakkai] recited this *possuk* [in response] to [that old man]: “It is eleven days’ journey from Chorev to Kodesh Barne’a by the way of Har Se’ir” (Devorim 1:2).

And if Moshe Rabbeinu was an *ohev yisroel*, why did he delay them in the wilderness forty years?” (Menachos, 65a-b)

This Gemara seems to imply that according to the Baitusi, Moshe Rabbeinu was an *ohev yisroel*, while according to R. Yochanan ben Zakkai, Moshe Rabbeinu was not, *chas v’sholom*, an *ohev yisroel*!

To answer this, we need to realize that the debate between the Baitusi and R. Yochanan ben Zakkai was not a one-time event. It is actually at the root of the disagreement between the Baitusim and the Chachomim in general:

The main point on which the Baitusim differed from the Chachomim is that the Baitusim believed only in Torah *shebiksav*, and not in Torah *shebaal peh*. The main difference between these two parts of Torah is that the written part was given to us exactly as we have it now, word for word; it leaves no room for human innovation. The Oral Torah, on the other hand, was given with the express intent for the Chachomim in each generation to be *mechadesh*, to add to the body of Torah.

From here stems the primary distinction between the two philosophies: According to the Baitusim, the best and most ideal scenario is when a person receives everything he needs from Hashem, without having to work for it. The ideal situation according to Chazal, on the other hand, is when a person does *not* receive everything he needs as a free gift, but rather as a reward for his efforts.

Now we can understand the Baitusi’s claim that since “Moshe Rabbeinu was an *ohev yisroel*... he arose and established it after Shabbos”: Since Moshe Rabbeinu loved and cared for the *yidden*, surely he wanted them to experience and enjoy the divine revelation of Shavuos without having to work and prepare for it. Therefore, it is fitting that the eve of Shavuos should fall out on Shabbos; a day that is all pleasure and no work; and thus “the *Yidden* would enjoy themselves

for two days.”

To this R. Yochanan ben Zakkai replied, “If Moshe Rabbeinu was an *ohev yisroel*, why did he delay them in the wilderness forty years?”: If Moshe Rabbeinu was an *ohev yisroel* in the Baitusi sense, wishing for *Yidden* to receive all their needs from Hashem without any work—then he should have brought them to Eretz Yisroel immediately and miraculously, sparing them the hardships of the desert for forty years?! The fact that Moshe Rabbeinu did *not* do so proves, therefore, that the Chachomim are correct, and the reason the *Yidden* had to spend forty years in the desert was so they could do *teshuva* for the *aveira* of the *meraglim* and withstand various tests, thus becoming truly *worthy* of entering Eretz Yisroel. Moshe cared that the *Yidden* should enter Eretz Yisroel only after the necessary preparations—*this* was his true and deep love for the *Yidden*.

**Takeaway:** The purpose of the lengthy *golus* in which we live is to ensure that we are truly prepared and ready for the *geula*—*b’pnimius*. The purpose of our *avoda* is so that the *geula* should not be imposed upon us and overwhelm us, but rather that we should be *keilim* to receive it—עבודה בכח עצמו. May we merit to finally experience the *geula* and greet Moshiach Tzidkeinu, *b’karov mamash!*

(Likkutei Sichos vol. 19, p. 4)

בהר

וְשַׁבְּתָה הָאֶרֶץ שַׁבַּת לַיהוָה (כ"ה, ב)

...The land shall rest, a Shabbos for Hashem.

Rashi comments on these words: “For the sake of Hashem, just as is stated regarding the Shabbos of Creation.” In other words, just as every seventh day is holy, proclaiming that Hashem Himself rested on the seventh day and thus acknowledging Him as the Creator of all, likewise, man must rest from working the land on the seventh year, for the sake of Hashem (and not for the land’s sake, so that it should get more fertile by allowing it to rest).

Let us further explore the comparison drawn between *shemita* (the seventh year) and Shabbos (the seventh day): One of the differences between Shabbos and *shemita* is that on Shabbos—when work is prohibited—a *Yid* withdraws completely from all mundane matters, while in the *shemita* year only the work of the land is prohibited. One's occupation with other mundane matters continues as usual.

There is reason to think, therefore, that the title “שבת להוי” is appropriate only for the Shabbos day; when one withdraws from worldliness and dedicates himself solely to Hashem; but the year of *shemita*, when one is still engaged with the mundane, does not deserve to be called “שבת להוי.” (Especially since the name “הוי” refers to a level of *Elokus* which is *above* nature, in contrast to the name “אלקים” which refers to a level of *Elokus* that resides *within* nature.)

The *possuk* teaches us that the year of *shemita* is also “שבת להוי,” just like the day of Shabbos. It is true that work is permitted during the *shemita* year (aside from working the ground), but its sanctity is not any less than that of Shabbos. On the contrary—in the year of *shemita*, the level of “שם הוי” which is above nature, comes into and *penetrates* the mundane world—“the **land** shall rest a **Shabbos for Hashem.**”

**Takeaway:** The paradoxical concept of drawing lofty levels of *Elokus* down into *gashmiyus* exists in every mitzvah: The Alter Rebbe states that the mindset of a person when he is involved in Torah and mitzvos should be that of *mesiras nefesh*; his physical needs don't exist in those moments. At the same time, one needs to be careful to fulfill the mitzvah properly, with all its nuances and details—quite the opposite of *mesiras nefesh*, which is above all limitations.

A mitzvah is a fusion of the two: Attention to the parameters of the mitzvah with all its nuance and detail, and, at the same time, a state of *mesiras nefesh*; complete and boundless devotion.

(The difference is that in other mitzvos, the fusion can be seen in the *manner* of the performance, whereas in *shemita*, it is seen in the performance itself.)

(Likkutei Sichos vol. 1, p. 107; p. 275)

## בחוקותי

אם יבקשתי תלכו (כ"ג)

If you follow My statutes...

Rashi says that from these words we learn that “you must toil in the study of Torah (שתהיו עמלים בתורה)”; to apply oneself with extra effort and exertion, beyond the norm.

This interpretation of Rashi is hinted to in the word “בחוקותי”: The Alter Rebbe explains in Likkutei Torah that the word “בחוקותי” shares the same root as the word “חקיקה,” which means “engraving.”

There are two ways in which engraving words is different than writing: 1. Engraving requires much more effort. 2. Engraving makes the letters an inseparable part of the material in which they are engraved.

In writing, by contrast, the letters are made of a separate material, and can be erased or removed without damaging the parchment or the paper on which they are written.

Toiling in Torah also has these two qualities: 1. It requires much mental and emotional effort, far more than basic learning. 2. When a person exerts himself in his learning, the Torah is absorbed in his heart and becomes unified with his *neshama* to such a degree that it is impossible to distinguish between him and the Torah, like letters engraved in stone.

**Takeaway:** One must never stop toiling in Torah.

Whatever one has accomplished yesterday is insufficient for today—this is “תלכו,” to grow more and more. As a result of this conduct, Hashem will *bentch* us—“ונתתי” גשמיכם בעתם—including the greatest *brocha* of all, the arrival of Moshiach tzidkeinu!

(Likkutei Sichos vol. 3, p. 1012; Ibid. vol. 17, p. 318)