



**In This Issue**

[HaRav Nebenzahl on Parshat Balak](#)

[Kollel Rennert Dvar Torah by Rav Daniel Corish](#)

[Petuchei Chotam on Parshat Balak](#)

[Dedication, Visitor Log, Mazal Tov's, Tehillim List](#)

[Join Our List](#)

**NEWSLETTER LITE- Parshat Balak**

[Printer Friendly](#)

**DEDICATE**

YNA now offers the ability to be Parnas Hayom and dedicate shiurim. To sponser, please click Dedicate

**DONATE**

American Friends of Netiv Aryeh supports our program. To contribute, please click Donate

**Hakarot Hatov**

Uri Kari and the Yeshiva would like to thank the following families for opening their homes during Uri's recent stay in the United States:



- Ronen (5755) and Sylvia Fuksbrumer
- Yudy (Yehuda, 5754) and Margaret Sheinfeld
- Shlomo (Jeremy, 5758-60) and Tziril Gardner
- Shmueli (Steven, 5753-54) and Amy Farkas
- Adam (5755-56) and Bini Dachs

May HaKadosh Baruch repay you for your chesed many times over.

**CHUG IN CAMP MORASHA**

There is a weekly Monday night chug, at Camp Morasha, with R Chanan Bina at 11:00 PM (10:00 PM camp time). For more details call 917-514-5438 or email [cbina.yna@gmail.com](mailto:cbina.yna@gmail.com).



**Shabbat Davening Times**

The new YNA Summer Kollel is in Tzfat this Shabbat, and there will be no minyanim in the Yeshiva.

[YNA.EDU](#)

[Ask Rav Nebenzahl](#)

[Suggestion Box](#)

[Contact Us](#)

[Alumni Update Form](#)

[Parsha Archives](#)

## HaRav Nebenzahl on Parshat Balak

HaRav Nebenzahl asks that his Divrei Torah are not read during Tefillah or the Rabbi's sermon.

Printer Friendly Sicha



There are still sponsorship and dedication opportunities for the following upcoming publications of Yerushalayim BeMoadeha, HaRav Nebenzahl Shlit"a's chiddushim:

Shabbat - Volume III - the 39 melachot (first printing) \$20,000 (\$5000 pledged, \$15,000 needed to go to print)

Bein HaMetzarim - The Three Weeks (reprint) \$8,000 (\$4,000 already pledged, \$4000 needed to go to print)

Donations of \$5,000 or more entitle you to dedication pages.

If you would like to dedicate all or part of these sefarim in honor or in memory of a loved one, please email [zevbader@yna.edu](mailto:zevbader@yna.edu)

### "True Freedom"

Bilaam said: "He perceived no iniquity in Yaakov and saw no perversity in Israel, Hashem his G-d is with him, and the friendship of the King is in him" (Bamidbar 23:21). What a beautiful pasuk! Just hearing it brings a smile to our face. Imagine! "He perceived no iniquity in Yaakov and saw no perversity in Israel! - we can sin and Hashem will ignore it. What an incredible promise!

Chazal, however, have a different view (see Midrash Tanchuma - addendum to Parshat Devarim). The pasuk states: "One who reproves a person will later find favor, more than one with a flattering tongue" (Mishle 28:23). Our Sages tell us that "one who reproves a person" refers to Moshe Rabenu, who rebuked the Jewish people, and "one with a flattering tongue" refers to Bilaam. The Midrash explains that Moshe and Bilaam can be compared to two guardians of a prince. One of the guardians genuinely loved and cared for the prince, while the other despised him. The guardian who loved him would constantly warn him that he must stay out of trouble. He knew that the prince's father the king, and judge of the land, would not play favorites and would punish his son for misdeeds by taking away his inheritance. The other guardian used to encourage the prince to get into mischief, saying "what do you care, do whatever you like do not be afraid of anybody, after all your father is the king and he clearly will not be so strict toward his own son!" (His underlying intent of course was to lure the prince into doing something to anger the king, who would then punish him by disinheriting him).

The prince in this analogy refers to the Jewish people, the two guardians are Moshe and Bilaam. Moshe loved the Jewish people, and in order to protect them warned them: "Beware for yourselves, lest your heart be seduced and you turn astray and serve gods of others and prostrate yourselves to them" (Devarim 11:16-17). Bilaam however would say to them: do not worry, for you are Hashem's children and you need fear no retribution, as the verse states: "He perceived no iniquity in Yaakov and saw no perversity in Israel". Bilaam's goal in bringing this pasuk was to give Israel bad advice causing them to sin so that Hashem would get angry at them and punish them as actually happened at the end of the Parsha.

This poses a difficulty: Did Bilaam speak for himself, was it not Hashem Who placed the words in his mouth? Why then do Chazal levy such harsh accusations against Bilaam? What is more puzzling is that this very pasuk is recited in the "malchuyot" section of the Rosh Hashana Musaf service. (In fact this pasuk would have been appropriate for "shofarot" as well, see Rosh Hashana 32b and Tur/Beit Yoseph Orach Chaim 591). If this pasuk amounts to nothing more than ill advice that Bilaam gave to the Jewish people with the intent of leading them to sin, how could we use it in "malchuyot" to describe Hashem's dominion over the world? Does the Torah lack for more appropriate psukim?

Hashem did in fact place the precise words into Bilaam's mouth, as he did with all prophecies He gave to Moshe Rabenu. (We cannot, G-d forbid, compare the prophecy of Moshe Rabenu to that of Bilaam. Of Moshe Rabenu it is said: "All the prophets looked into a dim glass, but Moshe looked through a clear glass"

(Yevamot 49b). The prophecy of the other prophets can be compared to light that passes through a colored glass. The light that appears on the other end will reflect the color of the glass. Hashem appeared to the prophets in a dream and each prophet interpreted that vision colored by his own ability to interpret and perceive: "one prophetic signal may come to several prophets, but two prophets never communicate a prophecy in exactly the same words" (Sanhedrin 89a). Moshe Rabenu was not like the other prophets, he transmitted Hashem's word to the Jewish people exactly as it was given to him - through a clear glass - word for word. With Bilaam the situation was the converse, his "glass" was totally black - no light could possibly pierce it. The only way that a blessed prophecy would come forth from his mouth would be if were to repeat word for word what Hashem dictated to him. Only in that way is there no danger of his "coloring" the prophecy to fit his own agenda).

Bilaam's words may be viewed from two perspectives. On the one hand, they contain Hashem's blessing filled with only good intentions and positive connotations ("Hashem saw no iniquity in Yaakov" due to the merit of their forefathers or perhaps the sounding of the Shofar - a pasuk very fitting for "malchuyot"). On the other hand, Bilaam himself did not have such positive intentions when he expressed this prophecy. Bilaam's intent was to repeat Hashem's beautiful words with his own negative interpretation - telling the Jewish people that they had no reason to fear sin, hoping that they would listen and eventually sin and suffer Divine retribution. The Midrash we quoted above is based on this latter understanding. "He perceived no iniquity in Yaakov" can now be viewed on two planes - the intention of the A-lmighty when he placed the words in Bilaam's mouth which makes it certainly an appropriate verse for "malchuyot", while Bilaam's intentions in the relaying of the prophecy account for the analogy Chazal used in the Midrash.

After all of Bilaam's wonderful promises, the Parsha concludes with the Jewish people sinning in the incident involving Baal Peor, where "the wrath of Hashem burned against the Jewish people" (Bamidbar 28:3). Hashem sent a plague that was so severe that had Pinchas not stepped in, the nation would have been in grave danger of annihilation, G-d forbid: "Pinchas son of Elazar son of Aharon the Kohen, turned back My wrath from upon the Children of Israel, when he zealously avenged My vengeance among them, so I did not consume the Children of Israel in My vengeance" (Bamidbar 25:11).

How did this happen? What happened to the promise "He perceived no iniquity in Yaakov"? What then could they possibly have done to bring on such harsh Divine retribution? There is a limit to how far Hashem will go and still look the other way. Similarly, Chazal tell us: "no one ever spent the night in Yerushalayim with his sins in hand, how so? The morning tamid atones for the sins of the night, while the afternoon tamid atones for the sins of the day" (Tanchuma Pinchas 13). If every sin was atoned for, why was Yerushalayim destroyed? Clearly the power of the tamid and even of the "seirim" of Yom Kippur to atone is limited. What occurred in the Shittim went beyond Hashem's limits.

In what way did they cross the line? Bilaam tried to bring Hashem's wrath upon the Jewish people by making mention of the chet haegel and other sins (see Onkelos and Yonatan ben Uziel on Bamidbar 24:1), only to realize the futility of his attempts, then he comes to the realization that "it is good in Hashem's eyes to bless Israel" (Bamidbar 24:1). Bilaam, however, was very wise and cunning when it came to evil. Bilaam points out to Balak that: "The G-d of these Israelites hates promiscuity" (Rashi Bamidbar 24:14), and suggests how he can bring about their downfall (see Sanhedrin 106a). Had it not been for Pinchas, Bilaam and Balak's quest to destroy the entire Jewish nation would have succeeded. Unfortunately, he did succeed partially causing many Jewish people to worship Baal Peor thereby denying the Torah of Moshe Rabenu (see Sanhedrin there) and getting involved with the daughters of Midian. We then read: "Moshe said to the judges of Israel 'let each man kill his men who were attached to Baal Peor'" (Bamidbar 25:5). This resulted in approximately one quarter of the Jewish people being killed (see Yerushalmi Sanhedrin 10:2, and Rashi Bamidbar 25:5).

There were still many people such as Zimri who did not worship Avoda Zara. The judges therefore were not empowered to punish them, for the punishment for cohabiting with a non-Jewish woman cannot be carried out by the courts: "one who has relations with a non-Jewish woman, zealots may kill him" (Sanhedrin 81b, Rashi Bamidbar 25:7). Pinchas was the zealot who arose and carried out Hashem's vengeance against Zimri. This needs to be understood: from where do we know that a Jew may not marry a non-Jew? It is true that the pasuk states: "You shall not intermarry with them; you shall not give your daughter to his son, and you shall not take his daughter for your son. For he will cause your child to turn away from after Me and they will worship the gods of others" (Devarim

7:3-4)? The interpretation of this pasuk however has been the subject of a dispute between the Chachamim and R' Shimon - the Chachamim are of the opinion that this pasuk only applies to the seven nations, while R'

Shimon extends the prohibition to all non-Jews: "'for he cause your child to turn away from after Me' to include all who would turn away" (Avoda Zara 36b). The Rambam rules according to R' Shimon (see Hilchot Isurei Bia 12:1), while the Tur follows the view of the Chachamim (see Even Haezer 16). (It would appear to me that the Rambam would even forbid one to marry certain members of the Jewish Faith. According to R' Shimon one is forbidden to marry anyone who may lead them astray, it would stand to reason that according to this view, it is a Torah prohibition to marry those who do not observe Torah and Mitzvot. Using the same logic, one may marry a "ger toshav" even though she is definitely not Jewish, because she believes in Hashem and observes the seven Noachide laws. Because she does not worship Avoda Zara, she will not lead him astray).

According to the Chachamim, who limit this prohibition to the seven nations, there is no explicit prohibition in the Torah that forbade Zimri to have relations with a Midianite woman. Perhaps the Chachamim would forbid doing so in a public setting, but the act itself did not involve any serious prohibition. Why then did this bring about such anger from Hashem that He killed Zimri along with twenty-four thousand others, not including those killed by the judges of Israel for having succumbed to idol worship, and had Pinchas not stepped in, the entire Jewish nation would have been destroyed by this plague? The explanation was given to us by Bilaam: "the G-d of these Israelites hates promiscuity". Hashem wishes our marital lives to be free from "hefkerut" - permissiveness. It was in this matter that the Jewish people went one step too far, and "the wrath of Hashem burned against the Jewish people".

"Hefkerut" in marriage is a slave mentality: "a slave certainly prefers a life without restraint" (Gittin 13a). We see how far a slave will go to preserve his life of "hefkerut" - rather than marrying a Jewish woman with proper "yichus", he opts for the company of the Canaanite maidservant "who seems cheap to him, who is available to him, and who is promiscuous with him" (ibid.). R' Meir adds that "hefkerut" is so attractive to him that he will give up his freedom for it and live the life of a slave. We, however, are not ordinary slaves - we are servants of Hashem. A servant of Hashem prefers a life of restraint, he "does not let his cohabitation be deemed a mere promiscuous cohabitation" (Yevamot 107a). A Jew prefers his married life to be orderly and filled with holiness.

The essence of a Canaanite slave is that he has no individuality, he totally negates himself to his master, whether he became a slave by choice or was taken captive and sold into slavery - a slave is not his own person. This is the reason why a Kohen's Canaanite slave may partake of his master's trumah while his Jewish counterpart is not entitled to it (see Vayikra 22:10-11). Does the entitlement to trumah imply that a Canaanite slave has greater "yichus" than a Jewish one? Certainly not! The Jewish slave's very essence is that of a free man, he does not negate himself for the sake of his master! He became a slave purely for monetary considerations (he either went into poverty or stole something that he was not able to return). Such a slave may not eat trumah as any Yisrael is forbidden to. The Canaanite, on the other hand, has no individuality: "whatever a slave acquires his master acquires" (Pesachim 88b). A non-Jewish slave is entitled to trumah the same way a Kohen's donkey is - he is the property of the Kohen.

I once asked the Rav (HaGaon HaRav Shlomo Zalman Auerbach) zt"l whether when the Canaanite slave of a Kohen eats trumah he must recite the bracha: "who has sanctified us with the holiness of Aharon and commanded us on eating trumah". The Rav's reply was in the negative. I have difficulty with this ruling, for the Rambam tells us: "one who eats trumah recites the bracha appropriate for the particular food and then recites 'who has sanctified us in the holiness of Aharon and commanded us on eating trumah'" (Hilchot Trumot 15:22). This would imply that the slave must also recite the bracha (presumably the Rav had an answer to this question). I mentioned my question to someone, who claimed that by the same token the Kohen's animal should recite a bracha prior to partaking of trumah. My response was that firstly an animal is not obligated in Mitzvot, and secondly his inability to talk makes it physically impossible to recite any bracha. A slave, on the other hand, is obligated in Mitzvot, including reciting brachot. If the animal were able to talk, he would be able to recite the bracha if he desired. Are we saying that the slave is imbued with the sanctity of Aharon? Yes! When it comes to trumah, his master's sanctity has spread to him, for he has negated his entire being for the sake of his master the Kohen. This can be compared to a button sewn on a shirt. One who does not use the button need not remove it before walking in a public domain on Shabbat. The buttons are not viewed as an additional item being carried but are part of the shirt. Because the slave carries the status of his master - the Kohen, he has no independent identity of his own which is why he "prefers a life without restraint". The whole concept of Kiddushin of sanctity of marital life does not apply to a slave. We, however, are a holy nation and such a lifestyle is not fitting for holy people. Hashem does not mind when a slave lives a life of promiscuity, but He despises when His servants do.

It is specifically this restriction which classifies man as free. Many mistakenly think that freedom implies lawlessness or "permissiveness". Chazal tell us the opposite, it is a slave who "prefers a life without restraint". Such a person is worthy of being a slave, and it is he who will have a master who limits his freedom of movement. A person who knows how to set his own limits does not need others to tell him how to do so. One of the motives of Avoda Zara is the lack of boundaries. This applies mostly to marriage-related issues, though by no means is it limited to that. Chazal comment on the pasuk: "Come to Beit E-I and rebel; in Gilgal rebel greatly! Bring your sacrifices every morning, your tithes for three days, burn thanksgiving-offerings of leavened bread" (Amos 4:4-5). The idol worshippers would say to Israel: come and worship Avoda Zara it is far less restrictive! The Torah commands: "nor may the fat of My festive-offering remain overnight until morning" (Shmot 23:8), while to Avoda Zara you may "bring your sacrifices every morning" - relax! Why put yourself under so much pressure, the fats may remain overnight and offered in the morning. In addition, the Torah demands: "on the day of your slaughter shall it be eaten and on the next day" (Vayikra 19:6) - offerings classified as "kodshim kalim" (among them maaser behema - the tithing of one's animals) may only be eaten for two days and the night in between, and "whatever remains until the third day shall be burned in fire" (ibid.). Avoda Zara lures you by offering you: "your tithes for three days" - even on the third day you may consume your animal tithes. Tithes of animals that are brought for Avoda Zara may be eaten even on the third day. The Torah insists "you shall not cause to go up in smoke from any leavening or fruit-honey as a fire offering to Hashem" (Vayikra 2:11). Avoda Zara does not care: "burn thanksgiving offerings of leavened bread" (see Yerushalmi Avoda Zara 1:1, cited by Rashi in Amos).

The common denominator here is "hefkerut", "do whatever you wish". I am not sure what Avoda Zara is, but it is certainly more understanding and permissive and very progressive. One of the main attractions of Avoda Zara was that one may bring an offering upon any mountain - it need not be in the Beit Hamikdash or any special place. This was difficult even for the devout. All of the righteous kings of Yehuda until Chizkiyahu were not able to overcome this temptation, as the prophet points out again and again: "the high places ("bamot" - where they brought offerings) did not cease" (Melachim II 12:4, 14:4, 15:4, 15:35). The nation was unable to overcome the restriction of an offering being limited to Yerushalayim (not to speak of their difficulty stemming from the lure of Avoda Zara), for their fathers were permitted to offer upon altars atop any mountain during the period of Nov and Givon. "If my father could do it, why can't I?" One who has gotten used to something, has a very hard time accepting the fact that it has suddenly become forbidden.

It once happened that the "eruv" in Bnei Brak tore, and HaRav Yaakov Landau zt"l - then Rav of the city, announced that it was forbidden to carry in public areas on that Shabbat. People began to complain that this was a new chumra of Rav Landau's. For years, carrying was permitted on Shabbat, why is it suddenly forbidden?! Prior to the first Beit Hamikdash, the Jewish people used to bring offerings atop any mountain. They therefore had a very hard time accepting this new restriction that was introduced to them with the building of the Beit Hamikdash - offerings may only be brought there. Keep in mind that during that time period, the desire to offer was far greater - we cannot relate to such a desire. On the one hand they so badly wanted offer sacrifices, on the other hand, they could not live with the restriction of only being able to sacrifice in Yerushalayim. Avoda Zara, afforded them such an opportunity. Not only was it permitted, the act of sacrificing on any mountaintop was deemed "Glatt Kosher", perhaps even a "hiddur Mitzvah".

Avoda Zara is much more permissive. For those following the path of the Torah, the world is not hefker and neither are our bodies, they are designated to be used to fulfill the Mitzvot of Hashem and to serve Him. Our eyes are not "hefker" and they may only view that which Hashem permits them to: "do not explore after your heart and after your eyes after which you stray" (Bamidbar 15:39). Our ears are not permitted to listen to everything said. Our mouths are also not hefker. The Chafetz Chaim wrote an entire book on the laws of Shmirat Halashon. There are other restrictions on what we may do with our mouths as well. R' Shimon Bar Yochai (Yerushalmi Brachot 1:2) said that had he lived when the Torah was given, he would have requested that each person be given two mouths. Given that there are certain mundane matters that one is permitted to and even required to speak of, it would not be fitting for it to come out of the same mouth used to discuss divrei Torah. He later retracted his statement (perhaps as a result of his having to flee from the Romans and hide in a cave due to the loshon hara that was spoken about him - see Shabbat 33b). He decided that it would be better to leave things as they are, for if the world cannot survive due to all the loshon hara spoken out of one mouth, imagine what would be if everyone had yet another vehicle for speaking loshon hara. If only he knew that there would one day be so many other mediums for loshon hara such as the radio and telephone. We must be very careful how we use our mouths, our eyes, and our ears.

The prophet tells us: "Israel is holy to Hashem" (Yirmiyahu 2:3) - what does it mean to be "holy to Hashem"? It means that they are designated specifically for Hashem. One who gets married declares "harei at mekudeshet li" "you are sanctified to me" - only to me (see Kiddushin 2b, Tosafot "de-asar"). The Jewish people are special and only serve Hashem - their lives are not ones of "hefkerut".

Moshe told Korach that "The Holy One Blessed is He, divided His world with boundaries" (Rashi Bamidbar 16:5). Just as morning cannot be turned into night, a Levi or Yisrael cannot suddenly become a Kohen. These restrictions must be understood and adhered to. Even within the Leviim themselves, there are those who sing and those who stand guard. Unless specifically appointed to, one may not decide for himself that he prefers a different task (see Erchin 11b). Everything has its limits - "the world, the year, and the soul" (Otzar HaMidrashim perek 6, Mishna 4). The world refers to limits of space. The sanctity of the Land of Israel is not that of Chutz la'aretz. The only place to truly serve Hashem is in Eretz Yisrael (see Rashi Devarim 11:18, which is elaborated upon by the Ramban Vayikra 18:25). (I have read advertisements for "religious excursions to chutz la'aretz", some even claim to serve the chareidi public. What does it mean to have a religious or chareidi trip to chutz la'aretz, are they going to pray at the grave of Shakespeare? The halacha forbids travel to chutz la'aretz just for the sake of taking a trip. Shaving is normally forbidden on Chol Hamoed, yet the Mishna in Moed Katan permits it for those who have just returned from a trip overseas. This permission is qualified as applying on to those who traveled in a permissible manner. The example given of one who traveled in a forbidden manner is one who has gone from Eretz Yisrael to chutz la'aretz (see Shulchan Aruch 531:4 and Mishna Brura 14). In any event, even one who does not shave is forbidden to travel to Chutz la'aretz if not for one of the reasons permitted by the halacha). The sanctity of Yerushalayim is greater than that of the rest of Eretz Yisrael, and the holiness of Har Habayit is even greater (see Massechet Keilim perek 1, Mishna 7-8). These are all various boundaries of space.

There are boundaries of time as well. Many of our weekday activities are forbidden on Chol Hamoed. Many activities permitted on Chol Hamoed are forbidden on Yom Tov, and that which we may do on Yom Tov may not necessarily be done on Shabbat and Yom Kippur. There are also differences between human beings, boundaries separating one person from another, as Moshe explained to Korach.

The world is filled with limits. Why did the Torah juxtapose the prohibition against bringing offerings which were slaughtered outside the Beit Hamikdash (Vayikra 17), with the laws pertaining to forbidden relations? To teach us that there is a similarity between sacrificial offerings such as the Yom Kippur service the Torah had just finished detailing and arayot. This service atones for the sins of the Jewish nation only when performed at the right place, the right time, and by the right person. If any of these factors are missing, not only does it not atone but it is a grave violation. Relations can be viewed in much the same way. The act itself when performed with one's wife and at the right time is a tremendous Mitzvah, yet when one of these factors are missing it can lead to violations punishable by karet or even worse. This is the foundation of the sanctity of the Jewish people, not to be as a slave who "prefers a life without restraint".

If we can preserve our boundaries, if we can remain close to Hashem, then Hashem will not arouse the enmity of other nations against us, G-d forbid. He will keep His end of the covenant, we will be His only nation that is designated and sanctified only for Him. The entire book of Shir Hashirim is devoted to the love between Hashem and the Jewish people: "I am for my beloved and my beloved is for me" (Shir HaShirim 6:3). If we can preserve and protect this love, the Hashem will protect the love as well. He will then redeem us from among the nations that seek to harm us, and may He return speedily in our day to dwell among us in Har Tzion and Yerushalayim. May we serve Hashem exclusively in Har HaMoriah - along with the entire nation, speedily in our day. Amen.

## Kollel Rennert Dvar Torah by Rav Daniel Corish

### A PATH TOWARDS SERVING HASHEM

"*Velo kam navi od beYisrael keMoshe*" "Never again has there arisen in Israel a prophet like Moshe" (*Devarim* 34:10) - only in Israel has there not arisen a prophet like Moshe, in the other nations there has. Who is that prophet? Bilaam ben Beor (Yalkut Shimoni 967). We find, however, distinctions between the prophetic capabilities of Moshe and that of Bilaam. For example, Moshe was unaware Who was speaking to Him, while regarding Bilaam it says: "*neum shome-a imrei Kel*" "the words of the one who hears the sayings of G-d" (*Bamidbar* 24:16). Secondly, Moshe did not know precisely when Hashem would speak to him until He actually spoke to him, while Bilaam was aware as it is written: "*veyode-a daat elyon*" "and knows the knowledge of the Supreme One" (*ibid.*).

On the one hand, Chazal describe for us the high spiritual level Bilaam was on and compare him to Moshe Rabenu. On the other hand Chazal teach us (*Avot* 5:19) just how low Bilaam was: "Whoever has the following three traits is among the disciples of our forefather Avraham, and whoever has three different traits is among the disciples of the wicked Bilaam. Those who have a good eye, a humble spirit, and a meek soul are among the disciples of our forefather Avraham. Those who have an evil eye, an arrogant spirit, and a greedy soul are among the disciples of the wicked Bilaam. How are the disciples of our forefather Avraham different from the disciples of the wicked Bilaam? The disciples of our forefather Avraham enjoy the fruits of their good deeds in this world and inherit the World to Come, as it is said: 'To cause those who love Me to inherit an everlasting position (the World to Come) and I will fill their storehouse (in this world)' (*Mishle* 8:21). But the disciples of the wicked Bilaam inherit Gehinom and descend into the well of destruction, as it is said: "and You, O G-d, shall lower them into the well of destruction, men of bloodshed and deceit shall not live out half their days, but as for me, I will trust in You" (*Tehillim* 55:24).

How can we explain such an inherent internal contradiction, how can a person capable of reaching such lofty spiritual heights sink to such depths of depravity?

Perhaps we can offer an explanation based on Bilaam's own words: "*neum Bilaam beno Beor uneum hagever shetum haayin*" "the words of Bilaam son of Beor, the words of the man with the *shetum haayin*" (*Bamidbar* 24:15). Rashi explains that *shetum haayin* means the one with the open eye. One explanation is that they eye has come out and the hole in the place where it was, is now open. Another possible interpretation is based on the Targum who says "*deshapir chazi*" - open means that he sees well. However, we must keep in mind that he was *shetum haayin* - only one eye, not both eyes, is described as *shetum*. This means that he "saw well" with only one eye and did not see at all with the second eye.

HaRav HaGaon Rav Yaakov Katz Shlit"za explains that although the *psukim* can certainly be understood on the simple level that he truly was blind in one eye, perhaps the Torah is alluding to something deeper here. The Torah is teaching us that a person must make use of both his eyes - view things on two planes - to look into the distance and strive for greatness and cleave to Hashem as well as to contemplate the little things going on around him, to develop his character and personal growth. He should work hard to make sure that there is no gap between his vision for the future and his current personal growth and development.

The Torah is perhaps teaching us what Bilaam was lacking by being blind in one eye. From one perspective he was greater than Moshe Rabenu while on the other hand he completely neglected his own personal development - he did not contemplate what was happening in his immediate surroundings. Twice the donkey hinted to him: "look where you are going", yet Bilaam was too obsessed with his desire to curse the Jewish people. He paid no attention to the fact that miraculously the donkey began to speak and rebuke him - he was not moved and continued arguing with the donkey until the angel appeared and threatened him. Bilaam may think he is able to see that which others cannot, but when it comes to his own personal development he

cannot even see that which the animal sees - he is blind when it comes to himself.

We now understand his behavior at the end of the *parsha*. He concludes his address with "big ships from the coast of Kittim will afflict Assyria and afflict the other bank - but it, too, will be forever destroyed" (Bamidbar 24:24). Immediately following, we read: "then Bilaam rose up and went and returned to his place". Bilaam continued his evil ways and did not take to heart all that he had said himself. He then causes the Jewish people to sin by engaging in illicit relations. Such is the way of one who goes through life with only one eye - without keeping an eye open regarding his own personal development, *middot*, and *derech erez*.

### Petuchei Chotam on Parshat Balak



Rav Chanan Bina will be teaching a passage from the sefer Petuchei Chotam each week on the parshat hashavua. The sefer was written by HaRav Yaakov Abuchatzera zt"l.

Click [here](#) to listen.

### Dedications, Visitor Log, Mazal Tov's, Tehillim List

#### Visitors

The following people visited/learned in the Yeshiva:

- Daniel Bral (5767)
- Mark Katzman (5757)



#### Mazal tov's

Yeshivat Netiv Aryeh would like to wish a mazal tov to:

- [Adam](#) (5765) and Alana Gelnick on the birth of a baby girl.
- [Daniel](#) Bukingolts (5765-66,71) on his marriage to Tova Kahn.
- [Mo](#) (Michael) Davidovits (5764) on his marriage to Laura Ruben.

#### Baruch Dayan Emet

Yeshivat Netiv Aryeh regrets to inform you of the loss of:

- The maternal grandmother of [Michael](#) Pilevsky (5757-58).

#### Tehillim List

The following members of our extended YNA family need our tefilot:

- |                               |                                     |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| • Michoel Pinchas ben Frachah | • Matityahu Yaakov ben Gittel Rivka |
| • Miriam Rivka bat Adina Leah | • Ada Bat Miriam                    |
| • Rachel bat Chana            | • Reuven ben Tova Chaya             |
| • Yehuda Pinchas ben Asna     | • Aharon ben Simah                  |
| • Sagit bat Esther            | • Shayna bat Chava                  |
| • Fruma bat Ita               | • Zev eliezer ben Chaya Shaindel    |
| • Chaya bat Grunia            | • Avram Gershon ben Tzippa          |

- Tamara Nechama bat Karmela
- Ester bat Chaya
- Binyamin Yonatan ben Leikah
- Chaya Chana bat Alta Rivkah
- Yosef ben Hilda
- Maron ben Hadas Esther
- Chaya Meira Mindel bat Chava Golda
- Chinoam Rina bat Avital Hoday-ya
- Ditzta bat Vardit Tali bat Devorah Bina
- Akiva ben Gittel
- Marcel Ben Pninah
- Evelyn Bat Dina
- Avraham Elizar ben Chana Pesha
- Mordechai Eliezer Hacoheh ben Esther Miria
- Yaakov Dov ben Blima Chana
- Reuven HaLevi Ben Sheina
- Ari ben Rivka
- Yosef ben Golda
- Esther bat Brana
- Miriam bat Shulamit
- Rivka Chava bat Rachel
- Margalit Chaya bat Rachel
- David ben Leah
- Elizabeth bat Annette
- Edmund Ben Nazira
- Shmuel Chai Ben Hadassa
- Alyza Sarah Bat Yehudit
- Inbal bat Nelya
- Yitzchak Shraga ben Chava



And of course we are always davening for the safe release of  
Gilad Shalit (Gilad ben Aviva)  
and Jonathan Pollard  
(Yehonatan ben Malka Pollard)



[Submit Names](#) to the list.

[Send Us Your Announcements](#)

Please, if you have any smachot or chas v'shalom, less happy occasions, [let our office know](#) so we can keep everybody updated. **Are you visiting Israel?** - [let us know!](#) We'd love to host you for a shabbat meal, davening, a shiur and would love for you to stop by.

**Shabbat Shalom,**  
Rav Bina,  
Yeshivat Netiv Aryeh