



# Likkutei Sichos

Volume 18 | Shelach | Sichah 3

## Their Shade has Departed

---

Translated by Rabbi Mendel Rapoport

General Editor: Rabbi Eliezer Robbins | Copy Editor: Rabbi Y. Eliezer Danzinger

Content Editor: Rabbi Zalmy Avtzon

© Copyright by Sichos In English 2022 ◦5782

A note on the translation: Rounded and square brackets reflect their use in the original *sichah*; curly brackets are interpolations of the translator or editor. The footnotes in curly brackets are those of the translator or editors and do not correspond to the footnotes in the original. Bolded words are italicized in the original text.

Considerable effort has been made to ensure the accuracy of the translation, while at the same time maintaining readability. The translation, however, carries no official authority. As in all translations, the possibility of inadvertent errors exists.

**Your feedback is needed — please send all comments to: [info@projectlikkuteisichos.org](mailto:info@projectlikkuteisichos.org)**

## 1.

### WONDROUS IDEAS AND *PSHAT*

As discussed many times,<sup>1</sup> the primary focus of Rashi in his commentary on the Torah is to explain the *pshat*<sup>2</sup> of Scripture. As Rashi himself emphasizes **again and again**, and immediately in the first *parshah* {*Bereishis*}, “I have come only to explain the plain meaning.”<sup>3</sup>

Nevertheless, as also discussed previously, Rashi’s commentary also contains “wondrous ideas” concerning other dimensions of Torah, even the “mysteries of Torah.” The Alter Rebbe would famously say, “Rashi’s commentary on the Torah is the **wine**<sup>4</sup> of Torah.”<sup>5</sup>

In order to fathom the “wondrous ideas” and “wine” of Torah in Rashi’s commentary, we must first learn and understand the *pshat*. This is because Rashi embedded the “wondrous ideas” and “wine” of Torah into his commentary on the *pshat*.

In this *parshah*, Rashi offers an interpretation that contains “wondrous ideas” in the realm of *halachah* (and “wine” of Torah). We must first explain, however, the plain meaning of this interpretation {in which these ideas are embedded}.

---

<sup>1</sup> See *Likkutei Sichos*, vol. 5, p. 1.

<sup>2</sup> {The plain meaning of Scripture.}

<sup>3</sup> Rashi on *Bereishis* 3:8.

<sup>4</sup> {“Wine” connotes complexity and depth. This refers to the deeper, mystical dimension of Torah that is not well known and considered “secret.”}

<sup>5</sup> *Hayom Yom*, p. 24.

## 2.

### RASHI'S PROOF

In the section of our *parshah* describing what Yehoshua and Kalev said to the Jewish people regarding entering the Land of Israel, the verse says:<sup>6</sup> “Only, against Hashem, do not rebel; and you, do not fear, אַל תִּירָאוּ, the people of the land, for they are our bread;<sup>7</sup> their protection has departed from them, etc.” In his caption, Rashi quotes the words “do not rebel” and explains: “and consequently, *will not fear*.”<sup>8</sup>

Commentators<sup>9</sup> explain that Rashi intends to point out that the next clause of the verse “and you, do not fear...” is not a distinct statement. Rather, the phrase, “do not fear” is a consequence of “do not rebel.” If {they fulfill} “against Hashem, do not rebel” — consequently — “and you will not fear.”

Rashi's proof to construe the verse this way is because the syntax is different in each clause: In the clause, “do not rebel,” **first**, it states {the direct object} (against whom — ) “against **Hashem** {do not rebel}.” However, in the next clause, first it says, “you, do not fear,” and only **afterward**, it states {the direct object} (**whom** you shall not fear) “the people of the land.” (Alternatively, Rashi's proof is derived from the inclusion of the word “you,” instead of just stating, “do not fear...”).<sup>10</sup>

On this basis, Rashi proves that “you, do not fear” is a continuation, and outcome of, “do not rebel” {and, therefore, the meaning of the clause is “you will not fear”}.

This explanation, however, is difficult. Rashi should have also quoted in his caption the words (that are immediately before the clause he quoted — ) “against Hashem,” and also the next clause, “and you, do not fear the people of the land”

---

<sup>6</sup> *Bamidbar* 14:9.

<sup>7</sup> {“*Lachmeinu*,” in the original Hebrew; lit. “food” or “bread”}.

<sup>8</sup> {In Hebrew, לשון הבטחה and לשון ציווי, imperative mood, and indicative mood, are identical, and the meaning must be derived from the context.}

<sup>9</sup> *Mizrachi*; *Gur Aryeh*; *Maskil LeDavid*.

<sup>10</sup> *Maskil LeDavid*; *Be'er Yitzchak*.

(or at least allude to them with “etc.”). After all, these words are the proof for his interpretation.

From Rashi’s omission of the words “against Hashem” and the later words of the verse, it is clear that his proof is primarily, at least (not from the syntax of the verse, but rather) from the subject, “do not rebel.”

### 3.

#### BREAD OF PREY

Next, Rashi quotes, in his caption, the words, “for they are our bread,” and explains, “we shall consume them like bread.” We must clarify:

- a) What novelty does Rashi intend to introduce? **Obviously**, the phrase, “they are our bread” in this context does not mean that the people are bread. It is a figurative expression that our victory over them will be as easy as eating bread.
- b) On the other hand, if the point is to express that the victory will be as easy as eating, eating **bread** isn’t easier than any other food. The verse could have stated more concisely, “we will consume them,” or the like. What is the intent of the nuance, “our bread” — “as bread?”
- c) On the contrary, Rashi should have **explained**, “we will consume them like food” (and not specifically bread). In **many** contexts, the word for *bread, lechem*, refers to any food!<sup>11</sup>
- d) Why does Rashi also quote {in his caption} the word “for” which he **does not** explain?

---

<sup>11</sup> *Bereishis* 31:54, 43:32; *Shemos* 18:12.

## 4.

### ONE FINAL RASHI

Following this explanation, Rashi quotes in his caption the words, “their shade has departed,” and comments, “their shield and their strength {has departed from them}; the decent ones among them are dead; Iyov, who had protected them.<sup>12</sup> Another explanation: The shade {protection} of Hashem has departed from them.” We must clarify: Why does Rashi need both explanations? What advantage does each of them have over the other?

## 5.

### YEHOSHUA AND KALEV

The explanation of Rashi’s remarks:

The reason Rashi must understand the verse in this manner — that “you will not fear” is a consequence of “do not rebel,” and not a distinct idea:

Previously, the Torah related how the spies claimed, “the people who inhabit the land are powerful”;<sup>13</sup> and, “all the people that we saw in it are of great size”;<sup>14</sup> and, “we looked like grasshoppers in our eyes, and so we were in their eyes.”<sup>15</sup> Yehoshua and Kalev **did not** refute their claims. The question arises: How can Yehoshua and Kalev have demanded, “you, do not fear the people of the land,” providing **no** reason why the Jewish people should have no fear?

The question is even stronger: Later on,<sup>16</sup> when “they awoke early in the morning...,” the Jewish people declared, “We are prepared to go up.” Moshe responded, “Do not go up, lest you be smitten..., for the Amalekites and the Canaanites will confront you....” We see that even Moshe thought it was

---

<sup>12</sup> *Sotah* 35a; *Bava Basra* 15a.

<sup>13</sup> *Bamidbar* 13:28

<sup>14</sup> {*Bamidbar* 13:32.}

<sup>15</sup> {*Bamidbar* 13:33.}

<sup>16</sup> *Bamidbar* 14:40-43.

understandable for the Jews to have been fearful. In that case, why did Yehoshua and Kalev demand, “you, do **not** fear?”

We must also clarify: With their words, “against Hashem, do not rebel,” Yehoshua and Kalev meant to say that the Jews should obey Hashem’s command to enter the Land of Israel. Yehoshua and Kalev should have expressed this point specifically, i.e., {not to rebel against} entering the Land of Israel. Why did they make a sweeping appeal, “against Hashem, do not **rebel**”?

Rashi addresses these questions with his explanation: “*do not rebel*, and **consequently**, *you will not fear*.” Yehoshua and Kalev said that “you will not fear” will result from “do not rebel.” True, “the people who inhabit the land are powerful” (and it is reasonable to be afraid); nevertheless, if you fulfill the directive “do not rebel” (i.e., you listen to what Hashem says), “consequently” — then, there will be absolutely no reason (even according to **nature**) to fear (even a powerful nation).

Therefore, Yehoshua and Kalev said, “against Hashem, do not *rebel*” (and did not specify that they should enter the Land of Israel): The clause, “against Hashem, do not rebel,” counters the claim that “the people who inhabit the land are powerful,” providing a reason for “you will not fear.” Then, the Jewish people will **automatically** enter the Land of Israel.

## 6.

### THEY WILL BE GIVEN TO US LIKE BREAD

In light of this explanation, we can understand why Rashi continues with his following interpretation of the words, “*For they are our bread* — we shall consume them like bread.” Here, we (can, and therefore) must understand the phrase, “our bread,” literally, like “bread.”

However, without Rashi’s remarks, we would have {mistakenly} understood this association with “bread” to mean that entering the Land of Israel and conquering its inhabitants was a necessity, just like bread.<sup>17</sup>

This would have justified the specific use of the word “bread” and the clause, “**for** they are our bread.” “You will not fear the people of the land” *for* “they are our bread.” Conquering them (and entering the Land of Israel) is a necessity, just like “bread,” and therefore, it is crucial that “you will not fear...”

Since Rashi explains that the reason “you will not fear” is because you will obey the command “do not rebel” — because you will go forward with G-d-given strength — we cannot say that the reason “you will not fear” is because “they are our bread,” and conquering them is essential like bread.

Additionally, if we were to understand the verse this way, we would have to clarify: {If entering the Land of Israel and conquering the people were a necessity} how was it that the Jewish people did not enter the Land of Israel for the **next** 39 years?!

Therefore, Rashi explains, “**we shall consume them** like bread”: The specific comparison to bread (does not connote the urgency and imperative nature of this war, but rather, it) metaphorizes **the manner of the victory**. They will conquer the Land of Israel as easily as bread is eaten.

---

<sup>17</sup> Note Rashi’s comments on *Shemos* 16:8: “Their request for bread was appropriate.” {I.e., bread is a necessary staple.}

Rashi does not need to explain the advantage of eating bread; even a novice student of Torah<sup>18</sup> has already studied *parshas Beshalach*<sup>19</sup> where Rashi explained that since “they had asked {for bread} appropriately,” Hashem would provide it “in a manner that shows His love” and “with a radiant countenance.” When we arrive at this verse, “for they are our bread,” and we learn that it means, “we shall consume them like bread,” we understand that Hashem will ensure that the Jewish people conquer (consume) the foreign nations “in a manner that shows His love” and “with a radiant countenance,” just as he gave them bread.

This also explains the wording, “you will not fear... **for** they are our bread”: You will have no fear at all, for they will be delivered to us “in a manner that shows His love” and “with a radiant countenance.”

## 7.

### THEIR “SHADE” HAS DEPARTED **FROM THEM**

Regarding the two interpretations that Rashi offers on the clause, “their protection has departed,” we can infer from Rashi’s wording itself the advantage of the second interpretation:

Rashi’s second interpretation is that “the shade {protection} of Hashem has **departed from them.**” In contrast, at the beginning of his remarks, when quoting the words of the verse (which apply to both interpretations), Rashi quotes only the words, “their protection has departed,” and omits “from them.” The explanation:

---

<sup>18</sup> {In the original, בן חמש למקרא, “a five-year-old, beginning to learn Scripture.” This is a term borrowed from *Pirkei Avos*, which teaches that the age for a child to study *Chumash* is at five. Rashi wrote his commentary on *Chumash* to solve problems that a 5-year-old student would encounter in understanding the simple meaning of a verse.}

<sup>19</sup> *Shemos* 16:7-8.



The word “departed” — and more specifically “departed **from them**” — means that something has departed from its original place (“from them”) and now is some place else (it continues to exist also later).

However, according to the first interpretation, “the decent ones among them **are dead**,” it turns out that the “shade” is completely gone. Accordingly, the word “departed” doesn’t fit, and even more so, the emphasis, “departed from them” doesn’t fit. Therefore, Rashi provides a second interpretation that the “shade” refers to “the shade of Hashem.” According to this second interpretation, the wording “departed,” and specifically, “departed from them,” fit in well: The “shade” of Hashem always exists. After all, “behold, I establish My covenant with you and your offspring after you, and with every living thing...”;<sup>20</sup> “His mercy is upon all His works.”<sup>21</sup> It has only “departed **from them**” — *they* do not have Hashem’s protection.

We can also explain (albeit with difficulty) the words “departed from them” according to the first interpretation (even though according to this interpretation, the “shade” no longer exists at all). This will explain why Rashi offers this interpretation (furthermore, he provides this interpretation **first**, as we will explain):

By saying, “*their* protection has departed” (“the decent ones among them are dead”), Yehoshua and Kalev were not speaking about the “shade” (about the decent ones among them),<sup>22</sup> but about “the people of the land” (whom the “shade” shields, the ones protecting the people of the land, have gone). Since no one is alive who can protect them, “you will not fear the people of the land.” The current status of the “people of the land” (and **not** the status of the “shade”) is relevant here. Therefore, they said, “their protection **has departed from them**” — there is no reason to fear them, for their protection has departed **from them** (even though the “shade” hadn’t really “departed” — it had “died”).

Since this answer is strained, though, Rashi gives a second interpretation.

---

<sup>20</sup> Bereishis 9:9-10.

<sup>21</sup> Tehillim 145:9.

<sup>22</sup> {I.e., *their* shade, שָׁדָה, does not refer to the decent ones, “the shade,” *providing* the protection. Rather, the pronoun *their* refers to those who had benefited from the protection.}

However, as mentioned above, the interpretation, “their shield and their strength {is departed from them},” is also reasonable. Furthermore, **this** interpretation is more plausible according to a straightforward understanding of the passage. Since Scripture speaks about foreign nations, it stands to reason that “their shade {protection}” refers to **their** “shade” — the decent ones among **them** {among the foreign nations} (and **does not** refer to “the shade of Hashem.” For if this were the case, the verse should have said, “*the* shade has departed...” {and not, “*their* shade”). Therefore, the interpretation, “their shield and their strength,” is quoted first, as the primary interpretation.<sup>23</sup>

## 8.

RAMBAM AND RAAVAD

The “wondrous ideas” that are embedded in Rashi’s commentary: These two interpretations that Rashi offers are contingent upon the opinions of Rambam and Raavad.

Rambam rules:<sup>24</sup>

When an idolater slaughters an animal, it is considered as a *neveilah*<sup>25</sup> and imparts impurity when carried.... Whether the slaughterer is an idolater, a Samaritan, or a righteous gentile,<sup>26</sup> his slaughter causes the animal to be considered as a *neveilah*. According to my estimation, this is also a rabbinic decree, for the impurity imparted by false deities and objects offered to them is a rabbinic decree.

---

<sup>23</sup> See *Maskil L'David*.

<sup>24</sup> *Mishneh Torah*, “*Hilchos Shaar Avos HaTumah*,” ch. 2, par. 10.

<sup>25</sup> {An improperly slaughtered animal, that is not kosher, and ritually impure.}

<sup>26</sup> {In the original, “*ger toshav*”; lit., “a resident convert”; a gentile who is allowed to reside in Israel having formally accepted the 7 Noahide laws.}

Raavad argues with Rambam and says:

Idolaters are like animals in that they do not carry or impart impurity. They are people that are compared to a donkey; they are but “a drop from a bucket,”<sup>27</sup> “the wind will carry them all off”;<sup>28</sup> a person who considers them worth anything has “gathered wind in his fists.”<sup>29</sup>

The *Kesef Mishnah* raises a question on the view of the Raavad: Why is it relevant that “they do not carry or impart impurity?” Here we are not addressing idolaters (whether they can become impure), rather, their act of slaughter.

The Rogatchover<sup>30</sup> clarifies Raavad’s opinion: When is it possible that a proper act of slaughter will spoil the animal and render it *neveilah*? Only if the slaughterer is “**a real existence**” (in the context of *halachah*). If they are considered a “non-existence,” however, then they cannot spoil an animal. This is what Raavad means: Since “idolaters are comparable to animals in that they do not carry or impart impurity,” they are considered “wind,”<sup>31</sup> “non-existent.” Therefore, their act of slaughter cannot ruin an animal and **render it a *neveilah***. (Therefore, Raavad understands that when an idolater slaughters an animal, it becomes a *neveilah* (not because the idolater ruins it, but) because his act of slaughter is not considered a *halachically* kosher act of slaughter; **automatically**, the animal becomes a *neveilah* just as if it had died on its own.)

[Still, why does Raavad say, “they do not carry or impart impurity”? According to the explanation offered by the Rogatchover, it is only relevant that they are considered “non-existent.” Why is it relevant that this concept plays out specifically in the laws of impurity, “they do not carry impurity”? We can suggest:

Everyone concurs, even Raavad, that regarding quite a few matters in *halachah*, an idolater is considered an “existence,” including the case of an idol that belongs to an idolater, which a Jew is forbidden to derive benefit from,<sup>32</sup> and

---

<sup>27</sup> {*Yeshayahu* 40:15.}

<sup>28</sup> {*Yeshayahu* 57:13.}

<sup>29</sup> {*Mishlei* 30:4.}

<sup>30</sup> *Tzafnas Paneach Al Hatorah, Haftorah of parshas Behar.*

<sup>31</sup> {See footnotes 26, 27.}

<sup>32</sup> *Avodah Zarah* 51b.

other cases as well. Therefore, Raavad cannot generalize that “idolaters are comparable to animals” in all situations. For this reason, he adds, “they do not carry or impart impurity.” Regarding the laws of **impurity**, they are considered similar to **animals**, i.e., “**non-existent**” (“gathered wind in his fists”). Consequently, they cannot render an animal that they slaughtered as a *neveilah* to impart **impurity**.]

This dispute between Rambam and Raavad regarding whether idolaters are considered as “existent” or “non-existent,” mirrors their opinions in another dispute regarding whether *hashgacha pratis*<sup>33</sup> includes idolaters: Rambam maintains that since they are deemed an “existence,” and *hashgacha pratis* also applies to them.<sup>34</sup> According to the opinion of Raavad, who maintains that they are deemed to be “non-existent,” however, *hashgacha pratis* does not apply to them.

## 9.

### TWO MEANINGS OF “THEIR SHADE”

We can further suggest that these two interpretations of Rashi — whether “their shade” refers to “their shield and their strength,” or “the shade of Hashem” — parallel the opinions of Rambam and Raavad:

The first interpretation follows the opinion of Raavad that gentiles<sup>35</sup> are considered “**non-existent**.” Consequently, we cannot understand “their shade” as referring to “the shade of Hashem” which was earlier “their shade” but has now “**departed from them**.” Such an understanding would prove that they are considered a **true** “existence.” The proof is that “the shade of Hashem” can be,

---

<sup>33</sup> {Lit., “{Divine} supervision over the particular.” Usually translated as *Divine providence*. In our context, though, emphasis is placed on the supervision over each *particular* entity. Although Jewish thinkers agreed that Hashem exercises supervision, as it were, over the species, etc., some opined that supervision over individual beings was commensurate with their consciousness of the Divine. See fn. 35, 50, 53, which are beyond the scope of this translation.}

<sup>34</sup> {In the original, “*gam heim hava geder hashgacha pratis*”; meaning, “they too are in the class {of those beings} receiving particular (Divine) supervision.”}

<sup>35</sup> {In the original, “בני נח.”}

and is, measured according to **their “existence”** (**similar** to a physical shadow which is made by a person). But they are considered “non-existent,” and (as the Rogatchover explains) so *hashgacha pratis* does not apply to them. Thus, we must understand “their shade” as referring to “their shield and their strength, the decent ones **among them** are dead...,” and not to “the shade of Hashem ({that} has departed from them).”

In contrast, the second interpretation, which follows Rambam’s approach, gentiles are classified as “existence.” Therefore, *hashgacha pratis* does apply to them. Hence, we can understand “their shade” to refer to “the shade of Hashem ({that} relates to)... them” — {the influence of} Hashem’s shade that applies to their “existence,” as discussed.

## 10.

### REWARD AND PUNISHMENT

This will be more clearly understood from a deeper perspective:

“The **shade** of Hashem” means a person’s actions make an impact Above that is analogous to (and patterned after) his action. As the Baal Shem Tov expounded<sup>36</sup> the verse, “Hashem is your shade {shadow}”:<sup>37</sup> A person’s actions down here below, elicits **similar** effects Above. This is analogous to a person’s shadow that exactly mirrors his movements. Hashem’s shade, for the gentiles, works in a **similar** fashion: Since Hashem does not withhold from any creature its due reward,<sup>38</sup> the actions of the gentiles bring about, so to speak, that Hashem’s shade is drawn down. In other words: When they do a positive act (when they fulfill the Seven Noahide Laws,<sup>39</sup> or the like) they are **given** their reward. If, however, they commit a sin, Hashem’s shade is drawn down in a (harmful) manner that reflects their behavior, as punishment.

---

<sup>36</sup> *Kedushas Levi, parshas Beshalach.*

<sup>37</sup> *Tehillim* 121:5. {In Hebrew, צל, means both *shade* and *shadow*.}

<sup>38</sup> *Pesachim* 118a, and sources noted there.

<sup>39</sup> {The Torah’s laws of morality for all humanity.}

The above description follows Rambam's approach that gentiles are considered a *halachic* "existence." Thus, they can elicit a flow in a manner of "shade" (mirroring their **individual** image) because *hashgacha pratis* does apply to them. In contrast, according to Raavad's opinion that they are considered as "non-existent," we cannot suggest that their actions can elicit a **mirrored** revelation from Above. This follows his opinion that *hashgacha pratis* does not apply to them.

According to Raavad, the reward and punishment that is administered to the gentiles comes automatically as a direct (and secondary) result of {fulfilling} their purpose — they were created for the sake of the Jewish people.

This is similar to the reward and punishment for animals: Although an animal is incapable of sinning, the Torah says, "the animal shall be killed,"<sup>40</sup> even though {our Sages ask,} "what is the animal's sin?"<sup>41</sup> It is only that "ruination came to a person through it." This death cannot be considered a punishment. Rather, since an animal's purpose is to serve human beings, if the animal does not do so but brings harm to a person, its existence cannot be justified and consequently, "the animal shall be killed."

The reward and punishment of gentiles follows a similar rationale:

Since the purpose of Creation is for the Jewish people, it must be that even the commandments that are addressed to gentiles (are unlike the commandments to the Jewish people, regarding which, observance of the mitzvah itself is the purpose, but) are subordinate, **for the sake of** the Jewish people. We have explained previously at length<sup>42</sup> that the purpose of the mitzvos given to the gentiles is to make the world inhabitable. That way, the Jewish people can create a home for Hashem by fulfilling (their) mitzvos and by learning Torah.

---

<sup>40</sup> *Vayikra* 20:15.

<sup>41</sup> See Rashi on the verse.

<sup>42</sup> See *Likkutei Sichos*, vol. 5 p. 159ff., and the sources cited there.

Therefore, the reward and punishment for the Seven Noahide Laws is a (natural) result (in this world) triggered automatically because of their purpose.

In light of this explanation, we also understand why there are no different types of punishment **at all** for gentiles. Rather, every prohibition is punishable by death.<sup>43</sup> This is unlike a “shadow,” the shape of which changes according to a person’s actions.

## 11.

“SHADE OF HASHEM” FOR THE GENTILES

The difference between the two interpretations that Rashi offers is contingent on the ideas discussed above (according to a mystical perspective, and also a halachic perspective):

The first interpretation follows Raavad’s approach that gentiles are considered “non-existent,” and the reward and punishment is an automatic consequence, as discussed. Therefore, Rashi understands that “their shade” does **not** refer to “the shade of Hashem,” but rather, to **their** “shield and their strength.” The “decent ones **among them**” provide strength **for them**, but they trigger **nothing** Above.

In contrast, the second explanation follows Rambam’s approach, that gentiles are considered an “existence” and there is *hashgacha pratis* for them.

True, Rambam also agrees that the existence of gentiles (and their seven mitzvos) is for the sake of the Jewish people. However, since they were, in fact, commanded to fulfill these mitzvos, and moreover, “Hashem commanded them in the **Torah** and notified them through Moshe *Rabbeinu*,”<sup>44</sup> we must conclude that when they fulfill Hashem’s commands, they draw down a **mirrored**

---

<sup>43</sup> See *Sanhedrin* 57a.

<sup>44</sup> *Mishneh Torah*, “*Hilchos Melachim*,” ch. 8, par. 11.

revelation from Above. Consequently, we can say that “the **shade** of Hashem” is drawn down like a (personal) shadow, to the extent that it is called “their shade.”

## 12.

HAVE NO FEAR

In light of this explanation, we better understand the solution to other perplexities in the passage's continuation and in Rashi's commentary:

a) Why did Yehoshua and Kalev add, “their shade has departed from them?”

Their earlier statement, “If {Hashem} is pleased with us...,”<sup>45</sup> is necessary. Likewise, their statements, “do not rebel” and “you will not fear” are necessary. As Rashi explains, the Jewish people will have no fear because they will obey the command “do not rebel,” as discussed. Meaning, when the Jewish people move forward with the strength of Hashem, then it is not at all possible (even under the laws of nature) to fear “the people of the land.” (“They are our bread,” “we shall consume them like bread” — Hashem will deliver them into our hands “in a manner that shows His love” and “with a radiant countenance”). All this explains the mindset that the Jewish people should adopt.

Why is it relevant to notify the Jewish people regarding the state of the people of the land: “Their shade has departed from them”?

In other words: “If Hashem is pleased with us... and He will give to us...,” and “do not rebel”; why must the Jewish people know that “their shade has departed from them”?

b) Since Yehoshua and Kalev already said, “we shall consume them,” it is self-understood that their protection and strength was gone. What, then, did they add by saying, “their shade has departed”?

---

<sup>45</sup> *Bamidbar* 14:8.



c) Why did Yehoshua and Kalev repeat themselves, “have no fear”?<sup>46</sup>

d) At first, it sufficed for them to say, “do not rebel” and then (consequently) “you will not fear.” Here, {why do} they add a reason — “Hashem is with us”?

The explanation: Of the land’s inhabitants who were vanquished, there were three categories:<sup>47</sup> (a) those who were killed; (b) those who were banished immediately (they were totally neutralized); and, (c) and who were eventually banished after the Jewish population multiplied sufficiently, (and in the interim, they were placed in servile positions — “our bread”).

To continue the earlier discussion:

Even according to Rashi’s second interpretation that gentiles experience the “shade of Hashem,” in accord with Rambam’s opinion that *hashgacha pratis* does apply to gentiles, obviously this is **altogether different** from the *hashgacha pratis* shown to the Jewish people. [As discussed above, the mitzvos given to the Jewish people were for the sake of the mitzvos themselves.]

Yehoshua and Kalev emphasized this point: First they refuted the claim that “the people who inhabit the land are powerful,” and they said, “you must not rebel against Hashem”; **consequently**, “you will not fear the people of the land.” There is no reason to fear the inhabitants, regardless of their situation.

Then, they added: “their shade has departed from them” (not only according to Rashi’s first interpretation of the word *shade*, “their shield and their strength,” but also according to the second interpretation that *shade* refers to) “the shade of Hashem has departed from them.” And moreover, “Hashem is (only) **with us**,” the complete opposite of “**their shade has departed.**” The Jewish people do not lack “the **shade** of Hashem,” Heaven forbid, but, moreover, “Hashem is **with us.**” In other words, for the gentiles, *hashgacha pratis* (even when present) is like “shade” — encompassing them {from a

---

<sup>46</sup> {*Bamidbar* 14:9.}

<sup>47</sup> *Shemos* 23:23-30, and Rashi’s commentary there.

distance, so to speak}.<sup>48</sup> However, not only does Hashem encompass the Jewish people, but He is also “with us” — He, with His *hashgacha pratis*, is **one** with us. We understand, then, why this results not only in that “you, do not fear the people of the **land**,” but also in the general command,<sup>49</sup> “do not fear them.” This is not only because they will cease to be the “people of **the land**,” since “Hashem will give it to us,” and their identity will be (only) to serve as “our bread,” but furthermore, they will become **non-entities** altogether, because “their shade has departed from them.”

One may posit that this {these three stages of subjugation, described above, concerning the people of the land} corresponds also to the other three methods of conquest:<sup>50</sup> (a) “You shall not allow any person to live”;<sup>51</sup> (b) {if the city responds to you} with peace {... all the people found therein} shall become tributary to you, and they shall serve you”;<sup>52</sup> and (c) “the Gergashites left for Africa.”

In the end, after they {the Gergashites} reappeared<sup>53</sup> (lodging a complaint, etc. {with Alexander of Macedon}) the Jewish people received “their fields when they were sown and their vineyards when they were planted.”

— From talks delivered on Shabbos *parshas Shelach*, 5730 and 5735 (1970 and 1975)

---

<sup>48</sup> {“*Makif*,” in the original Hebrew.}

<sup>49</sup> { *Bamidbar* 14:9, last words, “אל תיראם.” }

<sup>50</sup> See Talmud *Yerushalmi*, *Sheviis*, beginning of ch. 6; (*Vayikrah Rabbah* ch. 17, near the end) — cited in *Gittin* 46a, *Tosefos*, s.v. “*keevan*”; *Mishneh Torah*, “*Hilchos Melachim*,” ch. 6, par. 5, and the commentaries there; Rashi's commentary to *Devarim* 20:10-11, and the super-commentaries there. {The *Yerushalmi* and *Midrash* relate that before beginning to wage war on the Canaanites, Yehoshua sent them three proclamations. In the first, he invited the Canaanite nations to leave Israel voluntarily; in the second, to make peace but to agree to pay tribute and become servile; and in the third, to remain and wage war.}

<sup>51</sup> {*Devarim* 20:16.}

<sup>52</sup> {*Devarim* 20:11.}

<sup>53</sup> *Sanhedrin* 91a.