



**ושם איש ישראל המכה 25:14**  
**אשר הכה את המדינית זמרי בן**  
**“סלוא, נשיא בית אב לשמעוני”**

“The name of the Jewish man who was slain, who was slain with the Midyanite woman, was Zimri Ben Salu, the leader of the Bais Av of the Shimoni’s.” Why does the Torah say, “המכה אשר הכה” – “That was slain, who was slain” – which is certainly verbose? At the end of the previous Parsha, the Torah tells us about a man and a woman sinning, and Pinchos killing them. The Torah does not mention their names. Yet over here, when the Torah referred to that story, that Pinchos received reward for his heroic action, the Torah does mention the names of the man and woman who Pinchos killed. If Hashem wanted to reveal the names of those who sinned and Pinchos killed, then it should have done so when it says they were sinning. If Hashem did not want to reveal their names, just as it concealed the identity of the one who gathered wood on Shabbos – he sinned and was killed, then why did Hashem change His mind, so to say, and reveal their names here? The following Divrei Torah will expound on this topic and support the P’shat offered in the closing paragraph.

**ושם איש 25:14 - מנחה בלולה**  
**ישראל המכה אשר הכה את המדינית זמרי בן**  
**“סלוא, נשיא בית אב לשמעוני”** – The Posuk does not say that Pinchos was the one who did the slaying, for Pinchos was rewarded for his noble action, and received the Kehunah. Being that he was now a Kohen, we do not want to mention a Kohen killing another – even though Pinchos’ killing was a noble and commendable act.

**ושם איש ישראל 25:14 - רבינו יואל**  
**המכה אשר הכה את המדינית זמרי בן סלוא,**  
**“לשמעוני”** – “נשיא בית אב לשמעוני” is written missing the 'ו', as this was an embarrassment to Shevet Shimon – thus the 'ו' is left out. Conversely, in Divrei Hayomim 1:27:16 regarding the Tzaddik who came from Shevet Shimon, there the Posuk says, “שמעוני” – with the 'ו' for there it was bringing honor to the Shevet.

**ושם איש ישראל 25:14 – אור החיים**  
**המכה אשר הכה את המדינית זמרי בן סלוא,**  
**“נשיא בית אב לשמעוני”** – “The name of the Jewish man who was slain, who was slain with the Midyanite woman, was Zimri Ben Salu, the leader of the Bais Av of the Shimoni’s.” At the end of the previous

Parshah the Torah tells us about a man and a woman sinning, and Pinchos killing them. The Torah does not mention their names. Yet over here, when the Torah is referencing that story, that Pinchos received reward for his heroic action, the Torah does mention the names of the man and woman who Pinchos killed. If Hashem wanted to reveal the names of those who sinned and Pinchos killed, then it should have done so when it says they were sinning. If Hashem did not want to reveal their names, as it concealed the identity of the one who gathered wood on Shabbos – he sinned and was killed, then why did Hashem change His mind, so to say, and reveal their names here? One must know that Hakodosh Boruch Hu does not look to disparage even the wicked by publicizing the names of those who did abominable things in public. That the Torah does not mention the name of the wood gatherer on Shabbos proves this point. If there is no purpose in knowing who it is, why say it? Why disparage the person more than necessary?

The person receives the due punishment, and there is no need for further action, or embarrassment. Thus, when the Torah tells us of the abominable act of these two individuals, it does not state their names. However, here the Torah is not speaking directly about the sin, rather its purpose is to tell us of the noble act of Pinchos, what he had done and accomplished. Pinchos took vengeance for Hashem, thereby achieving atonement for Klal Yisroel. It is here that the Torah lets us know that he did not take his vengeance against a lowly person, rather against a great person – “נשיא בית אב”. The Torah continues to let us know that not only was the man a prominent individual, but the woman as well was one of importance – ראש הקליפות, the head of the Klipos (forces of impurity), and her father was a king – ראש אומות בית אב. Despite her position of power, Pinchos boldly killed her, and she was disgraced with a shameful death in full view of everyone. This type of degradation of the wicked caused the Name of Hashem to be sanctified. This was why the Torah tells us here who they were, for it showed the greatness of Pinchos, that he was not intimidated by their positions, but acted completely for the sake of Hashem.

Hakodosh Boruch Hu will not withhold His Eyes from a righteous one – Hashem’s concern for the benefit of the righteous takes precedence over His consideration of the wicked. Thus, the name of Zimri was shamed – but not arbitrarily, but rather to the benefit of Pinchos, to demonstrate his great courage. This is as it says in Mishlei 10:7 “זכר צדיק לברכה” – the mention of a Tzaddik brings blessing, “ושם רשעים ירקב” – even though the name of the wicked will rot through the mention of the praise of the Tzaddik.

**ושם איש ישראל 25:14 – אור החיים**  
**המכה אשר הכה את המדינית זמרי בן סלוא,**  
**“נשיא בית אב לשמעוני”** – “The name of the Jewish man who was slain, who was slain with the Midyanite woman, was Zimri Ben Salu, the leader of the Bais Av of the Shimoni’s.” Why does the Torah wait until here to identify Zimri and Kozbi, and not tell us in the previous Parshah when it tells us of their sin? When the Torah mentions the story in the previous Parshah, it says that these two people came and brought - they had not yet actually committed the sin – but they had only contemplated committing it. Then they sinned, and Pinchos killed them. As long as he had not actually sinned, the Torah would not shame him by mentioning his name. Here is the first time the Torah discusses them after they sinned, and here Hashem publicizes their names as it is a Mitzvah to publicize the wicked.

**ושם איש 25:14 - חכמת התורה**  
**ישראל המכה אשר הכה את המדינית זמרי בן**  
**“סלוא, נשיא בית אב לשמעוני”** – “The name of the Jewish man who was slain, who was slain with the Midyanite woman, was Zimri Ben Salu, the leader of the Bais Av of the Shimoni’s.” Why does the Torah wait until here to identify Zimri and Kozbi, and not tell us in the previous Parshah when it tells us of their sin? When one is born to a distinguished family, one with much Yichus, it is not surprising for that person to grow up to be a Tzaddik. Conversely, when one comes from a family of wicked people, it is not a surprise that he as well ends up being a wicked person. Based on this understanding, it does not seem to be a great feat that Pinchos acted in a virtuous manner. Of course he did, when he comes from such good stock, being the son of Elazar, the son of Aharon

Hakohen. Why do we heap great praise upon him? Similarly, the Midyanite woman, she came from a home of wicked people. Thus, it comes as no surprise that she too performed evil acts, and it is not nearly as shameful as one who would come from a good family. However, the Torah tells us that this is not so. Had there not been people to contradict this rule, then the reward for Pinchos would have been less, and the punishment for the Midyanis may have been less, for perhaps it wasn't her fault as much as it was the fault from the environment she came from. Zimri Ben Saul had great Yichus, came from good stock, yet acted exceedingly evil. Thus we see, that even someone from a good home, with good Yichus, can fall into the trap and perpetrate great evil. Thus, one who acts righteous, it is he himself who caused it to be so, he gets the credit for it, and is thus entitled to reward based on it. Similarly, Tziporah grew up in a home of the priest of Midyan. Initially her father, Yisro was very wicked; it was only later that he turned his life around, and followed after Hashem. Despite Tziporah growing up in such home, she rose to greatness, and was exceedingly righteous. She was worthy of being the wife of Moshe Rabbeinu. Kozbi as well was the daughter of a king, of great prominence, yet she chose to follow in their wicked ways, and was wicked – thus she deserved punishment. She could have been like Tziporah and rose above it – but she chose not to. This is as the Gemara in Yuma 35b says, that Hillel was Mechayiv the poor and R' Elazar Ben Charsom was Mechayiv the wealthy – meaning that although he was poor, he was able to serve Hashem properly, and despite that he was wealthy, he was able to serve Hakodosh Boruch Hu properly. Tziporah was Mechayiv Kozbi, for she too was from Midyan, yet she rose above it and was righteous.

**ושם איש 25:14 - חכמת התורה**  
**ישראל המכה אשר הכה את המדינית זמרי בן**  
**ישראל המכה אשר הכה את המדינית זמרי בן**  
 – “סלוא, נשיא בית אב לשמעוני” – “The name of the Jewish man who was slain, who was slain with the Midyanite woman, was Zimri Ben Salu, the leader of the Bais Av of the Shimoni's.” Why does the Torah wait till here to identify Zimri and Kozbi, and not tell us in the previous Parshah when it tells us of their sin? It says in

Yalkut that if the blood of the wicked is spilled that is like bringing a Korbon. The action of Pinchos killing the wicked, was like bringing Ketores, and effected a Kapparah for Klal Yisroel. Hakodosh Boruch Hu is praised by the downfall of the wicked. This is true when the wicked are known and the downfall is publicized. This is as the Midrash says on the Posuk in Megilas Esther 3:1, “גדל המלך אחשוורוש” – Haman was raised in stature, so that when he fell, it was a praise to Hakodosh Boruch Hu. If a wicked person of low stature is eliminated, that does not bring about a Kapparah. However, when the wicked is of great stature and greatly publicized, then his downfall is like bringing Ketores. This is why the Torah needs to mention the names here, and who they were. They were prominent people and thus their being eliminated was like bringing Ketores, and stopped the plague.

**ושם איש 25:14 - חכמת התורה**  
**ישראל המכה אשר הכה את המדינית זמרי בן**  
 – “סלוא, נשיא בית אב לשמעוני” – “The name of the Jewish man who was slain, who was slain with the Midyanite woman, was Zimri Ben Salu, the leader of the Bais Av of the Shimoni's.” Why does the Torah say, “המכה אשר הכה” – “That was slain, who was slain” – which is certainly verbose? There were two beatings that Zimri received. One, was that he was killed by Pinchos. The second one was that he was put in the same category as the Midyanite, he was slain with her. It was a terrible embarrassment, and that was the second beating.

**ושם איש 25:14 - חכמת התורה**  
**ישראל המכה אשר הכה את המדינית זמרי בן**  
 – “סלוא, נשיא בית אב לשמעוני” – “The name of the Jewish man who was slain, who was slain with the Midyanite woman, was Zimri Ben Salu, the leader of the Bais Av of the Shimoni's.” Why does the Torah say, “המכה אשר הכה” – “That was slain, who was slain” – which is certainly verbose? Chazal tell us that every Yid has a portion in Olam Habah. However, one who coming such an abominable act as Zimri, he does not receive his Olam Habah. Thus, the Torah uses a double Loshon of slaying by Zimri, for he was killed both in this world and the Next World. However, Kozbi, she was non-Jewish, and had no portion in Olam Habah in the first place. Thus, the Torah

only states that she was slain once, for she was slain in Olam Hazeh, but was not slain in Olam Habah – for she never had it to begin with.

**ושם איש 25:14 - חכמת התורה**  
**ישראל המכה אשר הכה את המדינית זמרי בן**  
 – “סלוא, נשיא בית אב לשמעוני” – “The name of the Jewish man who was slain, who was slain with the Midyanite woman, was Zimri Ben Salu, the leader of the Bais Av of the Shimoni's.” Why does the Torah say, “המכה אשר הכה” – “That was slain, who was slain” – which is certainly verbose? Hakodosh Boruch Hu loves Klal Yisroel. When a Yid sins, it causes Hakodosh Boruch Hu to be sad, Kevayachol, that He needs to punish them. When it says in Meseches Avos עבירה גוררת עבירה – it means that one sin brings another sin. When one sins, there is an automatic second sin, that is making Hashem sad, as the Posuk says, “בכל צרתם לו צר” – Hakodosh Boruch Hu is part of every Yid's pain. However, this only applies to Klal Yisroel and not to the other nations of the world. Thus, the Torah says a double of Loshon of being hit by the Yid, Zimri, for he received a double punishment: one for his abominable act and a second for causing pain to Hashem for his sin. While by Kozbi it is only one Loshon of hitting, for she only received punishment for her sin, and not the extra punishment for causing Hashem pain – for that only occurs with Yidin.

Now we can understand why the Torah seems to use a double Loshon of “המכה אשר הכה” – “That was slain, who was slain”. We are to learn how much Hashem loves us, that even Zimri, who did a terrible act against Hashem, he was still a Yid, and Hashem loves every Yid. It says in Meseches Avos עבירה גוררת עבירה – it means that one sin brings another sin. Hashem loves Klal Yisroel so much, that when a Yid does a Mitzvah, he gets another Mitzvah, מצוה גוררת מצוה. Hashem is so happy that a Yid performed a Mitzvah and will receive reward – that making Him happy is another Mitzvah. Chas V'Sholom, if one sins, that causes pain to Hashem, and that is the second Aveira. We must know that Hashem loves us so much and we must always try to make Him happy, and perform only Mitzvos. May we be Zoche to truly make Hakodosh Boruch Hu proud of us.