

Skeletons in the Closet

And Korach took... (Num. 16:1). Rashi explains that Korach “took” himself and tried to grab a position of power for himself. Rashi further writes that even though Korach was otherwise a smart person he fell into this stupidity because he was led astray by his “eye”, because he foresaw that he was destined to be the progenitor of important leaders like Shmuel HaNavi who equaled Moshe and Aharon, The *Yalkut HaGershuni* shares a fascinating explanation of this in the name of Rabbi Tzvi Liska: The Talmud (*Yoma* 22b) explains that King Saul’s dynasty never lasted because it had no “blemishes”. Rabbi Shimon bar Yochai further explained that “we do not appoint a leader on the public unless he has “a box of insects hanging over him from the back” (meaning, unless he has something inappropriate or unbefitting in his personal background) so that if he becomes haughty and started to overstep his authority, he can be told, “Go back to your origins.” To this effect, the Talmud explains that while Saul’s record was impeccable, King David, on the other hand, was a descendant of Ruth, so he came from questionable lineage, which is why his dynasty managed to endure while Saul’s did not. Now, Moshe and Aharon had some “skeletons in their closet” because they descended from the seemingly illicit union of Amram and his aunt Yocheved (see *Tiferes Yonasan* to Parshas VaEra). Because of that stain on their lineage, they were fit to serve in leadership positions. However, Korach only had desirable qualities, he was wise and rich, and boasted an impressive pedigree. So why did Korach think that he should be appointed to public position, if he was missing he requisite “skeletons in the closet” for such a position? To this Rashi answers that Korach was led astray by his eyes. He looked to the future and saw the prophet Shmuel who was destined to be amongst his descendants, and he realized that Shmuel was equal in his spiritual and political stature to Moshe and Aharon, yet unlike them, Shmuel had an impeccable record. Korach figured that just as Shmuel had an impeccable record and still ascended to a leadership position, so can he. However, Korach’s fatal mistake was that he failed to consider that perhaps **he himself would serve as the blotch of Shmuel’s record!** It turned out that Shmuel was not actually of impeccable lineage, because he descended from Korach. Korach’s failure to take this into account is alluded to in the word “And Korach took...” which Rashi explains means that he took himself, meaning, he took himself out of consideration when thinking about why he should get a leadership position.

Rabbi Elchanan Shoff

PARSHAS KORACH

Korach and the Cross

ח	ר	ק
י	י	ו
ת	ש	ף

ח	ר	ק
י	י	ו
ת	ש	ף

ח	ר	ק
י	י	ו
ת	ש	ף

ח	ר	ק
י	י	ו
ת	ש	ף

And Korach took... (Num. 16:1). Rabbeinu Menachem Tzioni writes that if one investigates “Korach” vertically and horizontally like a cross, one will discover an amazing secret. Rabbi Shimshon of Ostropolia (in the Horowitz MS, published in *Nitzotzei Shimshon*, p. 172) explains that if you take the word “Korach” (קרח) and spell out each of the letters in that name (חית + ריש + קוף), then you spell out the

names of four people as you go across and vertically: Korach, Yisro (יתרו), Jesus (ישו), and Kayin (קין). He clarifies that the name Kayin is not actually spelled out in this way, but is still alluded to in by the final letter *feh*.¹ He explains that when Moshe and Aharon later question Hashem’s decision to destroy the Jewish People on account of Korach’s rebellion, they say “Is it so that the man will sin, and You will be angry at the entire nation?” (Num. 16:22), and Rashi cryptically writes “that the man will sin – he is the sinner.” Why did Rashi have to write that “the man will sin” refers to the sinner, isn’t that obvious? Rather, Rabbi Shimshon explains that this alludes to Jesus, because the word “the man” (האיש = 316) in *gematria* equals Jesus (ישו = 316). Accordingly, he explains that Rashi was clandestinely referring to Jesus, who was destined to sin and bring G-d’s wrath upon the entire nation.

The work *Emek HaMelech* (p. 20) writes that Kayin’s *nesheama* was reincarnated as Yisro, his *ruach* as Korach, and his *nefesh* as the Egyptian man that Moshe killed. With this explains that the phrase, “for Kayin shall be established seven-fold” (Gen. 4:15) refers to these three aspects of his later reincarnation, as the word “shall be established” (יקם) is an acronym for these three people into whom Kayin was reincarnated (יתרו, קרח, מצרי). He explains that the soul of every sinner will eventually be purified and sanctified, but the last bit of that soul will always remain unable to be cleaned, so it will fall into the lowest depths of Hell and destruction, where there is boiling excrement. Jesus represents the last bit of Kayin’s soul which was unable to be cleansed and rectified. This is why the Talmud (*Gittin* 56a) says that Jesus is eternally punished in boiling excrement. **In a previous incarnation, Jesus**

¹ Tzioni explains that the *gematria* of the final ף equals 160 which is the numerical value of kayin, for two feh’s together are 160.

was the Egyptian whom Moshe killed by uttering Hashem's Ineffable name, which is why in his later incarnation, Jesus would use Hashem's name for idolatrous purposes. Indeed, when telling the punishment of one who curses with Hashem's name, the Bible says, "And he who expresses the Name of Hashem shall die" (ישו = ונוקב שם יי) and the first letters of the words in that phrase spell out the name Jesus. He also notes that the name Kayin is an acronym for Korach and Jesus of Nazareth (קרח ישו נוצרי = קין), alluding to this spiritual trajectory of Kayin's soul. In light of all this, *Emek HaMelech* explains that R. Menachem Tzioni meant that if one investigates all the different permutations of Kayin's reincarnations, one will find an amazing secret about the man behind the cross.

The Names of the Wicked

And Korach took... (Num. 16:1). Rabbi Moshe Sofer in *Chasam Sofer al HaTorah* (p. 75) asks why the righteous descendants of Levi would give one of their children the name Korach which had previously been used as the name of one of one of the chieftains of the Eisav (Gen. 36:14), especially in light of the fact that the Talmud (36:14), especially in light of the fact that the Talmud (*Yoma* 38b) rules that he do not use the names of wicked people because it causes people who bear those names to follow in that path. Rabbi Sofer answers that perhaps this is actually the lesson of the Torah's description of Korach, tracing his lineage all the way to Levi, that even though Korach was of impeccable lineage, he still ended up a sinner because his name was that of an Eisavite chieftain. See also responsa *Chasam Sofer* (*Even HaEzer*, vol. 2 22) who discusses this. Chida, similarly asks in *Shem HaGedolim* (*Maareches Aleph*, 24) how could Moshe Rabbeinu name his son Eliezer, if Eliezer was previously used as the name of Avraham's servant, who, as a descendant of Cham was cursed (which is why Avraham did not want his son Yitzchak to marry Eliezer's daughter)? Rabbi Yehudah Assad in *Yebuda Yaaleh* (*Orach Chaim* 199) similarly asks how can King Saul have borne the name Shaul, if previously, Shaul was the name of a chieftain in Eisav's family and was an alternate name for Zimri who publicly fornicated with Cozbi. How did they give King Saul the names shared by such wicked people? He answers that the idea that one should give somebody the name of a wicked person is derived from a passage in Proverbs which says "And the name of the wicked shall rot" (Prov. 10:7). The Book of Proverbs was taught by King Solomon, so Rabbi Assad argues that before Solomon's time, Jews were not particular about using such names, so it was permitted. See also the Talmud (*Sanhedrin* 109b) which says that Korach made a

“bald spot” in the Jewish People, which Rashi takes as a reference to him and his entourage being swallowed up in the ground and disappearing, while Maharsha (there) **explains that it refers to the name Korach which fell into disuse amongst the Jews after this story**, even as the descendants of Eisav continued to use that name. See also *Megadim Chadashim* (Bamidbar, p. 352) who addresses this at length.

Oil vs. Water

Korach son of Yitzhar... (Num. 16:1). The Midrash (*Bamidbar Rabbah* 18:16) explains that Korach felt that he could argue with Moshe because his father’s name was *Yitzhar* which literally means “oil” and when oil is put together with other liquids, the oil comes out on top. Accordingly, Korach thought that if he would fight with Moshe (whose name is related to him being drawn from “water”, he would come out on top). Moreover, he looked at a passage in Zecharia’s prophecy which talks about the “two sons of oil standing as masters over the entire land” (Zech. 4), and reasoned that these refer to Aharon and David, each of whom were anointed with oil and was granted a position of leadership as Kohen Gadol and king, respectively. Korach felt that he is better than them because he wasn’t just anointed with oil, he is the son of “oil”, so he should be given the position of Kohen Gadol and king. In Song of Songs, the Jewish People are compared to sweet-smelling oils, and the Midrash (*Shir HaShirim Rabbah* 1) explains that just as oil always rises to the top of all other liquids, so is the Jewish People in regard to other nations. The commentary *Yidei Moshe* (there) writes in the name of his brother-in-law that for this reason one should not make *kiddush* on Shabbos day with hard liquor, because such drinks are not really considered “liquids” because when one puts oil into hard liquor, the oil sinks and does not float on top of it, yet the Midrash claims that oil floats on top of all liquids, so it must be that hard liquor is not considered a liquid. This is cited in *Machatzis HaShekel* (to *Orach Chaim* 272:6). However, *Tosefes Shabbos* rejects this reasoning with the argument that one cannot use Aggadic Midrashim to determine Halacha. See also *Megadim Chadashim* (Bamidbar, p. 354).

Yaakov’s conspicuous absence

Korach son of Yitzhar son of Kehas son of Levi... (Num. 16:1). Rashi explains that Korach’s lineage was not traced all the way back to Yaakov because when Yaakov addressed Shimon and Levi on his deathbed, he said, “In their secret, my soul

will not come, in their congregation, do not single out my honor” (Gen. 49). Rabbi Moshe Sofer in *Chasam Sofer al HaTorah* explains this based on the words of the Sheloh who wrote that sometimes the merits of forefathers actually have a determinative influence on their descendants, if the latter stray from their forefathers’ righteous path. For this reason, when the Torah details the “rebuke” and various punishments destined to befall the Jewish People should they sin, that discussion is interrupted by a statement of Hashem “remembering” the forefathers (Lev. 26:42) in order to teach that this memory can make the punishments even worse. Accordingly, the Chasam Sofer explains that Yaakov prayed that his name not be mentioned in conjunction with Korach’s rebellious congregation so that his invoking his name will not end up making their punishment even more severe.

Korach suspects Moshe of adultery

And Moshe heard and he fell on his face, and he spoke to Korach and all of his congregation saying, ‘Morning [will come] and Hashem will make known that which is His...’ (Num. 16:4–5). It says in *Maaseh Rokeach* that Moshe pushed off the final showdown until the next morning because the Alshich (to Song of Songs 1:2), the *Sheloh* (beginning of Parshas Korach in the name of anonymous *mefarshim*), and others explain that this is related to what the Talmud (*Sanhedrin* 110a) says that “and Moshe heard” means that Korach and his men suspected Moshe of sinful behavior with a married woman “*eishes ish*” literally “wife of a man”. They explain that this does not literally mean that they suspected him committing adultery and started a rumor that Moshe had slept with another man’s wife. Rather, it means they started a rumor that Moshe’s prophecies do not come directly from Hashem, but rather come through the angel Gavriel. The relationship between a man and woman is often characterized as the relationship between one who influences (man/husband) and one who receives influence (woman/wife). Since Gavriel is often referred to as *ish* (literally “man”), then he who would receive something—in this case prophecy—from Gavriel can appropriately be called “the wife of a man”. So essentially when the Talmud says that the suspected Moshe of “the wife of a man” they suspected him of receiving his prophecies through Gavriel and not directly from Hashem. Now, the *Zohar* (1:23b) teaches that the archangel Gavriel is charged with bringing man’s *minchah* prayers to God. This means that the height of Gavriel’s power is in the afternoon time. In order to counter the idea that Moshe received his prophecies through Gavriel and not through God, Moshe sought to put off the final showdown

with Korach and his men until the next morning when Gavriel's power is not at its height so nobody will think that whatever spectacle would occur also happened through Gavriel, because Gavriel's power is in the afternoon, not in the morning.

The problem with the supposition that Moshe received his prophecies from the archangel Gavriel and not directly from God is that there is a major difference between direct prophecy and prophecy through an angel. If one received prophecy through an angel, then he can only receive prophecies when he is asleep and in a dream, while one who received prophecies directly from Hashem can even receive his prophecies while he is awake. Accordingly, the Jewish People should have known better than to consider Korach's rumor because they knew that Moshe received prophecies while he was awake. How then could they have even considered for a moment that Moshe only received his prophecies through the archangel Gavriel? The Alschich (to Ex. 33:7–11) asks this question and suggests that perhaps the Jewish People thought that even if it was previously known that Moshe received prophecy even when he was awake, after the Golden Calf debacle his level of prophecy was lowered such that he could only receive prophecy in a dream. The source for this idea is found in the work *Sefer HaMefoar* by Rabbi Shlomo Molcho (p. 8b) who wrote that while at Sinai, the Jewish People reached a certain level of prophecy which was taken away from them when they sinned at the Golden Calf. Commensurate with that, God also took away some of Moshe Rabbeinu's lofty spiritual achievements, for when He told Moshe to descend the mountain on his way back, He said, "Go down, for your nation has become corrupt". When the Jewish People realized that Moshe too was taken down from his lofty level, just like there were, they thought that he was brought down to a level where he would no longer receive prophecy directly from Hashem, but would only receive prophecy through an angelic intermediary, like we found other prophets who received their visions through Gavriel. Rabbi Shlomo Molcho explicitly writes that this was the basis for the Jewish People considering Korach's claim that Moshe ought to be suspected of "the wife of a man".

Megadim Chadashim (Bamidbar, p. 266) cites the *Pri Megadim* (Orach Chaim 115, *Mishbetzos Zehav*) who explains the meaning of the prayer "Grant from Yourself wisdom, understanding, and knowledge" means we want to have wisdom directly from Hashem, and not from Gavriel like those who suspected Moshe of "the wife of a man".

*Much of the material presented in **Oneg!** has been translated by Rabbi Reuven Chaim Klein from Rabbi Elchanan Shoff's weekly Hebrew 'Aalefcha Chochma' parsha sheet. To sign up to the **Oneg!** weekly email list, or to sponsor a week of **Oneg!** send an email to BKLashul@gmail.com*

Rabbi Elchanan Shoff

PARSHAS KORACH

The Talmud (*Yoma* 75a) says that the manna had the ability to reveal all hidden things hiding in the nooks and crannies. For example, if there was an argument between a man and woman over whether she had been unfaithful to him, then the manna could be used to determine her guilt. If her portion of manna fell at her husband's house, then she was innocent. But if her portion of manna fell at her father's house, then this means she had committed adultery and had become forbidden to her husband and needed to return to her father's house. Accordingly, several commentators (including *Rechovos HaNahar* to Num. 18:1, Maharam Schiff in *Devarim Nechmadim* at the end of *Chulin*, and the *Megaleh Amukos* 2nd edition, Korach drush #7) explain that Moshe pushed off the final showdown with Korach until the next morning, for at such time the manna will fall and clear him of the accusation of having committed adultery.

Poking out their eyes

Will not the eyes of those men be poked, we will not come up (Num. 16:14). Rabbi Eliezer Trillinger writes in *Mishnah Rabbi Eliezer* (cited by *Likkutei basar Likkutei*) that man's 248 limbs correspond to the 248 positive commandments. Accordingly, Korach and his ilk mocked the commandment of *tzitzis*, for they said that a *tallis* which is made up completely of *techeiles* should not be required to have strings of *tzitzis*. Now, the commandment of *tzitzis* corresponds to man's eyes, as the purpose of *tzitzis*, as the Torah tells us, is "and you shall *see* them and you shall remember all of Hashem's commandments". Therefore, without even realizing it, they referred to poking out the eyes which served as an allusion to their rejection of this important commandment.

The merits of the wicked

And Moshe became very angered and he said to Hashem 'do not heed their offering...' (Num. 16:15). The Midrash (*Bamidbar Rabbah* 18:10) explains that Moshe prayed that Hashem not accept their sacrifice and also not accept their repentance should they choose to repent. Rabbi Yoel Teitelbaum, the Satmar Rebbe, writes in *Chiddushei Torah* 1956, *Parshas Korach* p. 125) that this was not a matter of personal revenge that Moshe wished to serve up on Korach and his henchmen. Rather, the Satmar Rebbe offers a more sophisticated take on what was happening here. He brings three examples from elsewhere in the Bible where evil people did good things

and those good things and the reward they brought to the evil-doers ultimately had unfortunate consequences for the Jewish People:

The Talmud (*Sanhedrin* 102b) says that from Garav (where Micah's idol was housed) until Shiloh (where the Tabernacle stood) was a distance of 3 mil, and the smoke from the licit sacrifices at Shiloh would end up mixing together with the smoke from the illicit worship performed at Micah's idol. The Talmud relates that the ministering angels wanted to annihilate Micah for his role in this atrocity. However, Hashem rebuffed such requests saying that Micah has some merit because he also had a hotel which serviced passersby and provided them with bread. Ultimately, the Jewish People were punished for not putting a stop to Micah's idol. After the story of the Concubine of Givah, when the tribes of Israel took up arms against the tribe of Binyamin for raping and murdering an innocent women, Hashem said: "For My honor you do not protest, but for the honor of flesh and blood you protest?" Because of this hypocrisy, Hashem allowed many Jews to be killed in the aftermath of Concubine of Givah episode. What comes out from this is that Micah's merit of providing bread for wayfarers ended up sustaining his idol, and that idol later proved to be a stain on the Jews' record and ultimately lead to the decimation of the tribe of Binyamin and the loss of many lives. If you think about, the Jews really would have been better off had Micah not been so generous!

Moreover, we find that the Omri, King of Israel, who was a wicked man merited to found a dynasty that lasted several generations in the merit of him founding the city of Samaria. Yet, the Jewish People would have been much better off had Omri not done so, because it was his son Ahab who introduced the worship of Baal to the Kingdom of Israel which eventually brought about their downfall.

A similar thing is found concerning the Babylonian king Nebuchadnezzar who took four extra steps to honor Hashem's name when he was in the service of Baladan, and because of that honor he showed Hashem, he merited to become king of Babylonia and the entire world! Yet, the Jewish people would have been better off if Nebuchadnezzar had not done this act of piety and received reward for it, for then he would not have destroyed the Holy Temple in Jerusalem!

In all of these cases, we see that when Hashem sees wicked people doing good deeds, He might sometimes reward them in a way that is ultimately detrimental to the Jewish

People. For this reason, when Moshe began his final showdown with Korach, he prayed that Hashem not heed the sacrifices offered by Korach and his men, lest He accept those sacrifices and spare Korach, which could eventually cause utter calamities to befall the Jewish People.

Dasan and Aviram's Eternal Home

...and Dasan and Aviram came out standing at the entrance to their tent... (Num. 17:27). In this passage, Dasan and Aviram's home is described as a tent, yet a few verses later when the Torah describes the earth swallowing up Korach, his people, and all their possessions, it says, "And the land opened her mouth, and swallowed them and their houses..." (Num. 17:32). Here, it uses the word "houses" instead of "tents". Why does the Torah switch words? Rabbi Mordechai HaKohen of Tzfas in *Sifsei Kohen* explains that normally, a person's home in This World is only temporary, because after death he will move on to a better place. For this reason, such earthly domiciles are termed a "tent" which is also a temporary form of dwelling. However, after Korach and his men were swallowed up in the ground, that was to become their dwelling place for all of eternity. So when their homes went down under with them, those homes were called "houses" which implies a higher degree of permanence than "tent" does, because they were indeed damned to stay there forever.

The Deaths and the Plagues

And the deceased in the plague [numbered] fourteen-thousand seven-hundred, besides those who died over the matter of Korach (Num. 17:14). This passage is quite difficult to understand because the cantillation marks (i.e. the *esnachta*, which is like a weak period or strong comma, on the word **בַּמִּגְדָּה**) suggest splitting it into two fragments: "And the deceased in the plague" and "fourteen-thousand seven-hundred, besides those who died over the matter of Korach". This is difficult because seemingly the phrase "And the deceased in the plague" has absolutely no meaning on its own. *Kobeles Yitzchak* writes that it was revealed to his son in a dream an innovative way of understanding this passage. He explains that when Hashem decreed that a plague would afflict the Jews, He decided that 24,000 Jews should die (just like He decided concerning the plague at Shittim, see Num. 25:9). However, since it was actually a time of mercy from Hashem, He did not actually have 24,000 killed in the plague alone. Rather, He counted people who were supposed to die anyway as though they died as part of the plague in order to reach the number He had already

decided upon. Accordingly, “And the deceased in the plague” means that all those who died at that time were considered as though they were “in the plague” and counted towards the quota of 24,000 people.

Budding Scholars

And the man whom I have chosen, his staff will sprout... (Num. 17:20). The word “it will sprout” (יִפְרוֹת) appears three more times in the Bible, besides here, concerning Hashem choosing a specific tribe to serve Him. Once concerning the sprouting of a rose (Hos. 14). Once concerning the sprouting of the righteous like a date tree (Ps. 92) and one concerning the sprouting of the righteous in their lifetime (PS. 72). The *Yalkut Sofer* (cited by *Likkutei Basar Likkutei*, p. 154) explains that there are two types of righteous people: One type of righteous person not only studies Torah and does the right thing, but he also educates his children in the ways of Torah and Fearing Heaven, and he also tries to teach other people Torah. Such a person’s righteousness is everlasting, because even after he dies, his children and students will perpetuate his legacy and continue in his righteous path. There is also a righteous person who only works on himself and remains introverted, not trying to spread his approach or teach Torah to others. While this person too is considered righteous in Hashem’s eyes, and Hashem enjoys such a person during his lifetime, when this person dies, nothing will be left of him, for he has no students or children to carry on with his legacy. Concerning Chanoch, the Torah says, “And Chanoch walked with the God, and he is not, for God had taken him” *Chasam Sofer* explains that this means that Chanoch was a righteous person who only saw to his own righteousness, but did not attempt to positively influence others for the good. Such a person, when he dies, “he is not”, he completely ceases to exist, as there is nobody continuing his good path. This type of righteous person is comparable to the sprouting of a rose, which is flower that is surrounded by thorns and thistles. The rose does not allow anything more to grow except for itself, and it does not attempt to transform the thorns and thistles into something more positive and fruitful. This type of sprouting is confined to the life of the righteous man, and not beyond. On the other hand, a righteous man who influences the world for the good is comparable to a date tree which not only sprouts, but it gives off fruit which can further sprout more and continue flourishing even after the original tree has died. This type of righteous man is comparable to the verse at hand “And the man whom I have chosen, his staff will sprout...”, for this type of righteous man is the one “chosen” by God.

Rabbi Elchanan Shoff

PARSHAS KORACH

Almonds and Maccabees

And it produced almonds (Num. 17:23). The *Baal HaTurim* points out that the word “almonds” (שקדים = 454) in *gematria* equals the word “Hasmoneans” (חשמונאים = 454), for the Hasmoneans were descendants of Aharon, and the priesthood was maintained by them. This same *gematria* is also cited by *Peirush Rokeach al HaTorah* (p. 70). In the work *Chamra Tava* (beginning of *Parshas Korach*), he points out that the word “and it produced” (ויגמל = 89) in *gematria* equals the word “Chanuka” (חנוכה = 89) which is the holiday that celebrates the Hasmoneans’ efforts in preserving the Holy Temple and its sanctity.

Salty Treaties

All tithings of holy foodstuffs which the Children of Israel will lift for Hashem, I gave to you [Aharon] and your sons and your daughters with you, as an everlasting quota, it is an everlasting salt-treaty before Me Hashem, for you and your descendants with you (Num. 18:19). Rashi explains that Hashem made this deal with Aharon and his descendants in a way that resembles the “deal” He made with salt which never gets spoiled or expires. Rabbi Chaim Palagi in *Tenufah Chaim* explains this in another way. He cites the *Teshuvos HaRashba* (vol. 5, 239) who writes that if a Kohen committed a sin, then we should no longer give him the Priestly gifts. Rabbi Chaim Palagi explains that this is alluded to in the verse at hand which twice stresses “with you” as if to say that Kohanim can only receive the Priestly gifts if they are “with” Aharon, meaning like him, and have not committed nay sins. He writes that by contrast, the sons of Eli, who became corrupt lost their right to the Priestly gifts. Accordingly, he explains that this treaty is compared to “salt” because just as salt never gets spoiled, so does this treaty only apply to somebody who has never been spoiled by sin. Perhaps, we can extend this lesson to also apply in another way; that is, the salt-treaty says that even if a Kohen sins and can no longer accept the Priestly gifts, Hashem assures him that if he would do *teshuvah* and repent his sin, he does not lose his special rights, which are supposed to last forever and never expire, just as salt never gets spoiled.

Aharon can skip hisbodedus

I am your portion and your heritage, within the Children of Israel (Num. 18:20). Rabbi Shimon Sofer in *Shir Maon* explains that as is well-known, it is quite difficult to connect to Hashem when a person is busy dealing with other people. In

general, only being alone by oneself is conducive to such a spiritual connection. However, when it comes to Aharon we know that he was constantly busy trying to serve as a peace-keeper between people and spouses. Accordingly, one might have thought he would have difficulty connecting to Hashem in a spiritual way because he is always dealing with other people. To counter this notion, Hashem assures him “I am your portion and your heritage, within the Children of Israel” even when Aharon is “within the Children of Israel”, he will always be able to remain connected and attached to Hashem.