BS"D
February 28, 2020

Potomac Torah Study Center

Vol. 7 #19, February 27, 2020; Terumah 5780

NOTE: Devrei Torah presented weekly in Loving Memory of Rabbi Leonard S. Cahan z"l, Rabbi Emeritus of Congregation Har Shalom, who started me on my road to learning almost 50 years ago and was our family Rebbe and close friend until his recent untimely death.

LATE MAARIV AT BETH SHOLOM THIS WEEK MONDAY - THURSDAY AT 8 P.M. RSVPs appreciated. This week is the final week of the Late Maariv until November. AfisherADS@Yahoo.com.

Devrei Torah for Shabbat Terumah 5780 dedicated in loving memory of Susan Blumenthal, (Shoshana Frumah bat Arya Lev a"h), beloved wife, mother, and grandmother, by the Blumenthal family. Susan's yahrtzeit was 29 Shevat.

The presentation of the Mishkan chapters in the Torah focuses heavily on details, something perhaps of most interest to an architect. To me, focusing on the reason for the Mishkan and the parallels between the Mishkan and other sections of the Torah make the material far more interesting.

In Terumah, God tells Moshe to accept donations from the people to build a container of wood and to cover it inside and outside with gold. Once completed, the container would be a resting place for the tablets of testimony (testifying to the ten statements on Har Sinai). Once the people dedicated the Mishkan, containing that container, God would bring His presence to dwell above the container, among B'Nai Yisrael.

The presentation of the remaining parashot in Sefer Shemot raises numerous questions. For example, how does the Mishkan relate to other parts of the Torah? When did God present these instructions to Moshe? For example, Ramban, nearly always reads the Torah as being chronological, unless he finds compelling information to the contrary. Ramban states that God gave Moshe the instructions in Terumah (and Tetzevah) before Egel Zahav, the sin of the golden calf. Rashi, however, argues convincingly that God ordered Moshe to build a Mishkan to atone for and because of the sin of Egel Zahav. Rabbi Menachem Leibtag carefully explains this dispute between Ramban and Rashi in the Devar Torah attached by E-mail, and Rosh Yeshiva Rabbi Dov Linzer discusses further implications of their points of view in his Devar Torah below.

Rabbi David Fohrman compares the Aron in the Mishkan to another container in the Torah made of wood and covered with some other material on the top and bottom. This other structure is Noah's Ark, a wooden container covered top and bottom with pitch (a tar-like substance that is virtually the opposite of gold). Rabbi Fohrman demonstrates through an analysis of language and function that the Aron and the Ark mirror each other in many ways. The key is that both the Ark and the Aron form separations between the human world and God's world (a world in which humans could not survive). The Aron is where God's presence would reside, hovering in a cloud over the kaporet (covering). Noah's ark preserved humanity (Noah's family and animals) while the flood unraveled creation until nothing existed except a vast, dark water world with winds and waves crashing all over. After 40 days and nights of this chaos, God recreated the world anew in an order that paralleled the initial creation. During the period of the flood, however, Noah's ark protected those inside the ark from dying by being exposed to what the Torah describes as similar to God's world, the world before His initial week of creating a world fit for humans.

Like Noah, Moshe spent 40 days and nights on in God's space, on Har Sinai. The Torah presents instructions on constructing a Mishkan, which would enable the people to approach close to God's presence, in degrees that parallel the three physical separations of various Jews during the Har Sinai experience. Most Jews could only enter the outer section of the Mishkan. The Kohanim could enter a second section closer to the Aron, although only the Kohen Gadol could survive entering the holiest portion, by the Aron, and then only on Yom Kippur (after extensive preparations).

Rabbi Fohrman's analysis seems to me consistent with Ramban's interpretation that the purpose of the Mishkan was to enable the people to remember and relive the Har Sinai experience. As Jews sinned, they needed to relive the Har Sinai experience to enable them to return to a level of purity (physical and spiritual) worthy of living near God's presence. Following this interpretation, there still would have been a purpose in constructing the Mishkan even in the absence of Egel Zahav. According to Rabbi Leibtag, Rashi agrees with Ramban that B'Nai Yisrael needed a structure to remind the people of the Har Sinai experience (and a place from which God would present additional mitzvot). Rashi's interpretation, however, implies that in the absence of Egel Zahav, the people would have reached the promised land very soon and been able to build a permanent Mikdash (sanctuary) in Israel.

My beloved Rebbe, Rabbi Leonard Cahan, z"l, always found a way to make the Torah exciting, a trait that came through especially in legal sections of the Torah where the topics could seem very foreign to Americans in a modern world. The Mishkan section of the Torah certainly requires a reader's guide for us in the 21st Century. Hopefully some of the excitement of the sort that Rabbi Cahan brought to his Torah discussions comes through with a few of the insights that I summarized. Read the complete postings by Rabbi Fohrman and the others attached by E-mail to find more material of interest to Jews who are not architects.

Please daven for a Refuah Shlemah for Nossan ben Pessel, Mordechai ben Chaya, Baruch Yitzhak ben Perl, David Leib HaKohen ben Sheina Reizel, Zev ben Sara Chaya, Uzi Yehuda ben Mirda Behla, HaRav Dovid Meir ben Chaya Tzippa; Eliav Yerachmiel ben Sara Dina, Amoz ben Tziviah, Reuven ben Masha, Moshe David ben Hannah, Meir ben Sara, Yitzhok Tzvi ben Yehudit Miriam, Yaakov Naphtali ben Michal Leah, Kaddish Yehuda ben Golda, Dov Ber ben Sima, Tuvia Zev ben Chaya Rivka, Zissel Bat Mazal, Chana Bracha bas Rochel Leah, Elisheva Chaya bas Leah, Leah Fruma bat Musa Devorah, Hinda Behla bat Chaya Leah, Beyla bat Sara, Nechama bas Tikva Rachel, Miriam Chava bat Yachid, Ruth bat Sarah, and Tova bat Narges, all of whom greatly need our prayers.

Shabbat Shalom, Hannah & Alan

Drasha: Parsha Terumah: Ark of Inclusion

by Rabbi Mordechai Kamenetzky © 2002

[Please remember Mordechai ben Chaya for a Mishebarach!]

In this week's portion, Hashem commands the Jewish nation to build the Mishkan. Each one of the utensils is specified as to how it should be constructed, its width, its length, and its height. The type of material whether it was gold, silver, or copper, is enumerated and the details of its ornaments are provided.

The procedure for the construction of each vessel is preceded by a command stated in the singular form: "And you shall make" "And you shall make a show bread table." "And you shall make a Menorah." "And you shall make an Altar."

The command is directed toward Moshe to delegate the construction. The Aron Kodesh, the Holy Ark is different. Its command is not stated in the singular form, rather in the plural. The Torah does not say and you shall make a Holy Ark, it states, "And they shall make a Holy Ark." The commentaries ask, why was the command to build the Ark the only one that was given to a group?

In a small shul in Yerushalayim, a daily Daf HaYomi shiur (Talmudic folio class) was held each morning before Shacharis. An elderly Russian immigrant attended the shiur. Quiet as he was, his behavior in the shiur intrigued the lecturer. He would never ask a thing. Often he would nod off. Sometimes, when the Rabbi quoted a particular Talmudic sage, the old man's face would light up – especially when the Rabbi mentioned an opinion from a obscure Talmudic personality.

This behavior continued throughout the summer. Always quiet, the man would sometimes nod off, and at other times he would perk up. Then winter came. The group of men would gather around the table in the frigid mornings huddled close as they would warm to the strains of the Talmud and the straining heater in the old synagogue. The old man never missed a class.

One morning a rare snow blanketed Jerusalem. No one showed up to the shiur except the Rabbi and the elderly Russian Jew. Instead of giving his usual lecture, the Rabbi decided he would ask the old Jew a little bit about himself.

"Tell me," he inquired, "I watch you as I say my shiur. Sometimes you look intrigued but at other times you seem totally disinterested. The trouble is I would like to make the shiur more interesting for you during its entirety, but I can't seem to make out what perks you up and makes you doze?"

The old man smiled. "I never had a Jewish education. I can barely read Hebrew. I do not come to the shiur for the same reasons that the other men come." He paused as his eyes pondered his past. "You see, I was a soldier in the Red Army during World War II. Every day our commander would herd us into a room and put a gun to our heads. He commanded us to recite the names of every member of the Politburo. And we did. We learned those names backwards and forward. I come to this class to hear the names of every rabbi in the Talmud. If I cannot learn at least I will know the names of all the great sages! "That." he smiled "is my Daf HaYomi!"

Although the show bread table, the Menorah, and the Altar can be constructed by individuals — the Ark that holds the Torah is different. One man cannot make it alone. It must be a communal effort. Just as the Torah cannot be learned by one man alone, its Ark cannot be built by an individual either.

The Torah is given for everyone to learn and to experience – each one according to his or her own level and ability. Lighting a Menorah is a clear-cut ritual delegated to the Kohain. The Altar is used for the sacrifices brought by the kohanim. The Torah is for everybody. And each individual has his own Shas and Daf HaYomi. Each person has his share in Toras Yisrael. Everyone extracts something holy from the Torah. To some it may be extrapolative halachic theory, while for others it may be the refinement of character. And still for others it may be the names of Abayai and Rava.

Good Shabbos!

Can God Dwell on Earth?

by Rabbi Dov Linzer, Rosh HaYeshiva, Yeshivat Chovevei Torah © 2015, 2020

Why did God command the People of Israel to build a Mishkan? The answer seems obvious: "They shall build Me a sanctuary, and I will dwell in their midst" (Shemot, 25:8). The Mishkan, from the root sh'k'n, to dwell, was to be a place where mere mortals could feel God's actual presence, a place in which God could dwell in the physical realm.

Logically, this should not be possible. How can an infinite and transcendent God inhabit a physical space? The very reality of the Mishkan,the very purpose it purports to serve, is a religious absurdity and, thus, also a religious wonder. It is this absurdity and this wonder to which King Solomon gives such powerful voice in his dedication of the First Temple:

> *The Lord has said that He would dwell in a dark cloud; I have indeed built a magnificent temple for you, a place for you to dwell forever… But will God really dwell on earth? The heavens, even the highest heaven, cannot contain You. How much less this temple I have built?* (Melachim I, 8:12-13,27)

There is no way for God to dwell on the earth or for us to feel God's actual presence, yet God allows it to happen for our sake. We are physical beings, and we cannot connect to something that is not part of our physical world. This is the attraction of idolatry: it allows for a physical, concrete image to represent God and thus provides a means of tactile connection.

The Torah recognizes this human need but forbids any physical representation of God as a corruption of God. The solution is to create a Mishkan,a physical abode, a structure in which we can worship and offer sacrifices and a place toward which we can direct our prayers. But this does not address the theological problem, for the significance of this place is that it is God's abode. For God to dwell there, God must have some actual physical presence on Earth.

This theological paradox is not solved in Melachim; King Solomon states the impossibility and moves on. It is therefore not surprising that the Rabbis of the Talmud addressed the issue as well. Their first step in grappling with this problem was to introduce the idea of Shekhina, a word and concept not found in Tanakh. Like Mishkan, the word Shekhina derives from the verb to dwell, sh'k'n. Shekhina is not God but God's presence. God cannot be present on earth but the Shekhina can. The concept of Shekhina is a paradox: it is God's presence without God being present.

But for some the problem still remained, for how could even a manifestation of God be a part of our world? Perhaps it could not. Thus, in the Talmud we read:

> *Rabbi Yossi stated, Neither did the Shekhina ever descend to earth, nor did Moshe or Eliyahu ever ascend to Heaven as it is written, 'The heavens are the heavens of the Lord, but the earth hath He given to the sons of men.'*
>
> *But did not the Shekhina descend to earth? Is it not in fact written, And the Lord came down upon Mount Sinai? – That was above ten handbreadths* (Sukkah 5a).

For Rabbi Yossi, even the Shekhina never truly dwelt in the Mishkan. It always remained above the earth, hovering on top of the Ark but never entering into the human sphere. This should be understood not just physically and geographically but theologically as well. The gulf between the human and the divine is ultimately unbridgeable. No matter how great the human being, she will never escape her corporeal bounded-ness and rise above her physical reality. And although God descended upon Mount Sinai and God's presence dwelled in the Mishkan, God, infinite and divine, can never truly be present in our physical reality.

Not everyone agreed with Rabbi Yossi. The anonymous voice of the Talmud and other passages reflect the belief that Moshe did in fact ascend to heaven and that God did in fact descend to earth. In this view, points of contact are indeed possible. In other words, in the Creation of Adam, should Michelangelo have painted God's and Adam's fingers touching rather than leaving an unbridgeable gap between the two?

This debate has continued for centuries. In many ways it is a debate between rationalists and mystics or the mystically inclined. For the Kabbalists, contact was possible. One could enter into an ecstatic state and rise up into the supernal realms. More significantly, God was present in this world. Not only could one encounter God in the physical world, but the very performance of the mitzvot, done with the right intentions, could bring about the unification of the sephirot and shape God's nature. Rationalists like Maimonides would have none of this. For Maimonides, the Torah's use of human language and qualities may have been necessary to describe God, but this was already a major concession in relating to the divine. The idea that God could be anything but wholly transcendent was anathema to him.

Think about the question of God in nature. For a Kabbalist like Ramban, the laws of nature do not exist. God "renews every day the acts of creation" (commentary on Shemot,13:16). In contrast, Rambam states that the entire natural order – including miracles – was preprogrammed, and he devotes a large section of the Guide to rejecting the position that nature is constantly renewed (Guide for the Perplexed, II, 29). Ramban sees God in nature by seeing God's constant activity; Rambam does not see God in nature but is in awe of God's wisdom and of how God set everything in motion (Laws of Foundations of the Torah, 4:12). For Rambam, God remains ultimately transcendent.

Thus, it comes as no surprise that Ramban and Rambam disagree as to the purpose of the Mishkan. Ramban understands the verses literally: the Mishkan is the place for God's presence to dwell. At its center is the Ark, upon which the Shekhina rests and where Moshe encounters God and hears God's word (commentary on Shemot, 25:1). Rambam frames things differently: "It is a positive commandment to construct a House for God, prepared for sacrifices to be offered within, and to celebrate there three times a year, as it states: 'And you shall make Me a sanctuary'" (Laws of the Chosen House, 1:1). Notice that he talks only about the practical functions of the Temple: it is a place for sacrifices and a place to which the people can make festivals of pilgrimage. There is no sense that this House is in any way an actual dwelling place for the Divine presence. Notice, too, how Rambam significantly truncates the verse from our parasha, quoting the first part, "You shall make Me a sanctuary," but dropping the last, "that I may dwell therein"!

This also explains the debate between Rambam and Ramban regarding prayer. For Rambam, there is a Biblical mitzvah to pray daily, while for Ramban, prayer is a religious experience but not a commanded obligation (Rambam, Positive Mitzvot, 5). If God is wholly transcendent, as Rambam understood, then an obligation to pray – a duty to recognize God and our dependency on God on a daily basis – makes sense. But as a religious experience this makes less sense: What type of connection could be achieved with a fully transcendent God? On the other hand, if God truly dwells in this world as Ramban understood, then the religious person attuned to God's presence would be inwardly compelled to reach out and forge a connection. This is a self-propelled, intrinsically valuable religious experience which need not be commanded and which is lessened when it is the result of an external obligation. The religious person prays to God because she has the opportunity to do so, not because she has the duty to do so.

We must acknowledge that both types of people exist within a community. There are those who are more religious, more spiritual, who feel and connect to a sense of God's presence in this world. And there are those who are less religiously inclined but who can relate to a transcendent God through a sense of commanded-ness and duty. But then there are also those for whom God is not a felt, experiential reality and for whom a life of mitzvot is a lifestyle but not a religious duty. This is certainly less than ideal. Each of us needs to find a way to create a personal Mishkan that is true to who we are, a Mishkan that allows, one way or another, for God to dwell in our midst.

Shabbat Shalom!

Terumah: Miracle Grow

by Rabbi Mordechai Rhine ©2020 Teach 613

Parshas Terumah is about the building of the Mishkan. It took a great deal of patience, talent, and devotion. But at the end, despite all the effort, the Mishkan couldn't happen without a miracle.

The Medrash tells us that Moshe couldn't understand how mankind would be able to build a dwelling place for Hashem. Hashem replied, "You just follow directions, and I will place My Presence within it."

The Talmud relates that Moshe could not figure out how to make the ornate Menorah. Hashem replied, "Just place the right amount of gold in the fire, and I will make it happen."

Similarly, when it was time to erect the Mishkan, in Parshas Pikudei, it was impossible to do so because of the sheer weight of the beams. Hashem told Moshe, "Act with your hands as if you are lifting the beams, and they will arise miraculously."

One wonders: If the Mishkan would be built by a miracle anyway, what was the purpose of the donations and the devotion? Why couldn't Hashem just build the Mishkan in the first place?

Each year, as the winter season nears its end, I receive a catalog in the mail which advertises a certain "Miracle Grow" type planting-package. The advertisement illustrates a package of self-contained seeders, which require extremely low maintenance. You barely need to water, fertilize, weed, or care for them. It seems that you just need to plant them, and come back later to harvest. Pictured next to the illustration of the seeders, are happy customers with their bountiful crop.

And I wondered: What is the difference between these happy customers and me. Neither of us did much watering in our gardens; neither of us fertilized the plants or weeded them. Why is it that they ended up with a bountiful crop, and I did not?

I realized that even when "miracles" are involved, one has to take the first step in order for the miracle to occur. The reason they have a bountiful crop and I do not, is because they bought the seeder in the first place, and I did not. This was the message of the prophet Elisha, when he asked the poor woman (Melachim II Chapter 4), "What do you have in your house?" Because if she has one flask of oil then the prophet can bless her that she should miraculously have many. But if she has nothing to start with, then the opportunity for a miracle does not begin.

I once heard an analogy to this thought using a modern-day parable, undoubtedly based on the wisdom of old. A great king announced that he would offer great riches to anyone who would climb to the top of a newly erected tower, which had 50 flights of stairs. Many contestants came and tried. But after about 10 or 20 flights, they gave up exhausted. Only one man persevered with conviction. He said to himself, "If the benevolent king is offering reward for the challenge, it must indeed be possible to do." This man forced himself forward with great faith and as he turned the corner to the second half of the challenge, he saw that the king had installed a series of escalators to take the contestants up the second 25 flights of stairs.

As Jews we believe in miracles. In the inauguration days in our relationship with Hashem (the Biblical era) we experienced open miracles. Later on, we experienced hidden miracles. But in all cases, a miracle required that we buy in and do our part.

Likewise, we believe in Siyata Dishmaya, Hashem's helping hand. Once we make our contribution, we can proceed with Hashem's blessing and miraculously create great things: The Menorah, the Mishkan, a garden full of produce, and all kinds of fulfilled dreams resulting from our initial investment.

May Hashem place before you worthy investments. May Hashem crown your investments with miracles.

With best wishes for a wonderful Shabbos!

Rav Kook Torah
Terumah: Take for Me an Offering

In preparation for building the Tabernacle, God commanded Moses to collect the necessary materials:

> *"Speak to the Israelites and have them take for Me an offering. From every person whose heart inspires him to donate, you shall take My offering."* (Ex. 25:2)

Why did God command Moses to take the donations? The verse should read that they must give an offering!

The language of "taking" might lead one to conclude that the materials could have been taken from the people by force. But this was not the case, for the Torah stresses that the offerings were donated freely — "from every person whose heart inspires him to donate."

Why, in fact, did this collection need to be voluntary? The Talmud in Baba Batra 8b teaches that a community may force members of the community to support the poor and the needy. Using our money to help others is a trait that needs to be trained and developed. So why did God command that these gifts for the Tabernacle, the first act of tzedakah (charity) on a national level, be donated solely out of sincere generosity?

Two Goals of Tzedakah

The mitzvah of tzedakah is meant to accomplish two objectives. The first concerns the person receiving the charity. Through this mitzvah, the poor are provided with what they lack. The second objective concerns the one giving. By donating our time and money, we express our inner qualities of chessed and kindness in a concrete and tangible manner. The act of tzedakah actualizes our traits of generosity and contributes toward our own spiritual growth.

We can distinguish between these two objectives within the act itself. The first goal stresses the aspect of giving to the needy. The important factor here is that the poor person receives the assistance he needs. The second goal, on the other hand, stresses the aspect of taking from the benefactor. This is a special benefit of the mitzvah of tzedakah: by relinquishing our material possessions for the sake of others, we refine our character traits and elevate the soul.

Which of these two goals is the principal objective of tzedakah?

The Gimmel's Chase

The Sages in Shabbat 104a noted that the Hebrew letter Gimmel appears to be facing the next letter in the alphabet, the Dalet, with its left 'leg' stretched out toward the Dalet. Why is the Gimmel running toward the Dalet?

The Sages explained that the Gimmel is the benefactor (from the word gommeil, meaning one who gives or supports). The Gimmel is chasing after the impoverished Dalet (from the word dal, meaning 'poor' or 'needy') in order to help him.

Why is the benefactor running after the poor? Should it not be the other way around?

The Sages wanted to teach us that the principal aim of tzedakah is connected to the very foundations of the universe. The true goal of tzedakah is to elevate the soul of the giver. After all, if the purpose was to help the poor, God could have provided other means for their support without having to rely on the generosity of society. The shapes of the Hebrew letters — letters which God used to create the universe — hint at this fundamental truth. The Gimmels, the benefactors, need to pursue the Dalets, the poor, in order to grow and develop spiritually.

Thus the Jewish people's very first philanthropic project emphasized that the central aspect of tzedakah is not giving to the needy, but taking from the donor. "Have them take for Me an offering." God commanded that the contributions to the Tabernacle be given freely — "every person whose heart inspires him to donate" — since the soul and its traits are only refined when one donates willingly.

(Sapphire from the Land of Israel. Adapted from Otzarot HaRe'iyah vol. II, pp. 189-190).

Why Was the Holy Temple on a Mountain?

By Levi Avtzon* © Chabad 2020

Dear Rabbi,

It occurred to me that we often talk about the symbolism of the mountaintop setting of the Giving of the Torah, as well as the life lessons gleaned from that locale. I don't recall, however, learning about the symbolism behind the fact that the two Temples—and the third one to be built by Moshiach, please, G d, soon—were built on a mountain in Jerusalem, the Temple Mount. Is there a meaning and a lesson to this?

Answer:

Great question. Let us explore the fact that the Temple was built on a mountain, and then we can unpack its lessons.

If we look at the verses in the Torah that command us to build a Temple, we find no references to the idea that is should be constructed on a mountain. Rather, it is alluded to almost parenthetically in the Book of Deuteronomy.1

Indeed, the Mishkan (Tabernacle), which was the precursor to the Temple in Jerusalem and was set up in the desert by Moses, was built on a flat surface! Had there been any commandment or hint for it to be built on high ground, you could bet that Moses and the Israelites would have done so gladly.

So if there was no Divine request for a Temple on a mountain, and the Tabernacle wasn't erected on a peak, then did the site of the Temples just happen to be at an elevation?

A foundational principle in Judaism is that there are no coincidences in life, especially in something as significant as the Earthly Abode for the Divine. If the Temples stood on a mountaintop, then there is a deep lesson for all of us.

Holiness demands growth. The opposite of growth isn't descent; it's stagnation. We must move upward constantly. Yesterday's success was the actualization of yesterday's potential. Today demands fresh ideas, new vistas and novel approaches to the opportunities and challenges that G d puts before us today.

One can suggest that the Mishkan in the desert was the beginning of the journey and was therefore on flatlands. Growth demands that the next step be higher. Hence, the Temples in Jerusalem were placed on a mountain to symbolize that even the holiest of places can grow and elevate itself.

To further this metaphor: Not only was the Temple erected on high ground, the Temple itself had many levels. As one went deeper into the Temple compound, one found themselves climbing more and more stairs, ascending level after level. Thus, we must constantly grow. Even once we've entered the realm of holiness, we must grow higher and higher!2

On a personal note: My father, who passed away a few short weeks ago, epitomized this ideal. He was constantly reinventing himself. He never allowed the successes of yesterday to blind him to the calling of today. He directed a publishing house (sometimes printing a new book each month), all while raising 12 children. And if that wasn't enough, he decided about 20 years ago that he had a knack for matchmaking and went on to make hundreds of matches.

Here is a beautiful story that exemplifies this trait. Just under two years ago, my father suffered total kidney failure, and his life was in the balance. One of my siblings questioned the doctors about my father's chances of survival. The doctors were noncommittal. They couldn't offer any promises or even hopeful news. My father immediately picked up from the faces around him that his chances were slim.

What did he do?

My father always had manuscripts on him that needed to be edited. He had a policy, which he based on a memo from the Lubavitcher Rebbe to him, that every single book that was released by his publishing house had to be fully proofread by him. He would take full responsibility for anything published.

Lying in the hospital bed, facing his own mortality, my father started editing.

When he was asked why he didn't just take the time to rest, my father responded, "This was the task given to me by my teacher, the Rebbe. This is my life's mission. If I have a few moments left in this world, I want to use them to do what I was sent here to do. If I go up, I want to go up doing my calling." 3

My father did recover somewhat and lived for almost two years after that incident. But even during the many challenges and trials he faced until his untimely passing, he never stopped his work. On his last day of life, he managed to purify himself in the mikvah (a Chassidic custom that he was fervently committed to, and which due to his weakness demanded lots of stamina), pray with a minyan, proofread his upcoming books, and make some calls and send emails regarding setting up potential matches. He even bought a gift for my mother's birthday, which was the following day.

He never stopped growing, up until his very last minute. He continuously ascended the stairs of his Temple.

FOOTNOTES

1. "If a matter eludes you in judgment … then you shall rise and go up to the place the L rd, your G d, chooses," reads Deuteronomy 17:8. Rashi quotes Talmud, Sanhedrin 86, that this teaches that the Temple would be placed on high ground.

2. Based on the Rebbe's teachings brought in Yain Malchut (a collection of the Rebbe's teachings on Maimonides' Mishneh Torah), Book of Avodah, ch. 15.

3. Not exact quote, but very close and in the spirit of his words.

Dedicated in loving memory of my dear father, Rabbi Yonah (ben R' Meir) Avtzon, whose shloshim will be observed on Friday, 3 Adar I.

.

*. Senior Rabbi, Linksfield Senderwood Hebrew Congregation, Johannesburg, South Africa.

Terumah: A Cover for the Ark

by Rabbi Moshe Wisnefsky

G-d told Moses, "You must have them make a cover for the Ark." Shemot 25:17

The tablets housed in the Ark signify the union with G-d that we achieve by studying the Torah. **The Cover** of the Ark signifies G-d's grace from above, which we require in order to maintain Divine consciousness at all times -- even while uniting with Him through studying the Torah.

G-d grants us this assistance in virtue of our intrinsic connection to Him, which exists independent of the connection that we forge with Him through studying the Torah and observing the commandments.

This intrinsic bond is alluded to by the fact that the word for "cover" (kaporet) is related to the word for "atonement" (kaparah). Atonement for sin is possible only when we invoke and evoke G-d's essential love for us, which overrides the deficiencies in our relationship to Him that we cause when we disobey the Torah's instructions.

Our constant opportunity to repair and renew our relationship with G-d (represented by the Cover of the Ark) transforms our study of the Torah (represented by the tablets within the Ark) from a purely intellectual pursuit to a springboard for spiritual growth.

– From Kehot's Daily Wisdom #2

Gut Shabbos,
Rabbi Yosef B. Friedman
Kehot Publication Society

Likutei *Divrei* Torah

Gleanings of Divrei Torah on Parashat Hashavuah via the Internet

Volume 26, Issue 19 **Shabbat Parashat Teruma** **5780 B"H**

Covenant and Conversation
Rabbi Jonathan Sacks

A Portable Home

The parsha of Terumah describes the construction of the Tabernacle, the first collective house of worship in the history of Israel. The first but not the last; it was eventually succeeded by the Temple in Jerusalem. I want to focus on one moment in Jewish history which represents Jewish spirituality at its lowest ebb and highest flight: the moment the Temple was destroyed.

It is hard to understand the depth of the crisis into which the destruction of the First Temple plunged the Jewish people. Their very existence was predicated on a relationship with God symbolised by the worship that took place daily in Jerusalem. With the Babylonian conquest in 586 BCE, Jews lost not only their land and sovereignty. In losing the Temple, it was as if they had lost hope itself. For their hope lay in God, and how could they turn to God if the very place where they served Him was in ruins? One document has left a vivid record of the mood of Jews at that time, one of the most famous of the psalms:

By the waters of Babylon we sat and wept as we remembered Zion…How can we sing the songs of the Lord in a strange land? (Psalm 137)

It was then that an answer began to take shape. The Temple no longer stood, but its memory remained, and this memory was strong enough to bring Jews together in collective worship. In exile, in Babylon, Jews began to gather to expound Torah, articulate a collective hope of return, and recall the Temple and its service.

The prophet Ezekiel was one of those who shaped a vision of return and restoration, and it is to him we owe the first oblique reference to a radically new institution that eventually became known as the Beit Knesset, the synagogue: "This is what the sovereign Lord says: although I sent them far away among the nations and scattered them among the countries, yet I have become to them a small Sanctuary [Mikdash me'at] in the countries where they have gone" (Ezekiel 11:16). The central Sanctuary had been destroyed, but a small echo, a miniature, remained.

The synagogue is one of the most remarkable examples of an itaruta de'letata, "an awakening from below." It came into being not through words spoken by God to Israel, but by words spoken by Israel to God. There is no synagogue in Tanach, no command to build local houses of prayer. On the contrary, insofar as the Torah speaks of a "house of God" it refers to a central Sanctuary, a collective focus for the worship of the people as a whole.

We tend to forget how profound the concept of a synagogue was. Professor M. Stern has written that "in establishing the synagogue, Judaism created one of the greatest revolutions in the history of religion and society, for the synagogue was an entirely new environment for divine service, of a type unknown anywhere before." It became, according to Salo Baron, the institution through which the exilic community "completely shifted the emphasis from the place of worship, the Sanctuary, to the gathering of worshippers, the congregation, assembled at any time and any place in God's wide world." The synagogue became Jerusalem in exile, the home of the Jewish heart. It is the ultimate expression of monotheism – that wherever we gather to turn our hearts towards heaven, there the Divine Presence can be found, for God is everywhere.

Where did it come from, this world-changing idea? It did not come from the Temple, but rather from the much earlier institution described in this week's parsha: the Tabernacle. Its essence was that it was portable, made up of beams and hangings that could be dismantled and carried by the Levites as the Israelites journeyed through the wilderness. The Tabernacle, a temporary structure, turned out to have permanent influence, whereas the Temple, intended to be permanent, proved to be temporary – until, as we pray daily, it is rebuilt.

More significant than the physical structure of the Tabernacle was its metaphysical structure. The very idea that one can build a home for God seems absurd. It was all too easy to understand the concept of sacred space in a polytheistic worldview. The gods were half-human. They had places where they could be encountered. Monotheism tore this idea up at its roots, nowhere more eloquently than in Psalm 139:

Where can I go from Your Spirit?
Where can I flee from Your presence?
If I go up to the heavens, You are there;
If I make my bed in the depths, You are there.

Hence the question asked by Israel's wisest King, Solomon: "But will God really dwell on earth? The heavens, even the highest heaven, cannot contain You. How much less this temple I have built!" (I Kings 8:27).

The same question is posed in the name of God by one of Israel's greatest prophets, Isaiah:
Heaven is My throne,
and the earth is My footstool.
Where is the house you will build for Me?
Where will My resting place be? (Isaiah 66:1)

The very concept of making a home in finite space for an infinite presence seems a contradiction in terms. The answer, still astonishing in its profundity, is contained at the beginning of this week's parsha: "They shall make a Sanctuary for Me, and I will dwell in them [betokham]" (Exodus 25:8). The Jewish mystics pointed out the linguistic strangeness of this sentence. It should have said, "I will dwell in it," not "I will dwell in them." The answer is that the Divine Presence lives not in a building but in its builders; not in a physical place but in the human heart. The Sanctuary was not a place in which the objective existence of God was somehow more concentrated than elsewhere. Rather, it was a place whose holiness had the effect of opening hearts to the One worshipped there. God exists everywhere, but not everywhere do we feel the presence of God in the same way. The essence of "the holy" is that it is a place where we set aside all human devices and desires and enter a domain wholly set aside for God.

If the concept of the Mishkan, the Tabernacle, is that God lives in the human heart whenever it opens itself unreservedly to heaven, then its physical location is irrelevant. Thus the way was open, seven centuries later, to the synagogue: the supreme statement of the idea that if God is everywhere, He can be reached anywhere. I find it moving that the frail structure described in this week's parsha became the inspiration of an institution that, more than any other, kept the Jewish people alive through almost two thousand years of dispersion – the longest of all journeys through the wilderness.

Shabbat Shalom: Rabbi Shlomo Riskin

"Make one cherub on one end and the second cherub on the other; make the cherubim of one piece with the cover, at the two ends. The cherubim are to have their wings spread upward, overshadowing the cover with them. The cherubim are to face each other, looking toward the cover". (Ex 25:19-20)

What is the most crucial vehicle for the transmission of our Jewish faith and traditions? Is it the Synagogue, the Study Hall, the Jewish Community Center, the charitable organizations or none of the above? Let us study the details of two of the major accoutrements of the Desert Sanctuary and perhaps we will discover the answer to our question.

The Sanctuary menorah described in this week's Torah reading, had the shape of a golden tree, whose trunk extended into six branches, three on each side, replete with stems and flowers. (Ex. 25:31-40) It was a tree, which shed light.

The ark was the repository for the tablets of stone, which contained the Ten Commandments. A golden cover (Kaporet or Parokhet) was placed over and above the ark, from which two cherubs were hammered out on either side. Rashi cites the Midrash: "They had the form of the face of a young child." (B.T. Sukkah 5b) The cherubs were formed to be looking at each other, and the Almighty communicated with Moses from between the two cherubs. (Ex. 25:10-30)

The Sages described the special qualities of these cherubs, and the way in which our Gentile captors viewed these images: Rav Katina said, "When the Israelites would ascend to Jerusalem during the three Pilgrim Festivals, the (Temple custodians) would show them the cherubs, who were embracing each other. They would say to the pilgrims, See how your love before the Almighty should be as the love of a man for a woman'" Said Resh Lakish, "when the destruction (of the Temple) came about, the Gentiles entered (the sacred shrine) and said: 'These Jews, whose blessing is a blessing and whose curse is a curse, are involved in such a sculpture?' They derided the Israelites, citing the verse, 'All who (formerly) respected her, came to mock her, because they saw her nakedness'. And what was her nakedness? The cherubs, embracing each other!" (B.T. Yoma 54b)

Why did out Holy Temple feature sculptures like the cherubs-in-embrace, which allowed the Romans to revile Israel? We have seen that the menorah is a golden tree, symbolically reminiscent of the Tree of Life in the Garden of Eden. The first couple was banished from the primordial Garden of Perfection, and humanity prevented from eating of the tree of eternal life, because Adam and Eve sinned by partaking of the fruit of knowledge of good and evil. Our major commentator, Rashi suggests that the forbidden fruit injected within the human personality what Sigmund Freud would call the libido, substituting lust for love, illicit passion for sexual purity. That is original sin. The ultimate goal of Torah – also referred to as a "tree of life" in the Biblical Book of Proverbs as well as in our liturgy – is to re-fashion our imperfect world into the Garden of Eden, to enable a perfected humanity to finally eat the fruit of the tree of eternal life. According to Rashi's interpretation, this ultimate feat can only be achieved when sexual purity will be restored, when familial love rather than extra marital lust will be normative human behavior. Then we will have righted the wrong, done penance for the sin, which caused our existential exile in the first place.

The Roman conquerors missed the point of the cherub symbolism. Our Sages insist that "they had the form of the face of a young child", symbolizing purity, innocence, and whole-heartedness. The physical embrace of such male-female winged beings -with the pure faces of children – express love without lust, sexual unity which enhances family rather than sexual depravity which destroys family.

Undoubtedly, the family – that which has such powerful potential for creative supportiveness and spiritual continuity – can tragically degenerate into crippling destructiveness and pathological dysfunction. I heard it said in the name of the great Hassidic sage Rav Aharon Karliner that it is difficult to see the compassion with which God created the world – unless you take into account the fact that Adam and Eve were born without parents. Nevertheless, our religious tradition holds great store in the importance and ultimate potential of family as the matrix from which a perfected society will one day emerge – and therefore our Sabbath, festival, life-cycle and family purity rituals laws and customs, all aim to protect, strengthen and deepen the most positive family ties and relationships.

Dysfunctional family – Adam and Eve blaming each other for their own weaknesses – produces the first murder (Cain and Abel); unified family, – when the hearts of the parents turn to the children, and the hearts of the children to the parents – will herald national and world redemption. Family depraved banished humanity from Eden; family redeemed will return us to Eden and the tree of life.

The sacred objects of the desert Sanctuary teach us that the most important vehicle for the transmission of our tradition is the family. Only by nurturing family purity and unity will we succeed in protecting Torah and properly utilizing it to perfect all of society.

The Person in the Parsha
Rabbi Dr. Tzvi Hersh Weinreb

One of the Angels

My grandmother was one of the angels. Like every Jewish grandmother, she loved each and every one of her grandchildren. As her oldest grandchild, I believed that I was surely her favorite. But I eventually discovered that my siblings and cousins were all equally convinced that they were her favorites.

She had a way of making us each feel special. I remember distinctly how even as a very young boy, I knew that in her eyes I could do no wrong. She was a typical grandmother in almost every way.

I say "almost" because in some ways, she was very different from her peers. She was one of the first women in New York State to receive a driver's license. I vividly remember the newspaper clipping on the bulletin board in her kitchen. It showed her receiving a certificate from some public official under the headline "Brooklyn Grandma is in the Driver's Seat." It didn't mention that said driver's seat was in a huge Packard, one of the most glamorous cars then on the road.

Something else was unique about Grandmother. She was devoted to synagogue life. She spoke perfect English and rarely spoke to us in Yiddish, but she never used the word "synagogue." Instead, she called every Jewish house of worship "ah heilige sheel, a holy shul." She prayed privately twice a day and only attended sheel on the Sabbath and festivals. But those were the most glorious moments of her week.

It is at this time of year, when the weekly Torah portion of Terumah (Exodus 25:1-27:19) is read, that I am reminded of Grandmother's dedication to the synagogue. Parshat Terumah enumerates the components of the Tabernacle that the Jews built in the wilderness and describes what can be termed the first fundraising campaign in synagogue history.

Grandmother spearheaded synagogue building campaigns wherever she lived: the Lower East Side of Manhattan, Harlem, and finally Brooklyn. But it was not as a community activist that she conveyed her spiritual fervor to me. Rather, it was when she drove me and my cousin, in the shiny black Packard, to purchase kosher groceries in the "old neighborhood" every Sunday morning. She would drive over the Manhattan Bridge, and just as we crossed the river, she would point to a large gray stone building just under the bridge. Her eyes would tear and her voice would choke every time we passed that building. In a very subdued voice, she would deliver this message: "That building was once a sheel, built by angels. Now it is no longer a sheel. It is a kloyster. Non-Jews worship there."

When we asked her why "we" lost it and whether it was really built by angels, she would respond evasively, in typical grandmotherly fashion, "You are too young for me to answer you. One day, when you are older, you will understand."

Grandmother passed away more than fifty years ago. Gradually, after her passing, I began to understand who the angels were who built the shul and why "we" lost it. I discovered the angels when perusing the Midrash Rabba on the Book of Kohelet one Sukkot afternoon. I came across this passage:

"Rabbi Chanina ben Dosa observed the people of his city bringing materials for the reconstruction of the Holy Temple. He wished

to follow their example. He found a large boulder that would serve well as part of the Temple's new wall. He sculpted the stone and polished it. But it was far too heavy for him to carry up to Jerusalem. He asked passersby to help him, but they would only do so for a fee, which he could not afford. Finally, he beheld five strangers approaching him. They agreed to carry the stone, but only on the condition that he would place his hand on the stone. He did so and suddenly found himself, and the stone, miraculously transported to Jerusalem. The five men were nowhere to be found. He entered the Temple chamber in which the Sanhedrin sat and inquired after them. The sages told him that they were not men, but angels."

That passage in the Midrash taught me that those who simply lend a hand to a holy project are granted the assistance of the angels. Angels build synagogues.

That's the good news. The sad news is that only angels can sustain synagogues once they are built. Only when those who attend synagogue behave like angels, in a decorous and reverent manner, do synagogues endure. Improper behavior in a house of prayer results in its ultimate destruction. More than one of our great sages has identified irreverence in the synagogue as the reason that many former Jewish houses of worship are now churches or mosques, theaters or museums, and often entirely destroyed.

I can hear Grandmother speaking to me today: "Synagogues are built by angels, but we must behave in them as angels would. If we don't, we lose them." She recognized that the old grey building in Lower Manhattan may have been built by angels, but it wasn't maintained by angels. It was maintained by those who came to synagogue to chatter idly, gossip maliciously, and cynically mock the rabbi and the cantor. No wonder "we" lost it.

Achieving proper synagogue decorum has been a perennial problem for the Jewish community. When a community gathers to build a new synagogue, it does so as a group of angels with noble motives. But as we grow accustomed to the synagogue, as it becomes too familiar to us, we lose our "angelic" enthusiasm.

The holy Zohar, the magnum opus of Jewish mysticism, devotes much of its commentary on this week's Torah portion to this very problem. It is excited by the Torah's description of a successful building campaign, of men and women generously donating gold and silver to the new Tabernacle. But then the Zohar offers these words of caution: "Woe to the person who engages in mundane conversation in the synagogue. He causes a cosmic schism, a degradation of faith. Woe to him, for he has no portion in the God of Israel. He demonstrates by his levity that God does not exist, and that He certainly is not be found in the synagogue. He asserts that he has no relationship with Him, that he does not fear Him, and that he is indifferent to the disgrace of the Upper Celestial Realm."

With these words, the holy Zohar expresses in mystical terms what my Grandmother knew with her ample common sense. How well she taught me the lesson of our need to remain "angels" in the synagogue. I can still hear her tearfully grieving for that heilige sheel, and all too numerous other sacred spaces, which "we" lost because of our callous indifference to the Almighty's presence.

Mrs. Gussie Hartman, Gitel bat Tzvi Hersh HaLevi, rest in peace knowing that I am older, and that I understand, and that many others have just read your heartfelt message.

Torah.Org: Rabbi Yissocher Frand

"The Thought That Counts" Was the Yardstick

Throughout Parshas Teruma, and indeed throughout all the parshiyos that deal with the Mishkan, the Torah uses the expression "Kol nediv lev, yevee'eh-ha". There is a big emphasis in these parshiyos about generosity of the heart (nedivus halev) and generosity of the spirit to contribute to the Beis HaMikdash. We do not see this expression in other areas of the Torah. We do not even see it in connection with the mitzvah of Tzedakah [charity]. Why over here by the building of the Mishkan, in this period of history, is there such an emphasis on nedivus halev?

I saw the following answer in a sefer called Milchamos Yehudah: We need to realize with whom we are dealing. Klal Yisrael had just recently come out of Egypt. They were slaves. The very nature of a slave is that he owns nothing of his own. He is penniless. That which a slave acquires becomes the property of his master. While they were slaves in Egypt, they had nothing. So from where did they obtain the money that they were supposed to donate to the Beis HaMikdash?

The Torah says that prior to leaving Egypt "they asked their neighbors for silver vessels and clothing" [Shemos 12:35] – they received wealth upon exiting Egypt. Furthermore, Chazal say that when the Egyptians sank in the Yam Suf, the Israelites acquired great spoils from that miracle as well. In short, they received money. However, this is not like you and me receiving money. When we receive money, it is perhaps because we work for it. Perhaps we save money from our paychecks. Or perhaps we suddenly win the lottery or find out that a distant relative who we never heard of has died and left us with millions of dollars. At any event, it is a situation where we were struggling to make a living and then we came into money.

With the generation that left Egypt, it did not work like that. Until now, they did not need to work for a living (they worked, but they were not paid anything!). Furthermore, in the Wilderness, there were no worries about making a living. They received food from Heaven. They did not need to worry about rent or mortgages because they had the Clouds of Glory surrounding them. There were no utility bills. The Clouds of Glory provided full climate control. Clothes? "Your clothing did not wear out from upon you, and your feet did not swell these forty years" [Devarim 8:4]. The clothes with which they came out of Egypt are the same clothes with which they walked into Eretz Yisrael. They did not have any expenses.

These people never struggled for their money, and did not have any need for the wealth that they acquired. Now these people are asked for a contribution to the Mishkan building fund. "No problem. What am I saving it for? Easy come, easy go. What do I need it for?" To them, the amount was almost insignificant.

Normally, the size of the check that a person writes might be an indication regarding his level of devotion. If he writes a $10 check, it is one thing. If he writes a $10,000 check, it shows a different level of devotion. However, back then, such distinctions did not really exist. It simply was not difficult for them to part with their "hard earned money" like it is for us because their money was in fact not "hard earned."

So what was the measuring stick of their devotion? The only possible measure was the quality of Nedivus Lev – the spirit with which they gave it. That is why this is the only place where the Torah repeatedly emphasizes the 'Nedivus Lev'. Their degree of commitment could not be measured by the size of the check, but rather by their more ephemeral quality of generosity of spirit, which only the Ribono shel Olam can measure.

That is why, for instance, Chazal say that the Avnei Shoham that the Princes contributed were listed as the last item, even after the goats' hair, because the people who gave the goats' hair gave it with mesiras nefesh [self-sacrifice and devotion] and the Almighty appreciated the significance of such donations. The Princes, who were somewhat (for lack of a better term) 'lazy' in giving their contribution, had their contribution accepted with less fanfare.

The yardstick was not the amount of the check; the yardstick was "it's the thought that counts."

The Capacity to See the Eventuality

Rashi comments on one letter in the pasuk, "You shall make the boards of the Mishkan of shittim wood, standing erect." [Shemos 26:15] Rashi points out that the pasuk says, "And you shall make the boards (v'asisa es ha'kerashim)." A more straightforward way to say this would be "v'asisa kerashim". What does the "hay hayediah" (implying "these special boards") come to teach? Rashi comments that the Torah only uses such language by the kerashim – the boards. The Torah does not use the construct "es

haXXX" (the XXX) by any other keylim of the Beia Hamikdash.

Rashi in fact says in the name of the Medrash Tanchuma that these are special boards – prepared and reserved for this purpose. Yaakov Avinu foresaw prophetically that his descendants would leave Egypt and make a Mishkan out of wood. Chazal say that he therefore planted cedar trees when he came down to Egypt. Before he died, he told his children that they would one day leave the country and pointed out to them the cedar trees he planted that he wanted them to take with them.

Rabbeinu Eliyahu Mizrachi asks a question on this Rashi: Yaakov Avinu only commanded his children to take out the cedar trees (Arazim) that he planted in Egypt. That does not explain the construct "Es HaKerashim" (the Boards). Yaakov did not plant boards. He planted trees!

I heard an answer to this question from an acquaintance: When Yaakov Avinu planted the trees, he did not see them as trees. He saw the (future) boards of the Mishkan. Yaakov had the foresight, with Ruach HaKodesh, to say, "one day you will take these very trees and they will be the boards of the Mishkan." Yaakov had the capacity to see not only the present, but to see the dream, to see the eventuality, as well!

This acquaintance mentioned that the Ponnevizher Rav, zt"l, had this same capacity. When he bought the large tract of land that was to become the Ponnevizher Yeshiva, there were not twenty Yeshiva bochrim in all of Eretz Yisrael. He bought acres upon acres of land. Not only were there not twenty Yeshiva bochrim in all of Eretz Yisrael, but the German General, Erwin Rommel, was 11 days away from Tel Aviv! At that very moment, the Ponnevizher Rav was buying land for a Yeshiva to hold 1,000 bochrim! People told him "You are dreaming!" He responded, "I might be dreaming, but my eyes are open." He had the capacity to see the eventuality of a Yeshiva that needed space for 1,000 students.

When he saw that barren piece of land on an empty hilltop, he already saw upon it the Ponnevizher Yeshiva.

Rav Schwab tells the story that he was once walking with Rav Ruderman, zt"l, in the Forest Park neighborhood (where the yeshiva was originally situated). They were walking by a big old house and the Rosh Yeshiva said to Rav Schwab "This building can hold two hundred bochrim." In those days, there were maybe 20 or 30 bochrim in the whole Yeshiva. Rav Schwab chuckled to himself – why is Rav Ruderman worried about a building for 200 students? In those days a Yeshiva with 200 bochrim in America, and certainly in Baltimore, was a "crazy" idea.

Here again, a great man looked at a building and saw into the future – this could be a Yeshiva one day! These are called dreamers – visionaries. These are people with foresight to see what is not here now, but what can, and many times will, be here one day.

It is a rare commodity to be able to see beyond the here and now and see the future. That is what Yakov Avinu saw. When he planted those Arazim he did not just see cedar trees. He saw the walls of the Mishkan. Therefore the boards were called haKerashim with the Hay haYediah! We do not see it now, but a person with a long range of vision can see the future.

Dvar Torah
Chief Rabbi Ephraim Mirvis

What is the purpose of our shuls?

At the beginning of Parashat Terumah we are given a list of key ingredients used in the 'Mishkan'-the Sanctuary, and later in the Temple. One of them was 'Shemen Lameor' – oil for illumination.

In that word, 'Lameor', there is a missing 'Vav'. It is an example of 'Malei V'Chaser'. According to tradition if a letter is missing, it means that something there was diminished.

The Baal Haturim, bringing us the Gemara in Masechet Menachot (Daf Pei Vav Amud Beit) tells us that the light inside the Sanctuary, and later in the Temple, was diminished because this was not regular light but spiritual light.

Now we can understand the Rambam's explanation for kindling the Menorah twice a day – at night-time and in the morning. We can understand at night-time because it is dark but why was the Menorah kindled at day time? It was because it gave spiritual light to our people.

When King Solomon built his Temple, the First Book of Kings (chapter 6) tells us something about the shape of the windows of the Temple – they were narrow on the inside and broad on the outside.

Now, you would have thought that just the opposite would be the case. After all, windows are there in order to bring the light from outside so that those on the inside can see.

The reason is the spiritual light within the Temple, which was intended to illuminate the world around it. I believe that there is a powerful message here about Judaism – that we need to reach outwards. We need to guarantee that the beauty of our faith will touch the hearts and minds of those around us so that we can be a genuine light unto the nations.

There is a further important message relating to the 'Mikdash Me'at' – the small Temple – that is how we refer to shuls that we have in our communities today.

What is the purpose of the shul? It is not a building within which we are seeking to restrict the presence of Hashem to exist only inside it. Quite the contrary. It is from this building that we want to broaden out the experiences we have within it, so that wherever we go, we can take the presence of Hashem with us.

The light that is within our shuls, our spirituality, our community spirit, our friendship, the warmth of that experience needs to illuminate the world around us.

So, what is the purpose of our shuls? Ironically, it is not so much that what happens within them but it is the inspiration and the influence the shul provides to everything outside, around them.

OTS Dvar Torah: Rabbi Benjy Myers
What's the story?

It's interesting that right after the description of the covenant that Hashem makes with the children of Israel, instead of continuing the story of the Jews' journey in the desert, the Torah chooses to describe the work done in the Tabernacle. Why?

How is a community built? What are society's most basic needs? The answer to these questions, I believe, lies within the first chapters of the Book of Exodus. The first to call the children of Israel a "nation" is Pharaoh: "He said to his people, 'Behold, the nation of the children of Israel are more numerous and stronger than we are.'" (Exodus 1:9).

Pharaoh was the first who understood that the children of Jacob, once just a large family, had now developed into a nation. Fearing the nation of Israel would one day overwhelm Egypt, he decides to subjugate them, and this is where the story begins. The nascent nation takes shape through their common experiences, such as exile and subjugation, the plagues in Egypt, the nation's departure from that land, the splitting of the Red Sea and the subsequent Song of the Sea. The icing on the cake was the formative event at the giving of the Torah on Mount Sinai, when the entire nation was camped against the foothills of the mountain, an entire people united, their hearts beating as one, as they stood up and proudly proclaimed "we will do, and we will listen."

After the awesome events at Mount Sinai, which have left their mark on the Jewish people ever since, the Torah enumerates dozens of commandments between man and fellow man, emphasizing social justice and the proper treatment of the weaker elements of society. At the end of Parashat Mishpatim, we find a description of the covenant enacted between the Almighty and the nation of Israel. From this point on, we would have expected to encounter more stories about the nation travelling through the desert as it prepares to enter the Promised Land, as well as further details about the commandments.

This, however, isn't what happens. The text doesn't continue with the commandments between man and fellow man, such as commandments concerning the

implementation of a judicial system, or the laws regarding damages. It doesn't discuss commandments between man and God, either (like the laws of Shabbat, the festivals, or kosher food). Instead, the five parashiyot we will be reading in the upcoming weeks will deal almost exclusively with the construction of the Tabernacle and its vessels. The text contains a detailed description of the Holy Ark, the Table, the Menorah, the altars, the curtains, the tent-poles and other items used in the ceremonies performed in the Tabernacle. Some vessels are gold while others are silver. Some textiles are dyed sky-blue, while others are dyed scarlet.

Why, then, does the Torah continue with such a detailed description of the construction of the Tabernacle, instead of the other commandments that it could have discussed?

One answer is that it wished to "batten down the hatches". The commentators disagree over whether the Torah is written in chronological order, and whether the commandment to construct the Tabernacle was issued before the Sin of the Golden Calf. Without delving into this issue, I believe that clearly the purpose of recording this commandment at this point in the text is to teach us the proper uses of gold, before the Torah begins describing how it was misused.

Another reason can be found in the words of Nahmanides, who writes (in his commentary to Exodus 25:2) that after God gave the children of Israel "a few commandments which are like the principles of the commandments, as the rabbis practice with the converts that come to be Jewish – and Israel accepted to do all that He would command them through the hand of Moshe, and He made a covenant with them about all of this; behold, from then they are His as a people, and He is for them a God." After the nation of Israel declared "we are your sons and you are our father, we are your nation and you are our God", the time was ripe, and the people were ready for the next stage – determining where the Almighty would dwell within the nation, and from where He would speak to Moses and connect with the entire nation.

Perhaps, through a close reading of the words that begin this parasha, we'll attain another insight tied to the sequence of parashiyot that involve building a community. When referring to the Holy Ark, the text reads "and you (plural) shall make an Ark", though when referring to the other vessels, the text reads "and you (singular) shall make". This transition from the plural to the singular is indicative of the Torah's character. The Torah belongs to everyone, as echoed in the Gemara, in Tractate Kiddushin 66a, which states that the Torah is "wrapped and placed in the corner, anyone who wishes to study can come and study." The entire nation is connected to the Torah. The entire nation said "we will do, and we will listen". The Torah and its messages belong to everyone, to the entire community, as reflected in Shmot Rabbah (chapter 34, paragraph 2): "The Holy One said to him [Moses] – all can come and busy themselves with the ark, so that all come and merit the Torah."

Rabbi Avraham Ibn Ezra talks about another linguistic connection in his commentary on Exodus (25:10):
"Because he said in the beginning 'and they made [it] for me', he began in this way, and they shall make the Ark…" The commandment to build the Ark isn't the only one worded in the plural ("and they made [it]") – the commandment concerning the physical construction of the Tabernacle was addressed to a group. We are all commanded to take part and participate in the building of the Tabernacle, and I believe that this can teach us an important lesson for society at large. We have been given the responsibility and the obligation to work together in order to sanctify God's heavenly name on Earth. Each individual brings whatever inspires their generosity and whatever the individual can and will be able to contribute, which could be silver, gold, or even skills such as weaving, engraving or embroidery.

We are all responsible for building our communities. The entire nation is a partner in the endeavor, and each individual can make his or her contribution, but the thought behind this effort must be that it is done voluntarily. Anything I do for the community is done as a contribution. This contribution could elevate the general public or our surroundings into a better place.

Building a society grounded in the Torah, namely in studying Torah and following its teachings, in avodah – the concept of "work", and more specifically, work done together, with each individual contributing his or her two cents for the common good – and in gemilut hasadim, good deeds, when our giving is done as a contribution, keeping in mind that whatever I give will serve to benefit others.

Dvar Torah: TorahWeb.Org

Rabbi Yakov Haber

The Mishkan, Har Sinai, Torah and Eretz Yisrael

Parashas Teruma begins the Torah's lengthy presentation, spanning five parshiyos, of the building of the mishkan in the desert and, more generally, the concept of mikdash. Clearly, the number of chapters and verses devoted to this topic and the repeat of its major components both indicate its absolute centrality.

The words of Ramban in his introduction to Sefer Shemos are most informative of the purpose of the mishkan. Parts have been bolded for ease of reference in the subsequent analysis.

The book of "v'eileh shemos" was dedicated to the first explicitly decreed exile and to the redemption from it... Now, the exile is not complete until their return to their place and [when] they would return to the level of their ancestors. When they left Egypt, even though they had left the house of slavery, they were still considered exiled since they were in a land not theirs, wandering in the desert. When they came to har Sinai and made the mishkan[1], and HaKadosh Baruch Hu returned and rested His Shechina among them, then they returned to the level of their ancestors which was the secret communion (sod Eloka) with G-d on their tents, and they themselves were the Divine Chariot, and then they were considered redeemed. Therefore, this book ends with the completion of the mishkan and with the Glory of Hashem filling it constantly.

These brief but penetrating words of Ramban highlight the mishkan's role as nothing short of communion with the Divine presence itself, the goal of the entire creation - the level reached by our Avos, lost by their descendants and later achieved again. It is no wonder then that the Torah devotes so much time to this crucial concept.

However, his precious words require further study. In trying to uncover the unifying theme of the book of Shemos, Ramban presents the thesis that this sefer is the book of exile and the redemption from it. But the redemption is ostensibly over in the middle of parashas Beshalach when the Jewish people leave Yam Suf! To this question, Ramban answers that the Exodus from Egypt alone did not qualify as a complete redemption. The rest of the book of Shemos, describing the giving of the Torah and the building of the mishkan, addresses its completion.

However, Ramban seemingly starts with two criteria for redemption: 1) "their return to their place" and 2) "[their] return to the level of their ancestors". The first seems to address the physical return to their land from which they were exiled[2]; the second addresses the return to their lofty spiritual level lost by their exile. The stress on the physical exile is further highlighted by the subsequent statement "since they were in a land not theirs, wandering in the desert[3]". But yet, the Ramban, in describing how the Jewish people were considered redeemed as of the end of Sefer Shemos, focuses on only one theme: "then they returned to the level of their ancestors... then they were considered redeemed." Even though they had not returned to their place, they were still considered redeemed since the Divine presence rested among them. But the Ramban originally had included return to their place as another component of redemption! How can this contradiction be resolved?

The commentaries on Ramban are divided into two basic camps in resolving this problem. The first group (see Beis HaYayin, Oz v'Hadar, Tuv Yerushalayim, Lev Tzion, and Harerei Kodesh) views the initial statement "to their place" as a metaphor for their spiritual status. Hence, the Ramban never focused on the physical exile. However, this answer is difficult to accept since, as mentioned above, Ramban talks also of "a land not theirs".

The second approach (see Menacheim Tzion and Yekev Ephraim) understands that Ramban viewed the Jewish experience in the midbar as if they were actually in Eretz Yisrael. Both this approach and the first one, do not deny, of course, that entry into Eretz Yisrael was part of the Divine plan. Only in the Land of Israel would the Jews fully fulfill their spiritual destiny. But the entire purpose of entry into the Land was to live under the protective wings of the Shechina centered in the mikdash in Jerusalem (see Ramban, parashas Acharei Mos (18:25) at length). The first approach maintains that when this was achieved earlier in the midbar, they already achieved this basic milestone and could be considered redeemed even though they were not in Eretz Yisrael per se. The second approach goes a step further, explaining that being in this state of having the Divine presence rest upon them was as if, in at least an extended sense, "they returned to their place."

Yekev Ephraim, apparently still troubled by the fact that they did not actually enter "their place" quotes an awe-inspiring passage from Rav Moshe Cordovero's Pardes Rimonim (25:2) indicating that in the desert, they literally lived in the equivalent of Eretz Yisrael.[4] The passage reads as follows:
For the gateway to heaven to enter sanctity is Eretz Yisrael, and because of this, prophecy only rests in Eretz Yisrael... There is no difficulty from the generation of the desert, since the air of the Land of Israel went with them. If you do not say this, how did they eat kodoshimoutside of the Land?! Rather, the air, the expanses, the sky, the portals and the (angelic) officers, all of them traveled with the Shechina which traveled with them. This is explained in the Zohar (Teruma 140b). That gateway and air went with them until the entry into the Land of Israel, to its appropriate place. There is the resting place of sanctity for there is the gateway to heaven as we have explained.

The ReMaK seems to be saying that although the midbar was transformed into a "mini-Israel", this was only a temporary state until the everlasting place of the Shechina was entered. Perhaps we can suggest, that Hashem Yisborach, in His kindness, wished to demonstrate to us openly, soon after the Exodus, what Eretz Yisrael's essence was even though they would not see this manifestly anywhere in Eretz Yisrael except in the mikdash.

This link between Eretz Yisrael and midbar Sinai is also made by Ibn Ezra in his comments to Tehillim (68:18). The verse states: "Hashem is among them, Sinai in holiness". On this he writes: "The Divine presence is among them like Sinai in holiness. It is lacking the kof (like)... Its explanation is that the sanctity of Eretz Yisrael is like that of har Sinai."[5] It would appear that Ibn Ezra switches the comparison from that of ReMaK. Rav Cordovero states that the desert took on the sanctity of Israel. Ibn Ezra maintains that Eretz Yisrael has the sanctity of Sinai. (But see previous footnote.)

II. Rav Yosef Dov Soloveitchik zt"l advanced the link of har Sinai to Eretz Yisrael further. Since Rav Chaim Volozhin zt"l (Nefesh Hachaim 4:30) explains that the only objects that are considered "gufei kedusha" (objects of direct sanctity) are Torah or its parts, Eretz Yisrael's kedusha must somehow be linked to that of the Torah. The Rav explained that indeed the Aron HaBris containing the luchos and the Torah preceded the Jews in the battles of the conquest of the land. This was in order to "inject" the kedushas haTorah into Eretz Yisrael. (See MiPeninei HaRav, by mori v'Rabi Rav Hershel Schachter shlit"a, pp. 335).

However, this approach, at first glance, seems incomplete. Kaftor VaFerach explains that Eretz Yisrael has two types of sanctity: the sanctity of Shechina and the sanctity of mitzvos. The first was endowed by Hashem even before the Jewish people entered the Land of Israel. This manifests itself by, among other things, the special Divine providence present in the Land. The second was bestowed by the Jewish people: in the days of Yehoshua by conquest (kibbush) and in the days of Ezra by taking possession (chazaka). This sanctity has relevance for the mitzvos hateluyos ba'aretz enabling them to apply. In the language of Chasam Sofer, the second sanctity can be abrogated as it was after the Babyonian conquest. The first "is an eternal sanctity for the entire history of the world. It has never changed and will never change." (See Encylopedia Talmudit, vol. 2, Eretz Yisrael, 2, Kedushasa umitzvoseha.) How is the first type of sanctity dependent on Torah?

Perhaps we can explain that the only real source of kedusha in the world is Hakadosh Baruch Hu's presence. The study of Torah connects us to this Presence (see Avos 3:6). Hence both the first type of sanctity and the second type of sanctity are both rooted in kedushas haShechina. This duality is perhaps included in Ibn Ezra's brief but far-reaching words: "the sanctity of Eretz Yisrael is like that of har Sinai." Har Sinai was both a direct experience of openly revealed Shechina and was the place of the giving of the Torah whose study would continue to connect the Jewish people to this Presence even when not in the mikdash and even in the exile. The mishkan in the desert also served as a place of openly revealed Shechina and as a place of continued revelation of Torah to Moshe Rabbeinu. This dual role was also fulfilled later by the mikdash in Yerushalayim being the resting place of the Shechina and well as the seat of the Sanhedrin, the "ikar Torah shebe'al peh" (Ramban, Hilchos Mamrim 1:1).

May we always increase our connection to two of the main sources of Divine presence in the world: Hashem's holy Torah and His holy Land, two of the central gifts He has bestowed in His kindness to His beloved nation.

[1] See Ramban (beginning of Teruma) that the mishkan was a continuation of har Sinai. This is likely the reason why Ramban here juxtaposes the two as well.

[2] See Netzach Yisrael (1) of Maharal where he underscores the exile from the land as a crucial part of galus and the return to it as a central feature of geula.

[3] The commentraries on Ramban raise a difficulty with the phrase, "wandering in the desert" which was originally uttered by Pharaoh. The Jews were led by the Divine cloud and were not, in truth, "wandering"! Perhaps the Ramban, by this phrase, refers poetically to their spiritual malaise mentioned earlier. Hence, the two phrases "since they were in a land not theirs, wandering in the desert" parallel the earlier two phrases, "their return to their place and [when] they would return to the level of their ancestors".

[4] See also Rashi and Tosfos to Taanis (16a) who cryptically comment that har Hamoriya refers to har Sinai. This can be explained by Midrash Tehillim which states that har Hamoriya, the place of akeidas Yitzchak, uprooted to the midbar to join with har Sinai! (See Diveri Yatziv, C.M. 92.)

[5] The text in all printed editions of Ibn Ezra reads"וטעם ה' בם, השכינה בם בסיני בקדש, ויחסר כ"ף כמו 'ועיר פרא אדם יולד'. והנה הטעם כי קדושת ארץ ישראל בהר סיני" I translated it above as if it were written with a kof instead of a beis: כסיני and כהר סיני. I believe this reading is the only way to reconcile the statement "ויחסר כ"ף" and fits with Ibn Ezra's entire thesis that the perek addresses har HaMoriyah and the Beis Hamikdash and not har Sinai, as other commentaries maintain.

Bar Ilan University: Dvar Torah

"The locks of your head are like purple"
By Zohar Amar[1]

Argaman, or purple, is mentioned in Scripture numerous times as referring to dye, or to raw wool or garments colored with this dye, alongside other precious dyed items: *techelet* (blue) and *tola`at shani* (crimson).[2] These colors appear in combination in various woven items pertaining to the Tabernacle and its furnishings, as detailed in this week's reading. For example,"…bring Me gifts…gold, silver, and copper; blue, purple and crimson yarns, fine linen, goats' hair" (Ex. 25:2-4).

The use of purple is considered a mark of royalty: Mordechai went out, dressed in royal garments that included "a mantle of fine linen and purple wool" (Esther 8:15). The status of purple was akin to that of gold. Of King Solomon it is said that his couch was made of gold and the place where he sat of purple: "Its back of gold, its seat of purple wool" (Song 3:10).

[1] Aristotle, *The History of Animals* V 15, VII 13; Pliny, *Natural History* IX 125-141.

[2] II Chron. 2:6: "*argevan ve-kharmil*" (purple and crimson).

In Scripture the origin of *argaman* is hinted at in connection with the places where it was traded and where the expert dyers were, along the coast of the northern part of the land of Israel. Its Aramaic name appears in the account of Solomon's request to Huram, king of Tyre, that he send expert craftsmen to build the Temple and its furnishings: "Now send me a craftsman to work in gold, silver, bronze, and iron, and in purple (*argevan*), crimson, and blue yarn" (II Chron. 2:6).

Later on, Tyre is mentioned as a center of production and trade in precious textiles: "Aram traded with you because of your wealth of merchandise, dealing with you in turquoise, purple stuff, embroidery, fine linen" (Ezek. 27:16). Some of these goods were imported from one of the Greek isles (Elishah), apparently Cyprus: "Of blue and purple from the coasts of Elishah were your awnings" (Ezek. 27:7). Thus there can be no doubt that we are dealing with one of the expensive dyes of the ancient world, used by the very highest classes.

Argaman is not identified in Scripture, but in the Greek translations—the Septuagint and Aquila's—it is rendered as *purpura*, and in the Latin Vulgate, as *purpura*, a dye that was obtained from a kind of mollusk. This is also what Philo and Josephus said. The descriptions of *purpura* in Greco-Roman literature on the natural world and in the writings of Aristotle and Pliny[1] leave no doubt that we are dealing with the genus of *Murex* mollusks, from which a reddish-purple dye was derived.

Three candidates hold a reasonably high probability for the identity of this mollusk. Identification is based on matching the descriptions in the sources with the varieties that were found in large accumulations at archaeological sites, and also according to the species of *Murex* common along the shores of the Mediterranean today and from which dye can be derived in significant quantity. The primary definitive finding appears to be the remains of *purpura* dye found in ancient dying factories in close proximity to the shells of *Murex* mollusks, and whose chemical analysis proved the source of the dye to be the same mollusks. The confluence of these data reduces the possibilities to the following species: *Murex brandaris*, *Hexaplex trunculus*, and *Murex haemastoma*.

As for Scriptural sources, let us pause to consider the imagery of the beloved woman and her lover in Song of Songs, a work replete with imagery that has sophisticated dual and even triple meaning, as would befit the "Song" of "Songs": "The head upon you is like crimson wool (*Carmel*), the locks of your head are like purple—a king is held captive in the tresses" (Song 7:6).

Some have interpreted *carmel* as the reddish-orange color of the woman's hair, as in *carmil* (the Aramaic word for the Hebrew *tola`at shani*, rendered here as "crimson yarn"),[2] which parallels the color *argaman*, purple.[3] The imagery, "the locks (Heb. *dalah*) of your head are like purple," is taken from the weaver's craft and apparently refers to the woman's long plait, likened to the warp of purple threads connected to the upper beam of the loom.[4] The same use of *dalah* also occurs in this verse: "My life is rolled up like a web (*ka-oreg*, something woven) and cut from the thrum (*dalah*)" (Isa. 38:12). Moreover, in our verse, the word *argaman* carries a double meaning: woven (*arig-man*), as well as purple.

"A king held captive in the tresses" might be a way of referring to the "*argaman* mollusks,"[5] grown in ponds along the Carmel coast or kept alive there after having been hunted, until the dye could be removed from them. Thus the verse begins by describing the woman's hair, the color of *carmil*,[6] then continues with an image of her plait resembling a purple woven fabric, and concludes with the double meaning of king: the king himself, who is captivated by the woman's beauty, and the king as a way of referring to the color *argaman*, the color of royalty.[7]

On another level, the verse from Song of Songs places the woman geographically. It begins with her head held high as Mount Carmel ("The head upon you is like the Carmel"),[8] whose rolling hills descend to the sea (*dalat roshekh ke-argaman*, or "the locks of your head are like purple"),[9] reaching the coastline with its ponds and installations for keeping the *argaman* mollusks, from which the dye was derived ("a king held captive in the tresses"). Archaeological evidence of a purple dye industry was found in this region, in Shikmona from biblical times,[10] and in references to Haifa from the Mishnaic and Talmudic eras.[11] Several Greek sources also refer to a place called *Porphyron* in the same vicinity, *Porphyron* also being a name for *Murex* mollusks.[12] For our purposes, the important finding are the pools hewn in the

---

[1] See Rabbi Jonah ibn Janah, *Sefer ha-Shorashim*, A. Neubauer ed., Oxford 1875, root *c-r-m-l*, p. 338; Ibn Ezra on Song 7:6; Y. Felix, *Shir ha-Shirim: Teva, `Alilah ve-Alegoria*, Jerusalem 1980, pp. 22-23; Z. Amar, *Be-`Ikvot Tola`at ha-Shani ha-Eretz-Yisraelit*, Jerusalem 2007, p. 73.

[2] So Felix suggests, *Shir ha-Shirim*, p. 22.

[3] This was suggested by Relandi in his book, *Siyur be-Phalestina* (1695), and on this V. Goren wrote, *Te'ur Geography, Histori, ve-Archaeologi shel Eretz-Yisrael*, 5, Jerusalem 1984, p. 179: "It seems Relandi was of the opinion, not without justification, that the words cited below from Song of Songs ostensibly indicate that *Murex* mollusks were plentiful along the Carmel coast"; M. Har'el, *Teva ve-Enosh, Yofi ve-Ahavah be-Shir ha-Shirim*, Raanana 2009, p. 60. We shall further develop and substantiate this view below.

[4] As in dyeing with henna (*Lawsonia inermis*); cf. Song 1:14.

[5] In Song of Songs Rabbah, 7.6, *argaman* is compared to David or Daniel, who wore such garments, and the King is the Holy One, blessed be He.

[6] Cf. the previous verse: "Your nose like the Lebanon tower, that faces toward Damascus" (Song 7:5), and also mentioned in Scripture is *Rosh ha-Carmel* (=the top of Mount Carmel; I Kings 18:42, Amos 1:2, 9:3).

[7] Cf. "As surely as…Carmel is by the sea" (Jer. 46:18).

[8] Y. Elgavish, *Shikmonah le-Hof ha-Carmel*, Tel Avi 1994, p. 67; N. Karmon and E. Spanier, "Remains of a Purple Dye Industry Found at Tel Shiqmona," *IEJ*, 38 (1988), pp. 184-186.

[9] Cf. about "snail hunters from the Ladder of Tyre to Haifa" (Babylonian Talmud, *Shabbat* 26a and *Sifre* Deuteronomy 354, *s.v. davar aher*). According to Eusebius, the village of Shikmona was called Haifa; see E. Z. Melamed, *The Onomasticon of Eusebius* (in Hebrew), Jerusalem 1966, p. 53, no. 556.

[10] Rabbi Joseph Schwarz, *Tevu'ot ha-Aretz*, Jerusalem 1900, p. 235: "Haifa…and in the vernacular in ancient times it was called Porphyron, from the word *purpur*, which is the color purple, after the sea creature found in the water there and from whose blood they dyed purple." Also, attesting to this snail being found in the area of Acre and Haifa, note that the Arabic name is *al-hilzon ahmar* (= the red snail), *loc. cit.*, p. 378.

[11] See N. Karmon, *Ta`asiyat ha-Argaman ba-`Et ha-`Atika ba-Agan ha-Mizrahi shel ha-Yam ha-Tikhon*, Doctoral Dissertation, Haifa University 1986, p. 64.

[12] On the purple dye industry discovered in Dor and on the possibility that the mollusks were grown there in the pools near the shore, see E. Stern, *Dor ha-Moshelet ba-Yamim*, Jerusalem 1992, pp. 99-101. Likewise, from the depths of the sea across from the shore of Tirat ha-Carmel a jug was fished up, full of the shells of small *Murex* mollusks which had apparently been brought to the shore for the purposes of cultivation. See Carmon, pp. 124-125.

Calcareous sandstone along the Carmel coast, as at Dor and Shikmona, and connected with the purple dye industry.[1]

Imagery embedded in the verse

Roshekh alayikh ka-karmel	*Ve-dalat roshekh ka-argaman*	*Melekh asur ba-rehatim*
The head upon you is like crimson wool	the locks of your head are like purple	a king is held captive in the tresses
The woman's head	The woman's hair	The king
The color *carmil*, reddish-orange (or perhaps caramel?)	The color *argaman*, or the threads of a woven fabric (*arig-man*)	The mollusk producing purple dye
Mount Carmel	The slopes of the Carmel mountains	The pools hewn into the rocks at the coast

In the light of the interpretation that ascribes to King Solomon control over the purple dye industry along the Carmel coast, apparently in the district of Dor (see I Kings 4:11),[2] it is not clear why King Solomon turned to Huram, King of Tyre, requesting him to help provide craftsmen who were expert, *inter alia*, in purple dye (II Chron. 2:6).

Perhaps the amount of purple dye extracted in the region under Israelite control did not suffice for all the needs of the Temple, nor were there in the area sufficient top experts in extracting the dye. Perhaps there was also some preference for Tyrian purple, which was considered the finest and most precious in the ancient world.[3] Another explanation might be that the purple dye industry along the Acre and Carmel coasts were *de facto* controlled at that time by Tyrians and foreign elements from the Aegean Sea (the "Sea Peoples"),[4] as emerges from archaeological findings. One tradition explicitly attributes the founding of Dor to the Phoenicians, who discovered there a wealth of *Murex* mollusks. Translated by Rachel Rowen

---

[1] This was surely the situation in the Second Temple Period. See Pliny, *Natural History* IX 127, 137.

[2] B. Ts. Luria, "*Hof ha-Yam be-Tekufat Shivat Zion*," *Sinai*, 38 (1956, p. 182. Perhaps this explains why Hiram protested about not being properly recompensed by Solomon for the assistance he had given him. Solomon ostensibly gave him as a present "twenty towns in the region of Galilee" (I Kings 9:11-13), but *de facto* these cities were already under his control. For further views on relations between Solomon and Hiram regarding this region, see the *Encyclopedia Mikrait*, 4, p. 7.

[3] *The New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land* (E. Stern, ed. In chief; Hebrew), Jerusalem, Vol. 2, p. 787c, p. 1228.

[4] Appears in the writings of Stephen of Byzantium, 167, 18, and is cited by Stern, *Dor*, p. 137.

BS"D

To: parsha@groups.io
From: cshulman@gmail.com

INTERNET PARSHA SHEET
ON **TERUMAH** - 5780

parsha@groups.io / www.parsha.net - in our 25th year! To receive this parsha sheet, go to http://www.parsha.net and click Subscribe or send a blank e-mail to parsha+subscribe@groups.io Please also copy me at cshulman@gmail.com A complete archive of previous issues is now available at http://www.parsha.net It is also fully searchable.

Sponsored in memory of
Chaim Yissachar z"l ben Yechiel Zaydel Dov

Dedicated for a refuah shleimah to **Yisrael Yaakov ben Rut**

Sponsored by **Dr. Phil & Leah Kazlow**
in memory of Leah's mother - **Mrs. Moshe Stern**
Matil bas Dovid a"h - whose Yahrtzeit is Vav Adar

Sponsored by **Heshie and Nechie Schulhof**
L'zecher Nishmas
Yenta bas Nachum Tzvi a"h (Heshie's mother)

To sponsor a parsha sheet contact cshulman@parsha.net
(proceeds to tzedaka)

---

from: Rabbi Yissocher Frand <ryfrand@torah.org>
to: ravfrand@torah.org
date: Feb 27, 2020, 12:53 PM
subject: Rav Frand - Keruvim Embracing at the Churbon?
Dedicated to the speedy recovery of Mordechai ben Chaya

Rav Frand By Rabbi Yissocher Frand Dedicated to the speedy recovery of Mordechai ben Chaya To Dedicate an Article click here

Parshas Terumah

Keruvim Embracing at the Churbon?

havrusah Tapes on the weekly portion: #1108 Being from the First Ten at Davening. Good Shabbos!

Unlocking the Mystery of the Keruvim That Were Locked in Embrace Among the various physical components of the Mishkan, there were two Keruvim on top of the Aron (Ark) with child-like faces. One of the Keruvim was male in form and the other was female in form. In the Gemara in Yoma 54, Reish Lakish says that when the Romans came in to destroy the Bais HaMikdash (Holy Temple), they saw the Keruvim embracing one another. The Gemara in fact says that the Romans mocked the Jews for this. They thought the Jews were perverted. "Here in their Holy Temple, they have a statue of a man and a woman embracing!"

The Ramban and Ritva in Tractate Yoma ask a question: The Gemara [Bava Basra 99a] relates that a miraculous phenomenon occurred with the Keruvim in the Bais HaMikdash. During a time when Bnei Yisrael were fulfilling the Will of the Omnipresent, the Keruvim embraced one another; however, during times when Bnei Yisrael were not fulfilling the Will of the Omnipresent, the Keruvim faced away from each other. The aforementioned Rishonim ask a strong question: The Romans came in to destroy the Beis HaMikdash during terrible years for the Jewish people. Jews were not keeping "the Will of the Omnipresent." They were not doing what they were supposed to be doing.

These Rishonim therefore ask: How was it that the Romans came in and found that the male-female Keruvim were locked in an embrace? There is no greater "time when Bnei Yisrael were not fulfilling the Will of the Omnipresent" than this moment!

They cite an answer in the name of the Ri Migash (Rav Yosef ibn Migash): A miracle was performed at that moment, to cause embarrassment to the Jewish people.

Another answer is said over in the name of several of the great Chassidic leaders, including the Bnei Yissacher [Rav Tzvi Elimelech Spira of Munkatch] and the Ohev Yisrael [Rabbi Avraham Yehoshua Heschel of Apta]. It is a very interesting answer. I will cite the teaching of a Chazal they quote, and then I will try to put this answer into understandable terms.

This is an example of Chayav adam lifkod es ishto kodem she'yeitzei l'derech (A husband is duty-bound to "visit" his wife before setting out on a journey).

The reason the Keruvim were in this embrace at this time was because this was—as it were—a "goodbye embrace." Yes, it was a time when the Jews were not fulfilling the Will of the Almighty. But now, the Ribono shel Olam was going to leave us for what has become 2,000 years. When you are about to leave someone that you love, you kiss them good-bye. Therefore, in spite of the fact that it was a time where "they did not do G-d's Will," nevertheless, they embraced for that final moment. This was that good-bye kiss which the historical moment demanded. Despite the fact that the Jews had reached this very low level, nevertheless—"A husband is duty-bound to "visit" his wife before setting out on a journey."

I saw a third answer to this question in a sefer called Shabbos u'Moadim, which has somewhat of a different take on this situation. The Medrash [Vayikra Rabbah, Parshas Emor] cites a situation where one sees a Jew who is being brought to his death—being stoned. A voice calls out: "Why is this happening to you?" The response: "It is because I circumcised my son." (I am paying for my life for fulfilling the mitzvah at a time when there was a governmental decree against circumcision.) A voice calls out (to another person): "Why are you being burnt at the stake?" The response: "It is because I observed the Sabbath." Again, "Why are you going out to be beheaded?" "It is because I ate matzah." "Why are you being beaten by the whip?" It is because I made a Succah; I took a Lulav, I put on Tefillin, or I wore Techeilles. It is because I fulfilled the Will of Father in Heaven."

Through the centuries and through the millennia, the Jews have had this capacity that even if it cost them their lives, they still felt it necessary to cling to the Almighty and to His mitzvos. They still felt connected to Him. I once heard something which is so mind-boggling to me that it is hard to say over: The Chossid Yavetz (he was part of the expulsions from Spain and Portugal in the late fifteenth century) on Pirkei Avos writes that there was a woman who lost virtually her entire family. She had only one son remaining. She hired a ship to take her and her son away from Portugal. The shipmen took her to an island, killed her son, and left her abandoned there. The woman was heard praying, "Almighty, You are trying to push me away, but I won't give up my love for You."

It is mind-boggling that no matter what has happened to Jews, they still felt this connection to the Ribono shel Olam. If you remember from Succos, the alphabetic Hoshanna of "Om ani chomah" contains for the phrases beginning with the letters hay, vov, zayin, ches, the following expressions: "Ha'Harugah alecha" (murdered for Your sake); V'nechsheves k'tzon tivcha (and regarded like a sheep for slaughter); Zeruya bein mach'iseha (scattered among her provocateurs) but nevertheless—in spite of all of the above—Chavukah u'devukah Bach (she hugs and cleaves to You).

Rav Meir Shapiro says that this is the interpretation (albeit not the simple "pshat") of the pasuk "Has a people ever heard the voice of G-d speaking from the midst of the fire as you have heard, and survived?" [Devorim 4:33].

Rav Meir Shapiro interprets the pasuk as expressing amazement that Klal Yisrael has heard G-d speak to them from the fires of persecution and oppression by their enemies, and have yet kept their devotion to Him.

This, he says, is what happened over here with the Keruvim. Yes, the Ribono shel Olam was kicking us out. Nevertheless, He was kissing us goodbye. The Keruvim, who were locked in their final embrace, symbolized this.

Mah Inyan WSJ Aitzel Parshas Terumah? I would like to share an observation from an atypical source. It is from an article in this week's (January 28, 2011) Wall Street Journal. What does the Wall Street Journal have to do with Parshas Terumah? I do not read the WSJ on a regular basis, but there is a Rebbe in Lakewood—Rav Asher Dicker—who called me up and said, "This is an article that you can use."

The name of the article is, "The Fate of The Kilo Weighs Heavily on the Minds of the Metrologists."

In a vault beneath the 17th century pavilion on the outskirts of Paris sits a platinum cylinder known as "Le Grande K." From 1889 until 2019, the Le Grande K was the international prototype for the kilogram, the standard against which all other kilos are measured.

The article explained that this was "the kilogram." We need to know the exact value of a kilogram, and there is a vault in Paris that has a platinum cylinder that weighs exactly one kilo. Le Grande K was so well protected, that there were three people in the world with the three different keys to the vault. The vault could only be opened with all three people present. It was "the kilo." However, there was a crisis. Over the years, scientists noticed a problem. The "Grande K" was losing weight. Weigh-ins at the International Bureau of Weights and Measures showed that the bar had shed approximately 50 micrograms, which is the equivalent of one grain of sand.

To you and me, it does not make a great deal of difference that the "Grande K" is off by one grain of sand. However, this was a crisis in the scientific community. "It is a scandal that we have this kilogram hanging around and changing its mass and therefore changing the mass of everything else in the universe," Bill Phillips, a Nobel Prize winning physicist, exclaimed at a scientific summit in London this week. "No one knows for sure what went wrong with 'Le Grande K' but some theorize it lost weight from being cleaned."

What does this have to do with Parshas Teruma?

My friends, the Torah says about the Aron HaKodesh (Ark of the Testimony) in the Beis HaMikdash, "You shall place in the Ark the 'Testimony' that I shall give to you." [Shemos 25:16] The Luchos (Tablets of the Covenant) and the Master Sefer Torah were in the Aron. When did they use that Sefer Torah? The answer is, "Never!" When did they see that Sefer Torah? "Never!" Who went into the Kodesh Kadashim (Holy of Holies)? Only the Kohen Gadol (High Priest). He did not open up the Aron and look at the Sefer Torah.

If someone has a Sefer Torah that no one is going to learn out of and no one is even going to see, then what purpose does that Sefer Torah have? The answer is, le'havdil, it is like "Le Grande K." If there will ever be a person that will get a notion – I want to change the Sefer Torah – I want to take something out – I want to add something, who is going to know? I will start small – my neighborhood, then the city, then the country, and then the world. I will change the world!

The answer is – No! There is a Sefer Torah by which all other Sifrei Torah are measured. Therefore, you can never falsify the Sefer Torah because there is a master copy that is in the Aron HaKodesh that was from the Ribono shel Olam, Himself.

This is the interpretation of the Medrash: "When Moshe found out that he was going to die that very day – what did he do? Rav Yannai said he wrote 13 copies of the Sefer Torah – twelve copies he distributed to the twelve Tribes, and one copy he placed in the Aron HaKodesh. Why? Lest anyone think that he can change anything in the Sefer Torah – he needs to know that it will be validated against the Sefer Torah that Moshe himself wrote. Every Tribe will be able to look at the alleged text of the falsified Torah and say "No. This is wrong! That is not what the Sefer Torah says." This is why we need a Sefer Torah in the Aron.

This insight was said over by Rav Zalman Sorotzkin, zt"l, [1881-1966] in the eulogy he gave for the Brisker Rav, zt"l [R. Yitzchok Zev Soloveitchik, 1886-1959]. The Brisker Rav was, l'havdil, "Le Grande K." When he represented Da'as Torah, he was not going to let anything be changed that was against Torah. If it was, he stood up and he fought for it. Everyone feared him, because he would not stand for any nonsense.

Rav Zalman Sorotzkin said the Brisker Rav was the master copy of the Sefer Torah to his generation, the Sefer Torah in the Aron, by which to measure all things. If anybody got some bright idea about changing things, he would know that he would have to answer to the Brisker Rav.

This is what every generation needs. Every generation needs someone who people recognize will stand up for what is right and will not let anything false pass him by. When Rav Weinberg, zichrono l'Vracha, was niftar, Rav Heinemann eulogized him and called him (rightly so) "Gavra d'mistafeena me-nay" (the individual who I feared). He was the person in town from whom one had trepidation. One understood that if he was going to try to change anything, Rav Weinberg was going to let him have it, in no uncertain terms. He was fearless and peerless, and he did not take any garbage.

Every generation needs that and every town needs that. They need the "Gavra d'mistafeena me-nay" they need that "Sefer Torah in the Aron." We do not even need to use it. We do not even need to see it. Maybe it is never looked at in a person's lifetime. However, we know it is there, and because of that, the Torah can never be falsified.

Transcribed by David Twersky; Jerusalem DavidATwersky@gmail.com
Technical Assistance by Dovid Hoffman; Baltimore, MD
dhoffman@torah.org

This week's write-up is adapted from the hashkafa portion of Rabbi Yissochar Frand's Commuter Chavrusah Series on the weekly Torah portion.

---

fw from hamelaket@gmail.com from: Torah in Action /Shema Yisrael <parsha@torahinaction.com> subject: Peninim on the Torah by Rabbi A. Leib Scheinbaum

Shema Yisrael Torah Network Peninim on the Torah - Parshas Terumah פרשת תרומה תשפ

ויקחו לי תרומה מאת כל איש אשר ידבנו לבו תקחו את תרומתי And let them take for Me a portion from every man whose heart motivates him you shall take My portion. (25:2) *Horav Gamliel Rabinowitz, Shlita*, interprets this *pasuk* homiletically, employing it to establish the guideline for *tzedakah*, charitable giving. *Ish asher yidvenu libo*; a man whose heart compels him to give, who gives sincerely, has attained a lofty achievement. We all give, because we can, because Hashem has commanded us to give. Do we give out of shame, afraid of what our friends will say? Do we give out of a sense of guilt? How does one reach the plateau of honest, heartfelt giving? He must believe that it is not his money that he is giving to the poor man, but *Terumasi*; it is Hashem's money. You are taking the portion that you are giving from Hashem's treasury, a portion of which happens to be in your possession. Everything belongs to Hashem, and He has deposited it with you for the purpose of "spreading the wealth." Thus, the ritual of giving *tzedakah* is actually the process of taking Heavenly funds and giving them to *tzedakah*. Until one achieves the point that he realizes and acknowledges the Source of the funds in his possession, he cannot achieve *yidvenu libo*. As

long as one considers the funds to be his own, he will never achieve the level of *yidvenu libo*. The *Satmar Rav, zl*, was an extraordinary *baal tzedakah*, serving as the address for every hard-luck story, every Jew who required financial assistance. He once asked a wealthy Jew to increase his annual stipend. The man replied, "*Rebbe*, with my ten fingers (he raised both hands), I slaved to make my fortune." The *Rebbe* replied, "By us (in our Torah circles), these "ten fingers" are referred to as *siyata diShmaya*, Heavenly assistance. Nothing – absolutely nothing – is achieved without Hashem's will that it succeed. Without Hashem, one is unable to accomplish anything. While most of us know this, we sustain this awareness only until we "make it." Once the achievement occurs, we soon forget what we have believed and acknowledged all the time. Now it is all our own expertise, acumen, etc. that catalyzed our growth and success. Hashem is conveniently replaced with *kochi v'otzem yadi*, "My power and the might of my hand" (*Devarim* 8:17). *Rav* Gamliel explains that this was the role which the *gizbarim*, treasurers, played in the *Mishkan.* They oversaw the collection and appropriation of the funds used for the construction of the sanctuary in the wilderness. They understood the true motives behind the contributions. Deeply righteous men, who were Divinely inspired to peer deep into the souls of those who stood before them with their contributions, these men were not swayed by a person's station in life, lineage, or material assets. They looked for one thing: Money that people gave out of purity of heart and faith. The Jew who fully understands that whatever he possesses is from Hashem, is worthy of contributing to the *Mishkan*. *Rav* Gamliel remembers years earlier when he would often attend the *melave malkah* gathering at the *Baal HaTanya shul* in Meah Shearim. Many of the *chassidei Chabad* who lived in the area would attend this festive celebration of escorting out the *Shabbos* Queen. The tables were decked with food galore for everyone to partake. One man, named *Rav* Yehudah Levin prepared and sponsored the weekly event. It was apparent from his extreme devotion to this endeavor that it held lofty spiritual significance to him. When asked why this *melave malkah* was so special to him, *Rav* Yehudah explained that, years earlier, he had visited the *Lubavitcher Rebbe, zl*, who asked him, "Who sponsors *melave malkah* at the shul?" *Rav* Yehudah replied, "I do." "You are mistaken," the *Rebbe* countered. "You are not the one who gives. Hashem gives! Hashem gives everything!" These words penetrated *Rav* Yehudah's heart. He believed *be'emunah sheleimah*, with complete faith, that everything is "sponsored by" Hashem. If this is the case, why not spend more and prepare a lavish *melave malkah* for all to enjoy? He would "bill" it to Hashem's "account." This is the meaning of *tikchu es Terumasi*, "You shall take My portion. You shall be aware that when you are giving, you are actually *taking* from My portion which I have deposited with you for your surrogate spending."

---

from: **Ohr Somayach** <ohr@ohr.edu>
date: Feb 27, 2020, 6:30 AM
subject: **Torah Weekly - Parshat Teruma**
Parshat Teruma
by Rabbi Yaakov Asher Sinclair - www.seasonsofthemoon.com
PARSHA OVERVIEW
Hashem commands Moshe to build a Mishkan (Sanctuary) and supplies him with detailed instructions. The Bnei Yisrael are asked to contribute precious metals and stones, fabrics, skins, oil and spices. In the Mishkan's outer courtyard is an altar for the burnt offerings and a laver for washing. The Tent of Meeting is divided by a curtain into two chambers. The outer chamber is accessible only to the Kohanim, the descendants of Aharon. This contains the table of showbreads, the menorah, and the golden altar for incense. The innermost chamber, the Holy of Holies, may be entered only by the Kohen Gadol, and only once a year, on Yom Kippur. Here is the ark that held the Ten Commandments inscribed on the two tablets of stone which Hashem gave to the Jewish nation on Mount Sinai. All of the utensils and vessels, as well as the construction of the Mishkan, are described in great detail.
PARSHA INSIGHTS
Being a Mensch
"And let them take for Me a portion, from every man whose heart motivates him, you shall take My portion." (25:2)
"Being a mensch" is one of those untranslatable Yiddish phrases which define what it means to be Jewish.
A few years ago an El Al flight to London was carrying a young child in need of an urgent and critical operation. Apart from the child's medical problem, there was another problem: money. The parents had barely enough to cover the cost of the flight to London, which involved the purchase of a whole row of seats to accommodate the stricken child and his medical support systems.
During the flight, a religious Jew who was traveling in first class came to the back of the plane to pray with a minyan. On his way back to his seat he went over to the father of the child and asked how the child was doing. In the course of the conversation the father mentioned he had no idea how he was going to be able to cover the cost of the operation. He was already way over his head in debt with the medical expenses that he had already incurred. He would need nothing short of a small miracle.
Without further ado the man took his leave, walked back to the first class cabin, pulled out his hat, and proceeded to tour the aisles of the first-class cabin collecting for the operation. In approximately ten minutes his hat contained checks to the value of some $100,000, sufficient for both the operation and the flights and all the medical expenses to date.
If Jews excel at anything, it's tzedaka — charity.
"Charity," however, really doesn't translate the word tzedaka. Tzedaka means "righteousness." Unfortunately, as we live in a largely selfish and unrighteous world, the
word righteousness usually finds itself being used with the reflexive pronoun "self" as in "self-righteous." However, "righteousness" is no more than "rightness," doing what is right. A Jew gives tzedaka not because its charity, not because he is charitable, but because that's what's right. The definition of what is right is what G-d wants. Thus, ultimately we give tzedaka not because our hearts reach out to the plight of others but because that's what G-d wants from us.
"And let them take for Me a portion, from every man whose heart motivates him, you shall take My portion."
There are three kinds of tzedaka, and they are all hinted at in this verse.
The highest level is "let them take for Me a portion." Here the giving is "for Me" — because that's what G-d wants us to do. The second level is when we give tzedaka out of the kindness of our hearts because we cannot bear to see the suffering of the poor — "From every man whose heart motivates him." Noble as it is, this is not the highest level of giving.
And the third level is the person who would really prefer not to give at all, but he is too embarrassed to say no. About him the verse says, "You shall take My portion."
No one will ever know from which of these groups were the passengers in that first-class El Al cabin, but one thing is clear: whatever a Jew's motives, he knows what it means to be a mensch.
Source: Nachalat Chamisha in Iturei Torah

---

from: Rabbi Sacks <info@rabbisacks.org>
date: Feb 26, 2020, 2:37 PM
What Do We Receive When We Give?
(Terumah 5780) (Exodus 25:1-27:19)
by Rabbi Lord Jonathan Sacks
Attaining dignity through giving.
The Lord spoke to Moses, saying, "Tell the Israelites to take an offering for Me; take My offering from all whose heart moves them to give" (Ex. 25:1-2).

Our parsha marks a turning point in the relationship between the Israelites and God. Ostensibly what was new was the product: the Sanctuary, the travelling home for the Divine Presence as the people journeyed through the wilderness.

But a case could be made for saying that even more than the product was the process, summed up in the word that gives our parsha its name, Terumah, meaning, a gift, a contribution, an offering. The parsha is telling us something very profound. Giving confers dignity. Receiving does not.

Until that moment, the Israelites had been recipients. Virtually everything they had experienced had been God-given. He had redeemed them from Egypt, liberated them from slavery, led them through the wilderness, and created a path for them through the sea. When they were hungry, He gave them food. When they were thirsty, He gave them water. Apart from the battle against the Amalekites, they had done almost nothing for themselves.

Though at every physical level this was an unparalleled deliverance, the psychological effects were not good. The Israelites became dependent, expectant, irresponsible and immature. The Torah chronicles their repeated complaints. Reading them, we feel that they were an ungrateful, querulous, petulant people.

Yet, what else were they to do? They couldn't have crossed the sea by themselves. They couldn't have found food or water in the wilderness. What produced results was complaining. The people complained to Moshe. Moshe turned to God. God performed a miracle. The result was that, from the people's perspective, complaining worked.

Now, however, God gave them something else entirely. It had nothing to do with physical need and everything to do with psychological, moral and spiritual need. God gave them the opportunity to give.

One of my memories, still blazing through the mists of forgotten time, goes back to when I was a child, perhaps six or seven years old. I was blessed by very caring, and also very protective, parents. Life had not given them many chances, and they were determined that we, their four sons, should have some of the opportunities they were denied. My late father of blessed memory took immense pride in me, his firstborn son.

It seemed to me very important to show him my gratitude. But what could I possibly give him? Whatever I had, I had received from my mother and him. It was a completely asymmetrical relationship.

Eventually, in some shop I found a plastic model of a silver trophy. Underneath it was a plaque that read, "To the best father in the world." Today, all these years later, I cringe at the memory of that object. It was cheap, banal, almost comically absurd. What was unforgettable, though, was what he did after I had given it to him.

I can't remember what he said, or whether he even smiled. What I do remember is that he placed it on his bedside table, where it remained - humble, trite - for all the years that I was living at home.

He allowed me to give him something, and then showed that the gift mattered to him. In that act, he gave me dignity. He let me see that I could give even to someone who had given me all I had.

There is a strange provision of Jewish law that embodies this idea. "Even a poor person who is dependent on tzedakah (charity) is obligated to give tzedakah to another person."[1] On the face of it, this makes no sense at all. Why should a person who depends on charity be obligated to give charity? The principle of tzedakah is surely that one who has more than he or she needs should give to one who has less than he or she needs. By definition, someone who is dependent on tzedakah does not have more than they need.

The truth is, however, that tzedakah is not only directed to people's physical needs but also their psychological situation. To need and receive tzedakah is, according to one of Judaism's most profound insights, inherently humiliating. As we say in Birkat ha-Mazon, "Please, O Lord our God, do not make us dependent on the gifts or loans of other people, but only on Your full, open, holy and generous hand so that we may suffer neither shame nor humiliation for ever and for all time."

Many of the laws of tzedakah reflect this fact, such that it is preferable that the giver does not know to whom they give, and the recipient does not know from whom they receive. According to a famous ruling of Maimonides the highest of all levels of tzedakah is, "to fortify a fellow Jew and give him a gift, a loan, form with him a partnership, or find work for him, until he is strong enough so that he does not need to ask others [for sustenance]."[1] This is not charity at all in the conventional sense. It is finding someone employment or helping them start a business. Why then should it be the highest form of tzedakah? Because it is giving someone back their dignity.

Someone who is dependent on tzedakah has physical needs, and these must be met by other people or by community as a whole. But he or she also has psychological needs. That is why Jewish law rules that they must give to others. Giving confers dignity, and no one should be deprived of it.

The entire account of the construction of the Mishkan, the Sanctuary, is very strange indeed. King Solomon said in his address on the dedication of the Temple in Jerusalem, "But will God really dwell on earth? Even the heavens to their uttermost reaches cannot contain You, how much less this House that I have built!" (1 Kings 8:27). If that applied to the Temple in all its glory, how much more so of the Mishkan, a tiny, portable shrine made of beams and hangings that could be dismantled every time the people journeyed and reassembled every time they encamped. How could that possibly be a home for the God who created the universe, brought empires to their knees, performed miracles and wonders, and whose presence was almost unbearable in its intensity?

Yet, in its small but human way, I think what my father did when he put my cheap plastic gift by his bedside all those years ago was perhaps the most generous thing he did for me. And, lehavdil, meaning no comparison, what God did when he allowed the Israelites to present him with offerings, and out of them to make a kind of home for the Divine Presence, was an act of immense if paradoxical generosity.

It also tells us something very profound about Judaism. God wants us to have dignity. We are not tainted by original sin. We are not incapable of good without Divine grace. Faith is not mere submission. We are God's image, His children, His ambassadors, His partners, His emissaries. He wants us not merely to receive but also to give. And He is willing to live in the home we build for Him, however humble, however small.

This is hinted in the word that gives our parsha its name: Terumah. This is usually translated as an offering, a contribution. It really means something we lift. The paradox of giving is that when we lift something to give to another, it is we ourselves who are lifted.

I believe that what elevates us in life is not what we receive but what we give. The more of ourselves that we give, the greater we become.

Shabbat shalom.

NOTES 1. Rambam, Mishneh Torah, Hilchot Mattenot Aniyim 7:5. 2. Ibid., 10:7.

---

from: Project Genesis <genesis@torah.org>
to: weekly-halacha@torah.org
date: Feb 26, 2020, 4:14 PM
by **Rabbi Doniel Neustadt** (dneustadt@cordetroit.com)
subject: W**eekly Halacha - Mishloach Manos: The Basic Mitzvah**

Dedicated to the speedy recovery of Mordechai ben Chaya

Parshas Terumah Mishloach Manos: The Basic Mitzvah A discussion of Halachic topics related to the Parsha of the week. For final rulings, consult your Rav.

Mordechai and Esther, with the approval of the Rabbis of the time, introduced a mitzvas assei(1) which obligates every person to send two different kinds of foods to one friend on Purim. Two basic reasons are given for this mitzvah:

There are impoverished people who are too embarrassed to collect tzedakah for themselves and will therefore not have food for the seudas Purim. By

establishing a system whereby everyone receives packages of food on Purim, the rabbis ensured that even the most reticent of individuals will have food for the Purim seudah(2).

Sending food to a friend or an acquaintance is an expression of goodwill and fraternity. On Purim we wish to instill and perpetuate these feelings(3).

The goals of both of these reasons must be met in order to fulfill the mitzvah properly. For instance: One who sends clothing for mishloach manos does not fulfill the mitzvah(4) since he did nothing for his friend's Purim meal. Similarly, one who sends mishloach manos anonymously does not fulfill the mitzvah(5) since no friendship or goodwill is generated between him and the recipient.

Nowadays, we are witness to a marked proliferation of mishloach manos. Although mishloach manos is a relatively easy mitzvah to fulfill, if one is unaware of the halachos, he could send dozens of mishloach manos and still not properly fulfill the mitzvah. In addition, a clear distinction must be drawn between the minimum requirements for fulfilling the mitzvah, and the hiddur mitzvah, the more exacting form of fulfilling the mitzvah. There are also some little known halachos which are important for those who wish to fulfill the mitzvah according to the views of all the poskim. We have thus split the halachos into two parts – the first part discusses the basic rules, and the second part discusses chumros and hiddurim for those who wish to embellish upon this once-a-year mitzvah.

MISHLOACH MANOS: THE BASIC RULES

1.Who should send: Men and women are personally obligated in this mitzvah(6). Married women are obligated in their own right and are not exempted by their husband's mishloach manos(7). It is sufficient, however, for husband and wife to send mishloach manos together, as if it is coming from both of them – and the recipient recognizing that it is coming from both(8).

Some poskim hold that children over 13 – even those who are being supported by their parents – are obligated(9), while others exempt them since they do not own anything in their own right(10).

Parents should educate their children in the mitzvah of mishloach manos as they do with every mitzvah(11).

2. What to send: Any combination of two kinds of food(12), or one food and one drink(13), or two kinds of drink(14), is sufficient. Two pieces of the same food are considered as one food(15). Some poskim(16) specify that the foods be ready to eat and require no further cooking, while others(17) allow even uncooked foods to be sent.

3.To whom to send: To any Jewish(18) adult(19), wealthy or poor, with whom you are acquainted or to whom you are related. Although men should send to men only and women to women only(20), families may send to each other(21).

Mishloach manos should not be sent to a mourner(22) during the year of mourning for his parents, or during the thirty days of mourning for other relatives(23). A mourner who receives mishloach manos need not return them, and the sender fulfills his mitzvah by sending those mishloach manos(24). It is permitted for a woman to send to the wife of a mourner(25).

A mourner must send mishloach manos – even if he is in the middle of shivah. A mourner should refrain from sending "items of simchah" (items that elicit laughter and merriment)(26).

4.When to send: Mishloach Manos should be sent and received on Purim day(27). If it is received at night or on the days before or after Purim, the sender does not fulfill the mitzvah(28). If it is sent before Purim but is received on Purim, some poskim hold that the mitzvah is fulfilled(29) while others hold that it is not(30).

5.How to send: The sender himself may deliver the mishloach manos directly to the recipient(31). Some poskim(32) hold that it is preferable to send it via a messenger. The messenger may be a minor or a non-Jew(33). When sending with a messenger, it is proper to verify that the mishloach manos was indeed delivered(34), especially if the messenger is a minor or a non-Jew(35).

MISHLOACH MANOS: CHUMROS and HIDDURIM(36)

1. What to send: One should send foods which will be eaten at the seudas Purim(37).

A wealthy person who sends inexpensive items of food does not fulfill the mitzvah. In order for his mishloach manos to be considered as an expression of friendship, its cost must be relative to the sender's wealth(38).

One who sends inexpensive food items to a wealthy person does not fulfill the mitzvah, since such items are meaningless and unappreciated by him(39).

The minimum amount of mishloach manos is a meal's worth, about 6-7 fl. oz. of food(40). Other poskim require that one send no less of a meal [in volume] than one would normally serve a guest(41).

It is better to send two kinds of food than one food and one drink42 or two kinds of drink(43).

Two different kinds of fruit are considered as one food(44).

Two different kinds of wine, e.g., red wine and white wine, are considered as one kind of drink(45).

It is better not to send an item which the sender himself would not eat because of kashrus considerations(46).

To whom to send: One who sends mishloach manos as acknowledgment of a favor rendered to the sender does not fulfill the mitzvah(47).

One who sends mishloach manos to his enemy(48) or to a complete stranger(49) does not fulfill the mitzvah.

It is questionable if mishloach manos can be sent to one who is too drunk to be aware of having received them(50).

2. When to send: The mishloach manos should be sent as early as possible, but not before the reading of the megillah on Purim morning(51).

One who is traveling and will not be home must still send mishloach manos and cannot rely on a messenger or his family in another city to fulfill his obligation(52). If, however, he specifically appoints another person to send it for him, that is sufficient(53).

3.How to send: The two kinds of food or drink should not be placed in one utensil (plate or bowl), since the utensil combines them into one kind(54).

FOOTNOTES:

1 The poskim (see Achiezer 3:73) refer to this mitzvah as a mitzvah mi-divrei kabbalah, a rabbinical mitzvah which is incorporated into the written text (Esther 9:22). Accordingly, we do not say safek d'Rabbanan l'kulah in regard to the mitzvos of Purim (Tzafnas Panei'ach to Rambam Megillah 1:1).

2 Terumas ha-Deshen 111.

3 R' Shlomo Alkavatz in Manos ha-Levi quoted in Teshuvos Chasam Sofer O.C. 196.

4 Mishnah Berurah 695:20.

5 Kesav Sofer O.C. 141.

6 Rama O.C. 695:4.

7 Magen Avraham 695:12; Chayei Adam 155:33; Kitzur Shulchan Aruch 142:4; Mishnah Berurah 695:25; Aruch ha-Shulchan 695:18.

8 Harav S.Z. Auerbach (written responum quoted in Halichos Bas Yisrael, pg. 303 and oral ruling quoted in Halichos Beisah, pg. 354). Accordingly, the amount sent should be double the minimum amount of mishloach manos.

9 Aruch ha-Shulchan 694:2 (concerning matanos la-evyonim); Orchos Chayim 695:2 quoting Me'orei Ohr.

10 Responsa Kinyan Torah 1:132. It follows that if the children have their own possessions, then they are obligated like any adult.

11 Pri Megadim 695:14; Eishel Avraham 695; Kaf ha-Chayim 695:57. This means that parents should give their children food or money so that they can fulfill the mitzvah ??Chanoch l'Na'ar, pg. 66. See, however, Kinyan Torah 1:132 who holds that it is sufficient chinuch to allow the children to deliver the mishloach manos.

12 O.C. 695:4.

13 Mishnah Berurah 695:20.

14 Aruch ha-Shulchan 695:14.

15 Ibid. See Tzitz Eliezer 14:65; 15:31.

16 Magen Avraham 695:11; Ma'asei Rav 249; Chayei Adam 135:31; Kitzur Shulchan Aruch 142:2; Aruch ha-Shulchan 695:15.

17 Pri Chadash O.C. 695; Ha'amek Sh'eilah 67:9; Shevet Sofer O.C. 23; Yechaveh Da'as 6:45. Mishnah Berurah 695:20 quotes both views without rendering a decision.

18 Responsa Beis Yitzchak (Y.D. 2:142).

19 Aruch ha-Shulchan 695:18 rules that one fulfills the mitzvah by sending to a minor, but many poskim (Ya'avetz 1:121, Yad Sofer 24; Kaf ha-Chayim 694:12; Birur Halachah, pg. 405) rule that one does not fulfill the mitzvah in that manner.
20 Rama 695:4.
21 Harav S.Z. Auerbach (oral ruling quoted in Halichos Beisah, pg. 354).
22 Unless he is the rav of the city ?? Divrei Malkiel 5:237.
23 Rama O.C. 696:6.
24 Kesav Sofer O.C. 139.
25 Harav S.Y. Elyashiv (oral ruling quoted in Penei Baruch, pg. 322).
26 Mishnah Berurah 696:18.
27 Rama 695:4.
28 Aruch ha-Shulchan 695:16.
29 Be'er Heitev 695:7 quoting Yad Aharon; Responsa Beis She'arim O.C. 381; Chelkas Ya'akov 1:102.
30 Aruch ha-Shulchan 695:17; Levushei Mordechai O.C. 108.
31 Yehudah Ya'aleh O.C. 207; Eishel Avraham 695; Kaf ha-Chayim 695:41; Tzitz Eliezer 9:33.
32 Mekor Chayim 694; Binyan Tziyon 44 quoted by Mishnah Berurah 695:18; Chasam Sofer (Gitin 22b).
33 Chasam Sofer (Gitin 22b); R' Shlomo Kluger (Sefer ha-Chayim 695); Da'as Torah 695:4; Chelkas Ya'akov 1:103.
34 Achiezer 3:73.
35 Chelkas Ya'akov 1:104.
36 The following is a list of hiddurim that, if possible, one should follow for at least one set of mishloach manos so that he fulfills the mitzvah in accordance with all views. See note 1.
37 This is because the main purpose of mishloach manos is so that everyone will have a proper Purim meal,?see Ma'asei Rav 249.
38 Yad Dovid (Megillah 7a); Sdei Chemed, Purim 6.
39 Beiur Halachah 695:4 based on Ritva and Chayei Adam.
40 Sha'arei Teshuvah 694:1 quoting Zera Yaakov 11 concerning matanos la-evyonim. See Zera Ya'akov who rules the same way concerning mishloach manos.
41 Rosh Yosef, Megillah 7b; Eishel Avraham (Butchatch) 695; Aruch ha-Shulchan 695:15.
42 Nitei Gavriel, pg. 106 quoting several poskim based on R' Chananel (Megillah 7a).
43 Beis Yitzchak (Megillah 7b) based on the words of the Shelah.
44 See Rosh Yosef (Megillah 7a, quoted in Nitei Gavriel, pg. 107) who does not clearly decide this issue.
45 Orchos Chayim 695 quoting Tikkun Moshe.
46 See Chochmas Shelomo 695:4 and Maharam Shick O.C. 341.
47 Tzfnas Panei'ach (Rambam Hilchos Megillah 2:15).
48 Orchos Chayim 695:4 quoted in Nitei Gavriel, pg. 109. See, however, Pele Yoetz (Purim) who recommends sending mishloach manos as a way of settling disputes between people.
49 Harav M. Feinstein (oral ruling quoted in Ohalei Yeshurun, pg. 58).
50 See Nitei Gavriel, pg. 114.
51 Based on Mishnah Berurah 692:1 who says that the shehecheyanu recited at the daytime reading of the megillah applies to mishloach manos as well. Additionally, there is a view that holds that one who sends mishloach manos before the megillah does not fulfill his obligation altogether (Nitei Gavriel, pg. 125 quoting Tikkun Moshe, pg. 92).
52 Aruch ha-Shulchan 696:3; Mikra'ei Kodesh 39.
53 Aruch ha-Shulchan 695:16.
54 Ben Ish Chai, Tetzaveh 16 and in Torah Lishmah 189. Most poskim are not concerned with this.

Rabbi Neustadt is the principal of Yavne Teachers' College in Cleveland, Ohio. He is also the Magid Shiur of a daily Mishna Berurah class at Congregation Shomre Shabbos.

The Weekly-Halacha Series is distributed L'zchus Hayeled Doniel Meir ben Hinda. Weekly sponsorships are available–please send email to the moderator, Dr. Jeffrey Gross jgross@torah.org.

The series is distributed by the Harbotzas Torah Division of Congregation Shomre Shabbos, 1801 South Taylor Road, Cleveland Heights, Ohio 44118–HaRav Yisroel Grumer, Marah D'Asra

---

rom: Aish.com <newsletterserver@aish.com> via em.secureserver.net
date: Feb 27, 2020, 8:59 AM

Coronavirus and the Biblical Quarantine
Rabbi Benjamin Blech

Public health officials around the world are desperately trying to cope with the spread of the coronavirus. There is growing fear that a global pandemic may be impossible to stop. So far, this respiratory illness has infected more than 75,000 people and killed at least 2000 to the best of our knowledge. Cruise ships, unwitting tourists, travelers and others are slowly transmitting this angel of death to destinations far from its Chinese source.

Modern medicine, with all of its miracles, is stymied. There is no cure. The best and only solution for now is quarantine. Those suspected of being carriers need to be isolated. Contact with the infected is simply too dangerous.

There is a biblical parallel of quarantine that Jewish scholars viewed from a moral perspective.

The book of Leviticus describes the metzora, a person afflicted with tzara'at, a disease commonly mistranslated as leprosy. In fact, the disease is a spiritual malady, primarily caused by speaking slander about others. The metzora is someone who was, in Hebrew, motzi ra - an originator of evil talk, and he was to be quarantined, sent outside of the camp, sparing the community from his ability to infect others with his destructive gossip.

Thus, the biblical quarantine was intended not to isolate a carrier of physical disease but rather of moral turpitude.

While we hope to find a cure for the coronavirus, let us derive an ethical lesson from the ongoing misfortune. Everyone acknowledges the obvious: we dare not allow the healthy to be exposed to those who can harm them.

Isn't this the most fundamental truth about human relationships?

Friends are assuredly good for you. In recent years, scientific research has suggested that people who have strong friendships experience less stress, they recover more quickly from heart attacks and they are likely to live longer than the friendless. They are even less susceptible to the common cold, studies show.

But not all friends have such a salutary effect. Some lie, insult and betray. Some are overly needy. Some give too much advice. Psychologists and sociologists are now calling attention to the negative health effects of bad friends.

Do not underestimate the warning of King Solomon in his book of Proverbs: "He that walks with wise men shall be wise: but a companion of fools shall be destroyed" (Proverbs 13:20).

['Screaming Mary' VP from US hostage crisis has ...nypost.com › 2020/02/27 › irans-screaming-mary-vp-from-1979-us-... 14 hours ago - Masoumeh Ebtekar, an Iranian vice president who is better known as the infamous "**Screaming Mary**" during the 1979 US hostage crisis, has been diagnosed with the coronavirus, according to reports...]

---

from: Chabad.org <learntorah@chabad.org>
date: Feb 26, 2020, 12:17 PM
subject: TORAH STUDIES: Parshat Terumah

Terumah

Adapted by Rabbi Jonathan Sacks; From the teachings of the Lubavitcher Rebbe

The Jew faces a paradox when he considers himself: In the eyes of G-d all Jews are equal: They each have a soul whose source is from G-d ("And he breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and the man became a living soul"); but the Jew is an embodied souland in his attributes—intelligence, temperament and strength of will—each is different. Clearly the Jew is called to exercise his individuality to the full; and yet he is supposed constantly to be animated by the life of the soul through which he comes into relation with G-d and in which he stands as no more and no less than any other Jew. How are we to reconcile these two aspects? Where do man's sameness and his distinctness fit into the life of Torah? These are the questions explored in this Sicha.

1. The Three Kinds of Terumah

Terumah means a contribution for sacred purposes, something which the Israelites gave for the building and maintenance of the Sanctuary; and our Sidra, in detailing the plans for its construction, describes the form that these contributions should take. There were three kinds of Terumah:1

(i) Shekalim: The annual contribution of half-a-shekel that was to pay for the sacrifices;

(ii) The once-only payment of a half-a-shekel to provide for the sockets (Adanim) of the sanctuary;

(iii) The provision of the materials and the coverings of the Sanctuary, which again was a once-only contribution, ceasing once it was built.

The first, in other words, was a perpetual offering, persisting all the while the Sanctuary and the Temple existed,2 and still commemorated today, in the donation of half of the common unit of currency, before Purim.3 The second and third, however, were limited in time to the actual period of construction.

What interest, then, can they have for us today? The answer is that the Torah is eternal, meaning that its every detail has some relevant implication for all Jews at all times. And especially so for the details of the Sanctuary, for we read of it, "And they shall make Me a Sanctuary, and I shall dwell in them,"4 whose meaning is that G-d's presence will rest not only in the Sanctuary itself but also in the heart of each Jew. So that even if the physical building is destroyed, a Jew can construct his own sanctuary of the soul, as an inward correlate of the once-external place. And each detail of its construction will mirror the precise practical directives contained in this and the subsequent Sidrot.

2.The Foundation and the Building of the Sanctuary

The terumat ha-adanim (the offering for the sockets) was obligatory, everyone had to give an equal amount (half-a-shekel), and was for the foundation of the sanctuary. The terumat ha-mishkan (provision of materials) was voluntary, of diverse kinds, and was for the structure itself, and its coverings.

If we are to find their analogues in the inner life of the Jew, the adanim must be the original act of kabalat ol—the gesture of submission to G-d's will, when one foregoes one's independent existence and becomes a vehicle through which the Torah flows. For this act is one in which all men are equal—it does not depend on the particularized capacities of intellect or emotion; it is not the exercise of a power but a state of receptivity. And it is the foundation of all true service, for without it a man is always distant from G-d. If his thoughts and desires form a closed circle, there is no gap through which revelation can enter.

The Mishkan, on the other hand, is that which is built on the foundation. It is the articulation of one's faith and its suffusion through one's mind and heart. In this each man is different, because intellectual powers and temperament are not evenly distributed, and the extent to which he can grasp in thought, or allow his emotions to be refashioned by, the awareness of G-d which he has achieved through kabbalat ol, will depend on his particular capacities.

3. Inward Forms

What are the forms in which these inner activities are expressed? The adanim correspond to prayer, for prayer is the foundation and initiation of a man's daily service. The Mishkan, however, belongs to the realm of learning and action. Through learning, the molten energies aroused in prayer are shaped into thought and action, to be finally enacted in the practical world. Learning and action are the structure and outer covering of which prayer is the support and the animating spirit.

4. A Paradox

But in both the adanim and the Mishkan we can unearth a paradox, one that finds its way correspondingly into prayer on the one hand and learning and action on the other.

The fact that the terumat ha-adanim had to be brought in equal amounts by everyone suggests at a deeper level that the inner powers which it summoned forth were equal amongst men, and this is what was suggested by relating it to kabbalat ol, the gesture of submission which each man can make in the same way. If so, why was it that it was commanded only of men;5 why did it exclude women and children who were no less able to make the gesture? Similarly why is regular prayer commanded only to men,6 while in prayer all are equal, for each reads the same words?

On the other hand the provision for the Mishkan could be offered by anyone,7 women and children included. Yet the Mishkan stands for learning and action, precisely those areas where individual differences count and where, if anywhere, we would expect to find discrimination as to who may or may not participate. And similarly, we find that learning and action themselves are demanded of all, albeit suited to the particular individual: Some men are required to spend more time learning, some less, according to their situation;8 women learn those laws which are applicable to their situation;9 men must perform all of the Mitzvot; while women are released from positive commands which are bound up with a specific time.

5. The Foundation of Prayer and Action

The answer is that kabbalat ol lies even deeper than prayer. Its place is in the simple words of recognition and thanks that every Jew must say when he wakes in the morning, the Modeh Ani ("I make acknowledgment before You, living and enduring King, who has restored to me my soul in mercy great is Your faithfulness"). We say this even before washing our hands, which is necessary before all other prayer, because it comes from so deeply-embedded a recognition that however unprepared we may be for prayer in general, we are always in a position to utter these words.

When we turn later to prayer, we are transmitting this nascent awareness into something we can understand and feel. And because our intellectual and emotional capacities are finite, we must put it into a form of words. But because we pray in the aftermath of the act of kabbalat ol, we still stand as equals in submission, so each must use the same words. We are now using our particular powers, but in the light of the equality of souls.

So likewise does the paradox resolve itself in the case of the Mishkan, which is for us the symbol of learning and action. In action, unlike prayer, there is no limitation of finitude: We must seek to enact G-d's will everywhere. Hence it must devolve on all. But each in his own way. The scope of any individual's involvement in the world is bounded by his capacities and his situation. So neither the offering for the Mishkan nor the parallel acts of learning and Mitzvot, have set limits, even though they are asked of everyone.

6. Building an Inner Sanctuary

So we can see that an apparent anachronism—the terumot of the adanim and the Mishkan—which has no physical application today, in fact describes the precise manner in which a man must seek to build his own sanctuary within himself, and thus create a space for G-d's presence.

First, he must lay the foundation by the act of accepting G-d's will as his own, which he does in the Modeh Ani with his first waking words;

Second, he must articulate this foundation into thought and feeling, in the fixed forms of prayer (the adanim);

Third, he must realize its implication for his actions, by learning, which is the discrimination between acts which are in accord with G-d's will and those which are not;

Lastly, he must emerge into the world of action and embody there what has been transmitted to him in the prior stages of service (Mishkan).

These are the foundations, the walls and the coverings, of his personal sanctuary, ever recreated day by day, evolving as they do from what is most universal to what is most particular in his nature; and in this way he is able to admit G-d into the very depths of his being.

(Source: Likkutei Sichot, Vol. XI pp. 109-122 (adapted))

FOOTNOTES 1. Jerusalem Talmud, Shekalim, 1:1. 2. Rambam, beg. Hilchot Shekalim. 3. Shulchan Aruch, Orach Chaim, ch. 694. 4. Shemot 25:8. 5. Ibid., 38:26-7. 6. Berachot, 20a; Rambam, Hilchot Kriat Shema, 4:1; Shulchan Aruch, Orach Chaim, ch. 70. 7. Cf. Shemot 35:22. 8. Shulchan Aruch Harav, Hilchot Talmud Torah, 3:5. 9. Ibid., end ch. 1.

Adapted by Rabbi Jonathan Sacks; From the teachings of the Lubavitcher Rebbe

fw from hamelaket@gmail.com
from: **Rabbi Yirmiyohu Kaganoff** <ymkaganoff@gmail.com>
to: kaganoff-a@googlegroups.com

When May I Ask a Non-Jew for Help on Shabbos?

Rabbi Yirmiyohu Kaganoff

Each of the following questions is an actual situation about which I was asked:

Question #1: My car needs repair work, and the most convenient time to drop it off at Angelo's Service Station is Friday afternoon. May I bring Angelo the car then, knowing that he is going to repair it on Shabbos?

Question #2: A gala Shabbos sheva brachos is being held at an apartment several flights of stairs below street level, a very common situation in hilly Yerushalayim. The kallah's elderly grandmother arrived before Shabbos by elevator, intending to return home by using the Shabbos elevator (a subject I hope to discuss at a different time iy'H). Indeed, the building's elevator actually has a Shabbos setting, but we discover on Shabbos that the Shabbos setting is not working. How does Bubby get home?

Question #3: My friend lives in a neighborhood that does not have an eruv. She arranges before Shabbos for a non-Jew to push the baby carriage on Shabbos. May she do this?

Question #4: "If this contract does not arrive at its destination ASAP, I could suffer huge losses. May I mail it as an express mail package on Friday?"

Question #5: "If a registered letter arrives on Shabbos, may I ask the letter carrier to sign for me?"

Many people are under the mistaken impression that one may ask a non-Jew to do any prohibited activity on Shabbos. This is not accurate. I know of many instances in which someone asked a non-Jew to do work in situations in which making such a request is prohibited. Our Sages prohibited asking a non-Jew to work for us on Shabbos out of concern that this diminishes our sensitivity to doing melacha ourselves (Rambam, Hilchos Shabbos 6:1). Also, Chazal considered the non-Jew to be my agent -- thus, if he works for me on Shabbos, it is considered that I worked on Shabbos through a hired agent (Rashi, Shabbos 153a s.v. mai taama). By the way, the halachos of amira lenochri, asking a non-Jew to perform a prohibited activity, are not restricted to the laws of Shabbos, but apply to all mitzvos of the Torah. Thus, it is prohibited to have a non-Jew muzzle your animal while it works (see Bava Metzia 90a; Shulchan Aruch Choshen Mishpat 338:6), ask him to graft fruit trees, nor ask a non-Jew to do prohibited work on Chol Hamoed (Moed Katan 12a).

There are many complicated details governing when I may ask a non-Jew to do something on Shabbos and when I may not. These are some of the factors that one must consider: A. Is the non-Jew my employee or is he an "independent contractor"? B. What type of benefit do I receive from his work? C. Did I ask the non-Jew directly or indirectly? D. If a Jew were to perform the work, would it be prohibited min haTorah or only miderabbanan? E. Why do I want him to do this work? F. Could I do the work myself, albeit in a different way from how the non-Jew is likely to do it?

To show how these details affect a practical case, I will analyze the halachic issues involved in each of our cases mentioned above, starting with our first case -- leaving the car over Shabbos at a non-Jewish mechanic. The important detail here is that I did not ask the non-Jew to do the work on Shabbos – it is prohibited to do so. Instead, I brought him the car and allowed him to decide whether to do the work on Shabbos. Is he now my agent if he works on Shabbos?

AGENT VERSUS CONTRACTOR

There is a halachic difference whether the non-Jew is working as my agent (or employee) or whether he is an independent contractor who makes his own decisions. If he is my agent, I may not allow him to do prohibited activity on Shabbos. However, if he is an independent contractor, under certain circumstances, I am not responsible if he actually does the work on Shabbos.

When is the non-Jew considered a contractor? If the non-Jew decides on his own when to do the work and I hired him by the job, he is a contractor. In these cases, I may give him work that he might decide to perform on Shabbos, provided that he could do the work on a different day and that he does the work on his own premises. (Under certain circumstances, the last condition is waived.)

What are examples of contractors? The mailman, the repairman who repairs items on his own premises, and the dry cleaner are all contractors. On the other hand, a regular employee whom I ask to do work on Shabbos is not a contractor unless I pay him extra for this job.

Thus, I may drop off my car at the auto mechanic before Shabbos and leave it over Shabbos, provided I allow him time to do the work when it is not Shabbos, either on Friday afternoon or Motza'ei Shabbos. Even though I know that the non-Jewish mechanic will not be working Saturday night and will actually do the work on Shabbos, I need not be concerned, since he could choose to do the work after Shabbos.

However, dropping off my car before Shabbos is permitted only when: (1) He does the work on his own premises. (2) He is paid a fee for the completed job. (3) He decides whether or not he does the work on Shabbos. (It should be noted that some poskim prohibit doing this when the mechanic is closed Motza'ei Shabbos. Since I know that he is closed Motza'ei Shabbos, they consider it asking him to do the work on Shabbos, which is prohibited.) In a similar way, I could bring dry cleaning in on Friday afternoon expecting to pick up the cleaned clothes Saturday night, provided enough time exists to clean the clothes before or after Shabbos. We will now explore our second question: An elderly woman cannot ascend the several flights of stairs necessary to get to street level. The building has a Shabbos elevator, but we discover on Shabbos that the Shabbos setting is not working. How does Bubby get home? Can we have a non-Jew operate the elevator to get her home? Before answering this question, I want to share with you another story:

A DARK SIMCHAS TORAH SHABBOS

The following story occurred on a Simchas Torah in Yerushalayim that fell on Shabbos. (Although Simchas Torah outside Eretz Yisroel cannot occur on Shabbos, Shmini Atzeres, which can fall on Shabbos, is observed in Eretz Yisroel as Simchas Torah.) Just as the hakafos were beginning, the power in the shul went out, plunging the entire shul into darkness. The shul's emergency lights went on, leaving the shul dimly lit -- sufficient for people to exit safely and to dance in honor of Simchas Torah, but certainly making it more difficult to observe the usual Simchas Torah celebrations. The rav of the shul ruled that they could not ask a non-Jew to turn on the lights. If any element of danger had been involved, one could certainly have asked a non-Jew to turn on the lights. But the rav felt that the situation was not dangerous, and therefore maintained that one may not ask a non-Jew to turn on the lights. One of the congregants suggested a way to illuminate the shul. The same idea could get Bubby home! Before presenting his idea, I need to explain two concepts:

BENEFITING FROM A NON-JEW'S ACTION

If a non-Jew does melacha on Shabbos for his own benefit, a Jew may use the results. For example, if a non-Jew builds a ramp to disembark from a boat on Shabbos, a Jew may now exit the boat via the same ramp, since the non-Jew did no additional work in order to benefit the Jew. Similarly, if a non-Jew kindled a light so that he can read, a Jew may now use the light. One may use the light even if the non-Jew and the Jew know one another (Mishnah Shabbos 122a; Rambam 6:2; Shulchan Aruch Orach Chayim 325:11). However, if the non-Jew gathered grass to feed his animals, the Jew cannot let his animals eat the leftover grass if the two people know one another. This is so that the non-Jew will not in the future come to do melacha for the sake of the Jew (Shabbos 122a).

WHAT IS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE RAMP AND THE GRASS?

Why are these cases halachically different? Why may the Jew use the light or the ramp, but may not allow his animal to eat the grass? In the first cases, no additional work is necessary for the non-Jew to provide a ramp or light for the Jew. Once the non-Jew has built the ramp or kindled the light, any number of people can benefit from them without any additional melacha. However, cutting each blade of grass is a separate melacha activity. Thus, allowing one's animal to eat this grass might tempt the non-Jew to cut additional grass for the Jew's animal, which we must avoid.

So far, we have calculated that if we can figure out how to get the non-Jew to turn on the light for his own benefit, one may use the light. Thus, we might be able to turn lights on in the shul for Shabbos, or have a non-Jew ride the elevator up to the main floor and hopefully have Bubby in the elevator at the same time. However, how does one get the non-Jew to turn on the light or the elevator for his own benefit when one may not ask him to do any work on Shabbos?

HINTING

May I hint to a non-Jew that I would like him to perform a prohibited activity on Shabbos? The poskim dispute this issue. Some rule that this is prohibited (Tur Orach Chayim 307), whereas others permit it (Bach, Orach Chayim 307 s.v. uma shekasav rabbeinu). Thus, according to the second opinion, one may ask a non-Jew on Shabbos, "Why didn't you accompany Bubby on the elevator last Shabbos?" even though he clearly understands that you are asking him to take the elevator with her today. According to the first opinion, one may not do this, nor may one ask a non-Jew to clean up something in a dark room, since to do so he must turn on the light. However, the majority of poskim accept an intermediate position, contending that, although one may not hint to a non-Jew on Shabbos, one may hint to him on a weekday (Smag). Thus one may ask him on Friday, "Why didn't you do this last Shabbos? but one may not ask him this on Shabbos (Shulchan Aruch Orach Chayim 307:2; Rema Orach Chayim 307:22). According to this last ruling, one could tell the non-Jew during the week, "Why did you leave Bubby downstairs without taking her up in the elevator?" but one could not mention this to him on Shabbos.

PERMITTED HINTING VERSUS PROHIBITED HINTING

However, the poskim agree that one may tell a non-Jewish mailman on Shabbos, "I cannot read this letter until it is open." What is the difference between the two types of hinting?

The difference is that the forbidden type of hinting implies either a command or a rebuke, whereas the permitted type does not (Magen Avraham 307:31). Telling a non-Jew to clean something up in a dark room on Shabbos is, in essence, commanding him to perform a prohibited activity -- turning on the light. Similarly, when you rebuke him for not doing something last Shabbos, you are basically commanding him to do it the next Shabbos. However, one may make a statement of fact that is neither a command nor a rebuke. Therefore telling the non-Jew, "I cannot read this letter unless it is open" does not command him to do anything, and for this reason it is permitted. However, if the non-Jew then asks me, "Would you like me to open the letter for you?" I may not answer "Yes," since this is itself a command. (It is as if you said, "Yes, I would like you to open the letter for me.") I may tell him, "That's not a bad idea," or "I have no objections to your opening the letter," which does not directly ask him. I may even say, "I am not permitted to ask you to open it on my Sabbath."

How does this discussion affect our dark Simchas Torah or getting Bubby home?

The congregant suggested the following: One could create a situation whereby turning on the light is beneficial for the non-Jew, and then hint to him that if he wants to, he could benefit by turning the light on. One may do this because the non-Jew is turning on the light for his own use, and the Jew did not ask him directly to turn on the light. Thus, if you placed a bottle of whiskey or a gift of chocolate in the shul, and then notified the non-Jew that the bottle or chocolate is waiting for him there, you can show him how to turn on the lights so that he can find his present. This is permitted because the non-Jew is turning on the lights for his own benefit, and you did not ask him, nor even hint to him that you want him to turn on the lights. You simply notified him that if he wants to put on the lights, he could find himself a very nice present.

The same solution may help Bubby return home. Someone may invite a non-Jew to the sheva brachos, and then told him that a present awaits him in the building's entrance foyer. Does it bother him if Bubby shares the elevator with him while he goes to retrieve his present?

A word of caution: If one uses this approach, one must be careful that the non-Jew is indeed doing the melacha for his own purposes, such as to get the present as mentioned above. However, one may not ask the non-Jew to accompany you on a tour of the dark shul, and then he turns on the light to see his way. This is prohibited because the non-Jew is interested in the light only in order to accompany you on the walk, not because he gains anything (see Shulchan Aruch 276:3). We will continue this topic next week…

As I mentioned above, the Rambam explains the reason that Chazal prohibited asking a non-Jew to do work on Shabbos is so that we do not diminish sensitivity to doing melacha ourselves. Refraining from having even a non-Jew work for me on Shabbos shows even deeper testimony to my conviction that Hashem created the world.

---

www.halachafortoday.com From ben@halachafortoday.com

1) Each Motzaei Shabbos during Havdalah, we light a candle [of at least 2 wicks] and recite the Bracha of "Baruch Ata Hashem….Borei Me'Orei Ha'Eish". (Shulchan Aruch Siman 298:1 and 2). The reason for this is to commemorate the fact that Hashem created fire [i.e. gave Adam HaRishon the knowledge to rub two stones together to produce fire] on Motzaei Shabbos. (See Mishna Berura Siman 298:1 quoting the Talmud Pesachim 54)

It is customary to gaze at the palm of the hand and at the nails near the light of the Havdalah candle. The fingers should be bent inwards into the palm and cover the thumb, so that the four remaining nails and the palm can be gazed at simultaneously. (Rama Siman 298:3 and Mishna Berura S"K 10)

There are three reasons for looking at the fingernails and the palm:

a) The light needs to be bright enough to enable one to discern between 2 coins, thus if one can differentiate between nail and skin, it shows that the flame is adequate.

b) The nails are a symbol of Bracha, blessing, as they continuously grow and thus we want to start the week with an omen of blessing.

c) The palm of the hand has in it creases which contain within them symbols of Bracha. (See Mishna Berura Siman 298:9)

2) The cup of wine should be held in the left hand when the Bracha is recited and the nails and palm of the right hand should be gazed at and then the cup switched back to the right hand for the remainder of Havdalah. (Rama ibid. and Kaf HaChaim 298:21. See also Mishna Berura Siman 296:31)

May people have the custom after gazing at the nails of the right hand to then repeat the procedure and gaze at the nails and palm of the left hand. This Minhag doesn't really have a basis in Halacha, and in fact according to kabalistic sources it is an ominous sign to gaze at the left hand as doing so may cause spiritual harm. (See Aruch HaShulchan Siman 298:8, Sefer Minhag Yisroel Torah Siman 298:1 and Likutei MaHarich, Havdalah. There are some sources who do justify this Minhag, and each individual should follow their custom or consult a Rav.) Left handed people follow the same procedure and gaze at the nails and palm of the right hand. (If their custom is to gaze at both hands, the right hand still goes first) (See Darchei Moshe Siman 298)

3) On Pesach, at the Seder, there is a Mitzvah to eat while leaning (B'Heseiva) to demonstrate Cheirus, freedom. (Shulchan Aruch Siman 472:2)

The leaning should not be forward, backward or to the right side, rather it must be done on the left side. (Shulchan Aruch Siman 472:3). The reason for not leaning forward or backward is that doing so is not considered the way of Cheirus, freedom. (Mishna Berura 472:9) There are two reasons for not leaning to the right side. One reason is that doing so will prevent the person from eating comfortably with his right hand. (Mishna Berura ibid. S"K 10) According to this first reason alone, we may think that a left handed person would need to lean to the right side.

However, there is another [and more important] reason for leaning to the left, because a person's food pipe (esophagus) is to the right and the air canal (trachea)is to the left, and when leaning to the right there is a chance that the cover of the air canal will open

and the food may get lodged in the wrong pipe and cause choking Chas V'Shalom. (Mishna Berura ibid.)

Therefore, there is no difference between lefties and righties and both need to lean to the left. (Shulchan Aruch Siman 472:3 and Mishna Berura S"K 11) 4) If a left handed person leaned to the right, B'dieved he has satisfied his obligation. (Mishna Berura ibid.). If a right handed person leans to the right, according to some Poskim it is acceptable B'dieved, and according to others even B'dieved he has not satisfied his obligation. (Mishna Berura ibid. See also Kaf HaChaim Siman 472:23 and 48. See also Shu"t Hisorerus Teshuva Vol. 2 Siman 49)

---

from: **Naaleh** Torah Online <contact@naaleh.com>
date: Feb 27, 2020, 12:02 PM
subject: Parshat Teruma: Fundamental Foundations

Parshat Teruma Pivotal Planks

Based on a Naaleh.com shiur by **Mrs. Shira Smiles**

Summary by Channie Koplowitz Stein

Hashem informs Moshe of the position of the various beams of the Tabernacle and the materials to be used for their composition. Hashem concludes with, "You shall build the Tabernacle according to this manner, as you will have been shown on the mountain." Why repeat this last detail when we are already told that Bnei Yisroel did all exactly as Moshe had instructed them according to the command of Hashem?

The Tiv Hatorah explains that since Hashem had already told us that He desires a Sanctuary so that He may dwell within us, (veshochanti betocham), we are to understand that the Temple we build within ourselves must also be built according to His will. In other words, as the Yalkut Lekach Tov explains, your actions dedicated to Hashem's command should be the model upon which the physical structure is to be built. We must lead our lives according to His will so that it befits His presence within us and within our homes.

The Slonimer Rebbe points out that the Sanctuary had three distinct areas which corresponds to human physiology. The Holy of Holies, seat of the Ark and the Tablets of the Law, corresponds to the brain. As such, our thoughts and intentions in all our interactions must always be directed by Heaven, focusing on what He would want of us. The inner chamber where the Table of Showbread and the Menorah were placed corresponds to the heart, the seat of our emotions and hopes. These too should be focused toward Hashem. Finally, the outer chamber where the altar for sacrificial animals was located and which always had a fire burning corresponds to the kidneys, the seat of our physical desires and passions.

Rabbi Beyfus notes that the way to ensure that we dwell in the house of Hashem is to bring our passions and desires in alignment with Hashem's desires. Our entire orientation, must be a Torah orientation. We're here to build, to do, and to create that Sanctuary within ourselves so that it reflects the sanctity of the Holy Temple, so that we become a place where Hashem feels at home.

The Tiv Hatorah deduces from the ordered structure of the Mishkan that we too must create order in our service to Hashem. We should have a designated place where we daven, as the Sifsei Chaim points out, the Torah alludes to Yitzchak's going daily to Be'er Lachai Roee for his afternoon prayers, for this was a place already infused with holiness when an angel appeared there to Hagar. And, as Rav Dessler points out, a place from which previous prayers emanated would escort current prayers upward to God's throne. So too when we designate a particular area as our "prayer nook," we infuse it with the holiness of our cumulative prayers.

Letitcha Elyon cites Rabbi Reuvain Grozovsky who notes that creating a designated place refers not only to a physical area but also a mental, spiritual and emotional place where one can feel grounded, where the vicissitudes of life won't affect the basic structure. Therefore, one will be asked at the end of his life, "Did you designate times for Torah study," rather than, "Did you study Torah?" As Rabbi Pincus writes, we are not always in the mood to learn or to do acts of kindness, but if we designate specific times for these activities, these times for prayer, for learning and for doing acts of chessed become inviolate. Just as the entire world runs on structure or else chaos will result, so too must we invest our lives with structure, adds Rabbi Wolbe in Aleh Shor.

The Mishchat Shemen notes however, thatthe priests rotated their duties in the service in the Beit Hamikdosh. If order was so important, why deviate on this point? This was a means of dispelling rote performance and maintaining an element of spontaneity and enthusiasm even within the strict structure. So too must we try to recreate our original enthusiasm for each mitzvah on a daily basis.

We emulate Hashem by creating order and structure in the edifices of our lives, in the performance of mitzvot that form the daily fabric of our lives, because we recognize that Hashem is always guarding us, keeping us from harm. But we also know that Hashem's chessed is constant and ubiquitous, and we can emulate Hashem by also looking for spontaneous and constant opportunities to perform acts of loving kindness.

Rabbi M. Drucker quotes the observation of the Baal Haturim that the phrase "Ata horaita - you have been shown," is used only when Moshe reviews the Sinai experience, and here when Moshe instructs Bnei Yisroel in building the Sanctuary. Rabbi Drucker explains that you cannot build a structure of service to Hashem without faith. Whether you are building a physical sanctuary of wood and stone or the sanctuary within ourselves, you must be able to share and give of what you have, for Hashem is the One Who gives us everything. When you recognize that truth, you can imbue your life and all your actions with that belief and build a structure of commitment to Hashem that will withstand any threat.

---

from: **Rabbi Berel Wein** <genesis@torah.org>
to: rabbiwein@torah.org
date: Feb 26, 2020, 3:47 PM
subject: Rabbi Wein - The Wealth Challenge

Dedicated to the speedy recovery of Mordechai ben Chaya

Parshas Terumah

The Wealth Challenge

One of the greatest problems that has dogged religious life throughout the centuries is the place of material wealth and money in the structure of religious life. It is obvious to all that wealth corrupts and sullies noble programs and plans., The question boils down to the eternal issue as to whether the noble ends – Jewish education, synagogue worship, social charitable endeavors — justify the means, as the process often borders on the unethical procurement of money.

Monetary scandals have plagued all religious projects and ambitions from time immemorial. The fact that the goal trying to be achieved is so noble and morally necessary, makes the temptation to deviate from correct probity and proper behavior in fund raising and monetary conduct all the more tempting. Unfortunately, the history of religion is littered with monetary scandals driven by poor decisions.

The prophets of Israel decried this situation during First Temple times, but apparently to little avail. Religion sadly has a tendency to transform itself into a business, a commercial enterprise. And this always leads to the desecration of God's name and catastrophic disasters. Many commentaries and scholars have stated that this monetary corruption was the real basis for the destruction of the Temples themselves, and the continued cessation of Temple service even until our very day. Even buildings and programs conceived in holiness and founded by the most righteous of people are susceptible, over time, to fall into the trap of monetary scandal. I need not and will not enumerate specific examples of this weakness, but all of us are aware of their existence and sad influence.

Yet, despite all of this, these dangers are almost inevitable. This week's Torah reading combines the ideas of holy service to God with the necessity of fund raising and material wealth. The Torah apparently is of the opinion that the benefits of channeling and using money for noble good outweighs the dangers inherent in combining religion with wealth and money. In fact, this is the pattern of the Torah in all natters of everyday life, events and society.

Judaism does not allow for excess ascetism or hermit-like lifestyles. We are always somehow to be engaged in this world, tawdry and flawed as it may be. Yet the challenge is to somehow remain a holy people, a kingdom of priests, while dealing with these challenges that mark our daily lives and society. The holy tabernacle/mishkan is to be constructed through heartfelt donations of material wealth and personal volunteerism. Though religion and faith are corrupted by monetary issues, wealth applied correctly and through a generous hand can enhance and even ennoble religion.

Moshe was shown a coin of fire in Heaven. It could burn and destroy, but it could also warm and light the way. The word Terumah itself, in its literal sense, means to uplift and raise. Wealth properly used and applied can be the engine that propels all holy endeavors forward. As it was in the time of Moshe, so, too, does it remain one of the greatest challenges in Jewish life.

Shabbat shalom Rabbi Berel Wein

Parshat Terumah: Moshe's Mishkan

by Rabbi Eitan Mayer

HOW SEFER SHEMOT IS "BUILT":

The first half (chaps 1-24) of Sefer Shemot (Exodus) recounts:

1) The story of the enslavement and exodus.
2) The establishment of a covenant between Hashem and Bnei Yisrael through the Decalogue (known affectionately and inaccurately as "The Ten Commandments") and the laws of Parashat Mishpatim.

The second half (chaps 25-40)of the sefer (book) recounts Hashem's instructions for building a movable Temple (the "Mishkan") and the implementation of these instructions by Bnei Yisrael.

This week, we stand at the opening of this second half. This part of the sefer contains five parshiot: the first two and last two focus on the Mishkan, while the middle parasha (or at least the middle of the middle parasha) tells the infamous story of the Egel (Golden Calf):

1) Parashat Teruma: Mishkan
2) Parashat Tetzaveh: Mishkan
3) Parashat Ki Tisa: Egel
4) Parashat Va-Yak'hel: Mishkan
5) Parashat Pekudei: Mishkan

Or, divided by perakim (chapters):

25-31: Hashem commands Moshe to build the Mishkan and its contents, create clothing for the Kohanim (priests), and anoint the Kohanim.

31: a) Hashem tells Moshe to command Bnei Yisrael to observe Shabbat.
b) Moshe receives the Luhot ("Tablets") while the people create and worship the Egel.

32-34: Aftermath of the Egel: punishment, forgiveness, a new covenant (including Shabbat).

35: a) Moshe commands Bnei Yisrael to observe Shabbat.
b) Moshe commands Bnei Yisrael to build the Mishkan, Kelim, clothing, etc.

36-39: All of the work is done as instructed and brought to Moshe for inspection.

40: Assembly of the completed parts of the Mishkan, and investiture of the Shekhinah (divine presence).

THE TWO HALVES OF SEFER SHEMOT:

The first half of Sefer Shemot progresses from the arrival of Ya'akov's family in Egypt to their enslavement there, then to the birth and rise of Moshe, the plagues, the exodus, the miracles at the sea, the people's complaints, the visit of Yitro, the revelation at Sinai, and finally the laws of Parashat Mishpatim. Although what unites all these components of the story is the development of the nation and its relationship with Hashem, these events are all independent narrative/legal units.

For instance, while the story of Moshe's birth and development into adulthood is related, to some to degree, to the account of the plagues, and both of these are related to the splitting of the sea, and all of these themes are related to Hashem's increasing level of Self-revelation (climaxing at Sinai), and all of these have some connection to the visit of Yitro and the laws of Mishpatim, we can see that despite the connections between these units and the larger themes toward which they contribute, they are all distinct units.

In contrast, the second half of Sefer Shemot is unified and tightly cohesive, narrowly focused on one topic: how and whether Hashem will maintain an intimate Presence among Bnei Yisrael in the movable Temple, the Mishkan. Instead of looking at this unit piece by piece, parasha by parasha, this week we will take a bird's-eye view of the whole Biblical terrain before us.

THE MISHKAN PLAN -- AND THE EGEL:

In the end of Parashat Mishpatim, Moshe ascends Har Sinai to receive instructions from Hashem. In extraordinary detail, spanning Parshiot Teruma, Tetzaveh, and the beginning of Ki Tisa, Hashem lays out for Moshe the plan for His residence within the camp of Bnei Yisrael. All of these details come together to accomplish a fantastic (as in "fantasy") goal: "They shall make a Temple for Me, and I shall dwell in their midst" (25:8). Hashem plans to pitch His tent among the people's tents; He will be their next-door Neighbor.

HERE WE GO AGAIN!

Many people have wondered (some of them great biblical commentators, some of them bored shul-goers who can't believe they're hearing all of the innumerable details of the Mishkan, which they heard in Teruma and Tetzaveh, repeated almost word for word in Va-Yak'hel and Pekudei) why the Torah repeats all of the descriptions of the Mishkan and its peripherals. Is it not enough for us to "listen in" on Hashem's conversation with Moshe in Teruma and Tetzaveh, in which He goes through all of the details? What need is met by the nearly verbatim repetition of these details in Va-Yak'hel and Pekudei, where we hear that the Bnei Yisrael did all that Hashem had commanded? Why not just tell us, "Bnei Yisrael built the Mishkan exactly as Hashem had commanded Moshe at Har Sinai. They assembled the parts, and then Hashem's glory filled the Mishkan" -- end of sefer?

One oft-quoted answer is that the Torah wants to contrast the people's total obedience to the instructions for building the Mishkan with their disobedience in building and worshipping the Egel. There is some textual support for this idea in Parashat Pekudei: every time the Torah reports that the people finish working on a particular piece of the Mishkan, it ends by saying that they did the work "as Hashem had commanded Moshe." Some examples:

(39:1) . . . they made the holy clothing for Aharon, JUST AS HASHEM HAD COMMANDED MOSHE.

(39:5) . . . gold, blue, purple, and red, and fine-twisted linen, JUST AS HASHEM HAD COMMANDED MOSHE.

(39:7) . . . on the shoulders of the Efod as a reminder of Bnei Yisrael, JUST AS HASHEM HAD COMMANDED MOSHE.

This refrain appears so many times in Pekudei -- fifteen times! -- that one begins to feel that it cannot be incidental, and that the Torah is using this device to contrast the people's complete obedience to Hashem's commands with their earlier "Egel behavior."

This is a tempting reading, but there are at least two reasons why it is not a satisfying explanation for why the Torah repeats the intricate descriptions of the Mishkan and its contents:

1) All of the "just as Hashem had commanded Moshe" formulations appear only in Parashat Pekudei; none of them appear in Parashat Va-Yak'hel, where the Torah begins to repeat all of the Mishkan descriptions. If the purpose of the repetition of the descriptions is to drive home the "just as Hashem had commanded Moshe" point, this phrase should be hammered to us again and again starting in Parashat Va-Yak'hel, where the Mishkan repetition starts, not 118 pesukim (verses) later, when Parashat Pekudei begins.

2) If the point of the "just as Hashem had commanded Moshe" formulations is to emphasize the *people's* obedience, it is strange indeed that of the fifteen times the phrase appears, seven of its appearances refer to action done by *Moshe* himself, not the people. If the Torah is emphasizing *Bnei Yisrael's* obedience, this makes little sense.

While the "just as Hashem had commanded Moshe" is an important pattern and surely communicates something, it is difficult to use it to explain the repetition of the Mishkan's details. (Next week I will offer an explanation of this pattern which I believe works better than the above idea.)

THE EGEL AND THE MISHKAN:

Our question -- why the Torah repeats the Mishkan instructions in Va-Yak'hel and Pekudei -- may be answered by examing the relationship between the two poles of the second half of Sefer Shemot and the fulcrum between these poles; or, to put it in English, if the second half of Sefer Shemot is a sandwich, with Mishkan Description #1 (Teruma and Tetzaveh) and Mishkan Description #2 (Va-Yak'hel and Pekudei) as the "bread" sandwiching the Egel Disaster (Ki Tisa) between them, what is the relationship between the "bread" and the "filling" of this sandwich? How does the Egel disaster affect the Mishkan plans?

While Hashem is communicating the plans to Moshe, Bnei Yisrael are busy worshipping the Golden Calf. Hashem, of course, becomes infuriated; first He threatens to destroy the people completely, but then, somewhat appeased by Moshe, He spares them. But He refuses to accompany the people on their journey to Cana'an:

SHEMOT 33:2-3 --

"I will send an angel before you -- and I will drive out the Cana'ani, Emori, Hiti, Perizi, Hivi, Yevusi -- to a land flowing with milk and honey; but I will not go with you, because you are a stiff-necked nation, and I might destroy you on the way!" The people heard this evil news and mourned.

EVERYBODY OUT OF THE POOL:

Hashem's decision to not accompany the people on their trip to Eretz Cana'an is not simply a moment of discomfort in the developing relationship between Hashem and Bnei Yisrael; it brings the relationship screeching to an emergency stop. In response to the people's rejection of Him through their worship of the Egel, Hashem 'recoils,' completely cancelling the plan for the Mishkan! All of the intricate blueprints we have traced through Ki Tisa become, well, doodling paper. Since He refuses to dwell ("shokhen") among people who worship idols, what purpose would a dwelling ("Mishkan") serve? If there will be no "ve-shakhanti," then obviously there can be no "Mishkan." Ibn Ezra makes this point explicit:

IBN EZRA, SHEMOT 33:3 --

"I [Hashem] will not accompany you [to Cana'an]": they should not make a Mishkan, for I will not dwell among Bnei Yisrael.

THE "OHEL MO'ED" -- AND THE OTHER "OHEL MO'ED":

That the sin of the Egel spells the end of the Mishkan is not only logical and intuitively suggestive, it is also implicit in the way the Torah refers to the Mishkan throughout these parshiot. The Mishkan is referred to by several different names; one of the most prominent names is "Ohel Mo'ed," "The Tent of Meeting," which appears thirty-two times in Sefer Shemot in reference to the Mishkan. (Despite the fact that some people *do* go to shul in order to meet their friends, the "meeting" meant here is the meeting between Hashem and Bnei Yisrael.)

The word "mo'ed," "meeting," shares the same root as the words "no'adti" and "iva'ed," a word which Hashem uses in sentences like, "I will meet you ["ve-noadti"] there [in the Mishkan] and speak to you from atop the Kaporet [covering of the Ark], from between the two cherubs on top of the Ark of the Testament . . ." (25:22). The name of the movable Temple communicates its function: a place to meet with Hashem and stand before Him in worship and communication.

But then the people worship the Egel. Moshe descends the mountain, smashes the Tablets, punishes the chief offenders, and chastises Aharon for his role in the catastrophe. Hashem spares the people's lives but refuses to accompany them on their journey to Cana'an. Then the Torah reports (in Ki Tisa) that Moshe creates a new "Ohel Mo'ed":

SHEMOT 33:7 --

Moshe took the tent and pitched it outside the camp, far from the camp, and called it the "OHEL MO'ED." Anyone who sought Hashem would go to the "OHEL MO'ED" outside the camp.
In place of the real "Ohel Mo'ed,"

a) a structure of beauty, grandeur, and complexity, with gold and silver, exquisite weavings, coverings, and architecture,
b) intended as a national center to meet with Hashem and
c) located in the center of the camp,

there is now instead

a) a plain tent where
b) only individuals, not the nation as a group, can seek Hashem,
c) far outside the camp.

Moshe does not name this tent "Ohel Mo'ed" by accident. He is chastising the people, showing them what they must live with (or without) now that they have lost the Mishkan.

But the people do teshuva, and Moshe pleads their cause before Hashem. In several incredible scenes in Ki Tisa (which we will examine in microscopic detail when we get there), Moshe intercedes with Hashem and "convinces" Him to return His presence to the people and lead them "personally" to Cana'an. Hashem's agreeing to once again accompany the people means that the plan for the Mishkan is restored: His agreement to maintain His presence in their midst means that He will "need" the Mishkan to live in. (For some elaboration on whether Hashem needs a Temple or not, see this past week's haftara, "Ha-Shamayyim Kis'i," Yeshayahu 66:1-2.) The next two parshiot, Va-Yak'hel and Pekudei, detail Moshe's instructions to the people about the Mishkan and their faithful obedience to the instructions. And since Hashem has forgiven the people and restored His Presence, the Torah returns to using the term "Ohel Mo'ed" to refer to the grand Mishkan where He will reside (the term appears 15 times post-Egel in Sefer Shemot as a reference to the Mishkan) rather than the forlorn tent of the period of His anger.

WHY THE REPETITION?

With the understanding that the second half of Sefer Shemot is a cohesive "Mishkan unit" with the Egel at its core and "Mishkan sections" on both sides, we may have an explanation for why Va-Yak'hel and Pekudei repeat Teruma and Tetzaveh: the details of the Mishkan are repeated in order to powerfully communicate to us the total restoration of the plan of infusing the camp of Bnei Yisrael with Hashem's presence. If the audience of the Torah (i.e., us) were emotionless, purely intellectual beings, it might have sufficed to say simply, "Hashem forgave the people for the Egel at Moshe's behest and reinstated the plan to build the Mishkan. The people built the Mishkan, assembled it, and Hashem moved in." But the Torah's audience is people, emotional beings; we need more reassurance than just the stated fact of Hashem's return.

To illustrate with a cliched joke about Jews: a middle-aged Jewish couple come to see a marriage therapist. They have been married for thirty years. "What seems to be the trouble?" asks the therapist. "My husband doesn't love me anymore," the wife complains. "Ridiculous!" barks the husband, "of course I still love you! How could you say such a thing?!" The wife turns to her husband in surprise: "You still love me? You never tell me you love me!" The husband raises his finger in the air and says indignantly, "Thirty years ago, on our wedding night, I told you I loved you. If anything had changed, don't you think I would have told you?!"

It is not enough to just be told. Having read of the Hashem's murderous fury at Bnei Yisrael, then the severing of the close connection between Hashem and Bnei Yisrael, we need powerful reassurance to feel that He has truly forgiven us for our rebellion, that He has truly come back. The way the Torah communicates that Hashem is with Bnei Yisrael once again is by offering the Mishkan again in all of its detail. In a sense, we have 'lost our faith' in the first rendition of the Mishkan command; that command was taken away when we were unfaithful. We need to hear it again to believe that Hashem is again willing to live among us.

If this still seems far-fetched, perhaps an illustration will help. In Tanakh (the Bible), the relationship between Hashem and Bnei Yisrael is often compared to a relationship between a man and a woman. Midrash Tana de-Vei Eliyahu Zuta, chapter 4, offers the following parable to convey the impact of the Egel on this relationship:

". . . To what is this comparable? To a king of flesh and blood who had betrothed a woman and loved her completely. What did the king do? He sent for a man [i.e., Moshe] to serve as an intermediary between him and her. He showed him all of his marriage canopies, all of his rooms, all of his secret places [i.e., all the divine secrets revealed to Moshe during his seclusion with Hashem atop Sinai], and then he said to the intermediary, 'Go to the woman and tell her that I do not need anything of hers; except that she should make for me a small marriage canopy [i.e., the Mishkan] so that I can live with her, and all of my servants and the members of my household will know that I love her completely.' While the king was still busy commanding the intermediary about the marriage canopies and preparing to send many gifts to the woman, people came and said to him, 'Your fiance has committed adultery with another man!' [i.e., the Egel]. Immediately, the king put everything aside, and the intermediary was thrown out and left in haste from before the king. And so it was with the Holy One, Blessed be He, and Yisrael, as it says, 'Go down now, for your nation has strayed . . .' (Shemot 32)."

To summarize and extend this mashal: Hashem sits in private (Har Sinai) with his closest confidant, telling his friend (see 33:11) how he plans to make permanent his relationship with the 'woman' he loves. He talks in great detail about his plans for the home in which they will share their relationship and excitedly shows his friend drawings of the home and the furnishings he has designed for it (Parashat Teruma and Tetzaveh). But while he is eagerly sharing this dream with his friend, the woman he loves is in someone else's arms (Ki Tisa). A messenger interrupts the man's conversation with his friend to report his lover's betrayal. In a flash, his love turns to rage. He shreds the plans for the home they were to share.

Slowly, over time, the man's friend succeeds in convincing him to forgive the woman (latter half of Ki Tisa); he is also moved by her regret for what she did in a moment of weakness and insecurity ("We have no idea what happened to Moshe . . ."). But she is overcome by guilt; she cannot forgive herself, cannot believe that he has truly forgiven her. In order to convince her that he has forgiven her, the

man re-draws for her all of the intricate drawings he had made of the home they were to share and all the things with which they would fill it (Va-Yak'hel and Pekudei). He presents her with the images in all of their detail and intricate beauty -- and now she can believe it.

This may be why the Torah repeats the details of the Mishkan: we need to see the "drawings" again in all of their detail in order for us to believe that despite our infidelity, Hashem can forgive us when we do teshuva.

If you are one of the bored shul-goers, wondering at all this repetition, maybe thinking about the Mishkan in this way will help. Besides the repetition, we may be put off by the 'ritualistic' tone of the sections of the Torah which describe the korbanot (sacrifices, coming up mainly in Leviticus/VaYikra) and the technical-sounding sections of the Torah which describe the structure and contents of the Mishkan. But the essence of the Mishkan is not the ritual/technical, it is the place where Hashem 'goes' to be near us and where we go to be near Him. This is not a "modern" theme we are reading into a ritual/technical text, it is explicit in several places in the plans for the Mishkan, where Hashem articulates the theme that the Mishkan in general and the Aron (ark of the covenant) in particular are where "I will meet with you": see Shemot 25:22, 29:42, 29:43, 30:6, and 30:36. Obviously, then, both parties (Hashem and us) should be deeply caught up in the details of the encounter we experience when we visit Hashem at 'home.' Next week we will examine some of the technical details -- the special clothing of the kohanim -- and consider how this clothing contributes to the relationship between Hashem and Bnei Yisrael.

Shabbat Shalom

Emphasis added

****

THE TANACH STUDY CENTER www.tanach.org
In Memory of Rabbi Abraham Leibtag
Shiurim in Chumash & Navi by Menachem Leibtag

****

PARSHAT TERUMA

Had it not been for **chet ha-egel** [the sin of the Golden Calf], would Bnei Yisrael have needed a **mishkan**?

Many claim that the answer to this 'philosophical' question lies in the famous 'exegetical' controversy between **Rashi** and **Ramban** concerning **when** the commandment to build the mishkan was first given, **before** or **after** the sin of the golden calf.

In this week's shiur, as we study this controversy and its ramifications, we will show how the answer to this question is not so simple. While doing so, we will also try to make some sense out of the thorny issue of 'ein mukdam u-me'uchar ba-Torah'.

INTRODUCTION - FOUR UNITS

To understand the source of this controversy between Rashi and Ramban, we first divide the last half of Sefer Shmot into **four** distinct units. In last week's shiur, we defined and discussed the first of these four units - chapters 19-24, the unit we refer to as **Ma'amad Har Sinai**.

Chapters 25-31 [i.e. parshiot Teruma, Tetzaveh, and the first half of Ki Tisa] also form a distinct unit, as this section includes a set of laws whose sole topic is God's commandment to build the mishkan.

Similarly, Chapters 32-34 [the 2nd half of Parshat Ki Tisa] also form a distinct unit, as they contain a narrative that describes the incident of chet ha-egel.

Lastly, chapters 35-40 [parshiot Vayakhel/Pekudei] form the final unit in Sefer Shmot, as they describe the mishkan's actual construction.

The following table reviews these four units:

CHAPTERS	TOPIC	PARSHA
(A) 19-24	**Ma'amad Har Sinai** [the **first luchot**]	Yitro/Mishpatim
(B) 25-31	**The commandment to build the mishkan**	Teruma/Tetzaveh/ 1st half of Ki Tisa
(C) 32-34	**Chet Ha-egel** [the **second luchot**]	2nd half of Ki Tisa
(D) 35-40	**Building the mishkan**	Vayakhel/Pekudei

The above table can help us better understand the basic controversy between Rashi and Ramban. While Ramban keeps Chumash 'in order' [A-B-C-D], Rashi claims that God ordered the mishkan's construction [unit 'B'] only after the events of chet ha-egel [unit 'C'], and hence the order would be A-C-B-D. [See Rashi on 31:18.]

At first glance, Ramban's opinion appears most logical. To understand and appreciate Rashi's opinion, we must first explain more fully the basis of Ramban's approach.

THE FIRST FORTY DAYS - FOR WHAT?

Recall that at the conclusion of Parshat Mishpatim [the end of Unit A], Moshe ascended Har Sinai to receive the **"luchot, torah, & mitzva**" (see 24:12). As we know, the **luchot** are the tablets (upon which God inscribed the Ten Commandments). It is unclear, however, to what the words **torah & mitzva** refer. [Note how many different opinions are found among the commentators on 24:12!]

However, when we study the above chart, it may provide a simple answer to this question. If we simply follow the simple order of narrative in Chumash, then the **torah & mitzva** mentioned in 24:12 must be the mitzvot that follow, i.e. - **unit B**!

In other words, 24:12-18 tells us that Moshe ascends Har Sinai to receive the **torah & mitzva**, and then 25:1 continues by explaining what God told Moshe. Those commandments continue until the end of chapter 31.

[For those of you familiar with computers, this is similar to the concept of 'WYSIWYG' - What You See Is What You Get. What the Torah records when Moshe goes up - is exactly what Moshe received at that time.]

Furthermore, Moshe ascends Har Sinai first and foremost to receive the **luchot** (see 24:12) - the symbol of the covenant at Har Sinai (see 19:5, 24:7). Considering that these luchot are to be housed in the **aron**, then it is only logical that the **torah & mitzva** refer to the laws of the **mishkan**.

Finally, considering that God informs Moshe that once the mishkan is assembled he will continue convey His mitzvot from above the 'kaporet' (see 25:21-22), it stands to reason that the laws of the **mishkan** are not only the first - but also the **only** mitzvot transmitted to Moshe during those forty days. Once the mishkan is built, the remaining mitzvot can be transmitted to Moshe via the kaporet!

[In fact, note that once the mishkan is assembled (see Shmot chapter 40), immediately afterward God transmits an entire set of mitzvot to Moshe from the 'kaporet in the ohel mo'ed - better known as Sefer Vayikra! (See 1:1.)]

Despite the simplicity of this approach, not a single commentator advances it, for two very good reasons:

* First of all, it would not require **forty days** for God to teach Moshe just the laws of the **mishkan**. There must have been something else as well.
* Many other sources later in Chumash imply that Moshe Rabeinu learned many other mitzvot on Har Sinai. See, for example, Parshat Behar (see Vayikra 25:1) and the mitzvot in Sefer Devarim (see 5:1-28 and 6:1).

For these reasons, the commentators must explain why specifically the laws of the mishkan are recorded at this point in Sefer Shmot, even though many other mitzvot were also given to Moshe during those forty days.

Ramban (see 25:1) offers a very comprehensive and emphatic 'pro-mishkan' approach. Drafting both textual and conceptual arguments, Ramban claims that the mishkan serves as a vehicle to perpetuate the experience of **Ma'amad Har Sinai**; it is therefore the **first** mitzva that Moshe receives when he ascends Har Sinai. Even though Moshe received other mitzvot at that time as well (see Ramban on 24:12), Sefer Shmot focuses specifically on the mishkan because it reflects the unique level that Bnei Yisrael attained when they accepted God's covenant at Har Sinai.

Furthermore, at the focal point of the mishkan lies the **aron**, which contains the **luchot** - the symbol of that covenant at **Har Sinai**. [Hence the first mitzva is to build the **aron**.]

To summarize Ramban's approach, we will quote a few lines from his commentary [though it is highly recommended that you read the entire Ramban inside]:

"After God had given the Ten Commandments **directly** to Yisrael and instructed them with a sampling of the mitzvot (i.e. Parshat Mishpatim)... and Bnei Yisrael accepted these laws and entered a covenant (24:1-11)... behold they became His nation and He became their God, as was originally stipulated [at brit mila and Har Sinai]... Now they are worthy to have a house - His dwelling - in their midst dedicated to His Name, and there **He will speak with Moshe** and **command Bnei Yisrael**... Now the 'secret' ('sod') of the mishkan is that God's **glory** ('kavod') which dwelled on **Har Sinai** will now dwell [instead] on the **mishkan** 'be-nistar' [in a more hidden manner, in contrast to Har Sinai]..." (see Ramban 25:1).

RASHI'S APPROACH

Despite the beauty and simplicity of Ramban's approach, Rashi claims exactly the opposite (see 31:18): that the commandment to build the mishkan came not only **after**, but actually **because** of, chet ha-egel. In other words, Rashi posits that the parshiot are not presented according to their chronological order. Rashi goes even further, claiming that during the first forty days Moshe received **all** the mitzvot of the Torah

except the laws of the **mishkan**!

At first glance, such an interpretation seems untenable. Why should the Torah record at this point specifically the mitzvot that Moshe **did not** receive at this time, while omitting all the mitzvot which he **did** receive at this time? What could possibly have led Rashi to this conclusion?

To answer this question, we must first explain the exegetical principle of 'ein mukdam u-me'uchar ba-Torah' [literally: there is **no order** in the sequence of parshiot in the Torah]. Despite the common misunderstanding to the contrary, this principle does not imply that Chumash progresses in random sequence. Rather, it simply means that the arrangement in which Chumash records its parshiot does not necessarily reflect their chronological order.

[Most commentators, and especially many of the Midrashim quoted by Rashi, employ this approach. **Ramban**, however, consistently disagrees with this assumption, arguing that Chumash **does** follow in **chronological** order. Unless a certain technical detail 'forces' him to say otherwise, he will assume that the order in which Chumash is written corresponds with the precise chronological order of the events as they took place.]

The principle of ein mukdam u-me'uchar implies that when Moshe wrote down the Torah in its final form in the fortieth year (see Devarim 31:25-26), its parshiot were organized based on thematic considerations, and hence not necessarily according to the chronological order of when they were first given. By doing so, the Torah conveys its message not only by the content of each parshia, but also by intentionally juxtaposing certain parshiot next to one another.

[See Chizkuni on Shmot 34:32 for an important insight regarding this explanation.]

Rashi, following this approach, assumes that Chumash (at times) may prefer a conceptual sequence over a chronological one. Therefore, Rashi will often explain that a certain parshia actually took place earlier or later when the progression of theme implies as such.

With this background, we can better understand Rashi's approach in our context. Employing the principle of ein mukdam u-me'uchar, Rashi always begins with considerations of theme and content in mind. He therefore cannot overlook the glaring similarities between the construction of the mishkan and **chet ha-egel**. It cannot be just by chance that:

* Bnei Yisrael must collectively donate their gold to build the mishkan (compare 25:1-2, 32:2-3);
* Betzalel, Chur's grandson, is chosen to build the mishkan; [Rashi follows the Midrash which claims that Chur was killed because he refused to allow Bnei Yisrael to build the **egel**. (See Chizkuni 31:2.)]
* The opening pasuk concerning the mishkan - "and they shall make for Me a **mikdash** and I will **dwell in their midst**" (25:8) - appears to rectify Bnei Yisrael's situation in the aftermath of chet ha-egel, when Moshe must move his tent (called the **ohel mo'ed**) far away - outside the camp (33:7);
* Aharon must bring a **par** (a bull / an **egel** is a baby bull) for a **chatat** offering during the mishkan's dedication ceremony. [The requirement of a **chatat** implies the committal of a sin; see Rashi 29:1.]

Rashi therefore explains that the commandment to build the **mishkan** came **after** chet ha-egel (during the last forty days), for it served as a form of atonement for that sin.

[Nevertheless, it remains unclear according to Rashi **why** the Torah chose to record these parshiot out of chronological order. We'll return to this question later in the shiur.]

LECHATCHILA or BE-DI'AVAD?

It is very tempting to consider this dispute between Rashi and Ramban a fundamental argument regarding the reason behind the mishkan.

Clearly, according to Ramban, the mishkan is 'lechatchila' [ideal]. In other words, even had chet ha-egel never occurred, it still would have been God's desire that Bnei Yisrael build a **mishkan**, for it serves as a physical representation of God's presence in their midst.

How should we understand Rashi? Can we infer from his interpretation that the mishkan is 'be-di'avad' [a compromise]? In other words, had it not been for chet ha-egel, would there never have been a commandment to build a **mikdash**? Was the mitzva to build the mishkan simply an 'after-thought'? Was it only in the aftermath of Bnei Yisrael's sin that God realized the people's need for a physical representation of His presence?

Despite the temptation of this conclusion, we must first prove that, even according to Rashi's interpretation, one **can** (and **must**) agree that God had originally intended that at least some form of physical symbol be used to represent Him.

TEMPLE TERMINOLOGY

To reconcile Rashi's interpretation with Ramban's explanation of the mishkan, we must differentiate between two concepts:

(1) **MISHKAN** and

(2) **MIKDASH**.

Although both words describe a **sanctuary** dedicated to the worship of God, for the sake of clarity, each word (in our explanation that follows) will be given a more specific meaning.

* The **mishkan** is a **temporary** sanctuary (a Tabernacle), a portable, tent-like structure. [Good for travel.]
* The **mikdash** is a **permanent s**anctuary (a Temple), such as the massive stone structure built by King Solomon.

We posit that both Rashi and Ramban must agree that the concept of a Sanctuary, a symbol of God's **Shchina** (the divine presence) dwelling with Bnei Yisrael, is lechatchila and in fact comprises a fundamental theme throughout the entire Tanach. To prove this, we must return to some basic concepts previously discussed in our shiurim on Sefer Breishit.

Recall that we first encountered the theme of **mikdash** when Avraham Avinu builds a **mizbeiach** in **Bet-El** and "calls out in God's Name" (see 12:8 & 13:4). Later, at this same site, Yaakov Avinu awakes from his dream and exclaims:

"Alas, this is the site for a **Bet Elokim**, for it is the gate to the heavens" (Br.28:17).

Yaakov then erects a 'matzeva' (monument) and vows that upon his return to Canaan he will establish the site of his matzeva as a **Bet-Elokim** - a House for God. [See Breishit 28:17-22.]

Thus, the very concept of a **Bet-Elokim** clearly preceded the golden calf.

Furthermore, even in 'shirat ha-yam', the song that Bnei Yisrael sung after they crossed the Red Sea, we already find an allusion the establishment of a **mikdash** immediately upon their arrival in the land:

"Tevieimo ve-titaeimo be-**har** nachalatcha, machon le-shivtecha... - **mikdash**, Hashem konanu yadecha..."
(See Shmot 15:17, and its context!)

Finally, in Parshat Mishpatim we find conclusive proof that the basic concept of a **Bet-Elokim** is totally unrelated to the events of chet ha-egel. Recall that even according to Rashi, the laws recorded in Parshat Mishpatim were certainly given **before** chet ha-egel. [See Rashi on 31:18, where he explains that these laws were given to Moshe Rabeinu during his first forty days on Har Sinai.]

Recall as well that within that set of of laws we find the mitzva of 'aliya la-regel' - to '**visit** God' three times a year:

"Three times a year you shall celebrate for Me... Keep chag ha-matzot... and do not **visit me** empty-handed... Three times a year all your males **shall appear before me**... " (23:14-17).

First of all, the very existence of a mitzva to 'be seen by God' implies that there most be some type of sanctuary that would represent Him! Hence, without some sort of a **mikdash**, this mitzva of aliya la-regel could not be fulfilled.

However, the next pasuk provides conclusive proof that this sanctuary corresponds to the concept of a **Bet-Elokim**:

"Your first fruits must be brought to **bet Hashem** E**lokecha** - the **house** of Hashem your God..." (23:19).

This commandment to bring the 'bikurim' to the Bet Elokim clearly implies that there would have to be some sort of 'sanctuary' that will serve as God's House.

Hence, even Rashi must agree that there would have been a need for a **Bet-Elokim** even had Bnei Yisrael not sinned at chet ha-egel.

Furthermore, there is no reason why Rashi would have to argue with Ramban's explanation that the primary function of the mikdash was to perpetuate Bnei Yisrael's experience at Har Sinai.

Instead, we posit that the dispute between Rashi and Ramban stems from a less fundamental issue - concerning the need to construct a **temporary** sanctuary before Bnei Yisrael entered the Land of Israel.

According to Rashi's interpretation, we can assume that God's original intention was for Bnei Yisrael to build a mikdash only after they conquered the Land of Israel. However, because of their sin, conquest of the Land would now be delayed. Therefore, God ordered them to build a **temporary** mikdash [= mishkan] while they remained in the desert.

Ramban would argue that even had Bnei Yisrael not sinned, it would still have been necessary for them to build a temporary **mikdash** before they embarked on that journey.

Let's attempt to explain why.

THE WAY IT SHOULD HAVE BEEN

Rashi's position may be based upon God's original plan that Bnei Yisrael would conquer the land through supernatural, divine intervention (see 23:20-28). Assisted by God's miracles, Bnei Yisrael would have needed only a very short time to complete at least the first wave of conquest. Had that actually occurred, there would have been no need to build a temporary mishkan, for within a very short time it would have been possible to build a permanent mikdash instead.

However, in the aftermath of chet ha-egel, the entire situation changes. As God had removed His **Shchina**, Bnei Yisrael must first bring the **Shchina** back to the camp **before** they can conquer the Land. Hence, according to Rashi, the actual process of building the mishkan could be considered a form of 'spiritual rehabilitation'. Furthermore, the mishkan would now provide Aharon and Bnei Yisrael with the opportunity to offer korbanot and thus achieve atonement for their sin.

One could also suggest that due to chet ha-egel and the 'lower level' of the 'mal'ach' that will lead them into the land (see Shmot 33:1-5 and shiur on 13 midot), it may now take much longer for Bnei Yisrael to complete the conquest. Therefore, a temporary mikdash [= mishkan] is required, until a more permanent mikdash can be built.

A CONCEPTUAL JUXTAPOSITION

According to this interpretation, we can now suggest (according to Rashi) a beautiful reason for why the Torah places the commandment to build the mishkan out of chronological order:

Even though the mitzva to build the 'temporary' mishkan should have been recorded **after** the story of chet ha-egel, the Torah intentionally records it earlier - immediately after Ma'amad Har Sinai - to emphasize its thematic connection to that event! In other words, Rashi, like Ramban, can also understand that the primary function of the mikdash was to perpetuate Ma'amad Har Sinai. In fact, had Bnei Yisrael not sinned, the laws of the 'permanent' mikdash may have been recorded at this spot in Chumash. However, now that a mishkan was needed (due to the events of chet ha-egel), the laws of this temporary mikdash are recorded at this point in Chumash, to emphasize the very same thematic connection that Ramban describes in great detail!

Now that Rashi makes so much sense, why wouldn't Ramban agree? To answer this question, we must return to our discussion of the differing approaches to 'mukdam u-me'uchar'.

Ramban prefers his principle that Chumash follows chronological order. Despite the similarities between the mishkan and the story of chet ha-egel (as listed above), they are not convincing enough to warrant, in Ramban's view, a distortion of the order of these parshiot. Therefore, Ramban maintains that even had it not been for chet ha-egel, there still would have been a need for a temporary mishkan.

In fact, one could suggest a very simple reason for the immediate need of a temporary sanctuary. As we explained earlier, Bnei Yisrael must still receive many more mitzvot from God. A mishkan - with the **aron** and **keruvim** at its center - is therefore necessary as the medium through which God can convey the remaining mitzvot to Moshe. Furthermore, once the **Shchina** descended upon Har Sinai, some sort of vehicle is necessary to 'carry it' with them as they travel from Har Sinai towards Eretz Canaan.

[Accordingly, Ramban explains that most of all the mitzvot recorded in Sefer Vayikra and Sefer Bamidbar were actually given from the ohel mo'ed (mishkan). See Ramban Vayikra 1:1 & 7:38. In regard to Sefer Devarim, see Ramban on 24:1 & 24:12.]

To summarize, the dispute between Rashi and Ramban stems from their different exegetical approaches and pertains only to **why** a **temporary** mishkan was necessary. However, both would agree that a **permanent** mikdash would have been necessary even had Bnei Yisrael not sinned at chet ha-egel.

In our shiur on Parshat Tetzaveh, we will analyze the internal structure of this unit of chapters 25->31 in order to uncover additional parallels between the **mishkan** and the events of Ma'amad Har Sinai. Till then,

shabbat shalom
menachem

FOR FURTHER IYUN:

A. In the shiur we argue that even according to Rashi, the concept of a required mikdash for serving Hashem existed even prior to the worship of the golden calf. Along similar lines, Rav David Pardo, in his supra-commentary on Rashi entitled, "Maskil le-David", writes that even in Rashi's view, the general command to build a mishkan was transmitted to Moshe during his first forty days atop the mountain. Only the details of the construction, as presented in parshiyot Teruma & Tetzaveh (and the beginning of Ki Tisa), were transmitted later. Rav Pardo proves this from the repeated reference in parshat Teruma to Hashem's having shown Moshe the appearance of the mishkan "on the mountain" (25:40; 26:30; 27:8). In the final two of these three references, Hashem employs the past tense ("you have been shown"), suggesting that Moshe viewed the image the mishkan before receiving these detailed instructions. Apparently, as Rav Pardo argues, Moshe learned of the mishkan - albeit only the generalities - during his first forty days on the mountain, even before the calf. Thus, Rashi clearly did not view the mishkan as necessary only in response to the sin of the egel ha-zahav.

B. RAMBAN / RASHI - earlier sources

The argument as to whether Hashem ordered the construction of the mishkan before or after the sin of the golden calf predates Rashi and the Ramban; conflicting views appear already in the Midrashim. Rashi's view, that the parshiyot appear out of order, is the position of the Midrash Tanchuma (Teruma 8, Pekudei 6), Yerushalmi (Shkalim 1:1) and Midrash Hagadol to Shmot 25:17. The Ramban's opinion is found in Seder Eliyahu Rabba 17, which states explicitly that Hashem ordered the construction of the mishkan after Bnei Yisrael declared 'na'aseh ve-nishma'. Ibn Ezra (25:1) adopts the Ramban's approach, as do the Abarbanel (31:18) and the Netziv (29:20). Despite his general affinity for the Ramban's commentary, on this issue Rabbenu Bechayei adopts Rashi's approach (25:6)

C. Mikdash Before Chet Ha-egel: Midrashic Sources

Several Midrashic passages support our contention that a mikdash would have been necessary even had it not been for the golden calf. Bemidbar Rabba 12:12 compares the world before the mishkan to a chair with two legs, which cannot stand; the construction of the mishkan added the third leg, so-to-speak, which enabled the world to stand independently. However one understands the image of the chair, it clearly points to the indispensability of the mishkan - regardless of chet ha-egel. Similarly, Bemidbar Rabba 13:6 describes that from the time of creation, Hashem wished ('kivyachol') to reside on earth. When the mishkan was consecrated, Hashem announced that on that day the world was created. Once again, we see that the construction of the mishkan marked a critical stage in the history of the world and was necessary since the dawn of creation. In the same vein, Bemidbar Rabba 13 writes that when Bnei Yisrael left Egypt, Hashem wished to "bring them into His quarters", and thus instructed them to build the mishkan. This Midrash makes no mention of the incident of the golden calf as necessitating a mikdash. A similar passage appears in the Tanchuma Yashan - Bechukotai 65.

We suggested in the shiur that according to Rashi, the Torah presents Parshat Teruma immediately following Matan Torah - despite its having occurred later, after the egel - to emphasize the thematic relationship between the mishkan and Matan Torah. Rabbenu Bechayei (25:6), however, explains that the Torah rearranged the sequence in order to demonstrate how Hashem is "makdim trufa le-maka" (recall that, as cited earlier, Rav Kasher reads this explanation into the Midrash Lekach Tov). Rav Zalman Sorotzkin (Oznayim La-Torah) mentions this explanation without quoting Rabbenu Bechayei. A different answer was suggested by the late Lubavitcher Rebbe ("Be'urim Le-perush Rashi al Ha-Torah" - Shmot 31:18). The Torah specifically wanted to juxtapose the tzivuy ha-mishkan with the end of Parshat Mishpatim - the formal establishment of the 'brit' between Bnei Yisrael and Hashem. As the residence of the Shchina in the mishkan marked the complete fulfillment of that brit, it is only fitting that the parsha of the mishkan immediately follows that of the covenant. (This explanation, too, seems to point to the fact that the mishkan is lechatchila even according to Rashi.)

D. SEFORNO

The Seforno takes a particularly extreme approach to the concept of the mishkan. Already in his comments to 19:6, he notes that as a result of the egel, Bnei Yisrael forfeited "all the goodness of the future" promised to them before Matan Torah. As we will see in his comments elsewhere, this refers to God's direct revelation, which was supplanted by the mishkan. In his commentary to the final psukim of Parshat Yitro (20:20-22), the Seforno interprets these psukim as informing Bnei Yisrael that they have no need to construct a sanctuary to God. Matan Torah demonstrated that Hashem would descend, as it were, and reside among them even without any physical mediums. Commenting on 25:9, Seforno writes that after the incident of the golden calf Bnei Yisrael were required to construct a sanctuary; the direct communication experienced at Har Sinai could no longer be maintained. Seforno expresses his position even clearer in 31:18, where he describes more fully Bnei Yisrael's spiritual descent as a result of the golden calf, as a result of which they did not achieve the divine plan initially intended at Matan Torah. In this passage, he alludes to an interesting interpretation of the promise in 19:6 that Bnei Yisrael would be a 'mamlechet kohanim' (a kingdom of priests): that they would have no need for kohanim to serve as intermediaries. God had originally intended for all of Bnei Yisrael to serve God directly as kohanim. (Curiously, however, this is not how the Seforno explains the term in his commentary to 19:6 - "ve-tzarich iyun".) He develops this idea even further in Vayikra 11:2. There he explains that in response to the golden calf, Hashem decreed that He would remove His Shchina entirely from Bnei Yisrael. Moshe's intervention succeeded in restoring a very limited measure of 'hashra'at ha-Shchina', by which God would reside among Bnei Yisrael only through the structure of the mishkan. (In this passage, Seforno spells out more clearly what he meant by "the goodness of the future" of which he spoke in his comments to Shmot 19:6 - the direct presence of the Shchina, without the need for a physical representation.) Later in Sefer Vayikra, in his commentary to the brachot of Parshat Bechukotai (26:11-12), Seforno describes the ideal condition of God's constant presence among Benei Yisrael without it being confined to any specific location and without requiring any specific actions on Benei Yisrael's part. In direct contradistinction to the Ramban, Seforno there reads the pasuk in Truma, "Ve-asu li mikdash ve-shachanti betocham", as a punishment, confining the presence of the Shchina to the mishkan. Seforno's most elaborate development of this notion appears in his treatise "Ma'amar Kavanot ha-Torah" (published as a separate volume by Rav Yehuda Kuperman in 5754; the relevant material for our topic is found primarily in chapter 6 in Rav Kuperman's edition).

This position of the Seforno, of course, requires some explanation in light of the proofs mentioned in the shiur to the necessity of a mikdash even prior to the egel. In fact, the Seforno himself identifies Yaakov's Bet Elokim (Breishit 28:17) and the mikdash in the Shirat Ha-yam (Shmot 15:17) as the beit ha-mikdash. How could the concept of a mikdash be discussed before chet ha-egel - if it was never to have been necessary?

The Seforno does not address this question, but in at least two instances he alludes to what may be understood as a moderation of his approach. Commenting on the pasuk "be-chol ha-makom asher askir et Shmi avo eilecha" ("every place where I will have My Name mentioned I will come to you" - Shmot 20:21), the Seforno explains, "[Every place] that I will designate as a meeting place for My service". He then adds, "You will not need to draw My providence to you through mediums of silver and gold and the like, for I will come to you and bless you". Apparently, even according to this original plan, there would still be a place designated as a mikdash of sorts, only Bnei Yisrael would not need to invest effort in its lavish and intricate construction. In Ma'amar Kavanot ha-Torah, Seforno makes a somewhat similar comment in explaining this same pasuk: "In any place that will truly be called a Bet Elokim, such as batei midrash and the like - I will come to you and bless you." Here, too, he implies that there would be a special location - or perhaps several or many special locations - for avodat Hashem, only not what we know as the mishkan or mikdash. However, in his commentary to Parshat Bechukotai (Vayikra 26:12), the Seforno strongly implies that in the ideal condition Hashem reveals Himself anywhere, without any need for an especially designated location - 've-tzarich iyun'.

E. RAMBAM - Review Devarim chapter 12. Note the repeated use of the phrase "ha-makom asher yivchar Hashem" and its context. Pay special attention to 12:5-12, noting when is the proper time to build the mikdash. Relate this phrase to the concept of a **permanent** mikdash, as discussed in the above shiur. Considering that Sefer Devarim contains the mitzvot that God originally gave Moshe at Har Sinai (before chet ha-egel), explain why Sefer Devarim makes no mention of the **mishkan**, yet mentions "ha-makom asher yivchar Hashem" numerous times.

Although the Rambam did not write a commentary on Chumash, we can infer his understanding of certain psukim based on his psak halacha in Mishneh Torah.

The opening Rambam in Hilchot Beit Ha-bechira (Sefer Avoda) defines the source of the commandment to build a **mikdash** (see 1:1). Read that Rambam (and, if you have time, the first five halachot). What is difficult about the Rambam's wording in 1:1? What is the source of our obligation to build a **mikdash**? Why, according to the Rambam, is the phrase "ve-asu li mikdash" (25:8) insufficient as a source for this obligation?

Why does the Rambam include the criteria, 'ready to offer upon it korbanot' and 'to celebrate there **three** times a year'? Can you relate these phrases to Shmot 23:14-19 and this week's shiur? Why does the Rambam quote the pasuk from Devarim 12:9-11? Read those psukim carefully!

THE OHR SOMAYACH TORAH MAGAZINE • WWW.OHR.EDU

OHRNET

SHABBAT PARSHAT TERUMAH • 4 ADAR 5780 FEBRUARY 29, 2020 • VOL. 27 NO. 17

PARSHA INSIGHTS

by Rabbi Yaakov Asher Sinclair

Being a Mensch

"And let them take for Me a portion, from every man whose heart motivates him, you shall take My portion." (25:2)

"Being a mensch" is one of those untranslatable Yiddish phrases which define what it means to be Jewish.

A few years ago an El Al flight to London was carrying a young child in need of an urgent and critical operation. Apart from the child's medical problem, there was another problem: money. The parents had barely enough to cover the cost of the flight to London, which involved the purchase of a whole row of seats to accommodate the stricken child and his medical support systems.

During the flight, a religious Jew who was traveling in first class came to the back of the plane to pray with a *minyan*. On his way back to his seat he went over to the father of the child and asked how the child was doing. In the course of the conversation the father mentioned he had no idea how he was going to be able to cover the cost of the operation. He was already way over his head in debt with the medical expenses that he had already incurred. He would need nothing short of a small miracle.

Without further ado the man took his leave, walked back to the first class cabin, pulled out his hat, and proceeded to tour the aisles of the first-class cabin collecting for the operation. In approximately ten minutes his hat contained checks to the value of some $100,000, sufficient for both the operation and the flights and all the medical expenses to date.

If Jews excel at anything, it's *tzedaka* — charity.

"Charity," however, really doesn't translate the word *tzedaka*. *Tzedaka* means "righteousness." Unfortunately, as we live in a largely selfish and unrighteous world, the word righteousness usually finds itself being used with the reflexive pronoun "self" as in "self-righteous." However, "righteousness" is no more than "rightness," doing what is right. A Jew gives *tzedaka* not because its charity, not because he is charitable, but because that's what's right. The definition of what is right is what G-d wants. Thus, ultimately we give *tzedaka* not because our hearts reach out to the plight of others but because that's what G-d wants from us.

"And let them take for Me a portion, from every man whose heart motivates him, you shall take My portion."

There are three kinds of *tzedaka*, and they are all hinted at in this verse.

The highest level is *"let them take for Me a portion."* Here the giving is "for Me" — because that's what G-d wants us to do. The second level is when we give *tzedaka* out of the kindness of our hearts because we cannot bear to see the suffering of the poor — *"From every man whose heart motivates him."* Noble as it is, this is not the highest level of giving.

And the third level is the person who would really prefer not to give at all, but he is too embarrassed to say no. About him the verse says, *"You shall take My portion."*

No one will ever know from which of these groups were the passengers in that first-class El Al cabin, but one thing is clear: whatever a Jew's motives, he knows what it means to be a *mensch*.

- *Source: Nachalat Chamisha in Iturei Torah*

TALMUD TIPS

by Rabbi Moshe Newman

Terumah: Berachot *51-57*

Just the Right Length

Rav Yehuda said, "There are three things that if one extends them, his days and years are extended: at prayer, at the table and in the bathroom."

The *gemara* explains that the correct manner of prayer that Rav Yehuda refers to is only if one prays without expecting to receive everything that he desires on his own terms. A prayer that is unhurried, and accepting of whatever answer Hashem provides, is praiseworthy and deserving of being rewarded by Above with "long days and years."

The Maharsha cites another *gemara* where a *beraita* states that a person who says a "long *Amen*" is rewarded with long days and years. (Berachot 47a) Based on this *beraita*, he asks why Rav Yehuda seemingly failed to include an extended *Amen* in his list on our *daf*. The Maharsha answers that Rav Yehuda in fact included Amen in his list of three activities. When Rav Yehuda said "One who takes his time in his *prayer*," he was also speaking about saying *Amen* as well as other prayers.

Why is extending the *Amen* such a positive act? From another teaching in the *beraita* the significance of extending *Amen* is clear: "And he shouldn't throw a *beracha* from his mouth." Rashi explains that saying it too quickly makes it appear as if it is a burden to the person, something that he merely needs to rid himself of and get done. Rashi also notes that *Amen* is the ending of a *beracha*. Conversely, therefore, saying *Amen* without haste shows a person's love of Hashem, and that saying a *beracha*, a prayer or *Amen* is a divine pleasure.

It is important to note, Tosefot points out, that lthough a "long *Amen*" is good, too long of an *Amen* is not good. The reason for this, Tosefot explains, is because when a person says Amen for too long, the word is not said correctly and will lose its meaning and may even take on a different meaning.

Despite Tosefot's reasoning, it appears that the Maharsha offers a different reason for not saying *Amen* for longer than is appropriate. The *gemara* says that there is a dispute between two Amoraim regarding when a person who says *hamotzi* may cut the bread to eat it. One opinion is that he needs to wait until all others at the table have finished saying *Amen*. The other opinion is that he waits only until the majority of the others have concluded *Amen*. By means of explaining the latter opinion, the *gemara* states: "Whoever extends the word *Amen* for longer than is appropriate is mistaken." One way to understand this statement would be as Tosefot reasons, that saying the word for too long changes the word, and thus the minority of people at the table who are saying it at length are not really saying it and may be ignored. The Maharsha, however, writes a different explanation, an explanation that is quite novel and thought-provoking.

He writes that a person who says *Amen* for too long does so based on the teaching in the *gemara* that one who lengthens his saying of *Amen* is rewarded with the lengthening of his days and his years. While such a person's intention may be understandable, it is wrong, claims the Maharsha. The verse in Kohellet (12:1) states: "And remember your Creator in the days of your youth, before the days of evil come, and years arrive, about which you will say, '*I have no desire in them*.'" We are taught here that each person has an age beyond which is not desirable or good for him. Only Hashem knows what that age is. A person who prays for days and years beyond this age may unwittingly be asking for something not good for him. Therefore, a person should pray for a lifetime that is appropriate and good for him, as known by Hashem. According to this idea, a person who says *Amen* for too long — showing his desire to increase and increase his lifetime span — should be interrupted by the one who says *hamotzi* and not allowed to complete his long *Amen*. The interruption and disruption of his *Amen* is for his own benefit.

The practical halacha of how to say *Amen* is recorded in Shulchan Aruch, Orach Chaim 124:8. "One should not answer *Amen* this is short, rather it should be somewhat long, the length of time that it would take to say '*E-l Melech Ne'eman*' (Hashem is a faithful King), and one shouldn't lengthen it too much because the reading of the word won't express its meaning if it's extended too much." The Mishna Berurah points out that the ideal length for saying *Amen* is based on these three words since they are the meaning of *Amen* and *Amen* is an acronym for these words.

- *Berachot 54b*

Q & A

Questions

1. How many types of items were the Jews to donate?
2. The donation of silver for the Mishkan differed from the donation of the other items. How?
3. What property do *techelet* and *argaman* share that *orot eilim m'adamim* do not share?
4. What property do the above three share that *shesh* and *orot techashim* do not share?
5. Onkelos translates "*tachash*" as "*sasgona*." Why?
6. What kind of trees did Yaakov plant in Egypt?
7. Describe two uses of:
   (a) oil
   (b) spices
   (c) jewels
8. The *aron* was made with three boxes, one inside the other. Exactly how tall was the outer box?
9. Why is the Torah referred to as "testimony"?
10. What did the faces of the *keruvim* resemble?
11. On what day of the week was the *lechem hapanim* baked?
12. What does *miksha* mean?
13. What was the purpose of the *menorah's gevi'im* (cups)?
14. How did Moshe know the shape of the *menorah*?
15. What designs were embroidered into the tapestries of the Mishkan?
16. What is meant by "standing wood"?
17. How long was the Mishkan?
18. How wide was the interior of the Mishkan?
19. Why was the altar coated with *nechoshet*?
20. Which function did the copper *yeteidot* serve?

All references are to the verses and Rashi's commentary, unless otherwise stated.

Answers

1. 25:2 - 13.
2. 25:3 - No fixed amount of the other items was required. The silver was given as a fixed amount: a half-shekel.
3. 25:4-5 - They are wool; *orot eilim* are not.
4. 25:4-5 - They are dyed; *shesh* and *orot techashim* are not.
5. 25:5 - The *tachash* delights (*sas*) in its multi-colors (*g'vanim*).
6. 25:5 - *Arazim* - cedars.
7. 25:6-7:
   (a). The oil was lit in the *menorah* and used for anointing.
   (b). The spices were used in the anointing oil and for the incense.
   (c). The precious stones were for the *ephod* and the *choshen*.
8. 25:11 - The outer box was one and a half *amot* plus a *tefach* plus a little bit, because it rose a little bit above the *kaporet*. (The *kaporet* was a *tefach* thick — see 25:17).
9. 25:16 - It testifies that G-d commanded us to keep the mitzvahs.
10. 25:18 - The faces of children.
11. 25:29 - Friday.
12. 25:31 - Hammered.
13. 25:31 - Purely ornamental.
14. 25:40 - G-d showed Moshe a *menorah* of fire.
15. 26:1 - On one side a lion; on the other side an eagle.
16. 26:15 - The wooden beams were to be upright and not stacked one upon the other.
17. 26:16 - 30 *amot*.
18. 26:23 - 10 *amot*.
19. 27:2 - To atone for brazenness.
20. 27:19 - They secured the curtains against the wind.

WHAT'S IN A WORD?

Synonyms in the Hebrew Language
by Rabbi Reuven Chaim Klein

Foreheads and Fadihot

After detailing how to fashion the Kohen Gadol's *tzitz,* the Torah commands that the *tzitz* be placed on Aharon's *meitzach** (Ex. 29:38). The word *meitzach* is commonly translated as "forehead," although we will see below that this is not universally agreed upon. Targum pseudo-Jonathan (there) translates *meitzach* as *padachta,* a word which is also used in later Hebrew. In this essay we will attempt to distinguish between the Hebrew word *meitzach* — forms of which appear some thirteen times in the Bible — and the later *padachat,* which does not appear in the Bible but is found in rabbinic literature. In doing so we will explore several etymological theories regarding the origins of the word *padachat* and where it comes from.

Contrary to popular belief, most commentators understand that the Kohen Gadol's *tzitz* ought to be placed *above* the forehead in the same space where the *tefillin* is laid. These commentators will encounter difficulty in rendering the word *meitzach* as "forehead" because they maintain that the *tzitz* is not placed on the forehead, but higher up. How, then, do they explain the Torah's requirement to place the *tzitz* on Aharon's *meitzach*?

Chiddushei HaRitva and *Tosafos Yeshanim* (to *Yoma* 71b) explain that although the Torah literally says that the *tzitz* should be "on Aharon's *meitzach*" (Ex. 28:38), this actually means "*on top of* Aharon's *meitzach*." Thus, they understand that while *meitzach* means "forehead," the Torah never says that the *tzitz* should be placed *on* the forehead, but rather *above* the forehead. Alternatively, these two sources explain that while in Rabbinic Hebrew the term *meitzach* refers to the "forehead," in Biblical Hebrew it actually means the "top of the head" (or at least includes the top of the head along with the forehead). According to this explanation, the word *meitzach* cannot accurately be translated as "forehead." (See also *Tosafos HaShaleim* to Ex. 39:28 which states that *meitzach* does not mean *padachat*.)

Rabbi Shlomo Pappenheim of Breslau (1740-1814) connects the word *meitzach* to *netzach/nitzachon* ("victory"), explaining that the forehead is the most noticeable and visible part of the body, such that it seems to "overpower" the rest of one's person. Rabbi Pappenheim connects both words back to the biliteral root TZADI-CHET (*tzach*), although his way of explaining that connection may seem a bit farfetched. Rabbi David Chaim Chelouche (1920-2016), the late Chief Rabbi of Netanya, offers a more direct connection between *meitzach* and *tzach*. He explains that a person's forehead is generally smooth and devoid of hairs, so it can appropriately be described as *tzach* ("clean," "pristine").

As we mentioned in the beginning, another word for "forehead" in Hebrew is *padachat*. This word appears in the Mishna (*Niddah* 3:5), which states that a child is, according to halacha, considered "born" once his or her *padachat* has already exited the mother. Similarly, the Talmud (*Yevamos* 120a) rules that a corpse can be positively identified (to allow his widow to marry someone else) only if the *padachat* and face are intact. Of course, the Mishna and the Talmud do not explain what *padachat* means, so how do we know that it is a "forehead"?

A tradition going back to the Geonic period explains that the words *meitzach* and *padachat* are synonyms, but that the former is Biblical Hebrew and the latter is Rabbinic Hebrew. This idea is found in Rabbeinu Hai Gaon's commentary to the Mishna (*Niddah* 3:5) and in his student's commentary to the Talmud (*Shabbos* 80b). It is also cited by Rabbi Zecharia Aghmati (1120-1195) in *Sefer HaNer* (to *Shabbos* 80b) in the name of Rav Hai Gaon. This idea is later repeated by Rabbeinu Chananel (to *Shabbos* 80b) and *Sefer HaAruch*. According to this, *meitzach* and *padachat* mean the same thing, just in different versions/dialects of the Hebrew Language. Indeed, Rashi (*Shabbos* 151b, *Yevamos* 120a, *Kesubos* 75a, *Bechoros* 46b) always defines *padachat* as *meitzach*, suggesting that he too understood them to be perfectly synonymous. (My Belgian friend Rabbi Yosef de Jong suggests that *meitzach* refers specifically to the front of one's forehead, while *padachat* includes even the temples, although he concedes that he has no source to support this

suggestion. That said, the Academy of the Hebrew Language's official anatomical dictionary defines *padachat* as *glabella*—a Latin term which refers to the smooth part of the forehead above and between the eyebrows, thus seemingly excluding the temples.)

Now that we have essentially established that *meitzach* and *padachat* mean the same thing, we can begin to explore the etymological basis of the word *padachat*. Its root seems to be PEH-CHET-DALET, but such a root is not attested to anywhere else in Hebrew. Dr. Alexander Kohut (1842-1894) writes in *Aruch HaShaleim* that the word *padachat* is of Persian origin. Indeed, according to the *Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon Project* (known to scholars as CAL), the few places in which the word *padachat* appear in the Talmud and Rabbinic literature are the only instances of this word in Aramaic texts. This suggests that it is not really an Aramaic word, supporting Kohut's theory that the word is originally Persian, because if it is not from Hebrew or Aramaic, then Persian would be the next logical candidate.

Nonetheless, some learned rabbis argue for a Semitic or even Hebrew basis for the word *padachat.* By way of metathesis, Rabbi Yaakov Yehuda (Zilberberg) de Kassif (1914-2003) connects three different Hebrew roots which use the consonants PEH, DALET, and CHET in various orders: *dachaf* ("push"), *pachad* ("fear"), and *padachat*. He explains that haste and confusion oftentimes "push" their way to the forefront of a person's emotions, thus causing "fear" to become one's dominant feeling. One's internal sense of fear is, in turn, "pushed" outwards and is oftentimes physically manifest on his or her "forehead."

Rabbi Chelouche argues that since the letters MEM and PEH are interchangeable (because both are pronounced by the lips), and the letters TZADI and DALET can be interchangeable (as evidenced by their orthographic similarity in Arabic), *padachat* can actually be understood as a cognate of *metzach*.

Similarly, Rabbi Yehoshua Steinberg of the Veromemanu Foundation suggests connecting the root PEH-DALET-CHET with PEH-REISH-CHET because of the interchangeability of the letters DALET and REISH. The latter means "flowering" or "blossoming" and thus refers to something that protrudes or sticks out. This somewhat echoes Rashi's (to *Shabbos* 151b) comment about the *padachat/metzach,* that it is the smoothest and shiniest part of the face, such that it sticks out the most.

The Arabic word *fadiha* (or *fadichah*) has entered Modern Hebrew slang and is commonly used to refer to a "shameful occurrence," a "scandal," or an instance of "public shaming." When asked about an etymological connection between *fadiha* and *padachat,* Rabbi Shaul Goldman suggested two possible ways of understanding the word *fadiha.* Firstly, he suggests that the word *fadiha* is related to the Aramaic root BET-DALET-CHET, which means "happiness" or "joking" (and is the etymological basis for the Hebrew word *bedichah*, "joke," and the Hebrew/Yiddish word *badchan,* "joker"). Because synonyms for joyous expressions are often used to also refer to "ridicule," the BET morphed into a PEH to become *fadiha.*

Alternatively, Rabbi Goldman supposes that *padachat* and *fadiha* are related in that both imply "exposure" (noting that the verb *fadah* in Arabic means "to expose"): The forehead is the most *exposed* part of the body, and a *fadiha* is an embarrassing incident which *exposes* one's foibles. Although totally anachronistic, we may perhaps add that Jean-Luc Picard's memetic facepalm is a very human reaction to an embarrassing situation, which further cements the connection between *padachat* and *fadiha.*

**NOTE*: Cognates of this word in the Bible are always in the possessive/construct form, so they are vowelized with a TZEIRI (or CHIRIK) under the MEM to become *meitzach.* That said, there is a controversy over how the word should be vowelized when not in the construct form. Some argue that the MEM should still have TZEIRI and the word remains *meitzach*, while others maintain that the MEM should be vowelized with a SEGOL and becomes *metzach*. This dispute has practical ramifications in the Yom Kippur liturgy in which we confess sin committed with a "brazen forehead," as some prayer books read "*azut metzach*" and some read "*azut meitzach.*"

- *For questions, comments, or to propose ideas for a future article, please contact the author at rcklein@ohr.edu*

LETTER AND SPIRIT

Insights based on the writings of Rav S.R. Hirsch by Rabbi Yosef Hershman

The Menorah: Enlightened Spirit

The materials used in the construction of the Mishkan have symbolic value and convey a great deal about our relationship to G-d and the manner in which we are to consecrate our lives. The meaning of the menorah would seem obvious — it is the source of light, of spiritual enlightenment.

Normally we associate light with knowledge and wisdom, intellectual or spiritual enlightenment. Rav Hirsch cites a plethora of verses from the Tanach where lamp and light denote teaching, wisdom and Torah. But he cites an even greater number of verses in which *lamp* and *light* are used as metaphors for the source of growth and life, of unfolding and flowering, of progress and joy.

Perception and enlightenment are only part of the spiritual symbolism of light. The other essential component is movement, which, together with perception, epitomizes the effect and meaning of light. This movement is not physical movement, but organic and spiritual movement. In this sense, the light of the menorah represents both perception — the element that enlightens, and movement — the element that mobilizes. In man, this duality takes the form of *perception* and *volition*. The exercise of these two faculties demonstrates the presence of the human spirit.

At their root, volition and perception are one, and they strive to reunite in their objectives. Any perception of truth is of value only if there is practical implementation. And conversely, all doing of good must be oriented towards the recognition of truth. Only from this perception of truth does the good deed derive its motivation and assurance that it is truly of value.

The menorah was constructed of three pairs of lateral branches emerging from a central shaft. Each pair, representing perception and volition, issued from the same point on the central shaft. When they reach up to the top of the menorah, the two branches directed their light towards each other, and also to the central branch common to both. This central flame points upwards, symbolizing the spirit dedicated to G-d. The entire menorah is thus a call to set the dedication to G-d as the goal of our united perception and volition.

The menorah ideally is to be constructed from single piece of gold, chiseled away to create its structure. It is to be made of gold, the noblest of metals, but if gold is not available it may be made of other metals, excluding scrap metal. If necessary, it may also be constructed piece by piece. While the menorah's ideal construction symbolizes the purity of spirit that the Jew aspires to, the fact that it may be fashioned from other metals, and even piecemeal, suggests that the call to spiritual ascent is for every Jew. In every circumstance, at his level, with the faculties with which he is endowed, whether he lives in turbulent or tranquil times — he can achieve moral perfection.

- *Source: Commentary, Shemot 25:39*

PARSHA OVERVIEW

Hashem commands Moshe to build a Mishkan (Sanctuary) and supplies him with detailed instructions. The *Bnei Yisrael* are asked to contribute precious metals and stones, fabrics, skins, oil and spices. In the Mishkan's outer courtyard is an altar for the burnt offerings and a laver for washing. The Tent of Meeting is divided by a curtain into two chambers. The outer chamber is accessible only to the *Kohanim*, the descendants of Aharon. This contains the table of showbreads, the *menorah*, and the golden altar for incense. The innermost chamber, the Holy of Holies, may be entered only by the *Kohen Gadol*, and only once a year, on Yom Kippur. Here is the ark that held the Ten Commandments inscribed on the two tablets of stone which Hashem gave to the Jewish nation on Mount Sinai. All of the utensils and vessels, as well as the construction of the Mishkan, are described in great detail.

Immunity in the Community

Michael from NY asked:

With the current Corona virus scare, although there is no vaccine at this time, I was wondering: Are we required to immunize our children? Since the scientific knowledge is not 100% accurate and there is some proof that vaccines can cause harm, are we even allowed to vaccinate children?

Dear Michael,

Our Torah Sages teach that in medical matters we should rely on the experts in each generation. Therefore, as with any medical issue, one is required to find a doctor with sufficient expertise in the subject, such that his opinion may be relied upon.

There's no blanket answer concerning *all* vaccines, but certainly many childhood diseases have been practically eliminated or reduced since their introduction. Smallpox, for example, once a great killer of children, is today extremely rare. On the other hand, some vaccinations are of highly questionable value. Find a doctor whom you trust to help select the proper immunizations for your child.

The main point in Judaism is to take great care with one's own health and to take great care not to be negligent in caring about the health of someone else. There are two related principles in Judaism that may be seen to be reasons for making vaccination mandatory. I will present them to provide a basic understanding of the issue, but this discussion is only for general interest and not for making a real-life decision.

The first principle is that is forbidden for a Jew to place his life or health in unreasonable danger. In a classic article Rabbi Shlomo Yosef Zevin discusses the halachic enforceability of Shylock's agreement with Antonio in "The Merchant of Venice." Shylock stipulates that if Antonio does not pay his debt on time, Shylock will be entitled to a pound of Antonio's flesh. Rabbi Zevin demonstrates that such a clause would be absolutely unenforceable under Jewish law because "our bodies are not our own; they are the property of G-d." In effect, the Torah teaches us that our bodies are not our own property but belong to G-d to be used in His service and to be protected and preserved until such time as He chooses to reclaim it. This is in sharp contrast to modern medical ethics and political theory which posit autonomy and self-determination as supreme values, and enshrine the attitude that "it is my body and I can do with it what I will" — including reckless endangerment. And, obviously, if I do not have the right to endanger myself, I certainly don't have the right to endanger my children.

The second principle focuses on the duty that is owed to others. Just as we are commanded to preserve and protect our own lives, we are similarly commanded to remove impediments or stumbling blocks that cause dangers to others. This is derived from the mitzvah of erecting fences around flat roofs so that people who climb onto the roof should not fall down. Moreover, even if I am not the source of the danger I have a duty to do what I can to rescue someone from whatever peril they may be in, such as rescuing someone from drowning etc. "Do not stand by idly over your friend's blood" (Leviticus 19:16). Thus, we have duties owed to G-d not to expose ourselves, our children or others to hazards, risks or dangers. Since failure to vaccinate endangers both my children and the children of others, both obligations would lead to same result — a duty to minimize danger.

For questions, comments, or to propose ideas for a future article, please contact the author at rcklein@ohr.edu

OHRNET magazine is published by OHR SOMAYACH Tanenbaum College

POB 18103, Jerusalem 91180, Israel • Tel: +972-2-581-0315 • Email: info@ohr.edu • www.ohr.edu

Love of the Land, written by RAV MENDEL WEINBACH, zt"l • General Editor: RABBI MOSHE NEWMAN • Design: RABBI ELIEZER SHAPIRO z"l / DANIEL FREEDMAN

Ohr Somayach
Tanenbaum College

NEW SERIES

from Ohr Somayach

Q&A with Rav Breitowitz

www.podcast.ohr.edu

Rav Breitowitz answers common questions about Judaism.

Harry's Video Blog

www.ohr.edu/harry

Short weekly videos on the parsha by Harry Rothenberg, Esq.

Parshas Tetzaveh: A Continual Offering

By Rabbi Yitzchak Etshalom

"THEY SHALL MAKE FOR ME A MIKDASH"

Hashem spoke to Moses, saying, Speak to the people of Israel, that they bring me an offering; from every man that gives it willingly with his heart you shall take my offering. And this is the offering which you shall take from them; gold, and silver, and bronze, And blue, and purple, and scarlet, and fine linen, and goats' hair, And rams' skins dyed red, and goats' skins, and shittim wood, Oil for the light, spices for the anointing oil, and for sweet incense, Onyx stones, and stones to be set on the ephod, and on the breastplate. And let them make me a sanctuary; that I may dwell among them. According to all that I show you, after the pattern of the tabernacle, and the pattern of all its utensils, so shall you make it. (Sh'mot 25:1-9)

Rambam (MT Beit haBechirah 1:1), quoting what is arguably the most famous verse in our Parashah, sees in it the Toraic command to construct the Beit haBechirah (Beit haMikdash):

It is a Mitzvat 'Aseh to build a house for Hashem, constructed to bring offerings; we congregate there for celebration three times a year, as it says: "They will build for Me a Mikdash". The Mishkan constructed by Mosheh Rabbenu was already explicated in the Torah – and it was only temporary, as it says…

Rambam's adumbration clearly presents the Mishkan as being the forerunner of the Mikdash. This can be stated in one of two ways:

The Mishkan was the "temporary" Mikdash OR
The Mikdash is the permanent Mishkan.

While there are significant distinctions between these approaches – chiefly, which of the two abodes is seen as the "essential" one – both assessments share a common premise: That the Mishkan and the Mikdash are essentially, functionally and teleologically one and the same. This is, by and large, the conventional understanding, prevalent both in classical Rabbinic writings and more recent homiletic literature.

I would like to suggest that a closer look at the Mishkan and Mikdash, as they are presented in T'nakh, reveal a different relationship between the two, one that, if properly assayed, can help us appreciate the significance of each structure in its own right, as well as clarifying a number of troubling textual and extra-textual difficulties relating to these edifices.

Before continuing, it is prudent to point out that it is not a consensus in the exegetical tradition to interpret our verse as referring to the Beit haMikdash:

Granted that Mikdash is called Mishkan, for it is written: And I will set My Mishkan among you; but whence do we know that Mishkan is called Mikdash? Shall we say, because it is written: And the Kohathites, the bearers of the Mikdash set forward? This refers to the Ark, Well then, from this verse: And let them make me a Mikdash, that I may dwell among them; and it is written: According to all that I show thee the pattern of the Mishkan. (BT Shavuot 16b)

First of all, I'd like to point to several difficulties which the "conventional" approach generates within T'nakh.

II. THE QUESTIONS

A: AND IT CAME TO PASS IN THE 480TH YEAR…

The first glaring problem raised by the "Mishkan=Mikdash" approach is one of timing. If the Mishkan is simply the "temporary solution" to the Mikdash, i.e. that until the B'nei Yisra'el are settled in their land, they need a portable "mini-Mikdash", then why isn't the Beit haMikdash constructed as soon as they enter the Land. We see that the B'nei Yisra'el began implementing those commands which are Land-dependent (Mitzvot haT'luyot ba'Aretz – see Kiddushin 1:9) immediately, or as soon as it was feasible. For instance, as soon as the B'nei Yisra'el entered the Land, they performed the Pesach (see Yehoshua 5 – see also Sh'mot 12:25). Why, then, did they not construct the Mikdash immediately? Note how long it took:

And it came to pass in the four hundred and eightieth year after the B'nei Yisra'el came out of the land of Egypt, in the fourth year of Sh'lomo's reign over Yisra'el, in the month Ziv, which is the second month, that he began to build the house of Hashem. (I M'lakhim 6:1)

In other words, it took four hundred and forty years after entering the Land before the Mikdash was built.

The immediate and nearly visceral defense to this challenge is one of specific location – although they had entered the Land, they had not yet arrived at Yerushalayim – thus prolonging the reality adumbrated by Mosheh:

For you are not as yet come to the rest and to the inheritance, which Hashem your God gives you. (D'varim 12:9)

And yet, this defense does not stand up well to the testimony of the text. Among the first wars fought by Yehoshua (perhaps, as I argued in the essay in Parashat Beshalach this year [V'shinantam 3/16], his first real war of conquest), the king of Yerushalayim, who organized the "southern alliance" of five kings, is vanquished. One might counter that even though he was defeated, that doesn't mean that the city was conquered – but the text is quite clear in the summary of wars (Yehoshua 12):

And these are the kings of the country whom Yehoshua and the B'nei Yisra'el struck on this side of the Yarden on the west, from Ba'al-Gad in the valley of L'vanon to the Mount Halak, that ascends to Se'ir; which Yehoshua gave to the tribes of Yisra'el for a possession according to their divisions…The king of Jerusalem… (Yehoshua 12:7,10)

Yerushalayim was in Yisra'eli hands as early as the first all-out war fought in the Land – and it remained a Yisra'eli town throughout the period, as indicated by the verse at the beginning of Shoftim:

And the sons of Binyamin did not drive out the Yevusi who inhabited Yerushalayim; but the Yevusi live with the sons of Binyamin in

Yerushalayim to this day. (Shof'tim 1:21)

The next counter-argument is that since Yerushalayim was not totally under Yisra'eli control – and rid of any foreign citizens – the Beit haMikdash could not yet be built. This argument rests on three questionable premises:
1) The situation changed in the times of David or Sh'lomo; i.e. that David drove the Yevusi out of the city such that it was a totally Judean city. Every indication of the text, up to and including the purchase of Aravnah the Yevusi's granary (the future site of the Mikdash) by David (II Sh'mu'el 24:24) points to a continued Yevusi presence in the city.

2) Absolute control of the city is necessary in order to build the Mikdash. Again, the testimony of the text clearly refutes this. We need go no further than the rebuilding of the Mikdash by Zerubavel and Yehoshua (c. 518 BCE), when the city itself, inhabited by Cutean enemies and controlled by the Persian empire, was still a valid location for construction of the Mikdash. Even if one were to posit that this is only true once the first Mikdash was constructed (following the argument that the first sanctity was eternal – see MT Beit haBechirah 6:15-16), we still come back to the presence of the Yevusi, as a significant population in the city, during the times of David.

3) Yerushalayim was always destined as the place of the Mikdash. This is the conventional way of explaining the oft-repeated reference to "The place that I will choose to place My Name", which is nearly anthemic in Sefer D'varim (12:5, 11, 14, 18, 21; 14:23, 24, 25; 15:20; 16:2, 6, 7, 11, 15, 16; 17:8, 10; 18:6; 26:2; 31:11). It is generally understood as a veiled reference to Yerushalayim. For instance, Sifri identifies The place which Hashem will choose (12:18) as "Yerushalayim". This is consistent with the Rabbinic interpretation of a key verse which appears in the earliest context of "the place that I will choose":

For you are not as yet come to the Menuchah (rest) and to the Nachalah (inheritance) (D'varim 12:9) – Our Rabbis taught: Menuchah alludes to Shiloh (the site of the Mishkan from Yehoshua's time until the end of the period of the Shof'tim); Nachalah, to Yerushalayim. (BT Zevahim 119a)

Haza"l understand that the presence of the Mishkan in Shiloh was merely a "rest"; whereas the arrival in Yerushalayim was the "inheritance" i.e. final settlement. It is prudent to note that there are four opinions regarding the interpretation of these two terms, only one of which is quoted by Rashi (and thus is the "famous" one):

a) R. Yehudah: Menuchah = Shiloh; Nachalah = Yerushalayim

b) R. Shim'on: Menuchah = Yerushalayim; Nachalah = Shiloh

c) The school of R. Yishma'el: Menuchah = Shiloh; Nachalah = Shiloh

d) R. Shim'on b. Yohai: Menuchah = Yerushalayim; Nachalah = Yerushalayim

However we may wish to understand these four divergent interpretations, one thing seems clear and unanimous: that Yerushalayim is the proper understanding of "the place that I will choose". I would like to suggest that this is not necessarily the case – that these Midrashim reflect the historical reality that Yerushalayim was chosen as the site of the Mikdash. In other words, instead of reading these Midrashim as "the place that I will choose means Yerushalayim", we should understand them as "the place that I will choose turns out to be Yerushalayim". This idea will be explicated further down.

In any case, the argument that the Mikdash could not be built immediately after Yehoshua's conquest due to the "foreign" presence in the city of Yerushalayim is a difficult one.

One final argument might be mustered to explain the delay in building the Mikdash.

The Halakhah clearly states that the B'nei Yisra'el were given three commands which took effect upon their entry into the Land:

R. Yose said: Three commandments were given to Yisra'el when they entered the land;

to appoint a king;
to cut off the seed of Amalek;
and to build themselves the chosen house [i.e. the Temple]
and I do not know which of them has priority. But, when it is said: The hand upon the throne of Y-H, Hashem will have war with Amalek from generation to generation, we must infer that they had first to set up a king, for throne implies a king, as it is written, Then Sh'lomo sat on the throne of Hashem as king. (BT Sanhedrin 20b)

Since they could not (or perhaps were not obligated to) build the Mikdash until a king was anointed, the delay is now understandable – but is it?

First of all, this Halakhah itself begs the question – especially if we accept the underlying premise that the Mikdash is the "permanent Mishkan". Why would the Mitzvah of building a Mikdash be dependent on the prior anointing of a king? We do not find that other "Land-dependent" Mitzvot require a monarch and his throne to activate obligation or allow fulfillment – why does making the temporary Mishkan a permanent edifice have this prerequisite?

We have already addressed the second question raised by this Halakhah – why it took so long for the B'nei Yisra'el to appoint a king (see V'shinantam 1/27).

If we are to understand the role of the Mikdash, we must also find a solution to this "Halakhic sequencing" – something we will endeavor to do in this essay.

In sum, the first set of problems we have encountered if we accept that the principle of identity applies to the Mishkan and the Mikdash is the lengthy delay in building that great building.

B: THE ARON

It is abundantly clear that the Aron (ark), which houses the Edut (testimony – the tablets of the covenant) is the central "vessel" in the

Mishkan. It is the first item listed in the order of building (Sh'mot 25:10-16) and, more significantly, it is the base of the Keruvim, from where God will communicate with Mosheh:

And there I will meet with you, and I will talk with you from above the cover, from between the two Keruvim which are upon the ark of the Testimony, of all things which I will give you in commandment to the people of Yisra'el. (25:22)

In addition, the Aron (with attendant Kapporet and Keruvim) is the only vessel which sits in the Kodesh Kodashim, that most intimate and holy of locations.

If the Mikdash serves the same function as the Mishkan and is its permanent housing, we would expect the Aron to play a similarly central and significant role in the Mikdash. The text is quite clear on this point – the significance of the Aron changes dramatically (yet subtly) and its role is diminished once the Mikdash is constructed. This can be most easily seen from Rambam's description of the building of the Mikdash and its appurtenances (MT Beit haBechirah 1-4). Whereas Rambam lists the Shulchan (table), Menorah, incense altar, copper (outer) altar etc., there is no mention of the Aron. Rather, Rambam relegates the Aron to a somewhat historical presentation:

There was a rock in the west of the Kodesh Kodashim upon which the Aron rested. In front of it stood the vessel with the Mahn (see Sh'mot 16:32-34) and Aharon's staff (see Bamidbar 17:25). When Sh'lomo built the House and he knew that it would ultimately be destroyed, he built a place to hide the Aron, underneath in a deep and crooked hiding place and Yoshiyahu the king commanded and hid it in the place that Sh'lomo built as it says: And he said to the L'vi'im who taught all Yisra'el, who were holy to Hashem, Put the holy ark in the house which Sh'lomo the son of David king of Yisra'el built; it shall not be a burden upon your shoulders; serve now Hashem your God, (II Divrei haYamim 35:3) Along with it, Aharon's staff, the vessel which held the Mahn and oil of anointment were hidden – and they were never retrieved for the second (rebuilt) House… (MT Beit haBechirah 4:1)

Why was the Aron hidden? We understand Sh'lomo's concern – that when the Mikdash would be plundered, the Aron would not fall into enemy hands. Yet the practical implementation of this is difficult – how could a king (or anyone else) take it upon himself to remove (or pre-arrange for the removal of, as in Sh'lomo's case) the central vessel of the Mikdash? Aren't we commanded to maintain a proper Mikdash – and if God allows the enemy to plunder, so be it? How can we remove the central vessel from its place?

Our second question relates, then, to the Aron and its role. If the Mikdash is the "settled" Mishkan, why doesn't the Aron play the same prominent and central role in Yerushalayim as it did in the desert – and in Shiloh?

C: DAVID'S REQUEST

The key passage relating to the initiative to build the Mikdash is found in Sefer Sh'mu'el:

And it came to pass, when the king sat in his house, and Hashem had given him rest from all his enemies; That the king said to Nathan the prophet, See now, I live in a house of cedar, but the ark of God dwells within curtains. And Nathan said to the king, Go, do all that is in your heart; for Hashem is with you. And it came to pass that night, that the word of Hashem came to Nathan, saying, Go and tell My servant David, Thus said Hashem, Shall you build Me a house for Me to dwell in? Because I have not dwelt in any house since the time that I brought up the people of Yisra'el out of Egypt, even to this day, but have walked in a tent and in a tabernacle. In all the places where I have walked with all the people of Yisra'el spoke I a word with any of the tribes of Yisra'el, whom I commanded to feed my people Yisra'el, saying, Why do you not build Me a house of cedar? And therefore so shall you say to My servant David, Thus said Hashem of hosts, I took you from the sheepfold, from following the sheep, to be ruler over My people, over Yisra'el; And I was with you wherever you went, and have cut off all your enemies from your sight, and have made you a great name, like the names of the great men who are in the earth. And I have appointed a place for my people Yisra'el, and have planted them, that they may dwell in a place of their own, and move no more; nor shall the children of wickedness afflict them any more, as formerly, From the time that I commanded judges to be over my people Yisra'el, and have caused you to rest from all your enemies. Also Hashem tells you that He will make you a house. And when your days are fulfilled, and you shall sleep with your fathers, I will set up your seed after you, who shall issue from your bowels, and I will establish his kingdom. He shall build a house for My Name, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever. I will be his father, and he shall be My son. If he commits iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men, and with such plagues as befall the sons of men; But My mercy shall not depart away from him, as I took it from Sha'ul, whom I put away before you. And your house and your kingdom shall be established forever before you; your throne shall be established forever. According to all these words, and according to all this vision, so did Nathan speak to David. (II Sh'mu'el 7:1-17)

This selection raises a number of difficulties:

1) At the beginning of Nathan's prophecy, God seems to reject the notion of a dwelling place – "spoke I a word…saying, Why do you not build Me a house of cedar?" Yet, further on, God acceded to David's request. Does the Mikdash have Divine approval or not?

2) When God approves of David's initiative, He promises that the house will be built – by David's son. Why isn't David allowed to build it himself? Keep in mind that this prophecy occurs during the early part of David's career as "full monarch" (post-Sha'ul) – a career which spans 40.5 years. The commonly assumed reason for this generational delay is found in a passage in Divrei haYamim:

And David said to Sh'lomo, My son, as for me, it was in my mind to build a house to the name of Hashem my God; And the word of Hashem came to me, saying, You have shed abundant blood, and have made great wars; you shall not build a house to My Name, because you have shed much blood upon the earth in My sight. (I Divrei haYamim 22:7-8)

This is, however, not found anywhere in the contemporary texts (Sh'mu'el/M'lakhim) and reflects the overall perspective of Divrei haYamim (composed during the Second Temple era – see BT Bava Batra 14a), which heightens the "spiritual/religious" nature of the Yisra'eli monarchy. If this is a piece of the reason for prohibiting David from building, it is certainly not the whole story – for, if it were, why would it not be mentioned either by Nathan, by David (to Sh'lomo – see I M'lakhim 2) or by Sh'lomo (in his words to Hiram [I M'lakhim 5:17, 19] and to the nation [ibid. 8:17-19])

Why is David prevented from building the house himself?

D: URIM VETUMIM

An ancillary question, one which does not – at first blush – seem relevant to our discussion, revolves around the role of the Kohanic breastplate – the Hoshen – more commonly and directly known as the Urim veTumim.
Through the first post-Mosaic eras, the Urim veTumim played a central role in leading the nation – whenever the leader (be he Kohen, Navi or Melekh) had to resolve a crucial military or political matter, he would turn directly to God through the office of the Urim veTumim. (Indeed, it was the lack of response from the Urim veTumim [I Sh'mu'el 28:6] that drove Sha'ul to go- incognito – to the sorceress at Ein-Dor).

Here are a few examples of the use of this direct form of Divine guidance through the early political and military history of settlement:

1) The apportionment of the Land by Yehoshua and Elazar was accomplished through the breastplate (Bava Batra 122a, interpeting "Al Pi Hashem" in Yehoshua 19:50).

2) And it came to pass, after the death of Yehoshua, that the people of Yisra'el asked Hashem, saying, Who shall go up for us against the K'na'ani first, to fight against them? And Hashem said, Yehudah shall go up; behold, I have delivered the land into his hand. (Shof'tim 1:1-2 – see Ralbag and Rabbenu Yeshaya ad loc.)

3) And Sha'ul asked counsel of God, Shall I go down after the P'lish'tim? Will you deliver them into the hand of Yisra'el? (I Sh'mu'el 14:37)

4) And he inquired of Hashem for him, and gave him provisions, and gave him the sword of Goliath the Philistine. (I Sh'mu'el 22:10 – see, however, the animadversion of R. Yeshaya ad loc.)

5) Therefore David inquired of Hashem, saying, Shall I go and strike these P'lish'tim? And Hashem said to David, Go, and strike the P'lish'tim, and save Keilah. (I Sh'mu'el 23:2)

6) And it came to pass after this, that David inquired of Hashem, saying, Shall I go up to any of the cities of Yehudah? And Hashem said to him, Go up. And David said, Where shall I go up? And He said, To Hebron. (II Sh'mu'el 2:1)

Curiously, the Urim veTumim – or any direct address to God for this type of guidance – disappears during David's career.

Our final question, then, seems to be unrelated to the analysis of the relationship between the Mishkan and Mikdash: Why are the Urim veTumim "put to rest" during David's career?

It should be noted that Haza"l maintain the continued use of the Urim veTumim throughout the First Commonwealth (see, inter alia, Sotah 9:12 and Shavu'ot 2:2 and the Bavli ad loc.), nonetheless, they were used in a different fashion than earlier. Whereas in the pre-Davidic and Davidic examples noted above, the individual leader approached God via the Urim veTumim on his own, the Rabbinic description of the use of Urim veTumim necessitates the participation of the king and the Beit Din haGadol (Sanhedrin).

Regardless, the T'nakh makes no mention of their use after this period – and this certainly is a sea change in the relationship with God and in His direct leadership of His people. How can we understand this change?

E: SH'LOMO'S TEFILLAH

This, again, is a question which may not seem to relate to our question but its resolution is most certainly a piece of this puzzle.

In the beautiful T'fillah offered by Sh'lomo at the dedication of the Mikdash (I M'lakhim 8), Sh'lomo describes the apparent futility of attempting to "house God". He goes on to (apparently) describe the future function of the Mikdash, pointing out how His people will face His house in prayer when in need, at war etc. What is curiously missing from this T'fillah is any mention of offerings (Korbanot) – although that is certainly a most central and critical function of the Mishkan. How can we explain this omission?

III. SUMMARY

We noted that conventional wisdom holds that the Mishkan was the temporary forerunner to the Mikdash – or that the Mikdash was the permanent version of the Mishkan. Although these two formulations are not identical and reflect distinct understandings of the focal point of the Mishkan/Mikdash, they share a perspective which raises difficulties in several passages in T'nakh.

We asked why there was such a delay (nearly half a millenium) between entering the Land and the construction of the Mikdash – and that Yerushalayim, the eventual site of the Mikdash, was already in Yisra'eli hands during the early parts of Yehoshua's career. We also questioned whether Yerushalayim was the pre-determined location of the Mikdash, a topic we will expand upon next week, and pointed out that there was never a requirement of absolute Yisra'eli control over the town in order to build the Mikdash.

We then noted that the Aron seems to lose its role as the centerpiece of the Sanctuary within the context of the Mikdash – a role which is unquestioned and clear in the Mishkan.

We further pointed out the difficulties arising from David's request to build the Mikdash – and God's response through the prophet Nathan. It is unclear whether the "House of God" is even a desideratum, and once God agrees to David's request, he delays the construction until David's son will ascend the throne.

We concluded our questions with two apparently unrelated issues in T'nakh – the dramatic shift in the use of the Urim veTumim after the Davidic period and the omission of offerings from Sh'lomo's prayer at the dedication of the Mikdash.

In next week's essay, we will analyze the distinct functions of the Mishkan and the Mikdash, clarifying each and thereby responding to these difficulties.