

INTERNET PARSHA SHEET
ON TERUMAH - 5758

B'S'D'

To receive these Parsha sheets by e-mail, contact cshulman@aol.com
See also <http://members.aol.com/crshulman/torah.html>

weekly@jer1.co.il * TORAH WEEKLY * Highlights of the Weekly Torah Portion Parshas Terumah 27 & 28 February 1998 <http://www.ohr.org.il>
Insights The Lair Of The Lion "They shall make a Sanctuary for Me." (25:2) A couple of years ago a well-know Israeli daily newspaper, not known for its sympathy to religion, published a cartoon. In the cartoon, a man was having a dream. Out of his head came the statutory "think-bubbles." The bubbles got larger and larger until the following scene unraveled: The man saw himself "upstairs" being questioned by winged angels wearing black hats: "But why didn't you keep Shabbos?" they asked. "You knew there was a thing called Shabbos didn't you? What about Kashrus? You knew there was something called Kashrus?" In the following bubble, the man wakes up in a cold sweat. Then a close-up on his face. "Maybe they're right!" he says. Why isn't everyone religious? Why don't people think: "What if those religious fanatics are right? After all, if they're wrong, at least they have wonderfully rich and fulfilling lives, lovely families, etc. And if they're right, and I'm wrong? I'm going to lose out on something eternal. I'm going to get to the next world and I won't have the price of admission. I won't even be able to get a cheap seat! Maybe I will have to give an accounting in front of the real Supreme Court. I'll be religious just in case! Better safe than sorry!" Why don't people think like this? In this week's Parsha the Torah starts a lengthy description of the Mishkan. The sheer volume of this account outweighs almost every subject in the Torah. What was the Mishkan and why does it merit such voluminous expanse in the Book where nothing is merely descriptive and there is no place for literary embellishment? The word Mishkan comes from the word "to dwell." It was the place where Hashem "dwelled" in this lower world. But how can a mere building house the One whose glory fills the universe. How can the Omnipresent have a "house?" There is a difference between existence and presence. Hashem exists equally everywhere. He is no more in one place than another, because there is no place where He is not. Rather, the Mishkan was a place where the presence of Hashem was palpable. You could see He was there. Imagine sitting at a computer. You are typing away, lost in the great American/British/Israeli novel. Unbeknownst to you, a lion enters your room. It's a very quiet, well-behaved lion, and you carry on typing in blissful ignorance. The lion's existence is unaltered by whether you carry on typing or you turn around and give yourself a bit of a surprise. However, the presence of the lion has everything to do with whether you turn around or not. The Mishkan allowed one to see and fear the Lion. Hashem's presence there was palpable. The word for "sight" in Hebrew is from the same root as "fear" -- yirah. What is the connection between seeing and fearing? A person only fears what he can see. Intellectual concepts don't frighten us. The biggest proof is that even if we're religious and we know that there is a world-to-come, a cosmic day of reckoning, even though we know these things clearly, we can't see them, and so we don't really fear. Fear only comes from seeing the Lion. Going into the Mishkan was like going into the lion's lair.

Business As Usual "Take for Me an offering" (25:2) "I have given you a good `deal' (lit. `taking') _ My Torah, do not forsake it." (Tehillim, 132:8-10) The Torah is like business. If you have a bad week in business, you don't close up the shop. Because if you close the shop and give up working completely you'll just sink lower and lower until you hit bottom. Similarly in Torah study, even though there are times when we fail and we feel very despondent, we must continue to try harder and harder with an implacable will. For if we stop studying the Torah, if we "close up the shop," we will find ourselves suing for spiritual bankruptcy.

Heart Is Where The Home Is "And they shall make a Sanctuary for Me,

so I may dwell in them." (25:8) The Torah's choice of the words "so I may dwell in them" is unusual, for more correctly it should have written "so I may dwell in it." -- in the Sanctuary. However, the real meaning is that every Jew should make his heart into a Sanctuary where Hashem will dwell. "And they shall make their hearts into a Sanctuary for Me, so I may dwell in them."

The Jewel In The Crown "You shall cover it (the Aron) with pure gold, from within and without, and you shall make on it a gold crown all around. (25:11) The Aron HaKodesh, the Holy Ark, represents the Torah scholar. He must be as golden on the inside as he is on the outside -- his inner character must be consistent with his public demeanor. Then the Torah will be his crown and he will be a crown for the Torah.

Who's Carrying Whom? "The staves shall remain in the rings of the Ark, they may not be removed from it." (25:15) In the description of the Aron HaKodesh, the Holy Ark, the Torah tells us that the carrying staves are never to be separated from the Ark itself. These staves represent the financial supporters of Torah. Just as the staves of the Ark may not be removed, so are the Torah's supporters and benefactors inseparable from Torah scholarship. However, the Ark never really needed the staves because, not only did it miraculously bear its own weight, but it would lift up those who were "carrying" it. When Rabbi Eliezer Gordon, the founder of Telshe Yeshiva, got married, his father-in-law, Rabbi Avraham Yitzchak Neivezer wanted to support him so he could devote himself to study and become a great Torah scholar. As Rabbi Gordon's family began to grow, he became increasingly uncomfortable with the feeling that he was burdening his father-in-law, and frequently asked Reb Avraham to allow him to accept one of the numerous rabbinical positions that were then being offered to him. Despite difficult financial times, Reb Avraham refused to let him accept. He insisted that Rabbi Gordon carry on studying. Reb Avraham's wife asked her husband how long he intended to support their daughter and son-in-law. He replied "My dear wife, who knows who is supporting whom?" When finally Rabbi Gordon was offered the Rabbinate of Eisheshok, his father-in-law felt he could not restrain him from accepting such an important post. The day after the Gordon family left for Eisheshok, Reb Avraham Yitzchak, Rabbi Gordon's father-in-law, passed away. It then became clear who had been supporting whom.

Sources: o The Lair Of The Lion - Rabbi Moshe Shapiro, Rabbi Mordechai Perlman and Rabbi Naftali Kaplan o Business As Usual - Rabbi David MiKotzk o Heart Is Where The Home Is - Alshich o The Jewel In The Crown - Rabbeinu Chananel o Kochav M'Yaakov Written and Compiled by Rabbi Yaakov Asher Sinclair General Editor: Rabbi Moshe Newman Production Design: Lev Seltzer Prepared by the Jewish Learning Exchange of Ohr Somayach International <http://www.ohr.org.il> (C) 1998 Ohr Somayach International - All rights reserved.

drasha@torah.org by Rabbi Mordechai Kamenetzky DRASHA -- PARSHAS TERUMAH -- A VISION THING Volume 4 Issue 21

Among the items that were to be included in the building of the Tabernacle was acacia wood. And though there is no acacia wood in the Sinai Desert, Rashi tells us that 210 years before the exodus, on the journey to Egypt, Yaakov (Jacob) brought acacia trees to be planted in Egypt. He knew that one day the Jews would be liberated and would need a sanctuary in their sojourn. So he prepared wood. Yaakov had not seen his son for 22 years, yet mind while going to see Yoseph, he brought the material needed for a structure, that was to be built years in the future! What prompted Yaakov to think that way? Was there nothing else to bring to Egypt? Why wasn't he worried with the needs of the present? After all, 70 souls were entering a new land and culture. I am sure there were more pertinent things to bring than wood.

On a visit to Congregation Toras Chaim of Hewlett, NY, Rabbi Paysach Krohn told a wonderful story. Ponovez Yeshiva in Bnai Beraq is one of the most distinguished Yeshivos in the world. A number of years ago, at the beginning of a semester, a young boy from Switzerland who applied there was denied entry. The Rosh Yeshiva (Dean) told him to come back in a few years, his level of study was not advanced enough for the Yeshiva, and he also was a bit too young. The boy said he understood, but he wanted to speak to the Rebbitzin, the widow of the founder and late Rosh Yeshiva of

Ponovez, Rabbi Yosef Shlomo Kahanamen, of blessed memory. The Yeshiva administration was a bit surprised: Rav Kahanamen had passed away a number of years prior, and the young man did not claim to know the Rebbitzin. More important, she had no role in the admission process. Nevertheless, the young man was shown the Rebbitzin's apartment. After a few moments, the boy emerged, and the Rebbitzin asked to speak with the Rosh Yeshiva. It took less than a few minutes, for the Rosh Yeshiva to emerge and motion the young student waiting outside of the Rebbitzin's apartment. "Welcome to Ponovezer Yeshiva," the Rosh Yeshiva heartily declared. "We have decided to accept you wholeheartedly." The boy smiled while many of the students and others who gathered outside the apartment were baffled. "What could have influenced the decision?" they wondered. The young man solved the mystery for the students who had gathered near the Rebbitzin's apartment. "When I was seven years old, one summer my mother and I vacationed at a Swiss mountain resort." Coincidentally, the Ponovezer Rav z'l was in Switzerland for the summer and checked in to the only kosher hotel in the area - the one we were at! The problem was, the only available room was on the upper floor, and it was hard for the Rav to walk up and down. My mother heard about the problem and immediately offered to switch our room on the first floor, with his. After thanking her profusely, the Rav called my mother and me into his new room. "I want to thank you, Mrs. Schwartz," he said. "I understand that when on vacation it is hard to move rooms, but more so I also want to express appreciation to your son. I'd like to buy him a toy in a gift shop. What would he like?" "I told the Rav that I did not want a toy, I did not want any prize. I did not even want a few coins. All I wanted is to become a student one day in the Ponovez Yeshiva. The Rav smiled and said that he would accept me whenever I felt I was ready. Immediately, the Rav took out a pen and paper and wrote the note that I handed to the Rebbitzin today. Frankly, I never even read it. All I know is that the vision of my youth was fulfilled today."

Upon descending to Egypt, Yaakov Avinu knew that redemption would be a long way off. He also understood that one day there would be a Mishkan (Tabernacle) for his children. For without it, the exodus would be meaningless. Yaakov realized that a home for spirituality would be the key to Israel's survival. In Braishis (Genesis), after crossing a river, Yaakov worries about little things he left behind and returns to retrieve them. He worried about the small things that were dear to his children. He worried about the memories of the past. Here, Yaakov worries about what he needs to build the future. There were flourishing Jewish communities in the early years of American Jewish immigration. The communities that had the vision to bring the wood to build a Mishkan - the home for Torah -- are still vibrant and flourishing. For with the vision for spirituality the Jewish people will always have the spirituality for vision. Good Shabbos!

(C) 1997 Rabbi Mordechai Kamenetzky Drasha, Copyright (c) 1998 by Rabbi M. Kamenetzky and Project Genesis, Inc. Rabbi Mordechai Kamenetzky is the Rosh Mesivta at Mesivta Ateres Yaakov, the High School Division of Yeshiva of South Shore, <http://www.yoss.org/> Project Genesis: Torah on the Information Superhighway learn@torah.org 6810 Park Heights Ave. www.torah.org Baltimore, MD 21215 (410) 358-9800 FAX: 358-9801

ravfrand@torah.org "RavFrand" List - Rabbi Frand on Parshas Teruma

The Sequence of Parshiyos: First Mishpatim, Then Teruma Parshas Teruma follows on the heels of Parshas Mishpatim, but they are really two very different types of parshiyos. Mishpatim is a parsha filled with monetary laws -- virtually all of Bava Kama and Bava Metzia originate from Parshas Mishpatim. Parshas Teruma is a portion dealing with laws between man and G-d. It is the portion dealing with the building of the Beis HaMikdash, a portion dealing with sacrificial offerings. On the surface these would appear to be two totally distinct parshiyos. Yet, the Pardes Yosef writes, it is for a specific reason that the Torah wrote Parshas Teruma right after Parshas Mishpatim. The Torah wants us to know that when there is a Mitzvah to donate one's money to a Beis HaMikdash or to a shul ("And you shall take for Me an offering..." [Shmos 25:2]) we need to be sure where that money is coming from. The Torah wants us to know that there is a section called Mishpatim: There is a section dealing with theft and there is a section

dealing with the prohibition of taking interest on a loan. The Torah wants us to make sure that the money we are donating comes from sources which are legal and above board (Kosher v'Yosher). The Torah is not interested in a person donating money that was acquired illegally. There is an interesting Maharsha [Ketubot 67], which decries and criticizes stealing and then giving from that money to charity: "Many in this generation gather their wealth through measures which are without faith in G-d and which involve the desecration of G-d's name (Chillul HaShem) like by stealing from idolaters. Afterwards, they donate this money (for communal purposes) to get annual honors for themselves so that they will be blessed by the community (get a special "Mi She'Berach"). This is nothing other than a Mitzvah that comes by way of a sin (mitzvah ha'baah b'aveirah). Such money will not last." This, says Pardes Yosef, is the reason that Parshas Mishpatim comes before Parshas Teruma. We need to know about the prohibitions of theft and corruption, and Ribbis, and stealing from Jew and Gentile alike. Only then can we talk about making a long term pledge to the Beis HaMikdash.

The Dining Room Table -- How One Can Take It With Him There is a fascinating Rabbeinu Bachaye in this week's parsha. On the section dealing with the Shulchon - Table [Shmos 25:23-30] he goes through the symbolism of the Table and the "Show Breads" that were put on the Table. Then he says -- al derech haMedrash -- that the term Shittim (acacia wood, from which the Table was made) is an acronym for Shalom, Tova, Yeshua, Mechila (Peace, Good, Salvation, Forgiveness). He points out that the Aron and the Altar were likewise made of acacia wood (Shittim) for the same reason. Rabbeinu Bachaye is saying is that all gifts -- represented by Peace, Good, Salvation, and Forgiveness -- that the Jewish people received during the time of the Temple, came about through the conduit of the vessels of the Temple. Rabbeinu Bachaye goes on to ask that this is all fine and good while the Temple was standing -- we had all these utensils to provide us with these wonderful blessings -- but what do we have going for us now that we have been in Exile for 2000 years? He quotes a famous Talmudic passage "Now that the Temple is no longer standing a person receives atonement through his table" [Chagiga 27a]. What is our "Table" that atones for us now that we don't have a Temple? Our dining room table. What a person does with his dining room table -- if he feeds the poor and welcomes in the bride and he does acts of kindness -- that is his altar of atonement. When one sits at his Shabbos table and is surrounded by others with whom he is sharing his bounty, his table becomes his altar of atonement. Finally, Rabbeinu Bachaye goes on to say an awesome thing: "It is a custom of the pious people in France to use the wood from their dining room table to build their coffins for burial." Think about the imagery. A man spends many occasions and has many meals with his friend around his dining room table. Then he goes to his friend's funeral and he sees him being buried in the same wood that was his dining room table! The purpose of this custom -- says Rabbeinu Bachaye -- was to teach that a person will take nothing with him to the World of Truth except for the charity that he gave in his life and the goodness that he shared around his table. The charity, the guests, the widows, the orphans, the Baale Teshuva that one has fed and the influence that one dispenses around his dining room table is all that he takes with him. Our Rabbis said [Berochos 54b] "One who has a long table (ha'Marich b'shulchano) will have long days and long years". When I was in England I went to see Windsor Castle where the Queen lives on week-ends. In this palace was the longest dining room table I have ever seen in my life -- seventy-five chairs around it! That is not what the Rabbis were talking about. What the Rabbis were speaking about was not the length of the table but what one does around it. Rav Chavel brings in the footnote to Rabbeinu Bachaye a work called Sifsei Kohain who says that the acronym of ShLChaN (table) are Shamur Likevura Chessed Nideevosecha (Saved for your burial are the kindness of your generosity). The table is the altar of atonement for our generation -- only Kindness and Truth accompanies us to the True World.

Transcribed by David Twersky; Seattle, Washington twerskyd@aol.com Technical Assistance by Dovid Hoffman; Balt, MD dhoffman@clark.net RavFrand, Copyright (c) 1998 by Rabbi Y. Frand and Project Genesis, Inc. Project Genesis: Torah on the Information Superhighway

hamaayan@torah.org Hamaayan / The Torah Spring Edited by Shlomo Katz
Terumah Sponsored by The Katz family on the Jahrzeits of Avraham Abba ben Avigdor Moshe
Hakohen Katz a"h and Etia (Etush) bat Avigdor Moshe Hakohen Landau a"h

"They shall make a sanctuary for Me so that I may dwell among them - like everything that I am showing you, the form of the Tabernacle and the form of all its vessels, and so you shall do." (25:8-9) R' Moshe Sternbuch shlita observes: These verses contain a fundamental lesson, i.e., that the only way Bnei Yisrael could cause G-d to dwell among them was to make the Tabernacle _exactly_ as Hashem commanded. On the last words of verse 8, "[A]nd so shall you do," Rashi comments, "Forever." R' Sternbuch explains: As in the Tabernacle construction was it necessary to follow G-d's instructions to the letter, so it is with all of our mitzvot. The only way to cause Hashem to dwell among us is to follow halachah to the letter. (Ta'am Va'daat)

"The poles shall remain in the rings of the Aron/Ark, they may not be removed from it." (25:15) R' Yaakov Kamenetsky z"l writes: The Aron represents those who study Torah, and the poles represent their financial backers. The prohibition to remove the poles from the Aron alludes to the teaching of the gemara (Pesachim 53b) that those who support Torah study will be seated in Heaven right next to the scholars they supported. But how can this be? R' Kamenetsky asks. In Heaven, souls "sit" and "discuss" Torah topics. And, since Torah knowledge can be acquired only with much toil, how will a person who spent his whole life toiling in business (and not in Torah) take part in the discussion with the great scholars that he sits amongst? He explains: When a baby is in the womb, it is taught the entire Torah. Then, just before birth, it forgets what it learned. Why? Because, in the words of the prophet (Iyov 5:7), "Man was born to toil." Man must toil in this world to reclaim the Torah knowledge which he forgot at birth. A person who toils in business during his lifetime so that he can support Torah scholars has also toiled, R' Kamenetsky observes. Because he has toiled for the sake of Torah study just as the Torah scholar has, he, too, is able to reclaim his lost Torah knowledge. (Emet Le'Yaakov: Shmot 25:15 & Devarim 33:18)

Hamaayan, Copyright (c) 1998 by Shlomo Katz and Project Genesis, Inc. Posted by Alan Broder, ajb@torah.org. Web archives are available starting with Rosh HaShanah 5758 (1997) at <http://www.torah.org/learning/hamaayan/>. Text archives from 1990 through the present are available at <http://www.acoast.com/~seh/hamaayan/>. Donations to HaMaayan are tax-deductible. Project Genesis: Torah on the Information Superhighway learn@torah.org 6810 Park Heights Ave. <http://www.torah.org/> Baltimore, MD 21215 (410) 358-9800 FAX: 358-9801

The Chassidic Dimension Adaptation of Likutei Sichos by Rabbi Sholom Ber Wineberg Based on the teachings and talks of the Lubavitcher Rebbe Rabbi Menachem M. Schneerson on the weekly Torah Portion

Terumah Separating and Uplifting - The Torah portion of Terumah begins with G-d telling Moshe to have the Jewish people "take unto Me an offering" -- terumah. Rashi explains terumah to mean "separation"; the Jews were to "separate" an offering "for His Name's sake." The verse then goes on to explain what is to be done with this offering: "You shall make for Me a Sanctuary and I will rest within them." Rashi explains this to mean: "You shall make for My Name's sake a Holy edifice." Why does Rashi find it necessary in the latter verse as well to explain that "for" means "for My Name's sake"? In the former verse, where the Jews are commanded to detach their own mundane funds, the verse already explains that the money must be separated and earmarked "for My Name's sake." Here, however, when G-d describes how the money -- which was already set aside for a sacred purpose, and thus within the domain of holiness -- should be used, the explanation that this also was "for My Name's sake" seems superfluous. As mentioned earlier, Rashi explains "Sanctuary" to mean "a Holy edifice," i.e., not only an "edifice for Holiness," wherein holiness is found, but a "Holy edifice; the edifice itself is holy. We thus understand that erecting the Sanctuary caused a transformation in the objects used in its construction; they themselves became holy, part of the Holy edifice. Prior to this, their sanctity lay merely

in the fact that they had been donated to a sacred cause; now, however, they became part and parcel of the "Holy edifice." Since the construction of the Sanctuary brought about a much loftier degree of sanctity within the items used for its construction, it was therefore necessary that the construction itself be performed with an added measure of sanctity -- "for My Name's sake." According to the above, we may explain an additional matter in Rashi. As mentioned earlier, Rashi explains terumah to mean "separation." Terumah may also be translated as "raising and uplifting." It now becomes clear why Rashi chose the first translation. "Separation" implies that the object involved was merely detached from other similar objects, i.e., it remains essentially the same as the rest, the difference being only the domain in which the object finds itself. "Raising and uplifting," on the other hand, implies an essential change within the object itself -- the object has become transformed into something much higher than it was. According to Rashi, this is the difference between the verse "take unto Me an offering -- terumah" and the verse "You shall make for Me a Sanctuary." The first verse, which had the Jews donate to a sacred cause, involved mere "separation." For although the money or objects underwent a change of ownership from the mundane to the holy, they remained essentially the same. But by transforming them into "a Sanctuary for Me," the objects themselves were "raised and uplifted" to a strikingly higher degree of holiness. There is an important lesson here in terms of our own spiritual service. Our Sages tell us that every Jew is to transform his home into a Sanctuary for G-d. Here too, the two levels of service -- "separation" and "uplifting" -- are extremely germane. First and foremost, the Jew is to "separate" his home from its environment. In his house, all things are done "for the sake of Heaven;" he engages in mundane activities, but they are intended for a spiritual purpose. Thereafter, the individual transforms and uplifts his home so that it becomes a Sanctuary. During this stage, the house itself becomes more than a dwelling for holiness, it becomes a dwelling of holiness, permeated with Torah and mitzvot. Based on Likkutei Sichos, Vol. XXVI, pp. 167-174

weekly-halacha@torah.org Parshas Terumah-Business Competition (Part 3)
By Rabbi Doniel Neustadt A discussion of Halachic topics related to the Parsha of the week. For final rulings, consult your Rav. [Third in a series about Business Competition]

QUESTION: A person is negotiating the purchase of a house or a car. May another person come and bid for the item? DISCUSSION: Three factors must be determined in order to answer this question: 1) The extent of the negotiations; 2) The availability of other homes or cars of similar [or slightly different] size, location, condition, etc.; 3) The amount of money that the new bidder will save by buying this item and not another one which is available to him. Based on these three factors, the practical halachah breaks down as follows: If the buyer and seller have agreed [or are very close to agreeing(1)] on a price, and there are similar items available on the market, then it is prohibited for another person to bid for the item(2). Bais din has the right and duty to object to his bidding and to block him from doing so. If he disregards the halachah and places a bid anyway, he may be referred to as a rasha, a wicked person, publicly(3). Even if he has already bought and taken possession of the item, he is still duty bound to return it, lest he be referred to as a rasha(4). Bais din, however, does not have the power to forcibly remove it from his possession once he has already obtained it. If the buyer and seller agreed [or are close to agreeing] on a price, but there are no similar items available on the market, then it is permitted, according to the basic halachah, for the new bidder to bid for the item(5). A ba'al nefesh, though, should refrain from doing so(6). If the buyer and seller agreed [or are close to agreeing] on a price, and there are similar items available on the market, but the new bidder will save a big amount of money(7) if his bid is accepted, there are many poskim(8) who allow him to bid on the item while other poskim do not accept this leniency(9). Although bais din cannot get involved in such a case, a ba'al nefesh should refrain from entering into this position. If the buyer and seller did not agree [or come close to agreeing] on a price, then it is permitted for the new bidder to put in a bid for the item. If,

however, the item came up for sale only as a result of the first bidder's effort [e.g., the first bidder convinced the seller to put the item on the market], some poskim hold that a newcomer may not come and place a bid on the item(10).

QUESTION: May a worker offer his services to a prospective employer knowing full well that he will cause another Jew to lose his job by replacing him? **DISCUSSION:** It is prohibited for one to offer his services to an employer if he will be taking away another person's job, even if his intention is to replace him only after the current contract has expired. Bais din has the right and duty to object to his behavior and to stop him from doing so. If he disregards the halachah and does so anyway, he may be referred to as a rasha publicly(11). Bais din, however, does not have the power to forcibly terminate the newcomer's employment once he has already obtained it. In certain well-defined cases, this restriction does not apply. Among them are the following: If an employer asks him specifically to apply for the job(12); If it is known that the employer is dissatisfied with his present employee and is looking for an opportunity to replace him(13); If the present employee was hired initially only for a limited period of time and was never really counting on long-term employment(14); If he does not directly approach an employer directly but merely advertises his availability, even though his advertisement may result in the present employee losing his job(15). If, after spending time and effort looking for a job commensurate with his training and experience, he cannot find another job, then it is permitted for him to make himself available to an employer even though a current employee may lose his job(16). A ba'al nefesh, though, should refrain from doing so. A slightly different set of rules will apply when the current employee is long-term, has established a business relationship with his employer and has a well-founded assumption and expectation that the job is his for as long as he is interested in keeping it. In that case, many poskim(17) maintain that it is prohibited for a newcomer to directly approach an employer to hire him, even if the newcomer cannot find any other job. But this holds true only if other potential employees will also refrain from offering their services to that particular employer. If, however, this particular job will attract other candidates, then there is no obligation for the observant job-seeker to place himself at a disadvantage and limit his chances, even though the present long-term employee will lose his job.

QUESTION: Is it permitted for an employer to lure another company's employee from his present job? **DISCUSSION:** It is prohibited for an employer to lure away an employee from his present job, even if he will not employ him until his current contract has expired - unless he feels that this particular employee is superior to any other available employee on the market. In a case where an employer and employee have established a long-term business relationship, and the employer has a well-founded assumption and expectation that the employee will remain in his employ indefinitely, many poskim hold that it is prohibited for another employer to lure the employee away. However, this holds true only if other potential employers will not actively recruit this particular employee, as explained earlier.

FOOTNOTES: 1 See Pischei Teshuvah 237:3 and Aruch ha-Shulchan 237:1 quoting Perishah, who maintains that as long as the two parties were near agreement on a price, it is considered as if an agreement was reached in regards to this halachah. See Igros Moshe C.M. 1:60 who explains that this is the position of the Rama as well. Shulchan Aruch Harav, however, does not mention this Perishah. 2 C.M. 237:1. Even if the new bidder did not realize that a previous bid was placed on the house, he is still required to withdraw his bid once he finds out about the previous agreement. 3 If the new bidder did not follow the halachah and bid on the item, it is permitted for a third person to bid on the house at this time - Aruch ha-Shulchan 237:2. 4 In the case when his bid was made while yet unaware of the previous agreement, some poskim (Pischei Teshuvah; Aruch ha-Shulchan 237:2) maintain that he cannot be referred to as a rasha if he refuses to return the house once he has obtained it. Other poskim, however, disagree and hold that even in that case he may be referred to as a rasha (Keneses ha-Gedolah, Tur 19; Igros Moshe C.M. 1:60). 5 Rama 237:1; M'harshal 36; Ma'asas Binyamin 27, based on the view of R' Tam who permits this type of bidding. According to the Nesivos 237:3, Shulchan Aruch, too, agrees to this ruling. 6 Shulchan Aruch Harav (Hasogas Gevul 10), Har Tzvi O.C. 2:8 and Igros Moshe E.H. 1:91 based on the view of Rashi who prohibits this type of bid. See also Maharal (Nesivos Olam, Nesiv ha-Tzedek 3) who strongly endorses Rashi's approach to this question. 7 This is defined as being a "real bargain", savings that are undisputedly substantial. When it is unclear if the amount being saved is substantial, a bais din must be consulted. 8 Rama C.M. 237:1; Avnei Nezer C.M. 17. [Igros Moshe C.M. 1:60 seems to rule in accordance with this view.] 9 Shach 237:3 based on the view of the Ramban; Aruch ha-Shulchan 237:1. 10 Teshuvos M'Rashdam 259. See, however, Teshuvos Chasam Sofer C.M. 79 who seems to

disagree. See also Masa's Binyamin 27, Nachlas Tzvi C.M. 237 and Minchas Yitzchak 5:77. 11 C.M. 237:2 as explained in Shulchan Aruch Harav (Hasogas Gevul 12). 12 Teshuvos Alshich 67. 13 C.M. 237:2. 14 R' Akiva Eiger C.M. 237 quoting Teshuvos M'harshal 36. 15 Pischei Choshen, Sechirus, pg. 161. 16 Shulchan Aruch Harav, ibid.; Igros Moshe C.M. 1:60. 17 See our previous column entitled "Competition between Individuals" for elucidation of this issue.

Weekly-Halacha, Copyright (c) 1998 by Rabbi Neustadt, Dr. Jeffrey Gross and Project Genesis, Inc. The author, 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 Haya'el Doniel Meir ben Hinda. Weekly sponsorships are available - please mail to jgross@torah.org. Project Genesis: Torah on the Information Superhighway learn@torah.org 6810 Park Heights Ave. http://www.torah.org/ Baltimore, MD 21215

shabbat-zomet@jer1.co.il Shabbat Newsletter from Machon Zomet
Shabbat-B'Shabbato - Parshat Teruma No 689: 2 Adar 5758

EXPLAIN A MIDRASH: To Give Something Away but Still Remain Attached by Rabbi Yehudah Shaviv "It can happen that one who sells something 'sells' himself too. The Almighty said to Yisrael: I gave you the Torah, it is as if I was sold together with it, as is written 'Let them take TO ME a contribution' [Shemot 25:2]" [Shemot Rabba 33:1]. The word "li" is interpreted as if to mean, "together with me." The Almighty wanted to be taken by Yisrael together with the merchandise, the Torah. The Midrash compares this in a parable to "a king who had an only daughter. A neighboring king married her, and wanted to return home, taking his wife with him. The father said, She is my only daughter. I can not bear to part with her, but I cannot refuse to let you take her, since she is your wife. At least do me the following favor: Wherever you go, prepare for me a small room so that I can join you, because I cannot abandon my daughter. This is similar to what the Almighty said: I have given you the Torah; I cannot be separated from it, but I cannot refuse to let you take it. At least, wherever you go make a home for me, as is written, 'Make a temple for me' [Shemot 25:8]." This Midrash also explains a link to last week's Torah portion, which ended with G-d's words to Moshe, "Come up to me on the mountain ... and I will give you the stone tablets, and the Torah, and the mitzvot" [Shemot 24:12]. The passage emphasizes that even though the Torah descended to the earth and to mankind, its link to Divine roots must still be maintained. It will be kept close to its "father," in the Ark which will be at the center of the Holy of Holies, in the Temple. Thus, it may be understood that not only has the Torah descended to the earth, but the Divine spirit too has come to dwell on the earth.

yhe-sichot@jer1.co.il YESHIVA HAR ETZION ISRAEL KOSCHITZKY
VIRTUAL BEIT MIDRASH (VBM) STUDENT SUMMARIES OF
SICHOT DELIVERED BY THE ROSHEI YESHIVA PARASHAT
TERUMA SICHA OF HARAV YEHUDA AMITAL SHLIT"A

In memory of the yearzeit of my beloved father, Shalom ben Shlomo,
Sigmund Pick - by Harry K. Pick.

Obligation and Offering Summarized by Jeremy Spierer
"And God said to Moshe: Speak to the children of Israel and have them bring Me an offering (teruma). Take My offering from everyone whose heart impels him to give. The offering that you take from them shall consist of the following: gold, silver, copper... They shall make Me a sanctuary, and I will dwell among them." (Shemot 25:1-3, 8) "Meanwhile [the Israelites] were bringing more gifts each morning. All the craftsmen engaged in the sacred work [left] the work they were doing, and came [to Moshe]. They said to Moshe, 'The people are bringing much more than is needed for the work that God commanded to do.'" (Shemot 36:4-5) The Torah refers to an outpouring of generosity, nedivut lev. Not only did Benei Yisrael bring supplies voluntarily, but they brought in excess. The Torah's portrayal of these events is extremely positive. Rashi, in the beginning of our parasha, explains (based on Megilla 29b) that the three appearances of the word "teruma" here refer to three separate donations to the mishkan: the mandatory half-shekel for the adanim, the bases of the

beams, the mandatory half-shekel for the communal offerings, and the voluntary offering of an unspecified amount for the construction of the rest of the mishkan. The Maharal (Gur Aryeh) finds this comment difficult.

The Torah overtly relates only to the voluntary drive for the mishkan materials; there is no apparent reference to the other donations. The Maharal answers that logically, the demand for the mandatory half-shekels must precede the call for voluntary donations. The element of compulsion is indispensable in constructing the mishkan. Had the call for voluntary donations been issued first, the people might voluntarily have provided all of the resources for the Mishkan, thereby eliminating the need for the mandatory contributions (see notes on the Gur Aryeh). The Maharal's comments contain an important message. Nedivut lev, voluntary avodat Hashem, is certainly positive, but only if rooted first in a spirit of obligation, of commitment. The funds for the physical base of the mishkan came from an obligation, not from an act of altruism. The Torah describes the Jews' voluntary acceptance of the Torah, "We will do and we will understand" (24:7). Yet Chazal describe an acceptance through coercion: Hashem hoisted a mountain above their heads and said, 'If you accept [the Torah], good; if not, here will be your burial place'" (Shabbat 88a). Their voluntary acceptance, however positive, was not sufficient. Hashem required a firm commitment. Western culture, particularly that promoted in America, preaches individualism, personal choice. Nothing can infringe upon a person's rights. In our world this has taken many forms. People desire to keep mitzvot, to lead a religious life, but only because they want to, not because they feel they have to. In addition, people shy away from commitment - to family, to society. I visited a shul in America where I found very few children. After inquiring regarding the reason, I discovered that most of the members were single. They were not getting married; they were unwilling to commit. In Israel society, people speak of lack of motivation in the armed forces. People do not feel a commitment to defend the country; commitment smacks of coercion. "One thing I ask from Hashem ... that I may dwell in His house all the days of my life, to behold the beauty of Hashem and to visit in His temple" (Psalms 27:4). King David asks to establish permanent residence in Hashem's house - but at the same time to maintain the excitement and enthusiasm of a first-time visitor. Similarly, we should always strive to learn Torah with this enthusiasm, to arrive at the beit midrash as if it were our first time. But some days we wake up without this longing for the beit midrash. Yet we still have to come. Again, the overflowing generosity Benei Yisrael displayed was extremely positive. However, Rashi places this voluntary donation third, after the mandatory gifts. The first teruma for the adanim represents the need for an underlying obligation. The second teruma for the communal offerings represents an objective goal. Avodat Hashem is rooted first in obligation and defined goals, not in subjective desire. This is the message of the terumot. (Originally delivered Leil Shabbat, Parashat Teruma 5757.) Copyright (c) 1998 Yeshivat Har Etzion. All rights reserved.

dafyomi@jer1.co.il Insights into Daf Yomi from Ohr Somayach The Weekly Daf #211 Shabbos 86-92 By Rabbi Mendel Weinbach, Dean, Ohr Somayach

Impulsive or Trusting? So engrossed was he in his study of Torah that the Sage Rava was completely oblivious to the fact that he was sitting on the fingers of his hand and causing blood to rush to the surface. A heathen observer exploited this opportunity to taunt the Sage. "Impulsive people that you are!" he laughed. "You were impulsive when you put your mouths before your ears (when you declared at Sinai "we shall do" before you said "we shall hear"), and you are impulsive now in your self neglect. You first should have determined whether the Torah you were being offered did not demand more of you than is possible and only then accept it." Rava well understood that the heathen was interpreting his seemingly superhuman concentration on Torah study as evidence that the Jewish People had bitten off more than they can chew in accepting the Torah which had been rejected by all the less impulsive nations as being too difficult a challenge. His

response was to explain the difference between the non-Jewish attitude of suspicion toward Hashem's offer of the Torah and the Jewish attitude of total trust. This is how Rashi so eloquently translates the reply of Rava: "We related to Hashem with total trust in the manner of those who act out of love and we relied upon Him that He would not impose upon us any responsibility which we were not capable of fulfilling." Whether it was in accepting a Torah sight-unseen or studying that Torah with such intensity as to be oblivious to physical pain, Jews were not guilty of being impulsive. They were rather the bearers of confidence that the Creator who offers a challenge also provides the power to meet it. Shabbos 88a

What's in a Name -- Sinai? When Rabbi Kahana was asked for an explanation of "Sinai," the name of the mountain on which Hashem revealed Himself to the Jewish People and gave them the Torah he offered several suggestions which were rejected as falling short of the mark. Scrambling the letters would give us "Nisai," a reference to the miracles that took place at the time of the Sinai revelation. But then why scramble the letters instead of just writing them in their intended fashion? Perhaps "Sinai" approximates "Simnai" and is a reference to the "sign of good fortune" which was given to Jewry on that mountain. But then why omit the "m" sound in the name of the mountain? Rabbi Kahana's challenger finally revealed his own explanation which he had heard from leading Sages. "Sinai" sounds almost exactly like "Sinah" which means hatred. The name of the mountain communicates the fact that this is where "hatred descended to the nations of the world." Rashi explains this as a reference to Hashem's attitude to all the nations who rejected the Torah He had offered them. Another approach has been offered by one of the Torah giants of the previous generation who was martyred in the Holocaust, Rabbi Elchanan Wasserman, zatzal: "Sinai" and "Sinah" are two sides of the same coin. Once Jews accepted the responsibility of being a "holy nation" through acceptance of the Torah, there is no longer an option of copping out and being like all the other nations. It is our choice to preserve our uniqueness through the pleasant ways of "Sinai" Torah observance. Should we seek to assimilate and abdicate, Hashem made sure that "hatred descended to the nations" -- that anti-semitism would serve as a reminder that we are a people apart with a special destiny. Shabbos 89a
Written and Compiled by Rabbi Mendel Weinbach General Editor: Rabbi Moshe Newman
Production Design: Lev Seltzer Prepared by the Jewish Learning Exchange of Ohr Somayach International Home Page: <http://www.ohr.org.il> (C) 1998 Ohr Somayach International

daf-insights@shemayisrael.com Insights to the Daf. Shabbos 86-90 (*Full* version) INSIGHTS INTO THE DAILY DAF brought to you by Kollel Iyun Hadaf of Har Nof Rosh Kollel: Rabbi Mordecai Kornfeld

Shabbos 86b ALL AGREE THAT THE TORAH WAS GIVEN ON SHABBOS AGADAH: The Gemara explains that no matter what day of the month it was, the Torah was certainly given on Shabbos. This may be interpreted homiletically as follows. Shabbat is dedicated to the study -- and hence the preservation -- of the Torah and its Mitzvot. This theme reappears numerous times in Chazal: (a) "How I love Your Torah; it is my speech all of the day" (Tehillim 119:97). The Pasuk does not say "it is my speech all day," but rather, "it is my speech all *the* day." *The* day is a reference to the unique day, the Shabbat. On Shabbat, David would dedicate himself completely to the joy of the study of the Torah. (Rabbeinu Bachya, Shmot 20:8) (b) Throughout the entire Torah there is not a single section which begins with the convening of an assembly except for this one [the beginning of Parshas Vayakhel], which begins, "Moshe assembled the Bnei Yisrael," and continues with a discussion of the laws of Shabbat. Hashem meant to tell Moshe, "Make large assemblies [on Shabbat] and expound before them publicly on the laws of Shabbat, in order that future generations should learn from you to do the same. (Yalkut Shimoni #408) (c) The Torah complained before Hashem, saying, "When the Bnei Yisrael enter the Land of Israel, everyone will become preoccupied with their agricultural pursuits -- what will become of *me* then?" Hashem answered her, "I have an excellent mate for you -- the Shabbat. On that day, the Jews are not busy with their work, and they will be free to occupy themselves in studying you. (Tur Orach Chayim #290; see also Tanna D'vei Eliyahu Rabba, Chap. 1) [See also "Torah from the Internet," Parashat Vayakhel]

Shabbos 88 1) ON WHAT DAY DOES SHAVUOS FALL QUESTION: The Tur and Shulchan Aruch (OC 494:1) say that Shavuos falls on the sixth of Iyar, fifty days after the day of bringing the Omer offering (the second day of Pesach). This implies that Iyar of the year that the Torah was given was not a full (Malei) month, but was 29 days long, for if Iyar of that year was 30 days long, Matan Torah would have been on the fifty-*first* day after the day of the Omer offering, and not the fiftieth. Our Sugya seems to conclude that according to the Rabanan, who maintain that the Torah was given on the *sixth* of Sivan, there were indeed fifty-*one* days between Pesach and Shavuos (since the Gemara (87b) resolves the Beraisa which conflicts with the opinion of the Rabanan by saying that Iyar of that year had 30 days). How, then, can we rule that Shavuos is on the sixth of Sivan and only *fifty* days after the day of the Omer offering? Besides, no matter how we rule, according to both Rabbi Yosi and the Rabanan, the Torah was given on the fifty-*first* day. According to the Rabanan Iyar was 30 days, as we explained above, and according to Rabbi Yosi Iyar was 29 days but the Torah was given on the *7th* of Sivan, or 51 days after the day of the Omer offering. ANSWERS: (a) The MACHTZIS HA'SHEKEL explains that this question is only a question if the Jewish people left Egypt on a Thursday (which would mean that there are fifty-*one* days between the second day of Pesach (Friday) and the day they received the Torah (Shabbos)). The Seder Olam, though, says that they left Egypt on a *Friday*, and thus the Torah, which was given on a Shabbos, was given *fifty* days later. (The Seder Olam also states that the Man started falling on a Monday. Even though the Gemara derived from verses that the Man started falling on a Sunday, this inference is not at all explicit in the verses, and the simple understanding of the verses does not imply that the Man started falling on a Sunday). We rule like the Seder Olam, and not like the Gemara. (It should be noted that according to the Seder Olam, the tenth of Nisan (the day that the animals for the Korban Pesach were designated) was not Shabbos but Sunday -- contrary to what the TUR in OC 430 quotes from the Seder Olam -- since the Jews left Egypt on a Friday, as the

PERISHAH points out.) (b) The SEFAS EMES explains that the TUR holds that the Jewish people went out of Egypt on a *Thursday* (as he says in OC 430), and that the Torah was given on a *Friday* and not on Shabbos (as the Pirkei d'Rebbi Eliezer ch. 46 maintains). The Sefas Emes himself points out that this is problematic, because the Tur himself (OC 292) states that the Torah was given on Shabbos. (c) The RIVASH (#96) writes that the festival of Shavuos has nothing to do with the day upon which the Torah was given. Shavuos comes fifty days after the day of the Omer offering, whether or not it falls on the day that the Torah was given. The reason we call Shavuos "Zman Matan Toraseinu" is because the way our calendar is set up, the festival falls on the sixth of Sivan, which is the day of the month on which the Torah was given (according to the Rabanan, whose opinion we follow). Unlike the day upon which the Torah was given, our 6th of Sivan falls *fifty* days after the Omer offering, while the original day of Matan Torah was fifty-one days after the Omer (because they left Egypt on a Thursday and received the Torah on Shabbos, as our Gemara states). (d) The MAGEN AVRAHAM (OC 494) cites from SEFER ASARAH MA'AMAROS that by adding a day on his own, Moshe Rabeinu alluded to the second day of Yom Tov which is observed outside of Israel. Thus, the Torah was actually *supposed* to have been given on the fiftieth day after the Omer of that first year, which is why our holiday begins on the fiftieth day after the Omer. The Torah was actually given on the fifty-first day to symbolize that that day would be Yom Tov as well, when the Jews would go into exile. That is, just like Moshe Rabeinu made that day into the day of Kabalas ha'Torah, the Rabanan would later make that day into Yom Tov. The BEIS HA'LEVI (Parshas Yisro) expounds on the idea cited by the Magen Avraham. The Beis ha'Levi explains that even though the Jewish people received the Torah on the fifty-first day, the day that the Torah was *given* was the fiftieth day, as we shall explain. The Gemara (88b) says that the angels did not want the Torah to be given to Moshe. Why not? What were the angels going to do with the Torah? As Moshe Rabeinu argued, none of the Mitzvos are applicable to heavenly bodies; they are relevant only for humans! The Gemara (Bava Metzia 61a) states that the verse "Lo ba'Shamayim Hi" ("the Torah is not in the heavens") means that the authority to expound and elucidate the Torah is not in the heavens, but was to the Sages. The angels argued that *this authority* should not be given to man, because they did not think that it was appropriate for man to have the power to legislate in Torah matters. Moshe's decision to delay by one day the giving of the Torah was based on a Hekesh, as the Gemara explains ("just like the second day of Perishah was a day that follows a night, so, too, the first day must be a day that follows a night"). By using a Hekesh to derive a Torah law (i.e. the day that the Torah should be given), Moshe Rabeinu was asserting that the Torah was given to man to expound. The Gemara adds that indeed, Hashem agreed to Moshe's action. Therefore, even if we rule in accordance with Rabbi Yosi that we received the Torah on the seventh day, that was the day of *Kabalas ha'Torah*, when the Jews *received* the Torah. The day before, though, was the day of *Matan* Torah, when Hashem *gave* man the ability to make decisions regarding the Torah.

2) FORCED TO ACCEPT THE TORAH QUESTION: The Gemara says that at Har Sinai, Hashem held the mountain above the Jewish people and they accepted the Torah under pressure. The Gemara explains that because of this involuntary acceptance of the Torah, the Jewish people had a "Moda'a Rabah Y'Oraisa" -- a claim of immunity for any transgressions that they might commit. This "Moda'ah Rabah" lasted until the Jewish people willfully accepted the Torah during the time of Purim, nearly a thousand years later. If the Jewish people had this claim of immunity due to their forced acceptance of the Torah, why were they punished during the interim years for their sins, before they accepted the Torah willfully? In addition, what does it mean that they were forced to accept the Torah? The Torah tells us that the Jewish people exclaimed, "Na'aseh v'Nishma," which implies that they willfully accepted the Torah! ANSWERS: (a) TOSFOS (DH Moda'a) answers that although the "Moda'ah Rabah" vindicated them from punishments for most sins, they *were* punished for the sin of Avodah Zarah. The reason is because the Jewish people did accept upon themselves, willfully, not to practice idolatry. As for how the Gemara can say that their acceptance of the Torah was against their will when we know that they said "Na'aseh v'Nishma," Tosfos explains that initially, before they stood at Har Sinai, they said "Na'aseh v'Nishma," intending to accept the Torah willfully. However, when they stood at Har Sinai, Hashem had to hold the mountain over them lest they change their minds out of fright, when they saw the mountain afire and the full awe of the Divine presence (which caused their souls to leave their bodies). (b) The MIDRASH TANCHUMA (Parshas Noach) explains that they willfully accepted Torah sh'bi'Ch'tav, the Written Torah (the Pentateuch). If so, it was for the laws of Torah sh'bi'Ch'tav that they were punished. The "Moda'a" was for Torah sh'Bal' Peh, the Oral Torah, which they were forced to accept. They did not accept it willfully because it is much more difficult. (c) The RAMBAN and RASHBA explain that when they accepted the Torah, they accepted to keep it in the land of Israel. The land of Israel was being given to them only on condition that they keep the Torah (see Tehilim 105:24). The "Moda'a" was in effect only after they were exiled from the land (see Sanhedrin 105a).

On Purim they accepted the Torah out of love even in the Diaspora. They wanted to never again be separated from Hashem, so they accepted the Torah such that even if they must go into exile again, they will still remain loyal to the Torah. Thus, the "Moda'a" was no longer in force. The explanation of the Ramban is consistent with his explanation (Vayikra 18:25, Bereishis 26:5) that the primary goals of the Mitzvos are fulfilled only in the land of Israel. Although we must observe the Mitzvos outside of Israel as well, nevertheless the observance of the Torah does not accomplish as much in the spiritual realms when done outside of Israel as it accomplishes when done in Israel. Shabbos 89a WHERE IS THE TORAH QUESTION: The Satan wanted to know where the Torah had gone. Hashem told him to ask Moshe. When the Satan asked Moshe for the whereabouts of the Torah that Hashem had given to him, Moshe responded that he did not have the Torah. Hashem said to Moshe, "Are you a liar?" Moshe replied, "The [Torah, which is the] beloved hidden treasure in which you take pleasure every day -- how can I be so audacious to keep it for myself?" What exactly was going on in this interaction? What was Moshe answering to the Satan's inquiry, and how did he defend himself when Hashem asked him if he was lying? ANSWERS: (a) The MAHARSHA says that the issue revolved around Sodos ha'Torah, the deep secrets of the Torah. The Satan was asking Moshe how he could keep the Torah, when he is only a human whose capacity for understanding is limited, and he cannot fully understand the Torah. Moshe answered the Satan that the Satan is correct, for he only understands the revealed parts of Torah (Niglah) and not the hidden parts (Nistar). Hashem asked Moshe, "Are you lying? You also know the hidden parts of

Torah!" Moshe replied that were it for his own ability, he would never have been able to understand the hidden parts of Torah; it is only because Hashem spread his presence upon Moshe that he understood it. (b) The Gemara in Nedarim (38a) says that Hashem gave the ability to elucidate the Torah (Pilpul ha'Torah) to Moshe Rabeinu and his descendants, but in his generosity Moshe shared it with all of the Jewish people (see "Torah from the Internet," Parshas Ki Tisa). This is the subject of the discussion recorded in our Gemara. The Satan wanted to take back the Torah by taking away the Neshamah of Moshe, thereby removing all trace of the Torah from this world. Moshe said that it was no longer in his hands (because he had given it to all of the Jewish people). When Moshe said to Hashem, "Who am I to keep the Torah to myself," it was true that it was given to him, but he in turn gave it to the Jewish people. That is why Hashem said that the Torah will be called by the name of Moshe -- because it was Moshe's decision to share the Torah with the Jewish people. (M. Kornfeld)

89b YITZCHAK'S DEAL WITH G-D AGADAH: Yitzchak defended the Jewish people when Hashem wanted to punish them for their sins. Yitzchak argued that a man's life span is seventy years. Twenty of those years, man is not liable to heavenly punishment (because under the age of twenty one is not liable). Of the remaining years, half of them were nighttime, leaving twenty-five years, of which half were spent Davening, eating, and taking care of one's needs. Said Yitzchak, either You forgive them for those remaining twelve and a half years of sin, or I will take half and you take half. The KOCHVEI OHR in the name of RAV YISRAEL SALANTER explains this as follows. The Gemara in Berachos (17a) says that there are two things which keep the Jewish people from doing the will of Hashem -- the subjugation of the ruling nations ("Shibud Malchus") and the Yetzer ha'Ra ("Se'or sh'b'Isah"). When the Gemara says that Yitzchak suggested to go half and half with Hashem in sharing the responsibility for the sins of the Jewish people, it meant that Yitzchak was willing to take responsibility for subjecting the Jews to Shibud Malchus, which is one of the two things which cause them to sin. By giving the blessings to Esav, Yitzchak gave the descendants of Esav the power to rule over the Jewish people. Hashem, however, is responsible for the other element that causes the Jews to sin -- the Yetzer ha'Ra (as the Gemara says in Berachos 32a), and therefore He should take the responsibility for the other half of their sins.

(ARCHIVES: <http://www.shemayisrael.co.il/dafyomi2>) If you would like to sponsor an issue or otherwise help the Kollel continue its work, please contact us directly: daf@shemayisrael.co.il Mordecai Kornfeld |Email: kornfeld@virtual.co.il| Tl/Fx(02)6522633 6/12 Katzenellenbogen St. | kornfeld@netvision.net.il US:(718)520-0210 Har Nof, Jerusalem, ISRAEL | kornfeld@shemayisrael.co.il POB:43087, Jrslm

From jr@sco.COM Feb 13 1997 [last year] Josh Rapps <jr@sco.COM> mj-ravtorah@shamash.org Shiur HaRav Soloveichik on Parshas Terumah (the following is a re-post of the summary on Terumah submitted in 1996.)

"And you shall build a Mikdash for Me and I will dwell in them". The Mikdash had a two-fold purpose, as noted by the Rambam (Hilchos Bais Habechira 1:1): 1) the place where sacrifices were to be brought; 2) the destination for the tri-ennial pilgrimages at each of the 3 festivals. Both these roles are part of the identity of the Mikdash. These attributes applied to each Mikdash regardless if it was a temporary one (e.g. the Mishkan in the desert, Nov, Shilo, Givon) or a permanent one (Yerushalayim). The second aspect of the obligation to build a Mikdash was to erect a Bais Habechira, a permanent house which can never be substituted for and whose place can never be changed. After it was selected, Yerushalayim became the sole place where the Beis Hamikdash could be erected (see Rambam, *ibid*). The basis for this special status of Yerushalayim is the verse "And it shall be the place that Hashem will select to enshrine His name there, you shall strive to be around him and you shall come there". The Mishkan, by definition was a temporary notion. It connotes a transient dwelling. Bais Habechira implies a permanent structure and final site for the Beis Hamikdash. However, the Torah did not specify when the transition from Mishkan to Bais Habechira, from temporary to permanent status was to take place. No prophet ever spoke about this changeover. The notion of a Beis Hamikdash is inherently difficult to understand. The difficulty was posed by Shlomo Hamelech and incorporated into his prayer of dedication at the consecration of the first Beis Hamikdash. Shlomo asked is it possible to a house for HKB'H? How can HKB'H coexist with our material universe? How can infinity coexist with finite? The Midrash notes that Moshe raised the same question when he built the tabernacle in the desert. Nivhal Moshe, Moshe was frightened! How can Hashem, infinity, coexist with man, especially in the small confines of the Holy of Holies where the Shechina K'vayachol, rested within a square cubit of space? The Midrash says that Hashem answered Moshe by explaining that while Hashem carries the world, rather than the reverse, Hashem is capable of withdrawal, Tzimtzum, and through that process can rest quite comfortably even in the small space between the Cherubim. Moshe requested that Hashem teach him the concept of infinity can exist in a finite space

(Haraini Na Es Kvodacha). Hashem tells Moshe that he will grant him great wisdom and show him things that no other human will ever see or know. However, Moshe understood that there could be no answer to this question. He realized that when Hashem said Vasu Li Mikdash, even though you will always have the question of infinity within finite, accept that this is the will of Hashem. Shlomo did not seek an answer to the question he raised nor did he offer one. Shlomo, the wisest of men, who finally admitted that he too could not fathom the meaning of the Parah Adumah did not attempt an answer to this question that frightened Moshe. He also accepts that the commandment to create a house for Hashem is not within man's capacity to understand. Man must accept that this is the divine plan, Ratzon Hashem. As Shlomo says in Shir Hashirim, Dodi Yarad L'Gani. Hashem, Kvayachol, has descended from his infinite abode to the finite garden to be with Bney Yisrael.

[The Rav related a story told to him by Reb Simcha Zelig, the Dayan of Brisk who was Reb Chaim's closest friend. Reb Simcha Zelig accompanied Reb Chaim on a visit to a cousin of Reb Chaim who was a "Chabbadnik". While they waited for the man to return home they perused some of the Seforim that were in the house written by the Magen Avos. In one of the prefaces they read about the disagreement among Chazal as to the divine purpose in creating the world. The two major opinions were: 1) Hashem created the world so that it may offer praise to the greatness of Hashem; 2) Hashem created the world as a manifestation of His great attribute of kindness. Though he admitted that both ideas might be correct, Reb Chaim disagreed with both opinions. He said that there is no need to look for external reasons for creation. Creation, as all that occurs in the world, was and is the Ratzon Hashem. As we say in Kaddish, B'alma DiBra Kirusay, let the name of Hashem be glorified in the world that He created to fulfill His Ratzon. Infinity residing in a finite world, is the Ratzon Hashem and should simply be accepted as such.]

Shlomo enumerates the various types of prayers that correspond to the needs of man, that would flow from the Beis Hamikdash. In times of national crisis, such as facing defeat in war, and natural disasters like famine or infestation, Hashem should listen to the prayers of His people that will emanate from the Beis Hamikdash. The Mishnayos in Taanis that discuss the central role of prayer in times of drought express the same theme. In such times, Shlomo requests that Hashem grant forgiveness and fulfill the request. In times of exile, Hashem should listen to the prayers of the people no matter where they may be scattered. The theme of "And you shall hear them in the heavens, the place of Your throne". (The Rav added the following parenthetical note: man should not be embarrassed to pray for the fulfillment of his needs, no matter how foolish or mundane they might be. If man feels a need for something, he may ask Hashem for it. Hashem will decide whether to fulfill the request or not, but will not blame man for requesting).

[The aspect of Tzarah mentioned by Shlomo obligates man to pray. The Rambam and Ramban disagree as to whether the obligation to pray on a regular basis is Biblical or Rabbinic. Both agree that in time of crisis, Eis Tzarah, prayer is a biblical obligation. According to the Ramban, Tzarah is defined when many people are affected by a crisis of disastrous proportions. An individual who approaches Hashem for his own needs, does not fit the criteria of Eis Tzarah, and his obligation to pray is Rabbinic.]

The Rav continued his analysis of the prayer of Shlomo: We can derive the importance and central role that prayer plays in Judaism from the fact that Hashem wanted us to construct a home for Him. Various sacrifices were brought daily. Our daily prayers correspond to these sacrifices. One who is obligated to bring a sacrifice may send the sacrifice via a messenger and be granted the atonement provided by the sacrifice without appearing before Hashem and without leaving the comfort of his home or losing a day of work. Indeed it is from the Korban Pesach that we derive the Halacha of a surrogate, that Shelucho Shel Adam Kmoso. When it comes to prayer there is no concept of Shelucho Shel Adam Kmoso. I can not appoint someone else to fulfill my obligation to pray. One may ask: if the Anshei Maamad represented all of Bney Yisrael for the daily sacrifices, why is there no concept of surrogate for prayer that is based on the daily sacrifices? The Rav

explained that the distance between man and Hashem/the altar does not affect the acceptability of the sacrifice, so long as it is offered in a way that meets the requirements of the required sacrifice. Man can be working his fields while his sacrifice is offered. On the other hand prayer requires a closeness to Hashem, like one who is standing in front of a king. The essence of prayer is the drawing closer of man and Hashem. Without this Kavanah there is no prayer. Kavanah implies that I exist before Hashem, that I can express my needs before Him as I would to someone who I felt close to and secure with. The Rambam noted that the main reason for building the Beis Hamikdash was the Korbanos. Why weren't the Bamos, temporary alters, sufficient for this purpose? Why build a "house" for Hashem? The Rav explained that this expresses the desire of Hashem to Kvayachol live near us, to be our close neighbor. Korbanos can be accepted by Hashem even when great distances separate Hashem and man. For prayer, man needs to be close to Hashem and Hashem wants to be close to man, next door, Lshichno Tidrishu Uvasa Shama. The "house" of Hashem is unique because it is a house of prayer, Ki Baysi Bais Tefilah. Shlomo said "and they will admit their sins towards this city and their land". Prayer is the connection between man and Hashem that represents the strength of their relationship. Man can not embrace Hashem from the distance. He does not feel comfortable unburdening his heart and divulging his foolish dreams by having to shout over a distance. Shlomo knew that the Beis Hamikdash was not required for the Korbanos aspect. Hashem needs to be close to man so that man will feel as comfortable in approaching Hashem through prayer as a young child feels when approaching his father at any time. Hashem Kvayachol contracted to reside in the small space of a cubit by a cubit, so that man can always feel close to the residence of Hashem. Shlomo said "and they shall pray to Hashem via their land". In order to pray, the people must be able to focus and identify where does Hashem reside relative to where they may be. Through their land, through the city of Yerushalayim, through the Holy of Holies. Shlomo said that Hashem must take up residence in the Beis Hamikdash to be close to the people in order to show that building of the Beis Hamikdash was successful. Prayer must be Panim El Panim, face to face. Such prayer should be heard by Hashem and accepted. No matter what the people may pray for, be it repentance for a sin or for help in times of personal and national crisis. All prayer comes down to a single motive: Teshuva, repenting and returning closer to Hashem. This requires that Hashem be close and approachable, our next door neighbor. We say Shomeah Tefila Adecha Kol Basar Yavou. The word Adecha is used instead of the word Aylecha (towards you). Adecha implies coming close enough to touch. Prayer requires that man come so close to Hashem, to Kvayachol be able to touch each other. The Beis Hamikdash provided the framework for achieving this closeness. Hashem does not need a house. It is we who require that He be our neighbor, for prayer. We do not have to understand how Hashem allows the infinite to coexist with the finite. We must appreciate the proximity of Hashem to us that enables us to pray and shows that Hashem is indeed interested in our prayers.

This summary was (and still is!) Copyright 1996 by Dr. Israel Rivkin and Josh Rapps, Edison, N.J. These summaries are based on notes taken by Dr. Rivkin at the weekly Moriah Shiur given by Moraynu V'Rabbeinu Harav Yosef Dov Halevi Soloveichik ZTL over many years.