

INTERNET PARSHA SHEET
ON TRUMAH - 5760

To receive this parsha sheet in Word format, send e-mail message to
cshulman@cahill.com & crshulman@aol.com

Yated Neeman USA Columns II

PENINIM AL HATORAH Parshas Terumah BY RABBI A. LEIB
SCHEINBAUM Hebrew Academy of Cleveland

Speak to the Bnei Yisrael and let them take for Me a portion, from
every man whose heart motivates him you shall take My portion. (25:2)

One would expect that it would be incumbent upon every individual
to participate in the building of the Mishkan. Yet, the Torah's standard is
to take donations only "from every man whose heart motivates him."
Regarding other mitzvos, the Torah places emphasis upon activity, the
ma'aseh ha'mitzvah. Of prime importance regarding the building of the
Mishkan is that the individual displays unequivocal ratzon, good will
and desire to give. Imagine, had the people not exhibited pure ratzon to
contribute towards the Mishkan, the Mishkan never would have been
built! It behooves us to understand the significance of this willingness to
contribute, a trait which represents the underlying motif of the Mishkan.

Rashi defines the word "li," for Me, as "lishmi," for My Name. This
implies that it is not sufficient for the individual merely to give willingly.
Rather, one must demonstrate explicit intention to contribute for the sake
of Hashem's Name. He must have kavanah, intention, to donate towards
Hashem's Mishkan. Without this exclusive intention, the ensuing
construction is invalid. He must give the money willingly, and with
intention for it to help build Hashem's Mishkan; otherwise it will not be
the Mishkan. It will be an ordinary structure. Why? Last, for certain
mitzvos, "lishmah," intention for the mitzvah, is a pre-requisite. We
never find this demand in effect in the preparations for the mitzvah. For
instance, a get, divorce, must be written "lishmah"; that criteria,
however, applies only to the actual writing. The Torah certainly does not
demand that the quill be made lishmah, or that the parchment be made
lishmah from its very beginning when the skin is flayed from the animal.
Regarding the Mikdash, however, it would be invalid to use a stone
which had not been hewed explicitly to use in the construction of the
Mikdash. The question is glaring: Why should the Mishkan/Mikdash
necessitate such kavanah for every aspect of involvement, to its
culmination that each act must be performed with one intention -l'sheim
Hashem, for Hashem's Mishkan?

Horav Avigdor Nebentzhal, Shlita, gives a practical, yet compelling
response. The greater kedushah, holiness, of an object/endeavor, the
greater care we must take to see to it that the entire process be replete
with holiness every step of the way. Its origin, the foundation upon
which it is built, must be untainted and pure. Only when the foundation
is kadosh, holy, can the edifice be similarly holy.

In the Talmud Kesubos 103b, Chazal relate how Rabbi Chiya
dedicated himself to making sure that Torah would never be forgotten in
Klal Yisrael. He planted the flax seeds. He spun the flax into yarn from
which he made nets. He utilized the nets to catch deer. He used the flesh
of the deer to feed orphans. Finally, from the hide, he made parchment
upon which he wrote the Torah. He then travelled to any city which did
not have a melamed tinokos, Torah teacher for young children, in order
to teach them Torah. If we think about it, Rabbi Chiya seemed to be
"carried away" with his preparations for teaching the children. He could
have just as easily purchased skins or even a ready-made Sefer Torah
from which to teach. Why did he put himself through so much trouble,
spend so much time and effort preparing the scrolls?

The answer, claims Horav Nebentzhal, is that in order to ensure that
Torah not be forgotten, the entire process must be pristine. It must be

B'S'Dotally lishmah from its very beginning. Rabbi Chiya departed from his
personal Torah study for many hours in order to see to it that the Torah
he was teaching was lishmah-from its very beginning. He knew that if
the yesod, foundation, is not lishmah, somewhere down the line that flaw
would surface. Rabbi Chiya was uncompromising in his approach
towards teaching Torah. Is there really any other effective way?

You shall cover it with pure gold, from within and from without you
shall cover it.

The Aron's connection with the Torah is obvious. Indeed, the
arrangement of pure gold both within and without symbolizes Chazal's
dictum that a Torah scholar's public behavior must be consistent with his
inner character. He cannot profess one set of beliefs in his relationship
with Hashem while acting in a manner unbecoming a person of his
spiritual stature in his interaction with people. A talmid chacham is-and
should be-the embodiment of Torah. This should be reflected in his total
demeanor.

The Talmud, Berachos 28a, relates that when Rabban Gamliel was
the Nasi, prince, he decreed that any student who was not tocho k'baro,
his public demeanor not consistent with his internal character, could not
enter the Bais Hamedrash to study Torah. Obviously, such a demanding
criterion precluded many from entering the yeshiva's halls to study
Torah. When Rabbi Elazar ben Azariah became the Nasi, he removed the
guard that stood by the door as he relaxed the standard for entrance into
the yeshiva. Now it became possible for anyone who desired to study
Torah to gain access to the Bais Hamedrash. That day many new benches
were added to the Bais Hamedrash to accommodate the influx of
students.

The commentators question the identity of the shomer ha'pesach, the
watchman who was able to discern the spiritual integrity of those who
entered. Horav Avraham Yaakov Zvi, z"l m'Sadiger, comments that
actually no guard was tending the door. The doors of the Bais
Hamedrash were sealed closed with a bolt. The student who was really
devoted to his studies, who would not let anything stand in the way of
his spiritual achievement, found a way to get into the yeshiva. His entry
was dependent upon his desire. He who "traversed high fences" or "dug
deep beneath the ground" to gain access to the House of Study,
manifested that he truly possessed the resolution to study Torah,
regardless of the circumstances. This type of student embodied the trait,
tocho k'baro.

Horav D. Eisman, Shlita, observes that Chazal say that "benches"
were added. They do not focus on the many students who joined, but
rather on the benches. This implies that perhaps not so many new
students came. Rather the students' perspective towards material comfort
was transformed. The previous student body, whose spiritual devotion
and integrity were unquestionable, sufficed when studying Torah-even
under conditions that did not seem to provide for their creature comforts.
Even a crowded Bais Hamedrash with no place to sit did not deter them
from studying Torah. The new breed of students found it necessary to
demand a state-of-the-art Bais Hamedrash. Suddenly, there were not
enough benches to enable everyone to sit comfortably. By relaxing the
requirements for entrance, they also diminished the standard of
excellence among some of their students. It became crucial to provide for
the new group of students as well as the original ones. Only a gifted and
devoted Rosh Hayeshivah would have the skill to integrate the group in
such a way that the incoming students would fall under the influence of
those who also demonstrated a greater regard for their studies. That is the
basis of chinuch, Torah education.

Subj: Rabbi Frand on Parshas Terumah Date: Thu, 10 Feb 2000
6:48:28 PM Eastern Standard Time "RAVFRAND" LIST - Rabbi
Frand on Parshas Terumah

These divrei Torah were adapted from the hashkafa portion of Rabbi

Yissocher Frand's Commuter Chavrusah Tapes on the weekly portion:
Tape # 228, Selling A Shul. Good Shabbos!

You Shall Have A Dream

At the end of the description of the Menorah, the pasuk [verse] says, "(U'Re-ay v'asay..." -- "And see and construct according to the pattern that you were shown on the mountain" [25:40]. The Baal HaTurim has a very cryptic and enigmatic comment on this pasuk: "There are only 3 times in all of Tanach that a pasuk begins with the word 'u'Re-ay' ['And see']".

The other two occurrences are both in Tehillim -- "And see sons to your children, peace on Israel" [128:6] and "And see if I have an evil way; and lead me in the way of Eternity" [139:24]. The Baal HaTurim seems to provide us with a "Jewish Crossword Puzzle". The trick is to find the connection between these three pasukim [verses]. The Baal HaTurim himself suggests a common thread, but I will discuss an alternate explanation from the Shemen HaTov.

Rash"i on our verse comments that Moshe was puzzled about the appearance of the Menorah, until HaShem [G-d] showed him a replica of the Menorah made out of fire. Moshe was able to conceptualize all of the other Kaylim [vessels] of the Mishkan, but somehow he had difficulty conceptualizing the complex shape and structure of the Menorah. Therefore, HaShem formed a Menorah out of fire and showed Moshe exactly what the Menorah looked like. However, even that did not help. We know from another statement of the Sages that even after Moshe saw the image of the Menorah, he still could not construct it. Finally, HaShem instructed Moshe to (have Betzalel) throw the gold into the fire, and the Menorah was created miraculously.

The question must be asked: HaShem knew Moshe's capabilities. If, ultimately, HaShem knew that Moshe would not be able to construct the Menorah on his own, why did HaShem ask him to do something that he could not do?

The Shemen HaTov answers: it was vital and crucial for Moshe to see the shape and form of the Menorah -- even if he would not be able to duplicate it. A person must have a vision of what is required and expected. If one does not have the vision, he can not even begin. One must have a dream, whether that dream can be realized and become a reality or not. The minimum that is absolutely necessary is the perception of a direction and goal.

The initial image that HaShem showed to Moshe was the vision of the Menorah. Moshe was then at least aware of the dream -- the ultimate goal. If later, Moshe could not construct the Menorah himself, then HaShem would help, but at least Moshe knew what he was trying to accomplish.

There are many things in life that are beyond our capabilities. We need the Help of Heaven to accomplish them. However, in order to be able to invoke the Help of Heaven and reach that dream, we must first possess the dream and the vision. This is what we learn from the pasuk, "See and construct, according to the image that I showed you on the mountain."

Our Sages tell us that children, life and sustenance are dependent upon 'Mazal' [fortune]. We can do very little about how many children we will have; what type of children we will have; how our life will turn out; how our livelihood will go. These are things that are up to HaShem. But we must have the dream on our own.

The Shemen HaTov explains that this is what Dovid HaMelech [King David] is saying in the second pasuk in Tehillim "And see..." [139,24]. HaShem, I do not know what You have in store for me, but if it is not the type of productive life that I dream for, please fill it in, in accordance with those dreams. The dreams, however, are mine.

In addition, the Shemen HaTov explains that this is the connection that the Baal HaTurim is making to the first pasuk, "And see children to your children; peace on Israel". We never know what we will see from our children. Who knows? There are so many factors. One can try, put in

efforts, pray, do everything within his power. But who knows what will happen? There are so many factors that mold and affect a child. But we must have dreams for our children. I, like you, want to see children from my children. I want to see my grandchildren sharing my values. I want to see my children committed to Torah. I want them to be G-d fearing, honest Jews. I want to see from them, children who share those values as well. That is the definition of "Peace upon Israel".

These things are not always up to us or under our control to carry out but we must have the dreams and the wishes. We must always have the proper directions and goals.

Correction: An editing error appeared in last week's "RavFrاند". An Eved Ivri [Jewish Servant] works for a full six years from the day that he is sold, regardless of the seven-year Shmita cycle. Only Yovel [once every 50 years, immediately following 7 seven-year shmita cycles] interrupts an Eved Ivri's six years of work, freeing all Jewish slaves. [Rambam - Hilchos Avodim, Chapter 2, Halachah 2]

Personalities and Sources Ba'al HaTurim -- (1268-1340) Commentary on the Torah by Rabbi Yaakov ben Asher, also authored the Tur, one of the early codes of Jewish Law. First published in 1514 in Constantinople. Shemen HaTov -- Rabbi Dov Weinberger - contemporary author, Rabbi in Brooklyn, NY Rash"i -- (1040-1105) Rabbi Sh'lomo ben Yitzchak; Troyes and Worms, France; "Father of all Torah Commentaries."

Transcribed by David Twersky; Seattle, Washington twerskyd@aol.com Technical Assistance by Dovid Hoffman; Yerushalayim dhoffman@torah.org

RavFrاند, Copyright © 2000 by Rabbi Y. Frاند and Project Genesis, Inc. Project Genesis: Torah on the Information Superhighway 17 Warren Road, Suite 2B Baltimore, MD 21208 (410) 602-1350 FAX: 510-1053

From:Zomet Institute[SMTP:zomet@virtual.co.il] Shabbat-B'Shabbato - Parshat Teruma SHABBAT-ZOMET is an extract from SHABBAT-B'SHABBATO.. published by the Zomet Institute of Alon Shevut, Israel, under the auspices of the National Religious Party. Translated by: Moshe Goldberg <http://www.moresheet.co.il/zomet/comee.asp>

THE ROLE OF THE TABERNACLE

BY RABBI YAACOV MEIDAN, Yeshivat Har Etzion, Alon Shevut

The Torah description of the Tabernacle starts with the Ark, noting that the Tablets of the Covenant are stored inside it, and describing the cover of the Ark and the Keruvim. The Keruvim mark the site of Divine revelation, where the Almighty and Moshe meet. The act of meeting with Moshe and the giving of the Tablets are a continuation of two earlier occurrences: the ceremony at Sinai, where G-d descended to the top of the mountain, and the giving of the Torah, which includes the Tablets. Thus, the task of the Ark and the cover are to commemorate the unique event of the close approach between the Almighty and His nation at Mount Sinai, and to transform this one-time event into a constant proximity and an ongoing dialogue between the Almighty and His nation.

The Torah emphasizes this aspect of the Tabernacle many times. The Tabernacle is called the "Tabernacle of Testimony" in memory of the Tablets, and the tent is called the "Tent of Meeting" to commemorate the meetings between G-d and Moshe.

The description of the Tabernacle in this week's portion ends with the large altar on which the Olah sacrifice is brought, while next week's portion ends with the smaller altar, used for incense. Sacrifices and incense are part of the ritual of prayer, as is seen from the fact that the prayers were established corresponding to the daily sacrifices and the additional Musaf on holidays. (As is written, "We will replace the oxen with (the words of) our lips" [Hoshaya 14:3], and "Let my prayer be as

incense before you" [Tehillim 141:2].) The main elements of our prayers are praise for the greatness of the Almighty, as in the "Re'iyah" sacrifices offered on the holidays, a request for forgiveness, as in the sacrifices of atonement, and thanks to the Almighty, as in a Toda sacrifice. While at Sinai the Almighty appeared to the nation in cloud and fire, the incense altar provides an opportunity for the people to create a cloud of smoke for G-d, and the second altar lets the people create a pillar of fire.

While the main role of the Tabernacle is to extend the events at Sinai in terms of the leadership of G-d, in the Temple, which followed, the prophets emphasized the role of prayer. This is the main point stressed in the dedication by Shlomo, and it is also emphasized in Yeshayahu's prophecy: "For my house will be called a house of worship for all the nations" [56:7].

In a way, the Torah, in which G-d speaks to us, may be considered a "written Torah," while prayer, when we speak to G-d, is an "oral Torah," based on the community of Bnei Yisrael. In fact, the greatest accomplishment of the people who founded the era of the oral Torah - the "Anshei Knesset Hagedola" - was that they wrote the prayers, including the Shemona Essrei and the daily blessings.

The Torah and prayer are two pillars supporting the entire edifice linking the Almighty and Bnei Yisrael. In the Torah, G-d speaks to us and teaches us the mitzvot. In prayer, we speak to the Almighty and ask for our needs. Torah and prayer together form a complete picture of contact, a dialogue between the Almighty and us. The essence of the dialogue is seen in the "Shema Yisrael," as an example of Torah, and in the Shemona Essrei, a prayer which reminds us of the sacrifices.

From: Shlomo Katz[SMTP:skatz@torah.org]
Hamaayan / The Torah Spring Edited by Shlomo Katz Terumah
Sponsored by Alan and Paula Goldman in memory of Sam W.
Goldman and by The Katz family on the yahrzeits of Avraham Abba ben Avigdor Moshe Hakohen Katz a"h and Etia (Etush) bat Avigdor Moshe Hakohen Landau a"h

Today's Learning: ... Daf Yomi: Yevamot 74

The midrash teaches that at the moment when Bnei Yisrael said, "Na'aseh ve'nishmah"/"We will do and [then] we will hear," i.e., when Bnei Yisrael accepted the Torah unconditionally, Hashem said, "Let them take for Me terumah." R' Chaim Aryeh Lerner z"l explains this as follows:

There is an opinion in the gemara that one is not permitted to take a vow. How then did Yaakov take a vow (Bereishit ch.28)? Tosfos explains that all agree that one is permitted to take a vow in times of trouble.

We might think that precisely when a person is anguished he cannot be trusted to fulfill his vows. However, G-d trusts us to have faith in Him and to repay our vows even if He seems not to be answering our prayers. For example, when a Jew promises to give charity as a merit for an ill relative, G-d is confident that the vow will be fulfilled even if the relative does not recover. It is a Jew's nature to accept G-d's decrees.

The gemara (Shabbat 88a) records that a certain heretic told the sage Rava, "You are an impetuous nation! You should have heard what G-d was offering before you accepted it." Rava responded by explaining that when Bnei Yisrael accepted the Torah unconditionally without even knowing its contents, they expressed their faith in Hashem that He would not mislead or disappoint them. This is precisely the same Jewish trait that was mentioned above in connection with the making of vows.

We learn a halachah from Yaakov's vow. From the fact that he said (Bereishit 29:22), "I will repeatedly tithe to You," we learn that one is permitted to give up to two-tenths, or one-fifth, of his wealth to charity. This is alluded to in the word "terumah" as well, as we can read the word: "to'em heh"/"he gives five (i.e., one-fifth)." However, we could not learn this halachah from Yaakov's vow if we did not know that

Yaakov was permitted to take a vow. And, we would not know that Yaakov was permitted to take a vow in his time of trouble if the Jews had not said, "Na'aseh ve'nishmah." This is why at the moment when Bnei Yisrael said, "Na'aseh ve'nishmah," Hashem said, "Let them take for Me terumah." (Imrei Chaim p.49)

....

The Month of "Adar Rishon"

What is the halachic status of the first month of Adar in a leap year (which has two months of Adar)? On the one hand, many have the custom that if they lost a relative in the month of Adar in a year which was not a leap year, that they observe the traditional yahrzeit fast only in the _first_ Adar. On the other hand, a child who was born in Adar in a year which was not a leap year but whose thirteenth year is a leap year observes his bar mitzvah only in the _second_ Adar. Why?

R' Joseph B. Soloveitchik z"l explained: a yahrzeit is observed on the anniversary of another person's death. If the anniversary falls in Adar, then, in a leap year, there are two anniversaries. However, once a person has fulfilled his obligation to fast by fasting on the first anniversary which falls in a given year, he is no longer obligated to fast that year, even though the yahrzeit will fall again in the same year.

However, a bar mitzvah is not an observance of a "day". It represents the completion of thirteen years of life and the beginning of the fourteenth year. If one's birthday is, for example, the last day of Adar, then even after the first Adar has passed, the whole month of Adar is still to come. How then can this boy say that he has "completed" thirteen years of life?! (Quoted in Harrerei Kedem p. 311)

Hamaayan, Copyright © 2000 by Shlomo Katz and Project Genesis, Inc. Posted by Alan Broder, ajb@torah.org . <http://www.torah.org/learning/hamaayan/> . <http://www.acoast.com/~sehch/hamaayan/> . Donations to HaMaayan are tax-deductible. Project Genesis: Torah on the Information Superhighway learn@torah.org 17 Warren Road, Suite 2B <http://www.torah.org/> Baltimore, MD 21208 (410) 602-1350 FAX: 510-1053

From: RABBI YISROEL CINER [SMTP:ciner@torah.org]
Parsha-Insights--Parshas T'rumah

This week we read the parsha of T'rumah, which deals with the construction of the Mishkan {Tabernacle}. The focal point of the Mishkan was the 'aron', the ark, which contained the luchos {tablets upon which the Ten Commandments were written}. The root of the word 'aron' is 'ohr', meaning light. It contained the 'light' of the Jews and the entire world.

"V'asu aron atzay sheetim {And you all shall make an aron of sheetim wood}.[25:10]"

The Kli Yakar points out that by the other vessels, Moshe was commanded "va'a'sisa," and you shall make. Here the Torah says "va'asu," and you all shall make. This teaches that every single member of Klal Yisroel has a part in the Torah. Va'asu-and you all shall make. The aron, that which contains the light and essence of all Klal Yisroel, belongs to each and every individual.

Why was wood chosen as the principal component of the aron?

"It (the Torah) is a tree of life for those who uphold it. [Mishlay 3:18]" Shlomo HaMelech doesn't describe the Torah as only being a tree of life for those who learn it. Rather, it is a tree of life for those who uphold it. As we stated above, everyone has his or her unique share and connection to Torah. For some it is through their own personal learning and teaching, for others it is through the support that they lend to those involved in Torah. Both are doing their share in upholding the Torah. It is the wooden box of the aron, this tree of life for those who uphold it, which avails the Torah to all. Va'asu-and you all shall make.

"And you shall cover it with pure gold, inside and outside you shall cover it. [25:11]"

The Kli Yakar goes on to explain that the gold that covered the wooden box of the aron on the inside symbolized the hidden part of the

Torah and the gold on the outside symbolized the revealed part of the Torah.

Rashi explains how the aron was actually constructed. Three boxes were made, two of gold and one of wood. The wooden box was placed inside a golden box (thereby covering the outside with gold) and then the second golden box was placed inside the wooden box (thereby covering the inside with gold).

The Vilna Gaon points out that this seems to contradict the passuk {verse} which stated that first "inside" and then on "outside you shall cover it!"

He explains that there is really no contradiction between the order of the passuk and the manner that Rashi explained the construction. By putting the wooden box into a golden box, the inside of the gold (of that outer box) was covering the wood. When the second golden box was put inside, the 'outer' gold (of that inner box) was actually covering the wood. In other words, the passuk's reference of inside and outside is not referring to the wooden box itself but to the inside and outside of the golden boxes covering that wooden box.

Why did the passuk describe it in such a manner?

As we stated above, the outer box represented the revealed aspect of Torah and the inner box, the hidden aspect of Torah. In regard to the revealed part of Torah, the person (represented by the wood) can actually touch the inside; he can get down to the true depths. The inner part of the outer box of gold covered and touched the wood.

However, when it comes to the hidden aspect of Torah, there a person can only hope to reach the outside of that body of knowledge and only after having reached the depths of the revealed aspect of Torah. As the passuk states, after the inner part of the outer golden box (the depths of the revealed Torah) covered the wooden aron, only then did the outer part of the inner box (the hidden aspect of Torah) touch and cover the wooden aron.

Where does this leave the group of those who uphold the Torah that we mentioned above? Are those not actively involved in actual learning or teaching Torah considered to be bereft of this gold?

"And you shall make poles of wood, covered with gold and these shall be placed in rings on the side of the aron in order to carry the aron. In these rings of the aron the poles shall be, never to be removed. [25:13-15]"

If the purpose of these poles was simply to transport the aron, why weren't they removed once the aron had been positioned in its proper location? Why is there an explicit prohibition against ever removing these poles?

The Chofetz Chaim explains that these poles (covered with gold) represent those who lend support to the Torah. They uphold and carry the Torah. A person might mistakenly think that such people are deserving of honor while being actively involved in this support. However, once their support is no longer needed or they are no longer able to contribute, perhaps they are no longer deserving of this honor. Does their act of support fundamentally change who they are and render them sanctified individuals even after such acts are no longer forthcoming?

That is the lesson taught to us by these poles. They attain the same level of kedusha {holiness} as the aron. They are never to be removed. The aron is situated alone in the Holy of Holies-those poles are also in the Holy of Holies.

The Chofetz Chaim goes on to say that the unbreakable connection between the 'supporters' and the 'learners' actually is an eternal bond. They will 'sit' together in the next world and take pleasure in the same spiritual heights.

The story is told that there was a stormy halachic {Jewish law} dispute involving Rav Chaim Volozhiner and other great scholars over an aspect of shatnez {forbidden mixture of wool and linen}. During that time, someone who he had known to be a simple person in his life time

but had been an avid supporter of the scholars approached Rav Chaim Volozhiner in a dream. Rav Chaim asked him what the heaven's opinion was in regard to the shatnez debate. This person responded with a detailed, in depth analysis of the entire topic which was far beyond what he had been able to comprehend in his lifetime.

The poles are never to be removed from the aron. "It is a tree of life for those who uphold it. [Mishlay 3:18]"

Good Shabbos, Yisroel Ciner

Parsha-Insights, Copyright 1 2000 by Rabbi Yisroel Ciner and Project Genesis, Inc. Rabbi Yisroel Ciner is a Rebbe [teacher] at Neveh Zion, <http://www.neveh.org/>, located outside of Yerushalayim. Project Genesis: Torah on the Information Superhighway learn@torah.org 17 Warren Road, Suite 2B <http://www.torah.org/> Baltimore, MD 21208 (410) 602-1350 FAX: 510-1053

From: RABBI ARON TENDLER [SMTP:ravaron@torah.org]
Subject: Rabbi's Notebook - Parshas Terumah
Teaching Limits

In this week's Parsha, Moshe instructed the Bnai Yisroel in the design and construction of the Mishkan. The building of the Mishkan was in direct response to the sin of the Golden Calf. So long as the Jews had not sinned, G-d's constant caring and direction was open and overt. However, once the Jews lost faith in G-d's and worshipped the Golden Calf, G-d secreted His control over the universe within the laws of nature.

Before the sin of the Golden Calf G-d's reality was self-evident and obvious, similar to the way it was in the Garden of Eden before Adam and Chava sinned. After the sin of the Golden Calf the nation had to work and sacrifice in order to reveal G-d's presence, similar to the way it was after Adam and Chava sinned. After the Jews repented for the sin of the Golden Calf, G-d consented to partially reveal Himself within the midst of the people. However, the manner of His revelation would be limited to within the structure and service of the Mishkan. "Make Me a sanctuary so that I can dwell in their midst." (25:8)

Many of the commentaries explain that the Mishkan's stated purpose, "So that I can dwell in their midst," really means, "in their hearts." As it says, "In my heart I will build a Mishkan, for the sake of the glory of His honor." G-d originally intended that there not be a Mishkan or a Bais Hamikdash. G-d wanted that every person's actions would radiate the awareness of His presence in all instances, without the need of a Mishkan. (Sforno) Once the Jews lost their capacity to personally reflect G-d's presence, the Mishkan replaced what we should have each been. Therefore, our capacity to recognize and display G-dliness must be symbolically represented through the various components of the Mishkan described in Terumah and Tizaveh.

In this week's Parsha, the basic structure of the Mishkan, as well as the Aron (Ark), the Shulchan (Table), the Menorah, and the Mizbeach (Alter) are described. These constituted the primary vessels needed for the daily functioning of the Mishkan. These were the primary tools needed to reveal G-dliness in the universe. Each of these vessels is related to ourselves and our lives, and provides direction for integrating and evincing G-d within the family and society. Let us explore some of the Aron's symbolism.

The Aron:

The "box" containing the Luchos and the Broken Luchos were kept, was constructed of three concentric boxes. The outer and inner boxes were made from pure gold, and the inner middle box was made from acacia wood. The assembled boxes were covered with a single pure gold cover, the Kapores, upon which the two Cherubim stood. Around the perimeter of the outer gold box was a rim that acted as a raised border to contain the Kapores. The Torah describes this rim as a "crown." The Cherubim were winged figures, one adorned with the face of a boy and the other with the face of a girl. Permanently attached to the sides of the outer golden box were two Badim - carrying poles. (see page 447, note

17-22, Stone Edition)

Occupying the holiest place in the Mishkan, the Aron was the focal point of the Mishkan. "I will commune with you there speaking to you 'G-d' from between the two Cherubim 'G-d'" (25:22) The key function of the Aron appears to be how G-d communicated with us and how we were to communicate with Him. Note that on the one hand all prophecy emanated from between the Cherubim. (Rashi 25:22) On the other hand, all of our prayers are directed toward the Holy of Holies and the space between the Cherubim. The Aron symbolized our most prized human characteristic, our intellectual capacity to understand G-d, and our ability to communicate that understanding to others. As humans, we are the only creatures endowed with the ability to willfully communicate with G-d. All other creatures have an intrinsic awareness of G-d, but they are incapable of willfully expressing that awareness. With our capacity to understand and communicate, we are able to willfully acknowledge G-d's constancy and dominion. This is consistent with our place and purpose in nature. Nature as a whole manifests G-d's hidden presence. Our job is to reveal G-d's presence. Therefore, all other creations silently reflect G-d's presence through the manner of their existence. We, on the other hand, must actively reveal G-d's presence by communicating our understanding through our words and our actions.

The most effective way for recognizing G-d's hidden presence is to develop an ongoing relationship with G-d. The more intimate our relationship, the greater will be our awareness and understanding. Note: The Torah uses the word "to know" to describe the most intimate relationship between a husband and wife. As is true with all relationships, there must be communication between G-d and us. The more intimate the relationship, the greater the need for communication. Likewise, the more we communicate with G-d, the more intimate our relationship with Him will be.

It is extremely significant that G-d chose to "speak" to us from between the two Cherubim who were molded with the faces of a boy and a girl. There are few experiences as revealing of G-d's profound interaction in the laws of nature as having and raising children. First of all, the actual process of childbirth is miraculous. During childbirth a mother is at the complete mercy of the laws of nature and G-d. A woman is completely dependent upon G-d's participation in the miracle of birth. Regardless of the significant advances in medicine, the birth of child reveals G-d's presence in the world. As the famous expression goes, "There is no atheist in the delivery room." However, our real participation in the miracle of birth, is after the child is born. Cell division and DNA are G-d's domain; child rearing and education are our domain.

This week's Parsha clearly tells us that the greatest potential for revealing G-d in the world is through our children. By raising children in an environment that is filled with devotion to G-d and His Torah, we guarantee society's continued awareness and understanding of G-d. It is through our children and future generations that G-d communicates with society. Likewise, it is through the manner in which we raise our children and future generations that we communicate with G-d. If we value our relationship with G-d we will do everything possible to share Him with our children. Sharing G-d with our children involves two basic approaches. 1. The teaching of Torah. 2. The teaching of Halacha - Jewish law. It isn't enough to simply learn Torah. Torah must be experienced, and the experience of Torah can only be explored through the limits of Halacha. Torah study without imposed limitations, demands, or expectations is nothing more than an intellectual exercise in the theoretical existence of the Divine. Torah study alone will not create an intimacy with G-d that transcends place and time. If we are to share G-d with our children, we must share our relationship with G-d. Therefore, we must do everything possible to teach them Torah through the experience and limitations of Halacha that constitutes our relationship with G-d.

A few years ago, Rabbi Matis Sklar Shlita explained that the "crown" around the top of the Kapores represents the limits that the Torah imposes on our lives through Halacha. Likewise, my Father Shlita explained that the family unit is the syringe that G-d created in order to inject proper values (revealing His presence) into humanity. The Aron represents the Torah. The Cherubim represent our children and the family unit. The "crown" represents the limitations of Halacha. Our responsibility is to communicate our awareness of G-d to our children by the way we integrate the limitations of His law in our life. In so doing we create generations of teachers who will fulfill G-d's promise to Avraham, "And through you and your children will be blessed all the nations of the earth."

Rabbis-Notebook, Copyright 1 2000 by Rabbi Aron Tendler and Project Genesis, Inc. The author is Rabbi of Shaarey Zedek Congregation, North Hollywood, CA and Assistant Principal, YULA. Rabbi Tendler is also the author of the Parsha-Summary class. Project Genesis: Torah on the Information Superhighway learn@torah.org 17 Warren Road, Suite 2B <http://www.torah.org/> Baltimore, MD 21208 (410) 602-1350 FAX: 510-1053

From: Yeshivat Har Etzion's Israel Koschitzky Virtual Beit Midrash [SMTP:yehe@vbm-torah.org] Subject: SICHOT -19: Parashat Teruma Student Summaries of Sichot Given by the Roshei Yeshiva PARASHAT TERUMA

SICHA OF HARAV YEHUDA AMITAL SHLIT"A
A SENSE OF OBLIGATION

Summarized by Matan Glidai Translated by David Silverberg

The Torah tells us at the beginning of Parashat Teruma that the Beit Ha-mikdash is to be built through Benei Yisrael's donations. Later, in Parashat Vayakhel (chapter 36), the Torah describes the outpouring of materials Benei Yisrael contributed towards the construction of the Mishkan and its accessories. One gets the impression that the Torah here encourages good will and voluntarism, that it praises the Jewish people for their unsolicited contributions.

However, Rashi (25:2) writes that the sockets, which supported the beams of the Mishkan, were manufactured not from voluntary donations, but from the mandatory half-shekel tax levied from the people regardless of their generous contributions. Latent in this comment of Rashi is a critical lesson regarding avodat Hashem in general (see Maharal of Prague in "Gur Aryeh"). One's service of the Almighty must be based first and foremost upon an ingrained sense of obligation, duty, commitment - not good will and voluntarism. One must feel obligated to fulfill the mitzvot, and cannot perform them merely because he finds them interesting or appealing.

Some people think that a good Jew in one who fully identifies with everything he does and does not perform religious acts as if they have been forced upon him. Rashi here teaches us that although the Mishkan did require voluntary donations, the sockets - the very basis and foundation of the Mishkan - were built not from voluntary contributions but from mandatory taxation. One must inculcate within himself, before anything else, a profound sense of commitment.

Although Benei Yisrael declared "Na'aseh ve-nishma" - "We will do and we will hear" - before receiving the Torah, G-d nevertheless found it necessary to suspend the mountain over their heads and threaten them should they not accept the Torah (Shabbat 88b). The foundation of avodat Hashem is that we are obligated to uphold the mitzvot; only on this basis can one build a sense of voluntary service of G-d. In the Psalms (27:4), King David requests "to live in the House of G-d all the days of my life, to gaze upon the beauty of G-d and to frequent His temple." One must first live permanently in the House of G-d, out of necessity and obligation. Only thereafter comes the "frequenting of the temple," when one occasionally comes to visit out of personal interest and free will.

This message takes on particular significance today, when

Western society seeks to avoid any form of burden and obligation, a tendency that has made its way into our community, as well. The prevalent attitude encourages one to do only what his heart desires, and any type of coercion is considered harmful and threatening. People today raise onto a pedestal the ideal of human rights and freedom, and view any form of obligation or commitment as undermining this concept. Many have forgone the institution of marriage, preferring to live together without an official bond that demands loyalty and mutual devotion. Many have lost the motivation to serve in the Israeli Defense Forces, since they feel no commitment to defend the country. Society has divested itself of virtually every form of obligation and commitment.

We must rise above this dangerous attitude. Within the religious community, there are those who promote Torah study only because it is interesting and enjoyable. We must understand that Torah study must be based primarily upon a sense of commitment, and only thereafter can one speak of the enjoyment and interest generated therefrom. As symbolized by the sockets, as well as by the sacrifices (which are the primary purpose of the Mishkan), commitment forms the very basis and foundation of serving G-d, its bottom line and ultimate purpose.

(Originally delivered on Leil Shabbat Parashat Teruma 5757 [1997]).

From: Ohr Somayach[SMTP:ohr@virtual.co.il]
* TORAH WEEKLY * Highlights of the Weekly Torah Portion
Parshat Terumah

A Gilty Lily?

"Its knobs and its blossoms will be (hammered) from it..." (25:31)

In English, we speak of "gilding the lily," of applying unnecessary adornment. How can the lily be made more beautiful? If you paint it gold, will it be more radiant? When you paint a lily it detracts from its true beauty. It's ungepatchket -- overdone.

There's a common misconception that the Torah is like a lily, and the Rabbis were lily painters.

There is not a single Rabbinic dictum or law, not an extrapolation nor an embellishment that is not hinted to in the Torah itself. Everything stems ultimately from the Torah.

We can see this idea in this week's Parsha: "You shall make a menorah of pure gold, hammered out shall the menorah be made, its base, its shaft, its cups, its knobs and its blossoms will be [hammered] from it."

The menorah was fashioned from one solid block of gold. Nothing was grafted on to it. Just as its base, its shaft and its cups were integral, drawn from the same block of gold, so too were its knobs and its blossoms integral and drawn from the same block of gold.

The same is true with every law that the Rabbis promulgated. Nothing is grafted on. Nothing is unrelated embellishment. Just as the Torah laws -- the "shaft" and the "cups" of the Torah -- stem from an indivisible unity, so does every last Rabbinic dictum and decree -- its "knobs" and its "blossoms" -- derive from the that same "block of gold."

The lily is ungilded.

Love And Faith

"And they will make for me a sanctuary, and I will dwell in their midst" (25:8)

The son of a well-known Rosh Yeshiva (Dean of Rabbinic Seminary) in Israel was finding his yeshiva studies too difficult. He just didn't fit. His father was worried sick that his estrangement from Torah study would precipitate his fall into the wrong crowd. And from there -- who knows? His son sensed his father's anxiety. He came to his father one day and said "Daddy. Don't worry. I'm not going to become

non-religious -- because I know you love me."

On the surface, this is a non-sequitur. What have religious beliefs to do with love? What is the connection between being an observant Jew and having loving parents?

"And they will make for Me a sanctuary, and I will dwell in their midst."

There are no easy answers. Maybe this child felt his home was a sanctuary of love -- of his parents' love for him, of his parents' love for each other, for G-d and for Torah. Maybe that brought him to a closeness to G-d that transcended his lack of success in his yeshiva, welding him with iron bands to G-d and to the Jewish People.

Let us make our homes sanctuaries of love, of acceptance, where our children sense our love of our spouses, our love of them, and our love of the mitzvot and service of G-d. May this love permeate the hearts of all those troubled young lives who have fallen by the wayside, may it remove them and their parents from all sorrow, and may G-d dwell in our midst.

Sources: *A Gilty Lily - Chafetz Chaim Written and Compiled by RABBI YAAKOV ASHER SINCLAIR General Editor: Rabbi Moshe Newman Ohr Somayach International 22 Shimon Hatzadik Street, POB 18103 Jerusalem 91180, Israel Tel: 972-2-581-0315 Fax: 972-2-581-2890 E-Mail: info@ohr.org.il Home Page: <http://www.ohr.org.il>

From: RABBI RISKIN'S SHABBAT SHALOM LIST
[SMTP:parsha@ohrtorahstone.org.il]

Shabbat Shalom: Terumah (Exodus 25:1-27:19) by Shlomo Riskin
Efrat, Israel-- "They shall make me a sanctuary and I shall dwell among them." When was this commandment to build a sanctuary first presented by G-d to the Israelites? Strangely enough, the main Biblical commentary Rashi (R. Shlomo ben Yitzchak, 1040-1105) maintains that these actual instructions were given "the day following Yom Kippur," some four months after the Revelation at Sinai described at the conclusion of last week's portion, immediately after the Israelites had repented and been forgiven for their sin of worshiping the golden calf. But if this is the case, why does the Bible record it here, pre-golden calf, and not two portions later where it really belongs chronologically, post golden calf?

What do we gain by the fact that our central religious arena, the Holy Temple, is divorced from historical cause and-effect drama and placed into its own theological cocoon?

Indeed, this is not the only out-of-order sequence before us. Chapter 24 in Mishpatim, which immediately precedes our section and may well be considered its prelude, closes on a note that has little to do with the over-all character of last week's portion. Mishpatim presents specific details of torts and damages -- laws intended to protect person and property, to maintain order in a disorderly world, the civil rights and obligations of Israelites when they finally cross the Jordan River and establish their own model society. In the midst of all this, the Torah switches focus to a world of blood and sacrifices. "And he sent the young men of the children of Israel, who offered burnt offerings, and sacrificed peace offerings of oxen unto G-d. And Moses took half of the blood, and put it in basins; and half of the blood he dashed against the altar." [Ex. 24:5-6] And after the people make their famous declaration, "We will do, and we will hearken," [24:7] Moses sprinkles the blood upon the people.

On the spot, Rashi [24:1] tells us that this entire section, all the events of chapter 24, "were spoken (and actually occurred) before the Ten Commandments were given;" in effect that whole chapter 24 chronologically belonged in the beginning of Yitro, one portion earlier than it actually appears. Hence, at least according to Rashi and most midrashim the description of the sprinkling of the blood upon the nation of Israel and their covenantal declaration of acceptance of the laws as well as the central commandment to erect a Sanctuary and the

instructions as to how to do so textually follow the Revelation at Sinai and the catalogue of the major laws-- but nevertheless exposition belongs where it is chronologically. Why link the blood and the Sanctuary to the Revelation when they really do not belong there?

Please allow me to begin to respond to the question in a good Jewish fashion - by asking another question. Not surprisingly, the first furnishing to be constructed in the sanctuary is the Ark, the most important feature of the Sanctuary because it encased the tablets of testimony, the Torah: and they shall make an ark of acacia wood" (Ex.25:10), commands the Bible. But what is textually strange about this verse, the Midrash points out, is that throughout the rest of the account of the construction of the various furnishings and accoutrements, the command is given to Moses in second person: "You shall make ..." The main exception to this formulation is the Ark: "And they shall make ..." The Midrash records the question and answer: "Said R. Yehuda son of R. Shalom, G-d said 'they' so that everyone shall come and be involved in the construction of the Ark in order that all shall have a share in the Torah." (Exodus Rabah, Parsha 34:2). The only other exception is the very first verse, "and they shall make Me a Sanctuary." Why does the grammatical form stress the fact that the Sanctuary and the ark specifically are to be made by all of Israel - and not only by the specific artisans who may have been commissioned to do so?

We have previously explained that Israel is both a family-nation as well as a faith-religion, with the earlier portions of the Book of Exodus -those dealing especially with the festival of Passover and the familial celebration of the Paschal lamb - stressing the nation, and the Revelation at Sinai with its catalogue of laws and statutes (Yitro- Mishpatim) stressing the religion. By their very nature, nations are inclusive and religions are exclusive: those who belong to the family or who are residents of a specific nation-state are considered citizens regardless of their religious practices, whereas members of a specific faith community are considered adherents of a religion only if they practice its precepts.

The Revelation at Sinai and the legal ordinances which that revelation engendered signals our emergence as a religion, a religion which goes beyond the national boundaries of any one geographical entity and which demands the commitment of its adherents. However, the Bible wants to emphasize that we are not simply a religion like every other religion: the entire nation Israel must be included in our religious framework, and the Israelite leadership must do everything in its power to include the entire nation in the religious enterprise. Each generation must be inspired to publicly declare their commitment to the Revelation and the blood of sacrifice and celebration must be sprinkled over every single member of the nation. This is why the national acceptance appears after the revelation; even after we become a religion, we still maintained our concern for the nation.

This concern goes one step further. The religious faith of Israel presents a unique concept of a non-corporeal universal Deity who cannot be contained even by the expanse of the heavens; such a Deity can be worshiped anywhere beneath the open skies or within the hearth of a private home, and certainly does not require a specific sanctuary in a central location. However, the sin of the golden calf demonstrated that the Israelites had not yet reached the spiritual and conceptual level to enable them to relate to the Almighty without the inspiration of a physical Sanctuary. Hence, because our religion is concerned not only with the elite intellectuals and spiritualists but rather with the entire nation, immediately after we are forged as a religion at Sinai came the two commands: "Let them make Me a Sanctuary, let them make an ark": the entire nation must share in and have a share of the Torah, we must meet the nation's needs half-way by allowing them to all get involved in constructing a Sanctuary. The family-nation was forged by the religious revelation at Sinai, and that religious revelation must be made to inspire the entire nation.

In effect, the placement of the sprinkling of the blood and the

command to build a Sanctuary after the Revelation teaches us that G-d is not merely the Minister of Religions for the observant Jews; He is the Prime Minister of the entire nation and ultimately of the infinite cosmos. The mission and destiny of the Revelation must be made to touch every single member of the Jewish nation!

>From this perspective, we can appreciate an added dimension to the figures of the cherubs which adorned the ark-cover protecting the Torah: a male and female embracing each other with the faces of children (B.T. Yoma 54a). The image is clearly that of family: husband, wife and children. Our religion is both protected by and must relate to the entire family of Israel. Just like a parent can never divorce a child, the G-d of Revelation will never divorce even the most errant Israelite. "You are My children even when you do not act like My children," declares the G-d of Israel according to our Talmudic Sages. Such is the all-encompassing and all-embracing love of a religion which is committed to every single child of its nation.

Shabbat Shalom

You can find Rabbi Riskin's parshiot on the web at:
<http://www.ohrtorahstone.org.il/parsha/index.htm> Ohr Torah Stone Colleges and Graduate Programs Rabbi Shlomo Riskin, Chancellor Rabbi Chaim Brovender, Dean

From: Jeffrey Gross[SMTP:jgross@torah.org]
WEEKLY-HALACHA FOR 5760 SELECTED HALACHOS
RELATING TO PARSHAS TERUMAH
BY RABBI DONIEL NEUSTADT

A discussion of Halachic topics related to the Parsha of the week.
For final rulings, consult your Rav.

"You shall make the Mishkan of ten curtains (26:1) When a thread tore during the weaving process, they knotted the thread..."Shabbos 74b)

THE MELACHAH OF KNOTTING The Sages of the Mishnah and the Talmud(1) do not clearly define the exact parameters of the melachah of knotting, the twenty-first of the thirty-nine forbidden forms of "work" on Shabbos. The description of the Biblically prohibited knot, *keshet shel k'yama*, a permanent knot, is vague enough to allow for much dispute and debate among the Rishonim as to its exact identity. The debate focuses chiefly on the type of permanency required - must the knot be permanent in its intended duration, in its craftsmanship and quality, or in both? This discussion ultimately leads into its natural extension - the definition of a Rabbinically prohibited knot. Several other issues are debated among the poskim, such as the amount of time the knot must remain knotted in order for it to be considered permanent; the halachic differences between a professional ("craftsman's") knot and an amateur one; the status of a bow, etc.

Although some of these issues are ruled on definitively, others are not. Consequently, there are various opinions as to the practical halachah. Sometimes, the poskim take into account special circumstances - acute physical discomfort, a pressing need to fulfill a mitzvah, etc. To better understand the practical applications of the halachos, we have listed some daily activities which involve this melachah:

SHOELACES: Shoelaces are usually tied with a "single knot" [technically, an "overhand" knot, the first stage of tying shoes] followed by a bow. It is permitted to tie a shoelace in this manner provided that the knot will be undone before 24 hours have elapsed(2). A tight double knot, however, as is often tied on children's shoes to prevent the shoe from slipping off, may not be made on Shabbos even if it will be undone on the same day(3). In a case of acute physical discomfort, there are opinions(4) which allow a double knot to be made on Shabbos, even if the knot will not be undone before 24 hours have elapsed(5).

PLASTIC BAGS: It is prohibited to twist the top of a bag, make a loop, pull the top through the loop and tighten it to form a knot. This type of knot is considered like a double knot which is prohibited. It is

also forbidden to take the two top corners of a plastic bag, tie them and make a bow [as if tying a shoelace]. This type of knot is prohibited since foods and other items put into plastic bags usually remain in them for several days(6).

There are, however, two permissible ways of knotting a plastic bag on Shabbos: 1) Making a single [overhand] knot only, by taking the two top corners of a plastic bag and tying them [like the first stage of tying a shoelace]. Since such a knot will unravel even without manipulation, it is not considered a knot at all. After the single knot has been tied, one may not take the corners of the bag and tuck them under the single knot, since that strengthens the knot(7) [just as a bow, which strengthens the knot, may not be made over a single knot if the knot will not be undone before 24 hours have elapsed]; 2) Making a slip knot [a loop which is not completely pulled through and does not form a knot] at the top of the bag. This is not considered a knot but a bow.

PLASTIC [or PAPER] TWIST TIES: Some poskim(8) rule that it is prohibited to twist [or untwist] a paper-covered or a plastic-covered wire twister around a bag and then twist together its two ends. This ruling is based on the view of the Rambam(9) that one who twists two threads together is producing a rope and transgressing the melachah of knotting. According to this view, twisting the two ends of a twist tie together is similar to twisting two threads to make a rope and may very well be prohibited. Although other poskim maintain that the two cases are not comparable and it is essentially permitted to twist these ties(10), it is still recommended by some that, if possible, it is better not to use twist ties on Shabbos(11).

LULAV: It is a mitzvah to tie the three minim - lulav, hadasim and aravos - together. This must be done on erev Sukkos, since it is forbidden to tie any knot [double knot, overhand knot, single knot with a bow, or single knot with the ends tucked in] around a lulav on Shabbos or Yom Tov. The only solution for one who failed to prepare his lulav in advance is to wind a lulav leaf, etc., around the lulav, hadasim and aravos, make no knot whatsoever, but merely wind around and around so that the hadasim and aravos are "wrapped" around the lulav. The ends of the lulav leaf, etc., may be tucked in. Tucking in the ends is permitted in this case because no knot at all was made(12).

SEFER TORAH: Some poskim(13) rule that it is prohibited to make a single knot and a bow [or a single knot with the ends tucked in under the band] when putting away the Sefer Torah on Shabbos at the Minchah service. Since this knot will remain intact for over twenty- four hours, it should not be made on Shabbos. The custom in most places, however, is to be lenient, and many poskim accept the leniency(14). Another option is to wind the band around the Sefer Torah without making any knot at all, and then tuck the ends under the band, as explained earlier in the case of a lulav which is bound on Yom Tov. Those congregations that use a band with metal clasps or a special band called a wimple(15), avoid this potential problem altogether.

BELTS and KERCHIEFS: These items may be tied with a knot and a bow, or a loose double knot, since these knots are not normally tightened, and even if they are tightened, they are usually loosened within 24 hours(16).

ADDITIONAL NOTES: Tying a single knot at the end [or in the middle] of a string as is often done at the ends of tzitzis strings [to keep them from unraveling], is considered a prohibited [double] knot, since this type of knot is tight and permanent.

It is forbidden to make a knot on top of an existing knot(17), or a third knot on top of a double knot, since the third knot strengthens the entire knot(18).

A bandage may be tied around a wound - even with a tight double knot - as long as the intention is to remove it within seven days and there is no other way of securing it [e.g. through clips or bows]. This, according to many poskim, is a case of acute physical discomfort which may be alleviated by tying a knot(19).

When absolutely necessary, a non-Jew may be asked to tie a knot - even a tight double knot - provided that the knot is not intended to be "permanent" - to last indefinitely(20).

FOOTNOTES: 1 Shabbos 111b. 2 Mishnah Berurah 317:29. Therefore, when one removes his shoes, he must untie the laces, not merely slip the shoes off. 3 Mishnah Berurah 317:14. See Chazon Ish O.C. 52:17 who refers to this prohibition as a "chumrah b'alma" which has become the custom. 4 See Rama 317:1 who allows the untying of a double knot when in tza'ar. It remains unclear why Rama did not discuss tying under such circumstances. Some poskim suggest that there are not many cases where tza'ar can be alleviated by tying ??see Menorah ha-Tehorah 317:8, while other poskim explicitly permit tying a double knot in case of tza'ar ? see Aruch ha-Shulchan 317:10. 5 Rama's exact language is "tza'ar". We have chosen to translate that as "acute physical discomfort" based on Beirur ha-Gra's (see Damesek Eliezer) comparison of this tza'ar to the tza'ar caused by an insect bite, which is discussed in O.C. 316:9. Surely, tying children's shoes so that they do not slip off is not an example of such "tza'ar." 6 Shemiras Shabbos K'hilchasah 9:16; Rabbi P.E. Falk (Zachor v'Shamor, knotting, pg. 16). 7 Mishnah Berurah 651:11. 8 Harav S.Z. Auerbach in Shemiras Shabbos K'hilchasah 15: note 166 and in Tikunim u'Miluim; Shemiras Shabbos K'hilchasah 9:13; Rabbi P.E. Falk (Zachor v'Shamor, Knotting, pg. 16). 9 Quoted in Mishnah Berurah 317:34. Other Rishonim, however, do not agree that this is prohibited ? see Beirur Halachah 314:8. 10 Oral ruling heard in the name of Harav M. Feinstein (quoted in The Shabbos Home, pg. 223). See Igros Moshe O.C. 2:84 for a possible explanation. 11 Shevet ha-Levi 8:55; Harav Y. Roth (Ohr ha-Shabbos vol. 10, pg. 20). 12 Rama O.C. 651:1 and Mishnah Berurah 11. 13 Minchas Shabbos 80:155. According to this view, it is also prohibited to knot a Sefer Torah band in this fashion on Thursday, since it has been untied on Shabbos morning. 14 Ketzos ha-Shulchan 123:9; Tzitz Eliezer 7:29; Harav S.Z. Auerbach quoted in Shemiras Shabbos K'hilchasah 15 note 178. 15 Used mainly in German congregations. According to Harav S. Schwab (quoted in Knots on Shabbos), this type of band was introduced in order to avoid the issue of knotting on Shabbos. 16 Sha'arei Teshuvah 317:1 according to the explanation of Kaf ha-Chayim 317:23 and Shevet ha-Levi 8:60; See also Badei ha-Shulchan 123:4; Toras Shabbos 317:2 and Shemiras Shabbos K'hilchasah 15 note 167 quoting Harav S.Z. Auerbach. 17 Maharsham 6:34. 18 Harav S.Z. Auerbach quoted in Shemiras Shabbos K'hilchasah 15:51. See, however, Tikunim u'Miluim where he modifies his decision and remains undecided. 19 See Shemiras Shabbos K'hilchasah 15:52. 20 Mishnah Berurah 317:25.

Weekly-Halacha, Copyright © 2000 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 Doniel Meir ben Hinda. Weekly sponsorships are available - please mail to jgross@torah.org . Project Genesis: Torah on the Information Superhighway learn@torah.org 17 Warren Road, Suite 2B http://www.torah.org/ Baltimore, MD 21208 (410) 602-1350 FAX: 510-1053

From: Rabbi Mordechai Kamenetzky[SMTP:rmk@torah.org]
Subject: Drasha Parshas Mishpatim -- Crowned Comestibles
RABBI MORDECHAI KAMENETZKY

There is a common denominator among three prominent vessels that are conspicuously placed in the Mishkan. The Aron Kodesh that contains the Holy Luchos known as The Ten Commandments; the Mizbeach HaZahav, the Golden Altar of Incense; and the shulchan all have one aspect in common. They each are adorned with a "zair zahav" a gold crown that surrounds each vessel. The Jews are first told to make an Ark. "You shall cover it with pure gold, from within, and from without shall you cover it, and you shall make on it a gold crown all around" (Exodus: 25 11).

When they are told to build a golden altar for the incense offering, they are also commanded to make a crown around it. In reference to that altar, the Torah commands: "You shall cover it with pure gold, its roof and its walls all around, and its horns, and you shall make for it a gold crown, all around (Exodus 30:3). But when they are commanded to make the shulchan, the table that holds the lechem hapanim, the showbread, the order to make a crown takes on a different meaning. The Torah calls it more than a crown; it is called a guard.

"You shall make a table of acacia wood, two cubits its length, a cubit its width, and a cubit and a half its height. You shall cover it with pure gold, and you shall make for it a gold crown all around." The Torah reiterates the command to make a crown, but this time it uses a word that personifies the function of the crown *umisgarto saviv*."

"You shall make for it a border of a handbreadth all around, and you shall make a gold crown to guard it all around" (Exodus 25:25). The crown is more than an ornament for the shulchan; it is a border that embodies the Table.

Why is the crown designated for the shulchan different than the crown that adorns both the ark and the altar? Why does the shulchan need a crown to serve as border, a guard, a misgeres, more than the other vessels?

Reb Dovid of Lelov, a student of the Seer of Lublin, once came to Zelin to visit his friend Rabbi Dovid of Zelin. Hearing that the rabbi of Lelov was visiting him, the Zeliner Rebbe beseeched his wife to bake something special. Alas, the poverty of the couple was dire, and the poor Rebbitzin only had some flour and oil, which she made into biscuits.

Upon his first bite, the Rebbe exclaimed in earnest, "These cakes are truly exceptional!"

Knowing the source, the Rebbitzen dismissed the compliments of the bland and meager cakes as an appreciation of the effort. Weeks later, the Rebbitzen of Lelov met the Rebbitzen of Zelin. "You must tell me how you made those biscuits that you served my husband. I have never heard him get excited about food before, yet he did not stop praising the biscuits he ate in your home!"

The Zelin Rebbitzen answered meekly. "There was no recipe. When I heard that the Tzadik of Lelov was coming I realized that I had nothing to serve. Hashem knows that had I the means I would have made him a feast. But, alas, I could not. So I asked him to bestow His great goodness and the flavor of Gan Eden in the biscuits!" "Your prayers were answered," said the Rebbitzen of Lelov. "He said that they had the taste of Gan Eden!"

The Torah tells us that the Ark, which represents the Torah, should have a crown. When one learns Torah, he creates a crown that surrounds the Ark. The Altar, which represents service of Hashem, has a crown, too. Those who serve Hashem properly merit a crown. It is the crown of avodah.

But when it comes to the table, when it comes to the world of bread and butter, the mundane matters of life, the crown serves a different purpose. The crown of majesty turns a table into a Holy Shulchan! It guards it, surrounds it and ensconces it with an aura of spirituality that converts a simple, mundane meal into a holy feast. That crown is more than an adornment. The Torah calls it a misgeres, a guard, which turns our food from the ordinary into morsels flavored and seasoned by the Almighty.

Rabbi Shaul Kagan, of blessed memory, Rosh Kollel of Pittsburgh, disliked hearing Jews say, "I am going to a party." "Yidden don't party!" he used to exclaim. "They gather, they rejoice, and they celebrate in the boundaries of the crown of the Almighty. A royal table should not only be set. It should be crowned!"

Good Shabbos 1 2000 Rabbi Mordechai Kamenetzky

Condolences to the Bennet, Neuman, and Kest Families upon the loss of Ahron ben Yissochor Benet ob"m

Dedicated by Hedy & Ben Lipschitz and family in memory of Ruth Gleicher (Chaya) Rivka Bas HaRav Yoel o"bm Best wishes to the Berkowitz boys of Baltimore at juno.com Shiurim et al.... This Thursday Feb. 10, 2000 @ 1:30 PM a 15 minute talk at Adam Smith 101 East 52nd 29th Floor (corner Lex) "7 Adar & its significance in Jewish History" Shiur will be followed by Mincha at 1:45 Join Us at a downtown Chumash shiur given after the 4:45 Mincha / Ma'ariv Minyan at GFI, 50 Broadway NYC (5th Floor) Good Shabbos 1 1999 Rabbi Mordechai Kamenetzky Drasha is the email edition of FaxHomily which is funded on an annual basis by the Henry and Myrtle Hirsch Foundation Mordechai Kamenetzky Yeshiva of South Shore The Dr. Manfred & Jamie Lehmann Campus 1170 William Street Hewlett, NY 11557 <http://www.yoss.org/> - rmk@torah.org 516-374-7363 x114 Fax 516-374-2024 Drasha web site: <http://www.torah.org/learning/drasha> Project Genesis: Torah on the Information Superhighway learn@torah.org 17 Warren Road, Suite 2B <http://www.torah.org/>

From: RABBI JONATHAN SCHWARTZ jschwrtz@ymail.yu.edu
Subject: Internet Chaburah -- Parshas Terumah

Prologue: Things that are received are also donated. If we want to highlight someone's Tova, we would first acknowledge that which has

been donated before the perspective of that which has been received. If this is the case, why does Hashem open the Parsha with the strange request for Moshe to accept Terumah "Mai Itchem" as opposed to commanding that Terumah be donated?

Rav Zalman Sorotzkin recalled the time when he served as a shamash for Rav Chaim while the latter was still in Volozhin. It seems that Rav Chaim was sent on an emergency fund raising trip to Minsk to help ease a financial crisis the Yeshiva found itself in. Minsk was the home of two Gabbaim of the Yeshiva, Reb Boruch and Reb Dubar.

When Rav Chaim went to Reb Boruch's home and explained his crisis, Reb Boruch promised to help however he could. Rav Chaim went to learn as Reb Boruch went out to seek ways he could fulfill the financial needs of Volozhin. After a few days, half the amount was raised and within a month, the entire amount was raised by Reb Boruch. A relieved Rav Chaim returned to Volozhin.

Within a month there was a Din Torah in Volozhin between Reb Boruch and Reb Dubar. Reb Dubar complained that it was not fair that Reb Boruch had had the opportunity to save Volozhin all on his own. Until that point, the two Gabbaim had always split the Yeshiva's responsibilities and the resulting Sacher. Now, Reb Boruch had taken all of the Mitzva for himself. Upon investigation, it became apparent that not only had Reb Boruch raised the funds on his own, he had shouldered the financial responsibility on his own taking the necessary funds from his own pocket. Reb Dubar wanted to pay half the funds and split the Mitzva as usual.

Upon realizing the facts, Rav Chaim asked Reb Boruch why he had waited a full month before giving Rav Chaim the funds if he was merely planning on shouldering the responsibility on his own. Reb Boruch explained that it is not easy to donate such an expensive amount of money. One first must remove the desire for the money in his heart which Reb Boruch had done by reporting the raising of half the amount. Once the first half was successfully donated, Reb Boruch felt he could conquer his internal struggle over the full amount. Rav Sorotzkin (Oznaim L'torah) explains that this struggle explains Hashem's request to Bnei Yisroel. They were told to donate the money, but that it should be from a perspective where each and every donor worked on himself and his internal struggles to give from within his heart.

An Appealing Deal

The Mordechai (Rosh HaShanna Chap. 1 Siman 702) cites a question raised to Rabbeinu Tam concerning one who promised to donate money to a Shul. The questioner wanted to know when the individual is considered in violation of the Mitzva of Baal tiacher? Rabbeinu Tam is reported to have set the time as the moment that the Gabbai approaches the donor to make good on his pledge. If the donor refuses to give him the money, he is in violation of Baal Tiacher. Elsewhere (Mordechai to Bava Basra chap. 1 Siman 491) the Mordechai adds that when one makes a Neder to give Tzedakka to the poor, he can decide which poor he wants to give to. However, due to the saturation of worthy poor people, the problem of Baal Tiacher applies right away. One cannot state that he does not want to give to any of the poor people at a given moment for if he could, he could delay his donation forever.

Two key issues result from the Mordechai: A pledge for Tzedakka to a Shul must be given to a Gabbai and cannot be appropriated by the donor (unless stipulated as such from the appeal). Also, if one agrees to appropriate the monies on his own, he must do so immediately or be in violation of Baal Tiacher (See also Yoreh Deah 257:3 and Shach there note 8). It should be noted that Rabbeinu Tam (Tos. Rosh Hashanna 4a) is cited as being of the opposite position. Namely, he is supposed to be of the opinion that Baal Tiacher applies if there is a Gabbai but if there is no Gabbai, there will never be a problem of Baal Tiacher. How does one explain this position of Rabbeinu Tam in light of the above Mordechai?

The Ran (Rosh Hashanna) also cites the position of Rabbeinu Tam. He explains that Rabbeinu Tam was of the opinion that once the money has been given to the Gabbai, there is no Baal Tiacher if the Gabbai does not appropriate the monies immediately. However, if there is no Gabbai and the donor delays appropriating the money, then he is considered in violation of Baal Tiacher.

The Rosh (Rosh Hashanna Siman 1) complicates matters. He maintains that "It appears as if" one can set aside monies for Tzedakka to be appropriated bit by bit and the delay in releasing the funds does not constitute Baal Tiacher. This seems to be the Psak of one of the versions of Rabbeinu Tam. Why note that "it appears as if" this is the case. Is the Rosh suggesting a new chiddush?

Rav Yehuda Unterrman Ztl (Kovetz Beis HaKenesses, Vol. III) suggested that in order to understand the Sugya, one must first understand the Ran. He maintains that the Ran assumes that one who stipulates that he is going to decide how to divide up the monies is accepting the role of Gabbai upon himself. If he accepts the role and actively attempts to discharge the monies into appropriate Tzedakos, then he is acting as a trustworthy Gabbai. However, if he does not attempt to appropriate the pledged monies appropriately, he has demonstrated through his actions that he has not accepted the role of Gabbai upon himself. As a result, the rules of Baal Tiacher apply (Hence the Ran's wording of "La'sim Lev" referring to his obligation to accept the role of Gabbai Tzedakka or risk Baal Tiacher status).

The Rosh suggests a different ruling entirely. Whereas the Ran (and Rabbeinu Tam) seem to discuss the donor's role as a Gabbai, the Rosh suggests that it also his right as a donor to determine how much he wants to give and in what increments. The one stipulation is that he must make this condition while taking his pledge.

Rav Untermann suggests that a Nafka Mina between the Rosh and the Rabbeinu Tam would be in a situation where the appeal and pledge were for Tzedakka institutions. According to the Ran's understanding of Rabbeinu Tam, where the donor adopts the position of a Gabbai, this logic would not apply to institutions because they already have their set staff of Gabbaim. As a result, one must appropriate the monies to them immediately or risk violating Baal Tiacher. The Rosh holds that as a donor the right exists for the individual to space his donation into acceptable increments preventing Baal Tiacher even on the institutional level.

Hence we can understand why the Rosh does not cite the Rabbeinu Tam as the source of his Psak. The Rosh assumed that Rabbeinu Tam's exit from the issue of Baal Tiacher came as a result of the donor assuming the role of the Gabbai as well. The Rosh felt that this was unnecessary for even as a donor the Donor can agree to delay his payments provided that this is his stipulation from the beginning. Baltimore, MD 21208 (410) 602-1350 FAX: 510-1053

From: Mordecai Kornfeld [SMTP: kornfeld@netvision.net.il]
INSIGHTS INTO THE DAILY DAF brought to you by Kollel Iyun Hadaf of
Yerushalayim daf@dafyomi.co.il, http://www.dafyomi.co.il YEVAMOS 61-65
- Ari Kornfeld has generously sponsored the Dafyomi publications for these Dafim
for the benefit of Klal Yisrael. Help D.A.F. continue to bring the Daf to thousands!
Send donations to 140-32 69 Avenue, Flushing NY 11367, USA Free gift to our
donors -- D.A.F.'s unique "Rishonim" bookmark

Yevamos 65b LYING FOR PEACE QUESTION: Rebbi Illa'i teaches that it is permitted to alter the truth for the sake of peace, as he derives from the conduct of the brothers of Yosef, who told him that their father had commanded before his death that Yosef forgive them (when their father did not actually make such a statement). Rebbi Nasan asserts that it is a Mitzvah to alter the truth for the sake of peace, as he derives from Hashem's command to Shmuel to alter the truth when speaking to Shaul and to tell him that he was on his way to sacrifice a Korban to Hashem (when he was really on his way to coronate David ha'Melech). D'Vei Rebbi Yishmael adds that "great is peace, because even Hashem altered the truth

for the sake of peace." He derives this from Hashem's statement to Avraham Avinu concerning what Sarah said when she was informed that she would have a child. Hashem told Avraham (Bereishis 18:13) that she said, "Can I really have a child! But I have become old!" In truth, though, she said, "My husband is old!" Hashem altered her words when relating them to Avraham in order not to cause them to quarrel.

How do we see from there that Hashem changed her statement for the sake of peace? There were actually two parts to Sarah's statement (Bereishis 18:12): first, she said, "After I have become old, how could I become youthful again," and second, she added, "And my husband is old!" When Hashem quoted her as having said, "I have become old," perhaps Hashem was quoting the first part of her statement ("after I have become old, how could I become youthful again") and thus he was not changing her words at all!

ANSWERS: (a) The MIZRACHI explains that in her statement, Sarah was not wondering how she could regain her youth. Rather, she was making a declarative statement, saying that, "After I have become old, *I have become youthful again*," since she indeed experienced a rejuvenation of her womanly attributes, as Rashi there explains. She wondered that "even though I have regained my youth, how can my husband have children -- he is old!" Thus, when Hashem told Avraham that she wondered because *she* was old, He indeed was changing her statement.

(b) Rashi on the verse and other Rishonim, however, do explain that Sarah was asking wondering how she could return to her youth after being old. The MAHARSHA answers that, nevertheless, when Hashem quoted Sarah, he obviously was quoting the second part of her statement that "my husband is old" ("Adoni Zaken") because Hashem used a parallel phrase ("Ani Zakanti" -- and not the word "Belosi" that Sarah used when referring to herself). Therefore, He was indeed changing what she said.

(c) The RAMBAN there explains that when Hashem changed what she said, it means that instead of informing Avraham of both parts of her statement, instead He only told him one part (that *she* was old). This is also the explanation given by the CHAFETZ CHAIM (Hilchos Rechilus, Be'er Mayim Chaim 1:14), who adds that although Hashem did not actually change Sarah's statement but He merely omitted part of it, it is permitted to even misquote and change a statement, as the Gemara learns from what the brothers of Yosef told him.

This distinction might answer a number of questions. Rebbi Illa'i said that it is *permitted* to alter the truth for the sake of peace, quoting the brothers of Yosef. Why, then, did Rebbi Nasan say that it is a *Mitzvah* and bring proof from Shmuel?

Furthermore, the ARUCH LA'NER asks how can it be a Mitzvah to lie? We can understand that the Torah might permit it under certain circumstances, but how can it be a *Mitzvah*? On the contrary, the Torah says that a person should distance himself from lying ("mi'Devor Sheker Tirchak").

Finally, the OR HA'CHAIM asks how it is possible to say that Hashem, whose essence is "Emes," truth, told a Navi something that is not true?

The answer might be that there are two types of altering the truth for the sake of peace. The first manner is to say an outright lie. When a person actually lies for the sake of peace, it is only *permitted* to do so, but there is no obligation or Mitzvah to do so. The example of this is the case of the brothers of Yosef. It cannot be a Mitzvah, because the Torah tells us clearly that one may not lie. We never find Hashem altering the truth in such a way, even for the sake of peace.

There is a second manner of altering the truth for the sake of peace, which the Gemara calls a Mitzvah. That is the way that Hashem altered the truth when He quoted Sarah, and when He told Shmuel what to say to Shaul. In those cases, Hashem did not say an untruth; rather, He said a true statement that was left open for misinterpretation. When He spoke to Avraham, He merely omitted part of Sarah's statement. When He spoke to Shmuel, He was not telling him to lie, because Shmuel really did go to bring a Korban. This manner of altering the truth for the sake of peace is what the Gemara calls a Mitzvah. (SALMAS CHAIM #485 and the Taz in DIVREI DAVID, Bereishis 18:15)

(d) Others (ANAF YOSEF on Bava Metzria 23b and ARUCH LA'NER here) explain that the Gemara says only that it is "Mutar *I'Shanos*" ("to change") for the sake of peace; it does not say "Mutar *I'Shaker*" ("to lie"). They write that not only when Hashem quoted Sarah did He not say an actual lie, but even when the brothers misquoted their father to Yosef, they did not lie outright. The Aruch la'Ner explains that the brothers did not say to Yosef openly that their father had told them to tell Yosef to forgive them. Rather, they told him (via messengers) what their father had said before his death (unrelated to their sin against Yosef), and then they added on their own that *the messengers* should ask Yosef to forgive them. When they said, "Your father commanded, saying" -- "Avicha Tzivah Leimor," that was the end of their quote of their father; they were saying that Yakov had expressed his final will and testament. Then, the brothers added on

their own to their messengers, "So shall you say to Yosef...." They did not tell their messengers to say that their father had said it, but rather they said it in a way that would mislead the messengers into thinking that it was their father who said it.

However, SEFER DIVREI SHALOM (4:38) rejects this based on the Gemara in Beitza (20a), which relates that Hillel once brought a male animal to the Beis ha'Mikdash on Yom Tov to be offered as a Korban Olah, contrary to the opinion of Beis Shamai who held that an Olah may not be offered on Yom Tov. When students of Shamai confronted Hillel, he told them that the animal was female and that he was bringing it as a Korban Shelamim. Rashi explains that Hillel altered the truth, in his great humility, for the sake of peace. It is clear from here that it is permitted to say even an outright lie for the sake of peace.

WHEN LYING FOR PEACE IS PROHIBITED QUESTION: The Gemara tells us that it is permitted to lie or to alter the truth in order to maintain peace. Earlier (63a), we were told that when Rav would send a request to his wife via his son Chiya, Chiya would reverse Rav's requests because he knew that his mother would do the opposite of whatever Rav requested. When Rav found out about this he told his son to stop doing this, because it is improper to train oneself to lie. Why did Rav stop him, if our Gemara says that it is permitted to lie in order to maintain peace?

ANSWERS: (a) The ME'IRI answers that in the case of Rav, the peace of the home was not at stake. Rav never became angry when his wife did not fulfill his requests and he was entirely forgiving. Therefore it was not necessary for his son to lie for the sake of peace.

(b) The SEFER CHASIDIM (#426) writes that when the Chachamim permitted lying, they did so only when it is necessary to lie in order to correct a situation *that has already arisen* which can potentially lead to strife. One may alter the truth in order to avoid the quarrel. Lying in such a situation is considered to be fixing something that happened already, and it is permitted. In contrast, to lie about something in the future, such as what a person will or should do, is prohibited.

RAV RE'UVEN MARGULIOS, in his footnotes, cites the DIVREI SHAUL (Yevamos, here) and MAHARI ASAD (YD #316) who explain the logic of this distinction. Where the situation has already arisen, one may lie because it will not give him any reinforcement to lie again in the future; he is lying only to correct a situation that already arose, so he will only lie if such a situation arises again. He will not learn that it is permitted to lie all the time. In contrast, if a person lies about the future, he will get into the habit of lying about what will happen in the future and get used to it, since he can constantly find excuses for lying about his plans "to avoid strife.

The YAM SHEL SHLOMO (here) uses a similar distinction to explain why Rav told his son not to lie. He explains that in the cases cited by the Gemara, the situation that could cause strife was already in existence. In the case of Rav's wife, though, his wife had not yet mishandled his present request. His son was lying in order to prevent strife between his mother and father from arising when the situation for that strife had not yet arisen. Lying under such circumstances is not permitted.

For information on joining the Kollel's free Dafyomi mailing lists, write to info@dafyomi.co.il, or visit us at <http://www.dafyomi.co.il> Tel(IL):02-652-2633 -- Off(IL):02-651-5004 -- Fax(US):603-737-5728

From: Ohr Somayach[SMTP:ohr@virtual.co.il]
The Weekly Daf #311 Yevamos 69 - 75 By RABBI MENDEL WEINBACH,
Dean, Ohr Somayach Institutions

A Forty-Year Lapse When the Torah relates that the Children of Israel offered a korban Pesach (Passover Sacrifice) a year after their exodus from Egypt, it is to be understood as criticism rather than praise, say our Sages (Sifri Bamidbar 9), because it was the only one offered during their 40 years in the wilderness.

The reason they did not offer these sacrifices is that they did not perform circumcision on the children born in the wilderness, and an uncircumcised child disqualifies his father from offering a korban Pesach. But why, asks the gemara, did they not perform circumcision until they reached Eretz Yisrael some 40 years later? Two reasons are given in response. One is that the strain of traveling presented a danger to the life of a newly circumcised child. Another is that the northern wind necessary for allowing the healing rays of the sun to shine upon them did not blow during the day during all those years, so that it was dangerous to perform circumcision. If so, asks Tosefot, why was the nation criticized for not performing circumcision, since they were helpless to do so? Even if we explain the criticism on the grounds that they brought upon themselves the prolonged journey in the wilderness through the sin of the spies, they should not have been disqualified from offering a korban Pesach. Just as a child who has not

reached eight days of age does not disqualify his father from the korban Pesach, as he is not yet ready for circumcision and his father is helpless in this regard, so too, asks Tosefot, the helplessness of Jews in the wilderness to perform circumcision for medical reasons should not be a disqualifier. A response to the challenge of Tosefot has been provided by the commentaries. There is a sharp distinction between the status of a child not yet old enough for circumcision and one who is of age but incapable of undergoing circumcision for medical reasons. The former is not considered an uncircumcised "arel," because the mitzvah of milah is not yet incumbent on him. He therefore cannot disqualify his father because of being an "arel." The latter category, however, is considered an "arel" because the mitzvah is there, and the helplessness to perform it does not change that status. It may be compared to the classical "arel" mentioned at the outset of our perek - one who did not undergo circumcision because the death of his brothers through circumcision indicate a family weakness which presents a danger to life. * Yevamos 72a